Is Negotiation of Meaning Effective in a Narrative Task?[*]

Jungmin Ko

(Sungshin Women's University)

Ko, Jungmin. (2005). Is negotiation of meaning effective in a narrative task? *English Teaching, 60*(1), 149-165.**

The study investigates the effect of negotiation on the quality of oral narratives told by ESL learners. Forty-two students were randomly assigned to two groups. One group told a story for 2- to 3-minutes to classmates and the teacher, followed by a 4-5 minute period during which the narrator negotiated the meaning of certain points in the story. After the negotiation session, the students told the story to a different audience. The control group did not have negotiation sessions between two tellings. Using previous research on narrative structure, a rating scheme was developed to measure the qualities of oral narratives. How much improvement occurred from initial tellings to retellings between the experimental group and the control group were compared. There were no statistically significant overall differences between the groups and no interaction with proficiency level. Thus, the simple question of whether a negotiation session would help students improve the second telling of their stories remains inconclusive. This study, however, indicates that students seemed to negotiate with themselves as well as with the audience and suggest that future research focus on factors leading to successful negotiation of meaning sessions rather than the fact that students had negotiation with the audience.

I. INTRODUCTION

Negotiation, a process by which interactants modify what they are saying in order to be understood, plays a crucial role in language learning. This process of negotiation can provide learners with optimum language learning conditions such as comprehensible input, comprehensible output, and feedback (Long, 1996; Pica, 1994). Research on negotiation has gradually changed its focus with time. While researchers in the 1980s and early 1990s focused on the relationship of negotiation to comprehensible input (Krashen, 1982, 1985), those in the 1990s began to investigate the relationship of negotiation to comprehensible output (Swain, 1985). Compared to research in the 1980s and early 1990s that reported simply the causal relationship of negotiation to comprehensible input and comprehensible

output, the more recent research on negotiation has grown to include more complicated research design, and the results have concurrently become more complex.

Recently, research has examined the relationship between negotiated interaction and acquisition. Therefore, the current research tends to use a pre-test/post-test, post post-test design to investigate the relationship between negotiation and acquisition (Ellis, Tanaka, & Yamazaki, 1994; Gass, 1997; Loschky, 1994; Mackey, 1999; van den Branden, 1997). On the other hand, a qualitative approach has also been used to examine interaction in the social context (Aljaafresh & Lantolf, 1994; Antón, 1999; Donato, 1994).

Some researchers have pointed out that negotiation would be more effective in acquiring lexical items than morphosyntax because learners could comprehend messages without attending to morphosyntax and tend to negotiate more over lexical items than morphological items (Pica, 1994; Pica, Kanagy, & Falodun, 1993; Sato, 1986).

Proficiency has become another important factor in research on negotiation. Most studies have included low-level students to investigate the effect of negotiation on language development, which most likely came from Long's (1983) comment that "negotiation is of special value in the early stages of L2 acquisition" (cited in Ellis et al., 1994, p. 453). However, Pica, Holliday, Lewis, and Morgenthaler (1989) indicated that negotiation could occur more frequently for intermediate students rather than low-level students, by pointing out that native speakers are reluctant to negotiate unclear messages with very low-level non-native speakers. Linnell (1995) suggested that learners at different levels of proficiency would receive different benefits from negotiation. Intermediate level learners could benefit in their syntactic development, whereas low-level learners would benefit in simply understanding the input.

By finding out factors that influence negotiation, more recent studies have contributed to increasing our understanding of negotiation. However, there are still some issues that should be investigated further. According to Canale (1983), communicative competence was defined as grammatical, discourse, sociolinguistic, and strategic competences. Bachman (1990) categorized language competence as organizational competence including grammatical and textual competence, and pragmatic competence including illocutionary and sociolinguistic competence. However, most of the research on the role of negotiation in SLA has been limited to investigation of the effects of negotiation on learners' comprehension, grammatical development, or lexical development as the outcome of negotiation. Recently, Nakahama, Tyler, and van Lier (2001) investigated the way meaning is negotiated in an unstructured conversational task and an information-gap task. As part of their result, they reported frequencies of discourse markers and pragmatic strategies used in the two different activities. Other than Nakahama et al.'s (2001) study, however, there has been little research to show the effectiveness of negotiation on discourse or pragmatic competence. Therefore, there is a need to move research beyond comprehension and grammatical competence and to focus on the effect of negotiation on

discourse or pragmatic competence in order to increase our understanding of the role of negotiation in the field of SLA.

In investigating the effect of negotiation on discourse or pragmatic competence, levels of proficiency should be considered. Low-level students have problems with comprehension and grammatical competence, for which they could gain the most benefit through negotiation. Intermediate-level students, however, have few problems with basic comprehension and beginning grammatical outcomes. Therefore, discourse or pragmatic competence beyond basic comprehension or grammatical competence may be developed through active negotiation of meaning for intermediate level students.

Another issue to be investigated further is to develop different kinds of tasks that can promote negotiation in classroom contexts. Pica (1994) claimed that it was difficult to see true negotiation going on in real language classrooms. Long (1983) argued that classroom talk was mainly one-way because teachers usually used display questions for which they already know the answers. Pica (1987) pointed out differences in power between teacher and students, which prevented teachers and students from negotiating with each other. Musumeci (1996) gave another explanation on why so little negotiation occurs in the classroom: teachers wish to help students save face and want to move on to another point in the lesson. Loschky and Bley-Vroman (1990) focused on various tasks that could lead to development in different kinds of language items. Therefore, it is necessary to set up a task that could promote discourse or pragmatic competence through negotiation of meaning in classrooms.

Oral narratives based on personal experiences in ESL classrooms can be such a task that can promote discourse competence[1] through negotiation in classrooms. Because only narrators know what happened to themselves, even non-native storytellers can take the floor in spite of a lack of proficiency in the target language. Therefore, narrators can be less influenced by teachers' power. In addition, stories are sense-making opportunities and products of cultural experiences (Bruner, 1990). Therefore, there are great possibilities for negotiation of meaning (NOM) when learners engage in a narration task in ESL classrooms with students of different cultural backgrounds. As Ochs (1997) stated, "Once a story [narrative] is launched, it assumes a particular structure" (p. 194). The structural element is an aspect of oral narratives that has often been described. Therefore, the quality of stories told in foreign language classrooms may be assessed using a scoring rubric derived from the descriptions of narrative structure.

Storytellers from different cultures also often experience difficulties in employing the narrative structures of the target language culture (Scollon & Scollon, 1981). Their stories are often characterized by missing gaps and redundancy of information that influence narrative structures. In addition, storytellers can be expected to have a less-than-native

---

[1] In this study, discourse competence is defined as the ability to organize oral narrative elements such as plot, resolution, evaluation, coherence, and elaboration appropriately.

command of the target language. Therefore, their stories may not appear coherent and may turn out to be heard as different from what was intended. Together, these problems often result in miscommunications between speakers and hearers with different cultural background during the act of storytelling. Interactions between their native-speaker teacher and their peers could provide language learners who are telling a story with a chance that they can resolve miscommunications in collaboration with their listeners through negotiation of meaning.

Jungmin Ko (2003) examined an incoherent story told by an ESL learner and a successful negotiation session after the first telling. The study showed how the misunderstanding was resolved during the negotiation session. Even though the study reported that most of misunderstanding was resolved during negotiation sessions, her study did not investigate effectiveness of negotiation on quality of stories, that is, how negotiation would have influenced the second telling. In fact, it was expected, in Jungmin Ko's (2003) study, that the learner's second telling would have been improved to a certain degree if she had had a chance to retell the story because she, during her NOM session, realized what had been wrong with her initial story and repaired what she had said earlier.

II. RESEARCH DESIGN

1. Research Questions

This study, with a tightly designed narration task, intended to investigate the effect of negotiation of meaning on narrative structure produced during oral narration by second language learners in different proficiency levels in ESL classrooms. The combination of the two concepts—negotiation of meaning and oral narratives—was expected to provide an ideal environment to promote negotiation between tellers and listeners because of their underlying connection to sense-making activities. The research questions were as follows:

1) Is NOM a significantly more effective way to improve the quality of oral narratives?
2) Does the improvement differ for students in different language proficiency levels?

2. Participants

The participants were 42 students enrolled in speaking and listening classes in an Intensive English Program (IEP)[2] at a large university in the U. S. Data were collected in

---

[2] The Intensive English Program placed students in classes according to their scores on the CELT (Comprehensive English Language Text) placement test, an oral interview, and a short writing sample. The maximum score was 300. Scores ranging from 1 to 100 represent beginners, scores of

the classrooms of students from three intensive classes focused on academic preparation and from one class focused on more general language improvement. The intensive academic classes consisted of three different proficiency levels in English ranging from intermediate-low, intermediate-mid, and intermediate-high[3] In general, students taking the academic courses had B.A. degrees from their own countries and hoped to be admitted to a graduate school program in the U. S. By comparison, students in the general class simply wanted to expand their English for communication, study, business, or pleasure. General classes consisted of five different proficiency levels. The general class which participated in this study was in Level 5 and was categorized as intermediate-high+.

Among the 42 students were 27 students from such Asian countries as Korea, Taiwan, China, Japan, and Vietnam; 10 students from the Latin American countries of Columbia, Mexico, Panama, and Venezuela; three students from the European countries of Italy, French, and the Ukraine; and two students from an Arabic-speaking country. There were 24 women and 19 men. The four instructors of these sections, three women and one man, were all native English speakers.

3. Procedures

Data were collected in the actual classrooms of the students, with the storytelling procedures incorporated into the curriculum. A classroom task was devised that asked students to tell a 2- to 3-minute personal narrative about an embarrassing, exciting, sad, or funny experience that had happened to them in the past.

In each class, students were randomly assigned to two groups: the experimental (telling-NOM-retelling) group (n=21) or the control (telling-retelling) group (n=21). All students had the chance to tell the same personal story twice. The only point of difference was that for the experimental group of students, the NOM session occurred between the two storytellings whereas for the control group, there was no NOM session between two tellings.

101-200 represent intermediate students, and scores of 201-300 represent advanced students. When the data were collected, students in the lowest group had scores ranging from 100 to 166.6, students in the second group had scores of 133.3-200, and students in the highest group had scores of 166.6-233.3. Students in the general course showed somewhat higher proficiency than those in the highest academic course. From level to level, some scores were overlapped to balance between ethnicity and sex in each class.

[3] The IEP program specifies intermediate as low, middle and high. Intermediate in speaking is defined as follows: students can communicate on personal and academic topics, but speech has one or more of the following: deficiencies in pronunciation and/or intonation, excessive pauses and/or rephrasing, grammar errors, and inappropriate word choice. Presentations are sometimes difficult to follow; Intermediate in listening is defined as follows: some repetition, rephrasing, and/or slowed rate of speech may be required for comprehension. Students can often understand connected discourse on a variety of topics although comprehension may be uneven depending on familiarity with the topic. Often they have difficulty understanding ordinary conversations because of idiomatic language and rapid informal delivery.

For the storytelling itself, each class was divided into two groups of students meeting in two different locations that were very close to each other. The students in the experimental group told their first stories to one audience that included the teacher and two other student peers in one classroom; they then moved to the other classroom to tell the same story a second time to the rest of the class (i.e., a novel audience).

The audience of students in the experimental group was small, made up of two students so that all the students and the teacher could interact as much as possible. The students in the 'NOM' group were encouraged to come up with at least one question to ask of the storyteller as they listened. The audience was instructed to focus on those parts of the story that they had just heard but did not fully understand. The negotiation session lasted for 4-5 minutes.

By contrast, the students assigned to the control group told their first stories to a large audience consisting of 7- to 9-student peers; later, they told the same story a second time to a different audience including the teacher and the rest of the student peers in a different classroom. The only difference from the experimental group was that there was no NOM session between the two tellings.

The central data collection occurred on 2- to 3-consecutive days for each proficiency level, with 30 to 40 minutes devoted to storytelling each day. On those days, four students told their stories twice, rotating between two classrooms.

All storytellings as well as the negotiation of meaning sessions were audio-taped and later transcribed for analysis.

4. Data Analysis

The stories were analyzed and scored using a rubric developed from work on story structure. Previous research in the area of story structure (Labov, 1972; Polanyi, 1979; Reinhart, 1980) was used to develop five primary traits: (a) plot; (b) resolution; (c) evaluation; (d) coherence; and (e) elaboration. These five traits were given to three raters with detailed descriptions of how to interpret each scale point on a 7-point rating scale. The descriptions on the five criteria used to evaluate story structure are explained in Appendix A.

The three raters each had a one-hour informal consultation session with the researcher during which they were asked to evaluate the three transcripts from the whole story set. The raters did not discuss their ratings with each other. Inter-rater reliabilities were .80 for the ratings of the first telling and .87 for the second. The average scores across the three raters on each criterion became a student's mean score for that trait. The scores for these five criteria as well as the mean score of the five (overall mean score) became dependent measures in a quantitative analysis.

The scores for these six dependent variables (plot, resolution, evaluation, coherence,

elaboration, and overall mean) were analyzed in a series of analyses of variance (ANOVA). There were three independent variables: group (experimental and control), proficiency levels (4 levels), and time, a within-subject variable referring to initial telling and retelling. MANOVA (Multivariate ANOVA) and repeated-measures were used to determine the significant difference between groups, levels, and time, and to look for interactions among those variables, with scores on each criterion and overall mean score as dependent measures. In the case of significant effects of level, the Tukey HSD was used to tell which group, if any, was significantly different from the others.

III.　RESULTS

Descriptive results of the data are shown in Table 1. The numbers indicate overall mean scores across the five criteria from the three raters.

TABLE 1
A Comparison of Overall Mean Scores Between the Experimental groups (E) and the
Control groups (C) for Each Level

		Telling 1	Retelling	Improvement
Intermediate-low	Experimental	3.2	3.3	0.1
	Control	2.8	3.0	0.2
Intermediate-mid	Experimental	2.6	2.7	0.1
	Control	2.6	2.9	0.3
Intermediate-high	Experimental	3.4	3.7	0.3
	Control	3.7	3.9	0.2
Intermediate-hi+	Experimental	3.8	3.8	0
	Control	3.7	4.2	0.5

Across the top of this table, there were four different levels of proficiencies: intermediate-low, intermediate-mid, intermediate-high, and intermediate-hi+. In each proficiency level, there were the experimental group (E) and the control group (C). All the students told stories twice: the initial telling is called telling 1 and the second telling is called retelling. The scores in each cell refer to mean scores for the five traits (plot, resolution, evaluation, coherence, and elaboration) from three raters. For example, scores by students in the experimental group (E) in intermediate-low were 3.2 in initial tellings and 3.3 in retellings, indicating that there was an improvement in their stories by 0.1 from 3.2 (telling 1) to 3.3 (retelling).

As can be seen, there was not much difference in improvement between initial tellings (telling 1) and retellings in the experimental group and the control group for each level. Looking at the descriptive results, the overall means range from a low of 2.6 to a high of 4.2 within a scale of 1-7, indicating that there was probably not a ceiling effect or floor

effect that would have limited the possibility of scores showing any effect that might be present. In fact, there was no effect for group and for any of the interactions, which turned out to be different from the original expectations.

Table 2 shows time and level effects:

TABLE 2
MANOVA for Time and Level Effects

Effects: Wilks' Lamda	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Time	.568	4.56	5	30	.003*
Level	.350	2.567	15	83.218	.003*

*p< .05

Based on a MANOVA, there were significant effects for time, lambda (5, 30) = 4.56, p < .05 and level, lambda (15, 83) = 2.57, p < .05. Given time effect, the scores for retellings were significantly different from those for initial tellings. The level effects were as follows: average scores for initial stories and retellings were ordered from Level Intermediate-Mid, Intermediate-Low, Intermediate-High, and Intermediate-High+ with Level Intermediate-Mid always scoring the lowest. Based on Tukey HSD, scores of Intermediate-Mid combining initial tellings and retellings were significantly different from Levels Intermediate-High and Intermediate-High+. However, there was no effect for group and for any of the interactions. In other words, there was no significant difference between the experimental group and the control group, and there was no significant relationship of degree of improvement to proficiency levels.

Next, three-way repeated measures ANOVAs were used to analyze the effects of independent variables on each criterion. As shown in Table 3, resolution, coherence, and elaboration showed time effects (i.e. scores were significantly higher on the retellings for these criteria, p < .05), indicating that these story elements improved from telling 1 to telling 2.

TABLE 3
Tests of Within-Subjects Contrasts

Source	Measure	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Time	Plot	.312	1	.312	2.815	.103
	Resolution	.658	1	.658	6.023	.019*
	Evaluation	.242	1	.242	1.962	.170
	Coherence	1.499	1	1.499	8.943	.005*In
	Elaboration	1.893	1	1.893	15.088	.004*

*p < .05

As shown in Table 4, plot, evaluation, coherence, and elaboration showed level effects (p

< .05), indicating that these story elements may take some time to be improved.

TABLE 4
Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Measure	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Level	Plot	27.73	3	9.243	5.197	.005*
	Resolution	14.076	3	4.692	2.136	.114
	Evaluation	19.640	3	6.547	4.084	.014*
	Coherence	10.388	3	3.463	4.499	.009*
	Elaboration	25.254	3	8.418	8.402	.000*

*$p < .05$

IV. DISCUSSION

Contrary to my original expectation, there was no significant difference between the two groups. Before this study started, improvement was expected to occur only by the experimental group. In other words, most of the students in the experimental group were assumed to show great improvement, which turned out to be different from the original hypothesis. Possible factors that led to no significant differences are as follows: improvement that some students in the control group showed and no improvement that some in the experimental group showed; and different qualities of negotiation in the experimental group.

Although eleven students in the experimental group showed improvement between first and second tellings, ten students did not show any improvement at all. Also, thirteen students in the control group did improve their retellings, which indicates that learners could negotiate meaning with themselves during storytelling as well as with other people during negotiation session. As mentioned above, some students in the experimental group improved their retellings to a certain degree while others in the group did not improve at all. In the future, the reason why some students showed improvement and others did not has to be investigated. One of the possible explanations of different degrees of improvement is quality of negotiation sessions that occurred between the two tellings even though this study did not investigate the quality of NOM sessions. Therefore, qualitative approach should be taken to investigate negotiation sessions in depth in the future.

Even though there were no interaction effects between proficiency and time between the two groups, there were time effects and level effects. In terms of each story structure element, resolution, coherence, and elaboration showed time effects, indicating that these three story elements can be improved simply by telling stories. Therefore, storytellers themselves seemed to negotiate the meaning of stories simply by telling regardless of the chance that storytellers had negotiation sessions with their audience. In other words,

storytellers seemed to realize what was wrong with their stories and add or refine some information to make resolutions of their stories more sensible, which led to more coherent story, and to elaborate on their stories. Plot, evaluation, coherence, and elaboration showed level effects, indicating that these cannot be improved simply by telling stories and that it takes time to be improved. Note that plot and evaluation did not have any time effects, indicating that these two elements are not easily improved simply by retelling the stories.

V. CONCLUSION AND LIMITATIONS

This study has investigated the short-term effect of negotiation of meaning on improvement in oral narratives. To examine the effect of negotiation of meaning on the quality of discourse produced during oral narration, an experimental design was used. Students in the experimental group had a negotiation of meaning session occurring between two tellings while those in the control group did not have an NOM session between the two tellings. Contrary to the original expectations, results of quantitative data analysis indicated that there were no group effects (Research Question 1) and interaction effects (Research Question 2), even though there were time (retellings>initial tellings) and level effects. Therefore, it cannot be simply argued that NOM played an important role in improving the second telling.

In spite of being based on Jungmin Ko's (2003) study that showed an incoherent initial story told by a storyteller and a successful NOM session that she had, this study did not show any difference in the groups. In fact, no significant difference between the two groups as the result of short-term effect of NOM on storytelling coincides with Gass and Varonis' (1989) interpretation of their study. Gass and Varonis argued that one time experience in negotiation could not cause any change, and the change would occur at a later stage. Another interpretation of no significant difference is that both groups showed some sort of improvement. Before this study started, most students in the NOM group were expected to show great improvement between the two tellings. However, some students in the experimental group showed a certain degree of improvement whereas some did not show any improvement at all. Therefore, different degrees of improvement students showed in the experimental group might have been caused by quality of negotiation sessions that occurred between the two tellings. Negotiation sessions themselves should be investigated further.

Even though quantitative analysis did not show any significant difference between the two groups, the results indicate important findings on story structure elements. Resolution, coherence, and elaboration are the story elements that can be improved simply from practice effects, whereas plots, evaluation, coherence, and elaboration may take some time to be improved.

This study has its own limitations. At first, intermediate-mid students were assumed to show the greatest improvement. The idea was that students in intermediate-low would not have enough comprehension skills or interaction skills, which would prevent them from benefiting from the NOM sessions; students in intermediate-high and intermediate-high+ would tell very clear stories, and there would not be much information exchanged during the NOM sessions. However, students in intermediate-mid had been expected to have appropriate comprehension competence and interaction skills to profit from the NOM sessions, and that their initial stories would be unclear enough in certain aspects to merit the sort of discussion represented by a NOM sequence. However, students in intermediate-mid showed the lowest mean scores in their tellings. This finding seems to be explained partly by their largely uncooperative behavior and the limited time assigned to the research by the teacher: other teachers assigned the first 40 minutes of class time to the research whereas the teacher of intermediate-mid assigned only the last 20- to 35-minutes to tasks. In addition, the effect of NOM on these four different levels of students was expected to be different. However, those four different levels of students were in many ways all intermediate in language ability. Therefore, in a strict sense, this investigated what happened to intermediate level students, a fact that may explain why this study did not find any interaction effects with proficiency level. In future research, the narratives of students of different levels such as low-, intermediate- and high- should be compared.

In addition, the NOM sessions were not tightly controlled except for some directions and a time limit of 4- to 5-minutes. As audience members, students were simply asked to prepare at least one question about parts of the story that they had just heard but did not fully understand. Teachers were told that should the story be perfectly clear to students, they should lead the audience in asking the storyteller to elaborate on some part of the story. Not surprisingly, some students seemed to experience different qualities of negotiation sessions.

Teacher variables can be seen as another limitation. While I was collecting data, I was looking for teachers who taught two classes at the same proficiency level. However, each teacher taught different courses. Therefore, teacher variables relating to style, ability, or achievement were not controlled. The means for each proficiency level were ordered as follows: the mean scores for the intermediate-high+ group in terms of an overall total on all criteria were the highest (3.9), followed by the mean for intermediate-high (3.7), followed by intermediate-low (3.1), and finally by intermediate-mid (2.7). Therefore, the results seem to indicate that there were level effects rather than teacher variables, given that the low scores of intermediate-mid can be explained.

Despite its own limitations, this study is significant by pointing out that negotiation processes could occur with tellers themselves as well as with the audience by asking questions and answering them, and that negotiation itself might not be important based on the result of no significant difference between the two groups. Rather than negotiation

itself, quality of negotiation might be more important. Therefore, the research should focus on factors that could lead to successful negotiation.

REFERENCES

Aljaafresh, A., & Lantolf, J. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *Modern Language Journal, 78*, 465-483.

Antón, M. (1999). The discourse of a learner-centered classroom: Sociocultural perspectives on teacher-learner interaction in the second-language classroom. *Modern Language Journal, 83*, 303-318.

Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in languate testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 2-27). London: Longman.

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

Ellis, R., Tanaka, Y., & Yamazaki, A. (1994). Classroom interaction, comprehension, and the acquisition of L2 word meanings. *Language Learning, 44*, 449-491.

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

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

Gass, S. M., & Varonis, E. M. (1989). Incorporated repairs in nonnative discourse. In M. Eisenstein (Ed.), *The dynamic interlanguage: Empirical studies in second language variation* (pp. 71-86). New York: Plenum Press.

Ko, Jungmin. (2003). What caused misunderstanding during storytelling and how it was resolved: A case study. *English Teaching, 58*, 17-32.

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

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

Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city: Studies in the black English vernacular*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Linnell, J. (1995). *Negotiation as a context for learning syntax in a second language*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, PA.

Long, M. H. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation in the second

language classroom. In M. A. Clarke & J. Handscombe (Eds.), *On TESOL '82 Pacific perspectives on language learning and teaching* (pp. 207-225). Washington D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

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

Loschky, L. (1994). Comprehensible input and second language acquisition: What is the relationship? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 16*, 303-323.

Mackey, A. (1999). Input, interaction, and second language development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21*, 557-587.

Loschky, L., & Bley-Vroman, R. (1990). Grammar and task based methodology. In G. Crookes & S. M. Gass (Eds.), *Tasks and language learning: Integrating theory and practice* (pp. 123-167). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Musumeci, D. (1996). Teacher-learner negotiation in content-based instruction: Communication at cross-purposes? *Applied Linguistics, 17*, 286-325.

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

Ochs, E. (1997). Narrative. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as structure and process* (pp. 185-207). London: Sage.

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

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

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

Pica, T., Kanagy, R., & Falodun, J. (1993). Choosing and using communication tasks for second language instruction and research. In S. M. Gass & G. Crookes (Eds.), *Task-based learning in a second language* (pp. 9-34). Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Polanyi, L. (1979). So what's the point? *Semiotica, 25*, 207-241.

Reinhart, T. (1980). Conditions for text coherence. *Poetics Today, 1*, 161-180.

Sato, C. (1986). Conversation and interlanguage development: Rethinking the connection. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversations in second language acquisition* (pp. 23-48). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. B. (1981). *Narrative, literacy and face in interethnic communication*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.),

Input in second language acquisition (pp. 236-244). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

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

APPENDIX A

Definition on the Five Criteria Used to Evaluate Story Structure

Plot is defined as the sequence of events in the story. The plot not only proceeds linearly in time, but also expands in psychological space. As the story unfolds and events entangle the first-person narrator or other characters in conflict or tension, the listener feels that the narrative is moving in a direction of increasing complexity. Finally the listener begins to feel the need for a resolution, that is, some form of relief from the conflict or tension.

Resolution is defined as the final untangling of plot elements and release of psychological tension, at which point the world of the story returns to normal. Ideally, the resolution falls immediately after the listener's emotional involvement reaches a peak, that is, when the circumstances and events are at their most extreme. The resolution tells what finally happens, that is, provides the dialogue, events, or a character's actions or sudden realization that reveals the true character of what has gone on before.

Evaluation is defined as any narrative device or practice that reveals the speaker's attitude, emotion, or reaction toward events or circumstances within the story. By revealing his or her own evaluations of the action, the speaker shows why the story is interesting or in what light the listener is to understand the events of the story. The speaker may make evaluative comments directly to the listener ("Now this is the funny part"), describe the response of a character that coincides with the response of the speaker ("Naturally, he became frightened"), or describe an action that self-evidently suggests an evaluative stance ("I shrugged my shoulders when she asked if I wanted to go"). Other ways to show evaluation include giving an important idea grammatical prominence; repeating an idea in an emphatic way; using intensifiers, expletives, or evocative language; or making pejorative or euphemistic comparisons. The effect of evaluating elements is that the listener is stimulated to appreciate the point of the story on the same emotional plane as that of the speaker.

To be **coherent**, a story must have relevance, consistency, and connectedness (cohesion). The text is relevant when the sentences contribute to the development of the underlying topic or theme of the story. Relevance, therefore, connects the utterances, not just to each other, but to the theme of the story as well. The text is consistent when the core idea in each utterance is logically akin to the ideas in previous utterances; that is, the ideas "all can be true in the same set of affairs" (Reinhart, 1980). Consistency, therefore, links the sentences semantically. The text is cohesive when the speaker uses certain words and phrases to guide the listener from utterance to utterance. Such words and phrases are pronouns and transitional expressions like "on the other hand," "the following day," and "the next thing he knew…," all of which refer back to something already said or forward to something that will be named. Cohesion, therefore, links the sentences grammatically and usually presumes a variety of sentence types.

Elaboration refers to the explanation, description, or expansion of the narrative's ideas, characters, scenes, or actions. Elaboration is verbal detail that, though not entirely necessary to propel the plot, nevertheless aids the listener's visualization of the story's elements or refines the listener's appreciation of their settings and circumstantial import. Thus, elaboration relies not so much on the author's evaluative stance as on the amount and effectiveness of the concrete detail. The overall effect of elaboration is to characterize the people in the story and to give those people and their actions a

recognizable "real-world" context. Too much elaboration can be tedious, and too little turns the story into sterile, often truncated recitation of plot elements.

APPENDIX B

Changes Between Roxana's Initial Telling and the Retelling

1st Storytelling

OK! Uh- I will tell you uh- short history. It's funny history, but happened to a friend of mine. My, I was with him. So, for me was funny, but for him was embarrassing situation. OK. We went to the- HEB. A:nd you know it was the- first week that we have been in Austin. So we was like uh- nervous and everything was new for us. And the first time we went with a friend, and he played for us. We didn't talk with the cashier. OK! But the second time with wen, we- went together, and the, the cashier told us, uh- "Did you want uh- paper or plastic (speaking paper or plastic very fast)?" I mean the bag. "Have you been to the- grocery store?" OK. Say "Paper or plastic?" We didn't hear, uh- we didn't understand very well what she mean. And he said uh- "yes." And she look us. She said again, uh- "Paper or plastic?" (speaking very fast), but it was so fast, no, like with this speed. Uh- He said "yes." And she repeat in the, the third time said, "Paper or Plastic?" (slowly and clearly) Say "Ah ! OK. I am sorry." He was, um- he understood, uh- uh- credit of something like that. So, he take the-, the, I mean, the- the credit card. He said, "OK! Yes." He understood credit. So "you want to pay credit?" So it was funny for me, but it was like uh!~ he want to dead now.

Negotiation Session

T　: Did you have any questions?

S1　: what is his name, your friend?

ST　: Carlos.

S1　: Carlos?

ST　: Carlos. He went here, he come here because he was uh- interchange with business school so-. He know he, English even.I don't know but you know, he spoke, she spoke, the cashiers, so fast.

S1　: Did you have any problem with credit card or ATM card when you, when you have to use it? You must do like this.

ST　: Yeah, I know.

S1　: You have a problem? Because I have

ST　: No! No! I don't have problem with that.

T　: I-Chung, what do you think haven't in that story? Can you tell us play? back sort of?

S2　: No idea.

T　: Really? OK. Well ask then.

ST　: Did you understand the ma:in problem?

S2　: You, you can repeat the main idea

ST　: OK. The main idea was uh- when we were paying all the food that we bought in the cashiers

S2　: Cashier

ST　: Uh-huh. She say "paper or plastic?" But it was so fast we didn't understand what she was saying to us?

S2　: paper or plastic?

ST　: or plastic?

T   : What does that mean?
ST   : The bag. You know when she want.
S2   : cash or credit
ST   : No! No!
T   : That's what her friend thought. It is?
ST   : Yeah
T   : So~, Roxana
ST   ; No, the meaning of is if you want to put your food in bag, uh- paper bag or plas::ic bag,
I   : Paper bag, plastic bag
ST   : Uh-huh. They're both
T   : you know, it's a container.
ST   ; But we didn't understand. He say, he say "yes." He were thinking about "How do you want to
          pay, credit card? He said "Yes!" It is confusing.
T   : it IS confusing.
ST   : Yeah!
T   : Because they are both paper and plastic.
ST   : Yeah.
T   : So it, it makes sense to confuse it.
ST   : OK!   OK!
T   : Isn't it something else that you want to clear about? Where were they?
S2   : Uh- in, in your country or in United State
R   : in Austin,
S2   : Austin
ST   : Uh-huh, in HEB
T   : What's HEB?
S2   : HEB.
T   : What is that?
S2   : Supermarket
T   : OK!
T   : Because if you don't, if you don't shop at that supermarket..

2nd Storytelling

OK! I will tell you uh- short history. It happened four months ago in HEB store. Do, everyone know HEB store? OK. Uh- I went there with a friend. Um- when we were paying in the cashiers, the cashier told us uh- "paper or plastic?" (speaking fast). But it was so fast. So we didn't uh- quite understand what sh-, she want to, what she was saying. And may(be) my friend said "yes! (emphasis)" And she said, she look us like uh- "what are you saying?" And she repeat again, "paper or plastic?" (speaking fast) But it was so fast. OK! It was still fast. OK! He say" yes," because he was thinking about 'you want, do you want to pay with credit card?' So, he understood that. But she want to know if she put the all the stuff in bag, in the bag, but it's "plastic or paper?" But in Venezuela we use everything is plastic. So we don't have this kind of question. He didn't expect to hear that, because it was the first time in the, in the store. And OK! In the third time, she repeat, "uh- I mean if you want to, to put your articles in PAPER or PLASTIC?"(slowly) But it was uh- no fast, so slowly (laughs). "OK! I am sorry," he said. "Oh! Plastic. It's OK" So it was funny for me, but he's, he felt embarrassing, because he didn't understand what she want to, what she was saying. So it's all my history.

Jungmin Ko
Department of English Language and Literature
Sungshin Women's University
249-1 Dongseondong-3ga, Sungbuk-gu
Seoul 136-742, Korea
Tel: (02) 920-7594/H.P.:010-3938-7793
Fax: (02) 923-5646
Email: jmko@sungshin.ac.kr