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Abstract

This linguistic ethnographic study describes the process of how university students become communicatively competent and globally minded members of an academic group in a course of a global education program offered by a private university in Japan. As globalization expands, many universities in Japan are starting curriculums labeled “global”. Within these, students are expected to be globally minded, communicatively and linguistically competent; in other words, to become global human resources.

From the perspectives of language socialization and academic discourse socialization, in this study, I focus on how the students — a Japanese student and foreign students from Asian countries — learn English as a part of acquiring communicative competence to perform in their group. That is, I look at students’ socialization to use the languages in their linguistic repertoire, and through the use of language their socialization into academic discourse.

Linguistic ethnographic fieldwork for the study was conducted in a spring semester course which is a part of the program offered by the Division of International Affairs at Kansai University. From April to July in the 2014 school year, I took part in the course not only as an observer, but as a teaching assistant. I observed the class and gathered data by audio and video recording, as well as analyzing the course Program Document, while working for the class as a TA.

The study is data driven, with the priority in identifying “rich points” that would help us understand the overall context of the group as an academic community.
Reviewing the recorded fieldwork data as well as my experience in the course, several unexpected points emerged.

The study sheds light on several aspects relating to the development and use of global, academic discourse. Reviewing and summarizing the results of the analysis chapters, it was found that: learners were expected to participate in the group, observe the group events, know what to do for the group, be centered in the group, state individual ideas supporting the ideas with reasons in order to construct an overall group idea, and create knowledge. In addition, they needed to develop an ability to use their linguistic repertoires according to the situation, which might include “translanguaging” in multiple languages.

It is hoped that the study will provide a framework for researching academic and foreign language socialization in the global education era. Moreover, as a further research topic, the study points to the need for developing tools to measure academic proficiency in global and academic education contexts.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1 Overview of Study

This thesis describes the process by which university students became communicatively competent members in a class that is part of the global education program offered by a private university in Japan. As globalization proceeds, many universities in Japan have been attempting to set up courses and programs for educating their students as global human resources. In this course, students are socialized into the practice of the class in order to accomplish the course goals. As a part of this, they are expected to improve their English proficiencies, English being the medium language of the class, and thus prepare themselves for global interaction.

The students need both to learn English and to acquire “communicative competence” (Hymes, 1972a) to take part in the class. Looking at languages in the context as both a communication medium and learning target, I focus on the students’ socialization “to use language” and “through the use of language” (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). Socialization research has been expanding its focuses from the first language acquisition context to include “second language learning context”, “multilingual context”, and “academic discourse” (e.g., Duff, 2014; Bayley & Schecter, 2003; Kobayashi, Zappa-Hollman, & Duff, 2017). As a part of this expansion, the present study sheds light on the learning and use of second languages, as related to students’ socialization into globally oriented academic discourse.

Although I take a holistic perspective to understand classroom events, I was especially interested in participants’ spoken interactions in context; in other words, what
Becker (1988) refers to as “language in particular”. In addition to this, I also focus on the participants’ development of sociocultural competency to perform as a part of an academic group. The class studied consisted of six groups of learners divided according to scores on a pre-test. In this study, I focus on the most advanced group. Group members are from various linguistic and sociocultural backgrounds: Japanese, Indonesian, Thai, and American. I regard them as bilinguals in that they use their full language repertoires, including their second language, in the context of the classroom. That is, I look at their linguistic and communicative development and performance as their “becoming” and “being” bilingual (Cenoz & Gorter, 2005).

1.2 Author’s Interests and Opportunity for Research

1.2.1 Interests

Around 2013, I became interested in how students gained competence in the discourse of school learning, and the role of language learning as a part of this process. It was not just about how students acquired languages, in particular, foreign languages, but also how they became members of a community. These issues were familiar to me as an English teacher, but the phrase “communication proficiency” (komyunikesyon noryoku), which is a conventional phrase used in English education in Japan, was ambiguous. I was wondering, what did “communicative” actually mean? In fact, I felt that this phrase was just roaming around in the language of higher education without a clear definition.
Second, I was also interested in the commonly used term, “globalization”, or “global” in higher education contexts. According to Steger (2003), globalization is defined as

a multidimensional set of social processes that create, multiply, stretch, and intensify worldwide social interdependencies and exchanges while at the same time fostering in people a growing awareness of deepening connections between the local and the distant.

(p. 13)

In applied linguistics, it is interpreted in relation to English as

the phenomenon in which people in different locations worldwide are increasingly linked in such a way that events in one part of the world have an impact on local communities around the world. The spread of English is often linked to globalization since it provides for high levels of inter-connectedness among nation states and local economies and cultures.

(Richards & Schmidt, 2010, p. 247)

Through my English learning and teaching experience, the word, “globalization” often comes up in the context of English education or is used as a prefix to an education course concerned with acquisition of communication proficiency. I was interested in what a globally minded student would be, and what global competency is, as questions that could be addressed through the fieldwork of the present study.
1.2.2 Opportunity for research

In March, 2014, I received an invitation to participate as a teaching assistant (TA) in a course titled “TOEFL preparation” which was provided as a language course in the university’s Global Frontier program. It was the first year for this program, which was directed by the course coordinator and lecturer, Dr. Keiko Ikeda, an associate professor at Kansai University.

At the first meeting with Ikeda-sensei, I was told that she would also invite some others as TAs: three exchange students from the U.S., one other Japanese student, and one Chinese student. The Asian students had sufficient ability to use English to support the group activities. Therefore, it would be possible to use English as the medium in the classroom with the students.

I became excited about the possibility of researching the English medium interaction among students, and hoped that I would be able to focus both on university students’ language acquisition and their global communication development in the class. Although I did not have any particular thesis topic in mind at the outset, I did feel that I would experience communicative events that would differ from those in my past experience and allow me to understand globalization from a different perspective.

1.3 Ethnographic Research

1.3.1 Ethnography

The present study was conducted using ethnographic methods. Ethnography attempts to tell a story which is constructed through the ethnographer’s collection of
data as well as by writing “thick description” (Geertz, 1973, 1983). According to Heigham & Sakui (2009), ethnography refers to “the product — the presentation of the final analysis and interpretation of the completed study — and also the research process itself” (p. 92). According to this perspective, ethnography can be regarded both as a methodology and representation of the whole study. Taking a naturalistic perspective on events, ethnography is defined as “the study of people’s behavior in naturally occurring, ongoing settings, with a focus on the cultural interpretation of behavior” (Watson-Gegeo, 1988, p. 576).

1.3.2 Case study

The present study is a case study (Duff, 1995, 2008) which can be seen as a part of general ethnography. The events and language described in the study construct the particular context of the case. A “case” is defined by Hood (2009) as

a bounded system comprised of an individual, institution, or entity and the site and context in which social action takes place, the boundaries of which may not be clear and are determined by the scope of the researcher’s interests.

(p. 69)

Case studies and ethnography are not necessarily congruent, however. Duff (2008) describes a case study as being interested in “the behavior or attitudes of individual learners or other individuals/entities” (p. 34). In contrast, ethnography attempts to “understand and interpret the behaviors, values, and structures of collectivities or social groups with particular reference to the cultural basis for those behaviors and values” (p. 34). Looking at the present study, the features of the
individual case are seen as being a part of a larger cultural context and therefore being a part of ethnography as well as a case study.

1. 4 Chapters in the Dissertation

The thesis consists of nine chapters including this introduction. In Chapter 2, I will describe linguistic ethnography as a research methodological framework, and how the data were collected from the author’s fieldwork. As a theoretical and analytical framework, I will summarize the notions of language socialization, second language socialization, academic discourse socialization and ethnography of speaking (alternatively, ethnography of communication).

Chapter 3 gives background information related to the study. I describe for readers the setting in which I conducted the fieldwork, providing information on the course, the participants, the languages used in the research, details of the fieldwork, and the data itself. I will also review and discuss theory and methods of transcription as related to the present study. Finally, I will briefly overview the analytical frameworks to be used in each of the analysis chapters that follow.

Chapter 4 analyzes the “course document” that outlines the university’s education policy related to globalization and how it is to be implemented in the course. First, I review the overall orientation of the course document, and examine the expectations for student learning in the course. Following my first review of the document, I examine it again through interviews with the participants in order to gain insiders’ perspectives on the issues.
Chapter 5 examines functions of a specific discourse marker, “so” in students’ language socialization. In particular, focusing on an American TA’s use of the discourse marker in the group discussion, I shall look at how it functions to encourage the group members to take part in activities. In addition to the TA’s use, I also examine students’ use of “so” as a part of their group performance.

Chapter 6 describes how participants “translanguage” (García & Wei, 2014) in order to construct knowledge and accomplish academic group interaction. The chapter looks at how participants use their linguistic repertoire, including both first language and additional languages, to improve their communication abilities and accomplish group interaction. This is seen as one aspect of communicative proficiency, which is a part of the acquisition of academic literacy.

Chapter 7 focuses on one Japanese student’s experience in the course, including his pragmatic development. Here, I take “participating” as the key for analysis and discussion. Tracking the student’s comments from an interview, I will look at stages through which he passed to become a fully-participating and communicative member of the group.

Chapter 8, based on the discussion results of each analysis chapter, suggests how a framework of “academic and foreign language socialization” can be applied to the data. I consider aspects of higher education in the global era, focusing on English as a medium language and students’ globalization and localization in the community. Next, I reconsider the notion of communicative competence as required of learners in the global education context. Finally, I look at how this sheds light on socialization, including both language socialization and academic socialization.
As a thesis conclusion, in Chapter 9, I will look back on my research. I will discuss issues that come out of the study — particularly the outcomes of socialization, the influence and meaning of globalization in higher education, and limitations of the present study — from my experience as ethnographer and author.

1.5 Chapter Conclusion

In this chapter, I have set the overall frame for my case study of academic and foreign language socialization. In the next chapter, I will review specific perspectives that are useful for the study: linguistic ethnography as methodological framework, and language socialization and ethnography of speaking as theoretical frameworks.
Chapter 2
Background

2.1 Chapter Introduction

The present study is conducted through an interdisciplinary approach which draws on linguistics and ethnography. The study looks at a case of university students’ development of linguistic and communicative competence in an academic and global education context from the perspective of language socialization. In this chapter, I summarize the methodological and theoretical background of the present study. Regarding methodological background, I describe linguistic ethnography, which is a relatively new approach to examining language in local contexts. In the theoretical background part, I describe the framework of language socialization, which is a core paradigm of the present study. In particular, after summarizing key features of the language socialization paradigm for the present study, I review second language socialization, academic discourse socialization and ethnography of communication, which contextualize the events described in the present study.

2.2 Linguistic Ethnography

2.2.1 Linguistic ethnography in theory

The present study describes events from a linguistic perspective, focusing on participants’ development toward becoming community members. To conduct the study, that is, in order to shed light on the process of linguistic and communicative development, the research needs to be “thick”. As the way of looking at the phenomena
of the learners’ linguistic and communicative development, I apply an interdisciplinary approach that has dual linguistic and ethnographic aspects: that is, linguistic ethnography (Shaw, Copland & Snell, 2015).

Linguistic ethnography as a term is relatively new. In a framework which developed in the 1990s in the U.K. through the activities of BAAL (the British Association for Applied Linguistics), scholars aimed to combine linguistic study with an ethnographic approach, and thus launched a “methodological and theoretical debate” (Shaw, Copland & Snell, 2015, p. 2). This emergence corresponded with the fact that anthropology had become popular in the U.K. without linking it with linguistics (Copland & Creese, 2015). To this, Rampton (2007) states that we do not have any “properly institutionalized linguistic anthropology” (p. 594).

Linguistic ethnography is connected with linguistic anthropology in that it is interested in language and culture as practice and action. Linguistic ethnography regards language as “communicative action functioning in social contexts in ongoing routines of peoples’ daily lives” (Copland & Creese, 2015, p.27). Similarly, linguistic anthropology looks at how language functions in sociocultural contexts. Duranti (1997) states that linguistic anthropology is “the study of language as a cultural resource and speaking as a cultural practice” (p. 2, originally in italics).

While sharing interests about language with linguistic anthropology, there are some differences between linguistic ethnography and linguistic anthropology. For example, linguistic ethnography aims to focus on familiar things and make them unfamiliar; that is, make them into marked events that help us to understand “how social and communicative processes operate in a range of settings and contexts” (Copland & Creese, 2015, p. 1). On the other hand, linguistic anthropology attempts to get into
unfamiliar sites, find unfamiliar things and display them as familiar objects to us. In order to “make the familiar strange”, through an interpretive approach, linguistic ethnography looks at situations in the contexts around us, such as “the institution we know best, the routines we practice most, and the interactions we repeatedly engage in” (Copland & Creese, 2015, p. 13).

Looking at language socialization through linguistic and ethnographic perspectives, we will be able to see how language use reflects the meaning of its sociocultural context, and simultaneously how the context guides participants’ performance, including language use and academic behaviors. A fundamental direction of linguistic ethnography is the conviction that “to a considerable degree, language and the social world are mutually shaping, and that close analysis of situated language use can provide both fundamental and distinctive insights into the mechanisms and dynamics of social and cultural production in everyday activity” (Rampton, Tusting, Maybin, Barwell, Creese & Lytra, 2004, p. 2).

Linguistic ethnographic study looks at one particular social context and makes familiar events there unfamiliar, in contrast to linguistic anthropology, the goal of which is to make the unfamiliar familiar. In order to achieve its goal, Rampton (2007) emphasizes that the contexts and analysis of verbal data are essential in linguistic ethnographic research. He summarizes two concepts of linguistic ethnography that are also important to sociolinguists and linguistic anthropologists more generally:

1. that the contexts for communication should be investigated rather than assumed. Meaning takes shape within specific social relations, interactional
histories and institutional regimes, produced and construed by agents with expectations and repertoires that have to be grasped ethnographically

2. that analysis of the internal organisation of verbal (and other kinds of semiotic) data is essential to understanding its significance and position in the world. Meaning is far more than just the ‘expression of ideas’, and biography, identifications, stance and nuance are extensively signalled in the linguistic and textual fine-grain

(Rampton, 2007, p. 585)

As suggested above, linguistic ethnography as a discipline is a method more than a theory. Methodologically, it provides a case-oriented framework.

2.2.2 Linguistic ethnography in practice

The combination of linguistics with ethnography is the principal point for understanding the framework. Conducting and making research “linguistic ethnographic” benefits both linguists and ethnographers. As Shaw, Copland & Snell (2015) say, “For linguists, the combination with ethnography represents a reorientation: a conscious effort to resist the perceived empirical rigour, neatness and certainty of linguistic analysis and embrace the openness and uncertainty of ethnography” (p. 8) and “For ethnographers, the combination with linguistics presents an opportunity to hone in on specific instances of everyday life and to evidence analysis in small instances of social practice” (pp. 8-9). Understanding the two advantages above, I attempt to carry out the present study focusing on small, routine aspects of language use which are taken as ordinary in our daily life.
Linguistic ethnography is based on the approach of general ethnography. My way of carrying out this study (see Chapter 3) had are several key similarities with other types of ethnographic studies. First, linguistic ethnography takes a “topic-oriented” perspective (Hymes, 1996) to conduct the research and make it thick. In order to examine particular events which are originally familiar to us, the events need to be made more focused and unfamiliar. This unfamilializing is brought about by a data-driven perspective. We start our research with some general research questions related to the target context, but do not have specific questions to examine. Rather, most of the findings emerge from the fieldwork in practice and from reviewing data.

The making use of several types of data is a key to linguistic ethnography. As Blommaert (2007) mentions, all types of data which are collected are to be used to look at events, which are constructed of social, cultural and communicative components. Therefore, in linguistic ethnography, the various types of data are used as sources to interpret the events.

### 2.3 Language Socialization

#### 2.3.1 Traditional language socialization

The present study describes how language learners use language in a particular way in order to become members of a community. The participants not only learn and try to acquire a target language as a foreign language learning activity, but also learn precisely how to be involved in the language learning situation itself. Language socialization, which traditionally focused on children, considers that “language is a fundamental medium in children’s development of social and cultural knowledge.
sensibilities, a domain that the field of language acquisition does not capture” (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2012, p. 1). Although the present study deals with university students, who have already been socialized in their first linguistic and cultural context, we shall see that they are socialized again through language use to become members of a global academic discourse community.

Language socialization is described as having two aspects: “socialization through the use of language” and “socialization to use language” (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986, p.163). This paradigm shows that there are relationships among language acquisition, language use, and psychological development in the sociocultural situation where humans develop as community members. In addition, language socialization study not only focuses on children’s, newcomers’ or novices’ language acquisition, but is also seen as an activity that continues across the human life span.

Originally, language socialization study started by considering language acquisition and social contact, drawing its notions mainly from the disciplines of sociolinguistics and ethnography of communication (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984). With these approaches, early studies in language socialization focused mostly on how children grew up being socialized into communities (Schieffelin, 1986). This stage of language socialization research was characterized by the longitudinal study of children’s language acquisition and their cultural development, for example, among the Kaluli of Papua New Guinea as studied by Bambi Schieffelin (1986, 1990) and the children in a Samoan village by Elinor Ochs (1986, 1988). Both focus not only on children’s linguistic (phonetic, morphological and syntactic) development from a psycholinguistic perspective but also on pragmatic aspects, such as language usage conditions.
Historically, the study of language socialization focuses on how novices and children acquire language at the morphological and syntactic level in the interaction with mother, caregiver or veteran in a community (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008). In addition, this academic pursuit is interested not only in language acquisition but also in how people are socialized in a micro community and come to acquire cultural understanding through daily linguistic and non-linguistic activities.

From the notion that human beings are socialized into a community with and through language use and acquisition, the contexts where language socialization can be seen are of two main types (Ochs, 1990). According to Ochs (1990), processes and functions of language socialization can be divided into “explicit language socialization” and “implicit language socialization” (pp. 290-291). Explicit language socialization is where community members, teachers, caregivers and parents try to culturally and socially assimilate their novices into their customs through speaking activity. During this activity, a senior member in the community or in a certain group elicits what a novice is to say through models of speaking and interacting more generally.

However, paying attention only to explicit language socialization is inadequate for a complete understanding of language socialization. Since this explicit socialization is embedded in micro-contexts and carried out by more experienced community members, the impetus for such activity tends to be derived from the larger social context. The other type, implicit language socialization, is implemented through a process where novices acquire a target language through social activities in which they themselves participate, rather than through directly imposed models. (e.g., Ochs, 1990).

In addition to the notion that language socialization occurs in the course of language acquisition and can be researched from a psychological perspective, language
socialization has been approached from anthropological and sociological perspectives (Garrett, 2008). In order to analyze cultural knowledge acquisition while also focusing on language, it is crucial to consider the way in which language use occurs and the roles it plays in a cultural context. In anthropology, the role of language is found in community structure and as a social tool (ideological and communicative symbol); as such, language has played an important role in the study of anthropology (e.g., Levi-Strauss, 1963).

From the point of view of linguistic anthropology, Duranti (2003) shows the history of “language as culture” in anthropology, beginning with Boas’s concept of what anthropology entailed as an area of study. Boas regards language as a crucial aspect in field anthropology. However, a point of difference between Boas’s work and language socialization study is that Boas used and adopted linguistics to analyze and develop cultural study. By contrast, language socialization study is a combination of ideas focusing on language acquisition and language function related to gaining understanding of how cultural behavior develops.

Even if there are different understandings of the relative roles of language and culture in the study, as discussed above, the principal and natural academic field to handle cultural matters and language socialization is anthropology. Combining anthropology with linguistic study, Duranti (1997) defines linguistic anthropology as “a study of language as a cultural resource and speaking as a cultural practice” (p. 2), and thus attempts to make the study of language use one of the fields of anthropology.

Language socialization is thus a paradigm that emerges from this anthropological, cultural approach to language acquisition and use. However, it is also a sociolinguistic perspective which is distinguished from the more purely cultural view
characterized by “enculturation” (Mead, 1954[1928], 1930). In Mead’s work, language and the acquisition of language are a part of culture, but the connection between language and cultural knowledge is given little attention (Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004). In order to make comprehensive the study of linguistic and cultural development, language socialization study takes account of the role of language in the child’s cultural development, which Mead excluded. In contrast to enculturation, which considers each child as an isolated object that takes in cultural knowledge, the situation envisaged by language socialization is one in which children are involved in multiple and dual participations which have an influence on the subjects, where each participant is a factor in socialization (Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004).

Through an anthropological and cultural perspective, the study of language socialization focuses attention on the process of how participants are socialized and embedded into society through acquiring communicative competence. Therefore, the process of language socialization (the aspect of implicit language socialization as suggested above) occurs in social and cultural activities.

With such activities, novices and newcomers learn and acquire appropriate or fixed and expected “practice” through language learning and use in the daily life of a community. From a sociological perspective, new participants are socialized through fixed and expected practice, and are reproduced as members of a community (Bourdieu, e.g., 1977, 1990).

From the perspective that social class and identity constitute social order and structure, Bernstein (1972, 1986) has observed the relation between social class and home socialization which influences language use in school. He defines two codes, “elaborated code” and “restricted code”, to show how the usages of acquired language
are differentiated in society. According to Bernstein’s theory, students in school may display socialized practices and values different from those expected at home, and there thus occurs a contradiction between how participants are socialized at home and outside in the community. In addition to this, how the knowledge acquired from language socialization is used and reproduced depends on social, cultural and political factors (Heath, 1983).

Looking at how language socialization at home influences children’s school performance and the type of communicative competence required of them, Heath (1982) implemented a longitudinal and ethnographic study that shows the students’ practical gaps in understanding the given questions from a teacher in classroom interaction. Heath contrasted the uses of questioning in the home socialization of white children with those used in the African American children’s community, and showed how this caused gaps in the African American children’s understanding of questions at school.

In conclusion, then, language socialization is interested in how participants are socialized and become mature users of target languages in a context where they participate in activities through the languages they encounter. The two main academic perspectives in language socialization — one, a psychological approach (language acquisition) and the other coming from anthropology and sociology (acquisition of cultural knowledge) — are interrelated.

2.3.2 Second language socialization

As mentioned above, the emergence of a theory of language socialization was based on first language in first cultural contexts. This is logical in the sense that human beings must encounter a first situation in their life. However, to look at more complex
contexts such as translingual and multicultural ones, in which learners with various backgrounds are socialized, we need to consider how the participants can be socialized through or to use a second or foreign language.

Second language socialization has points similar to first-language socialization in its framework and interests (Duff, 1995, 2007, 2010a, 2012). Participants generally differ from first-language socialization participants in that the L2 learners entering an L2 context have already experienced and acquired some “repertoire of linguistic, discursive, and cultural traditions and community affiliations when encountering new ones” (Duff, 2007, p. 310). Added to this, however, participants keep being socialized in their first culture and through their first language, in parallel with the additional language and its culture, during this second phase of socialization (Duff, 2012).

Multilingual language learning complexifies the notion of language socialization. Bayley and Schecter (2003) point out that language socialization in general can occur in situations where the languages and sociocultural norms are in a dynamic relationship. This is especially true in regard to foreign language socialization, particularly in the context of English-as-a-foreign-language education. First culture practices such as rituals and routines are used in second language teaching as well, such as greeting routines at the beginning of an English class in junior high schools (e.g., Nukuto, 2015a). In cases such as these, it would seem that students are subjected to additional socialization in first-language practices through learning the second language. This brings to mind Risager’s (2006) contention that “languages spread across cultures, and cultures spread across languages. Linguistic and cultural practices change and spread through social networks along partially different routes” (p. 2). This perspective leaves
open the possibility that some aspects of first-culture knowledge can be learned through not only a first language but also a foreign language.

2.3.3 Academic discourse socialization

In addition to the general frameworks discussed above, in order to look at a more specific context of language socialization, the present study takes the perspective of “academic discourse socialization” (e.g., Morita & Kobayashi, 2008). This area of socialization is interested in “the social, cognitive, and cultural processes, ideologies, and practices involved in higher education in particular” (Kobayashi, Zappa-Hollman & Duff, 2017, p. 239).

Light can be shed on the process by which learners are socialized through the qualitative approaches of observing and analyzing cultural and linguistic development (Duff, 2012; Morita, 2000). According to this point of view, some studies of language socialization have started focusing on academic discourse within the context of language learning (e.g., Duff, 2010; Morita & Kobayashi, 2008).

In a second or foreign language learning context, from the perspective of language socialization, cultural knowledge for learners is created through teacher-student interaction. Poole (1992) focuses on the teacher’s role in supporting ESL students acquiring cultural knowledge through three patterns in the interactional discourse: accommodation, task accomplishment, and the showing of asymmetry which indicates the power relationship between a teacher and students. Through this pattern, the teacher decides the direction of the talk. Pool’s study illustrates how the participant whose cultural and linguistic competence are mature (the teacher) guides the novices
(ESL students) to acquire the second culture knowledge necessary to communicate in and study the second language.

The study of speaking (oral) skills is a relatively new development in academic English socialization, though it has been dealt with to some extent previously (Morita & Kobayashi, 2008). In second language learning situations, ESL students are required to have aural and oral skills to participate in pedagogical tasks such as oral-presentation or small-group interaction.

The linguistic and cultural socialization of students into academic discourse is a dynamic process occurring over various activities and involving multiple participants (e.g., Duff, 2010; Morita & Kobayashi, 2008). As contrasted with studies of language socialization based on relationships between distinctive participants, such as “child-caregiver, student-teacher, apprentice-master” (Morita, 2000, p. 302), in academic discourse, participant structures vary according to the tasks used. Morita (2000) examined ethnographically the process by which graduate students mastered the oral academic skills which they used in oral academic presentations (OAPs) in a Canadian university. Her findings suggest that in order to construct an OAP, students (both native speakers and nonnative speakers) experience negotiation with instructors and their peers as they prepare. Based on this, Morita (2000) emphasizes that academic socialization be regarded as a “potentially complex and conflictual process of negotiation” (p. 279).

Morita’s (2000) study suggests that students in a new context need to experience not only language learning but also certain kinds of academic routines in order to succeed in the context. Zappa-Hollman (2007), focusing on non-native English speakers’ academic presentations in the context of second language learning, states that “successful performance of oral activities requires not only that students possess high
levels of language proficiency but also that they have a good understanding of the rules and specific behaviours valued by each discipline and each institutional context” (p. 456).

Morita’s and Zappa-Hollman’s research both examine the role of presentation in socializing students into academic discourse in which they take part as newcomers. The present study will deal with students’ oral activities, but these occur in the form of group discussion rather than formal presentation. The participants need to sort through their linguistic repertoire and learn how to perform in the context of the academic discourse shared by the group.

2.4 Socialization Research in Japanese as L1 and L2

A number of researchers have examined the cases of language socialization related to Japanese, focusing on how infants, kindergartners, elementary students and adults are socialized into family and educational contexts (e.g., Anderson, 1995; Anderson & Wolfe, 2009; Burdelski, 2012, 2013; Clancy, 1986; Cook, 1999, 2008; Kanagy, 1999; Ohta, 1999;). A main focus of these works is how language socialization is promoted in the classroom through sequences of exchanges called interactional routines. An early study in this line of research, Peters and Boggs (1986), is not a case of school classrooms or from Japan, but it does refer to interactional routines and their role in language learning. According to Peters and Boggs, the socializing context, which consists of “time, place, participants, and desired outcomes” (p. 80), promotes language learning.
Through participation in interactional routines and language learning activities, children acquire a working knowledge of how to take part in the various classroom practices, and thereby acquire social and cultural knowledge. As the result of this routinized practice, Peters and Boggs (1986) show that 1) in the interactional sequence, children are given opportunities to practice various language skills, and to correct their language use based on the topic, time and interlocutors of the interchange; and 2) while observing these rules of language use, children acquire the ways of culturally communicating, what Peters and Boggs call “modes of speaking” (p. 94).

Generally, in the Japanese context, participants are expected to be patient listeners to what others are telling them (Clancy, 1986). From this point of the particular communicative competence of listening in the context of Japanese language communication, Cook (1999) describes the structure of participation in an elementary classroom. The study shows that Japanese classrooms prefer “a multi-party interactional pattern” (Cook, 1999), what Anderson (1995) has named the “interactional umbrella”. Within this type of interactional structure, students are socialized to listen carefully to what their peers say through a teacher’s implicit and explicit facilitative teaching.

Another aspect of communicative competence for fluent and culturally appropriate Japanese language communication is “alignment”. Participants in classroom language socialization not only listen to what others say but need to react to teacher-fronted and the learner-learner situations. Ohta (1999) shows this type of alignment and the expression of it in language socialization in the context of Japanese-as-foreign-language acquisition. In this work, she examines how the routines which are based on first language socialization in childhood affect and impact their behavior in adulthood.
The previous research on language socialization in Japanese language learning also sheds light on Japanese as a foreign language for immersion education in North America. Among studies in this area, Kanagy (1999) shows that children in kindergarten are socialized as participants through second language interaction. This work investigates how children, in the process of being immersed into a Japanese language classroom, learn initiation and response moves in discourse. During classroom activity, Kanagy found that the repetition and scaffolding offered by the teacher are important not to temporary question-answer interaction, but rather for socializing participants into interactional and communicative competence in L2 learning. This study can be used as a model for the case of foreign or second language socialization in Japan, though its focus is slightly different in terms of the target language and linguistic and social situations.

Even if we can find cases of language socialization in Japanese, it is still rare to encounter studies that were longitudinally conducted in Japanese institutional contexts. Anderson’s (1995) ethnographic study focuses on language socialization in a Japanese public elementary school. This work is a rare case in that he conducted longitudinal, ethnographic field work over one school year and focused on Japanese-as-a-first-language socialization. From the research, Anderson shows language socialization as a part of the structure of classroom interaction in greetings (aisatsu, in Japanese) and presentation (happyo, in Japanese) with the participants having active roles in the discourse. As shown in this and other previous studies, first culture knowledge is generally acquired as a part of first language socialization.

Without being labeled language socialization, it would seem possible to acquire a second (foreign) language and its sociocultural use in a particular context. For
example, Siegal (1994, 1995, 1996) examines how non-native speakers of Japanese, who were staying in Japan to study, acquired a second language as well as sociocultural competencies such as politeness and honorific expressions through their daily life. The case is similar to the experience of participants in the present study in that learners needed to learn not only linguistic aspects of L2 but also the competence to perform according to the requirements of the discourse.

Considering that the activity of language socialization is influenced by wider social, cultural and political purposes, knowledge and practice, interactional routines are shaped by the attempt of the teacher to transmit knowledge; that is, how, when and what sort of knowledge students should exhibit. One of the aspects of how Japanese students and children are socialized is the process of the interactional frame designed for the school and university entrance exams. Nukuto (2010, 2013) shows the structure of the power system in teacher-student interaction in the context of English education from the perspective of critical discourse analysis. This work suggests how factors from outside the classroom are transferred into the classroom with relation to power. It also shows how the teacher must take on this power to achieve discursive practice, which is created through demands on social knowledge.

2.5 Ethnography of Speaking (Communication)

2.5.1 Speech community

The present study focuses on one group, where members share norms of performance. I regard the group as a “speech community”, which is one of the important
units of analysis in the ethnography of communication. A speech community has been
defined several ways and these definitions continue to be a subject of consideration.

In an early definition, speech community was seen as a group where patterns of
language use were shared among members. Bloomfield (1933) describes a speech
community as “A group of people who use the same set of speech signals” (p. 29). In
Bloomfield’s definition, the core of a speech community is the shared linguistic norm.
However, as Hymes (1974) claims, features of a particular language are not the only
norm-based elements in the community. He holds that “the linguistic and
communicative boundaries between communities cannot be defined by linguistic
features alone” (p. 47). One can infer from this that a speech community is complex in
that it is not a group in which people share only one particular language. Rather than
that, a speech community consists of “shared” rules of communication, often distributed
over more than one traditional “language”.

A speech community is thus a community where members share various kinds
of norms. Hymes (1974) defines it as a community “sharing knowledge, of rules for the
conduct and interpretation of speech” (p. 51), and as such, the “shared” norms based on
members’ experience in the community. For example, the members share
communicative norms, knowledge and ways of understanding and creating meanings.

As mentioned above, a speech community is not defined just in terms of
linguistic features. However, language use is crucial in an understanding of features of
the community. Saville-Troike (2003) distinguishes two types of speech community,
particularly focusing on linguistic aspects. One is “hard-shelled”, in which only one
limited language is used, and the community is isolated from others outside of it. On the
contrary, a “soft-shelled” community is one where a major language is used by members but it is often a second or foreign language (Saville-Troike, 2003, p. 16).

In the present study, the group on which I will focus is a soft-shelled speech community. The norms in this group emerge from members participating in the group activities. Similarly, Labov (1972) defines a speech community “by participation in a set of shared norms” (p. 120). The present study will focus not only on features of language use and functions but also on how non-linguistic communication norms are created and shared in the group; this statement encourages us to consider whether a speech community is independent from language norms. Morgan (2014) concludes that,

while the concept of the speech community initially focused on language systems, relationships and boundaries, it expanded to include the notion of social representation and norms in the form of attitudes, values, beliefs and practices – and the notion that members of speech communities work their language as social and cultural products.

(p. 9)

The present study examines the notion of speech community further as one of the topics in the overall discussion chapter (Chapter 8). Considering the elements of the speech community as mentioned above, I see the speech community as a place where members construct norms through discursive practice before sharing elements needed in communication, or where the members may accomplish these at the same time through group events.
2.5.2 Communicative competence

The research area of language socialization is concerned with the phenomenological relation of language learning and socialization. These involve the acquisition of linguistic and pragmatic competence, and the sociocultural knowledge that is necessary to participate in a community. From the sociolinguistic perspective, these experiential skills are understood and defined as “communicative competence” (Hymes, 1968, 1972a).

Considering that language socialization study is interested in language acquisition and culture knowledge acquisition, it looks at how participants acquire competence in language, and the competence in using it while they are culturally maturing. These are called “linguistic competence” (Chomsky, 1965) and “communicative competence” (Hymes, 1972a), respectively.

“Communicative competence” (Hymes, 1972a) refers to the understanding of social and cultural context during language acquisition. Its framework is formulated through and composed of the idea of “speech community” and the “ethnography of speaking” by Hymes (1968, 1972a, 1972b). In the study of the ethnography of communication, Hymes (1974) suggests that “communicative competence” is in opposition to Chomsky’s theory with regard to the point of “competence”.

“Linguistic competence” (Chomsky, 1965) has been a major theoretical focus in the acquisition of the ability to create language. This theory focuses on how human beings acquire an ability to create grammatical sentences through their “language acquisition device” (Chomsky, 1965). In this point, the theory is totally independent from the contextual factors which might influence language learners, or from how
speakers act in a linguistic and cultural context. According to Hymes (1972a), the meaning of competence in “linguistic competence” is the knowledge of “grammar”. In contrast, Saville-Troike (2003) summarizes Hymes’s main idea to be that “communicative competence involves knowing not only the language code but also what to say to whom, and how to say it appropriately in any given situation” (p. 18).

Communicative competence is at the center of the study of language learning in the process of socialization, since this suggests that the learning of patterns of language use together with the appropriate culture knowledge is expected of participants in the community. From this perspective, it is important to focus on how participants appropriately contextualize their language ability and activity in cultural situations.

2.5.3 Rich points

In a “topic-oriented approach” (Hymes, 1996), ethnographers do not have established hypotheses or even predetermined focus points before arriving at the site of their research. According to Agar (1996), when we notice something unfamiliar to us in the research site, something we cannot easily understand, or imagine, this is a “rich point”. This point is of crucial note by the ethnographer during the fieldwork. The rich point also points to something contributable to the community; in other words, it implicitly describes an aspect of the community and is a key for us to understand the context and participate in the community.

In the present study, I will describe several rich points that I found in the field. As linguistic ethnography’s goal is to make the familiar unfamiliar, it is possible that my rich points will look “usual” to readers. However, I interpret each rich point as having a meaning that originates in community practice. Even if the rich point looks the
same as something which we might have already experienced, or looks similar to
something in our own community, it includes an original, contextual meaning in the
context of the research. In my interpretation of this, rich points are an indication of how
communicative competence and norms function within a speech community.

2.6 Chapter Conclusion: Research Niche

Looking over the studies of language socialization in Japanese as a first and
second (foreign) language, or of language socialization in Japan, it is still rare that
language socialization in languages other than Japanese has been examined. In addition,
it is also rare to see Japanese language as being involved in language socialization in
multilingual and multicultural contexts. Moreover, attempts to study globalization as
one of the contexts of language socialization are also rare. To address this gap, in the
present study, I attempt to show how socialization is found in “translingual practice”
(Canagarajha, 2013) and multicultural discourse, focusing on a higher education context
as a case study. In this context, the Japanese language is part of the linguistic repertoire
of participants together with a global language, English.

As an additional point of focus, by reviewing the studies in socialization in
academic discourse and in higher education, one can see that there has already been
some research focusing on oral activities in second language learning and socialization
into the academic community, particularly in universities in English-speaking countries.
By contrast, studies of academic socialization are not yet common in Japan. The present
study will address this gap by focusing on a higher education context in which foreign
students and Japanese students are socialized to be globally minded students through
experiencing academic group communication and using languages required by the context.
Chapter 3
Methodology

3.1. Chapter Introduction

This study is a case study of one particular context which I, as an ethnographer, experienced. The elements of the study are largely based on the methodology with which I looked at the context, and collected the data, and how I interpreted the events through the lens of several academic disciplines, that is, in an interdisciplinary manner. In this chapter, I will describe these elements in order to clarify the observations which will be described later on.

3.2 The Setting

3.2.1 The Course

This ethnographic research was conducted using data from a course offered by the Division of International Affairs at Kansai University. The Division deals with academic and administrative matters related to Japanese students interested in studying abroad and international students (including exchange program students) from foreign countries studying at Kansai University. In the 2014 school year, the Division started a program to educate Japanese students who want to study and work overseas, and international students who are in Japan to learn about Japanese language and culture.

Like most Japanese universities, which have implemented courses to create opportunities for students to experience an international, multicultural atmosphere on the school campus and in their curriculums, Kansai University has been aiming to become a more international and global university for at least a decade. In this period,
the number of international students on campus and the number of students who study abroad have both increased. As a part of its system of helping Japanese students study abroad and supporting international students in Kansai University, as well as assisting them with their daily life in school, the division offers an academic program for both types of students.

The program consists of several academic modules, each with various courses. According to the Course Guide (see details in 3.4.3), the division provides five modules, and in one there is a course where the students work on English communication skills concerned with academic issues relevant to their studies. The course where I conducted my fieldwork was in this module related to language learning.

I conducted my study in the course, “TOEFL Score up Training”, which belonged to the unit for the development of English communication skills. As the course title suggests, the purpose of this course is to improve students’ English ability, and in particular strategies for the TOEFL test. This course was open to any student from any of the faculties, as well as any international students, including exchange students, at Kansai University.

3.2.2 The Class

The class was in held the fifth period (16:20-17:50) every Friday, in the meeting room of the Division buiding. This room usually was used for the staff meeting in the Division, but was sometimes also used for courses. Officially, 22 Japanese students and other Asian students registered for this course. These learners took a placement test, similar to the TOEFL test, during the first week of the course. Based on the results of
the test, they were put into six groups: two advanced groups, two intermediate groups, and two beginner groups.

The class was managed and taught by one Japanese associate professor, who taught in the Division of International Affairs. The class also had six teaching assistants: three American TAs, two Japanese TAs, and one Chinese TA. Based on the English proficiency of each group, each TA was assigned one group.

Every class was organized as a short introductory lecture and group activities. Tasks in the group sessions mainly consisted of reading and listening. In addition, writing and speaking tasks were given to students as weekly assignments. Before assignments were given, students had opportunities in their class groups to confirm what they should do. The students could also prepare for the assignments with other members of the group.

Figure 1. Classroom layout
3.2.3 The Group

After the first few weeks of the course, I selected one advanced-level group for my fieldwork, and selected learners within the group whom I would focus on and whose data I would track according to the results of the interviews which I would carry out after the semester had finished.

This group was one of two advanced-level groups in the class. It was supported by an American student TA, Andrew. Three students had been slotted into this group according to their scores on the placement test. The members were Ozora (Japanese student), Rachmad (an exchange student from Indonesia), and Charlee (an exchange student from Thailand).

From the findings in the observation of this group, the following four characteristics could be seen: 1) most of the participants had reached a level where they could follow the native English TA, 2) all students attended most of the weeks, so I could follow their participation in the group, 3) this group had the most varied multilingual and multicultural background overall, including the TA, and 4) this group’s interactions were not necessarily managed by the TA, but often by the members themselves. These four points made the group a worthy focus for a study that addresses academic socialization in the global era.

3.2.4 Participants

As mentioned above, the group consists of one TA, Andrew, and three students: Ozora, Rachmad, and Charlee. The first three agreed to let me use their real names in this study; Charlee is a pseudonym for the third student. In addition to these, I should mention two others who were peripheral participants in the group: the class lecturer and
myself, as a class TA, an ethnographer, and an author. Basic facts about the participants are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1

The Participants in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>F/M</th>
<th>Resources (L1/L2)</th>
<th>Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew (Teaching Assistant)</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>English/Japanese</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozora</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Japanese/ English</td>
<td>Translation (English and Japanese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachmad</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Indonesian/ English, Japanese</td>
<td>Japanese language and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlee (pseudonym)</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Thai/ English, Japanese</td>
<td>Japanese language and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Japanese/ English</td>
<td>Holds Ph.D. in Second Language Studies (SLS) from a university in the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (Ethnographer, Author)</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Japanese/ English</td>
<td>Sociolinguistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.4.1 Andrew (Teaching Assistant)

Andrew, a 21-year-old American male, was an exchange student from the U.S. and majored in anthropology at his home university. He studied Japanese language and culture at Kansai University. He worked as a teaching assistant for this course. As such, he was in charge of the most advanced group. His way of managing the group was student-centered, in that he encouraged the students to express their ideas and to develop the group interaction. He was aware of the academic level of the group, so he
wanted the students to support their ideas with reasons. Although he managed the group in an academic way, he was kind and gentle in supporting the students.

3.2.4.2 Ozora

Ozora was a 19 year-old Japanese male student at Kansai University. He was in the Faculty of Foreign Language Studies and studied translation there. He took this course to improve his English skills, especially speaking and listening. He was also preparing to spend his second school year overseas in the UK as a part of his faculty’s program. His English level was relatively advanced based on the interaction data. However, during the first few weeks, he was not easily able to contribute to the group interaction because he had not developed communicative competence in multicultural group interactions and academic discourse. However, with his English ability, he was able to develop his skill in participating in the group interaction, involving himself in ongoing activities.

3.2.4.3 Rachmad

Rachmad was an international exchange student from Indonesia. He was a third year student in his home university, where he majored in Japanese language and culture. He was a very active student in the group. He often took the first turn, and tried to express his ideas. He was familiar with Japanese culture, particularly manga (Japanese comic books). Accordingly, he actively contributed to group interaction when the topic was related to culture. However, his English level was not as advanced as Ozora’s. He often expressed his ideas using only a few words, or with the teaching assistant’s help. However, his communication proficiency was prominent in the group activities. His behavior in the group was highly noticeable and contributed to my understanding of the
interaction data. He lacked the degree of English ability necessary to express his ideas fully or to make comments on the group interaction, but he had the ability to participate in and help to develop the group interaction.

3.2.4.4 Charlee

Charlee was an international exchange student from Thailand. She studied Japanese language and culture at Kansai University. I did not find her English proficiency as advanced as the other participants in the group, but she had a positive attitude toward the group activity. She often made jokes, but sometimes missed the point of the group conversation. However, she did contribute to the group discussion and helped it get to the goal. Unfortunately, I was not able to catch her after the class period or after the course, so I could not interview her. However, from my observations, she appeared to be a genuinely friendly and active student, contributing to the group and the course.

3.2.4.5 Lecturer

The lecturer holds a Ph.D. degree from a university in the U.S., and specializes in second language acquisition. She has long-term experience living abroad, starting from when she was young, and her English proficiency is quite near that of a native English speaker. In the course, she managed the overall classroom consisting of five different groups. In most of the classes, at the beginning or between each task, she gave a short lecture and guidance or asked an assistant to talk at the front of the room. She used English as a common language in the class.
3.2.4.6 “I” as Ethnographer and Author

I add myself, as an ethnographer and an author, to the participants in this research. I was not in the group which is the focus of the present study, but as mentioned before, I participated in the class as a teaching assistant for one of the beginning level groups. All students, including the other TAs, knew that I worked for the course in both capacities, as researcher and TA. This situation worked well in that I was able to blend in naturally to the classroom interaction: I had minimal influence on the group as observer.

The point here is the transition of my role from ethnographer to author. Geertz (1988) uses “an anthropologist as author” in his book title. According to Geertz, the role of ethnographers (which can in Geertz’s case be equated with anthropologists) is to bring out the customs or habits of a community where they spend time; in other words, to show the knowledge they have acquired in the context as a participant. Also, Geertz states that they do not have a style such as a writer of literature would have. Therefore, I will write and describe the “rich points” (Agar, 1994) that I noticed in the course of my role as TA and my observation in the course. In particular, I will discuss what I learned from the group and its participants through the fieldwork.

3.3 Languages

In anthropological and ethnographic fieldwork as well as linguistic fieldwork, the languages that the researcher uses to participate in activities, to gather the data, and to interpret the context are crucial. In linguistic fieldwork, particularly anthropological linguistics, there are several roles for languages. In the field, languages are broadly
categorized into two types: the language which researchers are interested in and the languages which are used to do research (Sakel & Everett, 2012). As Anderson (1995) states, we can view language as an “object” or as an “tool” in linguistic ethnographic research (p. 84). With this in mind, I review and categorize my own language use in the various situations of my research.

As an ethnographer, I undertook bilingual fieldwork through two languages, English and Japanese. In the classroom, most of the participants and I used English as much as we could because the class encouraged all participants to use English as a target language and a lingua franca. In other situations, I used English to communicate with the TAs; particularly the American student TAs in my interviews, while chatting, and in performing the class management tasks.

In addition to using English as a target language and also a lingua franca in the classroom, I used Japanese with the students in the target groups. In this case, the topics and situations were not directly related to the class, but rather our interactions were small talk.

In the interviews, I used one of the two languages depending on the interviewee. I interviewed the American TA of the target group in English, which was natural in that English was a daily communication tool for us. The choice of English was definitely convenient and helpful for him to express his ideas, and for me to ask about the class and the group events. The various choices of language are summarized in Table 2.
Table 2
Author’s use of language in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In Classroom</th>
<th>In Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>With TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Ethnographic Fieldwork

3.4.1 Participant observation

This research project was a longitudinal study of the language socialization and the development of EFL learners’ sociocultural and linguistic competence in academic discourse. The fieldwork was done from April to July in 2014 (the spring semester of the school year). As is common in general ethnography, linguistic anthropology and linguistic ethnography, I attended the class as one of the participants, not only to gather data but also to know the community and to be a part of the discursive practice.

As for my participation, I worked as a teaching assistant in the class. As mentioned in 3.2.2, the students were grouped into six groups in the class according to the results of a placement test, and I was the TA for the beginner level group. As a researcher, as in any sociolinguistic research, it is desirable to survey participants’ activities as they usually take place when there is no observer present. In other words, to avoid what Labov (1972) called the “observer’s paradox”, we have to create a situation where the researcher is not noticed (Genzuk, 2003).
Hymes mentions that “There is no way to avoid the fact that the ethnographer himself is a factor in the inquiry” (1980, p. 99). However, Schieffelin (1990) overcame this problem by being given the status of a local woman in the interaction and activities among Kaluli women and children. In my case, as well as Schieffelin’s, it was relatively easier to engage in the context because I had the position as a TA, namely a prescribed role in the context of the class. In other words, I had an identity other than that of only an “observer”, so that my existence in this context was quite natural. Thus, it would seem that my position as an observer had minimal influence on the situations.

3.4.2 Data collection

In ethnography, the materials which can be regarded as the data are of three types: documentation, observation, and interviews (e.g., Hammersley, 1990; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007; Fetterman, 2010). During my participant observation, I collected the data with digital voice recorders and a digital video camera. The main device used to gather spoken data was a digital voice recorder. I asked the TAs who were in the groups to pin a microphone connected to the IC recorders on their chest or clothes. By using a pinned microphone, rather than putting it in the center of the group, I intended to avoid or decrease the learners’ attention to the recording.

3.4.3 Data

3.4.3.1 Documentation (The Program Document)

As I described in 3.2.1, the outline of the program was available as a document on the website of the division (Kansai University Division of International Affairs, Accessed in 2014). The program document, as one type of data, describes the settings which are unfamiliar to outsiders and indicates expectations of participant proficiency in the course. Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) mention that “Documentation can provide
information about the settings being studied, or about their wider contexts, and particularly about key figures or organizations” (p. 122). The program document sets up the discourse of the target classroom, showing the aims of this course and the classroom cultural norms expected of the students and other participants.

The macro discourse, the broadest context of “the order of the discourse” (Fairclough, 1992), frames the ideal envisioned by the planners. In this study, the documentation does not only show the setting, but also indicates what the participants are expected to do in the classroom.

The contents of the document shall be discussed in Chapter 4, in which I will look at how global education policy is practiced and how the participants viewed their development of language and communication skills in the course.

3.4.3.2 Interview data

Interviewing plays an important role when ethnographers come back from the field and review the data before interpreting events, participants’ behaviors, and any rich points found in the community under study. In the interview sessions, I attempted to get at the insiders’ points of view by reviewing events with the participants. As Duranti (1997) notes, “the interview might be a time to obtain background cultural information that is crucial for understanding particular speech exchanges” (pp. 102-103).

The insider participants provided me with crucial clues to reconsider my impressions of the events and the context. Also, the interview data helped me to discover rich points which I tracked as major research topic foci.

I conducted the interviews with Andrew, Rachmad and Ozora (I could not make contact with Charlee) on July 18th, 2014, which was after the course finished. I
interviewed each for approximately 35 minutes (except for Rachmad, for 55 minutes). During the interview, I asked Andrew, the TA whose group I focused on as a target group, how he felt about the learning style of the classroom, such as the way of making groups each with a TA, as well as the performance and motivations of his group members. To Rachmad and Ozora, I asked questions about how they felt during the class, and what they remembered about their performance in the group discussion. In addition, I asked them how they felt about the other group members, including Andrew.

In addition to the face-to-face interviews, I used SNS chatting (Messenger) for online interviews to talk with the participants after most of them had returned to their home countries. These interviews were vital for the analysis presented in Chapter 4.

3.4.3.3 Observation and recorded data (Group interaction)

In addition to the two types of data above, data from one target group’s sessions were obtained during participant observation. As I mentioned in 3.4.2, I recorded group sessions with a digital voice recorder and also used a digital video camera for the entire class. The observation was carried out in the open style, through which an ethnographer observes the events without any a priori assumption. In my “open ethnographic observation” (Copeland & Creese, 2015), where I did not have any specific focus point, I wrote down as far as possible everything that I noticed in the class.

As mentioned earlier, I was a TA for one of the non-target groups, so I could not be present to document everything for the advanced group within the session time. Hence, I listened to the recordings, after the classes or at other times, to review and find rich points which would help describe the discourse. I mainly used audio recording data rather than video recordings. This was enough to meet the goals of the present study to
focus on learners’ spoken language in interactions. I went over the data five times, gradually focusing on particular aspects which appeared to be rich points of the study. In this way, I was able to re-observe the events after the fact while taking notes.

The amount of recorded data is in total 18.8 hours. This number includes not only the total length of group interactions but also pre- and post-class activities. In order to keep this study naturalistic as an ethnographic study, I handed a recorder to the TA before the group members got together in the class. This was to minimize my own presence in the classroom. On average, each class was approximately 90 minutes, but some weeks, such as the week when we set up a pre- and final examination, I did not carry out audio recording in the class.

In addition to the analytic practice described above, I tracked the events according to the interview data analysis. I applied a “tracking method” (Markee, 2008) to look at the development of students’ communicative competence or relate the observation data to other types of data, from macro to micro discourse.

3.5 Transcription
3.5.1 Issues in transcription

In ethnography, events are inevitably represented by transcribing the spoken data in order to describe rich points or reproduce contexts. Transcription has been a crucial tool in discourse analysis, anthropology, conversational analysis, and other areas which need to describe spoken events (e.g., Ochs, 1979; Mishler, 1991; Cook, 1990; Duranti, 2006). However, there are various issues surrounding to what extent and how to describe details of elements within verbal and nonverbal interactions and how they
should be described. In order to address these issues, we must consider what kinds of conventions should be used for transcribing events that are the focus of research.

In the process of ethnographic research, events are established and analyzed by creating and using transcription. However, transcription is not only an “analytic practice” (Mondada, 2007) but also a transmitting practice that ethnographers can use to show what they have found to an audience. The role of transcription in ethnography is as a supplementary aspect to help readers understand the events that are described.

In order to read transcriptions properly, two of their aspects should be noticed: what the transcript describes and how it is expressed. Bucholtz (2000) suggests two aspects of transcription: “interpretive decisions (What is transcribed?)” and “representational decisions (How is it transcribed?)” (p. 1439). These perspectives on transcription suggest that transcription includes ideological and political notions which the author of the transcription implies and which support the transcriber’s empirical understanding of the events and their rich points.

In addition to what to transcribe and how to transcribe, we must also consider what extent to describe. The transcription depends on what a researcher intends to show in a paper in terms of its research methodology and analysis. Jenks (2011) refers to “Open Transcript” and “Closed Transcript”. Open transcript is considered a result of events as the researcher saw them. In this style, all features of an interaction are transcribed. As the researcher planned to look at the transcribed data without any assumptions or research questions, the data are not transcribed after abstraction for any points to be focused on. Therefore, open transcription does not reflect the researcher’s decision on what is to be emphasized.
In contrast, closed transcription implies and reflects a research aim. The transcription presents the features of events that the researcher wishes to shed light on as rich points. Closed transcription is used in order to “selectively highlight only those features of talk and interaction that assist in the analysis of data” (Jenks, 2011, pp. 12-13).

Even if transcription can describe what researchers expect it to, it may still be difficult to understand the total context and events only through the transcribed spoken data. As Duranti (2006) states, transcripts are “merely second-hand interpretations of communicative events” (p. 301). Also, Jenks (2011) notes that transcription is an “empirical objective” (p. 13). Transcription works together with analytical methods, research aims and the researchers, and this makes readers understand the empirically objective expression.

3.5.2 Transcription in practice

As seen above, transcription is regarded theoretically (e.g., Ochs, 1979) in considering how it ought to be processed as a method for data description. As Duff (2008) states, how detailed transcriptions are depends on what a researcher attempts to say. In light of this, since the present study focuses on university students’ oral communication in the academic discourse, I will not pay attention to micro aspects of speaking and turns as is done in conversation analysis. Following my understanding of transcription theory, I will here summarize the practice of transcription as used for the present study.

All transcribed interactions in the present study are examples that describe a rich point in each analysis chapter. In other words, the transcriptions are representative.
These are closed transcriptions; in other words, I already have selected a rich point which will be presented in the transcription with my description and understanding of the context.

Following Copland, Creese, Rock, and Shaw’s (2015) framework for linguistic ethnography, the details of transcription of the interaction data depend on what the author is attempting to show the readers. Accordingly, in the present study, I have used a specific set of transcription conventions, which are shown in the Appendix.

The present study deals with not only English but also Japanese. I transcribe it in the Hepburn system of Romanization, in particular, Revised Hepburn. In addition to the use of Japanese by the participants, I also transcribe the language of non-native speakers of English. In doing so, I transcribe exactly what they said without corrections.

I also present the data from interviews via texting. In transcribing the English used in texting by native or non-native English speakers, I try to capture the intention of their language use as well as how they have expressed themselves, and therefore have not changed their language into Standard English expressions.

3.6 Analytical Framework
3.6.1 Classroom ethnography

Ethnography is interested in a continuum of sociocultural context from macro to micro. Events situated in local settings, but which also belong to a macro context, are studied (Blommaert & Jie, 2010). Similar to the focus on contextual unity in ethnography more generally, classroom ethnography sheds light on how classroom events are related to social and cultural contexts (Bloome, 2012).
In the process of looking at what is happening in the classroom, classroom ethnography “builds on a set of epistemological principles from anthropology and sociology concerned with the cultural nature of social groups including an emphasis on seeking an *emic* perspective” (Bloome, 2012, p. 10). Following this interdisciplinary perspective of ethnography and classroom discourse, I shall examine micro events, such as group interactions, paying attention to what sociocultural norms participants need to learn in the group, which is a part of a sociocultural discourse continuum.

3.6.2 Classroom Sociocultural Discourse Analysis

In analyzing the data collected in ethnographic fieldwork, ethnographers strive to find “rich points” (Agar, 1994, 1996) or to “locate patterns” in the data (Kaplan-Weinger & Ullman, 2015). These might be understood as phenomena that we interpret as sociocultural necessities in a certain sociocultural context.

I focus not only on language use and acquisition but also on how knowledge is constructed through language learning and various sociocultural practices. From the perspective of classroom discourse analysis, Cazden (2001) mentions that we put analytical focus on how “patterns of language use affect what counts as ‘knowledge,’ and what occurs as learning” (p. 3). Applying this perspective, I examine participants’ language use in relation to the outcomes of the group sessions.

In addition to the focus on the patterns of group language use, as suggested by Cazden (2001), I applied the framework of sociocultural discourse analysis (Mercer, 2004) to investigate how thought is constructed through interaction. Throughout group sessions where one discussion topic is given, participants not only use language (in an EFL context, they try to use a target language), but also think and take part in other
participants’ thinking. Mercer (2000) calls this “interthink”. Examining this type of interaction where interthinking occurs, sociocultural discourse analysis focuses on how language functions in creating knowledge rather than on particular language features (Mercer, 2004). From this perspective, I shall examine how the interaction is achieved, considering the learning and the interactional outcomes.

3.6.3 Other analytical frameworks

Looking at the events from the ethnographic and discourse analytical perspectives above, I will examine several interactions from linguistic and pragmatic points of views. This is based on the framework of linguistic ethnography’s proposal that encourages looking at events in an interdisciplinary way, combining ethnography and other academic areas.

The analysis Chapters 5-7 will make use of several analytical frameworks depending on the rich point of each. In Chapter 5, I will focus on the functions of a discourse marker and in interactions. In Chapter 6, within the framework of translanguaging, I look at participants’ use of their common linguistic repertoire. In Chapter 7, as mentioned before, I will adopt a “Behavior Tracking Methodology” (Markee, 2008) in order to look at a process of one student’s linguistic and communicative development.
3.7 Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I described the elements necessary to interpret the events of the present study. As a case study, this contextual information is necessary to establish the events of the present study as they are described.

Based on the information given in this chapter, in order to understand the context in more detail, I will look at what the course of the present study was, and how the participants felt about the context throughout the course period. In Chapter 4, I will examine the course document, in which the course goals are presented. After looking at the document, I will describe the interviews conducted with several participants and discuss how the university’s global education policy is realized in the classroom and how participants experienced the situation set up by the curriculum planner.
Chapter 4
A Course Planning and its Practice:
Feeling Globalization and Being Competent

4.1 Chapter Introduction

Before I started focusing on the topic of this chapter, I had paid more attention to what was happening in the group and how the participants performed there, looking at their linguistic and communicative skills. In other words, I was shedding light on what happens in verbal interaction. However, when I was writing a proposal for a conference which was focused on language policy and language acquisition, I attempted to bridge an aspect of the macro context and its practice in a micro discourse. At that time, I found, or rather, I went back to, a basic focus of ethnography: “micro-contextual factors” and “macro-contextual factors” as relevant to the whole context (Blommaert & Jie, 2010, p. 18). Therefore, I felt a need to clarify these aspects of the field for myself and for the readers, while discovering what the participants felt in order to capture an emic view of the context.

With the above points in mind, the present chapter addresses the following issues: 1) How are the goals of foreign language education planning influenced by “globalization”, and how are these reproduced in the micro context of the classroom? 2) How do participants develop competencies in English and intercultural communication in the micro-context of the classroom?
In recent years, the English education policy of Japan has become increasingly and self-consciously associated with the process of globalization. There are, however, various interpretations and definitions of “globalization” depending on the contexts where it appears—such as the economic, cultural or political (Maringe & Foskett, 2010). Nevertheless, there is a general feeling that globalization is something to which the aims and the style of teaching and learning need to respond (Butler & Iino, 2005). Various reforms have been implemented by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), a division of the Japanese government, explicitly in response to increasing globalization (MEXT, 2011).

However, the policy reforms not only have an influence on national schools, but also on private schools. While the government attempted to reform and make Japanese universities “global and internationally competitive” (Ishikawa, 2011, p. 193) with the selection of 13 universities for its so-called “Global 30” program (MEXT, 2009), other universities also have had to deal with the issue of education policy related to globalization.1

As we shall see, there appears to be a consensus among educators and students that “globalization”, in the context of language learning, is a matter less of language acquisition in itself than of practice in using English to actually interact with others, particularly in contexts where it is the lingua franca. For students, then, becoming “globalized” is often equated with using English in this way.
4.3 Language Policy in Language Education

Features of language policy and planning have had to be reformed as social situations have changed, in the other words, to respond to social and political conditions (Ricento, 2000). Private universities in Japan are generally free to conduct their own education planning even if they are influenced by sociocultural context and the government’s education policy. The Japanese government’s language policy has reconsidered language education in the era of globalization, for example, by suggesting a “Plan for 300,000 Exchange Students” in 2008 (The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, 2016). This plan was not only concerned with the acquisition of English as a global language, but also aimed at creating international pedagogical contexts within Japan, thereby promoting Japanese universities as international universities with international students.

Many Japanese universities have managed to create multilingual and multicultural environments. Since the early 2000s, Japanese universities have offered English programs through English only, or programs that use both Japanese and English to create opportunities for English learning related to globalization (Yamagami & Tollefson, 2011). In this type of program, English is expected to function not only as a target language but also as a medium of communication and a trigger of target language acquisition. From a practical perspective, this is important in that it has an influence on Teaching of English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) according to MEXT’s (2003) promotion of the idea of nurturing “Japanese who can use English” (Hashimoto, 2006, 2009).

English is expected to be a medium for learners to participate in global situations, and it is well accepted that English is used as a worldwide lingual franca, “a ‘contact
language’ between persons who share neither a common native tongue nor a common (national) culture, and for whom English is the chosen foreign language of communication”. (Firth, 1996, cited in Jenkins, 2014, p. 24). There have been cases where English as a medium for university management has been an issue in universities (Jenkins, 2014). In European universities, English functions as a lingua franca in administrative contexts where international students are involved, as well as in pedagogical contexts (Jenkins, 2014). Putting aside the issues highlighted by Jenkins (2014) — that there are some linguistic inequalities and difficulties in conducting school courses with international students – a similar linguistic situation might be ideal for Japan, where international curricula are managed through the medium of English, and macro-level situations related to globalization are reproduced in micro-level school contexts.

In addition to English proficiency, communication proficiency did appear in MEXT’s “Action Plan” (MEXT, 2003) as one of the important competencies for “global persons”. The MEXT policy thus started to use “komyunikeshon noryoku” (proficiency in communication) as a crucial target for the English learning context. According to Torikai (2005), with the appearance of this keyword, the occurrence of other words such as “culture” or “cultural understanding” has decreased. She states that “the government’s rationale for their decisions on the purpose and objects of English language education is to accommodate globalization” (Torikai, 2005, p. 251). As expressed in her summary, global education has two goals: English language competence and communicative competence for the global context.

In MEXT’s “Plan to Foster Global Human Resources (Gurobaru Jinzai Ikusei Keikaku)” (2012), “language” and “communication proficiency” are listed as two
crucial goals that define global human resources. These two proficiencies are an expected foundation of international communication. MEXT (2011) suggests, as an ideal level of foreign language proficiency, that “Foreign language proficiency required in global society can be defined as capability of smooth communication with people of different countries and cultures using foreign languages as a tool” (p. 3). In this quotation, language proficiency is converted into “capability of smooth communication”. These two proficiencies can also be seen as key terms in the university’s education document cited here.

4.4 Insights from Document and Interview Data

4.4.1 Program document

Here, I review and analyze three extracts from the program guide brochure: Curriculum: Overall Introduction, Program Aim (Intercultural Competence) and TOEFL Score up Training.

Extract 1 expresses the overall goal of the curriculum in which the target course is included. This extract announces the launch of the new curriculum designed for global education in the university.

Extract 1. Curriculum: Overall Introduction

Starting in 2014-2015, Kansai University has launched a new curriculum for international students and Japanese students who wish to develop their intercultural competence.

(p. 2)
In this extract, the curriculum planner outlined who could participate and what competence they would acquire through this curriculum. The term “intercultural competence” is not specific (in contrast to, for example, “improve their English”); it is unclear whether the definition includes language learning or not. However, it informs students that they can all take the courses in this curriculum, and that it particularly suits students who are interested in intercultural communication. Considering the overall aim here, it seems that the planner has attempted to encourage students to be globally minded and participate in intercultural interactions throughout this curriculum. The lack of reference to language itself is indicative of the emphasis on the importance of the idea of “intercultural competence”.

In addition to the key phrase, “intercultural competence”, the extract describes participants as “international students and Japanese students”. This phrase describes the courses as taking place in an intercultural setting, and this corresponds to the curriculum’s pedagogical aim of training students to be globally minded and international human resources.

Extract 2 explains the program aim, in particular focusing on “intercultural competence”. Following extract 1, the program guide goes into more detail about the competence needed for the courses. In extract 2, the key phrase, “a foreign language (e.g., English)” appears. This extract presents the details of the “intercultural competence” mentioned in the sub-title of the documents. The curriculum describes the needs for students to be intercultural human resources and to be communicatively active during intercultural interaction. In addition to these competencies, in order for students to take part in intercultural communication, the text points to the role of foreign language, of which English is used as the example. Here, communicative competence is
regarded as “vital” to language learning, and is defined as an “important focus” in this curriculum.

Extract 2. Program Aim (Intercultural Competence)

The KUGF curriculum aims to nurture a combination of attitudes, knowledge, understanding and skills necessary for students to understand and respect people from different cultural backgrounds, and how to respond appropriately and effectively when interacting and communicating with them. Good communication skills in a foreign language (e.g., English) is vital for such competency, and this is an important focus of the curriculum on offer.

(p. 3)

Extract 3 describes the micro context most focused on in the present study. As mentioned earlier, this course was officially offered to students for improving their TOEFL scores and their study strategies for TOEFL.

Extract 3. TOEFL Score up Training

This course is designed to help students improve their score on the TOEFL examination using academic language skills and test-taking strategies. The class will practice for specific sections of the test. By the end of the course, students will be able to approach the Listening, Structure/ Written Expression, and Reading/Vocabulary sections of paper-based TOEFL (iBT) with appropriate strategies. Some e-learning tools will be used to enhance the students’ self-learning activities outside class hours.

(p. 12)
According to extract 3, this class would focus on TOEFL preparation, considering “academic language skills” and “test-taking strategies”. The aim is to cover all sections of the TOEFL test, which is also relevant to English language learning on a broader scale.

This class was set up for students who desired to study abroad and needed to take the TOEFL exam. However, as later examples will show, most of the activities were for learning English and academic discourse strategies rather than for practicing the TOEFL test per se, although students should be able to acquire relevant TOEFL strategies through the activities.

4.4.2 Interviews

Participants from the course were interviewed as informants in order to examine how the idea of globalization influences the pedagogy for language acquisition and its practice in the classroom discourse. In particular, I wished to investigate the extent of participants’ awareness of the context and practice. I focused on 1) What participants felt were aspects of “globalization” in the course and in their group, and 2) whether participants were aware of any English acquisition having taken place. The following extracts from interviews are in the interviewees’ original English except where translation from Japanese is indicated.

I conducted the interviews with three participants from the group using Messenger. The interviews were conducted in June, 2015, which was one year after the course had finished. Around that time, Andrew and Rachmad had returned to their home countries, and Ozora was in the U.K as an exchange student from Kansai University. In the interviews, I asked them how they felt globalization in the class and in their group
relating to language acquisition. As presented later, it was found that each participant
had their own definition of globalization from their experience in the context.

4.4.2.1 Impression of globalization in the group and the classroom

At the beginning of the interview, I asked the interviewees whether they had
been able to “feel globalization” in their group. Interviewees had various impressions of
this group, but broadly speaking three elements were attributed to globalization: the
group composition and language use within the group, the sociocultural context, and the
form of interaction.

The TA, Andrew, mentioned that the composition of the group made him feel
globalization. In particular there was the fact that each student had come from a
different country. He also noted the use of English to communicate among participants
in the group.

I think the group itself was a good example of globalization, mostly due to the
fact that every member was of a different nationality and they were using
English (in the classroom) as a means to interact and integrate with each other.

Moreover, referring to the underlying reason why he and the other group
members had gotten together in the class, Andrew noted, from the perspective of an
exchange student in Japan, that learning about Japan and Japanese language was their
original purpose for coming to the country.

Also you would notice globalization in the fact that three of the group
members (myself included) were foreigners not from Japan, Japanese and
Japan in general was another factor that brought us together and in a sense was
part of globalization.
Andrew also mentioned that that the process of interaction in the group made him feel globalization, in that all students interacted to achieve one goal.

There was definitely times within the group that we felt really involved because everyone was moving towards one goal. I think because of this we felt some form of globalization through working towards a common goal.

Like Andrew, the Indonesian student, Rachmad, referred to the participants’ nationalities and the multicultural situation of the class as a representation of globalization. He noted that he felt globalization in the situation where students whose languages and cultural backgrounds were different got together. He also cited the differences of students’ cultural background as being shown by the style of interaction in the group.

Another condition is...when we learning one topic and then the author (the TA) always asked us "what about in ur country?" or "is it happening in ur country

According to Rachmad, the students in his group were often encouraged to refer to the case of their own country when they gave some comment or showed ideas to the group. Through this style of activity, he experienced globalization in exchanging and receiving knowledge of the various students’ countries. In addition, he mentioned different language features which he felt through the group interaction.

I felt it (globalization) when we were in conversation. Even in the same language (English) but we speak in different accent and pronounce.

He was referring to the function of English as a lingua franca in the group by emphasizing that each student had a different pronunciation.
The Japanese student, Ozora, also mentioned that the participants around him were a factor in his feeling of globalization in the group. In addition, he noted that he felt globalization due to the topics that they discussed.

At that time, there many foreign students around me, so I was feeling the difference. Sometimes, we talked about each of our cultures and customs, and we were surprised by each other.

(Translated from Japanese by the author)

This type of situation made him feel as if he was not in his university, but had gone into another sociocultural context.

The place was my school. But I felt more like I was a visitor.

(Translated from Japanese by the author)

4.4.2.2 Impression of English acquisition

As per the aim of the course, I asked interviewees about the development of the students’ English proficiency. First, Andrew indicated that he could not see any outstanding development of English proficiency among the students. He pointed out that this was a due to of the length of the course, and the number of classes in a semester.

I think it was too short a time to see much improvement in students’ overall English. I do believe they may have picked up vocabulary and some of the English colloquialisms but no drastic improvements.
He did note, however, that the students practiced using vocabulary while communicating with each other through spoken English.

Rachmad was unsure about whether he had improved his English through this course. However, he had a positive impression of the style of learning which he was able to acquire in the English course. He also compared this learning style with his learning experience in his home country.

I'm not pretty sure that my english got better but, the important thing is...when I joined into that class, I could learn english in different way...and it was so fun. it doesn't like what I've ever imagined.

About his learning experience, he described the difference from the present English class.

well you know, normally the class there just 1 teacher, and many students. the author teach us and we just listening and writing and you'll get bored, don't you? but it totally different when I joined with that english class. the class's atmosphere was really alive. we were so active in the class. we talk, we share, we give opinion etc.

From his description, the classes in his country seemed to be non-communicative and non-interactive. He said that style made him bored, but, in contrast, he felt that the TOEFL class was really alive.

As suggested above, participants in general did not feel any improvement in their English during the course. However, two students made reference to the way of communicating in group interaction. In a dialogue with me, the researcher, Ozora
described the style of communication used in the group when the members created group ideas.

Online Interview dialogue

Author: OK. How was your English acquisition? Did you learn anything?

Ozora: I think so! I learned how we should tell our ideas and so on.

Author: I see. How do you do that?

Ozora: Mainly, first, make sure of what we should say. First of all, we state our idea, and support it. I learned such an English style.

Author: Do you think you can use it outside the classroom?

Ozora: Anywhere we can! We should state our conclusion to show our own idea. That is the style in the UK.

(Translated from Japanese by the author)

In this interview dialogue, Ozora understood English acquisition as a particular aspect of communicative competence. He said he could acquire the way of telling his ideas to the group, along with the process of interaction as structured in the group. As for this skill, he said he could use this communication style not only in this class, but also in the UK, where he had been studying as an exchange student at the time when this interview was conducted.

Rachmad also mentioned the group interaction and how he had become confident about interacting with the group members.
we've got a lot of information from another student about their opinions, which is different in each other. another one.....hmm I think it could make us more interactive and built our confidence to speak in a group or forum.

He remembered that the style of exchanging opinions in the group was a factor in increasing his confidence. He did not mention anything about English use at all in this comment, but rather focused on his mastering of the style.

4.5 Actualization of the Course Plan

In my analysis, I looked at two types of data to examine how the university’s language education policy related to global education as practiced in the classroom, and how participants (learners) interpreted the situation envisioned by the curriculum planner. In addition, I examined what students were encouraged to learn in relation to the policy provisions. In what follows, I discuss two points related to global language education in the university, and also to the future development of global education policy: planned settings for language learning, and language learning through the acquisition of communicative competence.

4.5.1 “Planned Settings” for language learning

In order for language acquisition to occur, education organizations need to create and offer settings where learners interact while learning languages. Cooper (1989) refers to this as “language acquisition planning,” defining it as “those (means employed to attain acquisition goals) designed primarily to create or to improve the opportunity to learn” (p. 159, italics added by the present author). Hornberger (2006)
interprets this definition by noting that acquisition planning has an influence on language users by “improving opportunity” (p. 28).

In the analysis of the present study, it can be seen that the ideal setting was planned and shown in the documents. There, we could find that the curriculum aimed to produce an ideal setting, focusing on target participants with particular features; the course aspired to have international students as well as Japanese students who were interested in intercultural communication. Participants were encouraged to develop their intercultural competence and to be communicatively active. As seen in these expressions, the curriculum described not only a context for language learning, but one with a communicative learning orientation.

From the interviews, the participants remarked that in the class they felt globalization and that they experienced intercultural communication based on aspects of their identity such as nationality and cultural background. The Indonesian student, Rachmad, felt the difference in the cultural background when they had a chance to present their cultural knowledge in the group. In another example, the TA, Andrew, mentioned the mixture of the participants, and that they had a common reason for being in Japan. For the Japanese student, Ozora, the course was held at his home university, but it made him feel as if he were in another sociocultural context. For example, he likened his participation to that of a visiting student.

The multicultural composition of the class also promoted English-use situations within group communication. The participation structure created situations similar to the context of globalization, with learners using English as a lingua franca (Jenkins, 2003). Rachmad noticed each student’s English accent, and this made him feel involved in a global village. This case parallels the planning document (Extract 2) which noted
that foreign language (English) was “vital” to accomplish multicultural communication and was an important focus in the curriculum.

In conclusion, the curriculum plan was executed in a multicultural globally oriented context, which created a setting that encouraged students to use a foreign language (English) as a common language. Through their feedback it seems to be the case that the intercultural group communication practice aided their language learning.

4.5.2 Language learning through acquisition of “intercultural communicative competence”

Another theme which comes out of the analysis is a need for communication proficiency in language learning. The term, “communicative competence” has been discussed in a broad area of sociolinguistic studies (e.g., Hymes, 1972a, 1972b) to more pedagogical studies such as Canale and Swain (1980) and Canale (1983). In Japan’s language education policy, communication proficiency has also been raised as a crucial point. However, its definition is not clearly presented as a goal of foreign language education (Torikai, 2005).

In the curriculum document used in my research, the competency needed for students in the course is defined as “intercultural competence”. In the Japanese expression, this phrase is used, and it can be translated into “Intercultural Communicative Competence” or “Intercultural Communicative Proficiency”. The Japanese term is highly related to interaction in the global and multicultural situation of the course. Similarly, Byram (1997) suggests four crucial aspects of “intercultural communicative competence”: “knowledge, attitudes, skills of discovery and interaction” (p.33). His idea is appropriate not only for teaching and learning contexts but also for
interaction between intercultural speakers. In the curricular document as well, the relationship between linguistic and communicative ability is implicit, and English is regarded as an important tool for the development of communicative competence within the context of the classroom.

In the interviews, Andrew mentioned that he did not notice any drastic development of English ability among students in the course even though the students were able to use a variety of vocabulary to communicate within the group. Rachmad also said that he was not sure whether his English developed. Nevertheless, the style of the class, which was active compared to his country’s learning style, seemed to have created a positive attitude in him toward English learning.

In a globalized learning context, learners are required not only to use the language, but also to discover ways of communication suitable to the situation. More specifically, learners need to acquire not only linguistic skills, but also communicative competence through intercultural interaction and an understanding of multicultural elements. The communicative competence required in the context encourages students to use and acquire the target language, and learning English is a practical skill for global communication. Moreover, it reminds learners that language learning has practical global consequences.

To the question about the development of English ability, the Japanese student answered that he could communicate within the group. The learners were able to participate in “knowledge-constructing interaction” rather than just practicing and using the target language. This point shall be taken up further in relation to the use of discourse marker “so” (Chapter 5), translanguaging (Chapter 6), and an individual case of pragmatic competence (Chapter 7).
Even if it is difficult to show that target language learning was accomplished through the course, the students clearly acquired the competence appropriate to the situations of the group. In this case, the communicative competence which they needed depended on their community, where they interacted and studied English. As Hornberger (1989) has suggested, in describing her own acquisition of communicative competence in particular speech events in Spanish as a second language, participants are “communicatively competent” in that they “always get what they want, or …achieve what they set out to do in every situation” (p. 229). Siegal (1995) notes that the learners she studied were able to achieve goals at the same time that their utterances might have exhibited what Thomas (1983) has termed “pragmatic failure”. Siegal’s work disavows communicative competence in favor of a broader theory of language learning that includes factors such as race, ethnicity, gender, etc. and how these factors intersect within the language learning environment, an environment defined by a particular sociocultural context. In the present case, the American TA seems to have served an important role in guiding students toward a traditional view of communicative competence, but the students also made efforts to acquire communicative competence in the discourse of the classroom through the medium of English as a lingua franca.

4.6 Chapter Conclusion

This chapter has looked at language education planning and its practice in relation to the idea of globalization. In this context, foreign language acquisition planning has a feature of making English acquisition a secondary aim of the program. Owing to the variety of participants’ identities, a micro version of the sociocultural
context is reproduced in the classroom, where the target linguistic and intercultural communicative competence goals complement one another.

The curriculum documentation suggested a plan for a particular target group. The participants later recalled their experiences, which were in accordance with the planner’s wishes. They indicated that they could feel globalization, communicate with the group members, and use English as a communicative tool. This chapter suggests that language education, and foreign language education planning, focus on both learning a target language and on the acquisition of communicative competence through target language use. In addition, it is necessary to plan for situations through which learners can gain experience in applicable contexts beyond the classroom.

Having established what the course aimed at, and how the participants felt and interpreted this goal through their experiences in the group, in the next three analysis chapters (Chapter 5-7), I will describe the participants’ practice within this course.

Chapter 4 Notes

1. Global 30 Program (MEXT 2009) was renewed and launched as Top Global University Project (MEXT 2014)

2. Traditionally, English has been taught in Japan through the medium of the Japanese language, with the focus on grammar and translation and with little actual use of spoken English in the classroom.

3. Messenger is a free-toll texting tool. (see https://www.messenger.com/?_rdr)

4. This is the original title of the course, though it is a Japanese English expression.

5. The Indonesian student uses “author” to describe “teacher” or “TA”.
Chapter 5
Functions of the Discourse Marker “So” as Socialization

5.1 Chapter Introduction

As we saw in the previous chapter, the course encourages students to be communicative and active in a group interaction in order to be globally minded and accomplish intercultural interactions. Moreover, they need to interact striving to perform in a group as specified in the course document, through target language use (English). In the context where the students attempt to become community members, who is ideally described in the course guideline, they have to focus more on ongoing interactions rather than on the linguistic grammatical accuracy in their utterances.

A rich point related to the above, which emerged from the data analysis, is the use of the discourse marker “so”. It has several functions in the academic discourse socialization of students. Studies of discourse markers, in particular those focusing on “so”, have concentrated on its functions in marking inferential or causal connections between lines (e.g., Schiffrin, 1987). Although there are studies in conversation analysis which broaden the function of the “so” marker (e.g., Bolden, 2009), the functions of the marker in language socialization and academic interactional competence have not yet been examined.

This chapter considers linguistic aspects of the acquisition of language and interactional competence; in particular, the interactive functions and use of discourse marker “so”. From the perspective of second language acquisition, much light has already been shed on how learners acquire a target language. Some studies have also focused on how they become members of the second cultural community where they
learn and use the target language, from the perspective of language socialization in second language learning (e.g., Pool, 1992; Duff, 2010). In contrast to academic discourse socialization in writing (e.g., Bitchener, 2009), as Morita and Kobayashi (2008) mentioned, studies on oral activities in academic discourse are still developing (Morita, 2000, 2004; Ferris & Tagg, 1996a, 1996b). In light of this, I have focused on students’ acquisition of academic interactional competence and English competence in group discussion.

The chapter examines how the discourse marker “so” functions in students’ language socialization during group academic discussion. It will show how the TA, Andrew, used the discourse marker in the group session, and how the students acquired the use of the discourse marker for interaction in their group. The chapter also considers pedagogical implications.

5.2 “So” as a Discourse Marker

Discourse markers are defined as “sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk” (Schiffrin, 1987, p.31). In addition, particularly, the functions of the discourse marker “so” have been recognized as inferential and creating causal connections in clauses (e.g., Schiffrin, 1987). As such, “so” has been seen as having functions in casual conversation, but it has not been focused on as one of the linguistic features of spoken language analysis (Bolden, 2008). This is because the discourse marker was not recognized as having any grammatical meaning, but only as a “filler” between utterances (e.g., Fraser, 1999; Schiffrin, 1987). However, it has been noticed
that the marker works to build discourse and support participants’ pragmatic actions (e.g., Aijmar, 1996).

From the perspective of conversation analysis, which focuses more on sequential context, the discourse marker “so” functions not only as an inferential marker but also as one which encourages participants to actively participate in a sequence. Raymond (2004) suggested a new perspective on “so” as a marker which prompts participants to engage in a particular task. He points out that in ordinary conversation, “so” works as a “stand-alone”, to help speakers know where they are, how to restart to talk, and what actions are required in order to engage in the task. The discourse marker “so” is also used by a speaker in the course of interaction to open a new sequence (Bolden, 2006).

As the focus of the present study, discourse markers can be seen during interaction in educational contexts. If one considers discourse markers as a part of communicative competence or as a strategy used to teach foreign languages, learners’ awareness of how discourse markers guide the ongoing event is significant.

Discourse markers function in educational contexts, where they assist learners with comprehending content. Flowerdew and Tauroza (1995) explained the effectiveness of discourse markers in ESL students’ lecture comprehension. This research is remarkable in that it shows how discourse markers actually facilitate students’ understanding of the lecture content.

In pedagogical contexts, discourse markers are known to function “to signal the transition of a topic, marking the end of a topic and the beginning of another.” (Fung & Carter, 2007, p. 421). Fung and Carter also mention that discourse markers function to manage the structure of the discourse and signal connections in and transitions between
content such as “marking the opening and closing of topics, indicating sequence, topic shifts and topic continuation, and summarizing opinions” (Fung & Carter, 2007, p.435).

To the best of my knowledge, however, there are no studies that focus on how discourse markers such as “so” work to socialize foreign-language learners into routines for classroom and group interaction. In addition, there are no studies of how students acquire academic skills in contexts where discourse markers are used. In academic contexts such as group academic discussion, participants are encouraged to understand the content of this course while at the same time learning a foreign language.

As mentioned above, discourse markers have been examined from the syntactic perspective which focuses on the function of discourse markers in one sentence or utterance. In addition to this approach, discourse markers are also a means of repair of conversational sequence from the perspective of conversation analysis (e.g., Bolden, 2008, 2009; Raymond, 2004). These studies pay attention to how discourse markers function in order to transform a course of verbal action into a logical and grammatical sequence. However, they do not address how participants’ linguistic and communicative proficiencies are influenced by discourse markers and how they acquire and practice them, from the sociolinguistic and educational linguistic point of view.

5.3 Functions of “So” in Academic Socialization

In order to describe how discourse markers function in the process by which students acquire interactional competence through language socialization, I analyze extracts of the group discussion, focusing on the function of the discourse marker “so” in interaction between the TA and the group members, and its effect on socialization.
The results suggest that discourse markers function in four characteristic aspects of discourse: at the Beginning of Speech Events, in Comprehension Check, in Promoting Reasoning and Scaffolding, and in Students’ Utterances (students’ use). The first three features can be seen in the TA utterances, and the last one can be analyzed in students’ speaking turns. Although the TA’s use of discourse markers is the main analytical topic of this chapter, it will also be useful to examine, from the perspective of language socialization, how student outcomes are affected by discourse markers.

5.3.1 At the beginning of speech events

Discourse markers are used to get attention from students at the beginning of a sequence of action. This function informs and guides students to a new event in which the topic is to be introduced. In this moment, with the discourse marker “so”, students are made conscious of what they will do next according to the former event. Students, then, need not only to listen to the TA’s utterance, but to prepare their feedback for their speaking turns. In this case, students usually are not called by name. However, in response to this discourse marker, students spontaneously state their ideas.

Extract 1 is taken from a movie watching activity. The participants are trying to remember and explain the main character, “Patch Adams”, in the movie of the same name. After the instructor suggests what to do in each group, the group starts the discussion. The TA, Andrew, is mentioning a summary on a handout and is encouraging students to confirm their understanding.

Extract 1

16. Andrew: So ↓, what is this saying↑(...) What is (…) this whole summary saying about the movie↑

17. Charlee: About ah::: @@@
18. Andrew: Yes↑
19. Charlee: It will be a … xxx
20. Andrew: Anything else↓
21. Charlee: Because a movie comes up (…)
22. Andrew: Uh, huh ↑
23. Students: ((thinking of ideas))
24. Andrew: xxxx special↓
25. Charlee: Because he::: sick↑ He sick… He was sick ↓
26. Andrew: Uh-huh, ((this is said to Charlee)) sorry↑ ((in response to another student’s interruption))

In this extract, at first Andrew is starting a new sequence of action about the summary indicated as the work sheet (16). This discourse marker “so” functions as a speech act to introduce students to a new topic. With this marker, students not only focus on Andrew’s announcement, but also begin formulating ideas about the phrase (16) prefaced by “so.” After Andrew suggests the question, Charlee follows his guidance, trying to say, with the phrase “About ah::: @@@” (17). After these turns, turn-taking between Andrew and Charlee continues to the end of this sequence. Charlee holds the floor to build up the idea and is supported by Andrew’s scaffolding (19-26).

This expansion of the idea is what is aimed at first by Andrew’s discourse marker “so”. Therefore, this marker introduced a course of action, which is requiring the students to engage in academic discourse. Judging from Charlee’s participation, this discourse marker signals that it is time for participants to start the session.

The beginning utterance, which includes the discourse marker “so”, also provides additional information which might help students to easily start a discussion.
(in Line 16 of Extract 1). Presupposing that the discourse marker cannot work to inform the students of all that they need to know, it is supported by some phrases in the same turn. Even in this case, the discourse marker functions to signal the beginning of an activity.

Extract 2 shows the start of the group discussion about the topic “genetic modification”. The TA poses two questions for this topic.

Extract 2

71. Andrew: So↓ the first question is do you want it as a pet↑ And why↑ The second question is genetic modification ↓ Is it OK↑ SO!
72. Chrlee: No I don’t want ↓
73. Andrew: No, I don’t want the fish↑
74. Charlee: Because I don’t like fish↓
75. Andrew: Don’t like fish!

Andrew is calling for a discussion with two uses of discourse marker “so” at the beginning and the end of his utterance (71). Following that, Charlee gives a quick response. This answer seems accurate for the first question, “do you want it as a pet ↑ ” (71). This question requires students to state their ideas and reasons. This is an academic skill which students need in the class. Andrew is encouraging Charlee to give her reason why she does not want this type of fish. Contributing to this, Charlee answered correspondingly. Thus “so” conveys an interaction agenda; it gets the attention of the students in an attempt to start an academic interaction.

As shown in Extracts 1 and 2, this discourse marker is used to call for the beginning of a speech event. In addition to this, the discourse marker has a function of
Rachmad, interrupting the main agenda, is suggesting that it might be better to put their chairs in a circle. Andrew agrees with Rachmad’s idea (28). Following this, Rachmad starts to make a joke that his idea is genius (29). Andrew responds to this phase, but then restarts the main discussion agenda (31). Although it was very hard to pick up the voice of Charlee in (32) and (34) because of the recorded sound, from Andrew’s feedback (35), she is giving an appropriate answer to Andrew. And yet, her answer might be not enough to be seen as a full answer. For this, Andrew gives her encouragement to elicit a more sophisticated answer.
5.3.2 In comprehension check

As analyzed in the last part, the discourse marker “so” functions to begin an academic sequence of action. It informs students that they need to be ready for presenting an idea and its reason; in other words, the discourse marker promotes students’ socialization into an academic discourse. In the process of the academic discourse, as can be seen in the present study, Andrew often confirms how students understand what is offered to them and the direction of the group discussion.

Extract 4 describes part of a group discussion on “making an English story from a four picture cartoon”. Pictures are in black and white, and named A, B, C, and D on a handout. After discussing picture C, they begin talking about picture D in (1), and Andrew implicitly mentions “the next object is D”.

Extract 4
1. Andrew: Good, OK ↓ D:::
2. Rachmad: But ah::: they reserve this(...) no (…)
3. Charlee: xxx
4. Rachmad: Mm, no one get food ↓
5. Andrew: Mmm ↓ So↓ they realize that no one gain the food ↑
6. Charlee: No! no one get to the food::: ↑they realize that there is a problem↓
7. Andrew: Ah::: OK!

After evaluating the answer for Slide C, Andrew introduces a task on Slide D. During the course of this whole event, Rachmad is stating his idea on Slide D (2 and 4). Corresponding to his idea, “no one get food” (4), Andrew confirms his idea with some English correction (5). This phrase is led by the discourse marker “so” to encourage
students to review their ideas as final composite idea. As a response to Andrew’s confirming phrase, Charlee agrees with Andrew’s understanding of what the student Rachmad originally wanted to say as the group idea. In this utterance (6), the student adds additional information to Rachmad’s idea, “they realize that there is a problem.” Consequently, Andrew understands the students’ idea.

In Extract 4, we found how the discourse marker functions to introduce a comprehension check sequence. During this interaction, Andrew uses “so” to encourage and support students to check and finalize their own ideas. However, even if Andrew could accomplish the task of checking students’ understanding using the discourse marker, it is not necessarily the case that students understood how to produce an answer. In this situation, Andrew uses the discourse marker to help students to promote their ideas. In the next section, we focus on this function: how the discourse marker “so” serves to promote reasoning and scaffolding.

5.3.3 In Promoting reasoning and scaffolding

In academic discourse, such as this group session, students are encouraged to present their ideas with reasons for them. Once they confirm them with Andrew, what the topic in the interaction is and how they should answer to it, they start to clarify their ideas. In academic discourse, such as this group session, students are encouraged to present their ideas and reasons. Once students are assured (at times by Andrew) what the topic is and how they can address it, they can start to clarify their ideas. However, within student discourse, it might be the case that there is no good explanation of where an idea comes from.
In that case, for example, during teacher-student interaction in the classroom, scaffolding is seen\(^1\). This happens, in general, when one student cannot follow the discussion or answer according to the teacher’s elicitation. To overcome this block, the teacher or other students help the student (Hatch, 1992). At the same time, through scaffolding turn-taking, learners are able to develop reasoning ability related to their idea. In this part, we take a look at scaffolding and reasoning interaction focusing on the function of the discourse marker “so”.

Extract 5 begins the group activity where the students watch a movie and use its content as the basis for discussion. In this case, they are trying to find out the reason why the main character, Patch, is called “Patch” after watching the movie.

Extract 5
60. Andrew: Alright, so↓ first, how did he get his name ↑
61. Students: ((thinking ideas))
62. Andrew: You don’t know↑ You know↑
63. Ozora: The::: old man named…named, him ↓
64. Andrew: Yes, exactly ↓
65. Ozora: But I don’t know wh:::y↓ @@
66. Andrew: You don’t know wh:::y↑Alright, so↓, the cup is leaking, right↑
67. Rachmad: Uh huh↑
68. Andrew: Yes ↓ So::: when you have a leak, now, we say in English, if, if you:::
   plug the leak↓, patch it↓ You patch the leak↑
69. Rachmad: Ah::: ((He has understood the answer))
Andrew starts the discussion with discourse marker “so” as an announcement of the beginning as seen in the previous part (Function at the beginning of speech events). The question might be difficult for students to answer immediately, judging from their silence response (61). Yet Andrew keeps asking students to come up with some answer (62). Following this, the student Ozora is giving a clue, “The old man named…named, him” (63). While his answer is getting closer (Andrew evaluates the answer in (64)), it still seems difficult to get to the answer. He responded to Andrew’s evaluation with “But I don’t know wh:::y ↓ @@” (65). Here the student could point out the scene when Patch is so named.

According to this topical utterance, Andrew confirms that the next move of this sequence is difficult by saying “You don’t know wh:::y ↑ ”. Then Andrew uses “so” to start checking the sequence; he checks and guides students to understand the answer (66). This function of “so” seems to be understood by the students as the marker that informs them that Andrew is holding the floor in order to describe the key part of the answer (66-68). Corresponding to these utterances by Andrew, students might gradually understand the answer through Andrew’s guiding utterances (66-69).

In the last four lines of this sequence, there is no student’s content-based utterance. In contrast, Andrew’s utterances (66-68) are content-based, as not often seen in other extracts. Andrew’s activity here can be regarded as “scaffolding”.

Extract 6 describes the follow-up to Extract 4 in which Andrew and the students are discussing how to make an English story a from four-picture cartoon (see Extract 4). From Line 6, Charlee has the floor to state the idea, and is trying to explain it to Andrew.
Extract 6 (Continuing from Extract 4)

6. Charlee: No! no one get to the food↑↑ they realize that there is a problem↓
7. Andrew: Ah:: OK!
8. Ozora: They try to solve the problem↓
9. Andrew: Ah:: OK, so↓ recognize the problem now↑ Ah::: they (…)
10. Charlee: Because no one can get xxx↑((she might be saying “food”))
11. Rachmad: Food↓
12. Andrew: Because no::: one::: can::: get::: the food ((Writing this phrase on the board))

From the beginning of this sequence, Rachmad and Charlee are holding the floor to state the idea to Andrew (see Extract 4 as the prior sequence). In the sequence between Andrew and Charlee, Charlee rejects Andrew’s interpretation and revamps her idea in detail (6). According to this explanation, Andrew understood what Charlee wanted to answer as a group idea (7). Then Charlee adds more information to this answer to conclude this sequence (8). At this moment, students found that “they” (two horses in the picture) recognize the problem. Next, Andrew shows agreement, and gives the guidance, telling them they need to know the reason why the idea occurred (9), using the discourse marker “so”, to introduce the reasoning sequence. Charlee responds to this, and says, “no one can get xxx ↑”. This reasoning is accepted by Andrew, and he writes it down on the mini-board (12).

This reasoning and scaffolding sequence with the use of the discourse marker occurred in a single turn-taking (9-10). Yet as can be seen in a general classroom, scaffolding discourse is usually achieved through multiple turn-takings. Considering
In Extract 7, as in Extract 2, the group discusses “genetic modification”. In the next sequence, the topic shifts from “whether you would like a genetic modified pet or not” to “agree or disagree with genetic modification” from the point of view of ethical issues. Rachmad suggests “Bonsai” as an example of something created by genetic modification.

Extract 7

117. Rachmad: mmm (…) we still have problem with Bonsai↓ Do you know Bonsai↑
118. Andrew: Bonsai↑
119. Rachmad: Bonsai↓
120. Andrew: Oh ↓ The, the, the trees!
121. Rachmad: Trees↓
122. Andrew: Yes, yes, yes↓
123. Rachmad: We make a tree, Makes it small, like this↑ I don’t think (…) 
124. Andrew: So, you don’t like that↑
125. Rachmad: No, it’s not really (…) I think can’t problem↓ Just in case (…) 
126. Andrew: So, not a problem ↑ It’s like Bonsai trees↓
127. Rachmad: Yes, it’s no problem↓ If it live↓
128. Andrew: If, it live (…) O:::K ↓ I understand ↓ If (…) it (…) ((Writing down on the mini-board)) Oh! my mistake↓

Rachmad is suggesting “Bonsai” as an example of a problem of genetic modification (117). Andrew, at first, does not recognize the word Bonsai, but understands it in (119-122). Rachmad keeps explaining Bonsai by describing it with his
hands, but he cannot reach the conclusion (123). Following this, Andrew helps him (through scaffolding) to find the idea by using the discourse marker (124). Rachmad is still wondering about the idea, and reconsidering his idea negatively (125). In response to this stagnation, Andrew tries to help him to conclude his idea: whether the student thinks Bonsai is a problem or not, again with the discourse marker “so” (126). It seems that Rachmad comes to understand that his opinion about Bonsai, as a case of modification, is reasonable (127).

In this section, I examined the function of the discourse marker “so” in reasoning and scaffolding. As is often seen in the study of socialization, scaffolding and reasoning are mediums through which learners are socialized not only to acquire the target language but also to become active and communicatively competent participants.

In the next part, considering the results regarding the three functions of the discourse marker, “so”, I will focus on and analyze students’ use of the marker.

5.3.4 In student’s utterances (use)

In the previous analysis we examined the functions of a discourse marker which was often used by Andrew to encourage students to participate in and understand the group discussions. From the perspective of language socialization, through which students acquire competence in interaction and in language use, it is possible that, as the session progresses, students will acquire and practice the pragmatic function of the discourse marker to interact within the group, in the same ways that Andrew had used it.

In academic discussion, students need to have knowledge of academic topics as focused on in the session. In addition to this, they have to know how to interact and to deliver their ideas or academic knowledge to the group. Extract 8 shows Rachmad’s use
of the discourse marker “so”. Similar to Andrew’s use as we examined in previous parts, Rachmad starts the discussion with discourse marker “so”. In this interaction, as a part of a movie-watching lecture, they start to find out the reason why the main character in the film, Patch, is called so.

Extract 8

49. Rachmad: So ↓, fir:::st, ah::: section↑
50. Andrew: Uh-huh ↑
51. Rachmad: From, beginning until, sixty minute↑
52. Andrew: Yes↓
53. Rachmad: Especially, non, nothing certificate↓ So↓xxx cut all of↓
54. Andrew: You cut all of ↑ Mad ↑((Andrew calls Rachmad “Mad”))↑
55. Rachmad: I cut them ↓
56. Andrew: You cut all of them↑
57. Ozora: Yeah ↓
58. Andrew: Cut all of↑ Yes ↑ Checking half! Especially checking often you do!

Rachmad starts the discussion, confirming the point they have to check, using the discourse marker “so” to hold the floor to deliver his idea (49). By checking the place in the film where Patch gets his name, Rachmad suggests his idea, “Especially, non, nothing certificate” (53). Following this phrase, in the same utterance, he concludes the idea with the discourse marker “so” as “So ↓ xxx cut all of ↓ ” (53). However, since this answer is not what Andrew expected, he continues the sequence in order to reconfirm the students’ understanding of the direction of the task, and Ozora jumps in and says “Yeah” (57). Subsequently, Andrew tries to encourage them to return to the focus point, suggesting that they do what they usually do in the group (58).
As can be seen in Extract 8, it might be possible that students tend to use this discourse marker to show the conclusion of their idea. In the next extract where the group tries to check the reason why the main character, Patch, became a doctor, in the movie-watching task, Ozora also uses this discourse marker to confirm and conclude his idea.

Extract 9

39. Andrew: WHY does he become a doctor↑ That’s, that’s the key part↓ Yes, it’s especially because he was sick and became a doctor↓ xxx What is the motivation↑

40. Ozora: So:::true by for loving ↑

41. Andrew: Sorry↓ one more time ↑

42. Ozora: And true by loving care patients ↑

43. Andrew: Uh-huh↑ yes↓ How does he show that? You are right↓ How does he show it ↑

44. Ozora: To, ah::: to become doctor↓ A:::nd (…)

45. Andrew: Fair clo:::se, you got it!

After Andrew’s scaffolding which guides students to understand the focus point of the question (39), Ozora takes control of the sequence with “so” (40). Looking at the following sequence between Ozora and Andrew (41-43), Ozora seems to have accomplished his aim of holding the floor by using the discourse marker to help him present his idea, and as a part of this to engage in dialogue with Andrew. The effect of this discourse marker over several utterances, together with Andrew’s providing scaffolding for the sequence (41-45), is that Ozora is able to provide an appropriate answer.
These two cases of students’ use of the discourse marker “so” suggest two functions: obtaining the floor to talk and concluding the idea. Both functions work to help construct a discursive sequence for the group of students and to demonstrate the students’ communicative attitude toward the group. From the perspective of language socialization, these cases might be examined as the process or the result of socialization. This will be discussed in the next section.

5.4 Discourse Marker in Socialization

From the results of the data analysis focusing on the discourse marker “so” in the group sessions, it can be seen that the discourse marker not only functions to establish cohesion of a single sentence or discourse, but also has an influence on the development of the learner’s linguistic and communicative competence, and the process of becoming a competent member in a discussion group through academic interaction.

In the analysis, uses of “so” were categorized into four characteristic functions in the context: the beginning of speech events, comprehension checks, promoting reasoning and scaffolding, and students’ use in utterances. The first three discursive practices are crucial situations where students acquire academic competence in the class. In addition, we found that students used the discourse marker to perform in the group in the same ways as Andrew had used it.

In this section, I review and examine the results from two aspects: language socialization through discourse marker use, that is, how the discourse marker works functionally to socialize learners, and language socialization to use the discourse marker in order to interact with the group and to be a mature member in the cross-cultural group.
5.4.1 Language socialization through the use of discourse marker

Focusing on socialization into academic-interactional competence in a cross-cultural group, we found that students were guided to notice and realize what they should do through discourse marker use. In analyzing Andrew’s use, it was found that he encouraged students to state their ideas, to confirm what they suggested, and to reason their ideas, using the discourse marker “so”. These skills were understood and acquired by the students through English learning and cross-cultural interaction.

Regarding the three categories of the discourse marker “so” which were found in the data analysis, the academic-interactional competence which students would acquire are mainly oral language uses. As Morita mentions (2000), academic students are exposed to daily opportunities when they have to interact with peers, instructors and others in oral language use. This chapter focused on a case where students were involved in a practical situation of communicative language use. In the discussions, students implicitly experienced the use of the discourse marker, through which they were socialized into academic interactional discourse.

At first, we found that the discourse marker “so” functions to inform students of the beginning of the discussion or the re-starting of it. In this moment, particularly, students noticed not only that session was launched, but also what they should do for the discussion. Corresponding to this function of “so”, the encouragement of stating ideas, students prepare for the session and try to suggest ideas to the group. This function, which shows the beginning of the event, has already been suggested (e.g., Bolden, 2008). However, as far as I know, how the function of the discourse marker helps and influences the learner’s development of communicative competence has not been looked at. For example, in Extract 1, the students attempted to start the discussion
with their uncompleted idea after Andrew called for attention and announced the
beginning of the discussion with a “so”.

In Extracts 2 and 3, as in Extract 1, students are encouraged to begin discussion
even if they have not formulated their ideas yet. Considering this, as opposed to the
definition that discourse markers are optional grammatical elements, we can presuppose
that if Andrew does not use the discourse marker “so” to introduce the beginning of the
discussion, it might be hard for the students to find the starting point of discussion
because they are focused on listening to Andrew and thinking of ideas. As mentioned in
the literature review, the effect of discourse markers on learners’ intelligibility (or
phrases) in the lecture-style class have been examined (Flowerdew & Tauroza, 1995).
Referring to this research, the present study needs to re-examine the data, by comparing
the existence and non-existence of markers and their influence on students’
intelligibility in the group discussion.

As the second function, it was discovered that the discourse marker “so” works
to show students that Andrew is trying to confirm their ideas, following the sequence
where the discourse marker signals the beginning of the events. Through a discursive
practice in academic discourse, participants create common knowledge as a group idea.
The usage greatly depends on the interactional sequence in that Andrew needs to control
and guide the group to produce academic ideas in response to the discussion topic.

In Extract 4, following Andrew’s feedback, one student is able to take the floor
to reconfirm the group ideas with Andrew, and he can be reassured that the students had
actually formulated their ideas. This finding extends my suggestion that the discourse
marker used by Andrew guides and promotes socialization of students to review their
ideas. The aim of the group session for the students is not only to acquire English
linguistic proficiency, but also to be interactively competent members of the group. Although there is not space in the present study to consider to what extent students need to consider their linguistic accuracy and fluency, the function of comprehension check appears to encourage students’ fluent interactional competence in the group, supporting the progress of the group discussion. Thus, we can conclude that the discourse marker facilitates a content-based interactive event in the group session.

The third function of the discourse marker is to promote reasoning and scaffolding routines as shown in Extracts 5-7. The academic discourse of the group discussion as seen in the present study works toward the student’s acquisition of the competence to suggest a reasoned idea through the process in which students began the session, suggested an idea, and confirmed it. Following this process, in order to succeed in this academic discourse process, they have to promote the idea with Andrew’s reasoning and scaffolding support.

The function in promoting reasoning and scaffolding has several characteristic points responding to the situation which learners face. In Extract 5, the students faced a topic that was difficult to grasp and deliver ideas on. To improve this situation Andrew used the discourse marker “so” to change the sequence to a TA-centered one in which the students are made aware of missing points (scaffolding). Another case of a similar function showed, as in Extract 6, that “so” often introduces sequences where Andrew tries to elicit answers from a student. After this elicitation, the student was able to present the reasoning for her idea with a “because” phrase. In this sequence, Andrew did not use any explicit phrases to guide students to make the idea sound reasonable.

This function was also found in Extract 7, in which Andrew tried to develop the idea through scaffolding. In some cases, it might be hard to distinguish between
confirming the answer and scaffolding; however, we can see in the case of Extract 7, that the student’s awareness of the “so” moved him toward a final concluding statement. According to the progression in this sequence, the function of the discourse marker in scaffolding is understood as one that helps students develop and finalize their idea.

By examining the group session discourse, the present chapter found that in a sequence of academic discussion (in the order of the beginning, checking the student’s idea, and giving reasons for the idea), the discourse marker “so” functions to support students to be conscious of and interact in each event with the group members. Therefore, it appeared that through the use of the discourse marker by Andrew, learners were socialized into academic discourse and acquired academic interactional competence.

According to the definition of language socialization (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986), language socialization study can focus on two phenomenological aspects: socialization through language use and socialization to use language. We have discussed the former in this part. In the next, from the latter perspective, we review how students used the discourse marker “so”, and how by using it they were socialized into the academic group discourse.

5.4.2 Language socialization to use the discourse marker

The acquisition of academic discourse and interactional competence is crucial to becoming a mature member in the group. In the previous section, we discussed language socialization to academic interactional competence through discourse marker use. In this process, the students were put in a position where they implicitly received the meaning and language of the context from Andrew’s guiding discourse.
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In addition to the passive and receiving status, we discovered how students reacted actively to the process of language socialization by attending to attend to the interaction. During the discussion, the students were encouraged to state their ideas to the group; in other words, students were required not only to understand the topic and other participants but also to create contextual meaning and knowledge for the group. According to a classic definition of language socialization, “the child or the novice (in the case of older individuals) is not a passive recipient of sociocultural knowledge but rather an active contributor to the meaning and outcome of interactions with other members of a social group” (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986, p. 165).

Considering this perspective that a participant is a contributor to discursive knowledge in the interaction, in Extracts 8 and 9, we found that the students used the discourse marker to participate in and create the group session. The functions of their use of the discourse marker were similar to Andrew’s use to start the discussion and to conclude ideas. As an outcome of language socialization in academic discourse, it can be proposed that as the students experienced the group discussion, they acquired not only the knowledge of how to join and understand the academic discourse but also of how to be active participants who have academic-interactional competence and can create a discourse.

5.5 Chapter Conclusion

In this chapter, we looked at how the discourse marker “so” functions in the group interaction, and how it affects academic socialization. Considering academic discourse and students’ acquisition of it as interactional competence, it was found that
the discourse marker has three functions according to the flow of the discussion. In addition, the students showed a similar use of the marker to that of the TA, Andrew, to interact in the group with peers and with him. From a pedagogical perspective, and also from reviewing the group sessions, it is possible to suggest that using discourse markers encourages more interactive learning in which learners are centered in the context of interaction, even without any explicit or decontextualized instruction.

In the next chapter, we shall look at how the participants use their linguistic repertoire to overcome linguistic difficulties and create the context in the group. As this chapter illustrated, the group members normally carry out academic group interactions in English, or by using some aspects of English such as discourse markers. However, the interactions are not necessarily completed in English only. In the following chapter, we will see examples of cases where non-English codes are used.

**Chapter 5 Notes**

1. Scaffolding is a support provided by teachers or mature members in a community for learners or children. Scaffolding can be seen when tasks are beyond learners’ or children’s ability for the tasks (Richards & Schmidt, 2010).
Chapter 6
Translanguaging as Communicative Competence

6.1 Chapter Introduction

As shown in Chapter 3, the participants had a variety of linguistic repertoires which included native languages other than English and Japanese. Obviously, there were parts of their repertoires that could not be adopted as lingua francas in their interactions. According to the goal of the curriculum document and the class policy, the participants were encouraged to use English as much as they could. However, this “as much as they could” implied that they would also have opportunities to use non-English resources from their common repertoire, especially Japanese, to perform academic group activities.

As the researcher, I did not find that I had any linguistic difficulties in communicating with the participants or understanding what they were trying to say, including while doing interviews, and in and out of the classroom contexts. This is evidence of the participants’ multilingual competence not only in the classroom environment but also in their general campus life in Japan.

Throughout the present research, I have regarded the participants of the group as multilingual. In particular, I have judged them as “being multilingual” in the sense used by Cenoz and Gorter (2015). According to Cenoz and Gorter (2015), bilingual (multilingual) proficiency includes “developing multilingual identities”, “translanguaging”, and “natural communication in class and outside”. This framework, suggested by the sociolinguistic perspective, is interested in how speakers (learners) use their linguistic repertoire in their sociocultural practice.
With the above points in mind, I identified the existence of translanguaging as a “rich point” (Agar, 1994, 1996) in the activities of the focus group. This translanguaging can be seen as a part of the context of relatively recent changes in the concept of “language proficiency” in Japanese higher education.

This chapter, looking at translanguaging practice as a rich point, focuses on both the participants’ linguistic and communicative competence. These two competences are complementary in that “for multilinguals, languages are part of a repertoire that is accessed for their communicative purposes” (Canagarajah, 2011, p. 1)

6.2 Chapter Background

As part of overall changes in higher education resulting from globalization, recent years have seen many changes in foreign language and intercultural education as practiced in Japan. The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), a division of the Japanese government, has implemented policies explicitly in response to increasing globalization (MEXT, 2011). Language education policy, taking globalization into account, now encourages educators to respond to social needs by adapting teaching and learning styles to address current needs regarding communication and English proficiency (Butler & Iino, 2005).

At the heart of this focus on globalizing in language education, it has been suggested that English rather than the students’ first language be used as the dominant language in classroom interaction. MEXT (2011) defines foreign language proficiency as follows:
Foreign language proficiency required in global society can be defined as capability of smooth communication with people of different countries and cultures using foreign languages as a tool.

(p. 3)

However, the desirable language, or languages, for use in a foreign language classroom or intercultural education context remains a point of debate. As I reported in a previous case study (Nukuto, 2015b), the policy focusing on global education requires students to learn not only a foreign language but also to acquire communicative and intercultural competence in given contexts. There, learners complement their lack of certain aspects of English proficiency with resources from their wider linguistic repertoire in order to complete tasks in academic group activities.

The orientation to using English as a teaching medium and communicating language, or “English-Medium Instruction” (Wilkinson, 2013), has already been a topic in the higher education context, which is influenced by “economic, social, and political forces” (Wilkinson, 2013, p. 3). For example, according to Wilkinson (2013), the Academic Cooperation Association (see, Wächter & Maiworm, 2008) shows several reasons for the development of English-Medium Instruction. Three dominant reasons are: 1) “to attract international students who would not enroll in a programme in the domestic language”, 2) “to make domestic students fit for the global or international market”, and 3) “to sharpen the profile of the institution in comparison to others in the country” (Wächter & Maiworm, 2008, p. 8).

These three reasons do not necessarily fit the context of the present study, but some points are relevant. For example, through English learning, the participants are expected to become “fit for international minded” or “global” communication.
In order to look at the use and working of learners’ linguistic repertoires, the present chapter describes and analyzes some intercultural and academic interactions within the framework of translanguaging (Garcia & Wei, 2014; Mazak, 2017; Canagarajah, 2011). In the interactions, international students acquire communicative competence (Hymes, 1972; Canale & Swain, 1980; Canale, 1983) or intercultural communicative competence (Byram, 1997) to successfully complete academic group interaction.

The analysis shows students trying to accomplish group goals through translanguaging rather than by strictly adhering to English use. That is, in order to continue group interaction, students choose resources from among their shared foreign language repertoire, and in doing so enhance their foreign language skills.

6.3 Translanguaging

Translanguaging has emerged as a popular yet controversial term, with many interpretations such as a concept of bi/multilingualism and language pedagogy, in recent years (Mazak, 2017). Although the definitions of translanguaging vary, they are united by a common framework. García (2009) emphasizes that bilingualism is not an additive linguistic process, but is a dynamic one, which goes beyond categorizing languages as distinct entities. Based on this perspective, García (2009) defines translanguaging as “multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds” (p.45). Also, Garcia and Wei (2014) suggest that translanguaging refers to “both the complex language practices of plurilingual individuals and communities, as well as the pedagogical approaches that use those complex practices” (p. 20).
The multilingual context of translanguaging is similar to that of “code-switching”, a framework that has been used for a much longer time. Researching how some languages or codes function in verbal and social interactions, Blom and Gumperz (1972) introduced the terms “situational switching” and “metaphorical switching”. Situational switching is defined as switching according to changes in contexts, while metaphorical refers to switching activity by one speaker within a single situation based on psychological and communicative factors. In various contexts, speakers who are recognized as multi-language users purposefully choose and switch codes.

Auer (1984) considers conversation sequences as social actions through which code-switching occurs. Auer suggests two types of switching from the conversation and discourse analytic framework. “Discourse-related” codeswitching describes the phenomenon where the code alternation is determined by the contents of the interaction and the change or shift of topics. During a certain discourse or conversation, speakers can understand what code could be used in the discourse sequence. The other one is “preference-related” code-switching (also, called “participants-related” switching). As the name suggests, code choice is related to the character or attributes of the speaker. This type is regarded as determined by the speaker’s preference or as an ability-related choice.

According to Levine (2011, 2014), we might prefer using “code choice” to “code-switching” in a pedagogical context, where it sheds light on the choices of students in classroom interaction and of teachers in teaching and curriculum design. In the present context, English has been designated as the medium language in the classroom. In contrast, other linguistic repertoires have not explicitly been mentioned in the official document. Considering this linguistic ecology, the present study focuses
more on the participants’ practical use of linguistic repertoire in a group whose members have a transcultural and multilingual background.

In the translanguaging framework, we do not evaluate the appropriateness of speakers’ language use (in particular, target language use). Garcia and Wei (2014) distinguish translanguaging from code-switching by saying that it refers not simply to a shift or shuttle between two languages, but to the speakers’ construction and use of original and complex interrelated discursive practices that cannot be easily assigned to one or another traditional definition of a language, but that make up the speakers’ complete language repertoire.

(p. 22)

As this suggests, translanguaging does not presuppose situations where language educators and researchers need to consider learners’ target language proficiency so much as looking at how learners perform discursive practices in sociocultural language learning.

In the more concrete situation of higher education, Mazak (2017) summarizes some aspects inherent in the translanguaging framework. She sees translanguaging as a “pedagogical stance” and “set of practices” (Mazak, 2017, p. 5). The former implies that participants, including teachers, can rely on their repertoires to “teach and learn both language and content material in classrooms” where they face linguistic and communicative difficulties. The latter suggests that translanguaging “seeks to include any practices that draw on an individual’s linguistic and semiotic repertoires.” (Mazak, 2017, p. 5).

In the group, I found that students sometimes used Japanese as well as English. This is despite the fact that English was the common language and that the lecturer, all
TAs and students endeavored to use English as much as possible. In this situation, I did not expect that, in the advanced group, Japanese would be used to communicate. However, in order to communicate and construct group ideas, participants also used Japanese language, which was the first language for the one Japanese student, and a second foreign language for the international students.

As previously stated, this group as a whole had the highest level in oral English and was the most active in group interaction. Every student could follow the group TA’s support. Also, from my view as an observer, even if they fell short in vocabulary and grammatical correctness, they could still manage group work in the class language, English. That they would attempt to use English could be anticipated even before the course started from the fact that students who enrolled on this course were interested in not only learning English but also interacting with foreign students in English.

Examining two extracts from the class in the sections 6.4.1-2 below, I describe how the participants, including the group TA, communicate with each other outside of the framework of the use of a single language (English). In consideration of Mazak’s definition of translanguaging (Mazak, 2017, p. 5), I analyze academic group interactions focusing on participants’ linguistic repertoires and their discursive practice, in particular when they encounter linguistic difficulties.

6.4 Translanguaging: Examples and Functions

In this part, we will look at two extracts from the data, in which we can see participants’ translanguaging to complete the group interaction. These two extracts are representative, in that the participants, including Andrew (the group TA and an English native speaker), make use of the linguistic resources that each of them has acquired or has been learning. In each extract, Japanese was used as a common linguistic resource,
and it supported them in overcoming linguistic difficulties in intercultural and academic communication. Meanwhile, they, excluding Ozora (the Japanese student), had been learning Japanese as a foreign language.

6.4.1 Translanguaging to keep communicating

In this section, I describe the cases where the participants use translanguaging to maintain interaction in the group. In each interaction, there is always a stream and an implied rule that they need to maintain group interaction and use of the target language even if they have some English difficulties.

As shown in the previous chapters, in order to acquire linguistic and communicative competencies, the participants encourage each other to keep talking as part of the topic-oriented learning during group activities. In doing so, they are allowed to make some mistakes in their English as long as they follow the general direction of the interaction. Accordingly, the group TA, Andrew, does not pay so much attention to members’ mistakes or communication failures. Instead, just as the group members try to do, he keeps it in mind that his role is to promote continuation of the group interaction, rather than pointing out linguistic mistakes.

In most of their interaction, the students are able to complete their turns in English (even if, as mentioned above, this includes some incorrect aspects). Corresponding to this, the group TA attempts to help each member make clear their idea or draw out their piece of an idea. The TA often uses plain English phrases and repeats the members’ utterances to co-construct their idea. Moreover, he keeps using English, his first language as well as the classroom medium.

The point here is the way in which the students overcome their linguistic difficulties in the situation noted above. In English classrooms, it is common to check vocabulary using an electronic dictionary kept on one’s desk or taken out of a bag.
However, in this situation, in which a group discussion is in progress and all members need to participate in it all the time, they do not even have time to check the word with a dictionary. How the participants deal with linguistic difficulties in the context of the present study depends on their communicative proficiency. In some cases, they dealt with this problem by using resources from their common linguistic repertoire, that is, through translanguaging.

Extract 1 is from a group interaction in which students are discussing whether they agree with genetic modification in animals and pets or not. The first question for them is whether they “want a genetically modified animal as a pet”. After the group was given the topic, Andrew steered the activity toward a group idea.

Extract 1
1. Andrew: So, the first question is what (...) do you want one as a pet↑
   And why↑ The second question is genetic modification is OK↑ SO!
2. Charlee: No, I don’t want ↓
3. Andrew: No, I don’t want the fish↑
4. Charlee: Because I don’t like fish↓
5. Andrew: Don’t like fish!
6. Charlee: I actually eat it but I don’t want to (...) that fish↓
7. Andrew: So, you wanna eat it ↑
8. Students: xxx
9. Rachmad: I become cruel xxx↑
10. Charlee: xxx
11. Andrew: What else↑ Yes↑No↑
12. Rachmad: I will↓
13. Andrew: Why↑
14. Rachmad: Because I like fish↓
15. Andrew: xxx O! K!
Andrew is posing two questions to the students and encouraging them to start discussion through his use of the discourse marker, “SO!” (1) in English. Following this, Charlee responds in English showing she does not want (it as a pet). Andrew checks this statement adding “the fish” to her response (3). Charlee explains her reason by adding “Because I don’t like fish” (4). The flow of the conversation is characteristic of academic group interaction. Through the interaction, students are encouraged, as much as possible, to explain their reasons after stating their ideas in English. Responding to Charlee’s statement, Andrew does not complete the sequence and keeps asking Charlee about her idea. He shows some surprise at her idea (5). Responding to Andrew’s surprise, Charlee again presents the reason why she does not agree with the genetic modification, adding a new part, “I actually eat it but I don’t want to…that fish” (6). In this turn, she has been able to expand the reason in English. Finally, Andrew attempts to conclude this sequence by checking her idea (7). In Lines 8-10, without the TA (Andrew), the students are still talking about the point. It can be assumed that Rachmad said that he could eat the modified fish though some turns (8-10) were incomprehensible.

Andrew starts a new sequence asking the students to give a “yes” or “no” for the same discussion topic (11). Following this, Rachmad takes a turn and suggests that he is not bothered by the genetic modification (12). As the sequence proceeds, the
participants are still using English. Andrew then suggests that they should give a reason for the idea (13). Rachmad states his reason as “Because I like fish”. In this case, the author supposes that Rachmad regards the fish as a decorative item. In response to this new idea for the group, Andrew gives an OK and tries to complete the sequence (15). In addition, Rachmad tries to keep this turn using “And” (16) looking for additional comments. Andrew copies the “And”, thus encouraging Rachmad to keep talking (17).

So far, it can be seen that the participants are succeeding in performing English interaction and co-constructing group ideas. However, in Line 18, Rachmad fails in expressing his idea in English. He cannot find the word “rare”, and he uses another linguistic resource, Japanese (mezurashi:::), to express his idea (18). Not only does he use Japanese language, he also asks the members how to say the word in English (18). Andrew guesses and asks Rachmad what he wanted to say in English (19). With this help, Rachmad completes his turns to state his idea (20).

In the latter part of Extract 1, we can see translanguaging by Rachmad. The whole sequence largely consists of two sub-sequences as described above. The first one is from (1) to (10), where participants used only English. This is what the class aimed at: using English and communicating for the construction of ideas supported by specific reasons.

The course encourages the students to use English as a tool to accomplish intercultural communication, and in fact they generally try to use it throughout the interaction. However, in the latter part of the sub-sequence (18), Rachmad used another linguistic resource (Japanese language) to aid the interaction on the topic, putting English use aside. This linguistic and communicative action is possible because all participants in the group study Japanese as a foreign language or have acquired it as a first language. Considering the sequence as a whole, English and Japanese both function
as communication resources for achieving the two goals of the class. Japanese also
works as a second communicative resource to accomplish the goal of constructing a
reasoned idea in the group.

6.4.2 Translanguaging to learn a target language in interaction

As mentioned above, the implicit second language of the class, Japanese,
functions to secure the group interaction. On top of this, non-Japanese participants
improve their skill in Japanese as a foreign language while translanguaging to complete
the academic group interaction.

In addition to using Japanese as the second medium language to solve the
linguistic problems among them, the participants, in “being multilingual” (Cenoz &
Gorter, 2015), learn not only English (a first-common target language) but also Japanese,
which is a target language for three participants (Andrew, Rachmad, and Charlee) in the
group. In Extract 1, we saw the case where they translanguaged using linguistic
knowledge in Japanese. This case presupposed that they already had shared knowledge
of a language. However, even if there are shared aspects of their repertoires, this does
not necessarily mean that they can always overcome the linguistic difficulties.

In this part, I describe the case of translanguaging to learn a target language in a
group interaction. From my impression of the participants during observation and data
reviewing, all participants could interact using English and Japanese as parts of a
common repertoire, as they had been learning one or both of these two languages either
as a foreign language or as a first language. It would had been impossible for them to
help each other using only their native languages. In this classroom situation, the
lecturer could also help them to learn a new word.
In Extract 2, the participants, including the group TA, did not know the word *ethical* in English or *dotoku* in Japanese. Participants who were not first-language speakers of English or Japanese could learn a new word with the learner’s help.

The extract below shows an interaction that follows from the discussion of genetically modified fish in Extract 1. Ozora, as suggested by his use of “maybe”, shows that he is unable to present his idea clearly. This serves as a trigger for translanguaging, through which the students learned a key word. Ozora was unable to express his idea not because of a problem of constructing it in his mind but because of a linguistic problem.

**Extract 2**

22. Ozora: Maybe yes↓
23. Andrew: Maybe yes↑ Maybe yes↓ Why maybe yes↑
24. Ozora: Ah (…) it’s interesting but ah (…)
25. Charlee: You want to eat it↑
26. Andrew: xxx
27. Ozora: It’s (…) not (…) not too (…) dotoku (…)
   [Ethical (…)]
28. Andrew: *Dotoku*↑
   [Ethical ↑]
29. Ozora: *Dotoku (…) dotoku tte nante iun desu ka↑* ((To the lecturer beside the group))
   [Ethical (…) What do you say in English↑]
30. Rachmad: *Wakaran(…)*
   [I don’t know]
31. Ozora: *Dotoku tte(…)*
   [Ethical (…) what↑]
32. Lecturer: Ethically::: you find that↑ Ethically:::xxx
33. Andrew: O:::K::: *Dotoku (…)*
34. Ozora: *Dotoku*↓
35. Andrew: Ethical (…) Yes↑
The situation is that Ozora, the Japanese student, takes a turn to describe his idea in the group. He responds that he agrees with the idea of genetic modification (22). Andrew then asks Ozora to support his assertion with some reason (23). Ozora expresses a favorable impression of the modification ((…) it’s interesting (…) (24)). However, by using “but” he seems to want to qualify this statement (24). After turns taken by Charlee and Andrew (25-26), including an incomprehensible line, Ozora starts looking for a word to express his idea (27). It seems that he is trying to say that it was not too ethical, as in (27). He uses the Japanese word, *dotoku*, which means *ethics* in English. In response, to this turn, Andrew cannot fulfill his usual role because he does not know the meaning of *dotoku*. He asks the other members about what *dotoku* means (28).

In this situation, Ozora decontextualizes himself from the group and asks the lecturer, who was walking around and viewing the group, about the meaning of the word *dotoku* (29). This part can be seen as separate from the goal of the class to use English. Rachmad responds to Ozora’s question in Japanese Kansai dialect, *Wakaran*; [I don’t know] (30). This sequence describes how Ozora is looking for the English word at the same time as he is trying to present his idea. The latter is the main goal at this moment, and he uses a polite Japanese form to ask about the word in Lines 29-31. The lecturer uses English to respond to this question (32). With the lecturer’s help, Andrew understands the meaning of *dotoku* and learns it as a part of his foreign language, “O:::K:::Dotoku (…)” (33). In that line, Ozora completes his idea repeating the key word, *dotoku*. Moving away from Ozora’s use of Japanese, Andrew finishes up the sequence using English.

In this extract, the participants could build on the idea launched by Ozora, and overcome linguistic difficulties in the interaction. While trying to construct the group
idea, all the participants were looking for a word which meant *dotoku* in Japanese, in other words, *ethical* in English. It was rare in the interaction for the members of this group to look for a word which they did not know, and this kind of event interrupted what was otherwise a content-centered interaction. Here, it must be pointed out that translanguaging served not only the function of finding the word to continue the interaction, but also for learning the vocabulary from each other.

Another remarkable point which shows that translanguaging is an aspect of communicative competence in this academic discourse is that the participants concentrate on the construction of the ideas rather than on learning a target language. By the end of the extract, Ozora must have learned the English word “ethical”, which would help him to continue his turn in order to complete the idea. However, as seen in Lines 34-35, Ozora did not restate his idea using the English word he had just learned. In this case, all the participants were able to understand the idea formulated at the end of this interaction by sharing their common language resource, Japanese. This implies that it was not a matter of which language was used to do the work, since the main goal was simply to complete the group idea.

*6.5 From Translanguaging to Communicative Competence*

This chapter has described and examined how the participants (as language learners) translanguaged in order to accomplish the group activities in an academic, multilingual and multicultural learning context. Summarizing the results, three main generalizations can be made: 1) the students used translanguaging as a communicative tool to accomplish their tasks rather than being obsessive about using English as a target language, 2) some participants used another language from their foreign language repertoire (not English but Japanese) as a “common resource” in translanguaging, 3)
they could develop their own foreign language resources through translanguaging practice.

As for language use in the class, the course documentation clearly states that students are expected to learn both English as a communication tool and intercultural communication competence in academic group interaction. Following these goals, we could see how the participants performed linguistically and academically in the group interaction. There, they needed to express their ideas with supporting reasons and construct collective ideas among the group.

In two extracts, we found that the participants had difficulties in maintaining the interaction in English alone. For example, in Extract 1, Rachmad was unable to express his idea completely because he lacked the vocabulary for “rare”. Also, in Extract 2, Ozora could not find the word “ethical”, and other participants in the group could not help with these things. Both cases illustrate how they relied on multilingual group interaction rather than simply using English.

In Extract 2, the participants used Japanese rather than English in order to solve the linguistic difficulty in the interaction. Their Japanese was not at a native level, which of course was also true of the English of many participants in this interaction. However, their performance in the interaction suggests that they were able to use Japanese as a common resource to continue and construct the interaction through translanguaging, even if Japanese was not a designated target language for language acquisition.

By using a non-designated language, they not only continued the group interaction but also learned other aspects of foreign languages through translanguaging. This result suggests a role for translanguaging in academic and foreign language socialization. As part of the process of students becoming “academic” and
“communicative” in the group and the classroom, translanguaging serves as a resource promoting socialization into a particular mode of academic communication, as described in other analysis chapters.

6.6 Chapter Conclusion

In this chapter, we have seen how multiple languages are used in the process of learning and socialization into academic discourse, where the participants experienced intercultural communication and English learning. Some of the aspects of their repertoire are from languages that are foreign for some or all participants. Others are from first languages for some participants. As Mazak (2017, p. 5) points out, translanguaging is a “pedagogical stance” through which participants can draw on their linguistic and semiotic resources in order to address certain goals in classrooms. The present chapter supports this character of translanguaging, by showing how various languages can function as a part of communicative competence in intercultural learning contexts. Also, from the perspective of academic and foreign language socialization, translanguaging supports students’ acquisition of communicative competence, which is an element necessary for working as a group member and learning English in the group.

It is not clear that the participants consciously use the skill of translanguaging, as shown in the data. However, as a phenomenon in intercultural communication and in English classrooms, use of the whole of one’s linguistic repertoire is one of the elements contributing to academic and foreign language socialization. So far, I have described how the participants experienced the context of the multilingual classroom, how they were socialized by a minimal linguistic resource (a discourse marker) which is characteristic of spoken interaction, and how they used the multilingual repertoires which they had acquired both in and out of the classroom.
In the next chapter, which is the last of the analysis chapters, I shall describe how one student (the Japanese student) developed his identity and communicative competence through the course based on my interpretation of his comments during the interview. This should also give us an overall view of what students are able to achieve through the course.
Chapter 7
Pragmatic Development in Negotiating Participation and Role

“I couldn’t start to talk. It was a little bit frustrating. So, in the later weeks, as I participated in the class, I think the number of my speaking turns increased. In the first few weeks, I was not so positive. A little bit, like, “what should I say?” and I was still in the session. After that I barely spoke.”

Ozora
(Translated from Japanese)

7.1 Chapter Introduction: A Beginning Point

In previous chapters, we looked at how the participants felt about a context in which they were being explicitly socialized into becoming “globalized” to be interculturally communicative and English speakers. In this context, small linguistic aspects (such as the discourse marker “so”) influence the communicative awareness of the students and their ability to perform academic group interaction. In addition, we saw how they help each other to break through linguistic difficulties in the target language by using their common linguistic repertoire in translanguaging. In this chapter, we shall describe one participant’s experience in this process and show how pragmatic development in participation can be divided into three distinct stages: rote, receptive, and full participation.

I carried out an interview with Ozora (a Japanese student) a few weeks after the course finished in mid-July, 2014 (see 3.4.3.2 above). I was able to meet him at Kansai University and we talked about the course. During the interview, I expected him to remember what he had felt during the course without my asking any specific questions
related to linguistic or communicative events in the group. I began our interview by asking him what he thought of the course.

During the interview, he remembered the change in his participation and his contribution to the group sessions, as well as in his English ability. As in the translated statement at the beginning of this chapter, he described a gradual process he underwent as the course progressed over a few weeks. I did not draw his attention to any situations, or particular activities he experienced in the group, such as I have described in the previous chapters. Therefore, after the interview, in which I got his comment about his pragmatic development, I found I needed to look again at the data, focusing on Ozora alone.

In order to describe and examine the development of communicative competence in multicultural group interaction, such as the present case, I adopted “Behavior Tracking Methodology” (Markee, 2008). Markee outlined the methodology as an expanded approach to conversation analysis, which would include longitudinal observation, identifying behaviors in language learning, and the process of the learners’ achievement of linguistic and communicative competence acquisition in contexts of second language learning and acquisition. That is, the goal of the approach is to look at “how participants achieve successful language learning behavior over a period of several months” (2008, p. 421).

During the data tracking analysis, I tried to follow the process that Ozora mentioned having experienced as far as possible. Based on his comments, I divided the process into three stages: Rote Participating, Receptive Participating, and Active (Full) Participating.
7.2 Pragmatic Development and Language Socialization

In this chapter, the overall theoretical framework is “pragmatic development” or “developmental pragmatics” (Kasper & Rose, 2002) and its relation to language socialization. According to Kasper and Rose, it is difficult to decide on one theoretical perspective to deal with L2 pragmatic development (Kasper & Rose, 2002). Authentic approaches to pragmatic development include speech act theory and politeness theory, which can be observed in the scene of learners’ pragmatic development in language learning. However, as the present study suggests, the study of L2 pragmatic development should focus not only on the “object of study” but also the “learning process” (Kasper & Rose, 2002, p.13).

It is already clear that language socialization is a major theoretical perspective in the present research, and it is also a useful perspective in L2 (interlanguage) pragmatic development, as proposed by Kasper (2001). Language socialization can thus be applied to the present study of pragmatic development, which I consider the co-acquisition of language and culture. The framework focuses on language use and language acquisition during learning and the acquisition of communicative competence related to sociocultural norms of the learning context.

I focus on a case of the (interlanguage) pragmatic development of a non-English speaker from the perspective of language socialization. According to Schieffelin and Ochs (1986), the aim of the study of language socialization is to shed light on “the linking of microanalytic analysis of children’s discourse to more general ethnographic accounts of cultural beliefs and practices of the families, social groups, or communities into which children are socialized” (p. 168). Considering this statement, I look at how a focused learner, Ozora, while he is not a “child”, interacts and achieves his role in the
group, and at the same time, how his performance links to the concept and practice of academic discourse.

7.3 Three Stages in Becoming a Competent Member of the Group

7.3.1 Rote participating: How should I act next?

After reviewing Ozora’s comments, I found that there were situations where he observed what was happening in the group interaction, but did not interact actively himself. With this in mind, I attempted to determine the nature of his participation in the group talk.

First, in this section, I will examine one point that he mentioned: that he could not participate in the group interaction so positively. He described such situations as ones where he thought “what should I say?” during the group interaction. I remembered the situations he mentioned. These were when that he was listening carefully to what the assistant said about what other members were saying and about who would talk next. It did seem that he was capable of following the stream of the group interaction and even delivering his ideas in English. Also, Ozora tended to wait for the speaking turn to come to him, that is, for when the group assistant, Andrew, would give him a turn to speak. However, I did not regard these attitudes as in conflict with the group learning. I had the impression that he was genuinely interested in English learning and in intercultural communication. For example, he belonged to the Faculty of Foreign Language Study, and was planning to study abroad.

Extract 1 is an example of the first stage of Ozora’s pragmatic development. The students are talking about the topic, “what will you do if you get a million dollars?”
First, in this activity, each student gave their own idea of what they would do. After all the ideas had come out of the group, Andrew encouraged the students to start choosing some of the ideas to present at the end as a group idea.

This example is from the 25th of April, which was the third week of the course. The first week was a course introduction, and the second week was a placement test for grouping the students in the course. Therefore, this day was actually the first day for them to take part in an academic group activity.

Extract 1 (the 25th of April, 2014)

1. Andrew: Anything else, any::: other Ideas ↓Ah, we gonna start talking about which one you wanna go with ↓

2. Ozora: Ah:::

3. Charlee: Ah:::

4. Andrew: Any other ideas ↓You can XXX the money↓ You can burn it ↓You can do everyone with it ↓ You can save it ↓ Ah:::

5. Charlee: Comics↑

6. Andrew: Comics↑ O:::K::: Yes ↓

7. Charlee: @@@

8. Andrew: ((Writing down ideas on a mini-board))

9. Rachmad: You know (…) ((Writing down her idea on a mini-board))

10. Andrew: Yes, Yes, Yes↓

11. Charlee: ((Writing down his idea on the mini-board))

12. Andrew: Travel arou:::nd, O:::K:::

13. Students: ((thinking of ideas))

14. Andrew: Anything else, anything else↓ Other idea:::s ↓

15. Ozora: ((Writing down his idea on the mini-board))

16. Andrew: Go:::to:::

17. Ozora: Gig ↓
In Extract 1, Ozora’s utterance appears in (2) first, but after that, he switches his role into that of a listener during the sequence from (4) to (14). As usual, Andrew starts the activity.

Andrew keeps encouraging students to suggest other ideas, and choose one of them as a group idea (1). Ozora and Charlee are making para-linguistic responses such as “Ah:::” (2 and 3). This shows that they could understand what they are being asked to think about. After this, Andrew explains the discussion part using some examples such as “You can burn it”, “You can save it”. Following these hints, Charlee has got the idea of comics (that is, we can buy comics with that money). As Andrew and Charlee finished their sequence, Andrew writes down Charlee’s idea. Next, Rachmad takes a turn to suggest his idea (9). He writes his idea on the mini-board instead of saying it. With the words, “you know”, he draws attention to his action.

From (16), after Ozora observes the other students’ actions (3-14), he begins to perform as they did. He accomplishes his turn with Andrew’s help. After writing down the ideas, Andrew encourages the students to suggest other ideas, with “Anything else” (14). Then, Ozora starts to write down and say his idea as the other students had done.
before (15). As Andrew looks at the mini-board, Ozora reads the word on the board, “Gigs” (17). Andrew is trying to make sure that he understands Ozora’s idea (18). Andrew might have had several meanings of “gig” in mind, and was ascertaining that Ozora used “gig” as “like a band’s concert?”.

After Andrew has finished checking (18), Ozora clearly responds to Andrew, with “Yeah”. To complete this sequence, Andrew rephrases the idea as “go to a concert” (20). An interesting point here is that, after Andrew’s summary of the idea, Ozora tries to add more information to his idea, saying “a lot of” (21). The author assumes that Ozora wanted to say that a gig is something that a lot of bands participate in.

Finally, Andrew helps Ozora add more information, but he suggests that Ozora’s idea is sufficient as an answer here (22).

Thus, we find that, in an early week, Ozora takes an observational participation style though he has some motivation toward interacting in the group in English. In this style, he follows other members’ way of interaction. After that, when his turns come to him, he accomplishes his turns supported by the assistant. Thus, this stage could also be called “observational participating”, since this style of participation is determined less by the student’s understanding of, or response to, the overall aim or function of the activity than on a wish to correctly follow what has been observed.

In the next section, I will describe the second stage of his pragmatic development, in which, rather than simply imitating within a fixed format, he starts to read the context and know what to do for the group. This second stage is receptive participating.
7.3.2 Receptive participating: Reading the context and knowing what to do for the group

In the last part, we looked at Ozora’s early style of participating in the group. He observed the group interaction and followed what other students did. He could be evaluated as a competent student in that he could answer to the group in English and read the whole of the group interaction. However, in order to participate in the interaction as a part of the idea construction, he needed to respond to the group without observing and waiting for a speaking turn.

In this part, we shall look at Ozora’s intermediate stage of pragmatic development. In the group interaction, unlike the teacher-student interaction which can be seen in the classroom, there is not a particular sequence order such as IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). Instead, the students are encouraged to participate in an idea-constructing interaction rather than just stating each individual’s idea directly to the assistant.

In the first stage of Ozora’s pragmatic development in the group interaction as shown in the Extract 1, he waited for his turn and observed the interaction between the assistant and other students. As the weeks progressed and he became used to the group interaction, he became able to take turns in constructing the group idea, in other words, to incorporate his idea with the participants in the group. He contributed more and more to the group sessions, as he stated in the interview: “So, in the late weeks, as I participated in the class, I think the number of my speaking turns increased”.
Extract 2 is from a group activity where they watch a movie (Patch Adams) and use its content for discussion. In this event, they are trying to find out the reason why the main character, Patch, is called “Patch” after watching the movie.

This example is from the 23rd of May, which was almost the middle of the course. Not only has the participants’ English proficiency improved but they have also become more friendly with each other and more used to the style of the group interaction.

Extract 2 (the 23rd of May 2014)

55. Rachmad: Especially, non, nothing certificate ↓ So↓ xxx cut all of↓
56. Andrew: You cut all of ↑ Ma ↑ ((Andrew calls Rachmad “Mad”))+
57. Rachmad: I cut them↓
58. Andrew: You cut all of them ↑
59. Ozora: Yeah↓
60. Andrew: Cut all of ↑ Yes↑ Checking half! Especially checking often you do!
61. All students: @@@
62. Andrew: Alright, so↓, first, how did he get his name ↑
63. All students: ((thinking of ideas))
64. Andrew: You don’t know↑You know↑
65. Ozora: The::: old man named (...) named, him↓
66. Andrew: Yes, exactly↓
67. Ozora: But I don’t know wh:::y @@@
68. Andrew: You don’t know wh:::y↑Alright, so↓, The cup is leaking, right↑
69. Rachmad: Uh huh↑
70. Andrew: Yes↓ So::: when you have a leak, now, we say in English, if you, if you::: plug the leak ↓, you “patch it”↓ “You patch the leak”↑
71. Rachmad: AH:::
In this scene, Rachmad takes the turn first (55). It is not clear what he means by saying “I cut all of them” (56). Responding to this, Andrew elicits a shorter version of the same idea from Rachmad (57). Again, Andrew evaluates the idea as the group’s (58).

Following Andrew’s checking of Rachmad’s suggestion, Ozora reacts and shows his agreement with the tentative idea (59). This brings Ozora into the sequence. Andrew doubts the members’ understanding of the question, and suggests checking the context again, as they usually do (60).

In a new sequence from (62), Andrew poses the question, how Patch got his name, to the members (62). Because he does not receive any reaction from them, he checks whether they understand and have an idea or not (64). In response to this situation, which is difficult for them to overcome, Ozora opens a new sequence (65). Here, from Andrew’s response to Ozora, Ozora is getting close to the answer (66). In these lines (65-66), Ozora takes his turn in the group, which is an important turn to construct the group idea in this situation.

As mentioned, Andrew evaluates Ozora’s utterance with “exactly” (66). However, Ozora can not develop his idea anymore, and tells Andrew that he does not know why the main character is called Patch (67). In response, Andrew accepts the difficulty, and attempts to explain the reason why the main character was named Patch (68) using the discourse marker “right?” with a rising pitch (68). With this marker, Andrew is trying to assist them to get the answer. Rachmad reacts to this, and shows understanding with “Uh huh ↑” (69). However, Rachmad can not come up with an idea yet. Following this, Andrew expands the explanation of the answer in detail (70).
In this section, Ozora showed how his pragmatic proficiency had developed to read the context and understand how he should act in the discussion. In this case, Ozora repaired and restarted the group discussion in the situation where the other participants were having trouble in understanding what to do in the task. Without waiting for his turn, or turn designation by the assistant, Andrew, Ozora could open a new sequence leading toward the goal.

Following this stage of his pragmatic proficiency, he developed his proficiency in a more active way, in other words, by trying to be at the center of the group discussion. I will show this in the next section.

7.3.3 Active (Full) participating: Being centered in the group

In the last two sections, we looked at Ozora’s pragmatic development categorizing it into two stages: rote and receptive. Through these stages, his utterances gradually increased without help, based on his original understanding of the context.

As a presupposition for this chapter, I could not claim that Ozora was pragmatically proficient and socialized to be globally minded and academic. However, it is clear that he must have developed his spoken English, his ability to contribute to the group, and his identity through the course. In order to show evidence of this, in this section, I describe the third stage, in which Ozora performed fully and actively in the group.

In the later weeks, it was impressive to see how the participants concentrated on the group interaction, rather than on their English per se or how to participate in the group. Particularly, Ozora showed a change to become more central to the group interaction. Also, I was struck by the development of his English proficiency, which
became a more casual spoken variety. He came to repeat what he was told by Andrew and repeat what he said to other members to make sure they understood his idea. Therefore, in this stage, we can see both Ozora’s communicative and linguistic development.

Extract 3 shows the activity from the final week’s class. In this week, the participants are working on an activity in which students look at a picture, describe its features to the TA, and the TA draws it with hints from the students.

Extract 3 (the 11th of July, 2014)

70. Andrew: OK::: What is he wearing ↑ What does he look like ↑
71. Charlee: Long::: xxx
72. Andrew: Ah, a long shirt ↑ A long sleeved shirt ↑
73. Ozora: I think it is xxx
74. Charlee: xxx
75. Ozora: Ah::: line (…)  
76. Andrew: Stripe↑
77. Ozora: Not stripe, xxx like (…)
78. Charlee: Triangle↓
79. Andrew: Mm↑
80. Charlee: Triangle↓
81. Ozora: Looks like, looks like many “W”↓
82. Charlee: Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah↓
84. Andrew: Where ↑ Where does it look like that↑
85 Oh::: it’s like (…)
86. Ozora: His long (…) his long T-shirt (…)
87. Andrew: It’s a long sleeved T-shirt:::t ↑
88. Ozora: Long, long sleeved T-shirt, yeah↓
When Andrew asks about the topic, what is drawn in a picture, they start to talk about what a character is wearing in the picture (70). Charlee takes the floor to talk first. She describes a type of clothing and tries to say it is long (sleeved). After Andrew confirms the design of the t-shirt as modified by Charlee’s utterance “a long shirt? A long sleeved shirt?” (72), Ozora adds his idea to this, using the phrase “I think” (73).

As seen above, from linguistic and interlanguage pragmatic perspectives, Ozora uses the discourse marker “I think” which shows that he is helping to construct the group idea while identifying his idea clearly (73). Next, Ozora listens to Charlee’s new idea about the design of the T-shirt (74). He suggests a new characteristic of the shirt, and he tries to say it has “line” (75). After Andrew responds to his idea, asking if it might be a stripe (76), Ozora also uses “like” as a discourse marker to hold his turn after he rejects Andrew’s confirmation (77). To Ozora, who is looking for a description, Charlee gives a hint: “triangle” (78). Andrew accepts this and continues to guess about the picture (79). Charlee, again, suggests that there is a triangle on the shirt (80).

Following Charlee’s turns, Ozora takes a turn again (81). Here, he gives a new hint: that it looks like many “W” on the shirt. This must have been right because Charlee emphatically agrees with Ozora’s suggestion (82).

In this part, I can say that Ozora is central to the sequence in the construction of the overall interaction. Ozora repairs his explanation by providing more detail (83). With his explanation, Andrew’s interest goes on to the place where many “W” exist (84). Responding to this, Ozora takes another turn at guiding the interaction and gives a
new hint (86). This greatly helps Andrew picture what he needs to know. In (87), he is finding that it is a long sleeved T-shirt (87). Finally, he understands the description (89) with Ozora’s feedback (88).

Ozora’s participation contributed to the construction of the event. For example, he helped with Charlee’s idea that there was a “triangle” mark on the T-shirt (80-81). Also, at the end of the discussion, he helped Andrew find out the answer (84-89). We need to understand, to some extent, that the situation is one where the learners are central and take turns, while Andrew was passive in the task. Even so, we can conclude that Ozora could take turns to control the direction of the group discussion with some level of spoken English. In the next part, I will consider how learners, taking Ozora’s case as an example, developed their pragmatic skills through group interactions.

7.4 Participating: Three Stages of Pragmatic Development and Socialization

In the three stages above, we have looked at how the Japanese student, Ozora experienced and developed his pragmatic and linguistic competence. In the following discussion, I shall review the characteristics of the three stages and how they are relevant to socialization in the academic discourse.

Interpretation of “participating” is crucial in this stage. We have to look at and recognize all participants as positive and participating in that they face, and try to make an effort to contribute to the group, or to improve their linguistic and communicative competence. As the course document states (see Chapter 4), the learners are encouraged to become communicative and interculturally competent resources and to understand the different cultural backgrounds of each student in the class. In order to
accomplish these goals, the learners need to “participate” in the group interaction, in
English and with an interaction style that is unfamiliar to some students of the group.
For example, Ozora mentioned in an interview that he had learned how to interact in the
group through such participation (see 4.4.2.2). Becoming a member of the academic
group was a part of his socialization into academic interaction in English. Participating
is the most important aspect of the learner’s socialization in the various stages of
academic pragmatic development. Therefore, even if it does not seem that the learners
actively participate in the interaction as the course document suggests they should, I
recognized that Ozora was motivated to participate at some level in all stages.

7.4.1 The first stage: Rote participating

In the first stage, which is an early stage in the development of Ozora’s
pragmatic competence, he observes what is happening and learns what is expected as a
member of the group. In addition, in the beginning of each sequence, he observes what
other members do in the discussion and follows their lead. As such, he attends to the
way in which other students suggest their ideas so that he may later be able to replicate
it. During this process, he learns more about academic communication style than about
English itself. For example, Ozora follows the other two members’ pattern of
participation, and, with the assistant’s help, accomplishes his turns.

Ozora noted in an interview that he could not participate in the group discussion
in the early weeks of the course as actively as he had expected. However, I found that
even with this seemingly passive style, he felt that he was in fact taking part in the
discussion. Looking at his communicative competence, he was able to express his ideas
with the assistant’s help. However, he was not academically mature enough or familiar
enough with academic group interaction to express himself totally on his own.
From my own experience as an English learner and an English teacher, this type of participation tends to be evaluated as a negative attitude toward learning. However, it is a characteristic of a typical Japanese learner of English. In this case, there are two possible reasons for it: a lack of sufficient English proficiency to deliver one’s ideas, and communicative problems such as how to put oneself forward and negotiate a role in the group interaction. Here, it can be seen how participants are drawn into an unfamiliar situation where they are gradually made aware of the context that they need to be involved in. This awareness is a crucial first step for the participants in experiencing language use and intercultural learning in discursive practice.

7.4.2 The middle stage: Receptive participating

Receptive participating as the middle stage is defined as a period in which learners will become able to determine what to do without observing and imitating other members’ styles. Unlike in rote participating, learners have the ability to contribute to the group interaction according to their own will. We can see this development in the data, but still we notice that students in this stage need an assistant’s support to state their ideas to the group.

In this middle stage, Ozora has partly acquired the way of participating in and constructing group interaction, which he had learned in the first stage. This is a point that came out of the interview, where he remembered that he could not start to talk in the early weeks. This comment and the present stage are closely related to each other. It shows that he had not acquired the linguistic ability to express himself (know what to say in English) or the communicative competence to fully participate in the group (how to express himself). This “what” and “how” parallel Hymes’s framework of “communicative competence” (Hymes, 1972a, 1972b, 1974).
7.4.3 The third stage: Active (Full) participating

Active (Full) Participating is the stage during which learners become communicative and are able to contribute to the group discussion in the course. Ozora was able to perform in this stage as he expressed in the interview — “So, in the later weeks, as I participated in the class, I think the number of my speaking turns increased” — and as was highlighted at the beginning of this chapter. Contributing to the idea construction of the group, he became aware of his increased number of utterances in English. In the extract illustrating this stage, though each of his utterances was really plain and short, most of them functioned to help him take part in the group discussion. For example, in the extract, Ozora was able to take turns toward developing the discussion even if there was no turn designation by the group assistant.

During the group activity or discussion, Ozora also used discourse markers, such as “so”, as a linguistic strategy to hold his speaking turn. Also, in this stage, Ozora was able to work together with other members to help generate the group idea; this is a characteristic point here. By this stage, he had developed his competence, and he used it to deliver his ideas in English to the group.

Two types of competence seen in Ozora’s pragmatic development — English language competence and intercultural competence — are those specified as the elements of intercultural communicative competence in the course document, which explains how the course helps the students to become global resources (see 4.3.1). With this set of competencies, the participant can contribute to building shared knowledge in the group. In the first two stages, we could not see this combination of linguistic and communicative competence in Ozora. In particular, we noticed how he struggled with his communicative proficiency and hence was unable to put himself in the middle of the
discussion (although he was observing what was happening and what other students were doing).

Based on my reading of language socialization studies, the research tends not focus on the completion of participants’ socialization, but to describe the process of it. Thus we cannot regard this stage as the final stage in Ozora’s pragmatic development. However, in the fifteen weeks of the course, it is notable that he always tried to interpret situations in a way that would allow him to become a full member.

7.5 Chapter Conclusion: Interpretation of the Context

In this chapter, I focused on and examined the pragmatic development, particularly the development of communicative competence, of one Japanese student by tracking his participation throughout the group sessions. As evidenced in the interview, this tracking uncovered three characteristic stages, through which the development of his contribution to the group activity progressed together with his English use. The three stages were described as: Rote Participating, Receptive Participating, and Active (Full) Participating.

From the perspective of language socialization, in particular academic socialization, the above stages of participating can be regarded as a process of socialization to use a target language, but this is accomplished through the use of the participant’s entire linguistic repertoire. This socialization has both communicative and linguistic aspects.

The Japanese student, Ozora, experienced all of the stages. As Schieffelin and Ochs (1986) claim, the process of language socialization is best approached from a
phenomenological perspective. Ozora learned not only a language but also the local practices which he encountered over the three stages of development. However, this was not a result of the mature member’s (the group assistant’s) teaching so much as it was from his own experience through the course. According to Schieffelin and Ochs (1986), language socialization includes “the idea that members' perceptions and conceptions of entities are grounded in their subjective experiences and that members bring somewhat different realities to interpersonal encounters” (p. 165).

Therefore, the present chapter can also be looked at from a perspective of “implicit socialization” (Ochs, 1990). It is certain that the course document states what is expected of students. However, as we can see through the group interactions, there is no specific guidance for how the students should perform in the course or in the group except that they should use English. There was no situation where the assistant would “teach” members how to perform in the group. According to Kasper (2001),

most language socialization occurs implicitly, either through the learners’ repeated participation in target discourse practices, or through participation and various strategies by which the more competent co-participant makes the pragmatic information salient to the learner.

(p. 521)

Ozora’s three stages of pragmatic development — Rote participating, Receptive participating, and Active (Full) participating — through which he came to be able to interpret the context, were assisted by peer socialization by the other group members. However, Ozora was always active as a subject of socialization in the group. Persistently, he tried to interpret ways in which other members behaved and used
English. Through the three stages, he copied, reproduced, and contributed to creating the context.

In the next chapter, I will make use of the findings from the present and previous analysis chapters to provide an overall analysis of the state of foreign language and academic socialization in the global era and in higher education contexts.
Chapter 8
Academic and Foreign Language Socialization in Global Education

8.1 Chapter Introduction

In this chapter, I review the four analysis chapters (Chapters 4-7) and discuss the overall theme of foreign language and academic socialization in higher education in the global era. First, I review and reflect on those chapters, in order to set the stage for the broader discussion topics that will be dealt with in the present chapter. Based on this reflection, I consider three points: aspects of higher education in a global era, what communicative competence is required in the context, and academic and foreign language socialization.

8.2 Reviewing and Reflecting

8.2.1 Review

In the preceding four analysis chapters, I described the rich points in the findings of the fieldwork. These range from those that concern the pedagogical context to those relating to linguistic and communicative events of talk-in-interaction. As an ethnographic study that is interested in bridging the macro context and its practice in micro discourse, I found that I needed to look back at a basic premise: that both micro and macro factors combine to create the whole context.

“Globalization” is one of the keywords in the present study. It is also a key that influences the direction of language learning and higher-education, though there can be several understandings of the term “globalization”. To address this issue – that
globalization is vague and its interpretation changes according to context – I analyzed the course document and interviewed selected participants. In order to carry out this work, I focused on the influence of globalization as seen in the goals of foreign language and intercultural education, and how these goals were reproduced in the micro context of the group interaction. I then addressed the question of how participants developed their English proficiency and intercultural communicative competence in the group as the micro context.

There was a common understanding among students that “globalization”, in their context, was less a matter of language acquisition per se than of practice in using English to actually interact with others, particularly in contexts where it is the lingua franca. For students, then, becoming “globalized” is often connected with using English in a certain range of contexts, as English is recognized as a classroom medium for learners to participate in global situations, and as a worldwide lingua franca.

As we saw, the curriculum document encouraged students to be intercultural human resources and to be communicatively active during intercultural interaction. In addition, in order for students to take part in intercultural communication, the document points to the role of foreign language, of which English is used as the example.

From the interviews, the participants remarked that in the class they felt globalization and that they experienced intercultural communication in which their own identity, rooted in nationality and cultural background, played a role. They attributed three elements of the class structure to globalization: the group composition and language use within the group, the sociocultural context, and the form of interaction — which was promoted by the multicultural composition of the class. The class created
situations similar to the context of globalization, with learners using English as a lingua franca.

This relationship between linguistic and communicative ability was implicit in the curricular document. English is regarded as an important tool for the development of communicative competence within the context of the classroom. However, in a globalized learning context, learners are required not only to use the language, but also to discover ways of communication suitable to the situation. More specifically, learners need to acquire communicative competence through intercultural interaction and an understanding of others’ backgrounds. They are reminded that language learning has practical global consequences. Thus, while it is difficult to show the exact degree to which target language learning was accomplished through the course, the students clearly acquired a certain degree of the competence appropriate to the context they faced.

In the more micro context of group interactions, not only language itself but also communication more generally is learned. In other words, language is used and learned as a part of the communication practices of the group. The example of using “so” appropriately demonstrates this. This act is not just a matter of using a linguistic item as a discourse marker, but also of becoming aware of how to participate as a community member. In being socialized into the academic style of the group interaction through the TA’s use of the discourse marker, the members achieve the goal of group idea construction as well as the acquisition of the discourse marker’s functions.

In the context, the participants were able to use their common linguistic resources to communicate and establish the group interaction rather than only focusing on English use. Indeed, as we have seen, they translanguaged to keep the group
interaction oriented toward the original goal of constructing the group idea based on logical reasons. As a part of the linguistic socialization into the classroom community, the communicative competence which they needed depended on a local context where they interacted and studied English. In such situations, it might appear at times that English acquisition was almost a secondary aim of the program. Owing to the variety of participants’ identities, a micro version of the sociocultural context was reproduced in the classroom, where the target linguistic and intercultural communicative competence goals complemented one another.

As we saw, it is possible to analyze the process of academic and foreign language socialization in a global education context by focusing on three stages of development. This I did by tracking one Japanese student’s communicative development. In an interview, the Japanese student recalled how he had developed his communicative and academic competence through the course and the group interaction. I tracked his performance in the group and proposed several stages to describe how learners become contributing participants in the group. At the same time as the student was developing his communicative proficiency in English, he was changing his style of participating in the group. This change happened to him through negotiating his role in the group and through peer learning among the group members, which also led him to feel “global”.
8.2.2 Reflection

As suggested above, in the context of global education and foreign language education, the perspective of language socialization makes it possible to focus on both learning a target language and on the acquisition of communicative competence among the learners. Three main points are here presented in order to elucidate the role of language socialization in global higher education.

First, in the context of higher education influenced by globalization, where English is the main medium of instruction and interaction in the course, the learners become not only globally minded but at the same time “local” as a result of the socialization. It is definitely true that English functions as not only a target language in foreign language education but also as a lingua franca in the global context, including situations such as the present study. Through the extracts, we can see how English functions to enable the participants to communicate and deliver their academic ideas in the group. It is thus clear that English is a contributor to globalization, but I question whether “English only” is the most appropriate medium through which participants can become globally minded students. Related to this language issue is the participants’ awareness of “global” and “local”. It seemed that the students had awareness of being involved in the global context since they registered for the course in which “global” was a part of the title. Similarly, I also had thought that the classroom was global, but as the course proceeded, I noticed that the students were becoming increasingly conscious of the local environment defined by the classroom, and paying more and more attention to the immediate happenings there.

Second, as the most important factor in language socialization in the global classroom and in the group, I would like to reconsider the meaning of “competence” in
learning as it functions in the global program. In the course, competence was what the learners needed to acquire; however, it was more complex than one might expect since, in order to accomplish the activities, they were required to work on both language learning and sociocultural learning. From the findings of the analysis chapters, it appeared that they needed to be aware of how knowledge and ideas were constructed in the group. While trying to develop this dual competence, the learners needed to connect with the global context, where each student had their own cultural background and each of them moved between cultures in their mind when they were interacting in the group (this was pointed out during the interviews with the participants described in Chapter 4).

The two points discussed above provide support for the official course policy that academic and foreign language socialization were the goal of the course. As a third reflection, in the section that follows, I shall consider language socialization in the global education context, which turns out to be complex, with translinguistic and multicultural elements. Finally, I will suggest a new framework of language socialization appropriate to the goal of global educational in a higher education context.

8.3 Higher Education in a Global Era

8.3.1 English as a medium for participation

As discussed in Chapter 6 (6.2), English is already a common teaching and learning medium in higher education in non-native English countries; for example, in Europe. This trend is not only for purposes of language acquisition, but even more an institutional decision related to the student market in the era of globalization. Similarly,
in the case dealt with by the present study, English was the dominant language in the
course, the context of which was inspired by the current of globalization. This is clearly
reflected in the aim of the course and makes it easy to imagine that English has a
definite role in global education programs. The participants did manage to take part in
the class and the groups, which constituted a new context for them. In such a
community, they undertook two crucial tasks: learning English as a foreign language
and acquiring communication competence. These two skills are described in the
curriculum document as elements of a global competence (see Chapters 4 and 6). As
suggested by this document, the two competencies are supposed to function as a united
whole. However, this desirable goal was not always attained in the group. As discussed
in Chapter 6, it must be observed that negotiations among the participants taking part in
the group activities were carried out not only in English but also by using other parts of
their linguistic repertoires that were common to all members of the group. As a common
linguistic resource, they used elements of Japanese to keep the group interaction going
and to overcome linguistic difficulties in the medium language, English.

In light of the above, it was evident from the extracts of the group sessions that
the course did not have the specific goal of “learning English”. Even if the participants
had in mind that they needed or wanted to learn English in the class, it seemed that they
were involved in interaction rather than learning specific aspects of English such as
grammar, vocabulary, etc. This point invites us to consider what should be the preferred
task of the learners in such a context: to persist in using the prescribed medium
language, or to prioritize group interaction toward the other goal, which is to participate
in the group sessions. According to the published course aim, the preference would be
to address these two goals at once. Nevertheless, English did have particular functions
in the class, and Chapters 5 to 7 gave perspectives on the role of English in the socialization of learners into the academic context. In Chapter 5, it was seen that the linguistic and communicative actions of learners were guided by the English word “so”. Besides developing the ability to perform in the group, they experienced and implicitly recognized the functions of “so” in interaction. Also, as examined in Chapter 6, the learners used English until they encountered linguistic difficulties, at which point they switched to Japanese, another part of their common linguistic repertoire.

Reviewing the analysis chapters (in particular, Chapters 5-7), the extracts show situations where participants used English as a medium, which helped them join the group interaction. Also, as shown in Chapter 5, the learners used English in the group to construct the group idea and share knowledge. There, they were socialized to participate in the group discussion through the use of various devices such as the discourse marker “so”. They were also socialized to use this discourse marker for communication functions in the local context of the group interaction. Following the TA’s use of the discourse marker, the students showed a similar use of it to contribute to the academic discourse. As such, focusing on the extracts in Chapter 5, the use of English was a secondary consideration from the perspective of language socialization. The outcome was not language acquisition directly but becoming a mature member of the discourse community with communication competency. As the medium, the use of English elements, in this case, discourse markers, supported the learners’ academic socialization.

In addition to socialization through the use of the English discourse marker, the learners used English as part of their linguistic repertoire in the group. Having encountered linguistic and cultural diversity through group interaction, they used both English and Japanese on multiple occasions according to the situation. As we saw in
Chapter 6, Japanese was used among them as a common part of a collective linguistic repertoire which had been acquired through other school courses and in their daily lives on the campus. Translanguaging — that is, shuttling between English and Japanese — was seen as one aspect of the competence needed by the learners to solve problems during group activities.

Even if the participants were able to overcome linguistic difficulties by translanguaging, they tended to use English after having solved the problem. While the participants shared Japanese as a contextually supporting medium, English was the predominant language in the context of global education and in the participants’ local (classroom and group) situation. As per the interviews described in Chapter 4, they said that using English made them feel the need to participate in the global situation of the group and involve themselves in the global community.

Therefore, in the higher and global education context, I recognized that the participants used English as a medium rather than a learning target to accomplish their ultimate goal of constructing global interactions. The participants recognized English not merely as a target language but as a tool to participate in particular situations and to accomplish the academic goals related to those situations. This is different from conventional situations of English learning in the classroom in that learning English was secondary and was also subordinate to academic thinking and learning in the global education context. Moreover, English was not the only medium available for making a contribution to the global context. As a part of the overall learning, the participants were required to read the context to discover what aspects were common to their linguistic repertoires, and how these would be available to them to construct discourse.
8.3.2 To become globally minded and locally minded

As another topic to consider in connection with higher and global education, I will discuss how learners “become globally minded and locally minded” in the global education context. This topic looks paradoxical; as the learners become global, they also become more locally minded as members of the group. This is a challenging discussion relevant to the perspective of language socialization, which conventionally looks at micro events related to socialization, language use, and language acquisition in a certain community, while at the same time relating these to the broader social context. Considering this, the present study has focused on micro-level events rather than considerations such as how the learners might become global human resources in the global society. Presupposing that, as mentioned in Chapter 4, the classroom context is a “model” of global society, we will be able to recognize the events and the learners’ experience in the group as an index of the currents of the global society. From this perspective, looking at the group interactions and their role in reproducing aspects of the broader society, we can see how learners become globally and locally minded in the same context.

As an observer, a TA for the course, and a doctoral student, I was able to observe myself as a part of many unfamiliar events in the class. For example, when I got permission to observe the course as a researcher and received the agreement to become a TA, I felt that I would be entering a global class in which many foreign students would be participating, and where I would need to communicate with them and with the other TAs in English. When I began observing, what was most remarkable was the interaction with the other TAs, and in particular, the American TAs. The other Japanese TA and the Chinese TA also used English with them, and in the classroom, I used
English with these Asian TAs as well. In the context of classroom management, it was not so difficult to see the orientation of the context as global. In this context, we first encouraged the students to show their ideas rather than focusing on speaking fluent, grammatically correct English. But this orientation was not explicitly relevant to the learners becoming globally minded, as they first needed to be comfortable as members of the group in which they were slotted. My impressions of the way the class proceeded were similar to what the participants recalled in the interviews.

As the course document proposed (as examined in Chapter 4), the participants were conscious of and recognized the context as a global one for them. Among reasons for this were, for example, that English was used, that each participant had a different cultural background, and the way of learning in the classroom. As a researcher, and through my past experience as a student, I had similar feelings to the participants in the present study. However, as far as I remember, when I was a student I often heard the terms, “internationalization” and “studying abroad”, rather than “globalization”, which appears as a keyword in the present study. As suggested in the documents and in the classroom discourse, society has become global, or has at least started labeling itself “global” instead of international. At the same time, the situation of society has been reproduced in the class. Thus the participants felt global when they were in the class, as a part of a global society.

Even though this study is based on a case of group interactions in a single classroom, it is also an incipient model of how the discourse is played out in the global society, though this classroom is at the same time a part of discourse in global society. Looking at participants becoming globally and locally minded, I presuppose that micro settings such as the classroom, which are reproduced in the global, must also have their
own unique aspects. From the perspective of linguistic anthropology, which was one of the frameworks for the present study, events are regarded as “particulars” grounded in the field where the observations were made.

In order to become members of a classroom designed as a global learning community, the learners were required to contribute to the group activities. This defines students’ localization in the present study. The learners needed to take part in the group before they could be socialized as global. Remembering the case of the Japanese student, Ozora, we looked at his ways of participating in the group along with his comments on his own learning experience during the course. While Ozora was attempting to take part in the group interaction, he focused only on the interactions, and did not take globalization into consideration.

Rather, Ozora’s attention was centered on what other members were doing and how the TA expected them to perform in the group. In the interview discussed in Chapter 4, Ozora gave some comments on this experience. In addition to English learning, he recalled how he had learned to express ideas responding to the TA’s initiations, which was a necessary skill for the participants to take part in the group interaction. Also, as mentioned in Chapter 7, he characterized the way of communicating in the group as, “Mainly, first, make sure of what we should say. First of all, we state our idea, and support it” (from Chapter 4, interview dialogue). As such, while the course was designed considering globalization, the participants did pay more attention to learning the local practices.

In addition to learners’ development in aspects of learning behavior as described above, the acquisition and the use of particular language elements were also a part of the classroom learning in group contexts. As Pennycook (2010) says, “all views
on language are located in certain histories and articulated from certain perspectives” (p. 5). Considering this statement, and also based on my understanding of language in interaction in the present case study, the participants did not think of English as a lingua franca per se, but as something acquired through their experience in interaction. By performing tasks in the group, they constructed particular uses of language in the group.

As suggested above, along with the course direction as global-oriented according to the course document, the learners recognized language and the discourse, as also operating “locally”. As Chapter 5 shows, the use of specific elements of a language, such as discourse markers, embodies this “locality of language” (Pennycook, 2010). In addition to this, the learners were able to choose from their linguistic repertoire when they faced linguistic difficulties in English. This behavior was also local in that how they chose linguistic resources to use in the situations was not officially a part of the class, but was a strategy they developed through the group activities. Overall, as mentioned in Chapter 4, they felt the situations were global, but looking individually at each linguistic and communicative behavior, it can be noted that they “locally” participated in the group discourse and became a “local” group member.

Therefore, in order to perform in the higher and global education context, the participants needed to look at local elements of their situations as well as how they were involved in the context of global education. The concept of globalization is still vague, even if the present study has touched on some aspects that might suggest what global means and how the global is reproduced in learners’ contextual awareness in higher education. However, it is certain that they were localized in the class to be competent in the group activities.
8.4 Communicative Competence in the Global Education Context

8.4.1 Academic group as speech community

In this case study of the ethnography of communication, I focused on one academic activity group in a speech community. A speech community is one of the aspects of the ethnography of communication research as well as patterned and organized ways of communication in a group (Saville-Troike, 2003). It is possible to regard the speech community as a unit in which the members get to share a common, member-constructed knowledge with each other, and one that includes “everything involving the use of language and other communicative modalities” (Saville-Troike, 2003, p. 18).

As discussed previously, the learners participated in the classroom as a situation that was designed to be global. Also, it can be said that, for the students, being slotted into a group was the start of being global. A group, as a micro community, was established for the students as the place in which to become “globally minded”. However, no particular rules and customs that the participants needed to acquire had been established. Rather, there were many situations which they experienced together, in which they established and shared competence, ranging from the use of elements of linguistic repertoire to communication strategies — as we saw in the analysis chapters.

8.4.2 Looking at the context and entering it

In the global-oriented course, the learners, first of all, needed to participate in the group activities. Having been slotted into a multilingual and multicultural group, each student had to avoid the situation where they just observed what was happening. They had to be engaged in the work as a group community member. From my understanding
of the situations in the group, all learners were conscious of what to do in order to construct a group, their community. From the interview with the Japanese student, Ozora, it can be seen that he was keen on the group interactions even if he could not express his ideas sufficiently or fluently in English and his communication skill was initially inadequate.

In Chapter 7, we found that there were three stages discoverable in Ozora’s development in contributing to the group interaction: rote, receptive, and active (full) participation. Although he did not appear to be actively “participating”, according to the usual definition, during the first two stages, my interview with him suggested that he was in fact participating in a particular style.

Here, “participating” was the most basic skill required to enter into the group interaction; in other words, it was the one competence required to become a community member. As Hymes (1972a) mentions, competence is knowing “when to speak, when not, and as to what to talk about with whom, when, where, in what manner” (p.277). Thus, students needed to look at the events by participating to find these skills in the group. In particular, for the Japanese student, taking part in the oral discussion activities was not familiar because of the traditional learning style in Japanese classrooms — for example, secondary school English classes (see Nukuto, 2015a, 2017).

As an element of communicative competence in the global-interaction-oriented course, participating, looking at the situation and finding out how to participate in it, are crucial to becoming a member who is able to cooperate with other members and construct common knowledge and community.
8.4.3 Constructing knowledge and community

As discussed above, the participants took part in many tasks, getting accustomed to local events in the group. To participate in the group, they were looking at situations or events and finding out what to do for the group, as one its members. These behaviors are the first stage of communication in the group. Also, in the group, this behavior can be regarded as an attempt to join in the group interaction.

The primary contextual reason why they needed to participate was to construct knowledge, which was shared, and a community where they learned. After “participating”, the participants had to state their ideas and their reasons for them to the group in order to contribute to the overall group idea. In other words, they constructed the group knowledge through talk-in-interaction. In Chapters 5 and 6, we saw how they experienced this through some particular linguistic devices. By understanding and sharing this practice, they expressed their ideas, and supported each other toward the construction of the group idea. This was a prioritized behavior in the course.

As mentioned in Section 8.4.1, the group had started like an empty box, which was to be filled with things. There had been no rules, no guidelines for interaction style, nor designated and shared language use. In this situation, being supported by the American TA, the participants observed happenings and built a community through corroboration in interaction. As they were looking for the way of communication, they were trying to engage in the group activities. As the interviews in Chapter 4 show, some students recognized that they faced an unfamiliar learning style in the course and were able to express this. For example, an Indonesian student, Rachmad, indicated that he felt the class (the group) was active, in that all students needed to talk, state their ideas, and share them with the other group members. In addition, a Japanese student, Ozora,
recounted that they needed to show their ideas with supporting statements. As these individuals experienced, the group as an academic community was constructed by their “shared” experience and knowledge, which was found through participating.

Participants worked not only to achieve the acquisition of a language, which was expected to be a medium for global interaction, but also to create a community, in which they were socialized to be competent global human resources by finding the way of constructing the academic context and the way of using their linguistic repertoire. In Chapter 6, we saw the case of translanguaging. In doing this, the participants used not only the expected medium language, English, but Japanese, which was either a second language or a first language depending on the member of the group. In this case, constructing the group idea through whatever means necessary was preferred over using English only in interactions. This behavior suggests that they learned communicative competence to create their ideas and to build their academic community.

In sum, the participants needed communicative competence to construct and share knowledge for academic discourse, and to create group ideas and establish the community. The aspects of communicative competence described above are really individual cases from the group interactions, and not necessarily universal applications. However, as I mentioned in Chapter 4, these aspects of communicative competence define the participants’ roles and characteristics as members of the local context.
8. 5 Socialization

8.5.1 Socialization through the use of linguistic repertoire

As seen in some of the analysis chapters, language and participants’ language use functioned to promote their academic socialization to become globally competent members in the group. I have already discussed the context in which their competence developed, and the competencies which they aimed to acquire as needed in the group. In addition, it is notable that their total linguistic repertoire was a medium that promoted this academic and global discourse socialization in the class.

As seen in all interactions, including academically — stating the idea, supporting it and constructing group knowledge — the participants were encouraged to use English as a communication medium. In Chapter 5, it was shown that the participants were encouraged to contribute to or be aware of ongoing interaction. During interactions, the participants were academically socialized and their progress was revealed. We can see this by looking back at Extract 8 from Chapter 5 as an example, particularly Rachmad’s pragmatic development through discourse marker “so”. After noting his idea, without the TA’s feedback or initiation, he tries to keep his turn and state an extra idea, such as “Especially, non, nothing certificate. So ↓ xxx cut all of” Line 53 in Extract 8 from Chapter 5). Stating an extra idea was one of elements of the communicative competence which were required of the participants in the academic group.

In addition to English use in the group interaction, in Chapter 6, we looked at how the participants overcame difficulties using only English to establish group interaction. They choose and used other aspects of linguistic repertoire, as
translanguaging, to keep group discussion going. Participants tried to carry out a topic-oriented interaction rather than English use-oriented communication. In order to keep working on the topic and idea construction, they sometimes used Japanese from their common linguistic repertoire. By doing so, they completed their interaction with a communicative tool, translanguaging. An important goal in the group was not only to use English, but also to interact and construct the idea in the group. This case shows that in their interactions they prioritized the achievement of the group idea and arranged their language use accordingly.

The participants were implicitly socialized to be academically communicative, as described above, developing their linguistic repertoire according to their communicative situations. This differs from the original framework of language socialization in which a mature figure, such as a caregiver or a teacher, socializes children through language. However, considering the community in the present study, which was established by all participants who were aiming to become globally minded members, we see here a high degree of peer socialization. That is, while the parameters of the course, including the guidance of the teacher and TAs, were set out in the course curriculum, the actual process of socialization was largely accomplished through peer socialization and though the use of common elements from the participants’ linguistic repertoires.

8.5.2 Socialization to be academic

I looked at, through some of the analysis chapters, the process by which the participants were socialized into an academic community, acquired communicative competence and established their group as a community through using their linguistic repertoires, as aspects of academic discourse socialization. Duff (2010b) describes the
research agendas of academic discourse socialization in postsecondary discourse as follows:

How do newcomers to an academic culture learn how to participate successfully in the oral and written discourse and related practices of that discourse community? How are they socialized, explicitly or implicitly, into these local discursive practices? (p. 169)

The case of language socialization in the present study is implicit in that the participants were not directly guided to use particular elements of their linguistic repertoire in the interactions. Rather, they were encouraged to perform academically in the group. The students’ goal was to acquire academic literacy, in particular, which could be adapted to the global era.

As for academic literacy, the present study focused on the requirements laid out for the participants in the course document, as well as the group practice. In Chapter 4, in the course document, it was noted that students needed to acquire communication competence to become global human resources with an ability to use English in communication. Accordingly, the students experienced the way of participating in the group as well as using English in the group.

In the course document, it was not clear what the participants actually had to acquire to perform as global human resources, though the requirements of English ability and communication competence were stated. Through group activities over a few weeks in the course, it was found that the students were socialized through their discursive practice and language use, while constructing group ideas in the interactions. Although the present study focused only on oral discourse in the group, it described
aspects of students’ process of academic development. From the descriptions in the analysis chapters, communicative competence as academic literacy in the group is summarized as follows:

- Participating in the group
- Observing the group events
- Knowing what to do for the group
- Being centered in the group
- Stating ideas and supporting the ideas with reasons in order to construct the group idea, and create knowledge

In addition to these, the participants needed to have the following:

- Ability to use their linguistic repertoires according to the situation

These six aspects define academic literacy as one kind of communicative competence, and also as the goal of acquiring academic discourse in the present study. However, students’ academic discourse socialization is managed by the learners themselves, not necessarily guided by a mature participant using particular language.

In order to acquire academic literacy as communicative competence, the participants supported each other and became accustomed to the academic and global discourse. This kind of literacy was totally new for the participants and was not clearly explained in the course document nor taught to the participants in the group. However, in establishing the group as a local community in the classroom, through the interactions, the participants implicitly cooperated with each other to perform in the group and to be socialized into the academic discourse.
8.6 Chapter Conclusion: Academic and Foreign Language Socialization

Academic and language socialization occur within group interaction and global educational contexts. The participants in the present study were socialized into academic discourse and became locally communicative group members. In the process of socialization, they first acquired the ability to use their linguistic repertoire to participate in the group by translanguaging. In addition to English as a medium language, which the course encouraged the students to learn, they acquired a more general communicative competence which allowed them to perform in the group. In order to acquire academic competence, they took part in constructing the local community while developing their individual communication style. These processes occurred through peer socialization, in which the goals were not specific. The present case of academic discourse and language socialization was located within the local community (group), whose members learned to use common elements from their linguistic repertoires to construct the academic context.
9.1 Chapter Introduction

In this final chapter, I present a summary of university students’ academic and foreign language socialization in the global education program, and consider the limitations of the present study in relation to description and theory. I will conclude the chapter by suggesting implications for further research using academic and foreign language socialization as a framework for researching higher education in the global era.

9.2 Academic and Foreign Language Socialization

In the present study, I described how a particular group of university students were socialized into academic discourse. In Chapter 8, we reviewed and reflected on the results from the analysis chapters, Chapters 4-7. Academic foreign language socialization was presented as a new framework to look at multilingual and multicultural contexts in higher education.

There are various contextual aspects to consider in academic foreign language socialization. First, as Chapter 6 suggested, learners were able to use several languages including English as a medium, if they shared some aspects of their linguistic repertoires. By using the whole of their linguistic repertoire, they overcame linguistic difficulties and were able to complete their interaction. Secondly, as Chapter 5 described, they were also required to use English as a medium to take part in a globally oriented course. The English marker “so” helped them to perform in the group. Third,
Chapter 7 showed how learners came to participate in the group. “Participating” had several stages: rote participating, receptive participating and active (full) participating. Participating by all members contributed to knowledge construction in the group as a whole.

All of these elements, in the context of globally oriented learning, contribute to the students’ ability to participate as members of a local community defined by their class group. In such a context, the community is constructed through shared knowledge and group activities.

In sum, academic and foreign language socialization is complex in that elements of it are totally contextualized and depend on each other. Academic and foreign language socialization is defined as 1) socialization to construct knowledge in a context by participating in the community; and 2) socialization to use language by choosing from contextually appropriate aspects of one’s linguistic repertoire.

### 9.3 Globalization in Higher Education

In the present study, particularly in Chapter 4, it was found that globalization is characterized by situations in which the participants learn and practice their English and communication skills as demanded by global society. Based on the interviews, one can say that globalization is a factor that makes them feel that they are experiencing learning in an intercultural situation. In addition, the participants were aware of the idea of globalization as is suggested by their use of English as a common and academic language, and they were able to adapt their way of communicating to situations where each participant had their own national, sociocultural and linguistic background.
Globalization can thus be interpreted situationally and contextually. The present study makes it clear that globalization in higher education plays a role in creating situations with local demands, such as using a common language, including both English and other languages from the learners’ repertoires. This use of other multiple languages — translanguaging — can be seen as an academic skill which helps learners achieve the goal of contributing to the group.

Translanguaging, especially, is a factor representative of globalization in the group. This concept bridges learning languages as a tool for global communication and acquiring communicative competence which allows participants to contribute to the construction of interactions in the community.

9.4 Limitation and Implications for Further Research

The present study presented a framework of academic and foreign language socialization by looking at the course concepts, participants’ feedback, and events which demonstrated their practice in the context. The study is presented as a “case” which is described through an ethnographic approach; I also assumed an emic perspective by trying to understand the insiders’ views on the context and events.

Of course, there are weak points in the present study. First is its lack of overall “generalizability” (Duff, 2008, 2012). As Duff (2008) states, a major disadvantage of a case study is that it is difficult to look at the case as a general one. In a case study, we tend to focus more on particular and unfamiliar points rather than on general truths. In other words, the elements focused on in a case study are those which define particular situations in which the researcher is interested (Merriam, 1998).
As a limitation, first, the present study has not been able to validate the outcome of students being completely socialized into the globally oriented discourse. In particular, we cannot say whether they actually acquired the linguistic and communicative competence needed in the context. For example, in the chapter focusing on the discourse marker “so” in socialization, the extracts seem to show the process of learners’ acquisition of the marker, which helped them to complete the task. However, it might be only the process of using the marker, and not any real outcome, as Andrew stated in his interview that he could not find any major development in the students’ English ability. In Chapter 7, where I focused on an individual case of development of linguistic and communicative competence, I was unable to actually assess the student’s development without specific measurement scales.

A second limitation is the difficulty of doing longitudinal, ethnographic study in classrooms and school discourse, and the relative lack of previous studies of this type in Japan. A major reason for the former limitation is the problem of accessing the contexts where individual participant information is made readily available. As a result, obtaining permission to conduct longitudinal and ethnographic studies in schools is difficult. Indeed, this depends on having support from personnel.

As Cook and Burdelski (2017) mention, the number of language socialization studies in Japan is still few, and language socialization research is used in Japan now even less than it was before 2000 as a way of looking at the development of linguistic and communicative competence. There are, however, some exceptions, such as Takada (2013), as Cook and Burdelski (2017) state.

In sum, as a direction for further research, it would be useful to consider how to assess learners’ development in the learning context described by the present study.
That is, how might we best measure learner performance and linguistic and pragmatic development in relation to participation in a classroom community. This might not lend itself to traditional paper-based testing or interview style testing. Prior to this, in order to assess such learners’ development accurately, some longitudinal qualitative research would be needed to look at learners in practice. Linguistic ethnographic research might therefore play a major role in supporting second-language pedagogy.
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Appendix: Transcription Conventions

(Adapted from Richards, 2003)

(…) Short pause (less than 3 second)

[ ] English translation

@@@ Laughing

*Italic* Japanese use

Capital Emphasis

↑ Rising intonation

↓ Falling intonation

! Exclamatory utterance

xxx Unable to transcribe

::: Extended sound or syllable up to 2 second

⋯ Utterance is fading out

(( ))) Showing additional information