Noting and other language management processes of a learner of Japanese in his bilingual social networks

Naomi Kurata
Monash University

This case study examines the language problems that are noted and further managed by a Japanese language learner studying at an Australian university. Through the use of interviews as well as the analysis of the learner's natural conversation, the study mainly focuses on some major factors that affect these management processes. To date, there has been little research on noting and other management processes in out-of-class natural contexts, in particular that on presentational problems noted by foreign language learners. Utilising an approach that incorporates language management theory and activity theory, this study reveals that these problems seem to be perceived and managed seriously by the learner in his conversation.

The findings also indicate that one of the major factors that affect the learner's language management processes is a contradiction that emerges between two activities of the communities where the learner and his interactants are situated. This contradiction, in turn, seems to lead to a number of other contradictions between the three interactants' goals of the conversation, which possibly affect the learner's evaluations of language deviations and consequent adjustments in complex ways. Other factors include the learner's L2 use history, such as formal Japanese study, which might contribute to his correctness-oriented approach, and the strength of indication of each participant's preference for English or Japanese.

Key words: noting, language management, activity theory, contradiction between activities, L2 use history

Introduction

There have been a great number of studies that examine learners' noticing in the field of second language acquisition (SLA) (Schmidt, 1990; Gass, 1997; Swain,

Journal of Asian Pacific Communication 22:2 (2012), **232–248**. DOI 10.1075/japc.22.2.06kur
ISSN 0957–6851 / E-ISSN 1569–9838

2000; Qi & Lapkin, 2001; Shekary & Tahririan, 2006). The majority of them focus on the learners' cognitive processes in which they notice a gap in their interlanguage in terms of linguistic forms. These processes, as argued by Schmidt (1990), can be regarded as a necessary part of L2 development. In addition, most of these studies were conducted either in experimental (for example, Leow, 2000; Adams, 2003; Park, 2011) or classroom settings (for example, Williams, 1999; Mennim, 2007; Barnawi, 2010). Therefore, very little research has been concerned with learners' noticing in natural settings, in particular in foreign language (FL) learning contexts. In this paper I will employ the term "noting", following its regular use in the language management theory.

In his discussion about language problems noted in contact situations, Neustupný (1994a) highlights the necessity to investigate problems related not only to the "bare message" of a discourse (propositional problems) but also to the problems caused by lack of speakers' ability to send or receive information other than this bare message (presentational problems). This ability includes communicating their attitudes and intentions as well as presenting themselves in a particular way. Neustupný further states that presentational problems are not given adequate attention, even in the most advanced language teaching systems.

An area of deficiency in the previous L2 studies concerning noticing or noting is thus the investigation of these presentational as well as propositional problems noted in L2 interaction, in particular in out-of-class natural settings. Furthermore, as Neustupný (1994a) suggests, the relative weight of these types of language problems occurring in contact situations should be considered, and this requires much theoretical work.

The current study examines the problems that are noted and further managed by a Japanese language learner (male), studying at an Australian university, in his bilingual social networks. Taking up Neustupný's suggestion outlined above, this study is concerned with the processes through which learners manage propositional deviations as well as those of a presentational nature. By incorporating language management theory with a sociocultural framework, I also attempt to explore the major factors that seem to affect these processes. Specifically, the study addresses three questions:

1. What language problems are noted and further managed by a Japanese language learner in his interaction with Japanese network members?
2. What type(s) of these problems seem to be the most important for the learner in this interaction?
3. What factors contribute to such problems, their noting and further management processes?

Activity theory

In order to consider sociocultural influences on the processes of the learner's noting and further managing of language problems, activity theory is employed in the current study. Activity theory was constructed by A. N. Leont'ev (1978), a colleague of Vygotsky's who followed Vygotsky's ideas about social mediation. Vygotsky (1978) argued that humans use symbolic as well as physical tools/means, in order to mediate and regulate their relationships with the external environment. One of the most important symbolic tools is language, through which humans direct and organise our mental activity, including thinking and learning.

In activity theory, activity is taken as the unit of analysis and analysed as a three-level construct, namely, activity, action and operation. The highest level is activity, which is referred to as any human activity in a specific social setting, such as play and learning. This activity is linked to motive, which is the individual's underlying purpose for engaging in the activity. The second level of analysis is action, which is goal directed. Actions refer to the specific meditational means or strategies used to attain a goal, and this goal serves to operationalise motives into more specific objectives. At the third level of analysis, the actions at the second level are carried out under the influence of concrete conditions. This is the operation scheme and the observable level of behaviour. These three levels are thus hierarchical and all the elements in this construct influence each other; hence the activity is inherently dynamic.

An increasing number of studies that employ activity theory stress the importance of accounting for learner perspectives in relation to their interpretation of the situated context, which can be analysed by utilising this theory (Coughlan & Duff, 1994; Gillette, 1994; Thorne, 2003; Storch, 2004). In other words, the theory allows for an examination of an activity in a variety of learning contexts, through the learner's eyes (see also Basharina, 2007; Spence-Brown, 2007; Lei, 2008; Inaba, 2011; Kurata, 2011). With the object of investigating the major factors that seem to affect the language management processes of the informant from his perspective, the current study mainly draws upon the notions of activity, motives, goals and goal-directed actions.

Methodology

Informant

This study considers the experiences of a first-year undergraduate student, Max (a pseudonym), who was enrolled in an intermediate level Japanese subject at an

Australian university.[1] Max is an international student from Austria and his home language is German. He was 21 years old and had resided in Australia for about six months at the time of data collection. He studied Japanese at a university in Vienna for one and a half years, but had no experience of studying or living in Japan. In his interview, he indicated his strong desire to practise and improve his Japanese more than his English, due to his high level of English proficiency and his limited exposure to Japanese in an environment where English is the dominant language for his daily communication in Australia. I, as an L2 speaker of English, found his English proficiency more than adequate to conduct research interviews with me.

Procedure

A sample of Max's natural interaction in his hall of residence at university was collected.[2] I provided him with a small tape recorder for his use and instructed him to attempt to capture a natural conversation in which any language(s) could be used. The sample was an approximately 25-minute chat with two Japanese residents of Max's hall, Riku (male) and Yuki (female).[3] The recording took place while they were cooking in the kitchen and then eating dinner in the common room, which was their daily routine.

Subsequent to the collection of the sample, a further follow-up interview was conducted to elicit Max's reflections on the language use in the sample. Moreover, five one-hour "interaction interviews", as outlined by Neustupný (1994b), were conducted with Max over a period of nine months (two university semesters) to examine his language use in his bilingual social networks for the larger research project of which this paper is a part (Kurata, 2011). This "interaction interview" format avoids general questions about what informants usually do and concentrates on specific questions to find out what actually happened in a particular situation, usually within a set period of time. This methodology can be thus described as a kind of retrospective method. In addition, Muraoka (2002) explains that this interview method is particularly useful when it is difficult for researchers to record or observe their participants' linguistic behaviour and when investigating, among other things, speech events and interactions that occurred in participants' social networks (cf. Asaoka, 1987; Inaba, 2011; Kurata, 2011).

Findings

It is first necessary to describe Max's bilingual social networks and the language use patterns in these networks, as well as the recorded conversation, before presenting an analysis of his management of language problems, including noting.

Max's bilingual social networks

Max's social networks in which he was exposed to Japanese (regardless of the frequency of Japanese over English use) included an Australian classmate in his Japanese class, 11 native speakers (NSs) of Japanese who were situated in Australia, and another two NSs in Japan. Employing Nishimura's (1992) categories of three varieties of bilingual speech, Max's language use in his networks was categorised into three types: "the basically Japanese variety", "the basically English variety" and "the mixed variety". Through the analysis of the interaction interviews with Max, I found that he used "the basically English variety" with most of his network members, including those in Japan. He claimed that he had perceived that most Japanese people were very keen to talk in English and that he did not mind using English with them. His willingness to accommodate to his Japanese network members' English use thus might account for the predominance of "the basically English variety". Nevertheless, he also claimed to have interactions with a few of these Japanese members occasionally in "the mixed variety".

Language use patterns in Max's conversation

Table 1 below presents the number of turns taken by Max and his two Japanese interactants (Riku and Yuki) as well as showing the language used in their conversation. In the current study, turns are referred to as changes of speakers. "Mixed" denotes the use of the two languages within a turn. The numbers of turns by Riku (214 turns) and by Yuki (201 turns) are significantly larger than those by Max (117 turns).

The total number of turns by the three interactants in English (260 turns) is almost the same as that in Japanese (256 turns). The language use pattern in this conversation is thus regarded as "the mixed variety". However, the proportions of English to Japanese spoken by each interactant show that although the two NSs of Japanese employ this variety, Max's speech is categorised as "the basically English variety".

Table 1. Number of turns by language

	Max	**Riku**	**Yuki**	**Total**
English	97 (82.9%)	101 (47.2%)	62 (30.8%)	260
Japanese	18 (15.4%)	104 (48.6%)	134 (66.7%)	256
Mixed	2 (1.7%)	9 (4.2%)	5 (2.5%)	16
Total	117	214	201	532

Closer examination of the language used reveals that there are 10 sequences in which Riku and Yuki address each other almost all in Japanese, with Max's contributions to their talk being very limited. This accounts for Max's considerably lower number of turns compared with Yuki and Riku, as shown in Table 1 above.

Propositional problems

The sequences in which Riku and Yuki address each other mostly in Japanese indicate that they talk at a natural speed, employing colloquial expressions. It is thus no doubt difficult for Max to completely understand their conversations, although he seems to mostly get the gist of them, which is evidenced by his production of coherent utterances either in English or Japanese (cf. Excerpts 2 and 3 below). Such lack of complete comprehension by Max is consistent with his claim in his interaction interview that Riku spoke much faster than average Japanese persons, making it impossible for non-native speakers of Japanese to understand their talk, so he was simply trying to understand 50 per cent of it. This claim shows that he noted that the majority of their conversation remained uncomprehended by himself but that this propositional deviation was not perceived as a serious problem. Accordingly, as the analysis of these sequences suggests, no corrective adjustment was implemented. The further analysis of such absence of corrective adjustment from Max's perspective will be shown later by utilising activity theory.

I found another instance in which Max (M) notes his propositional problem by Riku's (R) provision of corrective feedback in the form of a recast (translations from English to Japanese by the author are shown in { }):

Excerpt 1

1 R: [ん：]、おっできるできる.
{Mmm:, yeah, we can, we can.}
2 M: (.) ((clearing his throat))
3 R: だって簡単なやつならだって(きっと)売ってるやつ買えばちょんちょんちょんってやりゃ(できるでしょ)?
{Because if we buy easy stuff, we can make it very easily.}
4 Y: うん.
{Yeah.}
5 R: 要するに[スポンジ買っちゃえ]ばさあ、
{In short, if we buy a sponge cake,}
→ 6 M: [( )]yeah. ろうそくを作って. (hhh)
{We make a candle.}
7 R: ろうそくをつけて.
{We light/put on a candle.}
8 M: Yeah.

9 Y: や、いらないよろうそく.
{Nope, I don't need a candle.}

The sequence that precedes this excerpt was mainly conducted in Japanese by Riku and Yuki (Y), with a limited contribution by Max. In line 6, Max said, "ろうそくを作って" (we make a candle). This utterance is grammatically correct, but contains a lexical error: what he means here is not "作る (*tsukuru*)" (make), but a similar sounding verb, "つける (*tsukeru*)" (put on/light). In line 7, Riku fully recasts Max's utterance by replacing "作る (*tsukuru*)" with "つける (*tsukeru*)". Max seems to note Riku's feedback as corrective, judging from his following utterance indicating noting (one type of uptake), "Yeah". This example therefore illustrates a deviation that was noted, evaluated and adjusted by the learner's Japanese interlocutor. This, in turn, seemed to result in the learner's noting of this deviation.

Apart from the above erroneous utterance in Excerpt 1, Max demonstrates his ability to formulate a proposition correctly in terms of grammar and lexical items. All of the 18 Japanese utterances produced by Max are also smooth with no prosodic cues that indicate any difficulty with producing these utterances. In addition, these utterances are followed by Riku or Yuki's coherent responses to them, which confirm no propositional deviations caused by the utterances. Given the fact that Max had undertaken formal Japanese study only for one and a half years with no in-country experience and had had very limited interactions with NSs of Japanese before his sojourn in Australia, it is probable that he tends to be correctness-oriented in his social interactions with Riku and Yuki. This orientation to correctness by Max is supported by another claim that he made in one of his interaction interviews about an uncomfortable experience in using Japanese. He claimed to have felt uncomfortable by being explicitly corrected by a NS of Japanese as well as recognising his error(s) that he had committed when he thought about it later. He further explained that he thus tended to produce utterances about which he was confident in terms of correctness. This is consistent with the above-mentioned fact regarding the accuracy of his utterances. In order to avoid such an uncomfortable experience, therefore, Max seems to pre-adjust his propositions in Japanese. This adjustment, in turn, appeared to contribute to the low frequency of propositional deviations in terms of the messages expressed by Max.

Presentational problems

In his follow-up interview, Max claimed that Riku and Yuki predominantly talked amongst themselves in Japanese in their conversation. Max further reported on his perception regarding Riku's use of Japanese in their interactions with Yuki, including the recorded session, as follows:

Max: Maybe Riku tried to talk to Yuki in Japanese very fast on purpose, and sometimes it gave the impression that, um, yeah, he didn't want me to participate in this part of the conversation. (…) Sometimes I felt excluded in this situation. They sometimes talked about me ((in Japanese)), thinking I can't understand their conversation.

This statement indicates that Max perceived that Japanese was being used by Riku as an in-group language, which in turn made Max feel excluded. It also shows that Max was aware of how Riku and Yuki perceived the level of his Japanese proficiency and that he was concerned about being viewed as not proficient enough to participate in their conversation. I suggest that he felt somewhat marginalised as a user of Japanese. It thus can be interpreted that he noted Riku and Yuki's disregard of Max as an addressee in their conversations in Japanese and evaluated it negatively. Another possible interpretation is that Max seemed to face difficulties in assessing his Japanese interlocutors' intentions of their dominant conversations, in particular, those of Riku's fast speech in Japanese. Both interpretations show presentational problems in this particular discourse event and how these problems are managed will be analysed next.

The following excerpt illustrates how these problems are managed by Max. It is taken from the conversation in which Yuki and Riku are talking about the pink cake that their mutual friend made. The conversation up to the beginning of this excerpt was conducted almost all in Japanese by Riku (R) and Yuki (Y), with a very limited contribution by Max (M).

Excerpt 2

1 R: すっごい<さ>かわいらしいケーキ．(1.5)
{VERY pretty cake.}
2 Y: なんかね、ピンクのケーキ焼いてくれるんだって．
{You know, he bakes a pink cake (for his friends).}
3 R: あーピあケーキは、ケーキはあるんだ
{Well, pi, well, cake is, you have a cake.}
4 Y: ケーキはねなんかねえ?ピンクのケーキをこないだ焼いたって言ったから、私またピンクがいいって<ピンクのケーキ焼いて>
{About the cake is, you know? He said he had baked a pink cake the other day, so I asked him to bake a pink one again, <asked him to bake a pink cake for me>.}
5 R: [(だろ：)]
{[I said that, didn't I]?}
6 Y: [ピンクのケー]キだって[どんなケーキ]だよって
{[Pink ca]ke, what type of cake is that pink cake?}
7 R: [( ) (ケーキ)]
{(cake)}

→ 8 M: ケーキを作ったことある?
{Have you ever made a cake?}
9 R: ケーキを作ったこと?んーある.
{Have I ever made a cake? Well, yes.}
10 Y: (.)あるの?
{Have you?}
11 M: [んー?]
[Mmm?]
12 R: [ある]何回かは(作った).
{[Yes], a number of times, (I have made one)}
13 Y: You?
14 M: (2.8) ない
{No.}
15 Y: 土台だけ作れると思わない? [できる]
{Don't you think we can make the cake base only? We can.}

It seems that Riku and Yuki's use of colloquial expressions, natural speed and Max's unfamiliarity with the person about whom they talk make it hard for Max to participate in their dominant conversation in this speech event. In line 8, however, Max initiates a Japanese utterance, which is not an abrupt topic change, but a more subtle topic shift. As van Lier and Matsuo (2000) explain, small sub-topics are not specifically marked as they change, but rather they flow from one into the other, and are collaboratively established by interactants; the researchers refer to this flow as topic shift, as opposed to topic change. Adopting their definition of topic shift, it can be said that Max introduces a sub-topic (about Riku's experience of baking cakes), into which the topic about the pink cake flows.

It thus can be analysed that this introduction of a new sub-topic allows him to re-engage in their conversation as a speaker of Japanese as well as a legitimate participant of their conversation that they should not exclude. Furthermore, by choosing a sub-topic rather than an abrupt topic change, Max seems to be able to maintain the flow of the ongoing talk as well as to develop their conversation. As shown in line 9, Riku repeats Max's utterance, which shows his acceptance of Max's selection of Japanese as well as his topic shift. Yuki, in line 10, also accepts this topic shift, so that it is collaboratively established by these three interactants.

In addition, Max responds to Yuki's question in English, in Japanese in line fourteen. This responsive utterance in the other language can be a strong index of his preference for Japanese (cf. Auer, 1998). Here, it is important to note that Max is situated as a learner, who is keen to use and practise Japanese as a FL. This situation partly accounts for his preference for Japanese which he is less competent to use. Therefore, I can argue that Max implements adjustment strategies, including such indication of his linguistic preference and his introduction of a sub-topic, in

order to manage the problem related to his Japanese interlocutors' disregard of him as an addressee and a user of Japanese. These strategies appear to be effective in the sense that Max successfully allows himself to participate in Riku and Yuki's dominant conversation as a speaker of Japanese in this speech event.

Nevertheless, there are a number of cases in which these adjustment strategies are not always effective. Excerpt 3, which includes an illustration of such a case, comes from the interaction in which Max, Riku and Yuki are talking about Yuki's English name, Meg. The surrounding stretch of talk is conducted in the mixed variety.

Excerpt 3

1 R: メグ？
{Meg?}
2 Y: (hhh)（ほんと）かわいいでしょ？
(hhh) {(It's a really) pretty name?}
3 R: あーちょっと.
{Well, a little bit.}
4 R Y: (hhh)
5 R: OK, OK, then,
6 Y: (じゃあ)でもね:友達はねすごい似合ってるって言ったのね:
{(well) but: my friends said it suits me very much:}
7 R: メグが?
{(You mean your English name) Meg (suits you)?}
8 Y: そうそうそうそう(.) でも他の子は:もっとセクシーな名前をつけろって.
{Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah (.) but other friends said: I should have a sexier name.}
9 R: メグってセクシーだと思う.
{I think Meg is a sexy name.}
10 Y: だめだよもっとセクシー[( )]
{No, a sexier} [( )]
→11 M: [Meg] Ryanのよう
{That is like Meg Ryan.}
12 Y: Yeah yeah yeah.
13 R: Meg Ryan.
→14 M: (3.0)あの(.)ジュリーさんも元気ですか?
{Um, (.) how is Julie?}
15 Y: ジュリー[は?]
{Julie [is?]}
16 R: [Julie]Julie?
17 Y: Julie ( )

18 R: Who is Julie?
19 Y: [( )]
20 R: [Ju Julie is] Yuko.
21 Y: Yeah yeah yeah.
… ((An omission of 10 turns spoken by Riku and Yuki in English))
32 M: (.) Did you have lunch with her today?

Subsequent to Riku and Yuki's conversation almost all in Japanese at a natural speed between lines 1 and 10, Max initiates a Japanese utterance with English code mixing in line eleven. However, in her responsive turn to this utterance, Yuki produces a phatic utterance in English, by which she signals her agreement with Max despite her disregard of his selection of Japanese. Riku then repeats the name of the actress in English in line thirteen. In spite of their code alternation to English, Max introduces a new sub-topic (about another Japanese girl's English name) in Japanese in line fourteen. It can be interpreted that Max applies the same adjustment strategy as that in Excerpt 2 here in order to actively participate in the conversation in which he has only been a listener.

Yuki, in her responsive turn in line 15, once aligns with Max's choice of Japanese. Riku, on the other hand, does not respond to Max's question ("how is Julie?") in line 14 directly but initiates another relevant question in English ("who is Julie?") in line eighteen. He knows the answer to this question, which is evidenced by his own utterance ("Julie is Yuko") in line twenty. The language use between Yuki and Riku then converges to English afterwards. Finally, such conflicting use of the two languages is resolved by Max's accommodation to Riku's and Yuki's choice of English in line thirty-two.

This sequence thus exhibits an unsuccessful result of the application of an adjustment strategy by Max. In terms of language selection, the sequence exemplifies a clear case of language negotiation where the interactants do not agree on one common language-of interaction (cf. Auer 1998). It also illustrates Max's and his Japanese interlocutors' preference for Japanese and English respectively in this situation. In addition, as Auer (1984) asserts, code alternation for the interlocutor's benefit, that is, to switch to his/her stronger language, is a dangerous move because this move may threaten his/her face. Riku and Yuki's code-alternation to English in response to Max's utterances in Japanese in lines 11 and 14 can be considered as the occurrence of another presentational problem that may threaten Max's face as a user of Japanese.

The language negotiation sequence resulting in the above unsuccessful adjustment process in Excerpt 3 presents a contrast with the absence of such a sequence in Excerpt two. The beginning part of these two excerpts, however, share an interactional feature that Yuki and Riku talk in Japanese exclusively between

themselves until Max initiates a Japanese utterance. In other words, both excerpts show a similar presentational problem. Hence, it is important to examine what factors contribute to the absence of language negotiation that seems conducive to Max's successful adjustment process in Excerpt 1 by comparing the sequences of these two excerpts.

Auer (1995) suggests comparing participants' language choice in responsive turns in order to see how their language negotiation can be won. This suggestion is based on the general feature of bilingual language negotiation where a participant tends to feel pressure to accommodate to his/her interlocutor's language selection for turns with a higher degree of cohesion with previous turns than for those with little cohesion, such as initiative turns. Following this suggestion, I will compare Riku and Yuki's responsive turns to Max's Japanese utterances in these two excerpts.

In Excerpt 2, Riku repeats and answers Max's question (line 8), which is followed by Yuki's use of a confirmation check strategy (line 10) regarding Riku's answer (in line 9). These lines between 8 and 10 therefore show a significantly high degree of cohesion, and in turn, there may be considerable pressure on Riku and Yuki to accept Max's choice of Japanese in this situation. Furthermore, Max's question is about Riku's experience of baking cakes, so it may be difficult or impossible for Riku to avoid a direct responsive position by producing another relevant question, as he does in line 18 of Excerpt three.

Compared to Max's utterance in Japanese in Excerpt 2, those of Max's in lines 11 and 14 in Excerpt 3 probably exert less pressure on Yuki and Riku to accommodate to his language selection. This may be because these utterances are not direct questions to Yuki and Riku about themselves but are referring to other people who are not participants in their conversation. Moreover, Riku and Yuki's choice of English in their responsive turns (lines 12 to 13) is a stronger indicator of their preference for English than Max's choice of Japanese in his initiative turn (line 14) is for Japanese (cf. Auer, 1988). In Excerpt 2, as mentioned above, Max signals his desire to use Japanese by his persistent use of it, even in his responsive turn to Yuki in line fourteen. Hence, I argue that, amongst other things, the degree of cohesion between turns (a discourse-related factor) and the strength of indication of each participant's preference for English or Japanese (a participant-related factor) in these two excerpts affect the occurrence or absence of language negotiation, which, in turn, affect the results of Max's implementation of adjustment strategies (regarding discourse- and participant-related factors, see Auer 1984, 1988).

The analysis of Max's actual interaction with Riku and Yuki has thus revealed a number of personal (participant-related), interpersonal and discourse-related factors that influence the problems that he notes as well as the further language management processes. Drawing upon activity theory, I will consider more

comprehensively how social and cultural structures are related to these problems and management processes next.

Two activities

According to activity theory, activities are based within communities, and driven by motives (cf. Engeström, 1999). The conversation between Max, Riku and Yuki can be regarded as actions within organizing activities; that is, informal social interaction and language learning. The former activity is driven by motives which include interpersonal engagement and cross-cultural communication in the community of students in their international hall of residence. The language learning activity seems to be driven by the motive of language since the majority of the members of this community tend to be motivated to improve their English proficiency as international students, as well as being interested in learning about the language and culture of their peers. However, there is probably a contradiction that emerges between these two activities in the sense that they are not always compatible with each other (cf. Engeström, 2001). This contradiction, in turn, seems to lead to a number of other contradictions between the three interactants' goals of the conversation.

One of the major contradictions occurs between Max's goal to socialise with Riku and Yuki through conversation, shared cooking and eating, and his other goal to use and practice Japanese. Max appears to always attempt to maintain the goal to socialise over the course of the conversation while the latter goal often seems temporary. I speculate that the reason for the temporariness of the goal to use Japanese is that if he persists in focusing on this goal, that is, if he defines his interaction with Riku and Yuki primarily as an opportunity to practice his Japanese, his goal to socialise would be undermined. It is clear that another contradiction emerges between Max's goal to use Japanese and the Japanese interactants' goal to use English. The language negotiation sequence in which Max's selection of Japanese is not accepted by Riku and Yuki in Excerpt 3 above exemplifies this contradiction between the goals of the two parties.

As discussed above, a number of propositional deviations, including Max's lack of comprehension of the majority of Riku and Yuki's dominant conversation, were identified in their conversation. However, Max does not seem to perceive these deviations as serious problems but is tolerant of his miscomprehension. As a result, such tolerance appears to lead to the absence of any corrective adjustments. It can be argued that this absence of adjustments is partly attributed to Max's probable attempt to give priority to the goal to socialise over the goal to use and learn Japanese. In other words, Max possibly does not aim at the total comprehension of Riku and Yuki's dominant conversation only for his L2 use or learning purpose,

but is satisfied with understanding the gist of this conversation in order to maintain his goal to socialise with them.

In contrast to the absence of adjustments for these propositional deviations, Max actively implements some corrective adjustments for those of a presentational nature, as shown in Excerpts 2 and 3. In these excerpts, as previously analysed, Max introduces a sub-topic in Japanese, possibly in order to be recognised as a legitimate addressee as well as a speaker of Japanese. I can argue that such linguistic behaviour of Max's allows himself to pursue his goals to socialise and to use Japanese at the same time. As mentioned above, Max's goal to use and learn Japanese is not always compatible with his other goal to socialise. Hence, he was likely to often keep the former goal in the background and decide to bring it in, giving consideration to personal, social and discourse conditions, which may or may not allow him to pursue his two goals at the same time. Such pursuit of dual goals, therefore, seems to underlie his active application of his corrective adjustment for the presentational problems. In other words, socialising activity and L2 use/learning opportunities are mediated, among other things, by Max's adjustment strategies.

Conclusion

Through the detailed analysis of Max's conversation, coupled with that of his interviews, the importance of presentational problems that the learner noted and further managed in this conversation has become apparent. Indeed, despite the common belief that propositional deviations constitute the mainstream of language problems in contact or L2 situations, those of a presentational nature seem to be perceived and managed more seriously by Max. The majority of the previous research in the field of L2 use and learning has paid scant attention to such importance of learners' interest and ability in communicating their intentions and attitudes and presenting themselves in a particular way in their actual interactions.

The approach incorporating the language management theory and activity theory has helped me to explore some major factors that seem to influence the processes of the management of language problems by Max. I have argued that one of these factors is a contradiction that emerges between two activities of the communities where Max and his interactants are situated. This contradiction, in turn, seems to lead to a number of other contradictions between the three interactants' goals of the conversation, which possibly affect the learner's evaluations of language deviations and consequent adjustments in complex ways. Other factors include the learner's L2 use history, such as formal Japanese study, which might contribute to his correctness-oriented approach. This approach, amongst other

things, is a probable determinant of his pre-adjustment strategies for his accurate and smooth utterances. The more micro-level analysis of Max's interaction has revealed a number of discourse-related and personal factors, including the degree of cohesion between turns and the strength of indication of each participant's preference for English or Japanese respectively. These factors appeared to influence how language negotiation can be won, which, in turn, affect the results of Max's implementation of adjustment strategies.

Max's case has thus shed light on our understanding of the way FL learners manage the various language problems that they note in their social network contexts. It indicates a necessity for these learners and their language teachers to be aware of the importance of presentational problems for the learners in their actual L2 interaction. In addition, giving consideration to the probable factors that the current study found influential in language management processes, it is recommended that educators provide students with useful adjustment strategies to solve problems, depending on the actual contexts. However, further studies in this area should be undertaken in other L2 use and learning settings. This would allow us to examine the extent to which these factors may be generalised to other contexts.

Notes

1. This intermediate level is the entry level for students who have studied Japanese at high school in Australia.

2. These samples were fully transcribed according to the CA conventions found in the Appendix A in Markee (2000) with the following minor modifications: (.) means a pause less than a second, [ ] indicates speech overlap and < > denotes a reduced volume.

3. Riku (a pseudonym) was a 21-year-old exchange student from Japan who Max had known for over six months at the time of the study. Yuki (a pseudonym), on the other hand, was a 22-year-old international student, knowing Max for about one month.

References

Adams, R. (2003). L2 output, reformulation, and noticing: Implications for IL development. *Language Teaching Research*, *7*, 347–376.

Asaoka, T. (1987). *Communication problems between Japanese and Australians at a dinner party. Working Papers of the Japanese Studies Centre No. 3*. Melbourne: Japanese Studies Centre.

Auer, J.C.P. (1984). *Bilingual conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Auer, J.C.P. (1988). A conversation analytic approach to code-switching and transfer. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Codeswitching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspective* (pp. 187–213). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Auer, J.C.P. (1995). The pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 115–135). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Auer, J.C.P. (1998). *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge.

Barnawi, O. (2010). Promoting noticing through collaborative feedback tasks in EFL college writing classrooms. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 22*(2), 209–217.

Basharina, O. (2007). An activity theory perspective on student-reported contradictions in international telecollaboration. *Language Learning & Technology, 11*(2), 82–103.

Coughlan, P., & Duff, P.A. (1994). Same task, different activities: Analysis of a second language acquisition task from an activity theory perspective. In J.P. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 173–191). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Engeström, Y. (1999). Activity theory and individual and social transformation. In Y. Engeström, R. Miettinen & R. Punamaki (Eds.), *Perspectives on activity theory* (pp. 19–38). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Engeström, Y. (2001). Expansive learning at work: Toward an activity theoretical reconceptualization. *Journal of Education and Work, 14*, 133–156.

Gass, S. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gillette, B. (1994). The role of learner goals in L2 success. In J.P. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 195–213). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Inaba, M. (2011). *L2 literacy practices of learners of Japanese outside the classroom*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Monash University, Melbourne.

Kurata, N. (2011). *Foreign language learning and use: Interaction in informal social networks*. London: Continuum.

Lei, X. (2008). Exploring a sociocultural approach to writing strategy research: Mediated actions in writing activities. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *17*(4), 217–236.

Leont'ev, A.N. (1978). *Activity, consciousness, and personality*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Leow, R. (2000). A study of the role of awareness in foreign language behavior: Aware versus unaware learners. *Studies in SLA, 22*, 557–584.

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Mennim, P. (2007). Long-term effects of noticing on oral output. *Language Teaching Research*, *11*(3), 265–280.

Muraoka, H. (2002). Interviews and questionnaires. In J.V. Neustupný & S. Miyazaki (Eds.), *Gengo kenkyuu no hoohoo — Gengogaku, nihongogaku, nihongo kyooikugaku ni tazusawaru hito no tame ni (Methods in language research — for those involved in linguistics, Japanese linguistics and Japanese teaching)* (pp. 126–142). Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.

Neustupný, J.V. (1994a). Problems of English contact discourse and language planning. In T. Kandiah & J. Kwan-Terry (Eds.), *English and language planning: A southeast Asian contribution* (pp. 50–69). Singapore: Times Academic Press.

Neustupný, J.V. (1994b). Nihon kenkyuu no hoohooron: Deeta shuushuu no dankai (A methodology for Japanese studies: A stage of collecting data). *Machikaneyama Ronsoo: Nihongakuhen, 28*, 1–24.

Nishimura, M. (1992). Language choice and in-group identity among Canadian niseis. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication, 3*(1), 97–113.

Park, E.S. (2011). Learner-generated noticing of written L2 input: What do learners notice and why? *Language Learning*, *61*(1), 146–186.
Qi, D.S., & Lapkin, S. (2001). Exploring the role of noticing in a three-stage second language writing task. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *10*(3), 277–303.
Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, *11*, 129–158.
Shekary, M., & Tahririan, M. H. (2006). Negotiation of meaning and noticing in text-based online chat. *The Modern Language Journal*, *90*(4), 557–573.
Spence-Brown, R. (2007). Learner motivation and engagement in a pedagogic and assessment task. In H.E. Marriott, T. Moore & R. Spence-Brown (Eds.), *Learning discourses and the discourses of learning* (Part three, pp. 1–15). Melbourne: Monash University ePress.
Storch, N. (2004). Using activity theory to explain differences in patterns of dyadic interactions in an ESL class. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *60*(4), 457–480.
Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J.P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97–114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Thorne, S.L. (2003). Artifacts and cultures-of-use in intercultural communication. *Language, Learning & Technology, 7*(2), 38–67.
van Lier, L., & Matuo, N. (2000). Varieties of conversational experience looking for learning opportunities. *Applied Language Learning, 11*(2), 265–287.
Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Williams, J. (1999). Learner-generated attention to form. *Language Learning*, *49*(4), 583–625.

Author's address

School of Languages, Cultures & Linguistics
Monash University, Clayton, Victoria
Australia, 3800
Tel: 61 3 9905 2196

Naomi.Kurata@monash.edu