UCLA
Issues in Applied Linguistics

Title
Applying Sociocultural Theory to an Analysis of Learner Discourse: Learner-Learner Collaborative Interaction in the Zone of Proximal Development

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0zs5j7ps

Journal
Issues in Applied Linguistics, 6(2)

ISSN
1050-4273

Author
Ohta, Amy Snyder

Publication Date
1995-12-31

DOI
10.5070/L462005219

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

Applying Sociocultural Theory to an Analysis of Learner Discourse: Learner-Learner Collaborative Interaction in the Zone of Proximal Development

Amy Snyder Ohta
University of Washington

SLA research in the tradition of sociocultural theory examines the dynamic relationship between interaction and acquisition, exploring how language, cognition, and culture are acquired through collaborative interaction. This paper presents an analysis of teacher-fronted and pair interaction involving two learners of Japanese in an intermediate language class, showing learner-learner collaborative activity between two students of differing levels of proficiency to result in creative interaction where scaffolding creates a positive environment for L2 acquisition. Learner use of Japanese in pair work is strikingly different from that in teacher-fronted practice, with learners becoming highly interactive and using the L2 for a variety of purposes, including 1) hypothesis-testing through language play, 2) talk about the here-and-now, 3) lexical experimentation, 4) modulating the pace of interaction, 5) repair, 6) negotiating roles 7) managing tasks, and 8) humor. Contribution of learner strengths and weaknesses results in refinement of both learners' L2 use, with both students learning and progressing through collaborative interaction in the zone of proximal development (ZPD).

INTRODUCTION

This paper presents the results of a qualitative case study of teacher-fronted and pair work interaction involving two intermediate[1] learners of Japanese, investigating how L2 development is constituted by learners in these contexts. Analysis reveals how collaborative interaction in a learner-learner role play task results in increased accuracy in L2 use, and provides evidence that not only can a learner with weaker L2 skills benefit by working with a more advanced learner, but that the more advanced learner can also benefit from interaction with a learner less proficient in the L2 as learner strengths are collaboratively joined. These results support the importance of cooperative learning opportunities as providing a place for L2 acquisition for learners in the zone of proximal development (ZPD).

Issues in Applied Linguistics
© Regents of the University of California
ISSN 1050-4273
Vol. 6 No. 2 1995 93-121

THEORETICAL ISSUES IN EXAMINING LEARNER-LEARNER INTERACTION

Sociocultural Theory and SLA

Sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978; Newman & Holzman, 1993; Lantolf, 1994) provides a window into language acquisition that is useful in considering the relationship between social interaction and language development. Sociocultural theory is radically different from other psycholinguistic and SLA theories in that social settings and psycholinguistic processes are not considered to be separate phenomenon, but processes which mutually constitute one another. For SLA researchers working within a sociocultural theoretical framework, second language acquisition research methodology is based upon the understanding that socialization and language acquisition cannot be separated from the interactive linguistic contexts in which they occur. Vygotskian psychologists Newman & Holzman (1993) have noted the "contradictory nature" of language development which arises from the fact that language development and interaction are interwoven into a single fabric of human development:

> The contradictory nature of language development is that the process of becoming a language user—by and large, the process of participating in societally determined fixed verbal intercourse . . .—occurs through the child's manifest ability to make meaning. (p. 87-88)

For L2 learners as well, this relationship between acquisition and speaking holds—L2 development progresses through the process of social interaction where the learner is an active participant in the meaning-making process through which the learner acquires the L2.[2] New research in SLA on language play (Lantolf, 1995; Coughlan, this volume) supports the importance of participating in meaning-making activity. For example, participation in conversation practice has a greater impact on SLA processes as evidenced through subsequent language play than do classroom drills, L2 reading, or studying grammar (Lantolf, 1995).

Previous Studies of Learner Interaction

The dominant theories of L2 acquisition do not acknowledge the constitutive relationship between language development and social interaction, but view the L2 which the learner encounters as *input*. Research done in this vein focuses upon learner negotiation, which consists of linguistic and interactional strategies learners have been shown to use to achieve modified input that is easier to understand. Negotiation strategies studied include clarification requests and comprehension checks used by learners, and the resulting simplified input is posited to function as *intake* for acquisition of the L2 (Pica, 1994; Long, 1985; Varonis & Gass, 1982). This view sees acquisition processes as linear—input is negotiated and becomes intake for SLA. Krashen's Input Hypothesis (1985) argues that L2 acquisition takes place as learners comprehend input that is slightly beyond their own level of development. This work has inspired a series of studies on input such as those cited above, which show that learners have higher comprehension of input when they have the opportunity to interact with the person providing that input. For example, when comparing comprehension of unmodified input, input modified to be easier to understand (containing redundancy and syntactic simplification, for example), and 'negotiated' input in which the learner may freely interact with his or her interlocutor, comprehension has been shown to be highest under the 'negotiated input' condition (Pica, 1987; Chaudron, 1983). In these studies, language is viewed as separate from its sociocultural context, as a culturally and affectively neutral bearer of propositional content.[3] While these studies do indicate the importance of interaction in SLA, they tend to utilize experimental settings, with 'interaction' being what occurs during completion of experimental tasks assigned by the researcher; interaction is considered in terms of negotiation of input, and is seen as important because it facilitates comprehension of input (see Pica, 1994 for a review of this research).

Recently, however, there has been growing interest in SLA circles in the impact of peer interaction on classroom L2 acquisition, with studies being done which compare learner language generated by pair interactive tasks with that occurring during teacher-fronted activities (Pica & Doughty, 1986; Roberts,[4] 1995; Deen, 1991). Through quantitative analyses of learner language, Pica & Doughty, Roberts, and Deen find that language in learner-learner interaction is either more grammatical (Deen, 1991; Roberts, 1995) or less grammatical (Pica & Doughty, 1986) than that in teacher-fronted activities. All three studies report that learners have more opportunities both to speak and to negotiate in peer interactive settings, and note that learner-learner interaction affords more opportunity for self- and other-correction than does teacher-fronted activity. Qualitative analysis (Deen, 1991; Roberts, 1995) shows learners supporting each other through corrective feedback. This classroom research reveals the potential of learner-learner interactive activity for promoting L2 acquisition. However, because language and interaction are not viewed as revealing learner cognitive processes, this work does not investigate learner language for evidence of how L2 development proceeds through and is constituted by meaning-making activity (Hall & Brooks, 1995).

A Sociocultural Approach to Learner-Learner Interaction

Research in the tradition of sociocultural theory approaches learner-learner interaction from a different perspective. When applied to second language acquisition, sociocultural theory reveals the richness of learner language and provides a window into how language is acquired through collaborative interaction (Donato, 1988; 1994). Studies utilizing a sociocultural framework have examined cooperative learning (Slavin, 1984; 1991), an approach to learning believed to be beneficial to L2 acquisition (McGroarty, 1989; Bejarano, 1987; McGuire, 1992; Milleret, 1992; Freeman, 1993). Results reveal how cooperative learning activities allow learners to incorporate their own cultural and social identities into academic tasks in a way that supports the acquisition of the L2 (Duran & Szymanski, 1993; 1995). When the framework of sociocultural theory is utilized in research on L2 interaction, analysis moves beyond properties of individual learner language to examination of the creation of context, construction of task, coordination of goals, affective variables, learner cognition, and learner collaboration in order to better understand how learners socially construct the shared understandings through which language is acquired (Brooks & Donato, 1995; Duff & Coughlan, 1994; Lantolf, 1995). The present paper is situated within this research paradigm, and contributes to our understanding of classroom language learning processes through its examination of learner-learner interaction from a sociocultural perspective, regarding social interaction and SLA as mutually constituting one another, with language development proceeding through an active process of L2 use for meaning-making in interaction as learners support each other collaboratively.

The Zone of Proximal Development in SLA

The zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1987; Newman & Holzman, 1993) is the interactively constituted social and cognitive place where language development occurs as learners participate in meaning-making activities with others—where language learning is a process of discovery-in-use. The ZPD as defined by Vygotsky (1978) is

> the difference between the child's developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the higher level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers (p. 86).

While developed to examine the cognitive development[5] of children, the conception of the ZPD is useful for analysis of SLA processes as well. For SLA purposes, I would like to conceptualize the ZPD as the difference between the L2 learner's developmental level as determined by independent language use, and the higher level of potential development as determined by how language is used in collaboration with a more capable interlocutor. Considered from the perspective of the ZPD, L2 learner-learner interaction is not simply a place for negotiation of meaning, but for collaborative construction of and engagement in activities between novice and expert—these are the very activities which constitute learning. L2 acquisition takes place as the gap between what the learner can do alone and with assistance is filled through collaboration. Researchers working with the ZPD have called this assistance *scaffolding* (Wood et. al., 1976; Clay & Cazden, 1990; Rogoff & Gardner, 1984). Donato (1994), has described how scaffolding takes place when learners do small-group interactive planning tasks. In his analysis, the locus of scaffolding can not be attributed to any one group member. Instead, the group of learners working together create a collaborative scaffold as the learners contribute their strengths to problem-solving activity.

Rather than analyzing learner language for evidence of negotiation of propositional content, examining learner interaction in the ZPD provides a richer view of L2 development, allowing the researcher to examine what learners are able to do with language and how language development occurs in turn by turn interaction. This view takes into account the importance of meaning making output (Swain,1993; 1995) for L2 acquisition. Language acquisition cannot be separated from the making of meaning which constitutes social interaction.

Opportunities for learners to participate in learner-learner interaction are increasing in the L2 classroom, with teachers being encouraged to increase the use of pair and group work in the classroom (Kramsch, 1987; Rivers, 1987; Long & Porter, 1985). Group and pair work provide learners the opportunity to engage in meaningful interaction, and to link L2 meanings to social context as they are given the opportunity to create with language in given contexts. Unlike NS-NNS[6] interaction in which there is a clear expert,[7] the roles of novice and expert are fluid and changing in learner-learner interaction as the learners contribute their individual differences in matured and maturing skills. Additionally, the learners' potential for accomplishments beyond their individual abilities increases when their strengths are collaboratively joined.

Language Socialization Theory and L2 Development

Language Socialization Theory applies sociocultural theory and the notion of activity (Leontiev 1981) in examining the cultural and linguistic development of children, focusing upon the importance of expert-novice interaction as children are socialized through language to become members of their communities (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984; 1986). While developed to examine how children acquire their L1, Language Socialization Theory has recently been applied to L2 classroom contexts as well (Hall, 1995; Poole, 1992; Ohta, 1993; 1994; 1995a; 1995b). In first-language acquisition contexts, experts socialize novices to use language to create culturally appropriate meanings, with this socialization taking place through the use of the language being acquired (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984). The novice is not a passive recipient of knowledge (Ochs, 1990), but an active co-constructor of shared understandings in interaction with both cultural experts and peers. Through the discursive process of expert-novice interaction, novices develop sociocultural competence by establishing links between language and social context in turn by turn interaction, with the novice being guided through the interaction itself into culturally appropriate social norms of language use.

Like first language acquisition, SLA is embedded in richly social contexts of human interaction. Research in the area of second language acquisition is beginning to take social context and interactional goals into account when examining L2 acquisition processes. However, the context of L2 acquisition may differ drastically from that experienced by children acquiring their L1. When SLA occurs in a classroom context, L2 learners have little opportunity for interaction with target natives or near-natives in natural contexts (Hall, 1995; Ohta, 1993; 1994), and are at risk of being socialized into interactive styles inappropriate for communication within the L2 community. For example, in classrooms learner participation in interaction is often restricted to the 'response' turn of the IRF[8] (Initiation/Response/Follow-up) elicitation activity (Ohta, 1993; 1994; 1995a; Mehan, 1985). This pattern of interaction has little value in preparing learners to interact in the real world, not only because learners are limited to being 'responders,' but also because the question/answer style IRF-dominated classroom discourse little resembles natural conversation (Hall, 1995; Ohta, 1993; 1994; 1995a; 1995b). In addition, in the traditional teacher-fronted classroom, classroom roles are defined by the teacher with learners generally unable to use the L2 in ways they will need outside of the classroom—to negotiate their own roles, manage their own activities, collaborate with others, or to use their emerging language skills for conversation not structured by teacher or textbook. In some Japanese classrooms learner language is rigidly controlled with the goals of reducing learner errors and creating links between language and social context (Jorden & Noda, 1987; Roberts, 1995). However, reports of increases in language play[9] following conversation practice as compared to controlled drills (Lantolf, 1995) provide evidence that rigid control of learner language may not be as productive for L2 acquisition as activities where learners are freer to use the L2 for creative meaning making.

A STUDY OF SITUATED CLASSROOM INTERACTION

The purpose of the present research is to learn more about how SLA occurs through learner participation in interactive classroom contexts. Analysis of teacher-fronted and pair work interaction in a natural classroom setting provides evidence of how pair work functions in the L2 acquisition of two learners. Building on Donato (1994) who expands the notion of scaffolding to collaborative learning in groups, this paper examines how scaffolding occurs in a learner-learner pair, specifically inquiring as to how scaffolding might function in pair activity between learners with differing levels of L2 proficiency.

In classrooms where pair work is used, expert-novice roles are at first clearly defined, as the teacher-expert sets up the pair activity, exercising control over the classroom interaction in a teacher-fronted setting. The teacher creates the context and task design, and exercises a level of control over the appropriateness of the language being produced when the learners work in pairs. Once pair work actually begins, however, another set of classroom roles comes into being. Within the individual pairs new roles must be co-constructed by the learners themselves through language in turn-by-turn interaction, with the roles created depending upon personalities and language proficiencies of the pair members as well as any roles defined for use within the particular task. The teacher remains in the role of teacher-expert, but the role changes subtly as the teacher ceases to be the allocator of turns, and gives a measure of control over to the learners. The teacher takes on a new, support role, moving about the classroom offering assistance to pairs.

The Data

The present data consist of video and audio-recordings of a 100-minute second-year university-level Japanese class at an urban American state university. There were seven students enrolled in the course, with six present the day of data collection. The video camera was positioned to record learner interaction and activity, with microphones for audio recording attached to the video camera at the front of the classroom and to Becky, a student volunteer. Clipping a microphone to Becky enabled collection of interaction during pair work. The teacher taught her class as usual, and did not revise her planned activities or methodology for the purposes of the research being conducted. Pair work was incorporated into classes on a daily basis, with learner pairings varying from day to day, and sometimes from activity to activity, with the result that each learner had the opportunity to work with all other class members. On the date of data collection, teacher was instructed to pair learners as she usually did. Prior to the class, one learner indicated that due to the data collection process he did not want to be paired with Becky. The teacher respected this learner's wish when she formed pairs.

Analysis

Analysis focuses on an instructional sequence consisting of a pair role play activity and the teacher-fronted activities which introduced and followed it (about 30 consecutive minutes of classroom activity). The activity was transcribed for analysis with reference to audio recordings of data collected via Becky's microphone as well as video recordings of the entire class. The focus of instruction during this sequence was the teaching of polite requests through teacher-fronted and role play activities. Analysis focused on the role of scaffolding in classroom interaction, specifically looking at the following: 1) how setting (teacher-fronted work or pair work) and interlocutor (teacher or another learner) impact learner language use; 2) the occurrence of peer scaffolding and its functions; 3) the function of Japanese used in pair work; 4) how errors are handled; 5) the construction of novice-expert roles in learner-learner interaction; and 6) any learner gains which might result from interaction with a peer.

Analysis of the data focuses upon Becky (age 20) and Mark (age 27), Becky's partner for the role play activity. The particular pairing of Becky and Mark provided the opportunity to examine how collaboration and scaffolding function in an asymmetrical pairing of a learner with weaker language skills (Mark) with a learner of higher L2 proficiency (Becky). Observations of Becky and Mark's classes as well as interviews in Japanese between both learners and the researcher[10] reveal that these two learners are very different in terms of what they can do with Japanese. While Becky actively experiments with Japanese and is able to express herself in the L2 at a level that might be expected from a second year student, Mark's progress is slower. Having taken a year off between first and second year Japanese, Mark struggles not only to put together sentences, but even to recall basic lexical items. Becky expresses herself with fluency, while Mark struggles with words.

Mark & Becky's Language Use in Teacher-Fronted vs. Pair Work Settings

In the present data, the teacher is teaching learners how to make polite requests using the humble verb *itadaku* in Japanese. Through creation of a situation in which a student makes a request of a teacher, the teacher provides a context for learners to make connections between the word *itadaku* and the social context it indexes: interaction with a person of higher status than the speaker. The expression taught '*te*-form verb + *itadakitai n desu ga*,' is formulaic in nature, and works as an interactional routine. The teacher begins this portion of the lesson in teacher-fronted preparation for pair work during which she introduces the target request, provides a context for using the language taught, maps out the interaction and key phrases on the blackboard and practices with the class by asking questions to be answered using the target request. During this phase, the teacher controls the allocation of turns as she asks *'Tanjoobi ni sensei ni nani o shite itadakitai desu ka'* (What would you like the teacher to do for you for your birthday?). The teacher asks learners to think of what they might like. In this first excerpt below, she directs her questions to John and Mark. Hal, another learner, actively offers his own ideas, prompting Mark to come up with something.

1)

1 T: John-san, Mark-san, nani ka arimasu ka?
John, Mark, do you have anything ((you'd like to have))?

2 M: Arimasu ka, arimasu ka? Chotto (.) ((scratching head))
Is there anything, is there anything? I'm not sure (.) ((scratching head))

3 T: Nani ka kangaete kudasai.
Please think of something.

4 H: ((to Mark)) Okane ga ii desu yo.
Money would be good.

5 T: Un.
Uh huh

6 M: iie iie iie iie iie.
No no no no no

7 T: Nan demo ii desu yo.
Anything is okay.

8 H: Tokei? Tokei?
A watch? A watch?

9 T: Tokei?
A watch?

--> 10 M: Chocolate. ((word said in English))

11 T: Chokoreeto?
Chocolate?

--> 12 H: Chokoreeto. Chokoreeto o
Chocolate. Chocolate ((topic marker))

--> 13 M: Chokoreeto o ssss um o (.) okuri?// okuri?// okutte?//
Chocolate ssss um (.) send? send? send?[11]

14 T: un. un. un.
uh huh. uh huh. uh huh.

--> 15 M: okutte itadakitai n desu ga.
Would you send me? [12]

16 T: Ii desu yo. Wakarimashita. A^ Mark-san, chokoreeto ga suki desu ka?
Sure. I understand. Oh^Mark, you like chocolate?

17 M: Hai, suki desu.
Yes, I do.

During interaction with the teacher, Mark refers to the board (where the teacher has written a model of the target request) for help with the expression he is formulating, and correctly makes a polite request of the teacher. Note Hal's prompting of Mark in line 12, where he begins to construct a request using 'chocolate,' adding the topic marker 'o' needed to make such a request. In line 13, Mark picks up on Hal's prompting, and works to formulate the request. He also comes up with the appropriate form of the verb *okuru* in line 13 on his third repetition of the verb, with the encouragement of the teacher (line 14) who accepts his first two (incorrect) formulations. Mark's participation in teacher-fronted practice is limited to these turns where he responds to initiations by the teacher and Hal.

Becky's participation in teacher-fronted practice is even more limited than Mark's. While Mark works to form a request with the help of the teacher and Hall, Becky simply answers *nandemo ii* [anything is fine].

2) 1 T: Becky-san, nani ga ii desu ka?
So Becky, what would you like?

2 B: Nandemo ii desu.
Anything is okay.

3 T: ((laughing)) Nandemo ii? Onegai shite kudasai ne::. Hai.
((laughing)) Anything? Make a request please::. Okay.

Those of us who have been students in U.S. classrooms recognize Becky's strategy as a safe response—this is part and parcel of U.S. classroom culture. As indicated by the teacher's third-turn follow-up to Becky's response, what the teacher really wants is Becky to make a request. However, she does not guide Becky to do so, and the exchange stops here. While the teacher has control of the interaction through the allocation of turns, Becky exercises her own control of the situation through a short, safe response that is appropriate to the classroom culture and succeeds in deflecting teacher attention to another learner. Becky completes her turn without any risk of error or embarrassment in front of the class, neither attempting to use the target structure nor trying to experiment with using Japanese. Both Mark and Becky's participation in teacher-fronted work is confined to the response turn. Neither uses Japanese for any other purpose than to respond to the teacher or Hal. However, they, handle the teacher-fronted portion of this activity very differently—Mark both comes up with an item he'd like to ask for (excerpt 1, line 5), and works to formulate the appropriate request targeted by the teacher (lines 8-10), while Becky works to avoid doing so.

After teacher-fronted question/answer work, the teacher sets up a role play activity and provides a context for learners to use the target request form. Learners are to play the role of 'teacher' and 'student,' with the 'student' politely asking a favor of the 'teacher' who may comply or refuse. The learners use exaggeration to create humorous content as they manipulate the culturally Japanese interactional routine which involves use of a humble form when talking to a superior.

Both Becky and Mark's use of Japanese in pair work is strikingly different from that used in teacher-fronted practice. In contrast to the teacher-fronted Q/A session shown in Excerpt 1 where Becky produced very little language, giving the safe answer *nandemo ii* [anything is fine], Becky becomes highly interactive in the role play activity. No longer on display in front of the class or locked into language production controlled by the teacher's allocation of turns, Becky and her partner Mark actively use Japanese to both regulate and perform the assigned task, injecting their own brand of humor as they go along. Even though the teacher is present during the beginning of pair role play practice before moving on to another pair, the teacher's new role as supportive 'coach' frees Becky to use much more language in this new configuration than she did when on display in front of the class. Mark, whose participation was limited to the response turn in teacher-fronted practice, uses Japanese effectively for regulatory functions (lines 1, 3, 5), as Becky takes control of the interaction by choosing her own role in line 6:

3a) 1 M: Suwatte kudasai.
Please sit down.

2 B: Hai. ((E adjusts chair)). Okay. ((looks at cameraman, laughs)) My cameraman!
Okay. ((E adjusts chair)). Okay. ((looks at cameraman, laughs)) My cameraman!

3 M: Doozo.
Go ahead.

4 B: Ano::.
Um::.

5 M: (.) Hajimete.
(.) Start.

6 B: Hai. Seito. Watash- ano:
Okay. Student. I- uh:

7 M: Anata (wa seito desu)
You (are the student)

--> 8 B: Atarashii kuruma o kashite itadakitai desu ga. ((laughs))
I would like you to lend me a new car. ((laughs))

Notice that rather than avoiding using the new language being taught as she did during teacher-fronted practice, Becky chooses her own role in line 6, selecting the more difficult role of 'student' where production of the target utterance is required. And, the language which Becky succinctly avoided using by answering *nandemo ii* in the first excerpt, she produces here in line 8. The contrast between these two excerpts suggests that the one-on-one environment with another learner is quite different for Becky than the teacher-fronted environment where Becky must perform in front of others.[13]

While his participation was limited to the response turn in teacher-fronted practice, in pair work Mark uses Japanese to regulate the activity, asking Becky to sit down (line 1) and get started (lines 3 & 5) in Japanese. After Becky selects her own role for the role play (line 6), Mark confirms her role (line 7). In one-on-one interaction with Becky, Mark uses Japanese for a practical purpose in setting up the role play activity, without help from the teacher, blackboard, or fellow learner.

Mark's Repair Initiation

In order to do the role play activity, Mark as 'teacher' has to understand what Becky says and respond appropriately. He has difficulty understanding the word *atarashii* [new] in Becky's line 8 utterance (shown above in 3a and repeated below in excerpt 3b), and checks his comprehension with a Next-Turn Repair Initiator (NTRI) (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks 1977) in line 9 by saying *ashita* [tomorrow], which he has clearly confused with *atarashii*. Mark's NTRI has a profound impact on Becky's language. In line 10, Becky rephrases her utterance. In her rephrasing she does not do a mere repetition, but also corrects a lexical error, replacing *kashite* [lend] with *katte* [buy], and increases the syntactic complexity of her request by adding 'n'[14] after 'itadaku,' a revision that makes her request like the target requests modeled by the teacher. Mark shows his understanding in line 11.

3b) 8 B: Atarashii kuruma o kashite itadakitai desu ga. ((laughs))
I would like you to lend me a new car. ((laughs))

9 M: Ashita?
Tomorrow? ((note, similarity of sound in the words 'atarashii' [new] and 'ashita' [tomorrow]))

--> 10 B: Atarashii kuruma o: katte itadaki-itadakitai n desu ga,
I wou- would like you to buy me a new car.

11 M: Aa! Atara- atarashi-
Oh! N- new-

While neither Becky's lexical error (using *kashite* instead of *katte*) nor her use of a simplified structure (with *'n'* deleted) were the trouble-sources for Mark, in her repetition she changes both. Mark's NTRI results in a refined restatement by Becky that is both grammatically more complex and corrects a lexical error, both without any assistance from the teacher who is standing by. Becky actively experiments with the language and corrects herself. In addition, her re-statement results in Mark's comprehension of the word *atarashii*, as he indicates in line 11.

Expert-Novice Roles in Excerpts 3a-c

While Becky is in the 'expert' role in her interaction with Mark, having chosen her own role and taken the lead in this interaction after Mark prompts her to begin 3a, so far, she is simultaneously still in the role of 'novice' under the watchful eye of the teacher-expert who is standing by and listening to their pair work. In excerpt 3c, after Becky self-corrects her lexical error, in line 12 she checks with the teacher to see if what she thought was an error was really wrong. And, discovering that her correction was accurate, Becky repeats the verb phrase in line 14. Mark confirms his understanding of *atarashii* with another NTRI in line 15 , and in response Becky repeats her entire request once again with ease and fluency.

3c) --> 12 B: Kashite? Kashite de ii?
Lend? Is 'lend' okay? ((note phonetic similarity between 'kashite' [lend] and 'katte' [buy]))

13 T: Katte.
Buy.

14 B: Katte? Katte itadakitai n desu ga,
Buy? I'd like you to buy.

15 M: Atara- atarashii?
N- new?

16 B: Atarashii ku//ruma o katte itadakitai n desu ga,
I'd like you to buy me a new car.

Finally, Mark shows comprehension and responds to Becky's request in line 17.

3d) 17 M: Aa soo desu ka. Aa, sore wa chotto.
Oh, is that right. Well, that's a little . . . ((note: this answer is an indirect refusal))

Excerpts 3(a-d) reveal a shifting of expert-novice roles between learners and teacher. Mark takes the lead in the interaction initially by prompting Becky to get started. Becky then chooses her own role, the more difficult role of 'student,' and acts as expert, repeating her utterance for Mark, the novice who is having difficulty understanding what she says. However, at the same time Becky acts as expert, she is also still a novice who consults the teacher to confirm her lexical choice.

Collaborative Learning in Pair Work

The data reveal that both Becky and Mark are able to learn and progress through collaborative meaning-making activity in Japanese. Not only do we see Becky, the learner with stronger language skills, assisting Mark by repeating herself so he can understand her, but these data reveal that even though Mark's skills are weaker than Becky's, Becky learns through working with him. Collaborative pair work with Mark allows Becky to experiment with and refine her own language use and play with the target utterance until she is able to say it with fluency and ease. Both of these learners are learning within their zones of proximal development in this mutually beneficial interaction. Mark, in his difficulty in understanding Becky, produces NTRIs which result in Becky's use of more refined, fluent language. Mark's successful use of NTRIs also aids in his own understanding. Modifications in Becky's language as a result of Mark's NTRIs, however, result in increased linguistic complexity, not simplicity. The lexical adjustment made is also not one in the direction of simplicity, but is a self-correction by Becky, and completely changes the meaning of the utterance. The results of negotiation (Pica, 1987; Chaudron, 1983), therefore, are not as clear-cut as previous research implies, but it is clear that Mark's NTRIs have an important function both in engaging him in the activity and allowing Becky the opportunity to correct herself and restate her utterance.

Peer Scaffolding

While the notion of scaffolding is generally used when considering dyadic interaction between a novice and a teacher or native speaker, peer interaction between Becky and Mark results in a higher level of performance than may have been attained by either learner working alone. One way that this occurs is through prompting and correcting of each other. In Mark and Becky's second pass through the activity, Becky takes an active role in supporting Mark's language production.

4) 1 B: Doozo
Go ahead.

2 M: Um. Um::::. Mmm:: Ah! (.) ((laughs))

3 B: Hai do::::zooo:! Hayaku!
Okay, go ahead ple::ase! Hurry!

4 M: Seko. Seko no. Seko no:: Seko no tokei ga:: (.) a::h um.
Seiko. A seiko. A seiko:: a seiko watch:: (.) a::h um.

--> 5 B: Ka::

6 M: Katte? itadakitai n desu ga?
Buy? I'd like you to buy?

7 B: Ha soo. Ii desu yo::.
Oh. Sure, that's fine::.

Here, Mark takes the role of 'student,' prompted by Becky's *'doozo'* in line 1. When he hesitates (line 2), Becky prompts him to hurry up in line 3. Mark haltingly begins in line 4, managing to get out the object of the sentence, a seiko watch, with false starts and repetitions. Becky helps Mark by giving him the first syllable of the verb in line 5, *'ka'*—she stretches out the vowel, prompting Mark to continue. This help functions as scaffolding, assistance he needs to participate in the activity. In line 6, Mark produces the second half of the utterance. Becky shows acceptance of his utterance by accepting his request. Another example of one learner providing scaffolding to another occurs in Excerpt 1, repeated in part below, where Hal not only prods Mark with his own ideas of possible presents (lines 4 & 8), but also prompts him to make a request by providing the object and object marker (line 12) Mark needs to get the request started.

1) 1 T: John-san, Mark-san, nani ka arimasu ka?
John, Mark, do you have anything ((you'd like to have))?

2 M: Arimasu ka, arimasu ka? Chotto (.) ((scratching head))
Is there anything, is there anything? I'm not sure (.)

3 T: Nani ka kangaete kudasai.
Please think of something.

--> 4 H: ((to Mark)) Okane ga ii desu yo.
Money would be good.

5 T: Un.
Uh huh

6 M: iie iie iie iie iie.
No no no no no

7 T: Nan demo ii desu yo.
Anything is okay.

--> 8 H: Tokei? Tokei?
A watch? A watch?

9 T: Tokei?
A watch?

10 M: Chocolate.

11 T: Chokoreeto?
Chocolate?

--> 12 H: Chokoreeto. Chokoreeto o
Chocolate. Chocolate ((topic marker))

13 M: Chokoreeto o ssss um o (.) okuri?// okuri?// okutte?//
Chocolate ssss um (.) send? send? send?

These data show how interaction with a more competent peer can help the learner to develop within the ZPD, the space where the novice is able to do something with assistance that s/he would have otherwise been unable to do alone. Becky & Hal's prompting provide Mark with help he needs to produce all parts of the target utterance.

Peer Correction

In the ZPD, learners gain socially situated language competence through collaborative joining of each others' strengths. The data show how this collaboration draws upon the matured skills of each learner, regardless of each learner's level of overall language development. In other words, any peer with mature skills to contribute becomes an expert. Even a peer who is weaker overall is expert when his or her strengths are contributed to help another learner. Analysis of the data reveal that not only is Becky (who is more skilled in the L2 overall) able to provide scaffolding for Mark, but (as will be shown below) Mark also aids Becky through explicit correction.

The following data are from the same pair work, but here we see Mark and Becky between passes at the role play activity. After completion of a pass through the role play, Becky begins to talk in Japanese about other things. In the next excerpt (5a), she starts talking about what Mark is wearing. She uses the wrong verb. In an NTRI in line 4, Mark repeats the verb (with rising intonation) that Becky chose. Becky repeats her utterance, pointing to Mark's vest, and repeats the incorrect verb in line 5. Mark then provides her with the correct verb in line 6, and she self-corrects in line 7.

5a) 1 B: Mark-san wa ano: besuto o (.)
Mark-san TP[15] *um: vest AC (.)*

2 gee how do you say you're wearing a-[16]

3 kitte! kitte imasu.
cut-! cutting.

4 M: Me? Kitte?
Me? Cut?

5 B: ((pointing to Mark's vest)) Besuto o kitte kitte kitte imasu.
((pointing to Mark's vest)) *You are cutting a vest.*

--> 6 M: ((fingering own vest)) Kiteimasu?
((pointing to Mark's vest)) *Wearing?*

7 B: Kiteimasu. Kiteimasu. (.)
Wearing. Wearing. (.)

Mark recognizes Becky's pronunciation error and provides her with the correct pronunciation in line 6, drawing upon his knowledge to help her. Through this interaction it is especially clear that novice and expert are fluid conceptions that vary with the differing expertise of the participants as each peer contributes his or her own strengths to the collaborative construction of the interaction (See also Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991).

Becky also provides Mark with explicit error correction. Although he was able to pronounce the verb *itadakitai* correctly both in teacher-fronted practice prior to pair work (where he referred to the blackboard in excerpt 1) and in his first attempt to do so during pair work (excerpt 4), the third time he plays the role of 'student' he has difficulty. In Excerpt 6, he incorrectly conjugates *itadakitai* in line 3, along with mispronouncing the Japanese word for 'ice skating' in line 1 (the errors are underlined). Becky asks Mark to repeat (line 4), a request that results in Mark's line 9 repetition of the grammatical error but in self-correction of his pronunciation of 'ice skating.' Mark also changes the verb he was using, from *naosu* [to repair] to *oshieru* [to teach]. It is not clear whether this is a correction (note that *naosu* and *oshieru* share certain phonetic features and that the noun *aisu sukeeto* refers to the activity of skating as well as to the ice skates themselves) or a change. In line 10 Becky then provides Mark with explicit correction of the grammatical error, and Mark corrects himself in line 11.

6) 1 M: Aisu Sukating?
Ice Skating?

2 B: Ice. Oh hai?
Ice. Oh uh-huh?

--> 3 M: Hai. (.) naoshite? (.) itadai n desu ga.
Yes. (.) repair? (.) would you repair?

--> 4 B: Moichido kudasai.
Again please?

5 M: Moichido kudasai?
Again please?

6 B: Watashi ((Cups hand behind ear)) (.) ano: (.) (yoku wakarimasen).
I don't understand well

--> 7 M: Aisu skating. Aisu suke- Aisu sukeeto//=[17]
Ice skating. Ice ska- Ice skate//=

8 B: //aisu sukeeto
//aisu sukeeto

9 M: =aisu sukeeto ga (.) um (.) um (.) oshiete? itada- itadai n desu.//
=Ice-skating (.) uh (.) uh (.) I would like to receive your teaching?

--> 10 B: //itadakitai n desu.
//I would like to receive.

--> 11 M: A^ itadakitai n desu ga?
Oh. I would like to receive?

12 B: Hai. So. Ii desu yo. Wakarimashita.
Yes. Right. Sure. I understand.

Similar to the function of Mark's earlier NTRI, Becky's request for repetition results in Mark's self-correction of a lexical error, as well as a change in lexical choice. Becky then explicitly corrects the remaining grammatical error, after which Mark repeats the correct pronunciation of the misconjugated word. Note also that we see Becky here repeating after Mark in line 8 (where she repeats Mark's line 7 use of *aisu sukeeto*), prior to her correction. Repetition is a form of language play posited to serve an important function in L2 acquisition, with learners repeating what is within their ability to acquire (Lantolf, 1995).

Peer Task Regulation: Defining the Task

In pair work, the teacher cannot regulate the progress of all pairs simultaneously, but generally monitors the learners as they engage in their activities. Different learners may define tasks differently, and use language for their own purposes within those tasks. For Becky, the assigned role play task is easy. In Excerpt 5b, below (a continuation of 5a, with line-numbering continuing to show consecutive development), Becky begins doing her own task, the task she began in 5a, that is different from the task assigned by the teacher.[18] Through this interaction, we see that for Becky, pair work becomes an opportunity for other forms of talking in Japanese. She uses Japanese to talk about the here and now—what Mark is wearing (excerpt 5a) and the camera operator (excerpt 5b, below). In both of these excerpts Becky is doing something different than what has been explicitly assigned, playing with the language in her talk about the classroom environment around her, and serving as her own conversation partner (see line 8), something perhaps more interesting (and clearly more challenging) to Becky than the assigned task at hand. She does this between passes of the assigned role play. This active use of Japanese for experimentation is important for Becky's acquisition of the L2, as well as for Mark, who through interaction with Becky has the opportunity to converse in Japanese for a natural, interactive purpose.

5b)[19] 8 B: Ano: ((looks at the camera operator)) Kanda-san wa tsukaa(.)te to omoimasu. Soo desu ne? Hai.
Um Mr. Kanda is tiring I think. He is, isn't he? Yes.

9 M: Hai?
Yes?

10 B: Tsuka- (.) tsukarete.[20]
Tir- (.) tiring.

11 M: Tsukarete.
Tiring

12 B: Tsukarete to (.) tsukarete to omoimasu.
I think he's (.) tiring.

13 M: ((looks at Mr. Kanda. Nods))

14 E: ((laughing)) Ano ((laughing)) tsumaranai (.) tsumaranakute// (.) to omoimasu. ((laughing))
((laughing)) uh ((laughing)) He's bored (.) boring//, I think.

15 M: ((laughs))

In this excerpt we again see Becky refining her language use in response to an NTRI (by Mark) after which she corrects *tsukaate* (line 8) to *tsukarete* (line 10). Though Mark shows engagement in the conversation Becky initiates (through his NTRI, nodding, and eye contact), he takes on the role of managing the pair work activity and gets Becky back onto the task assigned by the teacher in excerpt 5c. He does this in Japanese. This is the second time he uses Japanese to get Becky to do the assigned task, having done this earlier at the beginning of pair work (excerpt 3a). Notice how Mark's question and showing of his notes in line 16 results in Becky's return to the assigned task in line 18:

5c) --> 16 M: Chotto matte kudasai. ((picks up notebook. Scratches head. Looks at page.)) Ano: ima:: (.) nani o shiteimasu ka? Ima? ((shows notebook to Becky)).
One moment please. Uh, now what (.) are you/we doing? Now?

17 B: Mm?? ((lowers voice)) Nani o shiteimasu. Nani-
Mm?? ((lowers voice)) What am I doing. What-

--> 18 ((raises voice)) doozo! ((points to blackboard)) Ano (.)
watashi wa sensei desu.
((raises voice)) go ahead! ((points to blackboard)) Uh (.)
I'll be the teacher.

19 M: Anata [wa sensei desu?
You [*are the teacher?*

20 B: [Anata wa seito.
[*You are the student.*

21 M: Anata wa sensei?
You are the teacher?

22 B: Hai. Watashi wa sensei// desu.
Yes. I am the teacher.

23 M: Sensei?
Teacher?

24 B: Doozo.
Go ahead.

Mark gets Becky back onto the assigned task by asking her in line 16 what she (they) are doing. His question takes her by surprise, and she pauses to consider what he means, lowering her voice and repeating his question back to herself as private speech—speech that is communicative in appearance but psychological in function (DiCamilla & Lantolf, 1994). The purpose of private speech is to organize or direct the speaker's own mental activity—private speech has been found to emerge in adults when they confront difficult or novel circumstances (John-Steiner, 1992). Becky's difficulty in understanding Mark's simple question is further evidence that the two of them have defined their task differently (Duff & Coughlan, 1994)—Becky defines pair work not only as doing activities assigned by the teacher (in this case, the role play activity), but also as conversing in Japanese and playing with the language. Mark, however, sees Becky's conversation as off-task because *his* defined task is to do role plays. Mark uses Japanese successfully to regulate their work, appropriately getting Becky to do the assigned task.

The data reveal that Mark and Becky do their pair work *in Japanese* with minimal use of English, even using Japanese for conversation and task management—this is true not only for excerpts shown here, but for the entire pair work activity transcribed, from beginning to end. Brooks & Donato (1995) have noted that when learners of elementary L2 proficiency are exposed to unfamiliar tasks, they often rely on the L1 to create common ground and develop strategies to perform the new task (see also Hall, this volume). However, as learners gain experience doing the similar sort of task, L1 use decreases dramatically. Becky and Mark's ability to manage the pair tasks, role assignments, prompting, repair and conversational bantering in Japanese without using English is evidence of experience with learner-learner collaborative tasks, as well as their increasing competence in the L2. The only use of English we see between Mark and Becky occurs when Becky tries to come up with a lexical item in line 2 of excerpt 5a.

Performance After Pair Work

After pair work, the teacher returns the class to the teacher-fronted context for pairs to perform for the class. Mark and Becky are first asked to perform, with Mark acting as 'teacher' and Becky as 'student.' Although he conjugated *itadaku* correctly prior to the pair activity, and then both correctly and incorrectly during the role play activity (first correctly, then incorrectly, and then correctly again after correction from Becky) Mark makes the same and other errors when performing in front of the class (errors underlined):

7) --> 1 M: Hai. Becky-sensei. (.) Um (.) aisu sukeeto um::. Um.
Aisu-sukeeto ga (.) oshiete itadain desu ka?
Yes, Becky. Um, ice-skating, um::. Um. will you teach me ice-skating?

2 B: Hai. ii desu yo. Wakarimashita.
Yes. That's fine. I understand.

3 M: Hai doomo arigatoo gozaimashita.
Thank you very much.

4 B: Hai doo itashimashite.
You're welcome.

--> 5 T: Sukeeto o oshiete itadaikitai. Aisu sukeeto o::,
Would you teach me. Ice-skating::,

6 M: Aisu sukeeto o,
Ice skating:::,

7 T: Oshiete itadakitai n desu ga
Would you teach me.

In line 5, the teacher explicitly corrects the errors, prompting Mark to repeat after her by providing the object *'aisu sukeeto'* and its grammatical marker *'o'* in line 5, the first words of the target request *'aisu sukeeto o oshiete itadakitai n desu ga.'*. Mark repeats after the teacher in line 6, and the teacher provides the rest of the sentence in line 7, which Mark does not repeat.

Comparison of excerpt 7 with excerpt 6 shows Mark and Becky's performance for the class to be strikingly different than their interaction during pair work. In excerpt 6 pair work Mark uses rising intonation (line 1) to invite Becky's participation as he works to construct the target request, in his excerpt 7 performance Mark immediately produces the request targeted. This may be a result of previous rehearsal. However, Mark makes the same conjugation error in both excerpts, and differences between pair work and performance can be seen in the different way these errors are handled in the two contexts. In excerpt 6 pair activity, after Mark's conjugation error Becky asks him to repeat (line 4), and then explicitly corrects him (line 10) when he makes the same error again (line 9). In excerpt 7 performance, however, Becky ignores Mark's error. There are other differences between the two excerpts as well, including repetition by both Becky (line 8) and Mark (line 5) in excerpt 6, with no repetition evident the excerpt 7 performance. Overall, excerpt 6 and the other pair work excerpts show a high level of interaction and include repetition, repair, and language play that do not occur in performance where both Becky and Mark stick to their defined role play turns. The excerpt 7 performance also includes a thanking routine that is absent from their previous role plays. Mark's errors in conjugation of *itadaku* and in particle selection (he uses *ga* rather than *o* both here and in excerpt 6) are handled by the teacher through her prompts for him to repeat after her.

The Role of Pair Work in Classroom L2 Acquisition

In Vygotskian psycholinguistics, social interaction and cognitive/linguistic development are in a dynamic relationship. Analysis of Becky and Mark's interaction reveals that the guided social interaction occurring in collaborative learner-learner interaction allows these learners to creatively use Japanese for a variety of purposes and allows more flexibility in language use than is evidenced when learners are on display in front of their classmates whether in performance or when answering questions posed by the teacher. From a developmental perspective, pair work clearly provides an environment which allows learners to participate freely in using Japanese for their own purposes as they take part in meaning-making activity which increases the salience of the language used.

Free from teacher allocation of turns and from the formality of performance in front of classmates, Becky and Mark are able to use Japanese for a variety of authentic purposes in collaborative interaction. The present data show that while working on the target structure, the pair work context allows Mark and Becky the flexibility 1) to work on the assigned role-play activity; 2) to express humor; 3) to actively test hypotheses through language play; 4) to converse in Japanese about the here-and-now; 5) to experiment with lexical choice; 6) to use Japanese for conversational management including modulation of the pace of the interaction, repair, and role negotiation; 7) to use the L2 for regulatory functions (task management); and 8) to have a learning experience that allows each learner to work on their own tasks in the L2 while engaged in meaningful interaction. This use of Japanese for a wide variety of language functions does not occur in teacher-fronted practice which tends to restrict language use to the narrow confines of the role play, and learner participation to the response turn. Clearly pair work allows these learners to use Japanese for meaning-making activity both within and beyond the context of the assigned role play task.

Learners also develop in the ZPD through the opportunity to use both matured and maturing language—Mark is not yet able to correctly conjugate *itadaku* , but moves toward this through use of *itadaku* in interaction with Becky (and through participation as interlocutor when Becky uses it). Both work productively on the assigned task, and Becky in addition, having defined the task differently, works to express herself in Japanese and talk about what she sees happening around her in the classroom. In this language play we see Becky experimenting with the *te*-form of verbs and adjectives (Excerpt 5b), actively testing hypotheses in working to figure out how to fit this grammatical form into an appropriate context through her involvement in meaning-making activity. While her uses of the *te*-form are not target-like, this language play reveals how the pair work context allows active experimentation with the language through which the learner can question how language is used. That learners have the opportunity to experiment with the language in a comfortable environment is a necessary component of L2 acquisition, which, while common in naturalistic learning settings, may be restricted in L2 classrooms. As evidenced by Becky's experimentation with the lexical items *katte* [buy] and *kashite* [lend] in excerpts 3b and 3c, experimentation allows the learner to generate questions about language use, as seen when Becky checks with the teacher to see which word is appropriate for the given context.

The data reveal that Mark and Becky are using Japanese to develop increased L2 competence in the ZPD through their collaboration, and that they actively contribute their strengths to help one another. While both Becky and Mark make mistakes, we do not see evidence that they pick up one another's errors, but that working together helps them to reach a higher level of accuracy and communicative competence. Analysis reveals how in pair work learner expertise emerges in two ways which are absent or less evident in teacher-fronted work or learner performance in front of the class. First, peer interaction allows learners to share their strengths through scaffolding as learners explicitly help one another through prompting and error correction. In pair work, the roles of expert and novice are not fixed (Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991). Rather, peer interaction allows these learners to act as both expert and novice, constructing their roles through the varying levels of expertise they contribute to the interaction. Secondly, peer interaction provides learners with the opportunity to apply their developing competence to their own language use through self-correction and refinement of their own utterances. Both Becky and Mark help each other through explicit correction and repetition requests or NTRIs. Becky, in addition, provides Mark with assistance through prompting. Mark's clarification requests work not only to modulate the pace of interaction and increase his own opportunities to hear Japanese, but also provide Becky the opportunity to reflect upon her own language use as evidenced by Becky's refinement of her utterances. In the same way, Becky's requests for repetition allow Mark to refine and correct his own language. Each effectively serves as interlocutor and 'audience' for the other, a function whose importance cannot be denied when we realize that what we are working to prepare learners to do is to interact with others in the L2.

The analysis presented here, while providing data from only one learner pair, provides evidence that collaborative learner-learner interaction is a place where important L2 acquisition processes occur. There is nothing remarkable about Becky and Mark. They are two ordinary learners in an ordinary foreign language classroom. What this study reveals is how ordinary learners in a guided pair work interactive context move forward in their acquisition of the L2, sharing their strengths through the process of collaborative learning in the ZPD. More research is needed to better understand these processes. In addition, further analysis of classroom collaborative interaction in a variety of L2 classroom settings is needed to better understand how learner collaboration can be productively stimulated in L2 classrooms.

NOTES

[1] Students in their second year of Japanese language study at the university level enrolled in 'Intermediate Japanese.'

[2] While this "contradictory nature of language development" may seem to be circular to those accustomed to traditional Western scientific paradigms, the power of Vygotsky's theory lies in its elimination of discrete dualistic dichotomies. See Newman & Holzman (1993) for an extended discussion of the limitations of dualistic scientific paradigms.

[3] See Donato 1994 for a critique of this view.

[4] In Roberts (1995) the learner-learner task is a two-way communicative pair-work task conducted outside of the classroom since pair and group work were not a part of the curriculum of the program where he collected data.

[5] For Vygotsky, cognitive development and linguistic development are a unitary phenomenon.

[6] NS=Native Speaker NNS=Nonnative Speaker

[7] Recall that in the ZPD learner's (novice's) interaction with adults or more able peers (experts) enables them to do that which they could not do unaided.

[8] The Follow-up turn is defined by its sequential location and function as a second pair-part to the response turn and as the third turn of the 3-turn elicitation activity. Follow-up rather than Evaluation is used to describe this turn (IRF rather than IRE) since it may contain a wide variety of follow-up utterances, not only those which are evaluative (Sinclair & Coulthard 1975, Ohta 1993).

[9] Lantolf's review of the literature shows that language play involves learner manipulation of linguistic patterns of the L2, for example, verb paradigms, revealing learner focus on linguistic form. It is interesting that previous studies of language play indicate that this focus on form by L1

and L2 learners is stimulated by meaningful interaction. See Lantolf (1995) and the references cited therein.

[10] Interviews in Japanese, observation of their class, and the experience of the researcher teaching Becky and Mark in previous courses show Becky to more proficient in Japanese than Mark.

[11] Mark does not repeat the same grammatical form 'send' three times, but changes the form from 'okuri' to 'okutte.' 'Okutte' is the correct form for this particular context.

[12] The object 'chocolate' is not ellipted, but is stated in line 13 followed by the accusative marker 'o.' English glosses do not accurately capture the Japanese Mark is using, which is constructed correctly: *"Chokoreeto o okutte itadakitai n desu ga "* means "I request that you send me some chocolate".

[13] As evidenced by the dramatic difference in Becky's participation, participating in an activity in front of the class (where she is acting as herself and is on display) and with a partner (where she is playing the role of a student and does not have a large audience) constitute completely different activities for Becky (Duff & Coughlan 1994).

[14] The addition of 'n' transforms the utterance from a simple sentence to one containing an embedded clause.

[15] TP=topic marker (wa). AC=accusative (object) marker (o).

[16] Becky says this in English.

[17] The equal sign (=) is used to indicate that the speaker continues the turn without pause

[18] See Duff & Coughlan (1994) for an analysis of how seemingly identical tasks may in actuality be different activities for different participants.

[19] Rather than numbering this consecutively as excerpt '7,' this excerpt has been numbered '5b' because the portion of interaction transcribed here is an uninterrupted continuation of Mark and Becky's interaction shown in excerpt 5a. In the same way, excerpt 5c follows immediately after 5b.

[20] *Tsukarete* (lines 8 (where it is pronounced incorrectly), 10, 11, 12) and *tsumaranakute* (line 14) are difficult to translate here. *Tsukarete* and *tsumaranakute* are the *te*-forms of *tsukareru* and *tsumaranai*, respectively. While these are correct *te*-forms, they are both used in error, as the *te*-form of a verb or adjective cannot used with *to omoimasu*. However, Becky's utterances are comprehensible. Repeated use of the *te*-form is another example of Becky's language play. Repetition is not only a feature of discourse with interactional implications (Tannen 1989), but is a feature of language play (Lantolf 1995) that has an important cognitive function in both L1 and L2 acquisition (Johnstone 1987, Anton & DiCamilla 1995)

[21] Note that this excerpt contains repetition by both Becky and Mark.

REFERENCES

Anton, M. & DiCamilla, F.J. (1995, March). The role of repetition in the collaborative discourse of L2 learners. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Long Beach, CA.

Bejarano, Y. (1987). A cooperative small-group methodology in the language classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 21*:3, 483-501.

Brooks, F. & Donato R. (1995, November). Expanding the research on collaborative discourse in the L2 classroom. Paper presented at the Second Annual Gathering for Sociocultural Theory and L2. University of Georgia, Athens, GA.

Chaudron, C. (1983). Simplification of input: Topic restatements and their effect on L2 learners' recognition and recall. *TESOL Quarterly, 17*, 437-458.

Clay, M.M. & Cazden, C.B. (1990). A Vygotskian interpretation of Reading Recovery. In L. Moll (Ed.), *Vygotsky and Education.* (pp. 206-22). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coughlan, P. (1995). Coversations with Vov6: A case study of child second language acquisition and loss from a socio-cultural perspective. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 6*,2.

DiCamilla, F.J. & Lantolf, J.P. (1994). The linguistic analysis of private writing. *Language Sciences*, 16:3/4, 347-369.

Deen, J.Y. (1991). Comparing interaction in a cooperative learning and teacher-centered foreign language classroom. *Review of Applied Linguistics*, 93-94, 153-181.

Donato, R. (1988). A psycholinguistic rationale for collective activity in second language learning. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Delaware, Newark, NJ.

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

Duff, P.A. & Coughlan, P. (1994). Same task, different activities: Analysis of a SLA task from an activity theory perspective. In J. Lantolf & G. Appel, (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 33-56). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Company.

Duran, R.P. & Szymanski, M.H. (1993). *Construction of learning and interaction of language minority children in cooperative learning*. John Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students. Report No. 45.

Duran, R.P. & Szymanski, M.H. (1995). Cooperative learning interaction and construction of activity. *Discourse Processes*, *19*, 149-164.

Freeman, R. (1993). The importance of the participant role in cooperative learning. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 9:1, 1-20.

Hall, J.K. (1995). "Aw, man, where you goin'": Classroom interaction and developmental competence. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 6*:2.

Hall, J.K. & Brooks, F.B. (1995). An integrative framework linking classroom interaction, interactive practices, and the development of L2 interactional competence. Unpublished manuscript.

Jacoby, S. & Gonzales, P. (1991). The constitution of expert-novice in scientific discourse. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, *2*, 2, 149-182.

John-Steiner, V. (1992). Private speech among adults. In R. Diaz & L. Berk (Eds.). *Private speech: From social interaction to self-regulation*. (pp. 285-296). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Johnstone, B. (1987). An introduction. In B. Johnstone (Ed.), *Perspectives on Repetition*, a special issue of *Text*, *7*, 3, 205-214.

Jorden, E. & Noda, M. (1987). *Japanese: The spoken language, Volumes I, II & III.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Kramsch, C.J. (1987) Interactive discourse in small and large groups. In Rivers, W. (Ed.) *Interactive Language Teaching* (pp. 17-32). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. New York: Longman.

Lantolf, J.P. (1994). Sociocultural theory and second language learning: Introduction to the special issue. *Modern Language Journal*, *78*, 4, 418-420.

Lantolf, J.P. (1995, October). The role of language play in the acquisition of Spanish as a second language. Plenary address from the Pennsylvania State University Conference on the Acquisition of Spanish as a First and as a Second Language, University Park, PA.

Leontiev, A.N. (1981). The problem of activity in psychology. In J.V. Wertsch (Ed.), *The concept of activity in Soviet psychology* (pp. 37-71). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Long, M. H. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 377-393). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Long, M. & Porter, P. (1985). Group work , interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. TESOL Quarterly, *19*, 2, 207-228.

McGroarty, M. (1989). The benefits of cooperative learning arrangements in second language instruction. *NABE Journal*, *13*,2, 127-143.

McGuire, S. P. (1992). An application of cooperative learning to teaching English as a foreign language in Japan. Unpublished MA thesis, University of Minnesota.

Mehan, H. (1985). The structure of classroom discourse. In T. A. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis, Volume 3: Discourse and dialogue.* (pp. 119-131). London: Academic Press.

Milleret, M. (1992). Cooperative learning in the Portuguese-for-Spanish-speakers classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, *25*,5, 435-440.

Newman F. & Holzman, L. (1993). *Lev Vygotsky: Revolutionary scientist.* New York: Routledge.

Ochs, E. & Schieffelin, B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories and their implications. In R. Schweder & R. Levine (Eds.) *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self & emotion* (pp. 276-320). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Ochs, E. & Schieffelin, B. (Eds.) (1986). *Language Socialization Across Cultures.* New York: Cambridge University Press

Ohta, A.S. (1995a). Hey, you took my turn! Student use of affective particles in the Japanese as a foreign language classroom. In H. Nara & M. Noda, (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 1995 ATJ Conference on Literature, Language and Pedagogy.* (pp. 151-162). Middlebury, VT: Association of Teachers of Japanese.

Ohta, A.S. (1995b). The impact of teacher stance on the use of affective particles in classroom narratives. In H. Nara & M. Noda, (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 1995 ATJ Conference on Literature, Language and Pedagogy.* (pp. 163-172). Middlebury, VT: Association of Teachers of Japanese.

Ohta, A.S. (1993). Activity, Affect and Stance: Sentential Particles in the Discourse of the Japanese as a Foreign Language Classroom. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. UCLA.

Ohta, A.S. (1994). Socializing the expression of affect: an overview of affective particle use in the Japanese as a foreign language classroom. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 5,* 2, 303-326.

Pica, T. (1987). Second language acquisition, social interaction, and the classroom. *Applied Linguistics, 8,* 3-21.

Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, processes and outcomes? *Language learning,* 44:3, 493-527.

Pica, T. & Doughty, C. (1986). The role of group work in classroom second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 7, 233-248.

Poole, D. (1992). Language socialization in the second language classroom. *Language Learning,* 42:4, 593-616.

Rivers, W. (1987) Interaction as the key to teaching language for communication. In Rivers, W. (ed.) *Interactive Language Teaching* (pp. 3-16). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Roberts, M.A. (1995). Communicative interaction in teacher-fronted classrooms and student dyadic tasks: a comparison. Presented at the 9th Biennial Japanese Studies Association of Australia conference, University of Queensland, July 1995.

Rogoff, B. & Gardner, W. (1984). Guidance in cognitive development: an examination of mother-child instruction. In B. Rogoff and J. Lave (Eds.), *Everyday cognition: Its development in social context.* (pp. 95-116). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sinclair, J.M. & Coulthard, R.M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils.* London: Oxford University Press.

Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G. & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair of conversation. *Language, 53,* 361-382.

Slavin, R.E. (1984). Students motivating students to excel: Cooperative incentives, cooperative tasks, and student achievement. *The Elementary School Journal. 85,* 1, 53-63.

Slavin, R.E. (1991). Synthesis of research of cooperative learning. *Educational Leadership, 48,* 5, 71-82.

Swain, M. (1993). The output hypothesis: Just speaking and writing aren't enough. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 50,* 158-164.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *For H. G. Widdowson: Principles and practice in the study of language. A festschrift on the occasion of his 60th birthday.*

Tannen, D. (1989). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Varonis, E. & Gass, S.M. (1982). Non-native/non-native conversations: A model for the negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics,* 6, 71-90.

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

Vygotsky, L.S. (1987). *The collected works of L.S. Vygotsky. Vol. 1.* New York: Plenum.

Wood, D., Bruner, J. & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem-solving. *Journal of child psychology and psychiatry, 17,* 89-100.

Amy Snyder Ohta received her Ph.D from UCLA's Department of TESL and Applied Linguistics in 1993. She is currently an assistant professor in the department of Asian Languages and Literatures at the University of Washington. Her research interests are in the areas of the teaching and learning of Japanese, second language acquisition, and discourse analysis.