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ABSTRACT

The focus of this study is to analyze the interactional competence of native English speakers and international speakers in a Master of Arts in Education, Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages program. The research approach uses a combination of qualitative and quantitative data to examine the factors that influence the interactional social context between native and non-native English speakers. Participants were 22 native English speaking and international students at California State University, San Bernardino in the College of Education, M.A. in Education, Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages Option program.

This research illustrates critical factors that constrain or contribute to effective interactional discourse, negotiated meaning, and comprehensible feedback between speakers of different cultures and languages. The project analysis of participant planning behavior during curriculum project tasks was designed to encourage language development, to share sociolinguistic features of culture, behaviors, and values, and to provide and promote opportunities for second language acquisition through active and reciprocal social discourse.

The goal of this research is to create sensitivity and awareness among experienced educators, and novice teachers and other native English speakers of the need to teach.
conversational devices, assertive strategies, effective resources and tactics that encourage participatory speaking contributions from non-native English speakers.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Background of the Project

English has become an international language. Nations around the globe are engaged in preparing citizens to speak English as a second language, predominately a language of trade. Many of those who will teach English to speakers of English are not themselves native speakers of English. However, in order to teach English even as a foreign language, a minimum level of speaking ability is necessary, one which permits the instructor to model correct pronunciation and usage. Many non-native speakers of English pursue higher education in English-speaking countries to develop their English skills. One of the fundamental challenges inherent in academic programs which enroll non-native English speaking students as candidates for becoming teachers of English to speakers of other languages (TESOL) is the need to develop advanced speaking skills on the part of non-native English speakers.

Oral communication that takes place between native and non-native English speakers has been the subject of discourse analysis and research within the past decade. Native/non-native English Speaking discourse occurs on a daily basis in university TESOL teacher education classrooms. This constant source of social interaction demands attention to the important properties necessary for effective two-way conversation.
To take speaking turns in an orderly sequence is the accepted rule between speakers whether in face-to-face events or in small group interactions. This alternating speaking sequence is important for maintaining a balance in the flow of information, and to insure verbal contributions from all speakers desirous of a speaking turn. In addition, the turn-taking sequence tends, when balanced among speakers, to restrain any one speaker from dominating the interactional speaking process (Parker, 1988).

Efforts to increase the length and frequency of sequential turn-taking and participatory responses of international students are vitally important for equalized discourse with native speakers. By increasing interactional competence through intercultural communication in a social context, international students learn strategies for taking, holding, and defending their turn at talk. Interactional competence demonstrates the ability of a speaker to jointly co-construct connective discourse in face-to-face episodes of talk (Young, 1998).

Non-native English speakers are encouraged to engage in collaborative intercultural discourse with native speakers to improve the adverse differences in language and culture affecting interactional participation. This study focuses on interactional students and native English-speaking students in an M.A. in Education, Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages program at California State University, San
Bernardino (CSUSB), with the goal of addressing the need for non-native English speakers to use a variety of interactional strategies to help gain and protect speaking turns in discourse with native speakers. Data from this study show that native speaker domination of turn-taking and turn-time discouraged spontaneous, verbal participation from non-native English speakers. Native speakers gained the floor more often, maintained lengthier speaking turns, and interrupted other speakers to express their point. Moreover, research shows that in becoming aware of the turn-taking imbalance, and by instituting and augmenting effective discourse skills, interactional competence improves between speakers.

Target Teaching Level

My target teaching population is international student education, at language acquisition levels ranging front intermediate to high intermediate speech fluency. Situations and responsibilities that exist with this group include parenting, completing educational goals, pursuing employment, and managing daily business activities; these demand serious development and improvement, if they are to participate in interactional discourse in a complex and dynamic English-speaking society. Because meaningful communication involves a speaker and receiver alternating sequential turns to related messages effectively, international students need to strengthen their
conversational abilities with native speakers by gaining and controlling more turns in reciprocal encounters.

My interest in sociolinguistic and discourse analysis involves teaching people how they can relate to each other more effectively in their conversations, and how to minimize the inherent frustration experienced by less powerful speakers when culture and language differ. There is a need for research that will improve interactional and cross-cultural communicative skills, increase self-esteem and personal identity, prepare individuals for the speech exchanges in the workplace and society, and provide a deeper understanding and appreciation of language and cultural diversity.

Experience in Teaching

My experiences in teaching language learners and individuals acquiring a second language developed through work as a volunteer Certified Literacy Tutor in the Literacy Center of the Norman Feldhyme Library in San Bernardino, California. The students were of Mexican heritage, and desperate to improve their English language and qualify for U.S. citizenship. Additionally, time spent as a community volunteer tutor for language minority African-American and international speakers in the Literacy Access Center of the Adult School of the San Bernardino School district in San Bernardino provided numerous opportunities to assist others in obtaining language skills. My current work with the
American Culture and Language Program (ACLP) and Study Abroad for Yasuda Students (STAYS) Program at California State University, San Bernardino, teaching English grammar and composition, involves an international student population.

Analysis of Interactional Discourse Elements

Characteristic Problems in Native/Non-Native English Speaking Conversational Interaction

Discourse uncovers every type of inequality, including that between native English speakers and non-native English speakers. As evidenced in this talk exchange project, there are significant influences in turn-taking, such as differences in gender, power, interruption, use of eye-contact and gestures, and topic control. The conversational turn-taking system provides opportunities for any interested participant to speak; however, conversationalists do not want to be judged socially incompetent. Aware that their self-image is being examined by others, speakers strive to present themselves in a way that expresses approval, agreement, or attention.

Recognizing the typical problems that exist between native speakers and non-native English speakers in conversational discourse can be accomplished in two steps. The first step is understanding and using the specialized tactics, devices, and resources to effectively communicate and complete a group task successfully. The second step is
removing language barriers that diminish speaking turn opportunities by developing awareness and sensitivity to all speakers of different languages and cultures. Messages that are conveyed in a functional and meaningful way through interactional cooperation and turn-taking effectiveness are dependent in part, on the following elements.

**Turn-taking and turn-time.** Turn-taking is an organized way of alternating turns between speakers. The rules that apply in turn-taking determine the sequential order that allows speakers to gain the right to the next speaking turn. Martin-Jones and Saxena (1996) reveal that controlling and negotiating priority of speaking rights is a common feature of monolingual teachers. Overbearing and excessive speakers control speaking turns to a much greater extent than non-native English speakers. Turn time, or length of utterances by a participant in a conversation is not specified in advance, and turn-times can be brief or extensive (Schegloff, Sacks, and Jefferson, 1974).

**Differences in gender.** In earlier studies of female and male language and speech, researchers noted that speech behavior differs in mixed-gender situations from the speech used in single-sex encounters. For example, in mixed groupings, men have a notion of conversation as competition. Male status in discourse is achieved with faster speech rates, shorter pauses between utterances, quick responses, and lower pitched voices. According to Watts, (1992), men
interrupt more frequently than women. Women take longer pauses between utterances, talk slower, and speak in a higher pitch. Typically women are more expressive, and view conversation as a cooperative interaction requiring active participation.

**Power**. Power in conversation is the ability to influence events, cause things to happen, and achieve the speaker's communicative intention. Power determines decision-making because speakers are able to exercise control over topics and tasks for the individual participant, and the group as a whole. According to Orellana (1996), dominant speakers control and restrict the contributions of less dominant speakers. All speakers desire involvement in conversations, yet they need to maintain a sense of independence. Therefore, during conversational discourse, a struggle exists to solidify with others yet remain uncontrolled by the more dominant speakers. When dominant speakers are allowed to take over responsibility for controlling task discussions, the ensuing dependence of less dominant speakers for others to speak becomes the source of power for dominant speakers.

Speakers who are suppliers of the majority of information gain influence within the group. It is important that the tasks are maintained as a pooling of ideas and interdependent exchanges of information so that the power dynamic is minimized. In settings in which power is weighted
against less dominant speakers, there is greater need to utilize conversational strategies which will prepare them to challenge, contradict, or take power turns, rather than merely agree to what is being said, or remain silent, inert participants.

Furthermore, speakers who defer to other speakers in sequential turn-taking appear to lack power. Non-native English speakers may be accustomed to high context communication behavior in which message meanings are given and received with less information exchange. In contrast, English language communication contains many information-filled messages that are exchanged in negotiating meaning with others (Gudykunst, 1995). This cultural feature creates a negative effect for non-native English speakers toward maintaining an appropriate balance in intercultural social discourse.

**Theme introduction, defense, and support (sentence topics).** When native English speakers introduce new themes as sentence topics and control the turn-taking sequence, the potential flow of information and new ideas from less powerful speakers is curtailed. Interactive communication also fails when interruptions and frequent utterances are made by the more controlling speakers during any other speaker's turn. Using discourse strategies and domination, native English speakers obtain and defend more turns, maintain a greater length of turn-time, make frequent shifts
in sentence themes and topics, and generally appear to possess information that non-native English speakers do not have, or are unable to express due to minimalized speaking rights (Orellana, 1996).

**Eye contact and gestures.** Non-verbal communication is a vital part of social interaction. Using the eyes through communication, and employing explicit use of gestures or body language are ways speakers bring together the "mind and body" to express meaning during face-to-face discourse. When speakers want to gain information, they often nod their head forward, or gaze and focus attention to the current speaker. Eye contact can be used as an inclusory method. A current speaker may direct a glance toward a specific participant to invite interaction. These non-verbal signs are indicators of a desire for involvement and active participation. Generally, speakers who look downward and away from the speaker are not ready to verbally engage in the interaction. Use of facial expressions, tapping the fingers on a table, and finger pointing can also be expressions of non-verbal communication. All gestures have a related significance in the individual participant's formulation of inner thoughts and presentation of language before other speakers.

**Topic control.** Social discourse interaction is more effective when topics under discussion are treated in greater detail, and all participants are allowed opportunities to explore the content fully. In conversations
with non-native English speakers, a common characteristic occurs. Native speakers self-select the majority of topics for discussion. If non-native English speakers believe their language proficiency is too limited, they will passively allow the introduction of topics by others. Native speakers will continue to dominate the discussions, turntaking, and topic selections by opening, moving through, closing, and reopening new topics. If the non-native English speaker is unable to make topic-continuing moves, turntaking sequences may quickly become imbalanced.

**Interruption.** An interruption occurs by one speaker cutting across more than one word of a prior speaker's utterance. Interruptions are based on the speaker's communicative intention to take a turn. If this type of a violation of a speaker's right to complete a current turn is intentional and occurs frequently, the interrupting speaker displays no regard for the contribution being made by the current speaker. If the interruption violation is non-intentional, speakers resort to a strategy of conversation repair by becoming silent, which allows only one of the speakers to continue to speak. Less dominant speakers feel no need to interrupt, nor to resist interruptions by other speakers because they are not actively competing for a speaking turn.

Interruptions can be viewed as a powerful conversational tactic in discourse. It is a way for speakers
to take a turn from a current speaker, and self-select, to
talk. Further, it allows a speaker to cut across another
speaker's turn, and return the topic discussion in the
direction that the interrupting speaker desires.

Interruption permits speakers to consecutively take more
than one turn to get their point across before other
speakers are allotted a rightful speaking turn.

Summary and Proposed Solutions

Speakers will gain their rights to speaking turns by
understanding and applying the rules of turn-taking.
International students will gain skills in turn-taking in
conversations by knowing and applying rules that govern who
speaks, and when. Conversations are central to all speech
interactions; therefore, a knowledge of the basic rules that
a speaker is entitled to is essential. For example, within
the system of turn-taking, speakers are able to self-select
opportunities in taking turns to talk. Utterances may be
brief, in which case speakers must be prepared to speak in
anticipation of the completion of another speaker's turn.

Non-native English speakers must be able to understand the
rhythm of discourse which signals conversational gaps and
overlaps. A gap is an extended silence occurring in a
conversation at the end of a turn. An overlap occurs when a
speaker begins speaking before another speaker has finished
a turn. Understanding and applying the rules of turn-taking
gives the non-native English speaker opportunities to speak
at any transition point, or completion of a turn because of flexibility in the distribution and allocation of turns among speakers.

**Improving Theme Introduction, Defense, and Support (Sentence Topics)**

When non-native English speakers learn to use interactional resources, such as signaling boundaries in conversation, they can organize and mentally prepare for contribution of related or new themes, initiate and offer support to the conversation with fresh ideas. Utterances made by prior speakers permit subsequent speakers to predict appropriate follow-up responses, and can help generate development of new thoughts to convey. Prior utterances can stimulate a speaker to contribute additional information that can build on suggested ideas already offered. When a current theme has been exhausted, the introduction of new subject matter will allow opportunities for renewed interest and creative output from participants with different perspectives eager to share their thoughts with others. Once a speaker offers an idea up for discussion, that idea should be one that is worthy of defense. Other participants are allowed to question, challenge, debate, and resist the idea. However, the speaker has a responsibility to explain, describe, and support the relevant points of the idea. Yet the speaker should be prepared to compromise if necessary.
Non-native English Speakers Must Strive Toward a More Powerful and Influential Position During Interactional Discourse

Native speakers dominate turn-taking by speaking more frequently, faster, louder, by expanding the length of turns, and by interrupting. Non-native English speakers need strategies to balance these exchanges by taking greater control in initiating turns, increasing their number of turns and voice volume, and by lengthening turn-time. When speakers recognize the amount of influence that can be exerted through effective communication, they are motivated to interact using cooperation, determination, and persistence. Active speakers discover they are instrumental in maintaining group cohesion, planning and goal setting, and determining significant decisions.

Women Must Devise Discourse Styles that are Strong and Influential in Mixed-Group Talk

Speakers who hesitate and defer to others in conversation because of ineffective styles and strategies lose valuable opportunities to offer ideas or initiate shifts in topics, and appear less valued in information-giving. This is particularly true during discourse among male and female speakers. Male speakers have a tendency to take an oppositional stance during discourse, using the strategy of interruption to their advantage more often than do female speakers. When this form of turn violation occurs,
it can be assumed that female speakers generally overlook it, and accept a subordinate speaking position prescribed to them by males during mixed-gender talk encounters. By identifying, learning, and using strategies for managing interruptions, and other infringements on speaker rights, female speakers indicate an expectation to complete a turn, and a right to genuine equality between males and females in discourse. In sum, female speakers are entitled to interact in mixed-gender conversation without incurring blatant rule violations. When women routinely submit to a less prestigious speaking position, they are allowing male speakers reasonable evidence of a presumed inferiority in female speaking status.

Content of the Project
This project will examine the ways to achieve interactional parity between native and international students as identified in Chapter One. A preview of relevant research in Chapter Two explores the significance of interactional competence. Chapter Three introduces the design and methodology of the research. Chapter Four presents analysis of the data collected during this study. Chapter Five presents the conclusions drawn from the study.

Significance of the Project
The significance of this project is the possibility to equalize the discourse interactional competence of international students by introducing strategies based on
the problems previously noted. The educational goal in teaching English as a second language is to build and improve language interactional skills, to increase self-esteem and personal confidence in speaking, and to enhance speaker performance in face-to-face social discourse.
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Communicative Competence

What is Communicative Competence?

The framework of communicative competence as described by Canale & Swain (1980) includes an individual's ability to understand spoken language, speak, read, and write the language, and to understand the methods, concepts, customs, and practices of the target-language community. Communication with others in genuine, practical everyday events increases individual ability while reinforcing confidence with language use. Consequently, communicative competence ultimately determines the individual's level of strength and weaknesses in language proficiency through continuous practice in various educational and social contexts.

Speakers learn to communicate through natural practice in an interactive verbal connection with others. According to Savignon (1983), learners do not acquire language through using an artificial means of learning segments of syntax, analyzing grammar, and memorizing. Thus, the ability to use language and words may transmit what a speaker intends to say; but the importance of the communication depends on the listener's interpretation, and not on the intention of the speaker's words. Additionally, successful communication relies on body language, gestures, intonational and facial expressions to convey meaning. Effective communicative
competence means developing vital strategies that allow for listener feedback indicating that the speaker's message is fully understood. In interactive classrooms, learners are aided through group activities and discussions that promote the use of language skills, increase learner confidence, and provide opportunities to practice speaking in a familiar setting.

**Characteristics of good communicators.** According to Savignon (1983), communicative competence is interpersonal, rather than intrapersonal, because of its dependence on the joint interaction of two or more persons. Competence is demonstrated in written and spoken language through the learners' understanding of the specific context and prior experience, and the ability of learners to cooperate with each other through interaction. Further, the distinction is made between competence and performance in that competence is what an individual knows, while performance is what an individual does. Performance reveals an individual's competence (Savignon, 1983).

**Interactional Components of Communicative Competence**

Canale & Swain (1980) offered four components to define communicative competence: (1) grammatical competence, the linguistic knowledge of word meanings which vary from one inflectional form to another; (2) sociolinguistic competence, the knowledge of the relationship of the social and cultural aspects of language use; (3) discourse
competence, the knowledge of orderly and connected speech or writing for completeness of meaning; and (4) strategic competence, the knowledge of skillful ways to change language usage to individual advantage to meet a communicative goal. These four components extend the practical implications of communicative competence. How well they interact depends on the speaker's personal experiences in both the native language and in second language acquisition (Savignon, 1983).

Social competence facilitates interaction. To Canale & Swain's four components of communicative competence, Spitzberg (1984) contributed four additional interactional skill traits necessary for exhibiting communicative competence. The skill traits are described as follows: (1) cognitive complexity, the capacity to view social situations and people in multidimensional ways; (2) empathy, the ability to vicariously internalize the feelings of others, and to be able to predict events by imaginatively taking the role of others; and (3) interactional management, the demonstration of conversational competence through the use of behaviors in turn-taking. According to Hatch (1992), overlaps (speaking before a turn is complete) can represent a sense of connection and support. These interactional skills will be further explored in a subsequent section.

Spitzberg (1984) defined communicative competence as the ability of individuals to adapt messages appropriately
to the interactional context. Toward this end, linguistic competence is a necessary tool. But to say that a person must first have linguistic competence is to ignore the significance of interaction. For example, children acquire knowledge of sentences not only as grammatically used, but also as sentences are appropriately used. This implies that once the individual knows what is appropriate, that knowledge translates into the actual production of communicative behavior (Spitzberg, 1984).

Spitzberg offered that different degrees of perceptual awareness and sensitivity add to the varying amounts of individual communicative competence, including four specific constructs. The first is objective self-awareness. This construct is present when individuals look within to concentrate on their internal self and behavior. Individuals with high self-awareness tend to be very aware of social rules, and the manner in which they, as individuals, are perceived by others. Objectively self-awareness, when not taken to an extreme, is a behavior often used to describe competent communicators because of the individual's concern for interactive communicative rules, and concern for the feelings of others.

The second construct is an awareness of one's own thoughts and acts. This behavior can be private or public. Individuals who are publicly self-conscious are described as more sensitive to communicative feedback than those
individuals who are privately self-conscious. Publicly self-conscious individuals believe that others are focusing attention on them, and as a result, they are usually ready for social interaction.

The third construct is self-monitoring. This is the ability of the individual to track, regulate, and maintain self-control (Spitzberg, 1984). These individuals pay special attention to the social behavior and conversational manner of other people. They pattern their behavior on what they observe as positive behavior in others, as a model of self-presentation. For these individuals, it is not so much their type of disposition which determines their behavior, it is the situation. Self-monitoring individuals differ from self-conscious individuals because their attention is focused on external social demands. This means they are extremely efficient in using communicative competence in specific situations. Self-monitoring individuals easily adapt to different contexts and diverse people, which makes for highly competent communicators.

The fourth construct is interactive involvement. Individuals demonstrate this behavior by being perceptive, attentive, and responsive. These attributes are crucial indicators of communicative competence, particularly the ability to be perceptive. Individuals who become interactively involved are socially comfortable, flexible, empathetic, and know how to utilize effective communication
strategies for mutual interaction with others (Spitzberg, 1984).

**Skills deficit.** While not explicitly defining "skills," Spitzberg offered an example of skills deficit. "If an individual is motivated to interact competently, and may also know what needs to be done, yet finds it difficult actually to enact the desired behavioral sequences, then that individual is demonstrating a skills deficit." One might infer, then, that skills means "desired behavioral sequences. (p. 121)"

**Communicative competence incorporates motivation, knowledge, and skills.** Concerning the relationship of motivation, knowledge, and skill, each can be unrelated to the other, but each influences the other. Motivation is an affective response that determines whether an individual will approach or avoid an encounter. Motivation allows an individual to generate actual performance, and utilize social perception and cognitive complexity, which improve the interaction (Spitzberg, 1984). Knowledge is the ability to take cues from the social environment that tells how to appropriately adapt to the interaction of a specific context (Spitzberg, 1984). Knowledge is similar to self-monitoring, which is characterized by five dimensions: (1) concern with social appropriateness of one's self-presentation; (2) attention to social comparison information as cues to situationally appropriate expressive self-presentation; (3)
the ability to control and modify one's self-presentation and expressive behavior; (4) the use of this ability in particular situations; and (5) the extent to which one's expressive behavior and self-presentation are tailored and molded to particular situations (Spitzberg, 1984).

**Importance of Communicative Competence in Academic and Social Functioning**

According to Wiemann & Backlund (1980), the classroom is a composite academic and social environment that allows individuals to identify and develop their capabilities through productive communication and social interaction. Communicative competence, creatively encouraged, permits the development of appropriate interactional abilities and qualities necessary for effective types of discourse not only in the classroom, but also in the negotiation of meaning in other areas of society. Individuals are capable of expressing themselves differently in various situations; therefore, flexibility in wording, appropriateness, empathy, and interactional management in social contexts are extremely important aspects of communicative competence (Wiemann & Backlund, 1980).

Communicative competence is critical in social functioning. Firth (1935), recognized the unique tie of language form to social interaction. He argued that linguistics must be the foundation of actual language used in social discourse. For example, a speech act is a way to
assign function to utterances, which are articulated sounds (Hatch, 1992). Therefore, speech acts are defined more by the context or situation in which they occur than by the words that are spoken. Words, and the way words are used, may create more than one meaning. Interactional speaking involves naturally occurring utterances that differ somewhat from speakers purely using linguistic rules. Speakers predict and co-construct discourse based on speaker-to-speaker cooperation in making meaning.

Firth (1935) related that when individuals observe the behavior of others, a stimulus was created in the cognitive processes of the brain of the observer. When this happens it indicates a connection between knowledge and the observation of physical actions. Knowledge and skills allow an individual to do what is expected, to give information, to others, and to communicate emotions.

In sum, according to Young (1998), communicative competence is a "bundle of traits that can be assessed in a given individual" (p. 4). These traits identify the characteristics of good speakers, and enable the speaker to reach effective communication goals. Young confirmed that the theory of communicative competence is based on the interrelationship linguistic form and social context, and stated that the communicative competence theory explains what an individual needs to know and do in order to communicate.
Interactional Competence

Definition of Interactional Competence

Hall (1993) defined interactional competence as the capability of transmitting, modifying, and delivering effective communication between speakers in jointly constructed and recurring discourse. During such communication, verbal interactions create collective meaning moment-by-moment from participants involved in face-to-face sociocultural encounters. To communicate meaning in this manner, participants must be knowledgeable about the manner in which they are expected to respond, and also familiar with the context in which the interaction occurs. Cognitive capabilities and interactional influences increase as speakers take part in dialogue and learn how to accomplish their communicative goals with appropriate verbal, non-verbal, and activity-related skills and behaviors. According to Hall (1993), for non-native English speakers, repeated speaking experiences with native, or experienced speakers tend to be beneficial. Thus, second language learners obtain opportunities to learn how to show their competence within a native language group.

Interactional competence environment. Street, Brady, & Lee (1984) stated that the environment surrounding discourse interaction is significant to the speech behavior and the reactionary behavior of the participants. Individuals will modify their speech to standard English in order to fit
within the context of a formal setting. Likewise, they will modify their speech to a more non-standard form of English in a relaxed and casual environment. Hall (1993) stated that the interactional setting is important because speakers are conscious of their surroundings, and of the specific physical environment. Hall referred to six aspects within the discourse environment which are necessary in talk exchanges. First, speakers take meaning from the environment.

Second, cognitive and social stimuli act as purposes for interacting and gaining a voice with others. Third, topic and idea sharing allow speakers to take part in the sequences of talking and role-playing. Fourth, rhythm in discourse creates the timing while speaking and listening for verbal and non-verbal cues. Fifth, the participants themselves are engaging in the turn-taking. Finally, there is the theme of the discourse. All of these factors determine what is talked about in the interactional setting.

**Interactional competence and skills.** As was mentioned previously, Spitzberg (1984) indicated that interactional competence involves four skills: cognitive complexity, empathy, role-play, and interactional discourse management. Cognitive complexity allows an individual to process information about the social environment in a meaningful, flexible, and a clearly delineated manner. Individuals who are considered cognitively complex tend to be more
persistent in their assertiveness, according to Spitzberg (1984). Cognitively complex individuals bring perspective to social situations by using subtle and interpretative meanings about other people.

Empathy is an emotional reaction to, or an affective experience of another person's emotional state. Individuals with the capacity to empathize participate in another's feelings, or vicariously experience another person's feelings. They are good at predicting the responses of another person to messages, and can internally adapt to the person or the situation. Empathy and role-play enables an individual to internalize sensitivity, and show true concern for the feelings of others. This ability allows an individual an increasing capability to understand and interact with others in a functional manner (Spitzberg, 1984).

Role-playing is the actual adaption to the role of another person, and it offers clarity and interpretation to empathetic experiences. Highly empathetic individuals appear flexible, out-going, expressive, and warm. These attributes help in skillful interactional management of assertive dialogue. Assertiveness in an individual is characterized by self-confidence, determination, and boldness in declaring a proposition or statement. It utilizes a set of skills with self-defined goals, and resistance to influence from others (Spitzberg, 1984).
Interactional management allows individuals to demonstrate competence in their ability to hold a conversation, negotiate compromises in discussions, and achieve equal shares in turn-taking, obtaining, and maintaining the speaking floor. According to Kramsch (1993), interactional competence is enhanced when speakers discuss events in their lives, participate in role-play and functional activities, and socially engage with other speakers. In addition, interactional competence is increased with the exchange of ideas and emotions through language. Kramsch (1993), explicitly described five features of interactive dialogue that demonstrate competence. First, "The dialogue involves both language and the use of language, that is, it includes not only words and sentences, but all aspects of speech and verbal behavior that give language its materiality (pitch, tempo, dynamics); but also discourse style and the logic of conversations. Second, dialogue is motivated by ambivalent feelings of both empathy and antipathy, like all disorder or chaos. Dialogue draws its intensity from the delicate balance it maintains between the two. Third, dialogue is empowering. Since two interlocutors are never completely equal and since they are often politically non-equal, such a dialogue involves fundamental change in power—as the child who gradually grows up to acquire the power of his or her parents. Fourth, dialogue can happen unexpectedly in the most unlikely places, during a grammar drill, a vocabulary exercise, or the recitation of a poem. Fifth, dialogue is a 'liminal' (threshold) experience that creates a special space and time at the boundaries between two views of the world. Dialogue involves a sudden grasp of difference and an instantaneous understanding of the relationship between self and other" (Kramsch, 1993, p. 29).

**Interactional Competence Responses and Discourse Moves**

According to Hall (1993), as individuals acquire
interactional competence, they are able to recognize and cooperate in reciprocal speech patterns when speaking to others. For example, during speaking turns, generally one person speaks at a time. Other people may self-select to speak, or speak only when they are addressed. Speakers learn to watch, absorb, and imitate the speech moves in communication. Hatch (1992) referred to a speech move as a unit of analysis, similar to a sentence or utterance. Moves occur within a talk exchange. By simply watching other speakers, learners start to imitate and acquire effective speech behaviors. Speakers become proficient in providing appropriate responses in meaningful and specific constructions, and gain a fuller understanding of how to use discourse moves and resources for active participation in verbal exchanges. A resource is defined as a communication strategy kept in reserve, and ready for use if needed (Young, 1998). Young referred to interactional competence as co-construction; "the joint creation of a form, interpretation, circumstance, action, activity, identify, institution, skill, ideology, emotion, or other culturally meaningful reality" (p. 5).

**Practical Interactional Competence Resources**

Young (1998) posited that five linguistic and practical resources contribute to interactive competence in co-constructed, reciprocal dialogue. First, a knowledge of rhetorical scripts, shows the speaker's ability to
sequentially build onto discourse appropriately. Second, specific lexis and syntactic structures indicate a knowledge of conventional word usage and word order to maintain interactional continuity. Third, strategies for managing turns include planning ways to gain, hold, and defend speaker rights in turn-taking, as well as the means for repairing and correcting discourse violations. Fourth, management of topics to determine when a shift in topics occur, and which speaker may control changes in topics. Fifth, signaling the boundaries for speaker knowledge of which speakers open or close an interaction, either verbally or non-verbally is also included in the practical resources.

In sum, interactional competence is moment-to-moment communication between speakers who are knowledgeable of ways to talk and respond to each other to accomplish their communicative outcome. The discourse environment influences how speakers react during talk exchanges. The interactional competence skills of cognitive complexity, empathy, role-play, and interactional management assist speakers in taking part in dialogue. Dialogue is empowering, and interactional competence greatly improves as speakers talk with experienced speakers, and learn to imitate discourse moves, conversational devices, and strategic resources.

Native/Non-Native English Speaker Interaction

Native/Non-Native English Speakers in Social Context

Language acquirers need to take part in social and
cultural meanings transmitted through language use to expand their own perspective on how cultural reality is constructed and experienced by others. According to Kramsch (1993), the multicultural classroom is the best place for socializing learners with native speakers. In studies of classroom interaction within the past ten years, non-native English speakers are beginning to speak more freely with other non-native English and native speakers to clarify questions and gain meaning from conversations going on around them.

Kramsch (1993) identified three specific types of speakers and hearers in the social context of the language classroom: the principals, the animators, and the authors. The principals are those learners, hearers, and teachers who see themselves in an hierarchical structure, and speak to each other in ways that reflect a specific top-bottom order. They act as representatives, and they address each other accordingly. The principal is someone whose position is established by the words that are spoken. The animators are spontaneous speakers who speak out directly, primarily through formal presentations. Authors are individuals who are considered dominant speakers and use their own words. These are commonly teachers, but may be students. All three types are roles represented and personified by the teacher in the classroom.

Hearers are different types of participants in the classroom. They include the following: (1) the addressee,
the student of whom the teacher asks a question; (2) the bystanders, all of the other students of whom the teacher does not ask a question; and (3) the eavesdropper, a teacher who walks from area to area observing and listening to students discuss a project, or a student who listens for the conversation of one group while being a member of another group.

Awareness of the specific types of speakers and hearers in the classroom may help in recognizing reasons for lack of oral participation and interaction among students. This identification of types of speakers and hearers may enable the teacher to better integrated students for opportunities to talk.

Influence of knowledge and expertise. Zuengler & Bent (1991) reported that dominance of native speakers in native/non-native interactions is exemplified by native teachers in authoritative roles. This implies that native speaker dominance in the classroom is a common occurrence. Non-native English speakers react more submissively in-the unfamiliar territory of different language and social conventions. The compliant, unassertive role becomes a disadvantage for the non-native English speaker because it prevents negotiation of meaning through interaction.

Non-native English speakers' exposure to knowledge in various content areas increases their language proficiency, according to the Discourse Domain Model. The model claims
that the amount of knowledge and the level of expertise non-native English speakers gain in various content areas (domains) influences their willingness to participate in conversations. According to the Discourse Domain theory, when non-native English speakers are not confident of their knowledge about the content, they contribute less to the discourse. Their passive role in conversation has more to do with a lack of knowledge and unfamiliarity of the content area than with cultural or language differences (Zuengler & Bent, 1991). Most speakers are generally reluctant to talk when they know little about the subject matter being discussed. This holds especially true in the conversational performance of non-native English speakers interacting with native speakers.

Furthermore, non-native English speakers must progress through different stages during the development of their target language proficiency, and their knowledge will depend on the stage of development. Performance levels also depend on the amount of interactions to which the non-native English speaker has exposure, and are dependent on the amount of knowledge generated during conversational participation with others.

**Topic familiarity.** In one study that examined the native speaker familiarity with the topic of non-native conversation, results showed that native speakers were able to increase their understanding of the content delivered by
non-native English speakers because of familiarity with the discourse. According to Zuengler & Bent (1991), the results are not authentic as in actual face-to-face encounters because tape recorded passages were used and read by non-native English speakers. In other instances where the non-native English speakers perceived themselves to be more confident about their expertise than the native speakers, their levels of participation increased. In these studies, the main priority was to find out specifically which participation patterns were influenced by the larger amount of knowledge, and whether the speakers were native or non-native.

Four Hypothesis on Native/Non-Native Speaker Interaction

In Zuengler & Bent's 1991 study, the question of which speakers would interact when familiar with the context, whether native or non-native, prompted four hypotheses:

(1) "When the content domain is outside their major field, and the speakers have relatively equal knowledge of the domain, the native speaker will exhibit greater conversational participation than the non-native English speaker; (2) when the content domain involves their major field of study, and the speakers have relatively equal knowledge of that domain, the native speaker will exhibit greater conversational participation than the non-native English speaker; (3) when the content domain involves their major field of study, and the non-native English speaker has relatively greater content expertise than the native speaker has, the nonnative English speaker will exhibit greater conversational participation than native speaker; and (4) when the content domain involves their major field of study, and the native speaker has relatively greater content expertise than the non-native English speaker has, the native speaker will exhibit greater conversational participation than the nonnative speaker" (p. 400).
In this study of 90 male native and non-native English speakers, pairs of relatively equal expertise, who shared major fields, combined. However, the more advanced student of the pair assumed expertise in the content domain.

The six measures used to analyze speaker participation in Zuengler and Bent's (1991) study were the following: the amount of talk, interruptions, resisting interruptions, pause fillers such as (you know ... um ... uh... ), back channels, and leading or topic shifts. Speakers who resist interruptions are determined not to be subordinated during discourse with other speakers (Zuengler & Bent, 1991). Conversational topics were constructed for discussions, and a topic such as "food" was used to solicit knowledge outside of the major field of both speakers, a topic in which both speakers had equal knowledge. Conversations were also constructed for topics within the speakers' major fields. The conversations lasted 10 minutes. The findings of the study confirmed that content knowledge is greatly influential in determining participant interaction in conversational discourse, whether speakers are native or non-native (Zuengler & Bent, 1991).

Non-native English speakers as information equals. When native speakers interact with non-native English speakers, opportunities must be made for feedback from the non-native English speaker in order for negotiation to occur. This technique forces native speakers to modify their speech for
complete non-native English speaker comprehension, and maintains a two-way exchange of information between the speakers. If information is only flowing one-way, that is, from native speaker to non-native English speaker, the ability of the speaker to restructure and modify discourse for clearer understanding is lost. Equalizing the information exchange between native and non-native speakers is guaranteed when dominant speakers allow ways for negotiation to take place in conversational discourse (Zuengler & Bent, 1991).

**Phonological aspects of input in native/non-native interactions.** Zuengler (1985) described the results of a study that examined the phonological modifications or accommodations that speakers made in their speech when interacting if they perceive that they were in a communication encounter with someone who is unequal in status. The purpose of the study was to analyze the effects of unequal status on speech. In the study, dental students were paired, with one student having less experience than the other. They were then asked to speak about the issues about which only one of the dental students had advanced knowledge. Results showed the less knowledgeable students made their speech more standard in pronunciation, in an attempt to raise their self-esteem, while the student with more knowledge made their speech less standard in
pronunciation, in an attempt to make interaction with the less knowledgeable student more comfortable.

There is similarity in the findings of this study to the work of Long (1983), in which he observed that native speakers modified their language use when addressing non-native English speakers if

(1) "the non-native speaker has very low or no proficiency in the language of communication; (2) the native speaker is of higher status than the non-native English speaker; (3) the native speaker has considerable prior foreigner talk experience, but of a very limited kind; and (4) the conversation occurs spontaneously, i.e. not as part of a laboratory study" (Long, 1983, p. 127).

Native/Non-Native English Speaker Conversation in the Classroom

Traditionally, the purpose of the English as a second language classroom has been mainly for language instruction to emphasize language use rather than acquisition. More recently, the focus has switched to the use of non-instructional language to help learners gain proficiency in approximating the target language use in various situations (Long & Sato, 1983). In a 1982 study by Long & Sato, the teachers' use of speech during six ESL lessons was found to be comprehensible to non-native learners because they were responsive. However, the speech was modified in ways that made the language use "structurally and lexically controlled, repetitious in the extreme, and with little or no communicative value" (Long & Sato, 1983, p. 220).
Non-instructional conversation. Data from a 1979 study by Long & Sato of 36 native/non-native (informal outside of the classroom) conversations were compared to a 1981 study of the classroom conversations of six ESL teachers and their elementary level ESL students to find out how greatly the interactional structure of native/non-native English speaker conversation differed. Concerning the conversational structures of comprehension checks, clarification requests, and confirmation checks, the findings of the comparison revealed that

(1) "ESL teachers used a significantly greater number of comprehension checks than did native speakers addressing non-native English speakers outside the classroom; (2) ESL teachers used fewer clarification requests than did native speakers addressing non-native English speakers outside the classroom; and (3) ESL teachers used significantly fewer confirmation checks than did native speakers addressing non-native English speakers outside the classroom" (p. 217).

According to the findings, the second language classroom was not offering enough opportunities for communicative language use between native and non-native English speakers (Long & Sato, 1983).

Similarities and differences in concept learning and language learning. The situation most obvious in language learning classrooms is the problem the learner faces when a native speaker starts to talk with a non-native English speaker, and the speech from the native speaker is coming so rapidly that the non-native English speaker cannot possibly understand anything except small segments in the one-on-one
discourse. The native speaker is generally not aware of the real limits in the non-native English speaker's comprehension. These limitations may be caused in part, by native speaker speech rate, or when the native speaker is speaking before a native-speaking group, and unaware that the non-native English speakers are unable to decipher the discourse for understanding (Gass & Selinker, 1993).

An alternative offered by Gass & Selinker is for the non-native English speaker to create sentences and questions for practice with a native speaker to see if the target language is being comprehended. Native speakers assisting non-native English speakers may provide two basic variations of feedback during discourse. In the first variation, the non-native English speaker receives no feedback because the objective is for the speaker to approximate how well they are progressing in the language. This method does not work well if the non-native English speaker is practicing the variation with a native speaker who allows errors without correction.

In the second variation, the non-native English speaker receives feedback from the native speaker or from a computer. The feedback is immediate so the learner has an opportunity to negotiate the appropriate meaning. The there are three differences in concept learning and language learning. First, in concept learning, the items for practice are visual and not verbal which is vastly different.
in terms of the variation in cognitive patterns. A second difference is with artificial language tasks because these tasks do not return any meaning to the learner. The third difference occurs because the learner is practicing the use of sensorimotor skills; while the concept learner experiment is testing for cognitive patterns (Gass & Selinker, 1993).

In sum, native/non-native English speaker interaction is most effective when social discourse is experienced and practiced by speakers in multicultural classrooms. There are different types of speakers and hearers in the classroom, and recognizing and identifying the types of speakers helps the teacher integrate less dominant speakers into participatory social discourse activities. Even though native speaker dominance in the classroom occurs frequently, non-native English speakers exhibit greater participation in conversation when they perceive they are knowledgeable about the content under discussion. Non-native English speakers are provided greater opportunities to interact when native speakers share information, converse frequently, and allow chances for negotiating meaning with non-native English speakers in social discourse.

Negotiation

What is Negotiation?

Negotiation of meaning is the process of changing the makeup and organization of a communicative interaction to
achieve complete comprehension (Pica, 1994). Tasks that generate a negotiation of meaning are those in which speakers share information in a small group to solve a problem or make a decision. Negotiation supplies regular conversation, which creates meaning for the learner, as well as corrective feedback to the second language learner.

The main advantage of a small group setting is the opportunity learners have to modify the language they hear in the classroom with comprehension checks, confirmation checks, and clarification requests. Conversational changes routinely made by native speakers to negotiate meaning include discourse strategies such as conversational repairs and tactics such as repetition, emphases, and deliberate speech to minimize and resolve communication misunderstandings and breakdowns.

The role of input. For second language learners, simplifying input is not enough to insure comprehension; therefore, meaning must be negotiated through modification and a restructuring of the message so the learners' internal mechanisms appropriately receive the intended message (Krashen, 1988). The information that the second language learner receives from other speakers is input. Comprehensible input must challenge the current level of the learner's grammatical knowledge to increase developmental acquisition. Krashen explained this process through the Comprehensible Input Hypothesis. Comprehension is the
ability of the mind to perceive and understand, and according to Krashen (1988), "Comprehensible input may be at the heart of the language acquisition process" (p. 102). Learners acquire language by understanding a little beyond their current language level. When they are able to build onto their current level of competence, they are progressing in language acquisition. The learner's developmental movement along the current stage is input, and +1 implies additional language knowledge gained beyond the learner's current level. Input occurs while speakers are communicating to learners, and exposes learners to language structures that they may not already know (Krashen, 1988).

According to Glew (1998), studies confirm that interaction between the learner's cognitive processes and the language environment lead to second language acquisition. Awareness and attention to quality language input greatly facilitate language development. Input becomes comprehensible for learners when native speakers employ modification interactions such as conversational strategies that prevent communication breakdowns and misunderstandings; discourse repair tactics that correct mistakes which occur during conversation; and a combination of strategies to slow the speech rate, place emphasis on important words, and make use of appropriate repetition for clarification.

The role of output. Comprehensible output is meaningful language that a learner is able to produce
coherently and appropriately (Gass & Selinker, 1993). To verbally communicate, learners are forced to produce language. When information is received by the intake mechanism, the learner then has the ability to convey information adequately in return by choosing appropriate target language structures and soliciting meaningful feedback. Output shows the learner can create meaning appropriately. Speakers need opportunities to practice their oral skills by interacting with other speakers to reflect that their meanings are precise (Gass & Selinker, 1993).

**Negotiation and Feedback**

According to Glew (1998), during negotiation of meaning the learner's output is facilitated through corrective negative feedback by helping to modify the use of non-target language forms. Comprehensible input, intake, and comprehensible output result in effective interactional feedback through the awareness and repair of errors. Restructuring of language forms is the interactional function of negotiation because of the following: the corrective benefits for the learner; and interactional discourse which provides conversational meaning and clarification. When learners are able to self-correct, or to obtain corrective feedback, they can overcome communication difficulties through mutual understanding, and processing meaning. Negotiating meaning through clarification, confirmation, modification, and repetition makes the target
language forms clear enough for the language learner to pay attention and understand (Glew, 1998).

Negotiation allows the learner opportunities to engage in conversation through elicitation or clarification requests. Any input that learners do not understand can be repeated or modified, helping them learner to form connections between input, intake, selective attention, and corrected output. Glew (1998) reported the findings on Berducci's (1993) study on negotiated interaction opportunities of learners in three classrooms. The study revealed that 86% of class time could have been spent in activities engaging learners in negotiated interactions. However, only 3% of class time was devoted to conversation. In fact, the teacher controlled the majority of negotiations with the learners. These teachers claimed to use a Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach to promote interactional activities for communicative language learning. Berducci's study pointed out that the participating language teachers knew of the importance of negotiation, but were unable to facilitate the learners adequately through practical application in negotiated social interaction (Glew, 1998).

**Negotiation adjustments.** Musumeci (1996) asserted that circumstances for negotiation are increased or decreased by teaching approach, lesson content, and classroom behavior. These elements must collaborate appropriately if the second
language learner is to produce meaningful output. If the learner's communicative output is limited, the teacher is unable to generate higher levels of oral competence in the second language.

Pica, Holliday, Lewis, & Morgenthaler (1989) stated that learners and interlocutors contribute to the second language process by working together to produce comprehensible input and output. By using classroom activities and tasks that require learners to make their output comprehensible, learners are able to gain information from other speakers, and fill in missing information that may help them relate better with others. Non-native students are generally silent in the classroom, and this prevents negotiation of adequate feedback (Glew, 1998). Pica et al., (1989) described how nonnative English speaking Japanese males were able to converse with others more freely on a variety of other subjects than were Japanese females. The males contributed new topics, and revealed background information concerning their learning experiences. The males were able to manage their side of the discourse to allow native speakers a way to help in negotiating meaning. The openness of discourse helped males to experience greater opportunities for comprehension checks and clarification through negotiation with native speakers.

Impact of Classroom Negotiation

Investigation of classroom discourse and ethnic
communicative styles reveal that Asian learners take fewer speaking turns than non-Asian learners. This was a result of instructors not calling on the Asian learners, and the reluctance of Asian learners to verbally interact. According to Glew (1998), the learners are disadvantaged because of lost opportunities to develop through negotiation of target language forms. Small discussion groups increase interaction and the learner's level of proficiency because exposure is greater to clarification requests and confirmation checks (Day, 1986).

Negotiating power. According to Fairclough (1989), examination of the issues of language and power explain how less proficient language users are dominated by more powerful speakers. Learners must first be convinced they are functioning in a humanly changeable, social environment in which they too, are able to effect and shape change. The learner's critical consciousness must develop so they are aware of power relations and the influence of language use. Fairclough's language learning model illustrates two principles: (1) uniting awareness with practice--developing potential language capabilities depends on a union of purposeful discourse practice and critical language awareness; (2) building on experience--critical language awareness should be built on the existing language capabilities and experience developed from childhood. The principle of uniting awareness and practice explains that
learners must talk about interactions and social context as if affects them, and learn to use language in a way that empowers them. Learners need to develop their ability to describe, interpret, and explain their life experiences in a way that helps to create a powerful individual. In other words, learners need to develop critical language awareness so they may produce and interpret discourse in ways that strengthen them. Learners are to look at the assumptions in something that is said, examine the metaphors, and search for the value and meaning in spoken words (Fairclough, 1989).

Absence of Negotiation. In a 1980 study, Lakoff & Johnson documented the verbal interactions by classroom children, aged six through eight, who were placed in small groups and left alone by the teacher to solve a problem. Instead of cooperating to fulfill the task, the most active participants engaged in positioning and maneuvering to control and constrain discourse, and to weaken the contributions from less powerful speakers. Two factors may have led to the "war-like" speaking encounters in the classroom (p. 348). First, the children were left without a true authority figure; second, the assignment became complex when the children were instructed to actually solve problems. The more vocal children demonstrated a struggle for power, not for cooperation and equality, through the use of language (Lakoff & Johnson, 1996).
Orellana (1996) compared two classroom meetings to demonstrate how power is reorganized and negotiated by children. The majority of 32 class members did not orally participate in the discussions taking place. In the absence of the teacher, the more vocal learners spoke first, initiating a show of dominance and control through language use within the group.

**Negotiation Similarities in Speaking and Reading**

In the negotiation of meaning, the process of comprehensible input and, more specifically, the knowledge that the learner actually takes in, is closely aligned with the process language learners experience in reading. Kramsch (1993) related that there are two kinds of reading. In the first type, the reader is focused on acquiring information that will remain after the reading is completed. The primary concern is what the reader will take away from the reading, or *efferent* reading. In the second type of reading, the reader is paying attention to what is going on during the actual reading, and attention is centered on living through the experience of what is focused on at that moment in the text. This is known as *aesthetic* reading (Kramsch, 1993).

Kramsch explained the difficulty intermediate language learners may experience when asked to read. If a language learner is asked to read a story efferently, but the text reads best when read aesthetically, the language learner may not be able to understand the point of the story. It may be
lack of information, or not enough knowledge about the culture to illustrate the negotiation of meaning through the context of the relationship between reader and the text.

Because intake is the information from input that is actually comprehensible, absorbed, and understood, what is essential is the information that the learner carries away from the interaction, whether spoken or written. Comprehensible input and aesthetic reading are similar because the message is heard for the moment; and the individual is experiencing the moment. However, the message may not necessarily be carried away with the reader. Likewise, in the context of negotiated meaning, language learners may experience difficulty when asked to read. If a language learner is asked to read a story efferently, but the text reads best when read aesthetically, the language learner may lack complete understanding of the story. The reason may be lack of information, or that the learner was "living in the moment" of the text (Kramsch, 1993, p. 104). Accordingly, in the case of language learning, if the message is not comprehensible, it will not result in intake or complete understanding.

Producing Meaning Through Experimentation

According to Kramsch (1993), an experiment by linguist A.L. Becker illustrated to learners how writers develop the context of communication to produce meaning. In the experiment, Becker asked the learners to describe in one
written sentence his next actions. He slowly walked up the steps to a podium and laid a book on the desk. The learners were asked to read aloud their descriptive sentences of his actions, as Becker wrote them on the board.

None of the written sentences were the same, and it was explained that the differences would not have been so great if the learners had been instructed to speak, rather than to write the sentences. Another major difference was the manner in which the learners described the linguist. Some learners used "he," "the man," "the linguist," "you," and their manner of grammar varied with usage of main and dependent clauses, tenses, punctuation, choice and place of pronouns, and definite articles.

Learners reached back in their memory to create the event before them. The learners were told that there was not a sentence that was the most correct, because "describing the event creates it" (p. 108). The final point concerned the information that learners had not written down, in order to write other things. The learners were instructed that

"Each language represents a different equation between manifestations and silences. Each person leaves some things unsaid in order to be able to say others...hence, the immense difficulty of translation: translation is a matter of saying in a language precisely what that language tends to pass over in silence" (p. 108).

In sum, negotiation of meaning incorporates the making of interactional adjustments to ensure that comprehensible input takes place. The corrective feedback allows the
learner to clearly understand what is being said by others. Second language multicultural classrooms are the best places for negotiation of meaning to occur, particularly when native speakers are aware of giving opportunity to nonnative English speakers to make meaning. Negotiating meaning is critical in creating and shaping social change because individuals share and experience the different life perspectives of others. Each speaker has a responsibility to take speaking turns to avoid unequal talk encounters, and to take advantage of the need to make meaning. Comprehension can be reached through reading and speaking. In either case, meaningful comprehensible input is the route to language acquisition.

Turn-Taking

Instructional Turn-taking

According to Stasser and Taylor (1991), a speaking turn is any meaningful, intelligent utterance. Turns may consist of more than one sentence; however, they can serve as on word, such as "What?" or "Yeah." This implies that whatever the length of the utterance, all speakers are entitled to a speaking turn. Establishing equal turn distribution among speakers involves a collaborative effort during social communication (Lerner, 1995). Lerner's primary focus is directed toward enabling instructional activity through talk-in-interaction. This form of talk within the classroom engages students in small work groups as active participants.
in instructional turntaking. Non-native English speakers need opportunities for participation in reciprocal speaking turns with native speakers. The classroom-in-session setting described by Lerner (1995) invites turn-taking between teacher and student in which the teacher may withhold an answer to provide an opportunity for a reply. Responses from the students in the form of turn-taking acts as instructional resources. Two key features of language use that offer student opportunities for turn-taking are as follows: the student's ability to recognize turn completion, and learning to recognize when turn completions are occurring. These features teach students the proper places of reference when speakers may transition to a turn (Lerner, 1995).

**Speech exchange system.** Sacks (1974) referred to turn-taking in conversation as the “speech exchange system” to explain how turns are valued, and how turns require a strategy for obtaining and holding them until the next speaker is ready to release their specific turn at talk. Turns are organized in a system that operates on the apportionment of talk among speakers. The turn-taking system is dynamic, and speakers learn to use techniques and methods to gain and hold turns to maintain control of the speaking floor.

During the course of conversation, one speaker takes the floor as the other speakers act as co-participants in
the interaction. Rules govern the turn-taking system, and the rules apply at the end of turns in the transition relevance place where speakers compose utterances in preparation for a turn (Schegloff, Sacks, & Jefferson, 1974). The transition relevance place is the point where one turn ends just before another turn begins. At times, the rules are violated causing one speaker to begin to speak before another speaker has finished speaking. In this case, strategies of silence or repair are initiated by either of the speakers in recognition of the violation.

Accordingly, turn order is not fixed but changes. Similarly, the number of people involved varies. In different types of discourse, the turn-taking system differs. For example, debates, formal meetings, ceremonies, seminars, and interviews require a specific order of turns with a main speaker in control of turn-taking. In contrast, as valuable as turns are, they can be continuous or discontinuous; (a space where none of the speakers talk), and turns can often be avoided by participants of the interaction for various reasons (Schegloff, Sacks, and Jefferson, 1974).

Turn-taking Distribution and Turn-allocation Techniques

The two ways that turns are distributed are by (1) selection of the next speaker by the current speaker; or by (2) self-selection from an individual who desires to speak. This distribution technique is generally managed without
large gaps or overlaps with only one speaker talking at one time, and allows for the transfer of talk among speakers to occur smoothly. Turn constraint is maintained by the rules which set the pattern of turns, and the options for when taking a turn is appropriate; that is, at the turn transition relevance place (Schegloff, Sacks, & Jefferson, 1974). When speakers begin a turn at the same time, one speaker will stop speaking to eliminate an overlap. According to Schegloff et al., this happens in the majority of cases. However, bias in the turn-taking rule does occur because of the current speaker's precedence to select the next speaker. But the purpose that is served by the first speaker in selecting provides opportunities for any misunderstandings to be cleared by the next speaker selected. The length of the speaking turn may be short or extensive, and the speaker may say whatever is relevant, so long as the turn occurs at the transition relevance place. Turn-taking rules are designed for two-party conversations, and when a third individual is present the rules allocate a last turn to that party.

Therefore, advantage for number of turns and length of turns occurs most often between the first and selected second speaker. This can lead to a feeling of other speakers being "left out" by the way the rules operate. Consequently, there exists a form of competition among speakers when more
than two speakers are present during discourse (Schegloff, Sacks, & Jefferson, 1974).

**Gaps, pauses, and lapse in turn-taking.** Schegloff, Sacks, & Jefferson (1974) stated that a lapse occurs when the first speaker selects a second speaker, but the second speaker is not desirous of a turn, which creates a silence. The first speaker has the right to continue speaking or other speakers may self-select for their turn. Pauses occur in the discourse not considered transition relevance places, and therefore, those places are not available to other speakers as a turn. However when a gap occurs, it is generally at the transition relevance place. The gap is usually changed into a pause by the taking of a turn of a self-selected speaker.

According to Schegloff, Sacks, & Jefferson (1974), interruptions are turn-taking starts or false starts that can be self-corrected with remarks such as "Pardon me," "Excuse me," or "I'm sorry, go ahead." Within the rule system, there are ways of repairing conversation. The repairs often are made by both speakers. In conversation, the talk is interactive with speakers managing the length of their turn, and their content, and speakers also determine when they have arrived at the turn completion. Turn size and turn order depend on the participants, and speakers determine how they wish to share and allocate turns as they construct the discourse.
Turn-taking in Face-to-Face Group Discussions

In spite of the organized interactive system of turn-taking, in the type of discourse involving problem-solving, decision-making, and task-oriented groups, those individuals who control turns are seen as influential leaders, and providers of information (Stasser & Taylor, 1991). Although the talk that occurs in groups may at times appear and sound confusing, there is a distinct pattern in the sequence of interactive talk. Who speaks when, and how often, determines what messages are delivered and the influence level of certain speakers. Because verbal communication is the most efficient way for individuals to express themselves, the turn-taking system is the fundamental element of socially interacting, according to Stasser & Taylor, (1991). Through the formation of a DISCUSS model of group decision-making, Stasser & Taylor determined that turn-taking is not only an orderly and reciprocal system, but also a system of decision-making. Two patterns are apparent in discussion groups: group members participate at different rates, and the participation level fluctuates in proportion to group size, and once a member speaks in the group, that member will usually soon speak again.

Members take speaking turns based on when they desire to speak, the amount of time available, and who is present in the interaction. Parker (1988) noted that it is not uncommon for two speakers in a group to alternate turns,
with each speaker extending to two turns or more between them. The term floor holder refers to speakers who are often successful in regaining the floor when they desire. Based on Parker's 4-participant studies and his floor model of face-to-face speaking turns in group conversation (three or more speakers involved), the exchanges were initiated generally between two parties who had no problem whatever maintaining the floor. With an increase in the size of the group, obtaining turns becomes proportionately more difficult.

Three basic processes in group turn-taking. The three processes that account for dominant speaker turn-taking within groups are: (1) formation of speaking hierarchies within a group; (2) intermittent fluctuations in member's tendencies to talk; and (3) competition among members for speaking time. Parker (1988), concluded that dominant speaker turn-taking is a perceptive, yet complicated, intra-personal and sociocultural phenomena. Some speakers take "megaturns" or speak in clusters. This means they are holding the floor for longer periods of time. Even though a turn is defined as a change of speakers, ultimately the dominant speakers tend to remain the most influential members in group decision-making (Parker, 1988).

Relationship Between Turn-taking and Non-Verbal Behavior and Gestures

According to Morgenthaler (1990), based on group studies of communicative strategies among women at a liberal
arts college in Philadelphia, turn-taking distribution and allocation initiates from eye contact. The "inclusory glance" is aptly described as the first speaker moving her eyes from one woman to the next as a means of engendering the attention of a particular woman for participation in turn-taking (p. 541). Inclusory glances are used to signify available turn selection, and because women in groups appear to make constant eye contact, the glancing method is apparently effective. Speakers often signal boundaries through eye contact by inclusory glances to obtain attention for turns, or by looking downward to signal the end of their interaction. Eye contact remains a continuous feature in turn-taking in the aspects of floor/turn allocation, intended reference, and coming to consensus. Eye movement is significant because direct eye contact from participants is influential in decision-making, allowing the facilitator to decipher objections and approval (Morgenthaler, 1990).

**Addressed and non-addressed participants.** Addressed speakers generally look at the speaker addressing them, and will usually take a turn in response. Addressed participants watch the speaker more closely, and consequently, they are more acutely available for involvement in functional turn-taking. Morgenthaler (1990), suggested that participants who are not directly addressed by another speaker are less attentive, and less responsive than those who are addressed.
Gestures of the hand by a speaker will indicate recognition for a speaker to take a turn. Gestures such as finger and hand movements are called directive cues to indicate to the speaker that another speaker may contribute in the discourse. Additionally, certain semantic terms are used by the facilitator to signal turn-taking, such as: "okay," "um," "good," "anyway," and "great." Directive cues fill gaps in between turns, signal when another speaker has finished a turn, and provide opportunities for other speakers to offer opinions and suggestions.

**Participant support.** Often speakers get verbal support from one or more other speakers to show agreement or attentiveness by using fillers, comments, or questions within one speaker's turn. The facilitator of the group is usually the main supporter for a speaker, however this can often lead to comments and support from other speakers without actually taking the turn from the original speaker. This type of participant support is not interruptive, it is termed interweaving because it is cooperative and purposefully placed within a speaker's turn (Morgenthaler, 1990).

**Turn-taking in bilingual classrooms.** Martin-Jones & Saxena (1996), detailed the effects of turn-taking in bilingual classrooms in helping students acquire sufficient English. Specifically, attention is focused on the distinctions made between monolingual, and bilingual
learners (mostly from minority groups), and the positioning in social hierarchy that limits discourse interaction among bilingual learners, based on the notion that monolingual and bilinguals have different educational goals.

The main distinction revealed that monolingual learners received more child-centered discovery-type pedagogy, while the bilinguals received more drilling on the correct use of language forms. What was needed was more language support to help bilingual learners in their transition to speaking English in mainstream classrooms. Bilingual assistants are able to choose which language to use, allocate turns to learners, and incorporate familiar home and community language into the learner's curriculum to motivate the learner to take more turns, and to learn the turn-taking cues in educational and social discourse.

Bilingual assistants are significant because they encourage turn-taking in bilingual learners through contributions in the learner's home language, and by addressing the learner in their preferred language. In this way, bilingual learners can take on a voice, regardless of their social positioning within the mainstream classroom (Martin-Jones & Saxena, 1996).

**Turn-taking Patterns of International Students in University Classrooms**

Tapper (1996), examined the turn-taking patterns of international students in university classrooms to reveal
the amount of talk exchange among non-native English speakers of English in the academic setting. The implication is that the nature of teaching and learning calls for regular talk exchanges between teacher and student. It is necessary that non-native English students participate in the turn-taking system in student response and contribution based on a pattern of the three basic discourse moves in the classroom: (1) teacher initiation, (2) student response, and (3) teacher feedback. The focus of the teacher is to involve as many participants as possible in contributing orally (Tapper, 1996).

**Native speaker participation in college discourse.** According to Tapper (1996), research on college classroom discourse revealed that non-native English students often do not initiate exchange interactions, and when they do, the exchanges are short. In part, this type of minimal participation is based on the idea that non-native English students do not like to challenge or question the teacher. Gaining more oral exchanges from non-native English students allows the teacher to instruct more effectively to those learners with a non-English speaking background.

Tapper (1996), described two types of turns in native and non-native English student responses: the directed response in which the teachers specifically call on the student, and the undirected response in which the student selects to respond by deciding to join in the discourse.
Students may make utterances that are not bids for turns as a way of indicating that their attention is being paid to speaker.

In lectures, oral exchanges take place often between native speakers with little participation from nonnative English students. In laboratory settings, much of the discourse occurs in student-to-student interactions. In the context of teacher dominated-student conferences, non-native English students interact less in the one-on-one environment based on the turn-taking pattern of teacher initiation, student response, and teacher feedback and recommendations. As previously noted, non-native English students are reluctant to question teachers (Tapper, 1996). Turn-taking in the educational setting is significant for both native and non-native English students as a means of providing understanding through interactional feedback. Awareness of the turn-taking pattern in non-English speaking students helps the student accommodate to the discourse in academic settings.

The Development of Turn-taking for Classroom Competence. According to Gutierrez (1995), acquiring language is more than learning to speak. It is the process of acquiring the strategies of discourse. This requires turn-taking appropriateness in both language and social usage in terms of talking, acting, interpreting, and thinking in specific contexts. Therefore, development of
turn-taking strategies are imperative for effective discourse in language acquisition and social interactions.

In classroom discourse, differences in the degree of competence depend on the amount of discourse participation that learners have access to through interaction and learning activities. This means learners need knowledge of the rules of interpretation, exposure to different topics, and familiarity with the patterns of interaction (turn-taking), to increase their competence. Gutierrez (1995), stated that discourse competence is a measurement of how well the learner produces oral and written language. Academic competence is the measurement of the learner's production of content knowledge.

However, social knowledge and social interaction is the central link between discourse competence and academic competence. Classroom competence is transmitted through discourse co-constructed by participants, and social relationships depend on interactions and effective patterns of discourse. When learners have limited opportunities for reading, writing, and speaking, and when their participation in discourse is minimized to brief responses, they are unable to demonstrate competence in situations requiring extended communicative interaction with others.

Lack of discourse skills makes it difficult for students to learn from the activities in which they are expected to participate. When learners are passive in
classroom learning situations, and are not encouraged to contribute through oral discourse, they cannot effectively reveal their knowledge or understanding of subject matter. These are the linguistically and culturally diverse learners who find themselves placed into remedial courses that continuously ignore their need for meaningful turn-taking discourse. Learners must participate in the joint construction of turn-taking discourse to acquire language competency which leads to academic competency (Gutierrez, 1995).

**Turn-taking and the Role of Listeners**

According to Schegloff, Sacks, & Jefferson, (1974), turn-taking features are present throughout all types of discourse. The primary goals of taking turns in speaking are: to permit one person to speak at a time, and to ensure a change in speakers. The different types of discourse vary in the distribution of turns, turn size, and content. All speakers must learn that a turn is the right and obligation of each speaker engaged in conversational discourse. It is the listener's obligation to wait and observe for the intonation and other cues indicating the possible completion place of a speaker's turn. Transitions from speaker to speaker are performed generally without a gap demonstrating that speakers are ready to take their turn.

Schegloff, Sacks, & Jefferson, (1974), referred to this readiness as active speakership and active listenership in
alternating roles. Listeners use supportive fillers and nonverbal signals such as head nods in a timely way so that they correspond to the pauses in the speaker's turn. In this way, the role of the listener becomes that of positive reinforcement for the speaker to continue talking. And for the listener to continue actively listening.

**Turn-taking and silences.** The system of turn-taking does not command that a speaker speaks; it simply engenders the right to speak. If a speaker does not desire to speak there is a discontinuity in the conversation. At times, one speaker may take longer pauses than the other speaker. However, average silences are usually proportional between speakers. In a mixed-gender study by Sacks et al., (1974), women demonstrated the most silence, but in same sex conversations, the amount of silence was equally distributed.

The reasons for the disproportional silence in the mixed-gender conversations were given as: (1) a delayed "minimal response" by the male, (2) overlap by the male; and (3) an interruption by the male. The males took up to 10 seconds of silence. In other words, the males neglected to use finely timed placement within the structure of the women's utterances. According to Schegloff, Sacks, & Jefferson, (1974), poor timing reveals inattention to the listener, or some other communication problem during the turn-taking interaction.
Turn-taking violations. West & Zimmerman (1992) offered evidence of male dominance in conversational discourse through the tactical use of interruption. In two studies, their statistics reveal that men interrupted women, and that women did not interrupt men. An interruption occurs when a speaker intervenes across more than one lexical unit of a prior speaker's words, or when a speaker causes an overlap by continuing to speak.

Overlaps are instances of simultaneous speech where another speaker begins to speak before the first speaker has ended a turn. West & Zimmerman (1992) interpreted these types of continuous infringements of speaker rights as a gender issue. They believe men handle the role of listener differently when they are conversing with women than when men are conversing with men. The results of the studies serve as reminders to women of their subordinate place in mixed-gender speaker interactions, and of the inequality of power between males and females. West & Zimmerman viewed the male interruptions as a blatant show of face-to-face power interaction.

Contrary to the results obtained by West & Zimmerman (1992), researchers Beattie from 1992 and Murray from 1992 strongly disagreed with those findings. In Murray's study from 1992 both men and women interrupted each other, and women used the interruption tactic as a means of garnering attention. Beattie from 1992 identified interruptions by
using three criteria: (1) success; (2) presence of simultaneous speech; and (3) utterance completion. Additionally, Beattie described this speaker-switch as a form of interruption that is psycholinguistic skill acquired by expert speakers employing interactional competence.

According to Beattie from 1992, women used interactional competence, and their knowledge of competing for turns when they interrupted others. Beattie claimed men interrupted to make impressions on women. In the studies of male and female interruptions conducted by Murray from 1992, he introduced the idea of "member's model of interruption" in which a speaker may be allotted interruptions if they are making a first point, even if more than one turn was necessary to make that point. Participants engaged in discourse must use their judgment to determine if a conversational violation has been demonstrated, or if the speaker has chosen to use conversational strategy (Talbot, 1992, p. 456).

**Social control in turn-taking.** As previously mentioned, interruptions are violations of the turn-taking system. Interruptions infringe on the current speaker's right to complete a turn at talk. Ways of dealing with interruptions may include a negative sanction of the interrupting speaker, such as "You just interrupted me," or "You keep interrupting me." Another sanction includes counter-interruption, such as "Let me finish." This type of sanction allows the
interrupted speaker to regain his turn until completion (Schegloff, Sacks, & Jefferson, 1974).

In sum, turn-taking is a dynamic speaking rule system where two or more parties allocate and distribute speaking turns. Within this system, there are remedial techniques for instances of speaking out of turn, simultaneous starts, error, silences, and violation repair. Non-verbal behavior and gestures are used to signal turns, and each speaker involved in the interaction has a right to take a turn. The turn-taking system allows all speakers to enjoy the meaningful benefits of interactional discourse participation.
CHAPTER THREE: DESIGN/METHODOLOGY

Background of the Study

To analyze particular features of communicative interaction in collaborative discourse between native and non-native English speakers, this study involved carrying out a project in which turn-taking behavior between native and non-native English speakers could be assessed. The content of the project was based on the task of participant planning for a cultural tour. This type of tour is defined as a cross-cultural experience that teaches English as it exposes both international and local students to specific cultures. The cultural tours in this project were carried out as class projects for a course on cross-cultural teaching that was a requirement for the M.A. in Education, TESOL Option program at a state university. They included three specific U.S. geographical regions, the Midwest (Breadbasket), the Northwest (Ecotopia), and the Southwest (Mex-America); and two countries, South Korea and Taiwan.

Prior research validate the significance of capturing second-by-second demonstrations of turn-taking sequences occurring between speakers on videotape. Extensive analysis of participant utterances would reveal communicative behavior and participation in terms of whether native or non-native English initiated turns; began talking before another speaker was finished; blurted out beginning phrases to show a desire to speak; defended a turn at talk; signaled
a desire to speak through the use of eye contact or other non-verbal gestures; and ultimately, which speakers indicated an ability to maintain the floor after gaining a speaking turn.

Additionally, research studies by Zuengler & Bent (1991) indicated that non-native English speakers tend to participate more actively in conversational discourse when the content domain is familiar, and when the speaker possesses a certain amount of expertise on the subject matter under discussion.

In light of this research, the goal of this study is to analyze the conversational discourse between native and non-native English speakers for the following factors: total number of turns, total elapsed time of speech, and speaker's ability to utilize power turns, and thus gain influence within the group through skillful use of conversational tactics and strategies.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose for utilizing this collaborative conversational project was threefold. First, to directly engage native and non-native English speakers of English or English as a second language in sociocultural discourse for the purpose of language and content development. Second, to determine the quality of speaker inclusion and exclusion in co-constructed turn-taking in a collaborative context. Third, to identify the number, length, and type of native
In addition, conversational turn-taking projects such as cultural tours are designed to stimulate and promote spontaneous oral expression, mutual cooperation, and negotiated meaning and understanding. This project encourages reciprocal interaction among speakers as they learn various characteristics of cultures, including regional languages, core values and behaviors, significant cities and landmarks, holiday celebrations, rituals and customs, foods, habits, and dress.

Participants

Native and Non-native English Speakers

The twenty-two male and female participants who participated in the project were university students in the College of Education, M.A. in Education, Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages Option program. All students participated in the project as a part of class requirements. The second language proficiency of non-native English participants was required to be 547 points or better on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), a standardized test. Eleven students were native English speakers, and eleven were non-native English students.

Conversational Roles

Participants in co-planning took one of two roles, as consultant or presenter (major). The key responsibilities of
the consultant involved assisting the presenter (major) in the collection of factual and interesting content for the subsequent presentation. The responsibilities of the presenters included exploring and gaining knowledge about unfamiliar aspects of particular regions and cultures; actively participating in collaborative planning about presenting to the class as a whole; and the gathering and preparing of materials and various media necessary to acknowledge, define, and describe the nature of the assigned culture. The completed project culminated in a formal oral cultural presentation (the "tour") before an audience of student peers.

In this project the international students were assigned the role of consultants (experts) for the countries of Korea and Taiwan; the native English speakers were the presenters for these areas. The international students then became presenters (majors) about the assigned vernacular regions of the U.S., (Breadbasket, Ecotopia, and Mex America) with the native English speakers acting as consultants (experts) during the planning.

Design

Participants were assigned to two separate cultural tours on the basis of two principles. The first, that a native English speaker would act as consultant on a cultural tour when the presentation was to be of a North American region for which a non-native English speaker would present,
and vice versa. The second principle which governed participant assignment to a specific cultural tour was an attempt to distribute participants to groups so the number of male participants would be balanced across groups.

The idea of cultural tours originates from Garreau's 1981 book, The Nine Nations of North America. Garreau reconfigured the map of North America into nine regions and used vernacular regional names to illustrate the cultural characteristics that make the regions unique. Participants representing the assigned regions and countries assembled for two-three sessions each, a total of fourteen sessions of on-going cultural discussions, plans, decision-making, problem-solving, information updates, and team collaboration.

To test the hypotheses of the study, the independent variables used were the following: speaker characteristic (native and non-native English speakers); role (major and consultant); and gender (male and female). The dependent variables used were the following: Total Turns, Total Time, and Total Power Turns.

Operational Definitions of Terms

Native English speaker refers to an individual born in an English-speaking environment, and having a native ability to speak English as the first, or primary language.

Non-native English speaker refers to an individual belonging to, or coming from another country or nation,
whose English is learned as a second (non-primary) language. The non-native English speakers in this study were required to have a TOEFL score of at least 547 to enter graduate study of the university.

A speaking turn is defined as the unit of conversation in which one speaker begins and ends an utterance. Within the turn-taking system, speakers cooperate in allocating and distributing turns among each other.

A power turn is a turn that is taken by a speaker who is able to spontaneously shift away from the current topic to one desired by that speaker. The marked ability of a speaker to make power turns allows possession of more turns, and control of discourse topics. Power turns are differentiated from regular turns in that all interacting participants allow the abrupt shift in sentence theme or topic to occur, without any attempt to return to the current topic of discussion. Power turns create a power conversation for the speakers as are able to get in their share of turns, defend turns from loss or interruption, and introduce topics successfully. Power turns are initiated by the speaker starting to talk slightly before the current speaker is finished, blurting out beginning phrases to show that the speaker wants the floor, and by the speaker staying prepared to seize the next turn. Defining these terms clarifies their usage during the conversational project tasks.
The Audiovisual Media Center at California State University, San Bernardino provided the video tape micro-laboratories to record the planning phase of the project. The sessions were videotaped with the prior knowledge and consent of the participants. The media rooms were prepared in advance by the researcher to record the discussion sessions. All participants were instructed to sit at the discussion table facing the video camera, and to speak loudly enough to maintain normal audible sound quality throughout their interactions.

**Hypotheses of the Study**

This study offered three hypotheses. The first hypothesis predicts that native speakers of English will talk more. The second hypothesis predicts that native English speakers will take more turns and power turns. The third hypothesis predicts, consistent with previous research, that although native speakers will talk more, when non-native English speakers act in the role of a consultant (expert), the turn-taking differences will be less pronounced than when the native English speakers are in the consultant (expert) role. A subhypothesis here is that male native speakers will talk more than females.

**Variables**

The dependent variables are Total (Elapsed) Time (of Speech), Total Turns, and Total Power Turns. The independent variables are native versus non-native English speaker;
consultant versus major; and male versus female participants. To test Hypothesis 1, the variable Total Time will measure the amount and length of participant utterances. Hypothesis 2 will test the variable Total Turn for amount of turns taken, and Hypothesis 3 will test the variable Power Turns for ability to seize turns to speaker advantage.
CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS and RESULTS

Quantitative Analysis of the Results

Data Collection

Data collection was accomplished in four phases. In phase one, twelve videotapes recorded the interactional discourse during planning of the cultural tours (Breadbasket, Ecotopia, and Mex-America, two tapes each; Korea and Taiwan, three tapes each). The tapes were transcribed, first manually and then typed.

In the second phase, the transcriptions were classified according to the following factors: whether the speaker was native or non-native English speaking, major or consultant, and male or female. The number of turns, length of speaking time, and type of turns were recorded and analyzed. Participants' turns were timed and recorded by means of a stop watch, with data rounded to one-tenth of a second.

In the third phase, individual speakers' utterances were totaled to arrive at individual speaking turns per participant within each geographical area. In the fourth and final phase, a comparison was made of the total time that native English speakers spoke versus the time that non-native English speakers spoke, the total turns taken, and the total power turns taken.

Test of Hypothesis 1

This hypothesis predicts that native speakers of English will talk more overall. In conversational tasks of
all geographical regions and countries combined, out of 100%, native English speakers took Total Turns of 62% to non-native English speaker Total Turns of 38%. The result of these figures demonstrate that in Total Turns, native English speakers talked more overall.

**Test of Hypothesis 2**

The second hypothesis predicts that native English speakers will take more Total Turns and Power Turns than non-native English speakers. First, in terms of Total Turns, for all combined geographical regions: Of 100% of Total Turns, native English speakers produced Total Turns of 65% compared to non-native English speakers of 35%. These figures show that native English speakers controlled regular turns. In terms of Power Turns for all combined geographical regions, native English speakers produced Total Power Turns of 69% compared to non-native English speakers of 31%.

Native English speakers took Power Turns at will by abruptly shifting away from current discussion themes to more desired themes than non-native English speakers. Total Power Turns were controlled by native English speakers in discussions of regions in which they were not considered consultants (experts) providing further confirmation of Hypothesis 2. The results of these figures show consistency with the positive prediction and Total Turns finding as also established in Hypothesis 1.
Hypothesis 3

The third hypothesis predicts that although native English speakers will talk more, when non-native English speakers act in the role of a consultant (expert), the turn-taking differences will be less pronounced than when the native English speakers are in the consultant (expert) role. The results in this study show that turn-taking differences remained disproportionately imbalanced. Of 100%, (major) role speakers took 62% compared to (consultant-expert) role speakers produced Total Power Turns of 59% compared to (consultant-expert) role speakers of 41%. Native English speakers dominated non-native English speakers in Total Turns and Total Power Turns.

The result of the subhypothesis that male speakers will talk more than female speakers was confirmed in this study by the inclusive mixed-gender data findings for Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3. Female speakers took Total Turns 69% compared to male speakers of 31%. However, men comprised four of 22 speakers, and therefore should have talked about 18% of the Total Turns and time. Their 45% of the Total confirmed that they proportionately talked more than women. This disproportionality continued in the Total Turn behavior, with male speakers taking 31% of the Total Turns rather than 18%, (four of 22 of their “fair” number). Continuing this pattern, males took 32% of Total Power Turns, thus continuing their disproportionate dominance.
Descriptive Review of the Results

The results of interactional social discourse between native English speakers and non-native English speakers in the cultural tour project tasks reveal a pattern of imbalance in turn-taking, length of turn-time, and use of power turns; and subsequent interactional discourse disparity among the speakers. As has been shown, research data, figures and tables clearly indicate this imbalance. This section describes how the dominance occurs during conversations and infers some consequences of this imbalance. The dominance that emerged in the data was affected by the relative superiority of native English speakers in numbers: more Total Turns, more Total Time, and more Total Power Turns.

Native English speaker dominance in social discourse creates and reveals multiple communication problems. Interactional problems stemming from this turn-taking domination included the following: Non-native English speakers being excluded from turns; native English speaker dominance of group decision-making; native English speaker's usage of repetitive utterances to sustain turns; and native English speaker's elaborate, and questioning of nonnative English speakers' content information. Non-native English speaker inhibition occurred as a consequence of this turn-taking imbalance. To illustrate the inequality in turn-taking and conversational discourse between native and non-
native English participants in this cultural project, the following extracts are presented.

**Turn-taking Dominance**

In a conversational interaction in the Breadbasket planning session, language used in a way that shows native English speaker dominance within the group. As the session opens and continues, a native English male speaker assumes the more active speaking position totaling 21 speaking turns consisting of 5.58 seconds. While on that same tape, a non-native English speaker female takes a total of 14 speaking turns consisting of 14.4 seconds. Turn-taking dominance to this extent raises the question: Were native English speakers co-constructing ideas with non-native English speakers or simply expressing apparently unchallengeable decisions? Can this even be considered "cooperative planning?"

In this case, the native English speaking male portrays the role of consultant, and uses the majority of discussion time as the initiator of talk on various aspects of Midwestern culture. Multiple questions are directed to non-native English speakers without allowing sufficient time to receive their complete answers or necessary clarification. Turns attempted by non-native English speakers are frequently interrupted by the native English speaker to supply filler information. This excerpt might be seen as a worst case scenario, with most dominant (native English
speaking male) combined with least dominant (non-native English speaking female).

NS: We have students here who are going to be presenters for the Breadbasket and myself, and two of my colleagues who aren't here: they're consultants and...uh...so the area you're going to be presenting on is called the Breadbasket, which is in the Midwest—I'd say the Midwest region of the United States...and...OK, have you--did you have some ideas of what you'll be talking about within your tour of the Breadbasket area? That you'll be talkin,...let's see...that area's a lot of farmland ... and agriculture and so they're growing a lot in that area--I think that's where the terminology "The Breadbasket" comes from because everything's home--grown. So what areas do you think as presenters you'll be focusing on?" (58.28 sec.)

NNS: Breadbasket includes what...(2.39 sec.)

NS: Okay! (.63 sec.)

NNS: What state...(43 sec.)

NS: The states I think within that area are Missouri...ah...let's see, I don't think Arkansas, Arkansas is further on...ah...Okay...yeah, that's not that region as well...maybe...for example, you
can teach about the history of that area. (.30 sec.)

NNS: Okay, history... (.72 sec.)

NS: I think within the history you can talk about slavery, maybe, cause that might be a big part because if that's an agricultural area, maybe there's cotton pickin' so you can talk about the history of that area, the history... (12.41 sec.)

NNS: Uh Huh! (.42 sec.)

NS: That's maybe one idea for you... maybe you can talk about the people... (5 sec.)

NNS: The people... (.39 sec.)

NS: People's another aspect. And uh... maybe the type of crops they grow... the type of... wheat, maybe, I don't think cotton anymore, I don't think tobacco anymore... maybe to where the agriculture... and what else? Maybe you can talk about... (20.61 sec.)

NNS: Geography? (.31 sec.)


In the above excerpt, not only does the native English speaker dominate in total time, but also in discussion content. The native English speaker attempts to avoid
conversational trouble by introducing a choice of topics, and to immediately pass control of the topics to non-native English speakers. The hasty introduction of a series of potential topics results in either brief confirmations from non-native English speakers, or no verbal response at all.

Non-native English Speaker Exclusion in Talk Exchanges

In a discussion exploring the culture of Ecotopia, two native English speakers (a male and a female) appear in the role of consultants with two female non-native English speakers acting as majors. The two native English speakers take 26 turns compared to 11 turns taken by the non-native English speakers. In a discourse on cultural food and drinks, the native English speakers initiate the opening of the talk session, maintain dominance of the speaking floor, and control closure of the exchanges. A non-native English speaker introduces the custom of serving coffee. However, native English speakers keep consecutive turns among themselves, nearly eliminating non-native English commentary until the end of the discussion when the non-native English speaker reiterates the coffee question.

NS 1: You guys wanna stay longer? We probably can—if you want to—do you have any other things you want some help with? Like what about food? (12.87 sec.)

NS 2: Oh yeah...food. (.47 sec.)
NNS 1: We suggested coffee. (1.8 sec.)
NS 1: So you still want to do that? (17.48 sec.)
NNS 1: What about prepare coffee? (1.47 sec.)
NNS 2: I don't know. (.69 sec.)
NS 2: Coffee! (.35 sec.)
NNS 2: I have a coffee maker, but are we going to do--before class? (5.76 sec.)
NS 1: Well....here's what I'm thinking...okay...like okay coffee is very famous in the Northwest--they also have tea--basically--it's tea, coffee, specialty coffee, and hot chocolate. So I'm thinking, at that time of night--some people might drink coffee--but a lot of people won't want to. (17.48 sec.)
NS 2: I think it's cold weather--and over here--it's hot. (3.80 sec.)
NS 1: Coffee and hot chocolate--that way it's something for everyone. What do you think? (1.6 sec.)
NS 2: Yeah. I can't say that coffee is not appropriate cause it's hot over...(4.33 sec.)
NS 1: I just can't think of anything from the Northwest except seafood or...that's it. I can't think of anything else. (6.40 sec.)
NS 2: Northwest? (.26 sec.)
NS 1: There's nothing else--other than apples. (1.28 sec.)
NS 2: There you go! I thought about this one—why don't you bring apples? (3.64 sec.)

NS 1: Because they're from Eastern Washington, that's not Ecotopia. So that doesn't count—otherwise, apples would be perfect! We could bring an apple pie or something. (9.97 sec.)

NS 2: Couldn't it be that side? (2.33 sec.)

NS 1: Only the Western side. (1.27 sec.)

NS 2: Well—that closes the apples out then. (2.7 sec.)

NS 1: Yeah! (.24 sec.)

NNS: I like coffee very much. (.78 sec.)

NS 1: Yeah! (.27 sec.)

NNS: So we can prepare mild coffee? Decaf coffee? (4.6 sec.)

NS 1: Yeah—decaf and tea. (4.14 sec.)

In the above session, in spite of the presence and purpose of non-native English speakers for supportive, interactional discussions with native English speakers, there were 16 sequential instances of turn-taking exchanges between native English speakers, compared to only seven instances of interactional turn-taking between the native and non-native English speakers. In effect, native English speakers occupied the discourse time in a “two-way flow” of turns between themselves, relegating non-native English speakers to a position of marginal interactional
participation. This type of near exclusion of non-native English speakers resulted in lost opportunities for balanced turn allocations among all participants.

Influencing Native English Speaker Group Decision-making

In groupings in which native English speakers dominate turn-taking, they are often unreceptive to candid objections or criticisms offered by less powerful speakers. However, less powerful speakers may precipitate a change in dominant opinions because of personal feelings on a particular issue. In a Mex-America planning session, the non-native English speaker is the sole consultant (expert) during talk exchanges with a native English speaker in the role of major. The difficulty the non-native English speaker experiences is twofold: first, maintaining turns at talk; second, defending a point of view in a social grouping against a dominating native English speaker. A native English speaker gives multiple reasons for rejecting the nonnative English speaker's idea; however, the non-native English speaker competitively and persistently takes repeated speaking turns until satisfied that the idea has been heard and sufficiently acknowledged by the (non-expert) native English speaker.

NNS: You shouldn't forget to tell them about the Spanish people, Okay? Actually, they're the basis.

(4.57 sec.)
NS: Okay, well...the other student was gonna talk about Aztec. (1.67 sec.)

NNS: What about the Spanish? There's a difference. (2.10 sec.)

NS: They are different. (.61 sec.)

NS: Well...you know what...(.65 sec.)

NNS: We are a combination of Indian and Spanish so the Spanish has to appear in our picture and someplace else. (5.65 sec.)

NS: Okay! Well, on here, it talked about in New Mexico, the Indian influence, it's just...you know what...so much stuff to try to put together... (12.15 sec.)

NNS: You're right...(.24 sec.)

NS: ...and this is a wonderful topic--I mean...I could be talking all day and night--just like the other student was talking to me, and she said...you know...what would really be interesting if we were talking about he stereotypical...uh...what you wanna say...Chicano (16.26 sec.)

NNS: Uh huh. (.20 sec.)

NS: And you could talk about that and the barrio--type person--and yeah, that's really interesting and all that--but again, we're going kinda mainstream type. (16.87 sec.)

NNS: So...you're not going to mention that? (1.31 sec.)
NS: No, I wasn't going to get off on a tangent. (2.46 sec.)

NNS: You're mentioning nothing about Spanish at all? (.48 sec.)

NS: No--of the time constraints--I was just trying to stick to what we see in the pictures--on the posters. (5.70 sec.)

NNS: ...Cause it sounds weird to me just start talking about the Chicanos--they are coming from the Indians, and then you go directly to the cities--and you don't mention the Spanish--there's gonna be something missing--that's what I think. (15.32 sec.)

NS: Yeah. Okay, so...(26 sec.)

NNS: What I'm trying to say--You don't have a full class of the Spanish--just to mention--they came this way, they conquered Mexico--and keep going--that's it. (9.7 sec.)

NS: Okay. Uh...that's the thing. There was some papers on some different information--and I wasn't sure that fit in that--so let me make sure that that's included. If not, you know what?...I'll point that out in the mission information. (16.40 sec.)

In the struggle against native English speaker dominance, the non-native English speaker--who not
coincidentally was male—accomplishes a dual—and successful—communicative intent: obtains turns, and raises native English speaker consciousness about the origin of Spanish people in America through controlled persistence and competitive turn-taking.

Native English Speaker Use of Repetitive Utterances

In an effort to achieve comprehensive output with non-native English speakers, native English speakers may resort to ineffective devices in interactional communication. Language devices may include ungrammatical and simplified speech (foreigner register) and tedious repetition of utterances. This type of feedback disrupts the normal flow of exchanges, and makes the interpretation of two-way messages more, rather than less, complex for non-native English speakers. This problem is demonstrated in a planning discussion on land divisions in Korea. Non-native English speakers act as consultants with a native English speaker in the role of major.

NS: Okay...let me ask you something. In America, we have fifty states--in Korea, you have how many? (6.78 sec.)

NNS: We don't have states. (.47 sec.)

NS: Areas? Regions? Kingdoms? (2.19 sec.)

NS: What are they called? Provinces? (2.3 sec.)

NNS: Provinces. (.32 sec.)
NS: Provinces? You have nine in South Korea? (1.70 sec.)
NNS: Yeah. (.21 sec.)
NS: Nine provinces. Okay—now, the cities belong to each province...right? What is the name of the province for Seoul? (10.34 sec.)
NNS: Seoul is its own city, it is not in Korea. (6.8 sec.)
NS: It's not? (.22 sec.)
NS: It's an area, a province by itself, right? (1.4 sec.)
NNS: Right. (.36 sec.)
NS: I wanted to ask you...do you at this point consider North Korea part of your country? Or do you consider it a different part, now? (9.69 sec.)
NNS: Completely different. (.60 sec.)
NS: ...Cause one of these books said...the way they put it was...so that after the war, you probably thought of them as two different countries. (13.95 sec.)
NNS: We don't have any idea about North Korea, so (2.83 sec.)
NS: Yeah, I wondered why you'd put it that way--they made it sound like it was all one country...and I know you have a totally different government--can't even go across. (7.57 sec.)
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NNS: Well...we can go...(.27 sec.)
NS: Can you? (.24 sec.)
NNS: From this year--North Koreans open this section. (12.67 sec.)
NS: Do you have relatives over there? (.89 sec.)
NNS: No...(.25 sec.)
NNS: Maybe grandfather--older ones--not for us. (5.49 sec.)
NS: Yeah...right. I mean older ones. (1.7 sec.)

In the above exchange, of 13 turns taken by the native English speaker seven were repetitious utterances. Non-native English speakers in the consultant role took six turns.

**Elaborative Questioning by Native English Speakers**

Native English speaker dominance is sustained, in part, through a tenacious pattern of elaborative questioning of non-native English speakers during social discourse. This communication occurs in a discussion of cultural aspects of Taiwan, its writing system, and the Cantonese dialect. In this case, two non-native English speakers (male and female) act as consultant (experts) to a native English speaker (female) in the role of major. The female native English speaker takes 16 speaking turns; non-native English speakers take a combined total of 21 speaking turns.
Well...that's it...I'm so confused. Both of you speak Mandarin? (25.93 sec.)

We speak Taiwanese. (.32 sec.)

Taiwanese and Cantonese--they don't have the written systems. You only have one type of character writing. (10.85 sec.)

Closer to Mandarin or Cantonese? (1.33 sec.)

Oh-- (.81 sec.)

We didn't compare those. (1.10 sec.)

Cantonese is one kind of dialect. (2.93 sec.)

There are many provinces in mainland China. And many people from different provinces speak different. (6.29 sec.)

But in Taiwan, there's only one dialect. (1.27 sec.)

Yeah, but some people are from mainland China, so speak Cantonese too. (8.2 sec.)

Oh--Okay! (1.12 sec.)

Also powerful is Cantonese in business in United States. (3.20 sec.)

Mandarin is the only one you write? (1.5 sec.)

Right. (.17 sec.)

If I ask you, what language do you speak? (2.76 sec.)

We don't ever call it Taiwanese--we say Mandarin. (3.78 sec.)
NS: Taiwanese is dialect—right? Cantonese is a
dialect? What else? There's a lot, right? (9.70 sec.)

NNS 1: Yeah! (.23 sec.)

NS: For a long time, I thought Taiwan had its own
language. (1.77 sec.)

NNS 1: China uses a version of simplified...(4.17 sec.)

NNS 2: Explains before Chinese revolution they used
symbols of last couple of thousand years.
Afterwards, they tried to use simple as possible—
two types symbols, but all ancient books have this
type. (18.69 sec.)

NS: Oh! (.23 sec.)

NNS 2: Make easiest. (.35 sec.)

NS: But don't they still have to learn the hard one?
(1.49 sec.)

NNS 2: No. In Taiwan, learn this type easy. But in China,
learn this. Both—nobody learn both. (8.39 sec.)

NS: Oh really! (.26 sec.)

NNS 2: Yeah. China only learn this type. Taiwan only
learn this type. Same system—-but one is
simplified. Original character very difficult to
learn...(4.26 sec.)

Fewer questions asked by the native English speakers in
the above excerpt would have allowed opportunities for the
non-native English speakers to focus on second language skills, and to cognitively construct any elicited content more fully. When native English speakers ask frequent and often superfluous questions, non-native English speakers are virtually constrained to very brief replies, often resulting from ambiguous "information bits" that lack appropriate content depth. The above excerpts taken from discussions of content about five geographic regions and countries demonstrate the communication situations in which native English speakers fail to recognize their responsibility to equally share turns, co-construct talk exchanges, and permit extended discourse explanation from non-native English speakers.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

Interpretation

This study explored the communicative aspects of interactional talk that creates and sustains imbalance in conversational discourse between native and non-native English speakers. The pattern of dominance in turn-taking and turn-time among native English speakers when interacting with non-native English speakers becomes a major influential factor in diminishing non-native English speaker performance in a co-planning context. Second language learners need to socially contribute to conversation, negotiate meaning, and transmit feedback to native English speakers to substantiate comprehensible input and output of the target language; these data document the difficulty of their doing so.

The cultural tours conversational project tasks provided a primary opportunity for native English speakers and non-native English speakers to engage in a learning/teaching talk activity while exploring, discovering, and sharing the various and unique cultures of others. The particular circumstances of touring the five different regions and countries in the study allowed speakers to experience cultures, values, and languages with a broader perspective.

Inherent in the conversational project was the need to display communicative competence through active social discourse. Speakers were encouraged to contribute in talk
exchanges because of their contributory role as a major (presenter of information), or consultant (expert of information). As cultural representatives, all speakers had valuable and extensive subject content to share with others in the consultant role. Therefore, theoretically, the cultural tour context should have generated balanced turn-taking behavior.

Data on interactional competence between native English speakers and non-native English speakers was available via videotape in this study. Non-native English speakers faced challenges in utilizing their speaker rights for talk time because of the aggressive, controlling discourse style of native English speakers. All speakers apparently did not act as if interaction meant co-construction of conversation.

The native/non-native English speaker interaction in this project demonstrated a clear disparity in the balance of active participation of non-native English speakers in this type of discourse. Even in subject areas in which the non-native English speakers could have demonstrated expertise, the native English speakers positioned the non-native English speakers in subordinate speaking status.

Helping the non-native English speakers in developing negotiation competence through interaction received minimal consideration by native English speakers during discourse. Few opportunities were given to non-native English speakers to make conversation repairs, confirmation checks,
clarification requests, or to restructure messages to insure meaning from speaker to speaker. Native speakers needed to use fewer turns and allow more time for non-native English speakers to deliberate.

Equalizing turn-taking continues to be the critical factor in social discourse between native English speakers and non-native English speakers. Native English speakers seem to talk continuously, noticeably uncomfortable with extended pauses and gaps in on-going discourse. Generally, it is within these elements of discourse that the violation of interruption occurs. In an attempt to fill either the pause that occurs within a turn, or to fill a gap that occurs at the end of a turn, the native English speaker self-selects to speak at the same time that another speaker has begun to turn.

Another tactic that native English speakers use to prevent silence in discourse occurs through asking questions to elicit a turn from a selected participant. When native English speakers take a turn, they may extend the length of speaking time by taking multiple turns, or shifting the topic to generate more conversation to replace possible silence. More power turns were taken by native English speakers than by non-native English speakers indicating the dominance and aggressive use of conversational devices, strategies, tactics, and resources employed by native
English speakers to take, hold, defend, and maintain the speaking floor.

Power turns instantly transmit control and a show-of self-determination to coordinate the pattern of turns to the speaker's advantage. The effectiveness of this strategy is the manner in which discourse is maneuvered in an imposed direction which allows the speaker to gain attention, group support, and influence over other speakers.

Conclusion

Based on the extensive data presented from the cultural tours conversational project, the communicative competence of non-native English Speakers in interaction is severely jeopardized by the dominant discourse style of native English speakers. Non-native English speakers are unable to effectively maintain reciprocal speaking turns in interactional talk encounters. In addition, non-native English speakers do not utilize enough power turns to their advantage in obtaining a turn at talk. Native English speakers are not allowing opportunities to develop the second language acquisition of non-native English speakers, nor are they permitting non-native English speakers ways to negotiate meaning through feedback for comprehension. In the category of majors and consultants, the native English speakers assumed positions of expertise and dominance, even though the role portrayed for discussion of content domain
was not considered one of expertise for the native English speaker.

In the category of female and male speakers, the females are able to obtain speaking turns; however, they remain vulnerable to male interruption and a perceived lack of influence in a mixed-gender discourse situation. Ultimately, native English speakers must determine that interactional social discourse is the responsibility of both participants within the dynamics of balanced turn-taking.

Perhaps, the responsibility becomes even greater for the native English speaker to create turn opportunities because of the natural advantage gained through native language familiarity and everyday social usage. It appears obvious that the significance of conversation is to build bridges of communication between speakers for understanding and cooperation within a society and world. The time has arrived to equally share effective and meaningful two-way talk exchanges with speakers of other languages.

Implications for Teaching

Teachers--especially teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages--bear a responsibility for involving non-native English speakers in meaningful, interactive language activities. They must develop curriculum and lesson plans that are interesting and full of language that encourages social interaction. Small group tasks and pair work will stimulate conversations among less dominant speakers. Non-
native English speakers may need to be introduced to assertiveness training to develop communicative and interactive skills and abilities. Workshops which include role-playing, reading aloud skits, poems, and short stories, as well as social discourse among peers, will increase familiarity of resources and strategies for building confidence, and advancing second language proficiency in non-native English speakers.
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## TABLE 1

**BREADBASKET OVERVIEW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking Char.</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total Time</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total Turns</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Power Turns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2
ECOTOPIA OVERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking Char.</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total Time</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total Turns</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Power Turns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4551</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 4551 100%  512 100%  147
### TABLE 3
KOREA OVERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking Char.</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total Time</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total Turns</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Power Turns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2781</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2781</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Char.</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Total Time %</td>
<td>Total Turns %</td>
<td>Power Turns %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TAIWAN OVERVIEW**

**TABLE 4**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking Char.</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total Time</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total Turns</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Power Turns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 6
PERCENTAGE TOTAL OF REGIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking Char.</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total Time</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total Turns</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Power Turns</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2276</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13885</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2956</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OF TIME</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>TOTAL OF TURNS</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>TOTAL POWER TURNS</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13885</td>
<td></td>
<td>2956</td>
<td></td>
<td>399</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8860</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5225</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>13885</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2956</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>9631</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>4254</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>Non-native</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>13885</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2956</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>7782</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>6103</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>13885</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2956</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TOTAL TURNS
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Native Speaker 62%
Non-Native Speaker 38%
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Male Speaker 31%
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Native Speaker 65%
Non-Native 35%
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Major Role 52%
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Male Speaker 35%
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Non-Native Speaker 31%
TOTAL POWER TURNS
By Major Role vs. Consultant Role
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