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ABSTRACT

AN ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY OF AN ESL PRE-MBA CASE STUDY CLASSROOM: THE PROCESS OF CONCEPTUALIZING AND DEFINING AUTHENTICITY BY LEARNERS AND INSTRUCTORS

MAY 1999

RICARDO SABUUR ABDUL-KAREEM, B.A., SAINT JOHN’S UNIVERSITY

M.I.M., AMERICAN GRADUATE SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL MANAGEMENT

Ed.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Professor Jerri Willett

This study is an inquiry into the second language learning process of non-native English speaking adults who are preparing to enter graduate business programs in the U.S. or other English speaking countries. Specifically, I examine the process of negotiation of authenticity in communication by learners and the instructor. I begin with an initial understanding that authenticity does not reside in materials or tasks, but in how learners and instructors negotiate it (Gee, 1990).

I explore and develop a broad definition of authenticity as being a perception structured and influenced by learner’s needs, the instructor’s perception of the target skills and needs of the participants, and the learners’ own construction or negotiation of what they perceive to be appropriate in the target discourse. The site of this study was the ESL
Business Case Discussion Class offered at Harvard Summer School. Using ethnography of communication research as a guide for research methodology, I used participant observation, note-taking, videotaping, and interviewing as sources of gathering data over three years (1990-1992.)

There were seven conclusions of this study:
- Authenticity manifests itself and is negotiated over phases, there is a gradual process or development of communication skills, development of language skills seems to reach a plateau, reflection time enhances learning and acquisition, learners construct and accept multiple identities, tensions stimulate negotiation of learning and conceptualization of authenticity, and scaffolding generally facilitates, but can hinder the carrying out of authentic communication.

Implications of the conclusions are that understanding the process of negotiating authenticity will allow teacher educators to inform teachers on ways to improve teaching and increase learning and acquisition by structuring the learning environment to facilitate it. The 'preparation' case study class gives students the opportunity to create an authentic learning environment in which they explore all of the things that might assist them or get in the way of their success in the 'real
event. This kind of scaffolded or sheltered content class is important, but it does not take away the responsibility of the 'real case study instructors' to scaffold second language learners.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDY

This study is an inquiry into the second language learning process of non-native English speaking adults who are preparing to enter graduate business programs in the U.S. or other English speaking countries. One of the difficulties that international students face is the inability to participate actively in the oral discussion sessions of many business school classes. Graduate students who were excellent students, competent business professionals, and fluent speakers in their home countries and who may have strong content and quantitative knowledge, can find themselves feeling quite incompetent during aggressive discussion in the American graduate school classroom. According to the coordinator of the Harvard ESL Business Case Discussion Program, it was in the early 1980's that the Harvard Business School instructors expressed their concern that many international students were not successful in class discussions. They felt that these students needed to be taught the skills of how to use English, even though they may have studied English for years and achieved a high score on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL).

As a consequence of these concerns, the Harvard Business School asked the English as a Second Language Program, now a unit of the Division of Continuing
Education at Harvard, to develop a course to address this problem. This course was to give their newly accepted international students the communication skills and knowledge of behaviors needed to more effectively participate in a case discussion class. In this preparation course, there was to be an emphasis on oral skills, but writing skills would also be included.

The Harvard Business School (HBS) recommended this course to all of its international admittees, however, in some cases, they required certain incoming international students to take this summer course before beginning the MBA program in the fall as a condition of acceptance.

It was after completing my pilot study at this site that I identified and chose to investigate the meaning and role of authenticity as one of the primary factors in influencing language and communication skill acquisition. The first realization of a concept of authenticity occurred when I observed that students were calling for teachers and the institutions to be accountable for the learning that took place. They wanted to be sure that what they were learning in the classroom was going to help them be successful in their target community, be it a job or, in this case, graduate school.

In the field of second language acquisition, the understanding of “authenticity” has evolved from its early and limited use in reference to materials. With
the increase of discussion on discourse theory (Gee, 1990,) language acquisition is described as being more than the learning of word and grammar, but to also be the learning of how to use the language. I expanded a limited definition of authenticity that referred to real materials or materials of a target discourse that are not simplified for non-native speakers to a broader meaning that included the materials, activities, language behaviors and the physical environment of a target community.

A broader definition of authenticity is that it is a perception structured and influenced by learners' needs, the instructor's perception of the target skills and needs of the participants, and the learners' own construction or negotiation of what they perceive to be appropriate in the target discourse. It is this negotiation and construction of realities by students among themselves and the teacher that this dissertation will focus on. It is a study of the interaction and learning process around issues in negotiating authenticity that takes place in the ESL/Business Case Discussion course. I gathered ethnographic data through participant observation in this classroom over a three-year period.
Statement of the Problem

The focus of this study is to examine the process of communication that occurs as students acquire the skills needed to prepare for and participate in a classroom that has been designed as an English as a Second Language/Master’s of Business Administration (ESL/MBA) preparation class for international students. This class simulates a business school case-study discussion class. The instructor uses unsimplified authentic materials, (Davies, 1989) in the form of unmodified theoretical readings and business case studies. Unsimplified means that the materials have not been modified for teaching purposes. For example, a teacher can use a journal article, but may give explanations of specific terms or provide a vocabulary list, but the text used in the content class is not changed for the language class. This kind of support is called scaffolding. Scaffolding refers to the learning support activities or strategies provided by the instructor and sometimes by other students to assist the learning process.

It allows students to work with materials or perform in the ways of a discourse, which require a higher level of skills than they presently possess. Class activities and assignments simulate processes and experiences of an actual graduate business school class.
In such a preparation class, a culture is constructed by the learners based on what they conceive and communicate as being realistic or authentic to a specific target situation. This is because their language output and behavior reflect their perception and meaning making of an evolving understanding of what they are and think that they should be learning.

This study examines the learners negotiation of this culture, the process of negotiation, and intervening variables that influence the construction of an agreed upon discourse. This negotiation of learning produces tensions that aid in the construction of the classroom discourse, which provides the learners a bridging experience to the target discourse.

In addition, it is the intent of this study to explore the process of how discourse evolves and how students conceptualize their own definition of authenticity in relation to the target discourses of business school or a professional setting.

Statement of the Purpose

This study examines the role of authenticity in the second language acquisition process and how students and teachers jointly define what is authentic for them in the classroom, be it language usage, a specific activity, or a type of behavior. It thereby provides a better understanding of how the classroom community develops its
communication/ language skills and knowledge of ways of using the language.

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study of an English for Specific Purposes (ESP) classroom is that there is a paucity of research done on ESP for business classrooms, and in particular, on the use of business cases for language instruction. This research will focus on the role of authenticity in language learning, how it is defined, and how the students and teachers interpret what is authentic.

If teacher educators can better understand the process learners go through in constructing a cultural reality, they can then prepare teachers to effectively create more positive learning situations. The goal would be to help teachers understand that simply using "real" materials does not necessarily make a situation authentic, but that what is important is how the instructor uses the materials and the scaffolding to facilitate learning.

In addition, teacher educators want to understand the second language acquisition process and the factors that influence it. When teacher educators understand the possible positive or negative impact of certain factors on learning, they can use this knowledge to enhance their
instruction of teachers in training on how to plan their materials, activities, and strategies of teaching. The whole purpose of the training is to maximize the transference of skills from the classroom to actual usage in target situations.

This study should be significant for second language teachers interested in second language acquisition in general, as well as those with an interest in adult learners and learners of English for Specific, Academic, and Business Purposes. Many studies have been done in the K-12 classroom but there is still limited research on adult and ESP learners. This study can contribute to the fields of second language acquisition, adult learning, and English for Specific Purposes. The results of this study also have implications for the K-12 classroom, especially in regards to content ESL instruction.

Philosophic Assumptions

The first assumption that I make is that reality is a joint construction by the participants and the instructor and is not just a transmitted phenomenon from the instructor (Gee, 1990)

Secondly, I assume that authenticity facilitates learning because students who think that what they are learning is real and valuable for future usage or
application will be highly motivated to learn (Crusius, 1991).

The third assumption is that the participants construct reality primarily through the language and its use in interaction (Gee, 1990).

A fourth assumption is that the nature of interaction and negotiation changes over time as the language level of the community develops (Gee, 1990).

The fifth assumption is that the course designer, identified the target situation, the Harvard graduate business school classroom, completed a skills assessment, and considered the needs or requests expressed by students. For example, a few years ago, students finishing the course suggested in their final written evaluations that they would like to have had practice writing memos in the program. This request could have been motivated by students’ experience in business in their own countries or because they heard that it is necessary to do this in the graduate school. It is hard to know the source of the request, however, the course designer added a writing component to the course for the next year.

The instructor interprets what is authentic based on his experiences and impressions of the target situation. This interpretation was also based on research, which included interviews, questionnaires, and observation. The students' definition of what is authentic for the
target situation may be similar or different to that of the teacher in many aspects. However, in most cases, the participants have not experienced the target culture and are only constructing their ideas of what is authentic during the progress of the class. Nevertheless, students come with expectations about what is authentic, even though they may not have experienced the target culture. Consequently, these expectations play a role in the negotiation of learning and experiences that occur in the classroom.

**Definitions of Terms**

1. Discourse - The language and way of communicating in a community or culture.
2. Ethnography of Communication - Research method used for researching language and behaviors used in communication.
3. Discourse/Conversation Analysis - Methods of analyzing transcribed language used in conversation or discussion.
4. Discourse Community - The group of people of a specific language, culture or of a common affinity, such as members of a church or patrons of a coffee shop.
5. Scaffolding - Materials, activities, and other teaching strategies provided by the teacher to
help students perform tasks that are above their skill level or that they could not perform in a timely manner without this assistance. Scaffolding is also provided by fellow students in the various ways that a stronger student helps a weaker student communicate or perform a task.

Research Questions

1. How do students and teachers negotiate a shared agreement of what is authentic communication in the context of this graduate school preparation class for non-native speakers of English?

2. What is the nature of the identities and relations that are constructed in discourse and how do participants: students and teacher, evaluate these constructions in terms of authenticity and how these evaluations change over the course of the semester?

3. When do points of tension or conflict in constructing communication occur in the context, what seems to facilitate or hinder them, and what is their positive or negative effect on the learning and acquisition process?
4. What types of scaffolding develop or are provided by teacher or students and how do the different types of scaffolding facilitate or hinder the negotiation of the communication over time?

Limitations of the Study

This research focuses primarily on how students negotiate authenticity in the context of an ESL/Business case study course.

I explore the influences of the materials, activities, assignments or techniques used in the process of negotiating authenticity. However, this study does not evaluate the effectiveness of the classroom teaching and learning. It is not a course evaluation. Those concerns are beyond the scope of this study, but definitely merit research in the future.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

What is English for Specific Purposes?

I propose to study the process of negotiation of authenticity in communication. The context for this study is an academic graduate school level ESL classroom which is a preparation course for internationals entering American graduate schools of business or who are business professionals seeking communication skills development. In order for the reader to understand the context of the site and the role that authenticity plays, it is important to briefly describe what is the field of English for Specific Purposes (ESP and its place in second language teaching and research.

English for Specific Purposes (ESP) is a sub-field of the broader field ordinarily referred to as English as a Second Language (ESL). The development and application of techniques specific to the field of ESP have developed over the last thirty or so years as specific needs of learners have been identified.

Basically, ESP follows the same methodologies used in general language teaching. Thus, it is not different in kind from any other form of language teaching, but it differs in its approach to course content and methodology. As Hutchinson and Waters (1987) stated, in ESP all decisions related to the operation of the course are based on the learners' reasons for learning.
Robinson (1980) pointed out that General English instruction refers to any instruction in which language is the principal subject matter and purpose of the course. This would include courses generally focused on aspects of daily life, culture, and literary topics. In contrast to this, Mackay (1978) defines ESP as being used to refer to the teaching and learning of a foreign language for a clearly utilitarian purpose (cited in Hutchinson & Waters, 1987). There are a number of other terms and acronyms used to refer to the same idea, such as the general designations Language for Specific Purposes (LSP) and Special Purpose Language Teaching (SP-LT), and the more specific designations English for Science and Technology (EST), English for Academic Purposes (EAP), English for Vocational or Occupational Purposes (EVP/EOP), English for Specific Purpose - Business or English for Business Purposes (ESP-B/EBP), and so forth. Robinson (1980) noted that the sort of skill taught in this type of course can range from those needed for literacy and basic life activities to sophisticated preparation for academic, technical or other professional work.

As early as 1977, Strevens pointed out that two absolute components of ESP are needs assessment and discourse analysis (cited in Johns & Dudley-Evans, 1991). Other necessary features of the ESP course proposed by David Carver (1983) are authentic material, simulation
and role play, and some degree of self direction. He notes that authentic materials serve as a point of reference for the learners, making them aware from the beginning of the target behavior and thereby enabling them to build up strategies of self assessment. The use of role play, simulations and tasks also help ESP achieve its purpose-related orientation. All of these activities give students an opportunity to use the language for real, or close to real, purposes, and possibly to see the link between that and why they are learning or doing certain exercises (Kucer, 1991).

ESP has tended to be a needs and materials led movement, however with Hutchinson and Waters' support of learner-centered bias, there is an increased interest in methods (Johns, A. & Dudley-Evans, 1991). In fact, Hutchinson and Waters (1987), make a distinction between learner-centered or learning-centered approaches.

According to Hutchinson and Waters (1987), the learner-centered approach focuses on the point that learning is totally determined by the learner, as a result of a teacher's identification of a need or the learner's expressed desire.

Hutchinson and Waters (1987) suggested that the learning-centered approach is the preferable one because the concern that teachers have is to maximize learning. The learner is one factor to consider in the learning process, but not the only one. The fact that we are
trying to match our teaching with the needs of the students makes the question of how can we facilitate the learners' acquisition of the skills that s/he wants or needs in order to function in a target situation implicit in the definition of ESP and needs to be considered at every stage of preparation and execution of the ESP class.

The role of the ESP teacher is also a factor in language learning. The ESP practitioner is distinguished from the general English teacher in terms of what s/he has to consider when doing needs analysis, syllabus design, materials writing/adaptation and evaluation.

**ESP And Authenticity? Why Look at Them?**

Underlying all of the key characteristics of ESP is the issue of authenticity. In fact, ESP defines authenticity through its practices and integration of factors which contribute to learning. These factors of language learning are materials, environment, activities, language, social behavior, skills of using the discourse, evaluation of students, and students perception of what is being taught and learned (Kucer, 1991). The issue of authenticity manifests itself when ever we talk about any of the factors presented above. Now, let me discuss in more depth the concept of authenticity and how it relates to the context of my study.
Introduction to Authenticity

The topic of authenticity has two sources of interest for me. First, it comes out of my research on ESP, particularly in the discussion of how teachers need to choose appropriate materials and teaching activities that will give students the skills they will use in a target environment or for a particular purpose. The second motivation to explore this topic comes as a result of my experience teaching and observing in the ESL Business Case Study Program at Harvard University for three semesters (Summers 1990, 1991 and Spring 1992). This course was originally designed to be a preparation course for international students who needed to sharpen their oral communication skills before they entered the Harvard MBA program. Over the ten years of the program's existence, more and more students who were planning to go to other MBA programs or those who just wanted to develop their communication skills began coming to participate in the course. One of the initial questions that I raised as a result of my observations was how was task based learning being applied in the teaching of this course. Later, I shifted my attention to how were the course materials, activities, and other learning experiences being used to prepare students for the Harvard MBA program in particular. My observations and questions raised during three terms, motivated me to explore more
in depth the concept of authenticity and its meaning for the field of English for Specific Purposes.

For the dissertation research, I am exploring the issue of authenticity beyond its general application to a more wholistic view of its relation to many of the components that influence language learning. In the section, What Is Authenticity?, I discuss different definitions of authenticity, especially, as they relate to language teaching. In the section, "Four Insights on Authenticity," I examine four different views on authenticity and look at examples in the contexts of each view. Finally, in the Summary and Conclusions, I pull together my thoughts on the discussion of others and my experiences to build a definition of authenticity and what it means for the ESP teacher. As a result of this research and my experiences at Harvard University, this topic of authenticity in the ESP class of English preparation for graduate studies in business or economics is the context for my dissertation research.

What is Authenticity?

Authenticity is mentioned often in ESP literature. Honeyfield (1977) in Brinton (1989) referred to authenticity to distinguish materials not originally written for language teaching purposes. It is in regards to texts that you most often hear the term "authenticity"
used. Morrow (1977) defined authentic materials as real language, produced by a real speaker for a real audience to convey a real message. There are a number of authors such as Grosse (1988), Bernhardt (1988), and Morrow (1977) who advocate the use of authentic materials as being important in the teaching of ESP (cited in Grosse, 1988). Carver (1983) stated that the necessary features of ESP are authentic material, simulation, role play and some degree of self direction. Robinson (1980) referred to authentic data and says that it is often used with ambiguity. Realia is an earlier word used in the field to define authentic materials. One question related to this topic is what is the authentic material itself and the second question is how to use this material? Robinson (1980) asked if we are confusing authenticity with relevance? He says that you can have realia which is not relevant to a particular class of students and you can use relevant materials that are not authentic. (Note: Relevant materials refers to materials that are adapted or simplified for use in the class room setting. Widdowson, 1979, cited in Robinson (1980) suggests a misuse of the term authentic. If a student is presented authentic language, but cannot work with it, this is a misuse of the term. If communication fails because of the student's imperfect knowledge of the language, then the language in question is not authentic. Widdowson advocated construction of reading texts within
the competence of the students concerned. The constructed texts will achieve true communication with the students.

Authenticity is a function of the interaction between the reader/hearer and the text which incorporates the intentions of the writer/speaker. Simplification is the pedagogic analogue of the linguist's idealization of data: The teacher simplifies by selecting and ordering the linguistic phenomena he is to deal with so as to ease the task of learning (Widdowson, 1979, cited in Robinson, 1980).

In line with Widdowson's thinking, Alan Davies (1984) in Alderson (1984) discussed simplicity in terms of language. He looks at simple language, simplified language and simplification, which is deliberate and done for pedagogic purposes. Simple language would be like a pidgin which is the result over time of speakers inadequate second language acquisition. A pidgin is simple because it has a very narrow range of functions, its use is restricted to a few activities (Ferguson, 1977, cited in Davies, 1984).

Davies explained that speakers deliberately simplify their normal language in order to make communication possible with certain interlocuteurs. In line with that thinking, Ferguson (1971) described two kinds of simplified language. One is where functions are restricted by mothers to children or teachers to
students. The second kind is where language forms are reduced as in "baby talk" and "foreigner talk" (cited in Davies, 1984).

Simplification has a unique pedagogic purpose and can be seen as a process in which the teacher or his/her agent consciously adjusts the language presented to the learner (Davies and Widdowson, 1974). In the case of foreign language learning, all materials, including spoken, may be simplifications. The term is often used to refer to reading materials. In the case of the first language student, it refers most often to reading materials.

Widdowson (1978) makes a distinction between simplified versions of texts and simple accounts (cited in Davies, 1984). Simplified versions are passages which are derived from genuine instances of discourse by a process of lexical and syntactic substitution. A simple account, on the other hand represents not an alternative textualization of a given discourse but a different discourse altogether (Ibid.). The discourse itself is changed to suit a certain kind of reader. Widdowson (1978) stated that a simplified version always has a source script and simple accounts have a source but no script (cited in Davies, 1984).

Widdowson (1978) stated that simple accounts are to be preferred to simplified versions in that a simple account is a genuine instance of discourse, designed to
meet a communicative purpose. A simplified version is not genuine discourse, it is a contrivance for teaching language.

Lautamattii (1978) argued that simplified texts are used in the teaching of foreign language reading comprehension as a ladder towards less simplified and finally authentic texts.

Authenticity is not a quality residing in instances of language but is a quality which is bestowed upon them, created by the response of the receiver. Authenticity in this view is a function of the interaction between the reader/hearer and the text which incorporates the intentions of the writer/speaker (Widdowson, 1979, cited in Davies, 1984).

With a different perspective on authenticity, Breen (1985) talked about four types of authenticity and related them to language teaching. They are:

1. Authenticity of the texts for which we may use and input data for our learners
2. Authenticity of the learners' own interpretation of such texts.
3. Authenticity of tasks conducive to language learning
4. Authenticity of the actual situation of language classroom.

From the description of four types of authenticity, we can derive four questions for the language instruction and acquisition.
1. What is an authentic text?
2. For whom is it authentic?
3. For what authentic purpose?
4. In which particular situation?

In Breen's discussion, there was a broad and integrated view of authenticity. Authenticity is not something just dependent on the teacher's selection or creation of texts, but also on the learners' views of what is authentic for them. This discussion considered what kinds of uses or functions the learner would need to have command of. Thus, the teacher has to choose tasks that promote close to real life activity.

Four Other Insights on Authenticity

In addition to relating authenticity to texts, recent developments in theoretical literature suggest that the notion of authenticity needs further unpacking to understand how it should operate in the ESP classroom. There are four other theoretical notions that have informed my thinking about "authentic learning." These notions help me look wholistically at authenticity and to understand what needs to be authentic and how learners are to engage in authentic materials, tasks, language use, and communication activities. These four notions are discourse theory, situated cognition and the culture
of learning, anchored instruction, and philosophical hermeneutics.

**Discourse Theory**

I believe that the issues discussed by social linguists and theorists such as Gee (1990) are relevant to the learning process that occurs in second language learning settings and more specifically, the site of my study.

Discourse theory shows us that joining a social group or culture involves more than developing skills and knowledge. Gee (1990) defined a discourse as a sort of "identity kit" which comes complete with the appropriate costume and instructions on how to act, talk, and often write, so as to take on a particular social role that others will recognize (p. 142). A discourse is a socially accepted association among ways of using language, of thinking, feeling, believing, valuing and of acting that can be used to identify oneself as a member of a socially meaningful group or "social network" or to signal that one is playing a socially meaningful "role". The "ways" in which words are spoken, or the "how" of languages is the discourse system.

In the case of preparing students for Harvard's Business School, we need to ask such things as what attire is necessary and how does one need to act, talk, and even write in order to fit into that discourse.
Gee (1990) further divides discourse into Discourse with a capital "D" and discourse with a little "d". Discourse with a capital "D" is the combinations of saying, writing, doing, being, valuing, and believing. Discourse with a little "d" will be used for connected stretches of language that make sense like conversations, stories, reports, arguments, essays; "discourse" is part of "Discourse" - Discourse with a big "D" is always more than just language. Discourses are ways of being in the world, or forms of life which integrate words, acts, values, beliefs, attitudes, social identities, as well as gestures, glances, body positions and clothes (Gee, 1990).

The Primary Discourse is the language of the place of one's initial socialization. Secondary Discourses are Discourses beyond the primary discourse and are developed in association with, and by having access to and practice. Two discourses can interfere with one another and one discourse can be transferred to another. The key of secondary discourses is that they involve interaction with people with whom one is either not "intimate" or they involve interactions where one is being formal.

To extend this definition to ESP, I can see that ESP is one of many secondary Discourses that a learner will use. Students will need the language for general social communication, as well as, for specific usages, such as
in my study, for the classroom environment or a business situation.

Mastering a Discourse Using Acquisition and Learning

There are two ways people master a discourse, that is either through acquisition or learning. Gee (1990) defined acquisition as a process of acquiring something subconsciously by exposure to models, a process of trial and error, and practice within social groups, without formal teaching. It happens in natural settings which are meaningful and functional in the sense that acquirers know that they need to acquire the thing they are exposed to in order to function and they in fact want to so function. This is how most people come to control their first language.

Learning is a process that involves conscious knowledge gained through teaching, though not necessarily from someone officially designated a teacher, or through certain life experiences that trigger conscious reflection. This teaching or reflection involves explanation and analysis, that is, breaking down the thing to be learned into its analytic parts. It inherently involves attaining, along with the matter being taught, some degree of meta-knowledge about the matter.

Gee (1990) defined literacy as the mastery of or fluent control over a secondary Discourse or fluent
control over secondary discourses involving print. Any Discourse (primary or secondary) is for most people most of the time only mastered through acquisition not learning. However, in addition to the fluent control of a Discourse gained through acquisition, one needs meta-level knowledge, gained from learning, in order to critique one with another one. One needs to be able to criticize a discourse in order to be able to change it. For this reason, we say that literacy is always plural: combining acquired fluency with learned meta knowledge.

One reason for choosing this class as the site of this study is because it presents an excellent example of this plural literacy. The students have the opportunity to practice and acquire some of the communication skills needed for graduate school and at the same time, to learn the mechanics of how to make a presentation, write a report, and prepare an analysis. They also learn specific vocabulary and expressions that will help them perform well in the class discussions. Thus, this sight gives me, the researcher the opportunity to better understand the construction of authenticity.

The Distinction of Teach 1 and Teacha

If mastering a discourse or language for a learner comes by means of acquisition and learning, then it seems reasonable that there are parallel components for the
teacher to facilitate the learning process. These components are called Teachl and Teacha.

Teachl means overt teaching that leads to learning by a process of explanation and analysis that breaks down material into its analytic bits and develops "meta knowledge" of the structure of a given domain of knowledge. Teacha means to apprentice someone in a master-apprentice relationship in a social practice (Discourse) wherein you scaffold their growing ability to say, do, value, believe, within that discourse. Teacha facilitates acquisition. Teacha always precedes teachl if teachl is to be successful. Note: teacha without teachl can lead to successful, but colonized students. My interpretation of the term, "colonized students" is that students can have use of a discourse, but without Teachl, they will never know why something works. Effective teachers are good at both Teacha and Teachl.

Being aware of this concept of Teachl and Teacha is important for this study as I observe the process of negotiation that goes on between the learners and the instructor. I want to observe and identify when Teacha and/or Teachl occurs. I want to note what are the students' reactions or responses.

Also, I want to see what patterns there are when Teacha/Learna or Teachl/Learnl occurs. I will try to judge if the use of either one is by chance or
deliberate. I might not be able to determine this, but I will keep it in mind as I examine the data.

The Need for Apprenticeship in the Acquisition Process

As I mentioned earlier, fluency in a second language is acquired through enculturation (apprenticeship) into social practices through scaffolded and supported interaction. Scaffolding is a term used to refer to the learning aids that a teacher provides to support the students while they are learning the language. In order for students to attain fluency, acquisition must precede learning and apprenticeship must precede teaching.

An instructor can provide opportunities for activities that promote acquisition and allow for apprenticeship. In this study, I looked for examples in the data of this interplay between learning and apprenticeship experiences. For example, as a result of my pilot study at the research site, I observed that the order of instruction activities was: assign a theoretical reading, discuss reading, assign case, discuss case, give guidelines for activity, have activity, group (students and instructor) processes and evaluates performance.

These activities of discussion, presentation, debate, role play, feedback provide the learner occasions for both learning and apprenticing.
Fluency in a Discourse

In comparing fluency in a second language and fluency in a discourse, Gee (1990) defines literacy as the mastery of or fluent control over a secondary Discourse or fluent control over, secondary discourses involving print. In his first theorem of the primary and secondary discourses, he claims that discourses, unlike languages must be mastered in order for someone to be considered as having fluent control over them. Someone can speak English or another language, but not fluently. However, someone cannot engage in a Discourse in a less than fully fluent manner. One's lack of fluency marks one as a non-member of the group that controls this Discourse. Lack of fluency may mark a person as a pretender to the social role. S/he is an outsider with pretenses to being an insider. Gee (1990) stated, "YOU ARE AN APPRENTICE, AN "OUTSIDER", OR A "PRETENDER" (p. 155). There is no in between.

Gee (1990) further expands his definition of fluent control of a discourse to include the need for meta knowledge in his second theorem. As a result, in order to become fully fluent in a discourse, a person needs to acquire the appropriate social practices and uses of language by apprenticing in the target discourse and learning the meta-knowledge of the language. However, as mentioned earlier, acquisition must precede teaching, and apprenticeship must precede learning.
Consequences

One consequence of these theorems is that if a student is not properly apprenticed to the secondary discourses needed for school, the corporate world, etc, s/he will not be able to fully participate in and take full advantage of all the privileges that go with those secondary discourses (Gee, 1990).

Another consequence of these theorems is that sometimes the secondary Discourses conflict with the values in a learner’s primary Discourse. Even though people can acquire various levels of facility in more than one secondary discourse, tensions between various Discourses can exist (Gee, 1990).

True Acquisition of many mainstream Discourses involves, at least while being in them, active complicity with values that conflict with one's home and community based Discourses, especially for many women and minorities (Gee, 1990).

In regards to ESP and the adult learner who is typical of that situation, the conflict of discourses also exists. The adult international student of a pre-college or pre-graduate school ESP program is usually highly educated in his/her first language and this primary discourse is firmly established. Their need or desire to acquire the second language will push them to either suppress or cope with the conflicts they will encounter. How well they adjust to the value conflicts
will affect their rate of language acquisition and acclimation to, as Gee refers to it, the "secondary discourse community". For many, complicity is the price they are willing to pay in order to acquire fluency in the secondary Discourse.

When we talk about authenticity in the ESP classroom, we can see that only using strategies such as focusing on vocabulary or giving students authentic texts with comprehension questions, whether or not they are simplified, falls short of the prolonged apprenticeship described by Gee (1990.) The apprenticeship to a discourse facilitates the acquiring of ways of valuing, being, behaving and thinking in a secondary discourse.

In this study, I wanted to identify when conflicts between discourses occur for the students. As a result, I hoped to better understand the difference between having lack of knowledge of a discourse and having a conflict of values. In addition, I wanted to identify the signals of complicity and non-complicity with the target or negotiated discourse.

Situated Cognition and the Culture of Learning

One effort to help learners acquire the kinds of ways of thinking, valuing talking, etc. needed for entry into numerous secondary discourses has been addressed by a group of scholars who call their work "Situated Cognition and the Culture of Learning."
Another interpretation of authenticity, Cognitive apprenticeship, proposed that teachers try to enculture students into practices through activity and social interaction (Brown, Collins, and Duguid, 1989). Like Breen, they also discussed the difference between the class or school environment and the target environment. They argued for teaching skills with real life applications in mind. They stated that the school environment does not truly represent the "culture" that students will encounter outside of school. These authors proposed that collaborative learning integrated in the apprenticeship will promote skill development in collective problem solving, display of multiple roles, confrontation of ineffective strategies and misconceptions and provision of collaborative work skills.

Anchored Instruction

As a follow up to the Brown, Collins, and Duguid (1989) discussion on situated cognition, The Cognition and Technology Group (1990) argued that situated cognition provides a useful framework that emphasizes the importance of focusing on everyday cognition, authentic tasks, and the value of in context apprenticeship training. They claim that anchored instruction provides a way to recreate some of the advantages of apprenticeship training in a formal education setting.
The underlying theme of their argument is that students seem to develop critical thinking skills when they are involved in tasks and can see how their skills can be applied to solve some problem. The students can see the value of what might be otherwise be called rote learning.

The ideas of cognitive apprenticeship and anchored instruction are also relevant to this study because the underlying philosophy of the case method used in the site is to promote the use of problem solving skills by using real life situations presented in the form of written cases. The difference is that anchored instruction proposes the use of video as the main medium or source text and in the site of my study, written text is the main medium of presenting the situation and video is used as a secondary source. However, the goal of providing opportunities for apprenticeship training is the same. Because learning and doing are intertwined in both anchored instruction and the case method, a common result in the process is that the nature of problems and scaffolding change over time. As a result, the type of assistance will change as the learners get closer to the target community’s way of knowing, valuing, believing, talking, etc.

In addition to the view of the Cognition and Technology group, Clarke (1989) supported the idea of the importance of authenticity of tasks to learners. He
states that the instructor needs to engage the learner's interest by relating the task to his/her own life and by providing a purpose for undertaking the activity (p. 83).

There are two difficulties that must be taken into account when talking about the process of negotiating authenticity and the process of acquiring a way of communicating with a second discourse. One is that newcomers to a secondary discourse do question what they are acquiring and why (Gee, J. 1990). If the new discourse makes no sense to the learners then they will not engage in the activities in authentic ways which may prevent teachers from being able to provide appropriate scaffolding. If they do not already "identify" with (see the activities as authentic) and aim to be a member of the discourse, they will not acquire the necessary ways of behaving, talking etc. Gee (1990), Crusius (1991), and the Cognition and Technology Group (1990) all point to the need to start with interests and needs of the learners and the larger goals for what they are doing (i.e. Jasper and Sherlock project), provide explicit talk about subtle cultural cues and behaviors and strategies for doing them (e.g. Gee’s mushfaking), and to help them critically reflect on what they are learning and doing (Crusius, 1991.)
Philosophical Hermeneutics

Philosophical Hermeneutics, as described by Crusius (1991) looks at authenticity in terms of the learning and teaching process.

The teaching process is an effort to open a space where genuine engagement is a little less rare and a little more sustaining. In teaching, we have to develop authentic relationships with our students, so as to engage in dialogue with them. We want to overcome the passive alienation our educational system promotes by managing students rather than interacting with them.

If instructors really want students to think for themselves, as is often claimed, classical dialectic provides a powerful instrument, the basic questions of which are relatively easy to teach and for students to apply on their own. Classical dialectic is fundamentally an effort to specify how opinions may be questioned (Crusius, 1991).

Thus Philosophical Hermeneutics does not refer to authenticity as specific tools in the classroom such as the materials, activities or the language used, but refers to the process of learning and teaching. It proposes that students should be provided the opportunity to think, interpret and reflect on the discourse that they encounter.

For this study, I wanted to see how this process of learning and teaching is negotiated and develops over
time. In reflecting on ESL teaching, it seems to me that the language of the texts and of the classroom is authentic when and if the students are able to understand it, react to it, use it, and even develop further thinking on the topics discussed. This thinking seems to justify the use of simplified language and texts and is in line with Widdowson (1978) and Davies (1984) who support the use of simplified language in order to make communication possible with students at their level of competence (cited in Davies, 1984).

The second difficulty to consider for the negotiation of acquisition and negotiation of authenticity is that the type of assistance depends on the context and changing needs of students. The scaffolding (learning support strategies) in the classroom may not be the same as those that occur in the target contexts. There is a constant tension and flux between the scaffolding and authentic context and activity. Authenticity must be negotiated during the prolonged apprenticeship and will change.

In my study, the ESL Business Case Study class is an apprenticeship situation where those who do not have the prerequisite "Primary and Secondary Discourses" can acquire enough of the ways of thinking, believing, and talking to gain access to the Harvard Business School Case Study classes, which in turn is an apprenticeship for entry into the corporate world. The literature
review suggests some important questions about this situation if we are to understand the role of authentic learning in the ESP classroom. These questions are an extension of questions asked in Chapter 1. For example, to respond to question 1, which asks how students and teachers negotiate a shared agreement of what is authentic communication, I examined what kinds of problems, tools, materials, ways of thinking, talking, valuing are set up for the learners and how did this situation change over time as the learners acquired these ways of communicating.

Also related to question #1, I attempted to identify how learners engaged these tools, materials, ways of thinking, or valuing and what of these same resources did learners bring to the situation.

Identifying how learners and teachers together negotiate meaning using these tools, materials, ways of thinking, or valuing and seeing how these negotiations change over time helps me understand the nature of the identities and relations that are constructed in the discourse and how the participants evaluate these constructions in terms of authenticity as asked in question number 2.

The third research question asks when do points of tension occur? I identified and examined five areas of tension in the learning process. One point of tension that I examined is the nature of the tension produced
based simply on the characteristics of the instructors. The second instances of tension that I looked at relate to moments of negotiation of language and communication skills. The third point of tension I explored is that between the learners' own primary discourses and those to which they are being apprenticed. I looked at the role of cultural identification as the students dealt with different discourses of home, class, and the target communities, which in this study are two: the MBA class and the business world. A fourth tension that I explored is the situation where students reach a comfortable level of ability to communicate amongst themselves, but do not improve beyond that level. I tried to understand why they don't improve and tried to consider strategies to counter that. The fifth occurrence of tension that I identified is related to issues of gender. The question becomes, how do females acquire skills and language when the expectations of them as females are different in the new culture from the behavior expectations of their native culture and primary discourse?
CHAPTER 3
DESIGN OF THE STUDY AND RESEARCH METHODS APPROACH

Research Perspective: Ethnography of Communication

Since I am interested in understanding the process that occurs as students and teachers negotiate and construct what is an authentic form of communication for them and their own culture, I need to use a method that will allow me to do that. Ethnography and more specifically, ethnography of communication (EC) or ethnography of speaking (Philipsen, 1977) permits me to study the classroom community and the use of language as a way to understand the process of social construction that occurs during the series of interactions between the students and students, and the students and the teacher.

Ethnography of communication is a method which combines the research benefits of ethnographic research, which enable us to observe the culture of a community, and the benefits of communication research, which allow us to look at how people communicate with one another within a particular culture. It is the language that people use and how they use it with each other that I am interested in analyzing. Included with this language and language use are behaviors that accompany the conversation.
This method allows me to study the social construction of the language and acceptable ways of communicating and being in this particular situation. In this case, I want to see how the class interprets authenticity of language, language usage, and behaviors and the process they go through to establish language, usage, and behaviors that are authentic for them in their classroom community.

Carbaugh (1994) writes about (EC) ethnography of communication referring to the pioneers in the field such as Philipsen and Hymes. He defines EC as an approach to human communication with its own philosophy and methodology. Furthermore, EC is committed to discovering the distinctive communicative means that particular people use, on particular occasions, and thus to exploring the distinctive means in their natural environments in those particular places (Philipsen, 1989a, cited in Carbaugh, 1994). To understand the communicative life of the people is a primary objective of ethnographic studies of communication.

Assumptions that are made in EC are that everywhere there is communication; a system at work. In addition, there is cultural meaning and social organization everywhere, thus the communication system is at least partly constitutive of socio-cultural life (Philipsen, 1992, 7-16, cited in Carbaugh, 1994).
Ethnographic studies of communication demonstrated that when there is a communication pattern, there is some systemic organization at work. Pattern use reflects social life and a community's system of communication.

Communication is a socio-cultural performance. Philipsen (1992) says, to "speak" is fundamentally to speak culturally (cited in Carbaugh, 1994). Logically following this flow: communication is meaning making. Meanings are made from the participant's point of view and generally this point of view has to do with their particular cultural orientations. As a result, communication evokes a cultural meaning system. Communication is a way of acting, interpreting, and reflecting and constitutes part of social and cultural life.

Ethnography makes certain claims about communication. The first claim is that communication is organized in a place by people. It is an 'emic' kind of claim. It is a description of the practice and an interpretation of what the practice means to those who participate with it, what it enables for them and what it constrains them from doing.

A second claim of ethnography is that it builds on the basic descriptive work about communication practices, and identifies commonalities across these practices. This is the more 'etic' or more abstract claim.
Hymes (1994) describes ethnography of communication as trying to encourage studies that are ethnographic in basis and communicative in the range and kind. These studies are ethnographic analyses of communicative conduct (cited in Carbaugh, 1994).

Dell Hymes (1994) says that ethnographies of communication encourage studies that are ethnographic in basis and communicative in the range and kind (cited in Carbaugh, 1994). Carbaugh (1994) describes Hymes’ strategy of analysis by using the word SPEAKING as a mnemonic, which stands for:

1. Situation: setting and scene
2. Participants: personalities, social positions or statuses
3. Ends: goals and outcomes
4. Acts: message content, form, sequences
5. Key: tone or mode
6. Instrumentality: channel, media
7. Norms: of interaction and interpretation
8. Genre: native and formal

Hymes (1994) refers to these strategies as notions. He describes them as ways of speaking, fluent speaker, speech situation, speech event, speech act, components of speech events and acts, rules(relations) of speaking, and functions of speech.

The fluent speaker is the person who has the knowledge and is unimpeded in its usage (cv. Chomsky,
1965). The ability of the speakers must be part of the ethnography (cited in Hymes, 1994).

The speech community is a community sharing knowledge of rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech. We also need notions such as language field, speech field, and speech network. The speech community in this study was the ESL Business Case Program as a separate community from the general ESL Intensive Program community.

The speech situation refers to situations that serve as contexts for the manifestation of activity. In the context of this study, the Case Discussion Class and the Skills Hour would qualify as speech situations.

The speech event is restricted to activities, or aspects of activities, that are directly governed by rules or norms for the use of speech. Speech events identified in this site were: the case discussions, the bargaining sessions, the presentation sessions, the theoretical reading discussion sessions, the roundtable sessions, and the grand bargaining session.

The Speech act is the minimal term of the set: event, situation, and act. The components of speech events and acts are the following:

1. Message form - the consideration of how things are said and not just the content of what is said.
2. Message content is the topic or change of topic. Message form and content are components of "act sequence".

3. Setting is the time and place of a speech act.

4. Scene is the "psychological setting", or the cultural definition of an occasion as a certain type of scene.

5. Speaker is the participant.

6. Addressee can also be the speaker.

7. Hearer or audience can be the addressee or third party.

8. Addressee is receiving the message of the speaker.

9. Purposes - outcomes, expected outcomes

10. Purposes - goals

11. Key provides for the tone, manner, or spirit in which an act is done.

12. Channels can be oral, written, telegraphic, or semaphore.

13. Forms of speech often uses the term "code" to refer to mutual intelligibility and the term "variety" when use is in question.

14. Norms of interaction implicate analysis of social structure and social relationships, generally in a community.

15. Norms of interpretation implicate the belief system of a community.
16. Genres refers to categories of speech events, e.g. oration, lecture, presentation, etc.

Rules of speaking can be noted when there is a shift in any components of speaking.

Functions of speech suggest that the analysis of speaking is a means to the understanding of human purposes, needs, and their satisfaction.

The descriptive theory of Hymes (1972) is used as a way to describe communication in its contexts. It can describe communication practices. In addition, it can be used to interpret the cultural status or participant view. It can also be used to develop communication explanations. I am using this theory as a guide in describing and interpreting the communication that occurs in this community.

There are three recent developments that are influencing research in EC. They are cultural communication theory, communication theory and cultural interpretive theory.

The Cultural Communication Theory

The cultural communication theory is based on Gerry Philipsen's 1987 (cited in Carbaugh, 1994) essay titled, "The prospect for cultural communication." This essay contributes four ideas to the thinking in the EC community:
First, Philipsen proposes the study of cultural communication systems that elaborate "individual" impulses and some that elaborate "communal constraints." The basic idea is that there is an attempt to have a "healthy balance between forces of individualism and community" (249) (Carbaugh, 1994).

The second contribution of Philipsen is the idea of communal function (CF) which draws attention to how people constitute communal communication with their communication. Communal function "identifies communication as a means for linking individuals into communities of shared identity" (Philipsen, 1989b, cited in Carbaugh, 1994).

As his third contribution to thinking in ethnographic communication, Philipsen (1987) presents three generic cultural forms that can serve as interpretive devices for analyzing the various ways in which the communal function is communicated. They are ritual, myth, and social drama (cited in Carbaugh, 1994).

1. Ritual gives structure to communicative sequences
2. Myth provides communally potent narrative resources that an individual can use to "dignify and give coherence to life."
3. Social drama is a processual form in four phases through which cultural codes are violated, negotiated and revised, or reasserted.
Turner (1974) describes social dramas as processual units that represent sequences of social events, which seen retrospectively by an observer, can be shown to have a temporal structure (p. 35.) The focus of temporal structures are "goals," which include social goals. The study of temporal structures involves the study of the communication process, including the source of pressures to communicate within and among groups. This leads inevitably to the study of symbols, signs, signals and tokens, verbal and non verbal that people employ in order to attain personal and group goals (pp. 35-40.)

Turner (1974) describes the four phases of a social drama as follows:

1. Breach of regular, norm governed social relations occurs between persons or groups within the same system of social relations.

2. Crisis phase or "escalation of crisis." This is where the breach affects the widest set of relations to which the conflicting parties belong.

3. Redressive actions are certain adjustive and redressive "mechanisms," informal or formal; institutionalized or ad hoc, brought into operation. The type and complexity of these actions depend on factors such as the depth and shared social significance of the breach, the social inclusiveness of the crisis, the nature of the social group with which the breach took place, and the degrees of its
autonomy with reference to wider or external systems of social relations.

4. The reintegration phase results in either the reintegration of the disturbed social group or the social recognition and legitimization of an irreparable schism between the contesting parties.

The fourth contribution of ideas of Philipsen was the concept of speech codes. Looking at speech codes helps ethnographers of communication identify a correlation between culture and speaking, such that (1) a distinctive culture carries with it (minimally) a distinctive speech code, (2) a distinctive speech code implicates models for personhood, society, and strategic action, (3) the cultural significance of communication depends partly upon interpretations of these spoken implications (of personhood, society, and strategic action), and (4) such "codes are inextricably woven into speaking" (Philipsen, 1992, 136, cited in Carbaugh, 1994).

The Communication Theory

The second recent development in ethnography of communication is the communication theory of culture and society. This is based on the idea that ethnographers are interested in the ways communication helps constitute culture and society.
With regards to communication of culture there are three ingredients in the communication process: symbols, symbolic forms, their patterned use and interpretations. A communication theory of culture is erected upon the concepts of symbols, symbolic forms, social uses, and meanings, and builds an idea of culture as a historically grounded, socially negotiated, and individually applied system of meaningful expression.

Symbols and forms draw attention to the basic materials, or vehicles, of expression in for example a speech situation. Patterned use refers to the shape or symbols and symbolic forms and the ways these are employed on particular occasions by participants. Interpretations refer to mutually intelligible beliefs or premises, and values that are widely accessible to participants, deeply felt by them, and are thus associated with these expressions on the particular occasions (Philipsen, 1992, cited in Carbaugh, 1994).

Sometimes the concept of system is used to discuss cultural communication. If we think of culture as a system of expression, we must explore how a symbol or form functions within a larger "communicative situation."

Communication theory of culture then is based on concepts of symbols, symbolic forms, social uses, and meaning, and builds an idea of culture as a historically grounded, socially negotiated, and individually applied system of meaningful expression (Carbaugh, 1994).
Communication theory of society adds elements of norms or rules for action, social positions and relations, and institutions (Schneider 1976, cited in Carbaugh, 1994). Norms are symbolic expressions that actors can use to evaluate, justify, or explain conduct (Philipsen 1989a. Carbaugh 1990a, and Hall 1988/1990, cited in Carbaugh, 1994). Social positions and relationships are created, reaffirmed, or negotiated among participants. Finally, the communication of social institution implies that identities and relations among participants is strong.

Overall, the combination of the communication theories of culture and society implies that particular symbols, forms, and meanings are operative, that these are justifiable through a normative rule system, that this system of justification, or legitimization, solidifies certain positions for participants, and certain relations among participants, and that this configuration is robust socially, relatively durable, and stable. (Carbaugh, 1994).

The Cultural Interpretive Theory

The cultural interpretive theory or cultural structures in communication is the third recent development in ethnographic communication. This theory is based on ethnographic fieldwork that shows that there are three cultural structures in communication.
The first structure consists of symbols or symbolic forms. These are terms or meanings that identify persons, or kinds of persons, as social agents in society.

The second structural feature is the way social relations and perhaps human institutions, are culturally coded into the communication process.

The third cultural structure is the way conduct itself is culturally coded into the communication process. The kind of action one can do and is doing provide basic materials for the conduct and interpretation of communication.

Conclusion

As I mentioned earlier, the research method of ethnography of communication allowed me to study the culture of the business case study discussion classroom. I looked for patterns in the process of negotiation and formation of roles, identities, rules, and language in this particular situation, with an interest in the ongoing interpretation of authenticity by the participants, students and teacher.

In this study, I focussed on particular speech events to understand how authenticity is negotiated in the formation of a new discourse community. In describing and interpreting these speech activities, I
hope to contribute to the literature in the field of ESP for business.

Selection of Site, Familiarization, and Access Negotiation

The site is an (ESP) English for Specific Purposes class that was taught at Harvard Summer School during two summer terms of 1990 and 1991, and Spring term, 1992. This class was meant as a preparation for international students planning to enter the Harvard Business School (HBS). There was an emphasis on developing written and spoken communication skills needed to participate effectively in the Harvard business case-discussion class of its MBA program. In the past many international students had received less than average and unsatisfactory evaluations for participation in class discussion. This course was developed on request of the Business School in an effort to better prepare incoming international students for the case method, who other than for weak oral communication skills, were well prepared candidates for the MBA program.

There were four reasons for selecting this site: its uniqueness as an ESP-MBA preparation program, its diverse population, its design as a course for business/economics, and the access offered to me because of my involvement as an instructor.
First, this site was selected because it was one of the few ongoing ESP-MBA preparation programs in the country. The use of authentic HBS cases, case discussions, computer usage, videos, role-plays, and a language support component combined to produce an excellent source of different activities for observation.

The mix of the students was also a factor for selecting this site because I wanted to observe a heterogeneous class. This site met that criterion well because the 800 students in all the ESL summer courses represented at least 50 different countries. The ESL Business Case Study Program consisted of 100 of these 800 students and was organized in five sections of 20 students each. In any class section, there were usually students from at least eight countries.

The site was particularly interesting because my teaching and research interests are in ESP/EAP (English for Academic Purposes) programs which prepare students for graduate study in business or economics or that are part of a professional training program.

The final reason for choosing this site was access. I had been invited to be an assistant instructor in the program and after observing and instructing at the site for one term, I received permission to use it as a research site for two subsequent terms.
The Site, Setting, Population, Course Organization, and Teaching Method

The setting is an adult ESL university level class. The class is called ESL Business Case Study and takes place at the Harvard University Summer School in Cambridge Massachusetts. The class sections are initially composed of 20 students from a variety of countries. Twenty-five percent of the students are bound for the Harvard Business School (HBS) in September. Another 25 percent are bound for other MBA programs and the remaining 50 percent are a mixture of professionals taking a short time to improve their communication skills and others who aspire to enter HBS or some other MBA program in the future.

The final class profile of the research site included three women and sixteen men. One male from Japan had to return home after only three days of class because of business reasons. There were 11 countries represented: France, Germany, Switzerland, Holland, Austria, Peru, Vietnam, Japan, Korea, Spain, and Turkey.

The English language level of the participants was measured by the Comprehensive English Language Test (CELT.) Their scores ranged from 41% to 96% in structure and 60% to 100% in listening. According to an in-house placement system, these students fall in the high intermediate-low advanced range.
The target class, the 3:00 p.m. (a) class, was one of five sections of 20 students each in the Case Discussion Program. The results of oral interviews done by instructors during the registration period were used as a factor in determining placement in a specific class section. There was a 9:00 a.m., a 1:00 p.m., two 3:00 p.m. and a 6:00 p.m. section. There was an attempt to mix all the groups with a balance of gender, nationality, fields of expertise, length of work experience, age, and language skills.

One of the 3:00 p.m. sections, my group, was designated by the instructors, but not to the students' knowledge, to be the group with the lowest oral skills. The 6:00 p.m. class would have participants with the best oral skills, highest level of experiences, and most forceful personalities. In fact, the 6:00 p.m. group was labeled as the sharks by the lead instructor. He didn't have a label for the other groups. Shark referred not only to level of English proficiency, but also to personality, work experience, and confidence.

Another criteria for placing people in sections was to consider requests because it was felt that some people were morning people and would choose the morning sections. Many other students didn't care either way about their section assignment because they knew from the course description that this course required a full time commitment. Students were told that they could request a
time slot but that this could not be guaranteed. They had to be prepared to accept assignment to any section. This permitted the program to really balance each section by the various criteria the lead instructor had presented earlier. The lead instructor was sensitive to special schedule requests but in general, most people accepted there section assignments without protest or request for change.

The other three class sections had a mix of participants who were in the middle range of language skills, and who represented a variety of the above mentioned factors. All sections would have the same materials and activities. The lead instructor felt that grouping students with those of similar language skill levels facilitates more opportunities for participation in discussion by as many students as possible. This reduces the effect of only one or two strong people dominating the discussions.

Every group met for three hours daily: two hours in case discussion and one hour for skills support. The lead instructor and two assistants led the case discussion session. These three were called case leaders. They rotated between the five sections. This meant that each section might only have the same case leader/instructor twice a week. A case specialist facilitated the skills hour. I was a case specialist for the 3:00 p.m. (a) case class section. The Skills Hour for that section met from
2:00 - 3:00 p.m. daily. There were five case specialists, one for each case class section. Each specialist stayed with the same section throughout the term. The case specialists attended his/her corresponding case discussion class and then facilitated discussion and activities in the skills hour. Each specialist followed the same plan for review and discussion of theories and cases, activities, guidance on projects, and the correction and giving of feedback on all written analyses. The only difference would be in the personality, delivery, and teaching style of each case specialist. I was chosen to facilitate the group with the lowest level of English skills because my background included training and experience in both English as a Second Language (ESL) and business administration. Except for the lead instructor, who was an experienced (ESP) English for Specific Purposes instructor, the other case leaders and case specialists had backgrounds in economics and business administration and were not language specialists. Case specialists attended the two-hour case discussion class and were able to monitor the students' progress and identify their support needs.

The case discussion session and skills hour were structured similar to a model given by Brinton, Snow, and Wesche, 1989) in their work "Content Based Second Language Instruction." The content class and the language
support class were completely coordinated. At the sight of my research, the skills class paralleled the content class and had activities that reinforced concepts introduced previously, allowed discussion of theoretical readings, and provided practice of communication techniques that would enable students to participate more effectively in the case discussion hour.

The Case Discussion Method

The Case discussion method was developed at the Harvard Business School and is used exclusively in the MBA program. The key characteristic is that students are presented with a situation or problem that requires a combined application of management, marketing, or accounting theories and problem solving skills. Having to confront various problems and coming up with solutions after analysis is the closest approximation to the real event or environment that an instructor can provide for students or trainees. Under the discussion method, the instructor facilitates discussion of the case and theories, summarizing and moderating the group participation. There is not always one fixed answer for the case, so the instructor can pull together the results of the arguments and points presented. He or she might add important considerations or implications that may not have been mentioned.
The case discussion method promotes skill development in analysis, problem solving, and solution creation. Participants will practice research skills to develop and support their ideas, communication skills to express them, and leadership and group process skills to carry out projects.

This class is interesting for research because good oral communication skills are essential for success in this program. Many international students, especially, but not exclusively from Asian countries, have the theoretical background and analytical preparation but lack the communication skills and cultural knowledge of the North American style of discussion to be able to present, defend or negotiate their ideas and participate effectively in the case discussions and group work.

The purpose of the summer program is to give ESL many opportunities to practice these skills that will enhance their success in graduate school, in North America in general, and in programs that use the case discussion method in particular.

Trustworthiness of the Study

In the past, I have consulted with the lead instructor who created the course, in regards to the philosophy, organization, materials, activities, participants, interaction that occurs during the course,
and student and course evaluations. Mr. Ryan was available as a resource for checking validity of the study. He, some fellow doctoral student readers, and my doctoral advisors responded to my study and were instrumental in the triangulation of my data and analysis.

**Role of the Researcher**

My role in the study is as an instructor/researcher. I did not begin the study with any particular biases with regard to how ESP courses should be developed or implemented. Nevertheless, my interpretation of things that I observed are filtered by my 18 years of varied teaching experience, formal education in international management, and ESL/Second Language Acquisition. In spite of these possible factors, I have been open to understanding the process of how an authentic level of participation or performance in the class is negotiated and achieved.

**Ethical Considerations**

I obtained permission to use the site for the study from the program administration and the instructor. Students signed permission forms to participate in the
study. The student names are concealed in any written or oral discussion of the study.

**Data Gathering**

Primary and Secondary Data Collection Methods

I used the techniques of ethnographic research as described by Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. (1990) and others.

**Participative Observation**

I gathered data as a participant observer. The structure of the course allowed me to observe the case discussion class for two hours each day in the class during which I was able to take extensive field notes on the discussion and the students' performance. Following the two hour observation, I instructed the students for one hour on language skills, questions on the cases, and topics related to the cases. I was able to use the field notes to give students feedback on their performance in the case discussion sessions, as well as for data analysis later.

**Video Taping**

A secondary source of data are videotaped recordings of case discussion sessions. There were ten sessions recorded and that were used for this study. This allowed me to revisit the situation and to also to transcribe the
language used. Other secondary sources were artifacts of the course such as the syllabus, class handouts, sample written work of the students, initial placement test scores, final evaluations of students done by teachers, final course evaluations completed by students, and informal interviews of the students, lead instructor, and other assistant instructors. Total observation was 280 hours for summer terms 1 & 2, and 72 hours for term 3.

Data Management

Field notes were kept in designated notebooks. Videotapes of classes were later used for class instruction, and have been kept for research after the completion of the course. (See appendix for videotape list.) Artifacts are being assembled and catalogued.

Method and Design of Analysis

This section consists of three distinct, yet intertwined stages: transcription, coding, and analysis.
Transcription

The source of data such as voluminous notes on observations, interview comments, documents about the organization and content of the course, and background information on the participants all contribute to informing the study. However, the videotapes of the two-hour case discussion sessions served as the core source of data for analysis.

There are videotapes of ten sessions. Three of the ten tapes are recordings of the case discussion activity, three are of the bargaining sessions, one tape is an example of a quantitative case discussion session, and three are recordings of presentation and discussion sessions. The bargaining and presentation tapes include feedback and roundtable sessions.

I transcribed the first two-hour tape (90 hours of work) and identified critical incidents that I looked for in the other taped sessions. I reviewed the other tapes using some variation of the six-stage process of viewing tapes analytically as described by Frederick Erickson and Jeffrey Schultz (1981). Then, I transcribed and coded events that showed patterns that relate to the questions of the language learning process and negotiation of authenticity.
Coding and Preparation for Analysis

The transcription is organized in message units. Green, J. and Wallat, C. (1981) describe a message unit as having three functional parts: a saying, a making, and a doing phase. We must consider three specific structural characteristics of messages such as, one, message context and contextualization cues, which are critical aspects of conversational segmentation, two, co-verbal prosodic cues (pitch, stress, intonation, and tempo-timing-rhythm,) and three, nonverbal cues (kinesic and proxemic).

Coding is the next stage after transcription and at the same time it is quite distinct from doing analysis. Its' purpose is not to find results but to squeeze an unwieldy body of discourse into manageable chunks. The categories used in coding are guided by the research questions. Sometimes the questions of interest can be quite straight forward or at other times, the phenomenon of interest may not become clear until some analysis has taken place and a number of attempts at theoretical interpretation of the data have been made. In these cases, the process will be a cyclical one of moving between analysis and coding. Once the topic of analysis is clarified, however, the return to the data and preliminary coding becomes less problematic (Potter, J. and Wetherell, M. (1987).
Coding for Intertextuality

Bloome, D. and Egan-Robertson, A. (1993) present two steps for describing the social construction of intertextuality. Step 1 is to create a transcript of the event and Step 2 is to describe the evolving event on a message by message basis. There are five components to this description process: One, describing the individual message unit, two, identifying the interactional unit by genre/event type, three, locating the proposal, recognition, and acknowledgment of intertextuality and in my study, authenticity. Four is to describe the social consequences of intertextuality, and five is related to locating uses and references to written language.

After examining coding systems of Bloome, D. and Egan-Robertson, A. (1993), Willett, J. and Solsken, J. (1993), and Green, J. and Wallat, C. (1981), I modeled heavily my coding form from the system of Bloome, D. and Egan-Roberston, A. (1993) and took ideas from the other two. I added a few extra categories, which I observed as patterns in reviewing the tapes. They are: take the floor, self-editing, continuance, authenticity, summarizing, and making transition. (See Appendix B, Descriptive Analysis of Case Discussion Class.)

I used Green, J. and Wallat, C's (1981) definitions of features of message units as a guide for mapping the discussion. After transcribing, coding, and doing
analysis of the first tape and studying the detailed notes of the other nine tapes, I was able to decide whether to record or code the level, tie, or type of unit resolution. I identified interaction units, instructional sequence units, phase units, and lesson units. Further work with the data, selected transcribing, and coding helped me determine what areas of analysis to focus on.

Analysis

The categories of intertextuality dimensions and literacy issues were relevant to my study because I observed patterns of proposal, recognition, and acknowledgment, initially, in interactions between the instructor and students and later, in interactions between students and students. Bloome and Egan-Robertson’s (1993) coding for the group of categories: words/messages, interaction unit, genre, other, and literacy issues fit well for my research because they helped me understand and later describe the social construction that occurs in the class. In addition, the texts of the class under study played a key role as a basis for all discussion and are referred to as the source for proof in arguments. Also, the use of authentic Harvard Business School Cases and reading materials was a motivating factor in the learning process and the construction of the class culture.
The last category on the Descriptive Analysis coding chart is tensions. It represents five of the points of tensions that I have been able to identify through the literature review and the pilot study as key moments of negotiation and construction of the discourse and rules of that community. These tensions are produced on various occasions, such as: 1) during negotiation of classroom procedure, language and its use, 2) while discussing the content materials, 3) in the use and acceptance of scaffolding provided by the instructor or other students, and 4) in the switching between primary and secondary discourses. Identifying these moments facilitated my understanding of the gradual negotiation of authenticity in this discourse community.
CHAPTER 4
APPRENTICESHIP IN A NEW DISCOURSE:
A SOCIAL DRAMA

Introduction of the Course

Before I do analysis and discussion of what happens in the ESL-Case Discussion Class, I want to give the reader an idea of the schedule and flow of activities in the organization of the course. This will help the reader when I make reference to different aspects of the course.

As I mentioned in the methodology section, the purpose of the course is to assist international students in developing the communication skills needed to participate in business case study discussions and group-work activities.

The duration of the summer program was eight weeks. Students attended the Case Discussion Class for two hours and a second section called the Skills Hour for one hour daily.

The following are the requirements and plan for the Case Discussion Class and overall course in general:

Course Requirements

1. There were two written exams, one given mid-way through the course and one given at the end.

2. There were 12 cases discussed in class and students were required to turn in 10 written analyses. This
meant that they could choose not to do two of the ten.

3. Two written reports were required for the course. One was a group project and was due at the mid-point of the course. The second was done individually and was due at the end of the course as a final project. The group report was a marketing plan and the individual report was a one-year business plan.

The Course Content

The course content was organized by functional type of case and by communication skills introduced and exercised.

Week 1  Introduction, written case study requirements, and protocol for case class discussions were discussed. General management cases and related theoretical readings were given. Formula for giving and receiving feedback was introduced with readings and practice.

Week 2  Quantitative cases, marketing cases, and related theoretical readings were used. Guidelines for group project were given. The Roundtable exercise, which is a processing exercise, is introduced after peer feedback is given. Students can comment on their opinion of and...
activity including the feedback given by their peers. Some people called this session "feedback on the feedback"; however, they could comment on anything they wanted related to the activity. Guidelines for making presentations were given.

Week 3 Case discussions continue with performance of group presentations, practice of giving feedback, and taking part in roundtable.

Week 4 Mid-term written exam and Group Marketing plans were due.

Week 5 Exams were returned. Group Presentations continue with introduction to bargaining, negotiating, and business meeting skills.

Week 6 Group bargaining exercises based on cases continue. Students were assigned to teams. Each team was given a role based on the case. The teams organized themselves and divided the tasks. International and strategic planning cases were introduced.

Week 7 Case with business meeting is acted out. Final individual projects due, Final exam

Week 8 Cases, Grand Bargaining exercises where the five class sections were divided into three teams each and competed against the teams of
other sections. Written course and instructor evaluations handed out. Exams and projects scored. Instructors write final student grades and evaluations. Discussion of students' evaluations and comments were exchanged on the final day. Students were given their grades, feedback, and general comments from the instructors. The lead instructor talked about the business school and some of the things to expect. He made linkages between the summer course and many of the practices at the Harvard Business School in particular.

The assignments and activities for the Skills Hour corresponded to the schedule of the Case Discussion Class. The Skills Hour instructors or case specialists observed and took notes at the Case Discussion Class daily. The case specialists corrected and graded the written case analyses. They gave instructions on how to do reports or prepare for bargaining, presentations, meetings, and feedback sessions. Case specialists also taught vocabulary and appropriate language for particular activities such as bargaining, negotiating, and turn taking. In addition, students completed exercises in writing memos and business letters.

As I mentioned earlier, I was a case specialist at this site and taught one of the sections of the Skills
Hour. Even though I had contact with students in both sections, I am only using the data from my observation in the Case Discussion Class as the basis for discussion and analysis. My observation and interaction with the students in the Skills Hour inform the study and my analysis of various events.

In summary, I will refer to the following re-occurring learning activities in my upcoming description and analysis:

- The case: written description of the problem to be solved. Cases were anywhere from 1-35 pages in length.

- The case discussion: the discussion that followed assignment of the case. Students analyzed the problems, considered alternative solutions, and made recommendations for solutions.

- The written case analysis: the written analysis or report about the case that students had to hand in and were graded on. Students followed the specific guidelines provided by the course instructors.

- Theoretical readings: articles that provided conceptual background for the case, e.g. the product life cycle.
Bargaining/Negotiation Sessions: students participated in activities of bargaining or negotiating in teams. Two teams bargained and one team observed and gave feedback to the other two after the session.

Presentation sessions: students made presentations in teams. One team presented to another and the third team observed and gave feedback at the end.

Giving and receiving feedback sessions: students gave feedback to their peers according to a checklist of variables. They followed a prescribed procedure and were also evaluated on how well they performed their evaluation.

The teams: The bargaining, competing, or presenting teams participated according to their assignment. Each team had a chance to play the different roles. The evaluating team gave feedback to the other two teams, both as team and individual feedback.

Roundtable sessions: this session followed the feedback session. Every student was required to make one comment about the bargaining or presentation. They could
critique or compliment any team or team member. It was at this time that they could give feedback or make comments to the evaluation team. After everyone had made one comment, the floor was open to discussion for whatever time remained.

Pre-MBA Wonderland, An Analysis of a Social Drama

The ESL Pre-MBA Case Discussion Class is a progressive social drama in the negotiation of authenticity and development of language/communication skills. The course is an ongoing social drama of negotiation of learning and of the formation of a new discourse. For purposes of discussing this class, I have identified three acts of transition in the evolving of the definition and negotiation of authenticity, and the development of communication skills.

The first act begins the first day and lasts until the mid-term exam and the first project are due. The first act is the introduction to the new community. This is when the community is initially setup and ground rules are established by the instructor, interpreted and negotiated by the students, and eventually agreed upon as the community establishes itself. These initial
activities are the first events that contribute to the formation and defining of an authentic experience. The resulting experience is the product of what the instructor and students bring to the class as expectations and goals. The skills introduced in Act 1 are related to procedures for doing case discussion, the format for doing the written analysis, language strategies used in discussion, such as vocabulary, expressions, and ways of participating in the classroom. According to Swales (1990) these would be genres authentic to the "MBA classroom."

The second act begins taking place right after the mid-term exams as students begin to prepare for another set of activities and assignments. This would cover weeks 5-7. This act ends with the handing in of the individual projects and the taking of the final exam. In act two, students further develop their own individual view of authenticity and begin to vocalize cautiously their understanding and increased awareness of what is authentic for them. In addition, students practice and clarify their understanding of how to use the language and communication strategies that have been introduced in act one. They also learn how to perform in team/bargaining sessions. In addition, they learn how to use theories and strategies for giving and receiving
feedback. This is a topic and activity taught in the business curriculum, which turned out to be a key activity for language and communication skills development. Students also begin to participate in the round table discussion session. The giving and receiving feedback exercise and the round table session facilitate the idea of acquisition versus learning of communication skills as discussed by Gee (1990) because these sessions give students an opportunity to reflect on and discuss their learning up to this point in the course.

The third act opens with the final cases, proceeds to the Grand Bargaining exercise, and concludes with the discussion of final grades and course evaluation. There is a closing session where the instructors and students discuss the course and the experience. The lead instructor gives a summary on how what we did in the course relates to the Harvard MBA Program. He gives specific examples of some things to expect, such as how seating is assigned in classes and that there seems to be a relationship between where students sit in the class and their level of participation and performance.

In act three, students verbalize their interpretation and definition of authenticity rather freely. They practice strategies and specific language learned up to this point, and in addition, are introduced
to and practice giving presentations. They make clear and specific references to either the business classroom, their work experience, or real business activities. Near the end of this act, students have an opportunity to demonstrate their understanding of case analysis at that point in the course through a written exam and completion of a written business report. Furthermore, they have an opportunity to exercise all of their abilities in oral communication and analysis during a Grand Bargaining activity. After completion of these final activities, students are able to do self-assessment of where their strengths and weaknesses lie. The instructor team completes evaluations of the overall performance of each student. Students, in turn, have an opportunity to respond to a written evaluation on the various aspects of the course. In the final session, students and instructors discuss the various aspects of the course and how it can be improved.

Instructors introduce specific language and strategies from the beginning to the end of the course. Learners are willing to enact or try these behaviors throughout all three acts that I refer to. However, at the same time, they are negotiating their own interpretation of what are the appropriate and authentic ways of communicating. For me, negotiation means the
identification of meaning or understanding of something and then, an arriving at an agreed upon provisional understanding of that meaning between at least two or more persons. Of course, individuals are constantly negotiating meaning for themselves, but it is when there is some mutual agreement between others, that we have a community discourse.

For this study, the community discourse that I observed is that of the ESL Business Case Discussion Class, while the target discourse for those students is the discourse of the Harvard MBA class.

There is, in fact, a third level of reference in this continuum of authenticity, and that is the arena of the real business world in which the Harvard MBA program is trying to prepare students to participate productively.

A fourth discourse also surfaces from the data and that is the home discourse of the participants. This discourse adds another dimension to the factor of intercultural communication in Second Language Acquisition.

Even though, there are four major discourses of reference operating for most participants, as far as authentic ways of communicating are concerned, this study
focuses on the discourse negotiated in the ESL class in relation to the discourse and culture of the MBA class. In this chapter, I am going to discuss authenticity and its meaning as they are negotiated and conceptualized.

Conceptualizing and Negotiating Meaning of Authenticity

The Process of Negotiation of Authenticity

As mentioned before, the acts of this social drama follow the organization of the course content. Each act represents different types of cases and exercises. Assignments are presented in order of increasing difficulty. The process of negotiation of authenticity is, and in this case was, influenced partially by the order and types of materials and activities presented, but the process progresses regardless of that order or the length of time of the course, which is the life of the discourse community.

I witnessed a similar process occur when the same course was offered in a 5-week, 30 hour version versus the original, 8-week, 120 hour version. I see three phases of negotiation emerge in this process.

1. The introduction to the new discourse phase, where the members are confronted with the instructor’s plan and structure, but come with pre-conceived
expectations. The negotiation then begins between the instructor and all the students.

2. In the making sense phase, students are trying to make sense of the new discourse community. They are searching for meaning and what starts as an internal struggle begins to become a vocal struggle discussed with others as the rules and language of the new community is negotiated.

3. At the full emergence phase, students are confident with the rules and communication requirements of the discourse communication. They have become more certain of what this community means to them in relation to the target community and their personal goals. They are able to comfortably and effectively discuss their view of what is authentic for them. This negotiation continues until the last day the community meets as a group.

Surely the re-evaluation process continues as students move into one of the target communities or after enough time has elapsed so as to be able to make a value judgement on the experience they had. For example, the students who entered the Harvard MBA Program made reference to the ESL Case Discussion Class throughout their first year of studies. This came out in a
discussion I had with a group of graduates in Spring '92, one year after they had completed our program.

Phase 1 of Negotiation of Authenticity: Introduction to the New Discourse

For the students in the E.S.L. Pre-MBA Case Discussion class, the learning experience, and the whole process of how authenticity is identified, negotiated and agreed upon begins when a student decides to register for the course through the Division of Continuing Education. The course catalog describes the course as a preparation for the Harvard Business School and other similar business school programs. Its purpose is to give participants the experience of studying with the business case method and to improve their communication skills. They would use actual cases (written materials) that are used in graduate study and participate in group discussions, team projects and activities which are used in business school education. In addition to the brief introduction from the course catalog, students all come with unwritten and unclear expectations of the Harvard experience that they are going to have in the course. They bring with them everything they have heard or been told by others about the prestige of Harvard. This is all a part of the Harvard Mystique.
The Harvard Mystique (The Image)

The first time I had ever encountered the idea of an institutional mystique was when I attended graduate school at the American Graduate School of International Management or "Thunderbird," where students, faculty, and staff often referred to the "Thunderbird Mystique." There was this outstanding reputation associated with this institution that you become a part of. You can't identify exactly the specific characteristics that make it unique, but there is this reputation in the field that you find out about, and you do not want to do anything wrong that might tarnish that unspecific fame that it enjoys. Harvard University also has a mystique that I was not completely aware of before going to work there and to which I was not necessarily prepared for, but others, students and colleagues, have shared this mystique with me through their attitudes, comments, and actions. The Harvard Business School, in particular, enjoys a reputation that extends from academia to industry, and the general public.

It is this mystique which starts the process of authentification. The first day of class is really the continuation of the mystique, however, it marks the beginning of setting the stage for the upcoming experience itself.
It is at this point in the course that the instructor initializes the new learning environment, setting the purpose of the course and the guidelines for operation and minimal expectations for student performance, i.e. assignments and class participation. It really hits students that they are at Harvard and up for a challenging course when the instructors pass out the cases and theoretical readings for the first two weeks during the first session. I watched the reaction in their facial expressions to the large quantity of materials being handed out when they and the teachers assemble the packets of materials in three-hole binders on the first day of class. This activity appears to make a strong impression on the students. The in-class assembly was a logistical necessity, but, in addition, it provided the message that there was going to be a lot of work for this course and that it was serious business.

After the initial introduction session, students are apprenticed to the discussion class by actually discussing the cases. In the early sessions, they begin to practice turn taking, body language, and vocabulary. In some cases, these things are explicitly taught, or in others, they are just modeled by the instructors. For example, instructors explicitly teach the organization format of how to do a case analysis. The written
analysis is prepared in outline form. In the first session, instructors explain how to use the format, however, interpretation of what each section should be like is not stated explicitly and over the course of the first week, students begin to discuss what they believe is the purpose and limits of each section of the analysis and what should be included in each. (See Exhibit 3. Case Analysis Format)

At first, students participate in discussion very cautiously, as they try to make sense of how they should and are allowed to participate. The lead instructor sets up the initial seriousness and tone of the class. The first seed of the thought of authenticity is planted by the instructor in one of the early sessions, when he tells a student to stop his recitation and to improve his posture because it does not fit what’s needed for a business meeting. An example follows:

(#1a, Tape 1, L’s1-27)

Instructor: Ok, ladies and gentlemen, if you please put your nameplates out.

(Shuffling noise from students arranging papers.)

Instructor: Ok, today, we are working with the (uh) Tiberg (uh) Company, and Marcus would you please lead off. (Lead off refers to the
person who will start the discussion on a case.)

Marcus: (Seated far away from the table in a casual and slouched position.) First of all, (uh) summary.

Instructor: I am sorry, two things, number one, you are on camera, so would you take a power position at the (uh) table, (uh) second identify the case that (uh) you are working with.

Marcus: (Adjusts his seat to be closer to the table, sits up straight. The instructor begins to write on the board.) Our case is called, Tiberg Company. And, uh.

Instructor: Ok, yea, ladies and gentlemen, Tiberg Company analysis, start, go ahead.

After the student responds to the teacher’s comments about posture by sitting up straight, he tries to introduce the case for today. The instructor interrupts him to introduce one more rule for case discussion and that is to refer to the discussion as a case analysis. The proper way to talk about the analysis is in reference to a case. In this situation the case was Tiberg Co., so the correct reference for today’s discussion would be the
Tiberg Co. analysis. The previous excerpt took place at the beginning of a session early on in the course.

On another occasion, during the final summary of the discussion, the instructor refers to the situation of the case, where a manager had sent out letters communicating a new policy, but did not receive any response from the employees. The instructor discusses with the students the issues in the case. He refers to modes of communication and the need for knowing how to use alternative ways of communicating in business. (#1b, Tape 1, l’s 2518-2556) The following is a long passage, but is a good example of a rare long monologue by an instructor used mainly for giving summaries or feedback:

1 Us. We, together. OK, ladies and gentlemen,
2 you’re supposed to motivate the people who work for you. As a manager, you are a kind of leader. You motivate the people who work for you. There’s no us. There’s no we. There’s no we are going to work together to solve the problem. I give the order. I have supreme power from the board of directors. You follow the orders. There’s no effort made to create a working team here.
3 Instead, it’s all completely separate. OK,
4 again relationship. Now, ladies and gentlemen,
none of us has the time or perhaps the art or skill to produce perfect letters, perfect communication, time in and time out. But the point they try to bring across in this case is there is a need for you as a manager, now or in the future, or as a business school student, pay attention not only to content, the information you are trying to get across to someone else, but, these other factors too. How do you want to communicate the information? Do you want it to be personal or impersonal? What's a good time for you to do it? Who are you talking to? How do you want to talk to these people. Do you want style, some style, a lot of style, a lot of personality, or zero personality, why? What kind of feelings, what kind of attitude do you want to communicate to these people. OK. Do you want feedback? How do you want it? What's the point of view, we, you, I, it? OK, and all of this, ladies and gentlemen, people read into what you write to them. You may not mean it, but when you write something, people read this. People get this. So, he wrote something and it didn't work. So, he's decided that the way for him to deal with uh, uh, raw materials,
procuring raw materials is to centralize information. Now, he could do another letter or he could switch his mode of communication and he can go visit the plants. Buehler goes along, uh, Post goes along. OK. Uh, what are the advantages and disadvantages of Porte goes along?

In lines 1-10, The instructor is referring to the actions of the manager in the case. In lines 10-18, he links the need for effective written communication skills in management or in business school. He is making what I might call an “authenticity linkage.” He infers that what they are learning will be valuable to them in business or as a business student. In lines 18-33, he teaches the qualities and factors of good communication. Then, in lines 33-42, he transitions back to discuss the manager in the case and the decision options facing him. He opens the floor to student participation with a question in lines 41/42.

In the above examples, the teacher is beginning to creat a business world ambiance. In addition, the students also try to link discussion to their real life experiences, e.g.
#2. Tape 3, 1:39.35 Juan brings a real life example from his work past, which contributes to the developing authenticity of the ambiance as well as helping him to claim a valued identity.

Juan: Maybe, I can come up with an example I had when I quit IBM just before coming here. I had my subordinates and I had another person taking care of my subordinates, the meanwhile, but the problem for my manager was, who was gonna be the person that was gonna get my place at that moment, so he was really taking care about my subordinates, but the main problem for us was when we were getting together with them to see who can be the person that can be in charge of my subordinates. That was the really, the problem at that moment. The other person just was taking care of my subordinates, but but the subordinates were, were doing their job as always.

The instructor facilitates by directing the discussion, not necessarily giving opinion. When confusion is caused by misunderstanding of language or
the discussion itself, he might direct or interrupt the conversation to clarify a point in order to facilitate the continuation of the discussion. For example, when two or three students were confused about the appropriate use of the words, subjective/objective, the instructor, interjected and asked if someone could tell the class the difference between subjective and objective. After a brief discussion and some examples of differences in the two terms, he returned to the topic that was previously being discussed. This is a situation where language knowledge or lack of it can impede the authentic activity, which is discussion of the case.

During the discussion itself, the instructor facilitates discussion by pointing to and acknowledging who can have the next turn, but does not comment on the points made by the students. He allows the students to respond to each other’s comments. If the class seems to ignore someone, he might stop the flow of discussion to say, “How about what Mario. said?” This is common to discussion facilitation used in the business school and is another example of “authenticity linkage.” Sometimes, the instructor also insists that students state clearly, “I agree with...or I disagree with....” This forces the group to listen and to try to understand every member of
the community no matter how poor the level of pronunciation and oral comprehensibility.

Students don’t generally correct language of their peers, but if language interferes with communication, students with stronger skills will negotiate understanding. In some cases, they do this by helping with restatements or by just demanding that the other student try again by either rephrasing, using other vocabulary, or improving pronunciation. The pressure to resolve a tension of miscommunication forces them to continue negotiating for a mutually agreeable level of understanding. This is one communication strategy.

What we see in the following excerpts is that students of higher communication skills demand higher comprehensibility from each other and from students with lower comprehensibility:

Juan to Frank. (#3a, Tape 1, 1:01-1:02.49)

Frederique: (With a very strong French accent and intonation)

Even if a new centralization of purchasing procedure is working very well from the head office and the plants, do you think that the first problem is solved.

Juan: Excuse me, I can’t understand you.
Frederique: Even if the centralization of the purchasing procedure. Even if uh, Mr. Porte communicate very well, and every plant, plant manager agree with, with him and (uh) ask for (uh) each (uh) each contract. Do you think the first problem, which is (uh) secure (uh) securing (uh) raw materials (uhhh) should be solved?

Juan: "Well, that's one point you have to see after the plan is working. But right now, he hadn't been committed to the plan, so, so I can working, it didn't work.

In the previous exchange, Juan asks Frederique for clarification. Frederique has to rephrase his statement and adds to his question. Juan acknowledges the improved message by responding to the question.

In another exchange, a higher English level student demands improved comprehensibility from a lower level student.

(#3b, Tape 2, 6:42 Timothy to Mario)

Mario: (With very halting English) "You know what I mean? First is the strategy of the company and second was motivated for this fact.... (Student pauses, the instructor
passes the turn by giving a hand signal to Timothy, who had his hand raised.)

Timothy: "I don’t understand the point, I am sorry."

Mario: "Uhh, I want to say that the fact that the guy is the son of the minister of this colony....

In the above excerpt, Timothy presses Mario to restate his idea so as to be more comprehensible. Poor English expression gets in the way of communication. The weaker student has to adjust to make himself understood. Mario rethinks his ideas and attempts to present an explanation.

In addition to directing the flow of discussion and allocating turns, the instructor comments on behavior rules, or provides language for certain functions, such as:

(#4a, Tp 1, Lines 339-393)

Injr: "Ok, alright, ladies and gentlemen, so, we, we disagree about the length of the summary, alright, some of you say that this is too long. Others say, if I follow Felix’s point, this may not be long enough, that there’s not enough in here. Ok, we agree that we disagree, ladies and
gentlemen, I think however, we can agree the basic definition of the summary is, (pause) the important facts, background information a manager needs to know in order to begin solving the problem. Now, Juan you said that some important facts had been left out."

(#4b,T1, L's 351-359)

Guill:  
"Yeah, uh, I think, uh, Well, there is a very important...fact."

Injr:  
"Ok. Now, before you go on. So, remember, when you do a summary, it's introduce, it's introduce and then, first, we focus on whether or not you agree with the facts in the summary, second, any new information or anything left out that should have been put into the summary itself. Ok, Juan you have the floor."

In the previous two excerpts, the instructor is commenting on the technical part of doing an analysis. However, in the next two excerpts, he is allocating turns and coaching a student on how to get a turn.

(#4C, T1, L's 374-391)
(Consecutive talking by many students. Jay says, ok, amidst the noise, and Juan eventually takes the floor to respond.)

Marcus: "It means that they...."

Injr: "Ok, I'm sorry Juan.

Guill: "That's only one part of the case, but another case is like they never had anything in the headquarters. So they just been working as a separate units.

So..."

Juan is sitting next to Marcus. He looks directly at Marcus and makes hand signals. Marcus looks directly at him and shakes his head as if in agreement. Meanwhile, the instructor notices that Do wants to speak and tells him how to get into the discussion.

Injr: "Ok. Do, put the hand up. Ok, yeah, Do..."

Duc: "May I have a word?

A little later in the discussion, Duc wants to get into the discussion without being recognized by the instructor who is allocating turns. The instructor prompts him in the acceptable way to join in.

#4d, Tp1, L's 438-441)

(Duc interrupts)

Duc: "Juan, may I..."
Injr: “Ok, Duc put that hand up, Ok? Yeah....”

This behavior of hand raising could be categorized as general school behavior, but it was also the authentic behavior for case discussion in the business school. I observed this during my observation of Harvard Business School classes in the Spring '92 term.

Besides introducing authentic MBA classroom behavior, the instructor introduces a specific technique for discussion of facts as seen in the next excerpt:

(#5, Tp 1, L’s 418-436)

Injr: “Ok, let me interrupt, Ok. Uh, PPL, ladies and gentleman. When you are going to use the case to prove something, excellent, but PPL, page number, paragraph number, line number, so that, when you read, when you begin to read from the case, we can immediately check out what you are talking about. So, this technique is called PPL, page, paragraph, line number. Ok, so, Juan, page....”

Juan: “Well, page number one, paragraph one, uh, sentence number three, uh....”
"Ok, line, line three"

"Line three, uhm, where it says purchasing procedures have never been completely coordinated, and after that, in the same paragraph, uhm, on line number five where it says the plant manager cooperate with their staff as separate units in multi..."

PPL is a form of scaffolding developed to train students to refer to the texts in very specific terms, reflecting discussion styles in the authentic MBA classroom. The use of PPL and referral to the text is an evidence of intertextuality between the text and spoken language. The written text is the ultimate reference for proof in the oral discussion.

In the next exchange, we see that the instructor is trying to help the students connect with the ideas presented previously by the other speakers. As in excerpt #5, in excerpt #6, the instructor introduces a new technique or way of discussing and the students begin to use it almost immediately.

(#6, T1, L’s 818-826) (/// means there was overlap with the other speaker.)
Bette: It should be that the board of directors.///

Injr: ///Duc you agree or disagree? (With a strong tone)

Bette: (Looking at Romeo or Frank) “I disagree with you because the board of directors always responsible for everything. They just give him the job and he is responsible, the board of directors can’t solve the problem.

In excerpt #6, the instructor insists that the student focus her response, by asking her, Duc you agree or disagree?

The instructor reinforces appropriate communication strategies and techniques in different ways, as demonstrated in the following excerpts:

(#7, Tp1, L’s 954-967)

#7a

Injr: Ok, let me interrupt. Who is not going to give a political speech?

(Class laughter)

Renaldo: Mr. Porter is, to me, it is very clear that Mr. Porter is the doer because apart from the, he is the one responsible for his job.
Apart from the other reasons that have been given, he was given lat, wide latitude to organize his job, so he is absolutely responsible. The, and sec, second point.\\\\

Injr: //Stop, stop, ok, come on, you, you're giving a speech, ok, make your points fast.

In the above situation, the instructor uses humor to bring attention to long-winded replies. He also stops the person when they violate the desired behavior. The instructor also rewards correct use of a previously taught authentic strategy as in excerpt #7b.

#7b

Bette: I completely disagree with Romeo//.

Injr: Good start. Ok, you completely disagree is where?

Because?

Bette: Because the is only a part of the whole company, so it couldn't be the problem for him.
Romeo: You don't know that./// It is, It is, because all the other companies...///

Bette: Prove it. Prove it.

Injr: Ok, hold on just a moment.

Ok, write down, gold star, ok, prove it.

Eduar: You don't know that.///

Bette: I will prove it. First page, third paragraph, line///

She has the formula correct for PPL, but has counted the paragraphs incorrectly, so the instructor interjects.

#7c

Injr: ///Ok, page one, paragraph one, Ok. go ahead, page one.///

Bette: Ok,...Line three, uh, purchasing procedures had never completely coordinated, with the second paragraph, uh, uh, line, uh, uh, uh, nine, Mr. Manuel appointed an experienced purchasing executive, Mr. Porte, in charge of purchasing.///

Another example of the instructor encouraging previously taught authentic MBA behavior is when a student uses the expression, "I think"

In Tp 2, Bette says, "I think..."

(#8a Tp 2, 8:30)
Bette: I think, uh, misunderstood....
Injr: Ok, Drop the "I think." Drop the "I think."
Bette: Oh, it should be, uh, not be misunderstood. It's subjective. In summary, there are, uh facts, and if Reynolds misunderstood....

#8b
Fern: Well, I think, it is uh,
Injr: Ok, Drop the I think, now.
Fern: Sorry, uh, In my opinion, It should be, uh, subjective, so I agree with Bette.
Injr: Ok, you say its objective, uh, subjective.
        Ok, Arthur.

Another example of setting authentic discussion behavior is noted when the instructor says, "Remember your audience. Don't speak just to each other." Or "Are you going to make a speech?" (Reinforcing about being concise.)

When a student says, "I don't understand," the instructor insists, "Don't say you don't understand."

This is another example of reinforcing a standard in how to speak. The instructor wants the student to be confident and to show that confidence. He might suggest that the student decline to speak rather than say that he
doesn't understand, even though, it would be acceptable to ask for clarification.

Later in the first phase, students begin to use the PPL method without prompting from the instructor (See 9a, 9b, and 9c.)

#9a

Injr: Now, are there other points, ladies and gentlemen, that you would like to include in the summary, facts that we should all be aware of? Arthur?

Arthur: Yes, a very important fact is on page one, paragraph one line 5. He reads, "Uh, everything had been tidied up. "I don't know how to pronounce, tidied up. "except for the last vital interview." When in an interview is vital, and you do it at the last time, that thing you, you have to do is, I think that's the point which has to be included in the summary.

Injr: Ok, so you are bringing up, uh, a reference to the interview?

Students demonstrate that they are appropriating this skill.

#9b
Kyeon: I am gonna agree with you because...

Injr: With whom, now? With Lela?

Kyeon: With uh, (She looks at Lela) Lela, because what I am talking about is when he was referring to....

Unknown Student: Where are you?

Kyeon: I'm sorry. Page one, paragraph one, line, about, seven (Pause...) You said he didn't know, uh, he didn't know what he was talking. It's just a reflection. It's not a fact.

Students begin to use the technique to communicate and get clarification.

#9c Bette: And what about, uh, page, uh, one, uh, paragraph three, uh, line, uh, three. She reads the text.) The important task of Baker was the grooming of Rennals as his successor, so, he was busy with that for a couple of years or quite a time.

In the above excerpt, the student uses the text and the PPL technique to solicit specific reaction from the other students.

Even with the best intentions of facilitating communication, the instructor is not tireless or
eternally patient, because after the third person uses some form of, "I think" or "in my opinion," he reacts with a sign of impatience, e.g.

#10a    Tape 2 51:30-51:43
Injr:    Ok, lot's of people want to talk. Ok, very fast, down the line, you're last, you're first. (Looking at Chunghee) Sentence, Please.
Chunghee: Ok, in my opinion.
Injr:    Ohhh, don't Do in my opinion.
          Come on, Come on, sentence.
Chunghee: Mr. Baker is actor, that is Doer.
          Mr. Hutchins is decision maker.

The desired behavior is to give an opinion without using, "in my opinion" or "I think." The lead instructor had commented to the case specialists in our training meetings that those expressions showed weakness in the eyes of the listener. The instructor shows through his reaction that by now, he expects the students to have caught on and not use, "I think or in my opinion."

At some point in the learning process students self correct, for example, a few moments after Kyeoung's
statement above, Timothy says, "I think...," pauses, and quickly changes to, "I am convinced."

However, Timothy was the fourth person to make this mistake, and the instructor finally blurts out, "Ladies and gentlemen, you don't have to say, I am convinced, just say Baker will....." (See excerpt below:)

#10 Tape 2 50:30-50:45

Timothy: Uh, I think it is obvious,
Injr: I am going to interrupt, ok, no I think, Timothy, ok.
Timothy: I am convinced that it's Mr. Baker, the doer.
Injr: Ok, Ladies and Gentlemen, you don't even have to say, "I am convinced, "Baker is the doer (pauses and Timothy continues alone.....)

That was the instructor's opinion about that point. He felt that even, "I am convinced," showed a weak stance.

Timothy: (Timothy speaks in chorus with the instructor) Baker is the doer because if you look on the left on page 5.....
Besides providing expressions (verbal scaffolding) and giving examples of language usage, the instructor moderates protocol of turn-taking. He only does it when he feels the rules of turn-taking have been forgotten or violated and a struggle persists between students, e.g.

#11 Tape 2,53:50-54:08

Bette: CC: does mean carbon copy. You are right, Timothy, but Hutchins received also a letter, he has to...

Romeo: (Interrupts) but we don't know when. We don't know when.  

Bette: I am sorry, I was talking now. I don't like that uh...

Injr: Ok. Alright. Ok, now. It is her floor. Ok, and you let her finish.

Bette: Now, I forgot it.

She is flustered and has lost her train of thought. Meanwhile, the instructor interjects on a point of order and keeps the discussion going.

Injr: Alright, Ok, her comment had meant, had been CC: does mean carbon copy, and uh, the letter was typed there in the office that morning with the original to Baker and the
carbon copies to Hutchins, so presumably, it's already on Hutchin's desk. Now, has he come to work at the same time as Baker? Earlier, later, we don't know.

Renaldo: I think, before, earlier.

Injr: Ok, the production manager, perhaps even earlier. Ok, because it was Baker who had been to the goodbye party uh the night before. So your point is (To Bette) it is on his desk and if he hasn't read it yet, he will be reading it very very soon.

Bette: Yeah.

(Pause)

So, therefore....

Yeah, I think, uh, Hutchins has the authority, Baker hasn't the authority. Imagine you are in a company, You go away, You don't have the successor and you tell anybody, you can go in my function, so...

In the above excerpt, the instructor interjects and supports protocol when he says, "It is her floor." He is holding the floor and reviewing the conversation while she regroups and rejoins the discussion.
Another example of developing the ability to persuade in the American business discourse can be seen in excerpt #12.

(#12, Tape 3, 1:05.36) in the following exchange between Frank, the instructor, and Marcus:

Frank: "For me, he was a good leader.

Instructor: (Interjects) Why, Don’t say that he was a good leader and that’s it, I mean, back up your argument. (Instructor gives the turn to another student.)

Marcus: "He was not a good leader in my mind because, as you can see by Porter, communication is totally missing, so...

When the instructor responds, "Why?" "Back up your argument..." He is teaching them how to defend an argument. Almost immediately, students begin to model this. The very next speaker, Marcus says "...because...and...

At #13, Tape 3, 106.40, the following speaker, Do, uses the model when he says,

Duc: "My first point of view is that Bob Knowlton is not a good leader because he cannot produce proofability... My second point is that Fester is a good leader because he has influenced the other
members of this group how to behave, and he used the method of confronting and problem solving.

There seems to be a moment when the instructor and students phase from struggling with language and procedure back to dealing with the analysis itself. There is a limit of how long one can keep correcting for language because it detracts from moving through the case. However, when misunderstanding of the language impedes a true understanding of the discussion, the instructor stops the discussion and solicits definitions and understandings of meaning of the expression in question.

One of the things that the instructor does during this early stage is to often summarize and restate points made, but not necessarily giving his opinion. During the wrap-up and conclusion of the discussion of the case, he summarizes and solicits implications from the students, as seen in the following excerpt:

#14

1 Injr: Ok, look, ladies and gentlemen, Baker tries
to give the feedback. What does Rennals do,
one more time? Doesn’t want to listen
4 (Gestures for someone to answer.) Ok, so,
5 ending the feedback session, how are you
supposed to end it? Send the other person out
couraged. Ok, so, Baker's been there for
two years, he's tried. This guy isn't gonna
change. Doesn't accept feedback. So you say,
I'm 300, you're 50, (claps his hands.)
You are gonna be chief engineer tomorrow, you
can do an excellent job. Good bye, good
luck. (Pause) I'm, leaving. Ok.
The message was to get him out of the office
saying you're equal to it. Good luck, Matt,
and so on. Ok.
Uh, Ladies and gentlemen, does Matt Rennals
accept this?
(He looks for a response.)

Unidentified student voice: Yes.
Another student voice: No.
Injr: We have no, we have yes.
Felix: For the moment, he accept it, but when he think
about it, he doesn't accept it.
Injr: Ladies and gentlemen, in the office, he
accepted it. He smiles and so on and so
forth. He goes home. He talks to his father.
Was his father there at the meeting?
Students answer in chorus: No
Injr: (Answers with them.) No.
Ladies and gentlemen he comes back the next morning, signs a letter of resignation. My question to you is, is this the way you behave professionally? Is this professional, uh, behavior,

Students shake their heads and answer: No.

Injr: What are you supposed to do? Somebody gives you feedback. (Pause)

Lela: You give feedback to them

Injr: What?

Unknown: You give them feedback.

Injr: Ok, someone gives you feedback? They try to help you.

Renaldo: What do you mean when you say?

Injr: Right, you ask them to explain it. Give me an example. So, John, you just said, 360 years. I am not sure I understand, would you please explain. So, ladies and gentlemen, the professional thing is to go in there and talk to the person first. Ask them to explain it. They explain it and you feel that you indeed have been insulted, resign. But, what is this man doing? He is coming in and he is resigning, before he even talks to
Baker. Baker played tennis with him for two years. He spent two years trying to uhhh get him ready to take over the job. Is Rennals fair to Baker?

Renaldo: Absolutely not.

Injr: Has Rennals destroyed Baker's career?

Unknown: No

Unknown: No

Renaldo: Well, in a way he did, because he.....

Injr: Ladies and gentlemen, Baker can just hang it up. What will everybody remember always about Baker? The one who lost Rennals or the one who upset the son of the finance minister, so on and so forth. Ok, in effect, Baker can just, after Canada, he retires. Ok, he's done. Uh, no more fast track for him.

Here's a question to you, you have this option. Baker has to decide what to do, uh, now about Rennals. Do you want Rennals to come back?

Unknown: (Garbled)

Injr: (Looks at other student.) Do you want him back?

Toyama: Yea, sure. Yeah.

Injr: Sure, fine. You want Rennals back.
Pause) (Instructor is walking around.)

By getting him back as soon as possible.

Ok, so, ladies and gentlemen, some of you are saying get him back. You are saying, maybe you don’t want him back. Do you have any choice?

Sometimes you do.

You do? Son of the finance minister. Do you really have any choice.

You don’t have any choice.

She said, “You don’t have any choice.”

Baker is finished, destroyed. He’ll retire after two years in Canada. Uh, you are going to have to crawl up to Rennals.

Apologize to him. Bring him back. He’s behaved unprofessionally. He certainly is not setting an example for other people.

Uhh, and you really have no choice. Ok, the father, the political power, you are operating in that particular country and so on. You just, you have a bad situation and you’re just gonna have to deal with it. It is not going to be easy uh, working, working with uh, uhm in that situation. Ok, ladies and gentlemen, Friday.
As demonstrated in the above excerpt, generally at the end of each session, the instructor will do a thematic summary of the case, highlighting the main conclusions and important implications. He tries to include the students in processing the implications, but if they don’t mention all of the key points to consider, he clarifies and adds them to the discussion.

Summary of Student Interaction in the Introduction Phase

Even though the instructor’s role is as a leader in the initial construction of this classroom community, the interaction of the students in the discourse very quickly becomes an influencing factor in the development of the language, acceptable behaviors, and culture of the classroom. Both the instructors and the students have roles in the formation of this new discourse that is evolving.

As in any group, you have some members who are high risk takers and are willing to jump right into a situation, not knowing if they are on target or not. There is the other group of students who range from completely non-risk takers to moderates. These people will observe until their comfort level or a forced situation makes them participate.

Thus, initially, we see this interaction between the group of students with high level of English skills and
general confidence. The instructor is developing them but at the same time trying to bring all of the other class members on board as quickly as possible. The group of participants to first participate actively in class discussion could be referred to as early-birders. The early-birders serve as role models for the others and are setting the pace of the new discourse community that is developing.

In addition to the above example of negotiating levels of participation in the discourse, interaction of students also results in students negotiating where the line is between the world of the cases and that of their individual identities. An example of this would be in the following exchange between Marcus and Bette:

#17(Tp1, 1653-1669) Exchange between Marcus and Bette.

Bette: Yeah, so it's purchasing. Buying is purchasing. So, we agree.

Marcus: You mix it up. That's, That's your problem, maybe, because, uh, when we get back to the beginning, uh Mr. Porter was appointed the sole, the problem of, of raw materials, and just his title. The title of his job is uh, uhm purchasing executive and the problem to solve was just the lack
of raw materials. That's what paragraph two, page one, line four says. ///

Bette: But, it's not my problem. It's the problem of this case. So, I don't consider...correct///

Marcus: That's the problem.... ///

During this lively exchange involving Tom, Bette, and Renaldo, and Mario, Marcus has entered the discussion to support Mario's last statement with proof, however his words make the problem personal to Bette. When Bette responds, "It's not my problem, but the problem of the case." She separates herself as an individual from the problem and character of the case.

Overall, students do not correct each other's grammar or vocabulary too much in this initial stage, but what we do see is a negotiation of comprehensibility when the early-birds of high English language skills are having an exchange with others of weaker skills. When I refer to students as high, moderate, and low, I am referring to their level of comprehensibility of their oral speech as perceived and ranked by myself and the other instructors in the beginning of the course.

Initially in the establishment of the course experience, the students are introduced to the format of
the case class, Through the discussion the case with the instructor facilitating. There is discussion before or after on the theoretical topic. If there is time, the instructor makes comments. No feedback is exchanged between students. Students are negotiating format, procedure, interpretation of definitions, case content, and language, while doing the discussion.

Phase 2: Making Sense of Authenticity

It is in this phase that acknowledgment and negotiation of authenticity becomes more explicit. The feedback and roundtable sessions which appear in Act 2, give students an opportunity to comment on their learning and, in a sense, to process it. The emergence of authenticity happens early on in this phase, and mention of it gradually increases as the students become more confident in expressing themselves and taking on these new identities, as seen in the following excerpts:

#21 Tape 5, 47:06

(Giving feedback to the teams.)

Arthur: “Body language was fine, all were sitting like this (straight,) except for Marcus. He was sitting slumped, I think that, that’s not good when you are in negotiations, but that’s maybe coming when
you are personally are going to be spoken to.”

Tape 5, 106:35 or 1:07.17

Timothy: .....Yes, it was very interesting, because you have many things happen that you can’t predict.

Romeo: Uh, I feel that the case was very interesting, because it’s, uh, I think it is the closest to the reality that we had up to now. There was a lot of action in it, and we have to, uh, work, uh, with many issues and so on.1:07.35) Uh, concerning the feedback to the feedback Timothy just made. I completely agree, and I just want to point out two things, The criticism was that our attitude was too arrogant......

The students’ interest in contributing to the authentic ambiance begins to emerge during the role-play exercise itself. For example, when the negotiation session is just about to get underway, and one team is about to make introductions, some of the members of the other team begin to laugh. The leader of Team A, corrects everyone and states that this is serious business and
that everyone should be serious because of the lengthy and troublesome strike that is in progress in the case.

All respond by stopping their laughter and getting ready to do the bargaining session. In this situation, within a role-play, the student corrects the other students; in his role of the role-play activity, by saying that there is serious business or bargaining to do that day (See the following excerpt).

#23 Tape 5, 1:25-1:58

(Students are role-playing two teams, the union and the management.)

(Playing the role of the Union Representative)

Renaldo: But, first of all, let me introduce you to my people. We haven’t done that. We don’t know who you are. It is not a good starting point, but we’ll do it anyway. So, Mrs. Kienbassinger. She represents our women in our press union. Mr. Jackson, Michael Jackson, (pointing to Do from Vietnam, as many people laugh. Renaldo gives every one a stern and serious look and continues,) “This is not a funny game, ok. So, I mean, this is serious for us. We have been through 64 days. We’re not going to stay more, any longer, ok. Please, if you are not going to negotiate, if you are not gonna take it
seriously, we will just stand up and we have another 64 day strike, ok. So, he is Michael Jackson. He is representing our general employees.

In the above excerpt, the union representative calls on everyone to be serious and does it in the context of the case situation. This was a good move on his part, but some observers might say that if he and his group wanted to insure a serious tone for the negotiation, the union team would have chosen a name that would not be so famous or cause distraction. Of course the reaction of the union representative was spontaneous, so he and his team members probably didn’t imagine what the reaction of others would be.

Another trend that emerges is that when feedback is given, it is given without regard to the cultures of origin. The references made to what is good or what needs improvement are kinds of universally accepted standards in this ESL Case Class community of what counts as good group communication. Furthermore, the students had been given guidelines from which to evaluate each other, however they interpret these guidelines and put whatever significance they want on them.
Expressions of Authenticity

The manifestation and more outward expression of authenticity begin in Phase 2. Students conceptualize authenticity and gradually begin to articulate or try to verbalize their thinking about it.

Clearly, as students become more practiced in the communication strategies, the discussion format of cases, giving and receiving feedback, reflecting, and honestly speaking their minds, they are also more explicit about defining authenticity, and in turn applying this definition to the context of their discourse community, or classroom.

For example, in a case where a $100 million contract was being negotiated, Renaldo, as a judge, gives feedback to one of the teams:

#24 Tape 6, 42:15-42:30

Renaldo: The last negative point I want to mention is laughing. When the class first started with the presentation, you were laughing and I mean it’s a serious matter. It’s hard. It is difficult to avoid laughter, because I mean I did it myself, the other day, but I mean, it is supposed to be a serious bargaining session. We are talking about $100 million dollars, so I
mean there is no place for laughing. So, that's my feedback.

He is holding himself and the others responsible, calling for appropriate behavior on the part of the teams.

Students also use authentic reference to back up the feedback that they have given, for example:

#25 & 26 Tape 6, 43:40-44:07

(Giving feedback to Arthur)
Marcus: Overall the body language was very good. You didn't get too emotional, which was very important, but at the opposite, uh it seemed to me that he, he was too less engaged when he, negotiations, because I don't have to remind you there are a $100 million dollars involved. You should have been a little more active.

He backs up his suggestion that Arthur be more active with the idea that a large sum of money depended on his active participation in the bargaining.

Call for Authenticity

When there is a certain financial amount or a tangible asset at risk, such as a plant or company, students use that to inspire or call for authenticity.
For example, during the round table segment of the case discussion class, students are able to comment on their reaction to the discussion. In the following excerpts, they call on their colleagues to take the monetary value into consideration on how serious they should be about their work and bargaining.

#27a Tape 6, 1:05.22

Bette: Yeah, I completely agree with Mario. You don’t have to have a fight to bargain, but everybody, everybody was laughing all the time. We were too smooth to each other in the groups. You can have a little bit more power. It doesn’t mean you have to be aggressive, like I was yesterday, but you can use a little more power. Come on you are bargaining, uhm a $100,000 dollars.

Ed: A hundred million.

#27b Tape 6, 1:05.33-1:05.52

Marcus: I think that is absolutely true because, uh, if you are in a bargaining session, and ok, you make a proposal and there’s an agreement. I see the real bargaining session concerned about one hundred
dollars, there’s an agreement, uh, one hundred million dollars, There is an agreement after five minutes, I would say, ‘Ok, let’s push the agenda, I will shorten this.

Another way that students invoked authenticity was to refer the others to their jobs or occupations in the role-play, e.g.

#28 Tape 6, 1:06.40-1:07.31

(While evaluating the bargaining session that just occurred.)

Thom: We were not in the position to show power.
Guill: Can you imagine you are lawyers, you are lawyers of the company. You are representing the company. I thought that at the beginning, I had the power, you know, and, and, your way of behaving was like respect for us, because you know that that we can blast you down. When I said that strong thing, then Arthur said, No, (He demonstrates how Arthur elbowed him in the side not to say anything.) No, no, no, no. So, so, so, that’s why as a lawyer, I couldn’t say anymore.
He tries to make the comparison between the situation of the case and what the students imagine that lawyers do. In another example:

#29 Tape 6, 1:09.45-1:10.15

Bette: I have got the impression that you were not concerned about the money at all. Imagine, you are a real, real ABC. I didn’t get any sign or attention that you were ABC. (She demonstrates how they smiled and shook their heads as if to not take the situation seriously or realistically.) Well, you only wanted to agreement. I agree that you don’t have to fight, but you were not concerned about the money. Not at all.

Again a student makes references to the money as an asset, but in addition, she relates the situation to if they were “really” ABC Corporation, calling for an authentic attitude on the part of the participants.

There are other times that students define authenticity not in terms of money or the case itself, but in terms of the communicative activity itself, as seen in these two excerpts.

Activities Inspire Authenticity
Chunghee: I am very pleased to participate in the bargaining session, cause it was like a real, real discussion and I think we are all, all our members are really serious about our topics and all of them doing a good job.

Toyama: This discussion, this meeting is very vital for me, because I can see, I can feel the real feeling of argument and how to make a preparation for his argument is very good for me.

In these two instances, the students are making inference to what they interpret to be a bonafide discussion in business, which is authentic behavior for the MBA classroom. Sometimes reference to the MBA classroom is explicit:

Juan: And uh well also for Duc and Toyama, speaking Duc and Toyama. We are going to go to the MBA, and there are going to be 80 people in class, so our arguments need to be
really really good and very concise and much better English than we do.

Though the students are themselves now actively involved in negotiating authenticity, the instructor continues to reinforce this process. Joao, an instructor, follows up on Juan's comment:

#32a Tape 6, 1:35.05-1:35.35 (Instructor comments)

Joao is an instructor.

Joao: Thank you. Can I connect with that? If you are speaking for four or five minutes to express yourself. Forty five seconds to express one idea. Ok, have enough confidence make your point and let other people comment. If you hold the floor for a long time, it suggests maybe you are not so confident in what you’re saying, you don’t want to get trounced by anyone else. So, it’s a value to say it and get out. You got other people who wanna make a point.
Summary of Student Interaction in the Making Sense Phase

This second level of making sense of authenticity is a combination of realization and vocalization. The realization is gradually evolving, and eventually, as participants become more confident, they begin to express their thinking or struggle in negotiating meaning. Finally, what is key is that students have an opportunity provided by the feedback and round-table session to express their opinion about their learning process.

Phase 3: Full Emergence of Meaning Making of Authenticity

Signs of negotiation of authenticity become more and more identifiable as students became more confident in their ability to participate in the class. For example, when students made their group presentations, they assigned titles to each other and wore suits or a combination of something that gave the semblance of formality such as a white shirt and tie with blue jeans. This might seem like a contradiction, but in some cases, students didn’t come to the summer school prepared to wear suits. Another reason for mixing formal with informal wear could be that they acknowledged the formality of the presentation, but still saw it as a class and not completely the real thing. The actual practice of dressing up for the major presentations
varied from group to group and from class to class. The instructor did not make dress a specific and stated requirement. The charge to the students was to make the presentation in the context of a case. The students had to interpret and decide what was authentic for them. They themselves set the limits of what was an authentic professional presentation.

As students had more practice in various communication skills, they began to have a clearer idea of what behaviors would be expected of them in the target discourse and they were gradually able to articulate it more. During a feedback activity session, (#33, Tape 7, 45.31-46:00 or later) Lela says to Toyama, “Your weak point, the participation, I know you have the capacity to take the floor more time. If you are going to MBA, you need to develop the ability to take the floor.” This is a very direct reference to the target discourse which was not done earlier in the program.

Another way that students authenticated an activity was to compare it to an activity in which certain procedures were considered legitimate. Take the situation where the students are discussing that one team of the presenters did not use visuals or handouts and whether or not they should use visual and handouts in presentations:
I think that Bette's point has got some value. I think that the most important thing of a handout is that when transparency has gone, you can still review, when you think, oh, what's that point. You can go back. I think it is a good point to have a handout.

I think you can take notes easily.

When, when, you sit here on the next time, you don't see how helpful it is to spend the meeting having a handout. And we used to also have handouts, uh, we made handouts. And one page was divided in four. That machine was divided in four. Here, the first transparency, here, the second. And here, just lines that say notes. In all the meetings, all the people had that. When somebody was speaking, the other person could take notes on that part. And it was a must to have a handout.
In the above exchange, Arthur, Renaldo, and Juan give the advantages of using visuals and handouts. Each one is doing what the instructor called "piggy-backing" off of one another. Juan adds two strong arguments for their argument when he says, "When you sit here," he means, when you are in the role of the listener, you will see the value of the visuals and handouts. He goes further to refer to the expected usage of visuals and handouts in his previous job, adding some legitimacy to the argument. Being legitimate in the work place is a point for authenticity.

At some point, students begin to notice whether or not they are improving in the skills practiced and they might articulate this consciously or unconsciously. This can be seen in the following excerpt from a feedback session, where one student, Juan begins to give feedback to both teams:

#35 Tape 8, 1:12.30-1:12.42

Guill: First of all, I want to congratulate both groups. I think that the level of discussion was good. It seems that we are improving each day.

This is a general comment that because the discussion flowed, it was his judgment that this was what should have happened. His idea of improving implies that
he believes that the group is getting close to the level of discussion that he expects will be needed in the future.

Behavior also becomes a measure for inclusion and consideration. This includes body language which is one of the many areas for evaluation of a presentation.

Obviously, it is assumed that looking professional is what everyone in this class will want to do in order to fit into the M.B.A. class or a business/professional setting. Students address this issue in the following excerpts:

#36 Tape 9, 1:02.40-53 (Marcus is giving feedback to Felix.

Marcus: At the beginning, you had always the hand on your chin, like that. Which doesn't look professional, though, I can understand it. You played a lot with your pen. I would suggest you not to do that.

In another example, Toyama is giving feedback to Marcus about appearance and image:

#37 Tape 8, 1:24.10-1:25.45

Toyama: You are taking notes. Your .... is very good, and your... is very clear. You said specific but
important questions, and the negative feedback,
I guess somebody has to agree with me, but your eyes...
Your eyes are so nice and so kind and so beautiful, but sometimes you must look more hard impression.
My suggestion is, I am not sure if you agree with that, but maybe it is a good idea for you to use the glass, maybe something like Romeo’s. Then you can get very hard and hard impression.

Marcus: I don’t get what you mean, excuse
Toyama: Your face is so kind, but sometimes you need to hard to look with hard man.
I am a very hard negotiator
Do you agree with that?
But one way to do that is to buy a nice glass without any degree. And you put on the glass. So, you looks intelligent (everyone laughs) and more handsome.

Toyama smiled and laughed a little as he said these things. It was if he was trying to be careful not to offend, but other students also began to laugh at his
descriptive language that sounds awkward in North American culture, coming from a man in describing another. Toyama finally managed to get through the uneasy part of his description and better explained what he wanted to say, which was that Marcus should try different strategies to make himself appear older and more serious. This was to compensate for his rather boyish look. Whether this was a observation value shared by all observers or was just a value based on Japanese culture, Toyama’s home culture, is difficult to distinguish. It was probably a mixture of both Japanese cultural expectations and some transcultural standards of what makes a person appear to be youthful and inexperienced or mature and of strong character.

Marcus, the student in question was one of the younger participants in the case program. The profile of most of the participants was post-bachelors, graduate school, and often carrying a few years of work experience. Marcus was either going to be a junior or senior in his native country, Germany, which was the equivalent level of the U.S. junior or senior undergraduate around 20 years old. He had requested permission to take the course because his older brother had taken it a few years before and was now in the Harvard Business School MBA Program. He had recommended
that Marcus take our course as preparation to applying for the Harvard MBA Program in the future. For Marcus, the course's value as a preparation for the HBS MBA program is clear and authentic for him because his brother took this course and was later accepted into the MBA program.

It is not clear to me whether he believed that the course actually prepares one for the graduate studies or that just taking the course has some pull for getting you into the Harvard MBA program. Also, he may have believed that there is an advantage of just coming to the states, seeing Harvard, and studying in the U.S. gives a student an edge for seeking admission to an American University in the future.

I learned of his motivation through discussion in our individual advising session. I called his attention to his poor quality work and weak class participation during the first week. I had even suggested that he switch out of this course to the general ESL intensive program, if he was not serious. Well, that was enough to find out about his goals and motivations. He promised me that he was going to improve both in written assignments and class participation. In fact, he became quite active in class, improved the quality of his written
assignments, and successfully completed the course with above average evaluations.

Our discussion helped remind him of his purpose and mission that summer. It also reinforced for him the fact that the ESL Case Discussion Class was the authentic experience that he really wanted to have versus taking the general ESL intensive class.

Controlling Various Skills at an Adequate Level and Switching from One to the other Easily and Frequently

In the early part of the course, students are exposed to different strategies one by one or one or two at a time, for example how to do an analysis, the turn taking process, and different content themes, such as marketing, management, supervision, etc.

We see in previous examples that they negotiate each strategy one at time. However, as students become comfortable with different practices, they tend to be able to discuss a point of tension on classroom procedure and then switch to discuss the content or problem of the case and then consider the arguments made by the other students.

During the roundtable activity, students can choose to comment on different things. This is the only time that they get an opportunity to respond to feedback or to express their opinions on what has gone on in the
previous discussion and feedback portions of the class. Sometimes, they comment or respond to the feedback given by the judges. Other times, they discuss and negotiate the mechanical nuts and bolts of how a presentation should be done. In the early sessions, students tend to give feedback on performance, but are encouraged to and do comment on a range of issues, as well as, issues of the case being analyzed. As they become more experienced and comfortable with the round-table exercise, they comment on performance, communication skill, language, the content of the case, anything else that has impressed them.

In the round table activity of the last presentation of the course, the students talk more about the content of the case discussion itself and what some of the dynamics of that interaction were. This could be because they have discussed issues of form in the past and can jump tight into content or they felt that content was more important an issue for them than at that time. Some examples of comments and concerns mentioned during the round-table exercise by students follow:

#38a (Tape 10, 1:07.43-1:08.18)
Chunghee: .....enforce your power, when you said, "50%, 50%, as if you were going to kick them out of the company, and during your presentation, I knew that you
were losing control, because your overhead....one person, eye contact, and during this time, nobody seems like, listen to you.

The previous comment relates to presentation skills and techniques. Whereas, the following comment refers to role playing and the participants understanding of the case:

#38b (Tape 10, 1:09.45-1:10.10)

Juan: I want to connect, with, uh, Nelson. I don’t know, Toyama, you were supposed to be rated the worst and the issues were, you had the worst performance, so if I were you, I would get so mad. In front of everybody, he tell me I’m the worst and you were the only one supporting him. So, I didn’t understand that.

The above comments were made during the roundtable discussion after a negotiation session. Juan was commenting on the performance of the team members while under pressure and questioned the strategy used by Toyama during the role-play. In the case being discussed, Nelson was a supervisor and had rated the performance of the sales representative played by Toyama to be very poor. Here you see the blurring of case roles and identities of students in the class.
Questions on Culture

During the roundtable session, students could ask questions of the group or teacher about content, procedure, and culture/language issues. In the following excerpt, the student is asking what is the culturally correct way to behave in a meeting in the U.S. This leads to an opportunity for the instructor to talk about cultural expectations in the U.S.:

#38c (Tape 10, 1:11.35-12:50)

Suzuki: Let me make sure about some trainee position. It is very difficult for us to join the meeting, especially, I am not sure, so, if we can join or not. If in Japan, it is very impossible for us to join the training, so I have a one question. It’s possible to join like this situation, very exciting. Very exciting.

By “exciting,” he is referring to what would be called a heated discussion.

(1:11.54-12.20)

Injr: Yeah, you’re just supposed to show you are interested. Ok, and since some people think that the trainees are not that well prepared, so to sort of sit there quietly,
all, all meeting long, would not make a strong impression. So, In this country, I would expect the trainees to say something to show they’re listening, they’re interested, and they’re motivated.

When the instructor says, "strong impression," he means, that the trainees would not make a favorable impression on their boss, if they were silent for the whole meeting.

(1:12.20-12.24) Suzuki: So, what time should we get in the....?

(1:12.24-12.51) Injr: If it is only to say, to ask him a question to explain something. You just want to communicate to the manager that you are paying attention to what’s going on. Ok, in this culture, if you don’t say anything for an hour, you’re bored, you’re completely disinterested. You have to show from time to time, uh, that you are paying attention.

In the previous excerpt, the student’s question and the instructor’s comment show how cultural differences affect interpretation and analysis of cases. In Japan, a trainee would be expected to stay quiet and just listen,
while in the U.S., a trainee should be attentive and make comments to indicate that they are following the discussion.

Not only are students able to make comments or reflect on and discuss different skills, they begin to be able to separate them from each other and apply them to situations in or out of the restrictions of the role-play. e.g.:

In the following exchanges, the students, in roles of salespersons are responding to a presentation made by a manager about his plan for re-organization of territories for the sales representatives?

#39 (Tape 10, 24.43-25.35)

Lela: I'd like to say that I am very happy about your plan because I can suggest exactly this way. I .. two months ago. Sometimes it is very hard for me to cover a lot my accounts so far is and you, you give me exact, my first plan. I am very happy, because if I can concentrate my job in one area, I am sure that I can improve market share. I am very glad about that.

Ed: We are sure about that too.

Lela: Yeah
Ed: I mean, we know that it has been very hard for you to work in those two counties, too, too, too, too large, with so many accounts in them, and that's why we didn't....

Lela: I promise you I improve my performance very fast.

Ed: We are relying on you on that. I am sure you will do it.

Lela is telling the manager in the role-play that she is agreeable to his proposal.

During the next heated discussion, within the same role play, a usually active student in the class, Arthur, has held off making comments because he is expecting orderly turn-taking to occur. Finally, frustrated, he blurts out that he has been following the rule of raising his hand before speaking, but he hasn't been acknowledged. This was the class rule used to facilitate turn taking during discussion of the cases and he was applying that rule to this meeting in the role-play. The scene is depicted in the next excerpt:

#40 (Tape 10, 32.20, 32.25-30)

Arthur: (Hands go up. He waits for about 10 seconds and says,) "Mr. Timothy, I have my
hand in the air.” (Then, he slaps his hand on the table in disgust and frustration. He eventually gets in the conversation as follows.)

41 (Tape 10, 33.05)

Ed: Ok, I take you seriously. Mr. Taylor

(Giving the turn to Arthur.)

(33.08-45)

Arthur: Mr. Timothy, I can tell you, there is absolutely no reason for me to stay here as you are constantly, uh, holding monologue here. You are saying to people from 58, 48 years old, colleagues of mine, Mr. Simpson, who is, who is an excellent salesman You are telling him just to improve his sales techniques. I, I really wonder what you have in mind, then. I believe that you should give some examples. The only thing you are doing here is saying simple platitudes about getting more sales, uh, lower the costs, what is this all about? Come with some specific examples and we will answer you.
Contrary to how Lela chose to play her role in excerpt #39, Arthur as Mr. Taylor was not happy with the manager's plan.

Conclusions for the Full Emergence Phase of Meaning Making of Authenticity

In this phase, students are a lot more vocal and specific in what they consider authentic. They can give specific examples and make reference to the target discourse that they have in mind, be it the M.B.A. classroom, or the "real business world." In addition, we see that students are able to learn presentation skills and at the same time, practice problem solving/analysis, discussion, and writing skills. It is difficult to determine if the presentation/discussion activities help the students better understand the cases or if it is the cases that help the students develop the presentation skills. It is likely a little of both. By the latter part of this phase, students are demonstrating control of various skills at an adequate level and are switching from one to the other easily and frequently.

Secondly, it is even more clear in Act 3 how reflection, that allows students to identify skills they should learn or improve on, occurs in the feedback session. Most of this identification comes from the students themselves when they give and receive feedback.
Thirdly, as students have more and more opportunities to process their learning and to discuss it with each other, the important role of the roundtable activity in the skills acquisition process becomes more evident.

It is when students have opportunities to reflect on and process their learning that they are able to negotiate authenticity and the development of the new discourse.

In this process, they are continuously appropriating identities, relations, and ideologies that fit the discourse of the business world.
CHAPTER 5

TENSIONS IN NEGOTIATING AUTHENTICITY

In the case discussion class, the actual discussion format allows students to discuss the cases and to negotiate what should be or not be included in the different sections of the analysis. They are really struggling with what is expected of them in order to do an analysis. The task of having them figure this out with others forces them to communicate. It is while they try to communicate that they deal with language and procedure issues.

It is the struggle that represents moments of tension. Tensions, then are those times of friction that occur while attempting to communicate and negotiate learning. These moments of stress, either with another person or within oneself, usually result in a growth in understanding and learning. It is the tensions that develop while students carry out various activities that actually result in a defining and conceptualizing an authentic discourse community.

Using Turner’s (1974) four phases of social drama as a reference: breach, crisis, redressive action, and reintegration, it seemed to me that tensions play that breach role in this discourse community. They serve as catalysts for interaction. The drama becomes crisis when
anyone else in the community decides to address the breach. This can be a response from another student or an instructor. The ensuing exchange or discussion really is the redressive action or mechanism brought into play to deal with the crisis. The reintegration happens once the current exchange on an issue stops. The result may be a temporary agreement of some new general consensus or an agreement that there are different opinions and that people still have to make some choices based on what they have heard from others. Discussion on issues reoccurred throughout the life of this discourse community. Only on certain occasions, would an instructor influence an outcome with a specific, "This is it" statement. In most cases, the instructor would summarize the issues raised and leave it for the group to come to a conclusion unless there was some point that was indisputable or that was not clear to everyone in the group. In that case, s/he might explain some points in more detail to be sure that everyone understood the essential issues at hand.

I have identified eight factors which produce tensions in the learning environment and experience. These factors contribute to or impede the process of negotiation of authenticity. They are the instructor factor, negotiation of language and communication, negotiation of etiquette for the classroom, negotiation
of advanced levels of language, cultural identification, sorting out cultural differences and techniques, reaching a plateau in group level of comprehensibility, and issues of gender.

**Tension #1: The Instructor Factor**

Tensions take different forms throughout the course. The first tension I look at is the instructor factor. Who the instructor is affects the attitude and learning of the students. The instructor's age, ethnicity, first language, academic background, teaching style, and institution affiliation can affect the students' response to teaching and the learning/acquisition process. The tension really is how the students and instructors react to each other and how variables either have a positive, negative, or neutral effect.

There were eight instructors involved in this program of five sections of 100 students. Each section of 20 students had class for three hours per day of which there were two hours of case class and one hour of case skills class. Four other assistants and I taught the five sections of case skills. We were called case specialists. Each one of us taught the same group every day. We also sat in and observed every day, the case
class of our group in order to be able to help them improve in all skills: language and case analysis.

The lead instructor and two junior instructors taught the case class. They were all called case leaders or instructors. The three instructors rotated between the five sections so that each section would have a different case instructor each day, yet all sections would have experience with the lead instructor. The junior instructors had been case specialists in the past, had taken the course, or were presently in the Harvard MBA Program. The case discussion segment and skills hour were centrally planned and all of us were following the same schedule and lesson materials. Despite efforts to standardize the experience as much as possible, the differences between instructors influenced the learning experience. For example, the lead instructor created the course, understood the business case method, and had training and experience in language teaching. He is a European-American middle aged male. On the other hand, one of the junior instructors was a doctorate student in economics at Northeastern University and had worked with this program and the lead instructor for the two years previous to this as a case specialist. He had no training in language teaching. He is a person of African
descent, Cape Verdean heritage, who grew up here in Massachusetts and was a native speaker of English.

The third case instructor was from El Salvador. He was a second year MBA student in the (HBS) Harvard Business School. He had completed this program before entering the HBS and was the bearer of authentic knowledge of the MBA Case Studies Program. He had the appearance of a western European. Although he was fluent in English, he had a noticeable accent and made occasional errors in grammar and pronunciation. He had been a university instructor in business in his university in El Salvador. He did not, however, have training or experience as a language instructor.

I describe the instructors because I want to discuss how their different backgrounds and ways of teaching might affect the learning process.

The first theme that comes out is that all the junior instructors are apprentices of the lead instructor. When you observe the other instructors, including me, you can see his influences and hear expressions that he uses. The two junior instructors do well in facilitating the case discussion and follow the same plan of instruction as the lead instructor.

However, there are some noticeable differences between them and the lead instructor. One obvious point
is that the lead instructor corrects students for language, communication skills, and case analysis organization and content. The results are that students many times model the language and expressions of the lead instructor. An example of this is the use of the expression, “Let me piggy-back on that.” The lead instructor uses this early in the course and very soon after, I begin to hear students using the same expression. On the contrary, while students participate actively in the class discussions of the other instructors, they do not model the language of the two junior instructors. I raise the question, is this so because the junior instructors have no training in language development and very seldom correct students for this? Is this modeling done because the lead instructor often corrects them for grammar or expressions?

I wonder if the difference in response from the students is because one of the junior instructors is a non-native speaker. Also, could the fact that the other instructor is a person of color, have anything to do with the difference in modeling?

Another factor of difference is age. The lead instructor is considerably older than the junior instructors are. The evidence that age difference might affect learners’ reaction to the instructor is that the
junior instructors received more back talk and challenges than the lead instructor did.

This whole question of the effect of the perception of the students of the instructor is very interesting and worthy of further study. One inference I can ascertain from observing the classes is that those instructors who do not have any training in language development are not able to integrate it with their teaching of the cases as well as the lead instructor is able to do. They are able to comment on some communication skills but not to the same extent as the lead instructor does.

The other factor to consider is how the race, ethnicity, age, and first language of the instructor influence the negotiation of learning by the students. I can not pursue this point more in this study, but only mention it as a factor in the development of a discourse community. However, the issue is important to our discussion on tensions because students may be affected initially by differences of age, race, ethnicity, first language, gender, academic background, and institution affiliation. The effect may exist, but it is also a changing and negotiated influence.

Some factors may initially be blocks to learning. For example, if a student is uncomfortable communicating with an instructor because of the first language, s/he
may later get over this block. The student will approach the instructor in a positive way, as s/he gets accustomed to the difference in accent, recognizes the competencies of the person, and comes to accept that person as being able to meet his or her learning needs. This effect then is not necessarily a permanent one. Of course, some of these factors could also have a positive influence on students and their learning.

The differences in instructors and the reaction of students to those differences form tensions. The resolving of these tensions can either facilitate or hinder learning. Both the students and instructors are constantly negotiating these tensions. Where the tensions initially are having a negative effect or causing a block, there is a chance that the objection to an instructor is temporary and its negative effect will be lessened as the students work through their conscious or unconscious objections. Sometimes, people keep their objections and maintain some block or rejection of the instructor. Of course, some of these factors of objection are not controllable, such as ethnicity, physical size, gender, voice quality, age, and first language of instructor. Instructors should be aware of issues related to them as individuals, and how these
factors, whether controllable or uncontrollable, influence the development of class dynamics.

Another issue that I overheard students discussing was whether or not the instructors were "regular" Harvard instructors. This topic arises as students come to realize that instructors in the summer program are adjunct and come from other universities all over the country. This must affect their first impression of authenticity because they question it. However, once the course is under way, this topic doesn't seem to come up again. Apparently, the institution, campus, class materials, ambiance, and demanding course requirements seem to meet their need or desire to be at Harvard. Nevertheless, there is always this realization and undertone that the summer programs in general are good, but they are not quite the "real thing."

Tension #2: Negotiation of Language and Communication Skills

As far as language development is concerned, while facilitating discussion, the teachers do not correct grammar, vocabulary, or pronunciation and students do not correct each other on specific points. However, students are willing to ask for repetition when they can't
understand another person. e.g. (low level to high levels)
(The following excerpt is addressed to Juanermo a high level student by a low English level student.)

#1  (Tape 4, 49:10-49:16)

Lela: Stop, please, slowly, please, for my comprehension. OK?

Juan:  (Smiles and says,) OK.

Lela: Alright.

In the following excerpt, two high level students negotiate content related issues:

#2  (Tape 4, 59:33-59.58)

Bette: I have a question. I uh. It’s a question that I am not sure about. If you have an acid drop, it can also happen, if you have a sugar percentage from 25% or from 20. It doesn’t, If you have an acid drop, it doesn’t say that you must not include, it can be 25% of sugar or 20%.

Toyama: Yeah, if so, it can be included in this one.

Bette: So, your organization tree will be different then.
Juan: If you are showing that for a person that doesn’t know about wines, and you are telling him that if it’s less than 20% of concentration of sugar, they will have an acid crop. That’s, that’s not really the truth. You are like, trying to show something that is not true.

By the second half of the course, students demonstrated competency with the skill of using PPL (Page, Paragraph, and Line) referencing the text to prove arguments, which was introduced in earlier. We can see the ease of usage in the following passages:

#4 (Tape 4, 50:45-51:12)

Bette: Or I was wondering on the first page, first paragraph. It says, the storm just before the harvest is usually de, detrimental often ruining the crop. What about that factor, a storm is coming?

Juan: Where is it? Excuse me.

Bette: First page, third paragraph, line,... uhh, line 3,... line 5, sorry.

Another example of use and response by a second student:
#5 (Tape 4, 1:04.10-1:04.26)
Juan: I think that your assumption is very good because we have to work, with, with, with, things that we have here, for example, second page, second paragraph. In the middle of the paragraph, it says....

#5a (Tape 4, 1:04.28)
Bette: Yes, Yeah,

Just about midway through the course during the lesson entitled "Freemark Abbey," students demonstrate a confidence in working with the format and organization of the order for discussion, which is a goal of the early cases and activities. However, students continue to struggle with defining the process of turn taking, for example, during a heated exchange, as we see in the following conversation:

#6a (Tape 4, 10:53-11:13)
Mario: I can say that I am from Italy, and we have a tradition about that.

Bette: But red or white wine, you can make it outdoors. It doesn’t depend if you had white or grapes, it doesn’t matter. You make it...(Mario interrupts)

Mario: But. .
Bette: (I'm sorry, you make a decision....
Please let me finish. I am really worried about it. (She sits quietly for two seconds.)

Mario: Are you finished?

Bette: Yeah

Tension #3: Negotiation of Etiquette for the Discourse

The following excerpt is an example of negotiation of turn taking as strategy. This could be both an ESL or MBA strategy. It is hard to distinguish them because we taught turn taking as a negotiation strategy for the business class.

#6b (Tape 4, 13:10-13:37)

Bette: and you have different kinds of grapes.
You don't know it. If you only have
Riesling grapes. You don't know that, so
you are not sure. You are not sure about
that. (Other students begin interrupting.)
No, I am not finished yet. I will say
when I am finished. It is really
unpolite. I don't like it. I am not very
good in English, to talk that fast and you
aren't either, so, let's...Uh, Oh, I forgot what I said....
On another occasion, Renaldo has to negotiate his turn:

#7  (Tape 4, 45:55-46:30)

Mario:  I have a lot of information in this way.

Renaldo:  Then you are not making a decision tree.
          OK, let me finish.  Now, it's my turn, OK.
          Sorry, I don't want to be uh rude.  I mean.  OK, I see your point, uhh, in that compared.  You are talking about image.
          But, that kind of information is not supposed to appear in a decision tree.

Mario:  Yeah,

Renaldo:  To, to, to, to.  Image is one of your reasons for the problem.  The only reason for a decision tree is only concerned to numbers and probabilities and expected values.

Mario:  OK, OK.

Even though, at this point, the students are practicing and improving previously acquired skills, they are being introduced to two new skills. One set of skills is related to the preparation of this quantitative case, Freemark Abbey, and the second to presentation skills.
In this case, students had to prepare their analysis using a technique called "decision tree analysis." They either researched the technique on their own, or they read the handout that I had researched and given them, and/or both. My researching this topic and preparing a handout for my students was clearly a form of scaffolding that I did for my group. Nevertheless, neither the other instructors nor I presented a lecture on the technique, so students were left to figure it out individually or in groups.

The discussion of this quantitative case saw a change in the number of active participants. For example, those students who were strong in English and who had strong quantitative skills continued to be active participants in discussion. This group included Bette, Arthur, Juan, and Renaldo. On the other hand, students who had comparatively weak oral skills, but who were strong quantitatively, participated more than in previous discussions. This was the case of Mario, Lela, and Toyama. Those who were moderate in English skills, but weak in quantitative skills tended to be less active than they had been in previous sections.

The other skill that students were being introduced to was related to body language for presentation. After the class briefly reviewed the problem facing the company
in the case, students were asked to present the decision
trees they had prepared. Different students were called
on to come up to the board and explain some steps of the
decision tree. Each person would add or change a part of
the tree based on his/her idea. If someone disagreed
with the flow of the tree, then s/he was allowed or asked
to go to the board and show the class in what direction
s/he thought the tree should go.

It was while students came to the board for 1-3
minutes that the instructor made comments about
presentation skills, such as,

Tape 4 58:31
Joao (Instructor) says to Toyama:
“You have your back to the audience.”
Toyama says: “Yeah,” and turns sideways.

Tape 4 58:59
Joao (Instructor) to Toyama:
“You have to make more eye contact.
Toyama: Smiles and says, “Yeah

#8 (Tape 4, 58:00-58:19)
Toyama: Maybe, I will not write down, but I think
I try write down this, it’s more easy to
understand. So, Lela could understand it.
(Smiles)
Lela: Yeah,
Toyama: Well, anyway, can I go fast now?
58:16
Joao: Toyama, you got your back to the audience.
Toyama: Yeah, (Turns his body sideways, so that he is now perpendicular to the board and class.)

In the previous excerpt, Toyama, an advanced language speaker is showing concern that Lela, who is at an intermediate level of English language comprehension, can follow the discussion.

#9 (Tape 4, 18:45-18:57)
(Toyama is writing figures for his decision tree on the board. He has his back to the audience.)

Toyama: ...and this gonna be 3.2.
Joao: Toyama you are going to have to make more eye contact.

Toyama: Smiles) and says, Yeah.

This kind of correction was not prefaced by any kind of lecture on presentation skills, but was integrated into the carrying out of the task of doing and presenting
the decision tree. Later in the course, students would be given guidelines for making presentations, in turn, would make presentations, and finally evaluate each other based on these guidelines. They were also given criteria for how to give evaluation to others in the form of feedback and were in turn, scrutinized or evaluated by others on how well they gave feedback. For example, in a roundtable session, (See excerpts #10a-j.) Bette, Mario, Felix, Duc, and Timothy negotiate what feedback should be like, particularly about balancing the number of positive and negative points. During the feedback session, Ralf had presented two positive points and about seven negatives to another student. Most of the other students in the class felt that this was not a balanced approach. (See excerpts #10a-j.) Bette and Timothy debate whether hearing all the points you can improve on is good or if it is really a question of giving too much negative feedback at one time.

Arthur opens the discussion with his comment.

#10a (Tape 7, 1:17.55-

Arthur: I'd like to, to, to, give some feedback to the judges and maybe in general to Ralf. I think that you tried to make a lot of good feedback. May I make a suggestion for the future. Be a little bit more
concise. You were talking about, uh, Duc, I think, and you took about six or seven minutes and the purpose of this is you give with the six of you uh, uh, within 15 minutes your points, so please in the next time, take some notes and make it as short as possible.

According to the rules of the roundtable event, the students can evaluate or respond to the feedback that was given by the judges in the feedback event. During the roundtable exercise, there is equal chance for participants to respond to each other's comments, unlike in the feedback session, where those being evaluated cannot make any comments. The feedback form is taken from a model of supervision presented and discussed earlier as a theoretical reading. The rule was to give one or two positive points and one or two negative points and then suggestion(s) for improvement. Also the rule of the feedback session was that the team of judges of 5-6 persons had 15 minutes as a team to give the feedback, so they were supposed to all participate equally in that time limit.

#10b (Tape 7, 1:21.25-1:22.29) The instructor choosing to interject at that point by giving feedback to Romeo about his imbalance in giving positive and negative feedback.
I was very happy to see or to hear a couple of points from you Romeo. I think you have been giving good feedback, very critical feedback for each of you, however, keep in mind, on the other hand, that you know, when we studied how to give feedback for performance appraisal. You have to think in terms of how much can the person take. You, you went just with the big list of negatives and one, two, three, four, five and so on. I asked, my god, is there something nice about this person? Maybe you have a good points, but, however, can the person take that much? I mean, I, on the other hand, keep in mind that you were also taking time from the rest of the group of the judge who have to come up with feedback. Ok, the points are well taken, but don’t go to the extreme is the message.

The instructor was re-emphasizing two points, one, the need to balance between positive and negative points, and two, the need to keep to the time limit. He started off with a compliment and then moved into the negative
and suggestions for improvement. He also explained reasons why the student should consider the format.

#10c (Tape 7, 1:24.05-1:28.12) (Excerpt omitted)
In the continuing segment, students are evaluating the performance of one of their peers, and negotiate what is the best way to give feedback, in spite of the opinion of the instructor given earlier. Bette jumps right in after the instructor's comments and supports Romeo's actions.

#10d (1:24.05-1:14.43)
Bette: And another point, I want to connect with Romeo is that uh, uhm, I like your way of feedback very much, maybe I am the only one, but, I like it very much to get, just the negative points. In my point of view, you learn from the negative points. Everybody knows that you have positive points. It is good to tell them, I agree with the method, but I like it that you were very, you pointed out a lot of negative points and you know when you improve, this is a plus. You have to learn something. In business, you can't, or in business, in your job or whatever, you, you, can't ask well, uh, well that's
where you think I have to improve, and so I appreciate your feedback very much.

In this context, she is analyzing the method and stating her opinion of this. She acknowledges the theories and value of the method. I don’t believe that she is challenging the instructor individually. In spite, of the method, she is stating that she likes the negative comments so that she can know how to improve. She is trying to link it to business, but in fact, the original reading came from an article written by the president of a large corporation on how to give and receive feedback in a supervisory situation. Bette is telling the class that it is permissible to mention negative feedback and that there are some benefits to hearing your weak points, so that you can improve. Her points spark reaction and other students respond to clarify the issue specifically for the context of their community.

#10e (1:24.45-1:25.19)

Mario: (Looking at Bette.) About what you say. I think that you have to balance between the good points and the weak points, because on the contrary, how you can take a lot of weak points in your, how you are thinking. (. . . Incomprehensible...) If you
give me a list of 100 points, I lose uhhh control, and I can’t say which is my worst point, which is my weakest point. I don’t recognize.

Mario tries to give reasons to support the legitimacy of the method by stating how he feels about an overload of negative comments. When he uses the term, “lose control,” he is referring to becoming emotionally upset himself.

In support of Mario’s thinking, Felix adds his thoughts on the issue.

#10f (1:25.40-1:26.07)

Felix: I just want to, to, to point out that I strongly agree with Marioimiliano about the balance of weak points with the strong points, uh, and because if you give some, uh, too much weak points, it means, it’s kind of, you feel like I don’t want to speak anymore, because my format is so bad. I think you don’t feel encouraged to improve yourself.

This argument is presented in the original article. The author gives this as a reason not to overload the negatives because it might demoralize the employee or receiver.
The next speaker puts in a plug for the balanced approach.

#10g (1:26.10-1:26.25)
Frank: (Very choppy and accented pronunciation.)
About the feedback, uh, I think, uh, I, uhm, in your opinion, must be balanced between, uh, good feedback and weakness to improve.

This was a continuation of the theme of the previous two speakers. Bette re-enters the discussion with some conciliation to the others and modification of her ideas.

Inst: Bette.

#10h (1:26.36-1:26.54)
Bette: Oh, what I wanted to say I agree with you, but I think it depends also on the person you’re giving feedback to. You are doing a feedback session with two persons. One is getting, one is perceiving, so you have to control. So, maybe that’s what you want to keep in mind.

This raises a slightly different or variation of issues to the discussion. The original article and the case emphasize quantity and quality of feedback. The
quality or type would need to be adjusted to the receiver and his/her receptivity to it. The instructor invites Do to respond and He comments that in spite of the number of negative comments, he appreciated the feedback given by Romeo.

Inst: Ok, Duc, any comments, reactions?

#10i (1:26.54-1:27.17)

Duc: Yes, I agree completely with Bette and some of you because uh, uh, it depends very much on the person who you, uh, are going to give feedback. About this case, I appreciate very much Romeo’s feedback. And I know what is my weak point and I try to improve it in the future. Thank you.

Inst: Timothy.

The next speaker tries to balance between the two current opinions.
Timothy: Yes, uh, I go back to Bette, what really is essential, for the real way, for receiving, let's say for getting feedback, receiving feedback is the negative feedback, have to learn how to listen to the negative feedback in order to learn about that, but the main point for you, that you have to consider is also that it was not you (Bette) who was receiving feedback from Romeo, it was Marcus and Duc. And so, uh, the question of whether the balance of the positive points in the beginning and the real important negative points are in the second part was balanced or acceptable or not is really what you (Bette) said yourself, depend on the receiver and it might have been a misbalance in this particular case.

Timothy tries to pull out a main idea of the discussion and makes an authentic linkage, when he says, "the real way" is to listen to and learn from the negative feedback. He challenges Bette to consider that she was expressing her ideas and could not speak for
those receiving the feedback, Duc and Marcus. His ending statement, "it might have been a misbalance ..." implies to me that he felt that there was an imbalance.

Marcus, the other receiver of feedback never had an opportunity to respond or participate in the discussion. It ended before he had a chance to enter the exchange. I don’t know his opinion on the circumstance.

This exchange ends, but the issue is not settled. An important point that did not come out in this particular discussion was that the original article refers to the purpose of the feedback, which is to help the person receiving the feedback improve. Some students wanted to hear all of their weaknesses, but there was not enough time to deal with all of anyone’s weaknesses. For a supervisor and our purpose in the course, it was better to focus on one or two strengths and one or two areas that needed improvement. This was done for morale purposes and limitations of time. The discussion of how much feedback and how hard it should be would come up again throughout the course and students were allowed to express their opinions.

Since the conversation took the turn of considering whether someone could or could not handle a number of negative points, Duc may have agreed with those who
wanted to hear as many negative points as possible, or he may have wanted to position himself in a power position as someone strong enough to handle many negative points and suggestions. He may fit both ideas. I can’t be completely sure, but there is room for various interpretations.

However, for the purpose of our exercises in the course, it would be impossible to give individual feedback on every point because of the time constraints and nor would we want to as instructors in order to maintain a positive morale in the class. In a business situation, a supervisor, also, does not have time to give subordinates endless feedback, again because of the issue of morale and time constraints.

For the reader’s sake, let me say that the feedback given by the judge was all valid, but as you can see from the discussion, the issues raised were related to the form of giving feedback for the purpose of maintaining motivation, improvement, and time limitations.

Tension #4: Negotiation of Advanced Levels of Language

As students master the basic discussion skills and procedures and have reached a strong level of oral comprehensibility (understandability), they begin to be
able to negotiate more advanced and subtle aspects of language. For example, in a discussion on the use of the expressions, short, mid and long term, we hear the following exchange between four students.

#11 (Tape 9, 1:46.00-1:46.22)

Chunghee: Basically, "Short term is uh one month or two months, mid term is six, uh, six months..."

Unkn: to one year.

Chunghee: to uh one year.

Frank: I don't agree, I don't agree. In France, short term is one or two years and ...... (Others shake their heads and laugh.)

In the latter part of the course, students are willing to correct or make suggestions to their co-students about language, as seen in Excerpt #12:

#12 (Tape 9, 1:10.24-1:10.56)

Bette: The points in which you can improve is, you said, "I am sorry for being a financial person. Maybe I would suggest you to say, "I am a financial person, so, naturally I am interested in this figure." Uh, the question was very good because they ask for a lot of money, so you'd want to know when they think, when they're going to break even be at. And another point, you took the
floor one time, "May I ask a question?"

(She smiles and says,) "I want to ask a question." I would suggest. (Turning to the person next to her.) OK, you're next.

Bette is giving suggestions based on her impression of what the posture of a financial administrator should be and the language or expressions that give an image of a confident and assertive attitude.

Here we have an advanced speaker giving feedback to another advanced speaker. The level and subtlety of the correction require a high command of the language. In both corrections, she is trying to give him examples of language that express positive and assertive strength. This shows a higher level of skills on her part and the expectations that he can handle this higher level of language usage. This is also a good example of how students of high English language skills can challenge each other to improve.

How do these examples relate to tensions and what does it mean? When students negotiate a point of language, communication skill, behavior, or content there is a tension. After the topic has been discussed, there is a release of tension. There may not be complete agreement and the point may be revisited but with each visit to the same topic, the group reaches a higher level
of mutual agreement or understanding. This is an ongoing process. There are moments when I have heard the lead instructor say, "We can agree to disagree."

This is clearly the indicator of the reintegration phase of the social drama when there could be agreement, disagreement, or agreement of multiple views co-existing.

**Tension 5: Negotiation of Cultural Identification**

There are many themes that emerge in relation to the language and communication skills development. One is the reference to cultural identity. In one situation of tension during a discussion over whether two students should apologize for not having visuals or handouts prepared for the presentation. The other members of the same team had prepared visuals for their part of the presentation. The two in question, did not use visuals and one of them apologized to the listeners for not having visuals. A deep discussion ensued of whether or not those two students should apologize and then later, whether they should have used visuals or not. There was detailed discussion about the necessity for apologizing. This is a time when students refer back to their home cultures, e.g. (Excerpt #13)

#13 (Tape 7, 1:37.10-1:37.21)

Inst: Ok, Suzuki, you have a question too?
Suzuki: Yeah, uh, no. I completely disagree with your overview about the...

Inst: Please?

#13a (1:37.21-1:37.54)

Suzuki: About the apologize of situation. I think that in the business, the real business situation. They should have apologized because until then, the other persons showed uh, uh, O H V R, the picture. Then, they will do as well for five or ten minutes. So, no, no picture, so far, there’s a picture, I think they should say something and they should have apologized.

Suzuki raises two issues, one is the implication that the two presenters should have used transparencies and two that they should have apologized.

Inst: Lela.
Lela: I strongly disagree with Suzuki, because I think he (Very difficult to comprehend) You don’t need some transparency. You can talk very well, you can talk with out very well you have the material, so you don’t need to say, Oh sorry I hadn’t a transparency, but you can say, let’s go to talk about some point.

Lela responds to both issues by saying that you don’t have to use transparencies and you don’t have to apologize for not using them, but you have to make do with your situation.

Inst: Bette.

Bette: Suzuki, uh, in my point of view, if you apologize about your spelling or apologize about sheets, you are losing control, because you show a weak point and maybe they not even not notice it. So, you don’t. You must not do that.

Bette on the other hand only addresses the issue of apology. She raises the concern for show of strength or weakness. She asserts that you shouldn’t apologize
because the viewers may not notice the mistakes and you don’t want to appear weak.

(1:38.37-1:38.40) Inst: In fact, I didn’t, I hadn’t noticed that.

The instructor begins to assert an opinion of support for no apology and that he didn’t notice about no overhead.

(1:38.40-1:38.48) Bette: Yeah. (There is overlapping of speaking. Bette acknowledges the support statement of the instructor.

Next, Suzuki, comes back to say that the other presenters had used visuals. These two had not and that they should have apologized for that.

(1:38.48) Suzuki: At that time, I think Duc was going to, Duc was going to explain about five or six minutes. Until so far, everybody showed the picture and then that explain. Then, they are not going to show a picture, so I think that they should have said something.

Renaldo brings out the point about the presenter’s choice of using visuals or not. He doesn’t address the apology issue.
Renaldo: Do you choose the way you want to make a presentation? Do you choose your way? I mean if you can you convince people without transparencies, you choose your way. It’s up to the other party to get convinced or not.

Juan, on the other hand, does address the apology issue.

Juan: Maybe, that, that, that was why Romeo thought that, that Marcus didn’t prepare very well his part. Because when he apologized us. Like, why are you apologizing? Everyone has his own way to do his presentation. And, and if he does not put the transparency and he apologize for that, maybe it was because he did not have time or, or, what can you get from that? Just a weak point.

Juan refers to Romeo who rated the presenters low for not having used transparencies. He asserts that the person should not apologize no matter the reason.

Suzuki responds to Juan asserting that even if they don’t apologize, it is clear that they didn’t prepare.
Suzuki: Well, even if he didn’t say any thing about that. Maybe you, you understood about that situation, because five or six minutes is there to explain about the situation, their presentation. Maybe you understood about that because the other person showed, explain, using, ugh, picture. If you understand that, you, they didn’t prepare. They didn’t prepare, so.

Up to this point, no one else had stated that the presenters should have used visuals. Timothy addresses the issue and presents the benefits of using visuals. He also addresses the issue of apologizing.

Inst.: Timothy.

Tom: Yes, maybe you would rather prefer that Marcus should have prepared transparencies. That might be wrong. I think that he should have prepared transparencies because for me it was quite hard to follow, because I did not have the handouts to see, but once he doesn’t have transparencies out there, sufficient situation is, regardless of what they are
thinking about, he has to manage to come up with a plan, to make a presentation. The only responsibility he has is to make good presentation without transparencies. If he doesn’t have them, it is better not to refer to them.

Timothy clearly asserts the the presentation would have been more easily understood if they had used visuals. However, they had to make do without them. In regards to apologizing, he suggests that presenters not refer to not having visuals.

Suzuki doesn’t respond to Timothy but to the issue of losing control.

Suzuki: Someone said you are losing control. You lose the ability, but you are cooperating each other, not neg. This is not negotiation. This is a presentation. Even if you show some disadvantage...

Suzuki argues that the presentation is not a negotiation. You don’t have to have the same kind of competitive control.

Renaldo responds to the negotiation issue. He feels the purpose of the presentation is to convince the listener. He feels that if you apologize for mistakes, that you are losing control and are appearing weak.
Renaldo: In a certain way, it's not negotiating, you are asking them for money. That's more the main weakness I think. You are asking them for money. You have to convince them. In a certain way, you are negotiating. I mean if you lose control like I mean ... those comments were made. I mean when it said the spelling was wrong, maybe they didn't notice it and I was telling them I haven't had time and so on, OK, so, you are telling them, you are weak, you are weak.

Suzuki responds that his argument is mainly in reference to the use of visuals and not necessarily to mistakes, etc.

Suzuki: Excuse me, I didn't say
(Incomprehensible....) I said about no picture

The instructor interjects and sides with, no apology.

Inst: Ok, one second, let's stop here. Suzuki, if you believe that is a strong point to do when you are giving a presentation, fine. Ok, my recommendation is very strong. Don't do that. In the business
world, people is thinking about the data they have on the agenda. Thinking about the numbers there. Trying to pay attention to presentation. If you come up apologizing for not using a transparency, you know, you look like, you know, what’s going on here? I don’t care. I mean, why? It looks weak. I would think why did he say that? Why didn’t he instead did he work on the transparencies. So, you are just describing it yourself. That’s my recommendation, uh. We may disagree, but if we keep just talking about this point, we’re running out of time. Ok, Marcus.

The instructor gives the floor to Marcus, who is one of the two presenters being discussed. It is his first time to comment on this discussion.

Marcus: I see your point now and I think that it, it is not very good if you apologize for anything, because the way you present anything is your business.

Marcus feels that how you present is your choice and you don’t have to apologize. The instructor jumps back in to try to clarify this issue.
Inst: There are certain limits in which you have to apologize. Ok, I mean don't go to the other extreme. Regarding this type of pain.

Marcus responds.

Marcus: Ok, I just want to bring up the main point that it should not have been some kind of apologize, but an explanation....

The instructor again clarifies his idea about the issue.

Inst: Maybe, I would not even explain about it. Why would you explain that you don't have a transparency? Ok, Duc.

The instructor gives the floor to Duc, the other presenter.

Duc: How to say, How can I refer to the budget? There is no budget. Forget it.

Duc's comments and points are incomprehensible. No one responds to his comments and the instructor passes the floor on to Chunghee.

Inst. Ok, Chunghee.

Up to this point no one has mentioned anything about culture. Chunghee brings it up and defends Suzuki's position and the validity of his concerns.
Chunghee: For me, Suzuki’s question is very relevant cause it’s a just a cultural difference. uh, for Asian countries, in their companies, you have to apologize to their super, super, superiors or to their counterpart. If they don’t, if they don’t think comfortable in their way of thinking. Then that’s why he, uh, he...

Chunghee refers to the requirement of apology in Asian cultures. The instructor responds in thoughtful way to acknowledge that possible fact.

Inst: Chunghee, thank you very much. Maybe that’s something I overlooked. Suzuki, That’s fine. Yeah, maybe, might be a cultural issue. I mean, in certain culture, you want to apologize. Fine, I was only looking at my culture, ok. (Chunghee and others laugh and nervous laugh.) I apologize, we all make mistakes too, ok. Ok. Eh, Some, a couple of more points.

The instructor not only acknowledges the culture issue but that he was referencing his own culture, Latino
or Western. He also apologizes for having overlooked this difference in views.

Tension #6, Sorting Out Cultural Differences and Technique

Excerpts #13 or #13a demonstrate the tensions between students over the issue of should you apologize or not. What is interesting is that the instructor is also involved in the debate. Despite good points being brought up by both sides, a Korean student talks about the cultural issue and the difference between Asian and Western cultures. The instructor, at that point, acknowledges the cultural issue and that he had not considered that factor.

The second issue that comes out of this discussion is should they have used overhead visuals or not. Suzuki feels that they should have used visuals because they talked for five or six minutes and the other team members who spoke previously had all used overheads. Suzuki feels that the implication is that Duc and Marcus did not prepare overheads but should have. Timothy raises the point that they should have used overheads because the presentation was hard to follow and that they would have been more effective using them. He addresses the apology issue also and concurs that even though it would have
been good to have had transparencies, however, if they did not have them, then they should not mention them.

This exchange was a perfect opportunity moment for teaching on cultural differences in communication and on effective uses of visuals and styles of doing presentation. At the time of the incident, I was present observing and taking notes, but did not enter the discussion. I felt that they were perfect topics to discuss later in the Skills class, but because of time constraints, I was not able to follow-up on those two issues. As a researcher/instructor, I felt that the apology issue was definitely neither a right or wrong answer, but needed to be considered in context of cultural differences. In regards to presentation technique, I would like to have consulted some North American business communication trainers to know what they thought would be the best way to handle such a situation, and later, I would have shared their opinions with the class.

To me as the instructor for the skills side of the course, the use of visuals was an important issue in relation to effectiveness of a presentation is concerned. I evaluated the presentation of the two students discussed and felt that their presentation would have been much more effective had they used visuals.
In a follow-up class, I was going to show ways in which visuals would have improved the presentation. The presentation appeared disorganized, the main point and arguments were not clear, and the pronunciation and language of both speakers were practically incomprehensible. Using visuals would have forced the presenters to outline and organize what they wanted to say. They could have stated clearly their main point or argument.

In addition, the visuals are a support for the speakers and listeners when the pronunciation or language skills of the presenters are weak, which was the case in this presentation.

Unfortunately, the time schedule and number of new topics that had to be covered, did not allow me to address this incident in class. There were two other opportunities for students to present and give and receive feedback on presentations before the class ended. The quality of presentations and visuals improved after each one. The case instructor commented on the power issue of giving an apology, but did not address the issue of the use of visuals. This instructor stated his opinion, whereas, the lead instructor would have just summarized the different points discussed and left it to the students to consider the various opinions. I believe
that he would have commented in his summary on the
effectiveness of using visuals in a presentation.
Individual differences in personalities and teaching
experience determined how well instructors restrained
from giving their opinion during the discussion itself.
I never had an opportunity to have my voice heard on this
issue with the students or other instructors, even
though, I had taken copious notes on the incident and was
aware and felt strongly about the issue of presentation
skills and the importance of the use of visuals in this
situation.

The implication of cultural identification on the
learning and acquisition process of language is that
learners reference their home culture, sometimes
operating in the new discourse with the same strategies
that they would have used in their native country. If
those strategies work, fine, but if those strategies
don't work successfully for the learners, they try to
make sense of what went wrong. Sometimes, through
reflection and discussion with others, they learn that in
the new discourse, there is a different way of handling
situations than in the home discourse.

Once learners are aware or acknowledge to themselves
a different way of communicating, they decide whether or
not to adjust their behavior to the new discourse.
Whether or not they adjust will determine how successful they will be in the new discourse. If they acknowledge differences but decide not to adjust their behavior, then this will affect the degree of their acceptance or success in the new discourse (Gee, 1990.)

On another occasion, during a round table discussion of the performance of the participants in a negotiation, a student from Japan responds to the feedback he received that he should have participated more actively in the discussion.

In the simulation, he was playing the role of someone who was considered a trainee or relatively new staff person in the department, such as a recent college graduate.

In Excerpt #14, the student asks about expectations of behavior in the U.S. culture. (See Excerpt #14)

#14 (Tape 10, 1:11.44-1:13.07)
Suzuki: I want to mention about some trainee position. It’s very difficult for us to join the meeting. And especially, I am not sure so, if I, if we can join or not. If in Japan, I think it’s impossible to join. So, I have, uh, one question. It’s, it’s possible to join like this situation? Very exciting.
Renaldo: You did, you did. When you took the floor.

The student asks for clarification because his behavior in the role play was influenced by his culture in that a trainee in Japan would not say very much in this type of discussion. My knowledge of this fact is based on my experience working in a Japanese company for six years.

The instructor responds in excerpt #15 by giving an explanation of acceptable behavior in this culture, thus acknowledging culture differences, and limiting his answer to the American context.

#15
Injr: Yeah, you’re just supposed to show you are interested, ok, and since some people think that the trainees are not that well prepared, and so to sit there quietly all, all, all meeting long, you do not make a strong impression. So, in this country, I would expect the trainees to say something to show they’re listening, they’re interested, and they’re motivated.

Suzuki: So, what time should we get in the...

Injr: Even if it is only to say, to ask him a question to explain something. You just want to communicate to the manager that
you are paying attention to what's going on. Ok, in this culture, if you don't say anything for an hour, you're bored, you're completely disinterested. You have to show from time to time, uh, that, that you're paying attention. Ok, ladies and gentlemen, uh, what was gonna be a class round-table, has taken 15 minutes. Ok, Ralf.

This exchange brings to light the fact that the student's behavior in the class discussion was influenced by his home culture of Japan and of the fact that he was not sure what was acceptable behavior in this context.

The teacher's response demonstrates how an understanding of the target culture is explained to the student. This is a valid question and concern for the student and can serve as a significant moment of awareness for the student as far as being willing to possibly accept the differences between expectations in his home culture and the expectations in the target culture.

After reaching this realization of differences, the student may decide to adjust his behavior in order to be able to more effectively participate in the target
culture. The degree of this adjustment partially depends on the level of his desire to be a member of the target discourse (Gee, 1990) which is the MBA case discussion class.

In this situation, we know that the desire to affiliate with the target community is high, therefore, the willingness to try different communication strategies is high.

When giving feedback, students usually use the guidelines of the feedback evaluation sheet (Exhibit ?) that was provided by the instructor to guide them, but there are times when they add their own often culturally biased value judgments, e.g. (Suzuki’s comments to Arthur in excerpt #16)

#16 (Tape 7, 1:12.08-1:13.15)

Suzuki: About the Arthur. There are many point. You always check information. You always thinking about this. Very good point. Uh, uhm, eye contact is uh, when you speak opinion, you try to, uh, eye contact everybody. It’s very good point. And uh, your position, sitting position is very good. Like this style (He demonstrates sitting up straight.) It’s very good point. Also, his speaking is very, very
clear, but also very concise. Uh, I really want to become like you. (Suzuki smiles and laughs. Other classmates also laugh.) And weakest point is that, sometimes during the conversation and during the presentation, uh, you talk with friends or sometimes you smile. I think, uh, sometimes, especially in Japan, when you have a meeting in future in Japan, uh, during the conversation and during the meeting, if you, uh, smile or if you talk with another person, it's very impolite, very impolite thing. But I think, uh, you, uh, I'd like you to keep that in your mind, uh, not to speak with the other person, not to smile.

Arthur: Ok.

In the previous excerpt, the learner references his home country business experiences in making his comments. Actually, his comment about side talk during a meeting might be considered universal etiquette and not unique to Japan. The question of smiling or not could be discussed culturally because North Americans tend to like presenters to smile, which is associated with appearing friendly and open. I guess the extreme or excessive
smiling on the part of the presenter or listener could be taken to be offensive or appear as if s/he was not serious. Obviously, the classmates and instructor did not disagree with him because no one responded. The receiver of the feedback responded with a simple, Ok.

Tension #7: Reaching a Plateau in Group Level of Comprehensibility (I+1)

Tensions not only occur during the negotiation of learning information and skills, but also over the fact of whether someone feels like they are improving or not. In this course, students receive feedback from their colleagues on their oral discussions and presentations. They receive weekly evaluations on their written work and sit for two graded exams. With these exercises and their own self assessment, they can judge their improvement in various skill areas. The instructors are also taking notes on the level of participation and notable areas of improvement for each student. We exchange notes and comments during meetings. However, one skill that is not specifically evaluated at the end of the course is pronunciation and understandability/comprehensibility.

One of the things that became evident to me near the end of the course is that students within each skills hour group seemed to reach a plateau in their level of
oral comprehensibility. This includes pronunciation and understandability.

In general, the idea of improving constantly fits with Krashen’s (1990) idea of (I+1). That idea is to present students with a level of language that is slightly higher than what they already have. In this classroom, advanced students serve the purpose of modeling and producing output of (I+1) levels of language for the weaker students. Other advanced students and instructors serve this purpose for advanced students.

Once weaker students reach a level of general comprehensibility, (I+1) stalls for them. It is hard to tell where stronger students plateau, however, there are two evidences of the fact that a plateau of skill development is reached within the sections:

1. One incident of evidence for the plateau of skills becomes apparent during an exercise called the Grand Bargaining session between groups from different class hours. It showed students their weaknesses and strengths. The fact that learning reaches a plateau becomes more obvious during this exercise. Each of the five classes is divided up into three teams. The teams are then switched around and will have an exercise with two other teams from two different class sections.
During this switch of teams, (I+1) is challenged because students are no longer in the group that they have gotten accustomed to. They have to work harder to communicate with each other. Students reported that they felt challenged by the new groups because they felt they had become accustomed to the language and communication styles of their co-section members.

2. Evidence of a plateau of skill appears in another final activity when the Skills Hour instructors teach a case for the Case Hour, but to a different section than their own group. Thus, they are not familiar with the students and the students are not familiar with the instructor. The group stays intact and is not mixed with members from other groups. What I noticed was that the students in the group were comprehensible to each other but not to me as the outsider, I could not always comprehend them. On several occasions, students from that group translated a member’s utterance for me, the visiting teacher, sometimes rephrasing or re-explaining what the person wanted to say. They had negotiated an acceptable level of communication among themselves and were prepared to scaffold each other for communicating with others. This was unsolicited scaffolding and was given without hesitation.
In the bargaining session, students felt the difference was in the levels of students in different class sections. The tension they felt caused them to think about their own levels of competence and that even though they had reached satisfactory levels of discussion ability for the group, they, in fact were not at the highest level that was possible and that they could aim for.

In the situation of the instructor switch, I was most aware of the group's comfort level of communication with each other. My continued presence would force them to improve and work more on their pronunciation and comprehensibility in order to communicate with me. I realized that we instructors also become accustomed to the language of the students and can comprehend most of them after awhile. Unintentionally, we might not be teaching to their (F + I) level. The tension I felt forced me to reflect on how can I as an instructor prepare strategies that will continuously challenge students to reach higher levels of pronunciation and comprehensibility. Some of these strategies might be by mixing up the groups as we did or by inviting new audiences, etc.
Another area that I came to recognize while looking at and reflecting on the data relates to gender issues. This includes issues of identity, relations between genders, and power. The tension that occurs is that in the discourse acquisition process as it develops in this context, female participants are more often than not being asked to make a bigger jump than men in behavior or way of communicating. Since the style of communication being practiced in the class is Western and European-American male oriented, European and Latina women have to make smaller adjustments in making sense of what adaptations are necessary on their part than Asian women.

In spite of being willing to play the role play games of the business case class, a Western woman insisted on maintaining her identity as a woman. In excerpt #42, Bette insists on being called Mrs., even though, the original script had a male character.

#42 (Tape 10, 41.26) (Gender in role playing)

A female is playing the role of a character who is presented as male in the script. When she is addressed with a male title, she insists that she be called by the female title. This shows demand for acknowledgment of gender during role-play.
Renaldo: Mr. Howard, please. (Gives the turn to Bette.)

Bette: Mrs. Howard.

Renaldo: I'm sorry...

This action added more authenticity to the role-play because the actress was taking more ownership of the role and making it fit her reality and that of the class. By saying, "I'm sorry," Renaldo was acknowledging her identity and everyone else participating in the role-play followed suit.

I never had a chance to talk to just women alone about the issue of behavior changes necessary to adapt to the American style business school class. However, on one occasion, I overheard a mixed group of Japanese men and women talking about their difficulty in adapting to the way of communicating that they witnessed in the class. They were at a stage in acquisition where they were acknowledging the difference in communication styles, but had not reached a comfort level yet to really try this Western way of communicating and behaving. In time, I saw the Japanese, Korean, and Vietnamese men become more aggressive and active in class. However, the Korean and Japanese females took much longer to become active in class discussion or activity.
Both men and women gradually try this style of communication and become more comfortable using it with non-Japanese or Koreans. It remains difficult for a long time for them to use the western style with those of their same ethnic group. They go to measures of even trying to avoid having to do role-plays with those of the same ethnic group. However, this class situation prevents them from doing this because of the assigned groups, so in some ways, they are forced to deal with the issue. This phenomenon shows how difficult it is to break away from cultural expectations and roles. All the students would eventually, not only try, but would reach a comfortable level of communicating because the desire to affiliate with the target discourse community was high enough that they would keep trying until they were successful communicators (Gee, 1990).

An example of an Asian female asserting herself would be Chunghee’s defense of Hiroshi’s contention in Excerpt #13 that Suzuki’s concern was relevant because in Asian countries, it would be important to apologize.

Excerpt # 13
Chunghee: For me, Suzuki’s question is very relevant cause it’s a just a cultural difference. uh, for Asian countries, in their companies, you have to apologize to their
super, super, superiors or to their counterpart. If they don’t, if they don’t think comfortable in their way of thinking. Then that’s why he, uh, he...

The male instructor acknowledged and yielded to her point and the other students did not have a chance to respond. I would say that in general, the students responded to the points raised and accepted comments from everyone equally, regardless of gender. I did not notice any gender bashing or condescension. Also, I was not thinking about these issues during my observations, so my lense of observation and analysis did not pick up on these issues in detail.

It is my assertion that Asian women often have more internal conflict than the European and Latina women do in adjusting to U.S. culture because they are being asked to make a more drastic change in role, relationships with males, and way of speaking and acting. These characteristics are completely different from those they may have been socialized to in their home cultures.

Issues of gender in face to face and group interaction and cultural differences related to them are interesting and present a research question in itself, however, I will not explore this issue further in this study.
If tensions are moments of struggle to make meaning in communication, then scaffolding consists of activities and other factors, which help learners work through the tensions.

Scaffolding helps facilitate the learning process and authentification of the experience. In the early part of the course, scaffolding consisted of the various teaching tools and strategies used by the instructor to initiate the new classroom culture and discourse. This includes the following:

a) Initial explanation of the case discussion method with readings explaining the history and philosophy.

b) Specific instruction on how to read a case and do a written analysis. This instruction included how to outline the facts and what sections needed to be included in the analysis, such as options, recommendations and plan of action. In the MBA class, students might not be given such a detailed schema.

c) Another form of scaffolding provided to students during this phase is sample language that could be used to perform certain functions during discussion such as how to agree or disagree, etc.
The use of theoretical readings in the class produces multi-level benefits. Theoretical readings are used in the MBA program in parallel with cases. These contribute to the authenticity of the ESL Case Discussion Class. In addition, the readings assist the instructor in teaching certain communication skills, such as, giving and receiving feedback, making presentations, facilitating a meeting, and preparing reports and other written communication.

Giving and Receiving Feedback

One of the topics covered in the MBA management course is supervision. A good supervisor has to know how to give and receive feedback. This topic of supervision and giving and receiving feedback is the theme of one case and theoretical reading used in the summer program.

The use of giving and receiving feedback as a skill and a regular component of the ESL Case Discussion Class becomes a scaffolding that facilitates evaluation and discussion of the content of the class, as well as, the learning experience itself. This skill is gradually introduced from the beginning of the course. The first time that the students have an opportunity to give feedback is near the end of phase one, when after a 5 minute role play in which one student plays a manager,
the other students get to give him informal feedback on how he leads a brief meeting. On this occasion, students have not been given any guidelines for how to give and receive feedback. On this occasion, students have to respond quickly and without preparation or guidelines. Their own experiences acquired prior to the course are their source of how to respond.

For the next class, students have been assigned a reading on the why’s and how to’s of giving and receiving feedback. In the class, the instructor reviews specifically the procedure for giving and receiving feedback.

#4 (Tape 6, 1:33.18-1:36.56)

Injr: Ok, now, ladies and gentlemen. Uh, he explains his technique as he begins his uh feedback, uh, session, and, uh, he learned it in Germany and he starts with a plus and a minus. How is he supposed to end his feedback session? You have a plus and minus.

Class: Suggestion, Suggestion.

Injr: Ok, ladies and gentlemen. You have what’s called the sandwich, the ham sandwich. See you have, plus, minus, plus. Now, why do you have plus? Duane?
Duane:

Injr: So, if you begin a feedback session, and you start with a plus, ok, when you have this sandwich approach. Why start with the plus?

Chunghee: To feel good.

Injr: Ok, to make the person feel good. To demonstrate what? What's the first general rule of feedback?

Class: (In chorus, but difficult to comprehend.)

Injr: (The instructor must have heard an appropriate response, because he continues the sentence.) That you want to help. Ok, so you make them feel good. Ok, you get across the message that you want to help them and you recognize that they do something well. Ok, then, second step, Frank.

Frank: Uh, I gave mine to the receiver. He has something to improve.

Injr: Yeah, there's the meat. This is what, why we are really holding this meeting. You give him credit for feedback, an area for improvement. Then, you have the plus, you have bread, meat, bread to make your
sandwich. Why do you have to have another plus, Juan?

Juan: To make the other person feel comfortable before he goes.

Injr: That’s right, yeah! So, you don’t want someone to say gee whiz, the boss is angry with me. Ok, instead, you give,...

Bette: Why not?

Up to this point, the instructor is positioning the students as future bosses. He wants them to apply the principles of giving and receiving feedback, as if they are supervisors.

The “Why not?” is referring to the idea of why don’t you want the person to think the boss is angry. The instructor’s response is to refer back to the original theoretical reading which stated that the purpose of giving and receiving feedback in supervision was to help the employer be able to improve his/her performance. (See below.)

Injr: So, that the person can leave the office feeling some encouragement. Ok, now, remember, feedback is supposed to, you are trying to help a person do a job more effectively. Ok, this is not getting angry. You are giving feedback to help a
person perform the job more effectively. Getting angry is something else and maybe there is a time. You know. You’ve come to work late 12, uh, 12 times. Straighten up. Ok. That’s not feedback, that’s just anger. Ok, yes, Arthur.

Up to this point, the instructor is reviewing the basic principles of giving and receiving feedback according to the guidelines presented in the theoretical reading. When Betteadette questions, “Why not?” the instructor responds by trying to explain by referring to the original purposes of the exercise.

In the next exchange, the instructor responds to a proposed alternate way of giving feedback. He affirms the student’s suggestion by showing how the usage would be acceptable.

1:35.39

Arthur: I have a question. Is it not just possible, skipping the last plus, and just say, I have some suggestions for you and we are going to come out of this together and I am sure we will succeed. I think that’s a plus too, and you don’t have to say...
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Injr: You are giving a kind of plus, when you say, we will succeed. You give the critical, and then, I am sure will succeed.

Arthur: So, that’s a plus?

Injr: Yeah, that’s one way to do it. You don’t, you have many means by which to handle this. But, you give something critical, and as you said, before they leave, I’m sure you will succeed, I’m sure this will get better. So, Sabuur gives you back an analysis, ok, and says, well, the format is better, there’s more white space, but, however, does he let you leave the room with just the but, What will he always say to you?

Arthur: Next time better.

Injr: Next time better. Ok, now, that’s a kind of plus. He believes in you. He trusts, next time you’re going to be better. Ok, sandwich, ham sandwich feedback. Ok, now, I’m really running out of time. Ok, all right, ladies and gentlemen...

The students have this guide to evaluate the performance of the characters in the case being
discussed. The use of giving and receiving feedback is minimal at first, however, we later see it as an important tool for negotiating learning and improvement in various skills in the second and third portions of the course.

**Program Structure as Scaffolding**

The course was divided into two class sections, a case class of two hours, and a skill class of one hour. That meant there was a time built in the program to provide scaffolding for the case discussion activity. In a content class situation for native speakers, we might refer to the skills hour as the discussion section, where topics are reviewed or given more explanation than is given in the main or lecture class hour. In the skills hour, language and communication skills are taught, but also theoretical readings are discussed, and instruction is given on how to carry out report preparation, presentations and business letters and memos. It is difficult to separate what would also be scaffolding in the business school for the case class and what could be considered scaffolding just for the E.S.L. Case Discussion class. It is safe to say that the difference might be in the amount of explanation given and the
number of cases presented. More time is allowed for explanation and fewer cases are presented in the same time frame in the preparation course than would be in the M.B.A. Program.

**Practicing, Evaluating, Processing, Learning, and Acquiring**

The negotiation process of authenticity is able to come into its own with the introduction of the bargaining session. The class is divided into three teams. The format of the session is 40 minutes of bargaining between two teams. There is a five minute break, then, team C gives 15-20 minutes of feedback, followed by 15-20 minutes of Round Table discussion, which allows time for comments on anything; feedback from the participants on the comments of team C, and discussion of the case content. If there is time, the instructor can make comments, summary points, and suggestions.

For the bargaining activity, students of the class are divided into three groups: management team, labor representative, and judges. In this way, everyone has an active role, either as players in the bargaining activity or as active observer evaluators of the other two groups.

In this particular case, there is a strike at Washington Post Newspaper. The readings give the students the background of what has happened so far. The
day before, the class had discussed the facts of the case, the issues of both parties involved, and the options of recourse by the management team and the union representatives. The bargaining session represents a final effort of the management team and the labor representatives to negotiate a contract. The teams have prepared their strategies the night before and come to class prepared to negotiate. There is no prepared or right or wrong answer. What ever comes out of the negotiation is what happens. Students play the roles and represent the interest of those characters. The judge’s team gives feedback to the other two teams in regards to persuasiveness, organization, and communication skills.

The key point to know about the bargaining session is that it is an unsupervised moment as far as the instructor is concerned. Students have complete control of turn taking and the outcomes of the discussion. The bargaining activity is a practice, a role-playing, task oriented and problem solving activity. It is like a performance in which strategies previously introduced and practiced are put to use.

There are three other main points that seem to surface as a result of the bargaining session. One is that the feedback session allows students to do self-evaluation and to evaluate peers. It is during this very
activity that teach and learn occur (Gee, 1990).

Second, the discussion that takes place during the Round-Table Session facilitates the teacha and learna, bridging the gap between learning and acquisition (Gee 1992, Krashen, 199?). The third point is that authenticity is acknowledged and negotiated more than ever before when all three activities (bargaining, feedback, and round-table sessions) are in operation. (Examples from Tape 6.) Their effectiveness as individual activities is separate from when or at what point they are introduced in the course. In the following excerpt, one student expresses how he interprets what should happen in a bargaining session:

Tape 6, 1:02.09-1:02.33

Duane: I just think that we tried another way of making such a bargaining session. Our group made our goals and we received everything we want and so we’re happy. I think the other group was also satisfied with it. (Everyone smiles to display mixed agreement.) Why do you think we have to fight more?

#1b (Tape 6, 1:02.33-1:03.21)

Renaldo: No, the point was that you didn’t fight anything, I mean you didn’t fight
anything. You were agree on everything and you just exchange information, I am, I’m the Bank of Japan. I meant there was no important discussion. You just propose a plan. (Pause) You were too pleasant. I remember Kyeoung Hy when you introduce your marketing report and Timothyas interrupt you, you said, “I’m sorry, I’m sorry, I’m sorry. What, I mean, you, you, you, it’s uh, it’s it’s a hint of weakness. The only person, who’s been tough... Ok, I’m sorry. (The instructor gives him a signal that time’s up, so he stops.)

This second student responds with his point of view about the importance of being tough. However, another student, Romeo, chimes in that what was important was that the teams were negotiating and did not break off communication.

#1c (Tape 6, 1:03.21-1:03.50)

Romeo: Concerning to point specifically, I don’t agree with you, because it’s an idea concerning how to negotiate and our groups were very disciplinates, and we set our
goals. They told that they wanted to buy the whole land. At the end, we didn’t sign an agreement about this, but the, the, uh negotiations were continuing.

The next speaker argues for what might be called a win-win situation.

#1d (Tape 6, 1:03.51-1:04.13)
Arthur:
I think for judge, it is not nice to see such pleasant conversation. But what I think, what I think is when you look at this, this bargaining strategy story. I think that if we both have seen and see what we wanted to reach and we reach and we both are in a position in which we are blessed, why shouldn’t we be glad. That’s my point of view.

The next speaker further discusses the negotiation of whether or not bargaining is confrontative or cooperative.

#1e (Tape 6, 1:04.13-1:04.31)
Lela: I am wanting to connect with Arthur and Romeo. I think we are doing some confusion about negotiation. Negotiation is not necessarily only when people say, no, yes, no, yes, you can do a good negotiation
without problems, if we have the same objective.

The next speaker finishes this discussion by agreeing with some about not needing to be too aggressive, but at the same time, adding that a bargainer needs to show some power.

Her reference to $100,000 dollars is an attempt to appeal for authentic behavior to match the potential dollar value.

#1f and #27a (Tape 6, 1:05.22-1:05.31)
Bette: Yeah, I completely agree with Marioimiliano. You don’t have to have a fight to bargain, but everybody; everybody was laughing all the time. We were too smooth too each other in the groups. You can have a little bit more power. It doesn’t mean you have to be aggressive, like I was yesterday, but you can use a little more power. Come on you are bargaining, uhm a $100,000 dollars.

The Feedback Session

The responsibility for feedback has been assigned to the third team of judges. They have been instructed in
previous sessions to evaluate each team and individuals. The team of judges can organize themselves, as they like, for example, deciding who will give feedback to whom. However, they should follow the sandwich approach model that was introduced earlier. They have also been given a checklist of possible points that they can use to evaluate the two teams on (See appendices? & ? for examples.) Evaluation would cover language, communication, and bargaining strategy skills. The judges have a time limit, so they in turn are judged later by the others on the relevancy of their feedback, their conciseness, and how they managed their time.

In a previous Skills Hour, the students had been given a theoretical reading on giving and receiving feedback which describes in detail the philosophy and the how’s and why’s. One rule of the feedback procedure is that the person receiving the feedback cannot respond to the person giving feedback. The rationale of not allowing response was to get the listener to truly consider what was being said without having to give a rebuttal or comment right way.

It is during the Round-Table session that those being evaluated can respond to the judges and, in fact, give them feedback. The judges also have an opportunity
during the Round-Table session to share their reaction to the whole session.

It is because the students cannot respond during the initial feedback portion that I think that the teachl and learnl process begins (Gee, 1990.) However, because there is not a two-way dialogue, the process of acquiring the skills is only beginning and is fueled by self-reflection on the feedback received. When the discussion ensues during the Round Table activity, the receiver of feedback has had a few minutes to reflect on the previous comments and can respond. An exchange of ideas occurs, as each person shares their reaction to the session.

The Roundtable Session

This activity followed the extensive feedback given by the judges’ team. The time limit is 15-20 minutes or less if the two-hour time limit for the class runs out. Unlike in the feedback session, each person is expected to make a comment about the case negotiations, or feedback itself. The order of speaking was determined by going around the table. Usually, there was some divergence as others in the group wanted to add to or respond to someones’ comment. If there was time after everyone had a chance to speak once, then, the discussion would be opened to anyone to make additional comments.
Students often commented on the session and on the feedback, e.g.

Betteadette: "Found negotiation was difficult with six people." "Judges gave good feedback."

Frank: "Feedback was good and interesting."

Duc: "I liked the negotiation."

Renaldo: "Thanks for feedback. Negotiation: not willing to reach an agreement, group not coordinated, management was a bit arrogant. Lela was a good actress." "You were a manager."

Their references to the negotiation pertain to the discussion itself. Comments about judges refer to the feedback session. In the previous excerpt, #1b, Renaldo covers three bases in his statement. He comments on the feedback, evaluates the negotiation session, and gives feedback to a fellow student.

Students also make reference to the cultures of the other students as separate from the roles that they play in the class e.g.

Renaldo to Romeo: "You were very German."

Mario to Lela: "She was like an actress."

In the first comment to Romeo, who is German, Renaldo felt that Romeo's behavior was like that of a German or what Renaldo imagined German behavior to be. I
am not sure that Renaldo was criticizing how Romeo played the role, but that he read or labeled the behavior as being German like despite Romeo's effort to play an American manager. The observers could not completely separate Romeo's Germanness from the role he was playing.

Mario's comment implies that he feels that Lela played the role well as an American woman manager, but he also acknowledges that Lela, who was Brazilian of Italian heritage, was acting and playing a role.

Besides commenting on the content of the discussion, their performance in the negotiation, and the feedback given by judges, students begin to question or negotiate what is good feedback and how it can be useful.

This next episode (Excerpts #3a-3k) is an example of discussion during the round table session. In this session, students are in their roles as co-participants and equals in the class. They are in a de-briefing situation and are able to speak to each other freely. The first speaker opens the discussion about strategy and shows his analysis and self-reflection. The instructor allows the discussion to go for as many turns as necessary, until the comments seem to be exhausted in #3k.
I would like to comment on the strategy, because I think, at least as the Athenus group was concerned, we had no other choice. (Incomprehensible—... We came away with only a bit of...) we stayed in the project. This was our main objective, to stay in the project and from the other side, I have to say, I did, uh, competitive bargaining yesterday, and today, we had a rather collaborative one, and I must say that it is rather easy to make a competitive one because we know in the beginning it won't be very easy to get. So we can be tough and we don't have to risk losing something, let's say losing an agreement, but here in this situation an agreement was very close, so if you do a mistake, this could be common. It was one of the main factors we counted on, and uh. It turned out that the other group wasn't able to, to, to, uh, risk that because it was a high risk. And I understand quite well that when we offer them quite quickly, ok, this is your
money, I show it to you, here you are, that you take it, right away instead of risking no agreement.

#3b (Tape 6, 1:14.09-1:14.36)

Chunghee: I agree with Timothyas because . . . I don’t think the power, we have to be opposite. I think our bargaining session was very nice, of course it was based on the collaborative strategy.

#3c (Tape 6, 1:14.37-1:15.22)

Duane: I think our position was not as strong as you thought because we didn’t knew if Athenus had the certain millions to pay us in cash. Yet, probably offer his land, and we didn’t knew what it’s really worth. They get the certain damage that were not really damaged. And we also wanted to stay in the project. We pointed this out yesterday, and we can make the real big money there and we can’t afford Athenus to pay $100 million dollars that he don’t have.
I think that is a very good point, and that is why I disagree strongly with Betteadette. You are talking about $100 million dollars, but that has to be gotten in trial, a trial is going to take a long time. There’s not going to be a project. We want to have this project and we want to have it now, and we want to have it fast. That’s why we made an agreement. I think that is the best way.

In the context of the negotiation session, Arthur’s team chose to try to negotiate mutual terms with the owners rather than to take them to court.

As you are now pointing out, I want to have it now, fast. (Pounding on the table twice to emphasize now and fast.) That’s how you bargaining, not like... (shaking her head.)

That’s not true...

I’m sorry, This is my point of view, but it was just too easy, it was like...
Arthur: Let me explain. Let me explain you. When you are talking about something like this, a difficult problem, a problem with many kinds of people, and different kinds of people. What are you going to do? You are going, you are not going to say, "I want this and I want that." You have got to be very kind, don't you. We are 13 million dollars in the pocket now, and we are going to continue this project and we are going to make money. So, what's the problem, now? I don't see it.

#3g (Tape 6, 1:16.16-1:16.41)

Bette: Well, I only give you feedback. You can do with something with it or not. And the same, well, you can do something with it or not. If you don't agree, then the feedback is not uh, Well, it is not the intention of the feedback. The same as you Timothyas, you were pointing out, our strategy was, then I was only talking. and I say, ok, do not do with your feedback whatever you want.

This last statement by Betteadette is a good example of the last phase of social drama, re-integration, which
is when participants finish the exchange by agreeing or disagreeing and accepting but acknowledging differences in opinion.

The next student changes the subject of discussion.

#3h

(Tape 6, 1:16.41-1:17.17)

Juan: Uh, I want to ask something of my group. Maybe Timothyas can help us. Uh, I don't if I am wrong or not, but I had a feeling that at the beginning, you were like very respect for us, because you thought that we had power.

Many others chime in with Timothyas:

Timothy: Yes

Juan: So, you thought that we had uh power, and suddenly, our power began to vanish, and you began to get the power. That's, that's, I don't know, did you? because I, I, I felt like that. I don't know if you had the same feeling.

#3i (Tape 6, 1:17.18-1:17.41)

Felix: All's I can say that this is our strategy, to feel, to show you very weak. That you, to seek for clemency, you know, please, please, and you say, Oh, my God, poor
people, so you help us, you help us, at the end, we stayed with the property, with the land and continue negotiation, negotiation in the future.

Felix answers Juan's question, but Toyama directs the discussion to the basic question of who won.

#3j  (Tape 6, 1:17.41-1:18.01)

Toyama:  (Pronunciation is very difficult to comprehend) Ok, so .... won bargaining section? (Felix leans forward to try to hear what was said.) (So your team won the bargaining?

Felix:  Sorry?

Romeo:  (interjects) Are you asking...

Toyama:  Yeah, who won the bargaining section? You see ... the bargaining section? Yeah, he got the power?

#3k  (Tape 6, 1:18.08-1:18.46)

Renaldo:  Definitely, they got the power. That's what I wanted to talk about. To me it is not just, it's not that important that we solve the bargaining session. That's important, but what we are here to learn is how to bargain. It doesn't really matter, if you win or you lose. I mean if
you win, it’s better. So that if you tell me, ok, we were not aggressive enough, but we won, but it is not only that in the bargaining session, it’s how we do it.

In the above excerpt, (Excerpt #3k), Renaldo, talks about the bargaining session when he says, “what we are here to learn is how to bargain,” and demonstrates that he realizes the purpose of these exercises is to help the students develop skills for doing bargaining. He also acknowledges that there is the act of authentic bargaining without an instructional basis. He mentions the issues of what it means to win and how do you get there. The other issue that he raises about bargaining is which type of win is important, a win/win, or a win all/lose all situation? These ideas originated from the student and had never been discussed by the instructors with the students.

In the previous exchange, (Excerpts #3a-k), the students are negotiating what is good bargaining and how do you decide who won. The discussion on communication skills and how to give feedback are revisited and renegotiated constantly over the time of the course, for example on two occasions about a week apart, we hear the issues raised again in the following excerpts from tapes 5 and 6:
Arthur: (Opens the discussion) "What is the role of aggressivity in negotiation?"

Later Lela states, "Negotiation is not just arguing."

In a round-table discussion, about a week later, the same student raises the issue again:

Tape 6

Arthur: "I was disappointed at the discussion. I want negative feedback or how to improve."

Betteadette: "I agree with Arthur..."

This demand for tougher feedback comes up in other occasions until the end of the course and there is never complete agreement by the students, but you gradually see an increased confidence in giving specific feedback by the students after each one of these discussions on the issue.

Page, Paragraph, and Line (PPL) as Scaffolding

Earlier on in the course, the instructor introduces PPL as a way to refer to specific locations in a text. In the following excerpt, he nudges a student into using this technique, giving him cues of an appropriate way to use it.

#6 (Tape 2, 1:38.38-1:1:39.07)

Injr: Timothy, what happens?
Timothy: Let me say that right away, the plus far outweighs minus, so he ... The performance appraisal.

Injr: Now, would you be a little more specific.

Timothy: Uhm, he is starting with the plus and he uh...

Injr: Ok, I guess you’re on page 3, paragraph 3, line?

Timothy: No, paragraph 4, line 2, uhh, line 1.

Injr: Ok, fine, paragraph 4, line ....

Timothy: Line one.

Injr: Line one. Ok, go ahead.

The instructor interrupts the student’s turn, and at first, the student doesn’t get what the instructor is referring to, but eventually uses the technique and the instructor turns the floor back over to him, once he uses the PPL formula.

Presentation, Practice, Process, Acquisition, and Reflection

It is in the latter half of the course that we see multiple types of scaffolding being provided by instructors and students to each other. From a content or task based orientation, there is a common theme emerging of variations on presentations, meetings, negotiations and lots of practice of analysis and other skills that were introduced earlier in the course. Indeed the amount
of time spent on self-critique and reflection on learning continues to increase, day by day.

The presentation is a speech event that is the basis for all the sessions in the latter third of the course. All the cases presented and discussed are various cases from the Harvard MBA program. The cases were selected from the functional areas of general and strategic management, marketing and international business. The cases serve as the core information sources for the discussions and activities.

The format of the presentation is that the class is divided into three teams, one team presents to another team, and the third team acts as judges, observing and evaluating the other two teams. The presenting team has 30 minutes for the presentation. Then, there are 15-20 minutes for questions and challenges from team b. Next, comes a five-minute break, after which, the judges give feedback for 15 minutes. The Round Table discussion follows for 15-20 minutes. The procedures for giving and receiving feedback and the Round Table discussion are the same as practiced in earlier class sessions. The new strategies being emphasized are presentation strategies. During the Skills Hour, students have been given instructions and guidelines for preparing good presentations such as topic, organization, visuals, etc.
Students were expected to use overheads and make handouts. In three of the four presentation sessions, presentations were to be made by groups. Each group was expected to make the plan or proposed solution and present this to the rest of the class, which consisted of two other groups, a management team, and the judges’ team. The judges’ team observes the presenting and management teams and later gives feedback to both teams on their performance.

In the fourth session, an individual gives the presentation to a sales department team and the third group judges. In all the sessions, there is time for (Q & A) questions and answers, followed by feedback and roundtable. The format for feedback and roundtable are the same as in the previous discussions.

In addition to the specific skills of presentations, students have an opportunity to hone their discussion skills as they pertain to negotiations and meetings. This is a continuous process, which improves as students’ skills, and confidences improve.

What distinguishes later sessions from earlier sessions is the depth and level of self-critique done by students. The round-table session surely becomes the essential moment for analysis and reflection on learning. The awareness of learning becomes multifaceted as
students comment on content issues, cultural differences, communication skills, and implications of these exercises for their future studies and careers.

Other Significant Events that Contribute to the Negotiation of Authenticity in the Discourse Experience

The following are a list of activities or locations that contribute to the learning and authentic experience of the learners throughout the life of the class:

1. Group projects/Individual projects gave students opportunities to experience the challenge of group work as they would in the MBA Program.

2. Midterm and final exams were presented in U.S. graduate school format.

3. The computer lab was a shared lab with students from other programs and majors in the university.

4. Residence Hall Experience: Students were housed in actual university residence halls with other students. Some lived off campus.

5. Dining Hall: Those students living on-campus were required to eat in campus residence halls offering them opportunities to meet outside of class and to meet students enrolled in other classes.

6. Other social activities: Friday evening volleyball, tennis, and drinking.
7. Class Evaluation: Students were given the opportunity to evaluate the class both in a written format and through a group discussion. Teachers prepared quantitative and qualitative written evaluations of individual students.

The activity of class evaluation forces and allows for some final reflection and discussion of the overall learning experience. But this evaluation is preliminary at best because the realization and learning process continues for months after the class experience. Students seem to be able to put the experience into perspective many months after they had started the graduate school program. In speaking with a group of graduates from the summer 1991 program in April, 1992 at Harvard Business School, I found that in general, all felt the summer program was a good preparation for them for classroom discussion and some of the expectations of the graduate program. One thing that they mentioned was that in the graduate program they did not have to do an outline of the written analyses as they had to do in the summer program. This was an interesting comment, because I know that this requirement was one of the scaffolding that the course instructors were providing (Juan, Toyama, and Duc, spring 1992.) The students still did not realize that this and some other assignments were
given as scaffolding to enable them to develop and practice the skills that they would need in the graduate program and business environment.

The outline format acted as scaffolding for the course as a whole. I am sure that some students would have mastered the analysis process without it. However, the format allowed the class to be built on that uniformity. It meant that students were evaluated on form and content. Once they went to a M.B.A. program, they would find that each professor would require a different form of reporting even though they were all using the case method. I observed two Harvard M.B.A. classes and one UMASS M.B.A. class and found that each professor facilitated the case discussion differently and had different requirements for the written analysis. The components of the analysis were the similar or the same but each one may have put more emphasis on different sections or aspects. I don’t believe that students have to know or realize that something is scaffolding for it to be considered scaffolding. The instructor may create the scaffolding intentionally or unintentionally. In the site of this study, the outline format was deliberate scaffolding provided to structure and model a Western way of organizing and to include the components of the case analysis process.
Scaffolding is planned or devised to facilitate learning and to assist students to reach their (I+1) level of competency. Scaffolding could have a negative effect on achieving authenticity if the learners refuse to let it go and do not adapt to the demands of different instructors or classes they encounter after leaving the class discourse.
CHAPTER 7

FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

What can we learn from this study? There are seven major findings from this study, which relate to the four dissertation research questions:

**Question One and Findings**

**Question One**

How do students and teachers negotiate a shared agreement of what is authentic communication in the context of this graduate school preparation class for non-native speakers of English?

**Findings**

**Manifestations and Negotiation of Authenticity**

Authenticity manifests itself and is negotiated gradually over phases. In this study, I have labeled three phases of development: An introduction to the new discourse and community phase, where expectations are often unclear and unspoken. It is the instructor who is the initiator of the new framework. Gradually students begin to become clearer about what is authentic for them, and what they want to learn. In phase two, the making sense phase, students begin to acknowledge and vocalize that they are struggling to have an authentic experience.
and that they are going to challenge others to participate in the creation and carrying out of this authentic experience. By Phase three, the full emergence phase, students are confident in what they perceive as being authenticity and are able to distinguish varying degrees and categories for referencing authenticity, whether it be, in this situation, the MBA classroom, real life, their home culture, or home business environment.

Gradual Skill Development

Parallel to and simultaneous with the gradual evolution of defining, negotiating, and articulating an authentic discourse community and ways of communicating, there is a gradual process or development of skills. In this project, various skills are introduced and developed during the three acts of transition. Time spent on each individual skill is high at first and diminishes as the group negotiates and agrees on it within a range of competency. This negotiation never completely stops. It is continuous.

In Act 1, students are negotiating class procedures, acceptable behaviors, turn taking, discussion procedures, writing format, and language expression and usage. As students begin to establish themselves with these general
skills, they begin to transition to putting more attention on and writing skills in Act 2. It is in Act 3, that students are introduced to bargaining. They negotiated what bargaining means and what it actually means to win in a bargaining situation. It is also in this phase that they are introduced to the giving and receiving feedback activity, which represents the beginning of an opportunity for reflection on learning. After being able to evaluate each other, students are able to digest their learning through open discussion in the roundtable activity. Finally, we see the beginning of multiple and simultaneous skill negotiation.

Presentation skills are also introduced and emphasized in Act 3. Learners practice giving and receiving feedback and participating in the roundtable discussion. In the latter part of this phase, it becomes clear that the learners are confident in discussion, analysis, self-critique, and labeling certain acts as authentic. They are also able to switch easily between negotiation of procedure, language, content, and other communication skills.

Plateau of the Development of Language Skills

It was evident in Act 3 of the course that all the students had improved in their ability to communicate
orally, however, it became clear that there was also an agreed upon level of communicativity and group comprehension that developed in each group. This level of communicative competence would be reached, and unless there was a deliberate intervention by the instructor during the life of the discourse community, in this case, the course, to challenge the students in their language production, they would not continue to improve, particularly, in pronunciation or comprehensibility. Once they leave this discourse community, they will continue to be challenged and will adjust to the communicative demand of their new discourse communities.

Reflection Time Enhances Learning and Acquisition

The Roundtable sessions provided students with the time and opportunity to discuss and reflect on what they were learning or experiencing. Students could react to what they were observing and internalize their understanding, as well as, verbally describe what they were experiencing. Reflection brings students from learning to acquisition of control of language knowledge and ways of communicating.

The structure of this course which included a specific time for the giving and receiving of feedback and then specific space for post activity processing, in
the form of the roundtable exercise. I believe that by allowing time in the class for this discussion, it allowed students to begin meta-processing what they were learning from the feedback received from the fellow students and instructor. The roundtable session allows time for conscious and unconscious processing that allows acquisition to occur. Some students might not do that on their own. In addition, the group experience of processing is more effective than if it is done individually because in the group there are more opportunities for input of analysis and ideas from the others. Of course, each person's growth is their unique experience depending on their reaction to the experience.

**Question Two and Findings**

**Question Two**
What is the nature of the identities and relations that are constructed in discourse and how do participants: students and teacher, evaluate these constructions in terms of authenticity and how these evaluations change over the course of the semester?

**Findings**

**Construction and Acceptance of Multiple Identities**

The learners begin their experience in the program seeing themselves in their first identity, as who they
are by country of origin, gender, language, age, rank in
their jobs, status in school process, and home country
cultural practices. All of these factors seem to
influence their initial participation in the new
classroom culture that is developing.

As the classroom or program culture develops,
learners observe what is expected of them and later
discuss between themselves what they observe. I
overheard a group of Japanese students, one woman and two
men, speaking in English to some other students from
their class. They all talked about the type of
participation in the discussion that was expected and how
this was so different for them in Japan. The women
mentioned how women generally did not participate
aggressively in discussions with men, but here, in the
class, it was acceptable and expected that women
participate actively. The women are aware of their even
added burden of adaptation than men. I am not sure if
the men are aware of this gender issue or even care.

This moment of awareness is important because the
learners decide to adapt or not adapt to the classroom
culture. Some adjust more easily and come to future
classes more willing to participate actively. Others,
despite their awareness and desire to adjust to the new
expectations, will adjust at different rates of speed, depending on how much these expectations conflict with their home cultures.

Based on my experiences teaching in Japan and in the States and my observations in this site and others, I believe that the rules of the classroom culture can freeing for some students because the rules of this new culture, the classroom culture, give learners permission to violate their home culture rules and social practices. For example, women from Korea and Japan tended to participate more actively, after observing some of the European or Latina women participate equally with the men. Asian men, also, after becoming aware of the need for a different communication style from that of their home culture, began to take risks with their level of participation.

However, no matter how much we instructors think that we are providing a safe environment for people to be able to let go of home culture biases, that never happens completely. I can remember two separate situations: In one case, two Korean men in their twenties were in a class together. One was only one year older than the other, but they both were very conscious of being sure not to put the other in a compromising situation when it
came to role plays or discussions. They managed this concern and stayed together in the class. On the other hand, in another class session, there were two Korean bankers from the same bank. One was in his early 50’s and the other, in his mid or late 40’s. They were both executives, but the older one was the boss of the younger one. I had taught the senior manager in another communications class and he now wanted to take the more advanced class, which was the Case Discussion Class. The other manager had signed up for the course also and they both came to the first day of class. At the end of the day, I received a call from the senior manager stating that he was sorry, but he could not attend my class because the other manager would feel uncomfortable with him there. I wanted to try to convince him that this wouldn’t matter, but I realized that I needed to accept the influences that the home culture was having on this situation. As an instructor, I needed to be aware of the influences that the home cultures and dynamics of relationships would have on the learning in my classroom. I realize that an instructor doesn’t have to know everything about the cultures of all the students he/she teaches, however, some cultural knowledge will help them understand potential blocks to learning and this
understanding can help the instructor think of strategies to work with these blocks.

If we want to talk about authenticity in relation to this case discussion class, I can say that the difference between this preparation course and the actual case class is that the actual case class has no scaffolding activities built in to facilitate oral communication. I remember that when I was working in Japan, a Japanese executive shared with me his experience of being sent for one year to a law-training program at Harvard. During the first few days there, he reached an awareness of the communication style that would be necessary for him to actively participate in his courses and came to realize that he did not have the skills needed. The problem was that he did not know how to develop those skills and there were not any resources available to help him or others with the same problem. As a result, even though he became aware of the problem, he could not overcome it. The result was frustration and a low evaluation of his level of participation by the instructor. On the other hand, in the preparation course of this study, there is scaffolding for developing this skill in the form of being told to participate more often by instructors and other students, given vocabulary and expressions for
taking the floor and taking turns, and presented examples of good participation. Therefore, clearly the second identity, which develops in response to the new developing class or program culture, begins to emerge, the classroom cultural identity.

The third identity that the learners tend to experience is related to the roles they play in the role-plays and simulation activities. They are willing to go back and forth between their role identity and their classroom identity.

Later, after the passing of some time, it seems that the learners will refer to their cultural identity or past work experience only when they are negotiating or trying to make sense of something in the classroom culture. After awhile, the classroom identity dominates and the other two identities become much more secondary.

**Question Three and Findings**

**Question Three**

When do points of tension or conflict in constructing communication occur in the context, what seems to facilitate or hinder them, and what is their positive or negative effect on the learning and acquisition process?
Findings

Tensions

Learners initially negotiate tensions, one at a time, as they occur, for example, negotiating classroom procedure and etiquette, cultural identity, analysis procedures, etc. Later in the course, students are able to switch from negotiating procedure for a few minutes, to negotiating content, or language clarification. By Phase 3 of the course, they are able to move easily from negotiating one to the other.

If I say that without scaffolding, students could not participate successfully in certain authentic communication activities, I can say that without tensions, there would not be a growth in learning and acquisition of new levels of skills. Tensions are those moments of struggle when students are trying to make meaning of their experience. It is through interaction with others, both students and the instructor, that these tensions occur. It is after a moment of tension that a new level of understanding or knowledge is reached. In the course of a day, students deal with many tensions. A common understanding of a term, concept, or idea being discussed might be agreed upon for awhile, however, a certain tension may re-occur or be re-visited until a new
common agreed upon understanding is reached, or until everyone accepts to disagree or "agrees to disagree" as stated once by the lead instructor.

**Question Four and Findings**

**Question Four**

What types of scaffolding develop or are provided by teacher or students and how do the different types of scaffolding facilitate or hinder the negotiation of the communication over time?

**Findings**

**Scaffolding Facilitates Communication**

Scaffolding interventions prepared by the instructor facilitate communication and development of skill in activities that require a higher level of skills than what students possess before they begin the course. The scaffolding allows students to take part in authentic or activities modeled after those used in the target discourse communities. Scaffolding could have a negative effect if learners do not make the transition from using it as scaffolding to adapting to the demands of the discourses they eventually encounter.

Scaffolding takes many forms from outlining systems, vocabulary expression lists, and writing skills' instruction. This course had a time specifically set
aside for scaffolding support assistance and that was the Skills Hour. In addition, scaffolding was integrated in the main case class time, but this was separate from the scaffolding done in the Skills Hour slot.

**Significance and Implications**

Understanding the process of negotiation of authenticity will allow teacher educators to inform teachers and others of the evolving process of negotiating authenticity in Second Language Acquisition. We can improve teaching and increase learning and acquisition by structuring the learning environment to facilitate it. For example:

1. This knowledge could serve instructors in curriculum planning and selecting materials and tasks which require problem solving, provide for discussion, and include time to allow students to process what has been learned.

1a. Being more aware of the role of authenticity, instructors will be able to reflect on how they can set the initial tone of establishing a learning community. Knowing that scaffolding is needed with the authentic materials, tasks, and assignments, they can design scaffolding activities that will
support students in communicating as they pass through the various phases of conceptualization of authenticity, which are introduction, vocalizing, and strong interpretation.

2. Knowing that students can acquire various skills at the same time in a setting might give teachers confidence to use a variety of teaching techniques in their classrooms.

3. Knowing that students tend to reach a plateau in analytical, communicative, and language skills, a curriculum planner might consider using many strategies to counter that, such as switching the groups between the sections, as in the example of this study, early in the schedule and more than once in the term to help stimulate that \((I+1)\) phenomenon. The planner can prepare various ideas of how to motivate and continuously challenge the skill development of both high and low level students.

4. Allowing time and structuring activities in the course schedule that allows for reflection of the experience enhances the acquisition process versus just surface learning of language rules and how to apply those rules for communication. This process
should include reflection through discussion, self-evaluation, and group analysis.

**Recommendations for Further Research and Reflection on the Research Process**

The negotiation process for defining authenticity warrants further exploration. It will be interesting to understand more about the role of authenticity in the second language acquisition process through the carrying out of various studies in other ESP for business classrooms.

Another area that could be further explored is the role of scaffolding, first, in the second language learning process, and second, in the creation of authentic situations that will facilitate language and communication skills acquisition. This all relates to content-based ESL instruction. Further understanding of the topic could lead to the identification and development of various scaffolding strategies.

In addition, other researchers might want to look at tensions in the language learning process and the strategies that learners develop in reacting to them.

How cultural differences and gender influence the negotiation of authenticity and learning is another topic that could be further researched.
APPENDIX

HARVARD BUSINESS SCHOOL VIDEOTAPES-SUMMER 1991

The following tapes were transcribed or summarized for analysis. Each Tape is approximately two hours in length.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAPE #</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TOPIC/CASE/ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>7/1/91</td>
<td>Tiberg Case Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>7/3/91</td>
<td>Road to Hell Case Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>7/9/91</td>
<td>Bob Knowlton Case Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>7/12/91</td>
<td>Freemark Abbey Case Discussion (Quantitative Case-Decision Tree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>7/17/91</td>
<td>Washington Post - Bargaining Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>7/19/91</td>
<td>Fan Pier-Bargaining Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>7/23/91</td>
<td>Procter and Gamble-Bargaining Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>7/25/91</td>
<td>Southwest Airlines Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>8/2/91</td>
<td>Ideal Standard France Case Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>8/9/91</td>
<td>Puritan Case Report Presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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