

AN EXAMINATION OF CONVERSATIONAL PHENOMENA AND THEIR
SOCIOPRAGMATIC IMPLICATIONS FOR NATIVE AND NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS
OF ENGLISH NEGOTIATING IN AN INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS SETTING

Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements of the University of Liverpool
for the degree of Doctor in Philosophy by
Marlene F. Ringler

September 1997

Marlene F. Ringler

An Examination of Conversational Phenomena and their Sociopragmatic Implications for Native and Non-native Speakers of English Negotiating in an International Business Setting.

Abstract

Although the volume of world trade deriving from negotiations conducted in the *lingua franca*, English, is enormous, relatively little research has investigated the role of discourse in international business negotiations and specifically the problem of how non-native speakers of English learn to negotiate appropriately, apart from the findings reported in Fisher (1980), Hendriks (1991), Redding (1991), Donohue and Ramesh (1992), and Wilson (1992). This study provides a description and analysis of business negotiations as performed by native/non-native speaker pairs of negotiators.

The aim of the research was to investigate quantifiable differences between non-native and native speakers of English in their expression of five selected conversational features - repetition, self repair, paraphrase, opening up new subjects, and interruption - in an international business negotiation, including an analysis of the effect of the specific feature of interruption on the outcome of the negotiation. The study undertook to examine the sociopragmatic implications of the findings in relation to ESP practitioners.

Thirty negotiations simulating the purchase and sale of a computer were audiotaped, transcribed, and analysed according to the subjects' perceptions of their prediction and performance of their usage of the selected conversational features. An observer's checklist was designed and adopted as an analytical tool to confirm the findings of the quantitative analysis of the variables. A discourse analysis was applied to the feature interruption, selected as the variable most often associated in the research base with conflict resolution theories in international business negotiations.

No statistically-significant differences were found between the two populations regarding the five features either in the pre- or post-negotiation stages, with the exception of opening up new subjects in the pre-negotiation stage and self repairs in the post-negotiation phase. The self-perception of usage among both populations was more accurate following than preceding a negotiation, a finding which carries practical implications for both the student and the teacher. The observer's checklist stood as confirmation of the findings.

The discourse analysis elaborated the duality of the interruption as a feature which may serve as a barometer of a negotiation. The findings suggest that a constructive interruption may contribute to a positive atmosphere of mutual trust and goodwill, leading to a successful negotiating outcome, while interruptions conveying suspicion, aggression or distrust may act as contributing factors towards an unsuccessful outcome.

Pedagogical implications in training future international negotiators may derive from the findings that the expression of the five features among native and non-native English speakers was more alike than dissimilar and that rapport-oriented types of interruptions may serve a constructive role in ultimately contributing to goal achievement.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisors at the University of Liverpool: Dr. Michael Scott for his critical insights and suggestions on the drafting of the thesis, especially the quantitative analysis and statistical advice; to Dr. Susan Thompson for sharing my dream that a conversational analysis of an international negotiation may prove to be a worthy research undertaking, and for her guidance, support, and constant interest in the project as well as her detailed comments which helped me clarify the direction of the thesis; to Dr. Michael Hoey for his extensive comments on my earlier drafts and his encouragement to continue with my research and for his scholarly, sympathetic, and unfailing commitment to my research goals.

I also wish to thank the staff of the English Language Unit, University of Liverpool, for their continual support, expressed in many ways.

Associates and friends have been a rare and wonderful source of insight and support.

I thank Hilary Le Cornu who responded to the technical demands of the thesis with understanding and patience. I am also grateful for the guidance, friendship, and unconditional support of the people who have been there for me over the past years while I was undertaking this project, especially Dr. Aaron Auerbach, Sam Sherwin, Dr. Ellen, and Michael Feingold.

"I have learnt from all my teachers, and from my students most of all" (Ethics of the Fathers). I am deeply grateful to the many students I have had the privilege of teaching in the United States and Israel who have responded with insight, passion, and appreciation, in and after class, to my teaching.

To my mother, Ruth Smith, and sister, Evelyn Smith Bibi, and Joan Ringler, I wish to express my gratitude for being there; and to my children, Yaakov, Ami, and Elana I offer my thanks for the years they have been by me and encouraged me to study and research even when that meant taking time from them during their critical formative years.

Finally, I wish to thank my husband and friend, Stanley, whose unconditional love and unfailing encouragement created a time and space in our lives for critical thinking, research, and writing.

This dissertation is dedicated to my father, Russell Smith.
May his memory be blessed.

LIST OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE: DISCOURSE THEORIES AS THE CONTEXT FOR NEGOTIATIONS	
2.1.	Historical Introduction	13
2.2	Approaches to Analyzing Discourse	19
2.3	Discourse Theories and Sociolinguistics	25
2.4	Conversational Features	34
2.4.1	Opening Up Subjects	38
2.4.2	Paraphrases	40
2.4.3	Self Repairs	41
2.4.4	Repetitions	42
2.5	Interruptions	43
2.6	Sociopragmatic Implications of Interruptions	56
2.7	Conclusions	60
3	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE: ESP PEDAGOGY AS THE PRAGMATIC CONTEXT FOR NEGOTIATIONS	
3.1	Introduction	62
3.2	English for Specific Purposes	64
3.3	Issues Related to Negotiations within an ESP Perspective	72
3.4	Conclusions	79
4	NEGOTIATIONS	
4.1	Introduction	81
4.2	Negotiation Theories	82
4.3	Cross-cultural Aspects of Negotiations	98
4.4	Linguistic Features in Negotiations	108
4.5	Interruptions within the Framework of Negotiations	114
4.6	Conclusions	119

5	THE STUDY	
5.1	Introduction	120
5.2	Methodology	126
	5.2.1 Subjects	126
	5.2.2 Data Collection	130
	5.2.3 Negotiation Simulation	135
5.3	Perceptions of Data	136
	5.3.1 Pre-negotiation Questionnaire	136
	5.3.2 Post-negotiation Questionnaire	139
5.4	Observer's Data	139
	5.4.1 Observer's Checklist	140
5.5	Conclusions	142
6	QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS - RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	
6.1	Introduction	144
6.2	Analysis of Perceptions: the Five Conversational Features	147
	6.2.1 Prediction	147
	6.2.2 Performance	157
	6.2.3 Discussion	166
	6.2.4 Effect of Role	170
6.3	Analysis of Observer's Data: the Five Conversational Features	171
6.4	Perceptions of Goal Achievement	180
6.5	Conclusions	185
7	DISCOURSE ANALYSIS	
7.1	Introduction	192
7.2	Qualitative Analysis	196
	7.2.1 Function and Effect of Interruptions	202
	7.2.2 Model of Constructive Interruptions - Encounter No. 22	205
	7.2.3 Interruptions as a Positive Interrelational and Inter- actional Influence - Encounters Nos. 23 and 28	215
	7.2.4 Interruptions as a Mixed Influence - Encounters Nos. 3 and 17	225
	7.2.5 Interruptions in a Confrontational Encounter - Encounter No. 27	230
7.3	Relationship of Interruptions and Outcome	234

8	CONCLUSION	
8.1	Restatement of Themes	240
8.2	Summary of Findings	245
	8.2.1 Differences in Conversational Features	245
	8.2.2 Effect of Interruptions on Outcome	246
8.3	Limitations	250
8.4	Application of Findings	257
8.5	Future Research	265
	REFERENCES	269
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	277
	APPENDICES	284
A.	Negotiation Simulation	285
B.	Negotiation Role Play - Customer	286
C.	Negotiation Role Play - Supplier	287
D.	Pre-negotiation Questionnaire A-1 Native Speaker	288
E.	Pre-negotiation Questionnaire A-2 Non-native Speaker	290
F.	Post-negotiation Questionnaire	292
G.	Observer's Checklist	294
H.	Tapescripts	295

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This study focuses on an analysis of the usage of selected conversational features in spoken discourse between native (NS) and non-native speakers (NNS) of English within the specific setting of business negotiations. The five features selected were: interruptions, paraphrases, subject openers, self repairs, and repetitions. These are illustrative of the use of conversational features in the process, management, and outcome of negotiations conducted in a business setting between NSs/NNSs. The study examines the subjects' reported self-perceptions of the prediction and performance of these five selected features within the negotiating setting. It combines a quantitative analysis based on the subjects' self-perceptions of what occurred in the simulated negotiating encounters drawn from pre- and post-questionnaires with the actual occurrence of the features as examined by the observer's checklist and compares the data derived from the findings. A qualitative analysis of the feature most frequently associated with negotiations - interruptions - is developed in order to deepen the understanding of how negotiations proceed.

The study of conversational features is grounded in the linguistic research on spoken discourse. Spoken discourse analysis investigates the form and function of conversation. It attempts to identify the units which compose it, their interrelationships, the rules which appear to govern their use, as well as the identity and roles of the participants. Conversational analysis exhibits a practically-oriented approach to the study of spoken aspect of linguistics. It acknowledges the various models offered by the theoretical research and

then turns attention to the way in which these models *function* in actual discourse. The rules which govern the use of linguistic units or features are examined in the light of participant interaction in a real-life setting.

Language inadequacies are frequently cited as a perceived form of disadvantage by NNSs when negotiating with NSs. The NNS student negotiator often specifically attributes a self-described inability to know, for example, at which juncture interrupting was legitimate as a source of his/her lack of success in negotiating. It was considered important, in this respect, to attempt to provide NNSs studying English with up-to-date and useful information which might guide, influence, and direct their studies.

The five features were chosen as representative features of spoken discourse. The study singles out interruptions as the object of specific analysis in the hope that a comparison of its usage in business negotiations between NSs and NNSs can provide insights for future guidelines in preparing NNSs for real-life negotiating encounters. The study therefore perceives theoretical research as forming the necessary background for applied usage in social settings.

These particular features were selected out of a broader field because their usage appeared directly relevant to NNS students studying to become international business negotiators. Students seem, from experience in the classroom, to be practically interested in understanding when it is appropriate to introduce a new subject or when repetition can be employed as a useful tool, both areas of confusion as demonstrated by Westerfield's (1989) research.

Despite CA's implicit acknowledgement of the social implications of spoken discourse, only recently has the social setting of spoken discourse become the direct focus of linguistic research. The contributions of such conversational analysts as Coulthard (1985), Schegloff (1968, 1987), Sacks (1987), Jefferson (1987), and Leech (1983) not only address the social setting of spoken discourse but also suggest that current research needs to synthesize previous directions in the area of linguistics in order to move forward. The present study attempts to advance research by contending that theoretical concerns and findings be made directly relevant to those who put them into practical use. It is the practitioners - the teachers, trainers, and students - who have much to gain from understanding and appreciating current insights and new directions and dimensions of linguistic research.

Researchers such as Jefferson (1987), Sacks (1987), Tannen (1989), and Thompson (1994) suggest that examination of the practical implications of linguistic research is of vital interest and importance for future research. The prevalent social setting of today's world is one which has frequently been characterized as a "global village". The borders and boundaries of social interactants have simultaneously been broken down and radically extended. The "social setting" of spoken discourse has broadened out from the local conversation in the home, pub, office, etc., which in the past included, at the most, differing dialects of the same language and divergent customary usages, to embrace international interaction between people of different languages, cultures, norms, and beliefs. The role of English as the *lingua franca* of this global village is reflected in the fact that well over a billion people are currently using English to communicate through mail, fax, e-mail,

electronic transmission, writing, and face-to-face encounters. More than 65% of all international journals in chemistry, biology, physics, medicine, and mathematics are in English (Baldauf and Jernudd, 1983, as quoted in Johns and Dudley-Evans, 1991).

Since spoken discourse is not only local but also international in character, research which attempts to contextualize it in the social arena must take cognizance both of the use of different languages and of English as the *lingua franca* of people for whom it is not their native tongue.

As a practicing teacher of English to non-native speakers of English in the United States for over 20 years, and in Jerusalem where I currently reside, the neglect of the practical application of theoretical findings in linguistic research has frequently struck me. A large number of non-native speakers of English who have attained a high level of English proficiency in oral and written skills appear to be preoccupied with learning the function of conversational features. They are concerned with knowing how to recognize and to successfully deal with such issues as how new subjects are opened up, under what conditions interruptions are considered impolite, at what junctures self repairs are acceptable, and whether or not paraphrases and repetition devices strengthened or weakened their conversational points.

Conversational features should not therefore be considered as merely theoretical constructs. Especially in a global social context involving native and non-native English speakers, identification of their structure and use acts as a central device in helping NNSs to achieve English-language proficiency. The present study therefore suggests that linguistic research needs to move in the direction of providing such students with the tools to

successfully perform in a foreign linguistic environment. One way to accomplish this is to attempt to redress the imbalance in past research caused by the relative neglect or even oversight of the presence and function of universal linguistic features. It appears beneficial and effective to demonstrate to NNS students that similarities in language usage exist which cross cultural-linguistic boundaries. This approach increases students' self-confidence and thus augments their proficiency when dealing in a global environment. NNSs may be enabled to avoid being regarded as negotiating from a subordinate position because of their inferior language competency by being equipped with a confident knowledge of the most suitable use of the conversational features appropriate to the specific discourse.

This study focuses upon an analysis of the usage of selected conversational features in spoken discourse between NSs and NNSs. The subjects' reported self-perceptions of their prediction and performance of these variables are quantitatively analyzed. The occurrence of the use of the features is also analyzed, using an observer's checklist, and is presented within the specific framework of business negotiations. Negotiations provide a particularly rich environment for such an analysis. They possess a specific goal, together with rules to guide and monitor spoken discourse. Since these factors are understood by both partners, native as well as non-native speakers of English, discourse accommodation plays an important role which is clear to both negotiating partners. Providing insights into similarities or differences among both populations regarding the features might assist the NNSs to be both more realistic and successful regarding the outcome in their role as international negotiators.

The focus in this study on the global or "sociopragmatic" issues expressed in business negotiations is intended to indicate trends and themes of interest to both curriculum designers and practitioners in the field. This goal is pursued through the use of a number of research instruments. These include a combined use of quantitative and qualitative analyses, utilizing pre- and post-questionnaires, the observer's checklist, and a discourse analysis of one feature (interruptions).

The quantitative analysis is based on the self-perceptions and responses of the participants, and confirmed by an analysis and interpretation of the observer's checklist. The data was gained from simulated classroom business negotiating encounters set up and monitored through the questionnaires. The study therefore focuses on a simulation rather than authentic negotiating encounters, an acknowledged and necessary limitation which may be justified on the grounds that obtaining real data from actual business encounters was not an available option.

The data examined provides an example of students' learning experience, including their sense of participation and success, as well as their perceptions of their own abilities. To this is added a discourse analysis of interruptions. The qualitative analysis focuses on what actually happened during the negotiating encounters. The resulting findings are submitted in order to aid further discussion of how an understanding of the usage of conversational features can assist NNS students in becoming more effective negotiators.

Since interruptions possess a particularly relevant, although complex, relationship to potential conflict situations, this feature was chosen as the object of a discourse analysis. The study examines the linguistic definitions of interruptions, relating the feature to face,

conformity, and solidarity, and constraint tendencies, as well as to conflict theories. Interruptions may not only create a potential breakdown in co-operation (Stubbs, 1983; Sacks, 1987) but may also be related to the act of co-operating as described in the literature on negotiations (Putnam and Roloff, 1992) and to the bonding effect between partners (Tannen, 1989). They may therefore play a role in negotiating a mutually-satisfactory outcome (Tannen, 1989, 1990).

The combined quantitative and qualitative analysis of interruptions reflects the advantages of integrating these two approaches. Quantitative research enables the researcher to draw conclusions based on the testing of hypotheses concerning significant distinctions between two populations (Fasold, 1987). As noted by Brown (1991), English for Specific Purposes (ESP) practitioners can benefit from understanding and incorporating statistical studies into their curriculum design. The use of qualitative analysis points to possible themes, patterns, and trends in the quantified feature of interruptions selected for specific analysis in this study. The value of combining both types of analysis lies in the fact that the ultimate commitment to "research of quality" is best served by supplying the nearest approximation to validity (Johnson and Saville-Troike, 1992).

The examination of interruptions links together the quantitative and qualitative analyses of the dissertation. The general interpretation of interruptions as reflecting dominance on the part of one or other of the negotiating partners may not necessarily be statistically substantiated. On the contrary, interruptions may be seen as a reinforcing, co-operative, or bond-forming feature, in which case they may advance a successful rather than unsuccessful negotiating outcome. This result may help develop some further grounds

for follow-up discussions concerning teaching students of English as a Foreign Language and for curriculum development in such settings as English for Specific Purposes and English for Business Purposes (EBP).

The study was conducted on the basis of simulated business negotiations between a set of NS and NNS interlocutors, the former university-trained English as a Second Language teachers from various English-speaking countries and the latter Israeli nationals from a cross-section of public and private Israeli institutions. The partners responded to pre-and post-questionnaires designed to indicate their perception of the influence of language usage on the process of negotiating and of their own competence as negotiators. An observer's checklist was set up to report the actual performance and to provide a useful comparison for an analysis of the prediction-performance relationship.

The actual data, including selected simulated negotiations encounters, role plays (customer and supplier), pre- and post-negotiation questionnaires for NSs and NNSs, observer's checklist, and tapescripts, are presented in the appendices at the end of the study.

The goal of the present study was to analyze five conversational features in simulated business negotiation encounters designed to represent real-life encounters. The study describes how theoretical research has increasingly acknowledged its need for practical application in social settings, reflected in the two main approaches of discourse analysis and conversational analysis. Interruptions are suggested as a pertinent feature for a combined quantitative and qualitative analysis, providing data both on the learning experience of the student and on instructional aids for teachers of potential NNS negotiators. The argument thus logically runs from the broad context of sociopragmatics to a more specific field

(negotiations) and finally to an illustration of one particular conversational feature (interruptions). The subjects and themes are based on the identification of a gap in research regarding the practical application of a study of conversational features in courses for training NNS students.

The thesis is divided into the following chapters.

Chapter 2 provides the theoretical background of the thesis. Intimacy with, a deep appreciation for, and close understanding of spoken discourse theories produced a growing conviction that the theoretical labors of researchers may be made directly applicable to curriculum design for NNS learners in English for Specific Purposes and other related areas.

The chapter therefore reviews the relevant research into spoken discourse, together with the research findings from the fields of discourse analysis and ethnography of communication.

Five conversational features - interruptions, paraphrases, repetition, opening up of subjects, and self repairs - are surveyed as examples of features directly relevant to training NNSs in a negotiating setting. The theoretical background and the role and function of interruptions are examined, in order to provide the necessary framework for the discourse analysis of interruptions presented in Chapter 7.

Chapter 3 integrates the sociopragmatic issues specifically related to English for Specific Purposes pedagogy into the theoretical basis established in Chapter 2. It discusses the nature and characteristics of English for Specific Purposes, and introduces the chapter on negotiations (Chapter 4) by contextualizing the selected conversational features of spoken discourse in their usage in a negotiation setting.

Chapter 4 examines the specific context of negotiations. It presents applied research findings in international business encounters and discusses gaps in knowledge as well as weaknesses in previous research in order to demonstrate the importance of addressing such sociopragmatic issues as politeness, face, co-operation, and solidarity which derive from research in spoken discourse. Various models for consideration of the interrelationship between negotiations and communications are reviewed, together with alternative views of the central elements on which the English for Specific Purposes practitioner might focus. This chapter thus gives the theoretical background for the discourse analysis of interruptions in a negotiating setting presented in Chapter 7.

Chapter 5 presents the basic research perspectives and methodology adopted in the study, including data collection procedures, instruments, and systems of analysis. The basic premise is developed that quantitative and qualitative analyses can potentially prove to be inseparable in applied research in such fields as English for Specific Purposes and international business negotiations settings. This makes possible a comparison of the subjects' perception of the negotiating process and of their own competence as negotiators, drawn from their response to pre- and post-questionnaires, and what actually happened during the negotiations, as evidenced through the observer's checklist. Although the participants' self-perceptions of their performance is subjective, implying a qualitative character, the process of evaluating the data assumes the use of quantitative instruments. The outcome or results can therefore be regarded as quantitative in nature. By applying combined quantitative research procedures and qualitative interpretive and evaluative discussions, an

effort was made to conduct a legitimate investigation (Brown, 1991) into phenomena in spoken discourse .

Chapter 6 presents the results gained from the study in Chapter 5. Using graphs and charts, it provides quantitative analyses of the selected conversational features. These analyses examine and discuss the perceived prediction and performance aspects of the subjects' use of the five conversational features in the simulated negotiations encounters. A comparative analysis of the findings of the observer's checklist complements the analyst's and subjects' insights.

Chapter 7 presents a qualitative discourse analysis of the data derived from the study which were quantitatively analyzed in Chapter 6. The qualitative analysis derives from the data gained from the observer's checklist and confirmed by the perceptual data, and focuses on the specific feature of interruptions as a particular example for the relevance of applied research in the field of international business negotiations and the training of NNS students. Interruptions - as demonstrated within a potential conflict situation such as negotiations - can also function positively to bring about a successful outcome. These findings may help towards designing appropriate curricula in English for Specific Purposes and English for Business Purposes and related fields.

Chapter 8 presents the conclusions drawn from the results given in Chapters 6 and 7 and provides some tentative guidelines for the future direction of research in the area of sociolinguistics. Based on a discussion of the results derived, it emphasizes the importance for spoken discourse research of applied studies in such areas as English for Specific Purposes and international business negotiations. The dual strands of quantitative and

qualitative analyses may indicate some of the areas - such as goal orientation and the teacher's role in training for real-world events - which may prove to be among the most fruitful areas of future sociolinguistic research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE:

DISCOURSE THEORIES AS THE CONTEXT FOR NEGOTIATIONS

2.1 Historical Introduction

This chapter reviews the literature on discourse theories as a framework for the investigation of selected conversational features in the context-specific setting of negotiations. The field of discourse theories has come to be viewed as an interdisciplinary approach which covers speech act theory, computational linguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, the ethnography of communication, and conversational and discourse analysis.

Discourse analysis can be described as being concerned with the "study of the relationship between language and the contexts in which it is used" (McCarthy, 1991, p. 5).

It has developed into a relatively diverse area of study, encompassing disciplines covering a wide range of analytical approaches (Brown and Yule, 1983; Fairclough, 1992).

Contemporary research reflects the fact that these methods have come to be regarded as valid and complementary, each making its own contribution to the overall field. The present study presents a discourse analysis of the feature of interruptions in an international negotiating setting in Chapter 7.

Traditionally, linguistic research tended to concentrate on theoretical issues, paying little or no attention to the pragmatic functions of language and to the relationship of discourse to its context (Coulthard, 1985; Leech, 1983). In discussing the value of

understanding the role which pragmatics plays in human communication, Leech (1983) describes the difficulty which earlier linguistic research found in talking about anything more than morphophonemics, not to speak of syntax:

To the generation which followed Bloomfield, linguistics meant phonetics, phonemics, and if one was daring - morphophonemics; but syntax was considered so abstract as to be virtually beyond the horizon of discovery. (Leech, 1983, p. 1)

This situation was described by Coulthard as representing a "time bomb", according to which linguistic research would ultimately erupt if it continued to ignore the significance of pragmatics. Coulthard argued that linguistics should integrate disciplines such as discourse analysis, conversation analysis, and ethnography of communication in order to give meaning and direction to current research. The act of setting a speech event in a particular context (e.g., negotiations) reflects contemporary trends which emphasize the importance of understanding spoken discourse in relation to the "real world".

The expansion of linguistics into a broad discipline which is exploring new ways to synthesize form, meaning, and context reflects the realization among many researchers that situational realities in human communication could no longer be ignored. Thus in the 1960's, the explosion of interest and renewal in linguistics included the recognition that context was an important consideration for research purposes. Perhaps empowered by the unique years of this decade, which saw radical changes in political directions of world leaders, a re-ordering of international priorities, and a concern for relevance, meaning, and significance in life's events, linguistics as a field of science advanced in pace with the requirements of those years.

The resulting interdependence between linguistics and sociolinguistics was influenced by the wide-reaching implications of the "reason and relativism" debate, in which language continues to play a large role. Philosophically-minded linguists such as Austin (1962), Searle (1969), and Grice (1975) contributed to this debate by addressing the issues of negotiating and inferring meaning, while sociolinguists such as Lakoff (1973), Halliday and Hasan (1976), and Firth (1990) expanded earlier work into theories of the social context of language. The traditional Bloomfieldian conviction that "meaning" was best left to other social scientists in order to enable the linguist to concentrate on form and structure was firmly renounced as the pragmatic function of language in specific contexts was acknowledged as an authentic focus of study within sociolinguistics.

In the shift from language competence to language performance, the task of the sociolinguist broadened to include observing and describing language in use. Meaning in use - pragmatics - rather than meaning in an abstract vacuum, became a focused theme in linguistic research. Its situated context was established as an accepted and valid - if controversial - issue. Rejecting Chomsky's (1965) abstraction of an ideal speaker/listener, sociolinguists take great pains to avoid judging the speaker's grammar, lexis, and morphology. They present themselves instead as "ethnographers", whose concerns lie with descriptions rather than prescriptions. Consequently, they easily integrated themselves into the burgeoning interdisciplinary studies focusing on language planning and politics, language transformations, and national language profiles. In addition, analysis of cross-cultural discourse and issues of linguistic accommodation became valid areas of inquiry.

The principle of linguistic accommodation or convergence directly addressed the challenge of unravelling the multiple layers of meaning created in cross-cultural discourse. As sociolinguists have noted (Stubbs, 1983; Hymes, 1987; Saville-Troike, 1989), the notion of linguistic convergence relates to the way(s) in which communicative performance is culturally determined. Separating a manner of speaking from what is being said is frequently a matter of understanding and taking into account the difference in cultural contexts:

. . . *how* something is said is part of *what* is said. Nor can one prescribe in advance the gross size of the signal that will be crucial to content. . . .
(Hymes, 1989, p. 59)

Hymes has further suggested that the traditional focus of linguistics on abstract code characteristics has not only neglected language function but has also left us ignorant of the valuable role of language in social, political, and business life (1989, p. 265).

Although initially defined by Saville-Troike (1989) as a device for gaining social approval, linguistic accommodation may also be used as a technique or strategy to demonstrate loyalty or solidarity. In the negotiating setting, the principle relates to the modification of language use in response to the forms used by the more favored or native speaker: the NNS tends to imitate those linguistic codes which s/he perceives the NS to regard as most appropriate.

Research such as Labov's (1978) studies on language variations in Martha's Vineyard, New York City, and examinations of "Black English" have consequently become a classic part of sociolinguistic literature. Similarly, sociolinguistics have included the identification and analysis of spoken discourse in specific social settings, such as the courtroom, medical interview and, as demonstrated in this study, international business negotiations.

Sociolinguists have also addressed themselves to areas of educational and curricular reform, where the role of the linguist was adapted to confront and redress social inequalities. Thus the "deficit hypothesis", for example, which had become a widely-accepted educational notion in the 1960's to explain the apparently "deficient" or poor English prevalent among minority populations in the United States (Bugelski, 1964; Hamachek, 1965), was itself regarded as deficient when sociolinguistics took seriously the social setting of language. When no external "objective" standard was imposed upon these distinct social communities - or, in other words, their use of language was not judged according to the "population norm" - no deficiencies could be identified.

A large number of studies in related disciplines have also shown that stereotypical attitudes are commonly held by one language group towards speakers of other language groups. Gumperz's (1988, 1989) studies in black English throughout the 1970's and early 1980's further stirred a rising awareness of, and an appreciation for, linguistic variables. Subsequently, an unprecedented wave of respect arose for the contribution of linguistics towards perceptions of social identity. Such emphases on social issues led sociolinguistic research into the further areas of medicine, law, business, and diplomacy (Fisher, 1980; Gorman, 1992; Rankins, 1982; Victor, 1987; Redding, 1991; Scott, 1991; Hilton, 1992).

Researchers also began to look closely at settings in the courtroom, hospital examining room, classroom, and negotiating field - the last two areas possessing specific relevance for the present study. Within this context of an increasing interest in institutionally-situated interactions, this study perceives the negotiation encounter as a

potentially rich pragmatic setting for delineating the learning needs of the potential NNS negotiator.

The particular setting of negotiations is more specific and goal-directed, as well as more rule-bound, than routinized conversational exchanges, where little of significance may be at stake. A negotiation, for example, largely depends on individual interactions for topic realization and regulation. The rituals and routines which a negotiator brings to the negotiating session are embedded in the cultural competence and linguistic code mastery attained by the learner. Control over explicitness and implicitness in lexis, for instance, requires a certain degree of cultural, linguistic, and business knowledge.

Such examples of verbal behaviour as interruptions, hesitations, and repetitions are linguistic strategies which may be related to specific cultural codes. Partners in negotiations not only construct new realities through the process but also negotiate meanings and business relationships. Negotiators may not always say what they mean at the negotiating table. The challenge is to unravel, understand, interpret, and react to the multiple layers of meaning embedded in the specific discourse setting. This synthesizing and molding process is a form of communicative behaviour which needs to be learned in the process of taking on the role of negotiator.

The developments in the field of pragmatics surveyed above increased the challenge to sociolinguistic researchers to integrate and synthesize theoretical findings with applications to teaching materials, classroom approaches and techniques, and learner needs.

Without such a process, while the research remains a viable contribution, its findings remain isolated from those who can most practically benefit from it. One direct development out

of this situation was the establishment of English for Specific Purposes courses, whose methods and principles will be examined in the following chapter.

The present study proposes that the direction for the future lies not only in making linguistic research available to the practitioners but also in formulating the aims and goals of the research specifically with the practitioners in mind. The study thus focuses on the process of interactive communication as a pivotal point for comparing and contrasting the usage of conversational features between NSs and NNSs in a business negotiating setting, with the pedagogical purpose of applying the findings to the field of English for Specific Purposes material development and identification of learner needs.

2.2 Approaches to Analyzing Discourse

As has been mentioned, two of the main approaches in the field of discourse theory are discourse analysis (DA) and conversational analysis (CA). Both these streams emanate from philosophical theories of language, and give an account of how linguistic coherence and organization are achieved. The general aim of discourse analysis is to identify and describe linguistic structures in order to discover rules and units for purposes of classification and analysis. DA seeks to elaborate systems capable of providing a comprehensive account of spoken and written data, thus being pragmatically-oriented and interdisciplinary in nature.

In his preface to Coulthard's seminal work, *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*, Candlin (1985) identifies one of the primary focuses of discourse analysis as the interactive process of interpreting meaning:

On the one hand discourse analysis must portray the structure of suprasentential text or social transaction by imposing some framework upon the data, explicitly or implicitly. On the other hand discourse analysis should offer us a characterization of how, in the context of negotiation, participants go about the process of interpreting meaning.

(Candlin, 1985, p. viii)

Coulthard (1985, p. 6) suggests that discovering the rules for the production of coherent discourse and describing the structures they generate is one of the major aims of discourse analysis. Coulthard's view of discourse analysis emerges from the Birmingham School, and is exemplified by both Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) work on classroom interactions. Coulthard proposes that some of the questions which DA sets out to answer might include: how the basic unit of interaction might be characterized, how many different functions there are, and how they are realized lexico-grammatically. He also addresses the confusion over how to categorize what takes place in spoken discourse prevalent amongst different researchers. Coulthard indicates that the social role of speaker and listener, turn taking, non-verbal signalling, and social relationships are all further elements of DA, since the latter directly examines the relationship between the discourse and the speaker and hearer. This idea is validated in the present study through understanding how the role assumed by negotiators influences the direction and outcome of the encounter under examination.

Coulthard's (1985) terminological schemes have been given an interesting delineation by Fiksdal (1986):

Act:	A unit defined by its function and which cannot stand alone.
Move:	The minimal contribution a speaker can make to an exchange.
Exchange:	Formed by moves and including informing and eliciting.

Discourse analysis maintains that a distinction exists between written text(s) and spoken discourse. Spoken discourse, for example, places greater weight on interactivity than written discourse. Thus in his preface to Coulthard's second edition, Candlin (1985) credits Coulthard with attempting to give a broader view to discourse analysis by connecting language form and use through conjoining the disciplines of philosophy, social anthropology, and psychology. According to Stubbs (1983, p. 9), much of the confusion in understanding discourse analysis results from "ambiguities in the term discourse analysis". Informed by insights and discussions from psychology, sociology, and anthropology, Stubbs, like Coulthard, presents a strong case for the linking and interrelatedness of these disciplines in DA.

The theme of naturally-occurring connected discourse is a common topic of interest among discourse analysts (Sacks, 1987; Jefferson, 1987), as well as ethnographers of communication such as Saville-Troike (1989). Brown and Yule (1983) describe the analysis of discourse as the analysis of discourse in use or in its functional capacity, using the terms transactional and interactional:

. . . That function which language serves in the expression of content we will describe as **transactional**, and that function involved in expressing social relations and personal attitudes we will describe as **interactional**.
(Brown and Yule, 1983, p. 1)

Critiques of the discourse analytical approach revolve around both the appeal to native-speaker intuition and the use of methods and tools imported from theoretical linguistics. Levinson (1983), for example, asserts that conversation is not a structured product in the same way as is a sentence. He makes the claim (not embraced by all discourse

analysts) that moving from the study of the sentence to the study of conversation is like moving from a study of physics to a study of biology, utilizing the same analytical procedures and methods. Viewing Levinson's studies from the '90's, it is obvious that although he had much to contribute as a major theoretician, influencing many of his successors, his working definitions have become somewhat outmoded.

Although DA and CA are both theoretical approaches, they begin from different starting points, have different goals, and use different models. Conversational analysis primarily focuses on the interpretive and interactional level of language production, together with the interrelatedness of language and meaning. Researchers who adopt a CA approach to the analysis of spoken discourse similarly utilize socio-rhetorical categories (Tripp, 1969; Brown and Yule, 1983; Sacks, 1987). They look for patterns of behaviour and at how co-conversationalists interpret these patterns in a particular context in order to create social order from them.

Although DA uses a terminology different from that of CA, in both approaches moves and turns form a linear sequence which can be grouped into larger chunks called exchanges or sequences (Fiksdal, 1986, p. 70):

- Turn: Composed of structural units such as words, clauses, and sentences and defined by use as a listener decides when a turn is complete.
- Sequence: Connected pairs.
- Topic: The reason for the conversation.

One of the differences between DA and CA lies in the emphasis in CA on the interactional; i.e., with turn exchanges (Sacks and Schegloff, 1974), rules of address (Tripp, 1969), and the use of language to save face (Brown and Levinson, 1987). Conversational

analysts perhaps pay closer attention than DA to the status and roles negotiated through language function as instruments of social interactions. Everyday human interactions, they posit, are primarily characterized by interactional functions. In greetings and openers, for example, the speaker attempts to establish an interactional connection with the listener rather than concentrating on the transmission of information. This theme is taken up in later discussions of the qualitative aspects of interruptions as an interactional feature of negotiations, while the opening of a negotiation will also be examined in light of this description of interactional connectedness between negotiating partners.

If discourse is understood as language as it occurs within a context, it can be said to constitute an all-inclusive category (Tannen, 1989). This view presents the possibility of an interesting distinction between DA, which Tannen considers to be uniquely heterogeneous among the varied disciplines of linguistics, and conversational analysis (CA). The term "conversational analysis", as pioneered by Sacks and Schegloff (1974), can then be taken to refer to the particular and the specific, "a particular combination of theory and method employed in studying a particular kind of data" (Tannen, p. 6). As Tannen herself describes in her book *Talking Voices*, theory and method in a CA approach combine to examine a particular type of data, such as imagery in conversational discourse, or repetition and variation. DA, she maintains, on the other hand,

. . . does not refer to a particular method of analysis. It does not entail a single theory or coherent set of theories. Moreover, the term does not describe a theoretical perspective or methodological framework at all. It simply describes the object of study: language beyond the sentence.
(Tannen, 1989, p. 6)

According to this view, DA encompasses at least nine disciplines: linguistics, anthropology, sociology, psychology, literature, rhetoric, philology, speech communication, and philosophy. In contrast to other definitions, discourse analysis does not need to be perceived as a monolithic theory embracing a unitary method of analysis. DA is more accurately seen as uniquely heterogeneous and diverse (Tannen, 1989). In fact, Tannen speculates that the term "discourse analysis" was in fact first developed in order to legitimate analysis of language which did not fit into already-existing subfields of linguistics.

A further issue raised in both DA and CA regards one of the paradoxes in research into spoken discourse. It has been suggested (Stubbs, 1983) that the clarity of speech which is evident to the interactants during an actual conversation - such as a negotiation - may actually hide the complexity of the linguistic units which form it. Thus although conversation appears to be clear, straightforward, and sensible to the co-conversationalists as negotiating partners, it tends to appear strange and "broken" when written or transcribed:

A most important point is that much of the complexity of spoken conversation is evident only in close *written* transcriptions: it is typically not evident to the participants themselves. I am thinking of such frequent conversational complexities as: false starts, hesitations, self-corrections, ungrammatical and unfinished sentences, overlapping utterances, and so on. Conversation *looks* odd, incoherent and broken when seen in the written medium - but it does not *sound* odd to those taking part in it.
(Stubbs, 1983, p. 228)

On the other hand, while transcribed conversations allow the linguistic units to emerge, the transcriptions themselves can appear incoherent and muddled. "Meaning" in both written and spoken discourse is embedded within the syntactic structure. In written discourse, however, it is ostensibly less dependent on inference and interpretation. In recognition of this

problem, this study proceeds on the assumption that despite the incoherency disadvantages of transcriptions of actual conversations, the written form of the spoken discourse is useful both for highlighting the occurrence of conversational features and for the ultimately greater comprehensibility of written texts for the analyst (whether researcher or practitioner).

The trend today in the '90's is to look towards social organization to learn more about the way spoken and written discourse is organized and coherence achieved. Thus, for example, Hatch (1992) calls for a new direction to bring various ways of analyzing discourse into a coherent whole. She maintains that work which informs practice as well as theory is still lacking.

The present study represents an attempt to redress the lack identified by Hatch. Since the theoretical framework of CA emphasizes patterns and regularities, it might be possible to generalize pedagogic models identified through predictable patterns. The five conversational features examined represent established categories in CA. Conversational analysis thus becomes a practical stepping stone linking sociolinguistics and negotiating theory. The study further recognizes the contribution of CA to examining the practical implications of the selected conversational features for English for Specific Purposes practitioners.

2.3 Discourse Theories and Sociolinguistics

The premise of this study is that the theoretical strands or themes in discourse analysis should not be isolated from their practical application. It therefore attempts to demonstrate the interrelatedness of research and practice. The sociolinguist attempts to

understand and explain the meaning of language in the events of human life. Meaning transformed and mediated by conversational rules reflects speakers' attitudes towards the topic and towards each other, as well as the setting of the extended discourse.

Sociolinguistics considers the role of the social actors on the stage of conversational encounters in order to develop adequate descriptions, as well as new modes of classification.

However, in order to develop models or theories, a satisfactory explanation linking disciplines or theories within disciplines must first exist. Thus this study not only considers conversational elements using an ethnographic approach but also situates the speech act within the domain of international business negotiation principles. This approach was adopted in order to help demonstrate how research might be applied in specific settings such as English for Specific Purposes and English for Business Purposes curriculum design.

The theoretical perspectives discussed below are examined as they relate to the issues of NS/NNS spoken interactions in simulated business negotiations. Since negotiators can be viewed, according to Hymes (1989), as forming a distinct speech community, discussion of the negotiating setting includes such issues as those raised by discourse analysis and conversational analysis, as well as the cross-cultural aspects of speech act theory and genre analysis. These cross-cultural aspects can be viewed as "macro-level" issues related to "meta"- cultural, sociological, and anthropological questions.

Sociolinguistics deals with both "cultural" and "cross-cultural" phenomena because it relates to "context-related" language usage. "Context-related language" here carries the meaning of culturally-bound language - language non-translatable or transferable to other cultures - and of cross-cultural, non-culturally-specific language usage. Consequently, in

asserting that conversational features should be considered as context bound, this study emphasizes both their social setting and the need to allow the cross-cultural similarities in varying language usages to be brought to the attention of the English for Specific Purposes learner.

From an historical overview of the development of the phases in the field of pragmatics, it seems clear that the Gricean (1975) framework forms both the basis and starting-point for later models, most notably including that offered by Brown and Levinson (1987).

Grice (1975) derives the concept of conversational implicature from a general principle of "co-operation":

Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.
(Grice, 1975, p. 45)

This principle is supported by further conversational maxims or conventions which include:

Quantity: Make the contribution as informative as required.
Quality: Say only that for which evidence exists.
Relation: Be relevant.
Manner: Be brief and orderly, avoiding ambiguity.
(Grice, 1975, p. 47)

Grice suggests that persons engaged in conversation recognize that, by its nature, talk is both efficient and rational (p. 47). When it superficially appears to flout or contradict this basic nature, another level of meaning - or implicature - is introduced into the conversation, requiring the speaker/listener to make assumptions regarding intentions. This assumption

of conversational rationality, it has been argued, presents a cross-cultural rather than a culturally- constrained basis for language.

Even Gricean accounts of communication, therefore, are not necessarily culturally specific. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain how this claim may be justified:

We turn finally to the charge of cultural bias in the Gricean account of communication, and in our own emphasis on rational sources for behavior Our defense still seems to be adequate: if we make the assumption of rationality, and the behavioral facts then tally, there must be something right about it.

(Brown and Levinson, 1987, p. 9)

Brown and Levinson reinforce the claim that rationality creates the grounds for a linguistic "universality" by discussing the transfer of politeness strategies from one language to another in second language learning contexts. However, they also allow, citing studies of native/non-native English speakers' judgments of politeness in indirect speech acts, that although some evidence exists that non-natives perceive more politeness distinctions than do native speakers, these differences may well be attributable to an over-sensitivity to grammatical form rather than to a lack of concern or sensitivity regarding politeness as a universal in language use (1987, p. 35).

In his classic work on pragmatics, Levinson (1983) suggests that there is good reason to believe that rules of conversational organization exist in all cultures of the world. They are present, for example, in the management of talk, back channels, repairs, paraphrases, and overlaps. The awareness of the universality of rule systems contributes to language acquisition on the part of the learner, who also needs to recognize that competence lies in the speaker's ability to employ the appropriate rule for the specific speech context.

Pragmatics and sociolinguistics share the common goal of trying to understand the social significance of patterns of language. This raises the issue of coherency and appropriateness in language usage. While an utterance may be linguistically coherent it may lack appropriateness to the social encounter, to a lesser or greater degree, a point reflected in the studies conducted by Moerman (1988) and Ervin-Tripp (1989). Moerman proposes that any description of rules of speaking and analysis of conversation must consider the cultural context. In his book *Talking Culture* (1988, p. 12), he contends that analysis of conversation might profit from understanding the roots of the conflict of interpretations in situations where ". . . individuals of different conversational tradition and of differential power conduct important business together". He uses an ethnographic study of the social organization of speech at Thai criminal trials to illustrate his claim that language usage is culturally bound:

Most of the speech occasions that conversation analysts have examined have been in English and among Americans. Inasmuch as face-to-face interaction is the major analytic and experiential locus of social organization, and conversation a major component of interaction, Thai conversation *must* be radically different from American in what it substantively communicates, expresses, and represents.
(Moerman, 1988, pp. 3-4)

Ervin-Tripp's (1989) quote of the exchange between Poussaint and a policeman is a classic example of how elements of spoken discourse need to take appropriateness, as well as shared norms, turn taking signals, and address systems, into account:

A scene on a public street in contemporary U.S.:
"What's your name, boy?" the policeman asked.
"Dr. Poussaint. I'm a physician."

"What's your first name, boy?"

"Alvin."

(Poussaint, 1967, p. 52)

Although the syntax is coherent, in that it is understood by both speakers, the encounter lacks social appropriateness. Riley (1985) adds another example to the aspect of language appropriateness and coherency. He appeals to Labov's (1970) discussion of schizophrenic talk as a classic example of inappropriateness:

A: What is your name?

B: Well, let's say you might have thought you had something from before, but you haven't got it anymore.

While the language used is syntactically appropriate, the response to the question is completely inappropriate. Despite this, however, Riley maintains that the very fact that B took a turn and made a contribution shows that communication has not, in fact, broken down.

On this basis, he further distinguishes between the elements of interaction, illocution, content, and realization to support his claim that the communication act can be acceptable on one level, although not always at all levels. This is an interesting point to consider.

However, in the context of negotiations, appropriateness of response constitutes a key element in defining such a goal-oriented encounter.

Discourse theories further address the issue of how talk is organized (Button and Lee, 1987; Hymes, 1987). In their preface to *Talk and Social Organization* (1987, p. 1), Button and Lee suggest that greater understanding of social conversational interactions might be achieved by examining discourse in its social setting - as in law courts and doctors' offices, for example. While acknowledging the exploratory nature of such fields of enquiry, Button

and Lee propose that this method might achieve greater insights into the communication process.

In the prologue to their volume, Lee (1987) defines the position in which co-conversationalists are placed. What happens during the conversation defines its situation (Button and Lee, 1987, p. 25). Talk achieves its social organization, he asserts, when co-conversationalists generate discourse related in time and sequence, and when continuity is maintained through an understanding of the prior utterance. Applying this notion to negotiations, the present task can be defined as that of identifying the specific linguistic features produced during negotiations, focusing particularly on interruptions. Since conversational features are contextually based, the challenge is to understand and interpret the way in which such features or utterances are embedded and organized within the negotiators' conversation.

The question might validly be asked whether the co-conversationalists themselves are oriented to the time sequence and continuity organization. While there is no empirical evidence to support a positive claim, there is also no evidence to refute it. This study suggests that native-language intuition plays a prominent role. Language training which includes an appreciation of conversational features can serve the best interest of the NNS learner aspiring to attain a level of social organization in spoken discourse, particularly in the role of an international business negotiator.

Hymes (1987) directly addresses the issues related to the social context and organization of language by specifying features which might add relevance to the interpretation of discourse. Among the features he considers are: audience, topic, physical

setting, channel, code, message-form, event, key, and purpose. These contextual features, he asserts, contribute to the understanding of the communication event, and can support, limit, focus, and guide intention and meaning.

Adapting this schema to the present study, the following modification of Hymes' model can be applied to the specific context of negotiations:

Audience	Negotiating partners Observers
Topic	Business negotiations Purchase and sale of a computer
Physical Setting	Real time Location of encounter
Channel	Spoken discourse
Code	English - Native Non-native
Message Form	Negotiations
Event	A negotiation as genre
Key	Evaluation by participants of goal realization
Purpose	Goal realization Winner/winner

Hymes' model identifies explicit and identifiable features which are not culturally specific and highlights the social context of the speech situation by minimizing cross-cultural misunderstandings. Looking at speech and discourse communities in order to contextualize spoken interactions, he describes the shift in emphasis from grammar to communication (Hymes, 1989). He consequently sets forth the description of social role and language

features as the current challenge in the field of sociolinguistics. In order to develop models or theories of the interaction of language and social life, adequate descriptions of that interaction must be available. Such descriptions call for an approach which partly links, but partly cuts across, the ordinary practices of the disciplines.

According to Hymes, this is what makes sociolinguistics exciting and necessary (p. 41). Sociolinguists, he argues, need to set forth models of description and formulate sets of conversational features, recognizing that classification is not an end in itself. Rather than focusing on speech variety, the sociolinguist considers linguistic variations within a particular social group, identified as a speech community. Such a notion enables researchers to postulate descriptions based on social as well as linguistic entities. The natural unit for sociolinguistic taxonomy (and description) shifts away from language itself to the speech community which uses it (Hymes, 1989, p. 43). The present study suggests that negotiators or persons linguistically trained and prepared to conduct negotiations may qualify as a distinct speech community, sharing rules for conduct and interpretation of speech.

The notion of a speech community has always been central in linguistic investigation, although a satisfactory definition remains to be found (Graddol et al, 1994, p. 23). Speech communities may alternatively be titled "discourse communities". In arguing for a distinction between a speech community and a discourse community, Swales (1990), for example, maintains that a speech community is a group based on sociolinguistic features, in contrast to a discourse community, which is socio-rhetorical. The latter possesses six defining characteristics, including "a broadly agreed set of common public goals".

According to Swales, it is the "commonality of goal, not shared object of study that is critical" in defining a discourse community:

A speech community typically inherits its membership by birth, accident or adoption; a discourse community recruits its members by persuasion, training or relevant qualification.
(Swales, 1990, p. 24)

This distinction seems to point more to the lack of a satisfactory definition of "speech communities", however, than to any real differentiation. The general framework provided by the concept of speech communities, as set out by Hymes (1989), remains clear and useful.

This discussion of the nature of discourse theories demonstrates how the two streams of discourse analysis and conversational analysis can be beneficially combined in research. It further indicates how the shift towards sociolinguistics promotes a pragmatic approach which is also interdisciplinary. Both pragmatics and interdisciplinary methodology relate to and are reflected in teaching English for Specific Purposes. This study will focus on an examination of the nature and function of English for Specific Purposes pedagogy in the next chapter, in light of the emphasis in the existing literature on the pragmatic aspects of sociolinguistic theory.

2.4 Conversational Features

Conversational analysts have examined the language variables which structure the flow of spoken discourse and described the function of these linguistic components. For example, Schegloff (1968) looks at conversational openings and sequencing; Jefferson (1987) addresses correction in conversations; Sacks (1987) discusses preferences for

agreement in conversations and conversational turn taking; Tripp (1987) examines rules of address; Westerfield (1989) looks at back channelling and turn taking; Tannen (1989) has worked extensively in the area of conversational involvement; and Holmes (1990) has done research on hedges and boosters in gender specific speech.

Westerfield serves as a model for this study since she represents a specific example of a sociolinguist who has chosen to examine the conversational features of turn taking and back channel devices. Unlike most researchers, Westerfield looks at both NSs and NNSs, in the setting of a pre-MBA program specifically designed to improve the students' oral and written skills. In her work, she cites the difficulty experienced by NNSs in terms of both receptive and productive language skill requirements during class presentations. As the case study method used by business programs in Great Britain and the United States demonstrates, 25% of an MBA student's course grade is frequently based on an oral presentation.

In Westerfield's videotaped study, the two conversational features which caused NNSs the greatest difficulty were turn taking and back channel devices. NNSs found both the use and interpretation of back channels and identification of the appropriate juncture to join in a discussion and to relinquish the floor enigmatic. As cited earlier, misunderstanding, vulnerability, and missed cues may largely reflect the failure to appreciate sociocultural differences. Westerfield suggests that greater use should be made of videotaping in order to enable NNSs to become aware of such conversational features as feedback devices, back channels, and turn taking systems in order to perform more effectively in a business setting.

Westerfield thus approaches conversational features from a similar point of view to Brown and Levinson's examination of politeness strategies. In his foreword to the second

edition, Gumperz (1988) remarks that Brown and Levinson have definitively demonstrated that politeness principles are reflected in "linguistic universals". The expression and exercise of politeness presupposes that an aggressive potential exists within all social groups, which must be monitored and regulated. Because politeness strategies constitute one way of controlling this force, politeness phenomena may be viewed as crossing cultural boundaries. Hymes (1989) has further taken up the call to place linguistic studies within a universal framework.

Modes of restraint and control of human aggression stood out strikingly in the encounters recorded for this study. Even at the business negotiating table, where success is measured in quantitative terms, politeness strategies were extensively used. Brown and Levinson's principle of politeness as a linguistic universal can be perceived in the efforts of the negotiating partners to work through problems and settle differences, while at the same time maintaining a qualitative edge throughout the negotiations.

Sacks' (1987) and Schegloff's (1968) sociological studies further underscore Brown and Levinson's anthropological investigation of universal politeness strategies. Sacks' assertion that talk flows continuously from person to person indicates that such sequential analysis displays a preference for agreement. Although he emphasizes the organizational aspect of sequential talk, Sacks also acknowledges the preference for agreement in conversation, suggesting that disagreement "may well be pushed rather deep into the turn that it occupies" (p. 58). Schegloff's examination, on the other hand, of the orderliness and intelligibility of conversation leads him to concentrate on rules of behaviour.

Brown and Levinson's work as anthropologists, and Sacks and Schegloff's as sociologists, both contribute to an understanding of universal language principles, albeit from differing perspectives and emphases. Although politeness strategies are culturally determined and expressed, they nonetheless represent universal themes which cross cultural boundaries. In proposing that conversational features can also be viewed as functioning as universals, it is, of course, acknowledged that the concept of universals is far from clear.

For purposes of examination, five particular features, detailed below, have been selected in the present study. The selection of these particular variables is justified on the grounds that they are illustrative of features frequently associated with negotiations and conflict resolution. Negotiators use such variables as they manage, guide, and determine the final outcome. All five of these features are quantitatively analyzed, enabling the study to potentially serve both as a learning tool/experience for the subjects and as a research-data example. The quantitative analysis of the five selected conversational features provides the quantifiable data for the study, with the features themselves serving as analytical tools. The discourse analysis of the chosen feature of interruptions, monitored through the use of an observer's checklist, regarded the data examined as part of the dynamic process of negotiating. In this way, some of the regularities or features used by the negotiators to communicate intentions, meanings, and, ultimately, to realize a goal, could be identified and analyzed. The results of these findings are presented in Chapters 6 and 7.

2.4.1 Opening Up Subjects

Opening up subjects refers to the introduction of a subject or topic which was either not raised during the conversation or was suggested but not maintained at an earlier stage.

The feature suggests that a particular topic, issue, or concept is interjected into the conversation as information in order to clarify or elaborate a point. Its relationship to repetition is discussed by Schegloff (1987), for example, who views repetitions and subject openings along a continuum of spoken discourse. According to his research, close inspection of recorded, spontaneous conversation will almost always yield examples of repetition. Schegloff posits that repeating and recycling utterances occur most often at the opening or beginning of a subject.

The use of a negotiation setting to test Schegloff's claims might risk oversimplifying his assertions, to the extent that negotiations imply a degree of precision, conciseness, and clarity to achieve preset goals. Nonetheless, repetition does appear rather consistently during the opening up of subjects in the recorded and transcribed data on negotiations. Whether or not a causal relationship exists between repetition and opening up subjects is less clear.

Swales and Woken's (1989) study of task-oriented instruction between the NS as learner and NNS as instructor has yielded some interesting results and insights regarding the opening up of subjects. Transcripts representing two hours of talk were examined regarding length of talk, inquiries, repairs, corrections, and directions. Non-natives as topic experts assumed conversational characteristics more closely representing NS-NS talk than the NS-NNS talk which had been predicted:

. . . we will need to recognize that there are real world circumstances in which NS - NNS conversations assume the expected characteristics of NS - NS conversations.

(Swales and Woken, 1989, p. 224)

Talk status, opening up of new subjects, and topic expertise had a powerful impact on the nature of the conversational encounter. Swales and Woken suggest that topic expertise rather than linguistic symmetry played a greater role in the distribution of functional talk.

A typical example of the feature of opening up subjects was taken from Encounter No. 3. Following a lengthy discussion about the quality and price of the computers on the market, the NS/Seller introduces the subjects of charges for delivery and installation:

NS-Seller /then perhaps, perhaps there is room for flexibility here, because in addition to the price of the computer there's also a charge for delivery and installation, and on the issue of delivery and installation it may be that we would be able to flex [unclear]/

NNS-Buyer /Well, this I took for granted that this will not cost us any money, I mean/

NS-Seller /No, the delivery and installation of/

Another example is taken from Encounter No. 22, when the NS/Buyer opens up the subject of a warranty period:

NS-Buyer Mm-hm. Well, um, we are interested in quick delivery, um, when you mentioned twelve weeks, that's far longer than, than we are prepared to, to wait. We need this rather urgently. And, um, I should also tell you that I know that your, er, competitors, er, offer a better warranty period, and, um, a better price.

NSS-Seller Oh, warranty and price goes together, and, er, if if, er, if we can, er, agree about the price that I offer, then I'm sure I can improve on the, er, warranty, so, er, if you are willing to pay

more [laughs] then, then we can im-, improve our warranty period. (Buyer: well,) What, what, what type of warranty period will we, er, will you, er, be interested to see?

2.4.2 Paraphrases

Paraphrasing refers to the restating of a previous utterance without changing its meaning. It is a device used to extend, explain, or clarify meaning, and serves in this study as a conversational feature through which the negotiator is seen to check for errors, reassert a point, or clarify a position.

In examining how native speakers as respondents used the strategy of paraphrasing during interviews with non-native students, Fiksdal (1986) found that the strategy did not occur when the interviewer spoke to native speakers. According to her findings, NSs tend to use more "repetitions, clarifications, and topic changes than when they talk with other native speakers" (Fiksdal, 1986, p. 8). The feature is also used by NNSs who are at an advanced level of oral proficiency and were being interviewed by NSs. Fiksdal does not develop the implications of this phenomenon in her study, however.

In her discussions regarding gatekeeping interviews, Fiksdal further notes that researchers who have studied NS-NNS spoken discourse (e.g., Ferguson, 1971) refer to the phenomenon of native speakers' continuous modification of discourse as "foreigner talk".

She appears to link paraphrasing with Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks' (1987) notion of hyperexplanation, a term which they use to describe a repetition or paraphrasing. In fact, Fiksdal's descriptive categories are unclear and appear to confuse rather than clarify her

discussion relating to her analysis of cross-cultural gatekeeping interviews. She does, however, address the inconclusive nature of her findings regarding discourse strategies of NSs and NNSs by suggesting several plausible explanations:

- 1) the NNSs in the present study have higher proficiency in the target language than subjects in previous studies;
 - 2) the interviews under investigation are naturally occurring interviews;
 - 3) the subjects in the present study share some background about NS regulations and procedures.
- (Fiksdal, 1986, p. 200)

2.4.3 Self Repairs

Discussions in the literature related to self repairs generally refer to NS-NS interactions. Swales and Woken (1989) refer to "repairs and corrections", but only as related to topic expertise.

An interesting discussion regarding not only the definition of self repairs but also of the function of the repair system in spoken discourse is provided by Taylor and Cameron (1987), although their discussions refer exclusively to NS-NS interaction. They use as their starting point the concept of "ill-formedness" as postulated by Stubbs (1983), and raise the question whether the concept is a function of the context or of intuition or is an extension and flouting of "tacitly-known rules" (Taylor and Cameron, 1987, p. 78).

Stubbs (1983) addresses the issue of whether or not speakers possess intuitions about the "formedness of discourse", since he maintains that such intuitions are displayed when repairs occur following syntactic ill-formedness. Taylor and Cameron, however, ask ". . . how far we can take repairs . . . as displaying intuitions that some exchange is 'ill-formed' (assuming for the sake of argument that we can actually recognize repairs in the first place

...)" (Taylor and Cameron, 1987, p. 77). They point out that structural features identified by conversation analysts incorporate adjacency pairs, and that repairs, like openings and closings, are part of this formulation. Taylor and Cameron conclude their discussion of self repairs by presenting the principle of intersubjectivity:

According to this principle, communication is a means of bringing the participants in it to a mutual awareness, a common perception, of an idea, an emotion, a representation, a governing structure and so on. Manifestations of the principle are to be found throughout the history of linguistic thought, and is perhaps the strongest influence (and constraint) on the development of linguistic theory and linguistic methods.

(Taylor and Cameron, 1987, p. 111)

The principle of intersubjectivity, Taylor and Cameron assert, leads to the assumption that a conversation is perceived alike by the co-conversationalists and therefore that questions, repairs, and face threatening acts are perceived in the same way, a dubious premise in NS-NNS discourse.

2.4.4 Repetitions

Another conversational feature under consideration in the present study is the use of repetitions during phases of negotiations. Tannen cites repetition as playing a key role in creating and maintaining discourse coherence, not unlike the role, she suggests, that Halliday and Hasan (1976) assigned to repetition as a cohesive device in written discourse. Tannen points out that repetition contributes to meaning. In that sense, she asserts, the role of repetition becomes evaluative; that is, it contributes to the point as well as serving as an intensifier. Other functions served by repetition, according to Tannen, include getting and

keeping the floor, showing listenership, gearing up to answer or speak, linking speakers, showing appreciation of a good line, and affirming another's contribution.

Repetition is a useful linguistic strategy because it helps to create interpersonal involvement in spoken discourse. Without such involvement, Tannen asserts, spoken discourse is reduced to utterances lacking in cohesion and coherence, and, most importantly, interpersonal connections (1989, p. 51). Repetition of sentences, for example, might show the listener how new utterances are linked to previous ones or how ideas are related to each other. Within Halliday and Hasan's taxonomy of cohesive devices, according to Tannen, repetition serves a "referential and tying function" (1989, p. 50).

Although a statistical analysis is made later in this study, it is interesting to note here that repetition among NNSs may serve more simply as a functional holding device to buy time before going on to the next step in a business encounter. Whether repetition was used with the same frequency among both the NS and NNS population will also be taken up in later chapters.

2.5 Interruptions

The present study has selected the feature of interruptions for a discourse analysis, drawn from the tapescripts. Here, a review of the literature on interruptions serves to provide a framework for the follow-up discussions in Chapters 6 and 7. The "standard" thesis of interruptions associates the variable with conflict issues, notably a struggle for turns. More recently, alternative definitions have been raised by writers such as Tannen (1989), Goldberg (1990), Talbot (1992), and Schiffrin (1994). Various different views regarding the function

of interruptions have also been suggested (Hawkins, 1991; Langford, 1994; Stenstrom, 1994).

Interruptions have characteristically been defined as a subcategory of overlaps and are frequently described as breaks made by the listener in the conversational flow of the speaker (West, 1979). In the typical context of conflict management, interruptions were distinguished from overlaps and false starts both mechanically and intentionally: by the number of syllables a speaker is allowed to utter (West, 1979) and by the interrupter's intention to "hold the floor" and gain control of the conversation. Early studies concluded that both the frequency and the significance or "meaning" of interruptions directly correlates to the amount of time the first speaker has held the floor (Natale et al, 1979; Murray, 1988; Murray and Covelli, 1988). Other studies suggest that some interruptions arise as a direct consequence of the interactants' respective participatory rights and obligations (Agrawal, 1976, p. 68; Bennett, 1981; Edelsky, 1981). This temporal criterion focuses on conversational phases and reveals very little about the interrupter's personality or interactional demeanour (Goldberg, 1990, p. 885).

An alternative model focuses upon the personal perspective. This approach studies the interrupter's intention and is consequently directly connected to positive and negative politeness and face issues. According to the prevalent assumption that "one's right to a turn is considered to be sacrosanct such that during multiparty encounters [e.g., negotiations], one and only one person may appropriately speak at any given time (Duncan (1972), Sacks et al (1974))" (Goldberg, p. 884), and that interruptions "violate the turn-taking rule that protects a person's right to finish a turn once begun (Bennett, 1981; Duncan, 1972, 1973;

Goodwin, 1981; Sacks *et al.*, 1974)" (Hawkins, p. 186), interruptions constitute a direct face threatening act.

The conversational definition of interruptions challenges some of the assumptions implied in the idea of a "single-speaker code". Building on relational elements, researchers such as Goldberg (1990) suggest that:

interruptions arise not as mere violations of the turn-taking rules but in response to the inherent conflict between interactional norms which promote single speakership and normative pressures which are often satisfied only by flouting those turn-taking constraints.
(Goldberg, 1990, p. 886).

This view of interruptions allows for a more conceptually-coherent explanation of the feature by accounting for both how and why different types occur. Moreover, it specifically addresses the issues raised by cross-cultural factors in suggesting how the single speakership code is directly related to the values of a particular culture or society (Goldberg, p. 887). The personal and conversational aspects of interruptions will be taken up in Chapter 7, where they will be specifically examined in the context of negotiations.

Some of the most recent material on interruptions focuses on how the feature functions as a turn-taking strategy less in conflict-management terms than in interactional conversational terms (Tannen, 1989; Hawkins, 1991; Talbot, 1992; Schiffrin, 1994; Stenstrom, 1994; Langford, 1994; Gordon, 1994). The relation of interruptions to competence in communication also forms a central issue (Hawkins, 1991), in light of earlier research in the 1970's and 80's on communication competence as presented in the review of discourse theories in Chapter 1.

Although interruptions may be perceived as indicating misunderstanding, they can also be understood as expressions of politeness. The relevance of an interactional framework for usefully defining and understanding interruptions in this way has recently been the object of several studies. Schiffrin (1994) develops this model according to the lines laid out by Brown and Levinson (1987). Her model proposes interpreting the feature of interruptions as a potential display of positive politeness in which the bonding of a relationship takes precedence over the potential misunderstanding an interruption might bring with it. Brown and Levinson (1987), however, suggested that while the feature may signal a politeness code it does have the potential to be viewed as a violation, an invasive act or as a potential face threatening act (FTA), a position which Schiffrin also acknowledges.

Schiffrin refers to the type of interruption which is a display of politeness as "chipping in" in distinction to "butting in", which she considers a violation of negative face. Schiffrin (1994, p. 109) acknowledges that this type of interruption is invasive and demeaning, and suggests that the speaker is "unable to maintain her own position in conversation". She makes the linkage between the interrupting behaviour and the consequences attendant upon it by addressing the "interactive meanings of speaking for others" within the context of social relationships and identities. Schiffrin extends her description to context: if the interrupting behaviour occurs within a setting such as a government office or a physician's reception room, the interrupter assumes the responsibility of interrupting as a result of an "institutionally sanctioned role". Institutionally-situated interruptions, Schiffrin maintains, impute different meanings to the interruption. She sums

up the multiple meanings of interruptions as she takes into account role allocations, defined status, and the shifting of roles during an encounter:

The range of interpretations that can hold for an act of speaking for another increases during conversation - when acts are bound not only (or not even) to institutional status and role, but to interactional positioning and participant footing. Because participant roles shift during conversation, the right to either take or abdicate responsibility for one's words also shifts. What this means is that the interactional meaning of speaking for another can be altered depending on current perceptions of alignments, such that speaking for another during a conversation can just as easily be positively or negatively glossed (as noted above). Furthermore, since social relationships are also reinforced (if not even created) during conversation, speaking for another during conversation can have not only local interactive meaning, but also broader implications about one's own (and the other's) rights, privileges, and responsibilities.

(Schiffrin, 1994, p. 110)

Schiffrin provides an interesting conclusion to her discussions when she suggests that rather than looking at the goals or intentions of the interrupter, it is far more enlightening to consider the feature as a "way of speaking" which is relationally specific and contextually oriented, reflecting a belief that "it is the social contextualization of an utterance that motivates and explains its use" (p. 114).

Interruptions have also been commonly assumed to demonstrate and reflect strategies of involvement in discourse. Tannen, for example, proposes that such strategies in conversation "reflect and create interpersonal involvement" (Tannen, 1989, p. 9). Tannen's work is framed by the parameters suggested by Gumperz (1989). Tannen describes conversational involvement as including strategies of interrupting whose aim is to build rapport. She thus adapts Gumperz's idea that conversational involvement is attained by co-conversationalists as they decipher, predict, and generate understanding at the sentence

and discourse level. In this way, she attributes to interruptions the function of what Sacks and Schegloff (1974) call interactional achievement.

Both Tannen and Schiffrin share the notion developed more than half a century ago by the sociologist George Herbert Mead (1934) that the process of socialization into a specific community includes shared meanings which are provided during communication and expressed through learning specific clusters of behaviour expected of one occupying a particular social position. Sociolinguists such as Tannen and Schiffrin have adapted Mead's notions to encompass the concepts of rapport building, solidarity, and relational bonding in relation to interruptions.

It can thus be seen that Mead's sociologically-based explanation of the socialization process includes language behaviour tasks and can be extended to take into account "linguistic behaviour", including interrupting strategies. In other words, when linguistically and culturally different partners are striving to achieve a successful outcome at the negotiating table, the "linguistic behaviour" or linguistic strategy of each partner may indeed influence, guide, support, and validate the other. If the negotiation itself can be perceived, as Fisher (1980) suggests, as a self-contained entity with its own institutionally-oriented manners, linguistic expressions and behaviours, and set goals, then the process of socializing speakers as negotiators can be viewed in terms of each partner assuming the shared meanings, presuppositions, and knowledge of the other. By so doing, a mutuality of understanding may be achieved leading to goal achievement. How this mutual understanding is expressed might be seen in the examples of interruptions which support and guide the negotiation cited in the present study.

The role of the feature of interruptions has further been suggested as partaking of the process of socializing negotiators into a specific negotiating community. Focusing on "the investigation of how people interact verbally" as a means to investigate the ways in which "we go beyond the words used", Langford (1994), himself a teacher, looks at how co-conversationalists make sense of each other's behaviour (p. ix). Langford attempts to present a systematic description of how this "sense" is achieved, developing some of Fisher's (1980) tenets in his functional approach to spoken discourse generally and to negotiations in particular. Recording, analyzing, and investigating verbal interactions among a variety of speakers is a valuable approach, Langford suggests. He proffers a series of descriptive categories of interruptions as a framework for analyzing talk as a "rich and complex" daily verbal interaction, a method which might prove a good analytical basis for examining negotiations.

Langford tenders a three-part taxonomy of interrupting behaviour: preemptive, simultaneous, and competitive. When there are grounds, indications, or signals to predict turn constructional unit completion, interruptions can be perceived as preemptive or simultaneous. When these signals are absent, Langford asserts, competitive interruptions occur. Langford's propositions are interesting in light of the findings of the present study, although the fact that he only analyzed NSs limits the applicability of his constructs. He seems to indicate that an interruption is not a positive feature of spoken discourse:

Of course, the set of rights and obligations relevant to the control of turn taking can be abused . . . When this happens we have a case of overlapping talk that is interruptive, i.e. an **interruption**.
(Langford, 1994, p. 90)

He makes the claim that explicit signalling for turn taking allocation is not necessary for the "effective transfer of speaking turns"; what is necessary is the "mutual acknowledgement of a set of speaker rights and recipient obligations". Instead of precisely specifying what these mutual obligations are, Langford prefers to focus exclusively on the verbal interactions between native speakers of English. This factor somewhat limits the applicability of his findings to the present study.

Like Langford, Stenstrom (1994) also emphasizes the factor of interactionality, which derives from the fact that speakers and listeners generally attend to each other in a conversation. This phenomenon assures that "smooth speaker shifts are far more common than unsmooth ones" (p. 68). When the listener fails to be attentive, the potential exists for the listener to "butt in without waiting for the current speaker to finish . . . which results in overlapping turns and interruptions . . ." (p. 68). Stenstrom views interactional strategies of a conversation as containing three basic behaviours or turn-taking strategies: taking, holding, or yielding a turn. Stenstrom does not discuss the implications of such behaviour, since she moves on to describe the structure of the spoken interaction rather than to analyze the pragmatic implications.

Research generated in the eighties and onwards (Thorne, Kramarae, and Henley, 1983; Murray, 1988; Murray and Covelli, 1988; Talbot, 1988; Gordon, 1994) revolved to a great extent around gender-based issues and topics, to the almost complete exclusion of context consideration. The concepts of speaker intent, gender dominance, distributive justice, and violational infringement of speaker rights all appear in the literature in the discussions revolving around identifying an interruption and what effect it may have on the

current speaker's conversational status. However, consideration of the context and the influence the context may have on the interpretation of an interruption is almost completely lacking.

Challenging works by West (1979), Murray (1988) asserts that West's efforts to demonstrate that an "interruption is *always* an interpretation - by interactants as well as by analysts - of the *intent* of a second speaker" (p. 115) take his research beyond what he dismisses as "mindless counting of any phonetic variable" in previous literature (p. 116). Murray's contributions to the analysis of interruptions serve to pave the way for follow-up discussions in the early 1990's both in defining the formal characteristics of interruptions and in establishing schemes for a functional analysis. Calling for future researchers to go beyond "accepting mechanistic and simplistic models of turn taking", he suggests some new directions but seems unable to specify or predict what points later researchers could develop.

In the early 1990's, for example, Talbot (1992) and Gordon (1994) have extended Murray's findings.

Researchers have recently further explored the role played by behaviour and judgment in relation to interruptions. Gordon's (1994) investigation highlights four factors of people's interrupting behaviour - age, gender, politeness, and self-perception. His findings indicated that judgments about interruptions appeared to reflect a perception of status hierarchy according to which younger people used interruptions significantly more than older people. Interruptions were generally perceived as cooperative or neutral in function, although no comparison with the subjects' self-perception was undertaken. Nevertheless, the

attention paid to participants' self-perception and performance is worthy of notice, especially in light of the consideration given to the issue in the present study.

Regard has also been given to the pragmatic implications of interrupting behaviour. Talbot (1992), for example, discusses who is allowed to interrupt. Challenging the assumption that interruptions are by definition violations of speakers' rights, Talbot states that interruptions are always appropriations of a right to speak. She addresses various methods for identifying interruptions and suggests a qualitative rather than a quantitative approach to the analysis of interruptions. Her call is for research to take into consideration overlaps, which she defines as simultaneous speech lasting less than one syllable.

Overlaps can be distinguished from interruptions on the basis of a distinction between "shallow" and "deep" interruptions: shallow interruptions refer to "simultaneities between the first and second or next-to-last syllable of the unit" (p. 186), while deep interruptions occur at least two syllables away from a unit such as a phrase or lexical construction. Deep interruptions demonstrate intention or purpose, and are consequently those interruptions to which attention is primarily paid in this study.

Talbot goes on to suggest her own functional definition, observing that distinguishing between interruptions and overlaps is non-productive and "difficult to work with". Although a speaker may claim the right to speak, the participant's notions about these rights and the appropriate distribution of turns - a type of "distribution justice" (p. 464) - are open to discussion, Talbot implies. Concluding that a statistical approach is of limited value, Talbot calls for investigating "interruptions in action", a call taken up in this study which sets out to investigate interruptions in a negotiation, if "action" is taken to refer to context orientation.

In developing some of the relational aspects of interruptions, the issue of "pan-cultural phenomena" has been raised (Goldberg, 1990). Goldberg's contribution to this study lies in her recognition that the single speakership code is a geographically-restricted norm. It is of limited applicability for a host of other English and non-English speaking subcultures such as those described by Reisman (1974) in his descriptions of an Antiguan village. In relating to interactional rights and obligations of the moment, on the one hand, and the satisfaction of interactional needs, on the other, Goldberg distinguishes between "power and non-power interruptions" (p. 885). She takes strong issue with earlier writers who claim that interruptions represent an individual's need to dominate, control, or exert power over another and thus serve to violate speakers' rights (West, 1979). She suggests instead a more complex dynamic according to which interruptions are multifunctional in nature and take into account "a multitude of personal, relational and conversational" sources (p. 885).

Citing studies which indicate that the correlation of interruptions with power and control issues is weaker than had been earlier presumed (Tannen, 1989; Murray, 1988), Goldberg claims that perception of interruptions as always occasioned by and expressive of dominance and control issues is "patently incorrect". On the contrary, interruptions may in fact provide, according to Goldberg, a possible, unique, and viable alternative to conversational dilemmas which are created when co-conversationalists are in the process of deciding whose rights and obligations take precedence.

Goldberg identifies an additional pressure as deriving from opposing politeness norms. Any of these pressures, says Goldberg, may be sufficient reason for the listener to

initiate a turn, i.e., to interrupt, before a speaker has finished. This strategy is used throughout the negotiation encounters and is discussed in the discourse analysis on interruptions (Chapter 7). The speakership code, as well as the interactional and relational norms presented by Goldberg, provide a conceptually-sound framework for accounting for interruptions, capable of explaining how interruptions function and under what conditions they occur. Goldberg's discussions are unfortunately weakened by her use of secondary rather than primary data.

Goldberg's excellent framework has been taken a step further in Hawkins' (1991) investigative study of deep interruptions in task-oriented communication. Hawkins specifically attempts to answer the theoretical question of the effects of an interruption on subsequent turn taking and on interpersonal evaluations made by listeners regarding the interruption. Her results indicated that interruptions were more successful at securing more subsequent turns significantly more often than not. A successful deep interruption, according to Hawkins, acts as an effective device to "beat out" one's partner. This is an intriguing finding, as it appears to indicate that the conversationalist who is most adept at interrupting is able to "secure the floor". Thus a deep interruption can ultimately become a powerful tool in small group discussions for a person wishing to have greater participation in the conversation.

Regarding the consequences on interpersonal evaluations made by listeners, Hawkins suggests that interrupters were rated as less appropriate in their communication behaviour than those interrupted. She argues that this conclusion is in line with earlier studies which suggested a trend towards judging people lacking interaction management skills (the

interruption) as possessing poor communication skills. At the same time, however, interrupters were also perceived to be "more dynamic than those they interrupt" (p. 197). A possible conclusion could suggest an intriguing and paradoxical proposition, namely that dynamism in communication skills does not necessarily suggest communicative competence. Interruptions involve a calculated trade-off between gaining control of the conversation at the expense of positive interpersonal evaluation. The need to decide between two conflicting priorities should determine a person's willingness to use (deep) interruptions:

These results suggest the strategic implications of deep interruption. A trade-off seems clear: deep interrupters may gain in conversational control and perceptions of dynamism, but they lose in perceptions of attractiveness and appropriateness The salient point is this: given the effects of the use of deep interruption, such use should not be accidental, but be purposive and strategic.

(Hawkins, 1991, p. 198)

The discussions presented above clearly demonstrate that researchers refer to the characteristics of an interruption which befit their particular level and purpose of analysis.

Defining an interruption from the perspective of the observer, i.e. whether an observer feels that the interjection of a second speaker disrupts the utterance of the first speaker, allows for a comprehensive definition but is fraught with such limitations as the obvious difference in opinion of the observer and participant and the lack of identification specifying the turn taking strategy. Thus in the present study, the observer's checklist, which is discussed in detail in Chapter 6, was presented as an interesting extension of the quantitative analysis but was not intended to be used as the sole instrument of analysis. Tapescripts were analyzed separately from the observer's checklist so as to move towards a more formal and comprehensive description of an interruption.

2.6 Sociopragmatic Implications of Interruptions

This study attempts to move beyond earlier descriptions and definitions of interruptions by considering the sociopragmatic implications of interruptions in a business negotiation. The following discussion is informed by two major principles: a) that context relevancy is critical regarding interpretive discussions on conversational phenomena; and b) that relational issues are important to consider regarding the effect of an interruption. Questions addressed in Chapter 7 which distinguish sociopragmatic functions and the co-occurring features associated with interruptions within the context of negotiations include:

- What relationship, if any, exists between the interruption in a negotiation and the overall tone of the negotiation?
- Does the interrupting behaviour establish a discernable pattern of communicating in a negotiation and if so, does it have any effect on the negotiation itself?
- Are there observable patterns of behaviour which distinguish and characterize "interrupting behaviour"?
- What are some of the relational issues which emerge from an interruption or patterns of interruptions?
- Do patterns of co-occurrence of interruptions with other conversational phenomena exist which may signal interesting points in a negotiation?
- What are some of the interactional and interrelational issues which emerge as a result of interrupting behaviour between partners in a negotiation? In other words, do interruptions serve to signal such relational dimensions as power and rapport issues in a negotiation?

A question which is associated with the overall aim of the study would be: Is interrupting behaviour among the NNS population distinct from the interrupting behaviour of the NS?

Earlier discussions in this chapter defining interruptions demonstrated that the lexicon adopted by the researchers often reflects the assumption made regarding the effect of an interruption. If an interruption is referred to as a violation, the orientation to the interrupting behaviour tends to emphasize the negativity of an interruption (West and Zimmerman, 1977; Murray, 1988; Langford, 1994). On the other hand, if an interruption is perceived to possess potential relationship building, establishing, and maintaining qualities (Tannen, 1990; Goldberg, 1990; Schiffrin, 1994), then the definitions and illustrations presented in the writings tend to highlight and reinforce the analysis.

The present study, as will be suggested in Chapter 7, maintains that interruptions possess the potential both to establish and maintain positive relationships, creating an atmosphere of good will in a negotiation, and to promote competitiveness, reinforce power bids, and set a tone un conducive to a successful outcome. This effect is of significance for apprehending what some of the potential results of interrupting behaviour may be on a negotiation. In this way, NNS students preparing to play a role in business negotiations may be more effectively informed and instructed.

The use of politeness strategies is generally assumed to be in the best interest of the negotiating parties. It would, however, be difficult to generalize Brown and Levinson's (1987) presentation of politeness strategies to interrupting behaviour since their presentation of politeness categories does not explicitly focus on interruptions. Positive and negative face

issues and face threatening acts, such as criticizing or ridiculing, may be perceived or interpreted as forming a basis to distinguish interrupting behaviour from other types of behaviour during a negotiation, although this was not the criterion adopted in this study. More specific criteria for identifying and examining an interruption were defined on the basis of the formal and functional characteristics.

The issue of politeness will be referred to throughout the discussion on sociopragmatic implications of interruptions in Chapter 7, highlighting the importance of the development of interpersonal relationships relative to the phases of negotiation. Negotiators worry about losing face when an action during a negotiation serves to discredit them in the eyes of their negotiating partner. Although some negotiators, according to Levinson (1983), may choose to be seen as firm or tough, this description may be too restrictive; it does not take into account the possibility that losing face can also happen when a negotiator fails in the eyes of the partner to be seen as trustworthy and fair.

The following discussions form the basis for examining the character and quality of an interruption as a conversational phenomenon which may create, mould, and support the tone of a negotiation in the discourse analysis in Chapter 7.

Contrary to the assumption that a speaker's turn is considered sacrosanct such that during a negotiation one person and only one person may appropriately speak at any given time, this study contends that flouting the no gap/no overlap principle does not necessarily constitute a negative move. As noted earlier, anthropologists such as Moerman have written about cultures in the world where simultaneous talking is valued (e.g., Thailand). Watson

(1975) coined the term "partnership in performance" in describing Hawaiian children's verbal routines in which they constantly engage in interrupting behaviour.

As with other types of interpersonal communicative activities, negotiations occur in the context of a relationship. The negotiating encounter thus includes postures and statements which purport to modify and establish that relationship in the best interest of the end goal. To effectively negotiate, the parties must learn or be instructed to pay attention to strategies designed to reduce risks, increase trust, and discover mutual expectations and interests.

Understanding the potential effect of an interruption is one way to accomplish this goal. However, interruptions have seldom been described as a learned or intentional strategy which may have a positive or negative basis in the overall goal achievement of a negotiation.

The negotiation can be described in this light as a "continuous process of interaction of risk management" (Bercovitch, 1991, p. 10), a type of action/reaction/interaction cycle which carries the partners through to a successful or disappointing conclusion. When intentionally used by negotiating partners in order to promote solidarity, interruptions can set the tone for a successful outcome; when intentionally used to express discord, they can direct a negotiation towards a less successful end.

Linking this theme, Ulijin and Li (1995) discuss the effects of politeness and rapport-building issues on interrupting behaviour in terms of temporal aspects of interruptions in Chinese and Western intercultural business encounters. They conclude that the Chinese may view an interruption as an opportunity to "create a sort of mutual bond between the speaker and interlocutor" (Ulijin and Li, p. 603). They describe the image of

two swordsmiths "hammering a blade in turn" (p. 603) as both partners help each other in the process of collectively producing sentences. In furthering their discussion of the nature of an interruption, Ulijin and Li refer to the value orientation of a Confucian culture which emphasizes notions of co-operation, interdependence, and collectivism.

This perception of an interruption coincides with Tannen's (1990) descriptions of interrupting behaviour as relationship building and Goldberg's (1990) presentation of interruptions as rapport establishment through verbal strategies. Each argue rather convincingly, referring to Western cultures, that interruptions may be viewed as rapport- and relationship-oriented and may express solidarity and concern. Extending this description of an interruption as perceived as a constructive act of solidarity, Ulijin and Li go even further when they suggest that such parameters of characterizing an interruption within the setting of a business negotiation might mean:

an eagerness to do business with each other for mutual benefit. If this is true for monocultural settings it might also be true for intercultural negotiations. (Ulijin and Li, 1995, p. 598).

2.7 Conclusions

This study assumes that linguistic phenomena and conversational features quite obviously cross cultural boundaries and may thus form common sources of mutual understanding and therefore form an indisputable part of socio-rhetorical interaction. At the same time, however, it is equally evident that language is also context-bound or "biased" (Grice, 1975). This view of language means that both misunderstandings and commonalities are also naturally found in cross-cultural conversations. When addressing English for

Specific Purposes learner needs in a negotiation setting, these commonalities can be used to highlight the similarities rather than the differences in language usage.

The present study contributes to research by presenting the findings of the usage and function of conversational features by NSs and NNSs within a simulated business negotiation setting. The investigation suggests some insights and curriculum guidelines for the practitioner in English for Specific Purposes, English for Business Purposes, and other related fields. Our premise that meaning is bound to specific societies and at the same time exhibits universal features is of particular significance when business negotiators are understood to function as a distinct community. Cognizance of the politeness codes which exist in specific cultures sheds light on how to interpret the meaning of interruptions as used by a native English speaker. The universal aspects of politeness issues, however, establish a common ground for understanding between NSs and NNSs. Emphasis on the similarities which exist in language usage, together with perceiving interruptions as potentially co-operative and bond-forming devices as described in Chapter 7, may be considered as an important aspect in the training of NNSs to be successful international negotiators.

CHAPTER 3

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE:

ESP PEDAGOGY AS THE PRAGMATIC CONTEXT FOR NEGOTIATIONS

3.1 Introduction

The previous chapter reviewed the theoretical background of conversational features in spoken discourse in order to provide an appropriate research framework for understanding how these features can be identified and defined. This chapter surveys the purposes and methods of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) courses and curriculum design, and suggests that such courses may provide an appropriate context for training international students in language usage specific to the negotiation setting.

English for Specific Purposes, as defined by Fitzgerald (1989), Nunan (1991), Johns and Dudley-Evans (1991), Barron (1991), and others is a pragmatic approach used to specify and meet learner needs in the context of the professional demands and environmental realities of the work setting. According to Johns and Dudley-Evans (1991), English for Specific Purposes specialists are concerned with identifying features of situated, authentic language and designing curriculum material for courses in which English is taught to meet specific needs. Its subjects are non-native English speakers who require English skills to perform in today's global world.

English for Specific Purposes methodology is founded on a competency-based instructional model in which the specific purpose of the students' English studies is merged

with the tasks defined by the students' job needs or study requirements. In broad terms, English for Specific Purposes curricula are designed to be task-specific and product-oriented. Emphasis is laid on the specificity of the language task; it is assumed that the learning process and the outcome will be more effective when student needs are most closely met. English for Specific Purposes therefore serves the twofold function of defining the language components on the one hand and presenting the language learning task in such a way as to maximize language acquisition in a learner-centred environment on the other.

Many of the pedagogical elements which English for Specific Purposes incorporates into the curricula are derived from the theories of discourse, including DA and CA, discussed in Chapter 2. Until fairly recently, however, theoretical research in linguistics has produced relatively little material of direct relevance and usefulness for teaching English for Specific Purposes. Researchers themselves (Wardell, 1987; Grosse, 1988; Williams, 1988) have lamented the disparity between research and its practical application in the classroom. Moreover, the empirical data made available through studies which have been made, such as Swales (1981), Peng (1987), and Marshall (1987), is circumscribed because of its limited applicability in the classroom. Practitioners have therefore been left struggling not only because of a general dearth of material but also in consequence of the quality of what has in fact been produced, a situation only now receiving redress. The value and effectiveness of the case study as a valid methodology in English for Specific Purposes courses will be examined in the light of its popular use in the classroom.

3.2 English for Specific Purposes

The history, trends, and stages in the development of material for English for Specific Purposes courses are reviewed in Swales (1985) and Johns and Dudley-Evans (1991). These researchers identify learners' specific needs, context relevance, and thematic appropriateness as essential for the design of pedagogical materials and activities. Swales (1981), Thompson (1991), Block (1992), Shih (1992), and Williams and Hoekje (1992) have taken a fresh look at particular English for Specific Purposes tasks in order to apply discourse analysis theories to NNS language requirements.

While until recently research appears to have lagged well behind material and curriculum development, some studies have attempted to rectify the gap by looking at issues linked to genre. Genre-based approaches to English for Specific Purposes seek to bring together communicative purpose and linguistic choices at every level. Consequently, genre analysis can be perceived as combining product and process methodologies (Fishman, 1972; Olsen and Huckin, 1990; Jones, 1990).

As one example, Thompson (1991) questions the effectiveness of the more traditional, product-oriented approach to English for Specific Purposes in her study of multinational organizations' responses to customer complaints. She asserts that product-based approaches lead to an impoverishment of models of language, neglect of the communicative needs of the learner, and an overemphasis on accuracy and correctness at the expense of developing fluency and competency. Warning against the swing of the pendulum too far away from product to process in material design and development, however, she calls for a "multilayered approach" which emphasizes the interrelatedness of linguistic and

non-linguistic elements. She suggests that this kind of model might replace, or at least complement, product-based approaches by adding greater depth to the subject.

Other studies have focused on why and under what conditions selected linguistic features occur in a particular genre and how such insights might inform classroom instruction. These include Swales' (1981) discussions of administrative discourse as a real-life genre, Peng's (1987) analysis of chemical engineering research articles, and Marshall's (1987) paper on tender reports from the Singapore Polytechnic.

In his paper entitled "A Genre-based Approach to Language Across the Curriculum" (1981), Swales adapts the notion of genre to apply to a recognized communication event. Under this rubric, "genre" is widened from its strict literary sense to refer to a particular discourse setting; or, in other words, to the sociopragmatic context in which language is used. Swales himself focuses on administrative discourse as a particular example of genre. In Swales' view, genres are the most "stable and solid" of communication events. He further suggests that investigation of the characteristics of genre is a relevant pursuit for practitioners, who can beneficially examine how such characteristics relate to teaching curricula objectives.

Peng's (1987) review of the discourse organization features of research articles is a similar study of the occurrence of linguistic features in a specific "genre". Peng specifically examines introductions in articles relating to chemical engineering, drawing the conclusion that NNSs conducting research in chemical engineering need to be explicitly taught the four moves identified by Swales (1981): establishing the field, previous research, preparing for present research, and introducing present research.

Swales' work on genre is further taken up by Marshall (1987). She suggests that viewing tender reports as a genre allows students and instructors to train and be trained according to appropriate information components as a result of the generalizations drawn. Marshall analyzes 20 tender reports written at the Singapore Polytechnic, and concludes that NSs tended to discuss the tenders in one complete section, while NNSs addressed each tender separately. In addition, she notes that NNSs generally used a briefer style, writing single, simple sentences in a more polite, formal, and less direct manner. NSs, on the other hand, tended to include their opinions more often, frequently using linking devices and writing in a more expansive fashion. Both NSs and NNSs consistently made use of charts and graphs. The results of Marshall's study led her to conclude that NNSs "engineering students are trained to communicate poorly" (p. 151) and to lament the limited preparations received by teachers to cope with genre-based instructional approaches.

In recognition of the limited teacher preparation for specific language-learning tasks, this study adopts the premise that for the language teacher to more effectively prepare learners to develop natural spoken skills, the teacher must be aware of, and knowledgeable about, sociolinguistic factors such as those described by Ranney (1992) and others. These factors include the ability to select and perform a speech act befitting a specific occasion, use interruptions as a rapport-building strategy, manage turns and topics in a conversational encounter, recognize variations in register, infer meaning from context, and negotiate spoken discourse approximating near-native fluency - while appearing knowledgeable in the subject area under consideration (Ranney, 1992, p. 25). If, for example, international students are preparing to use English in a negotiating setting, the necessary language-appropriate tasks

should be defined in such a way as to maximize the learners' opportunities to practise such tasks. Targeted skills include those needed in a negotiating setting, which are acquired as part of the language-acquisition process in a business-oriented learning environment (Richards, 1985). Teachers need to be trained to focus very specifically on the design, development, and presentation of the tasks.

Concerns about language performance and the need for teachers to be aware of sociocultural aspects of spoken discourse are interrelated themes, which reflect both teacher awareness and learner-centred needs. Goal-oriented spoken discourse such as negotiations and medical interviews, for example, require both the teacher and the learner to extend their knowledge of how speech acts and speech events mould together to produce a successful negotiation or interview. Theories were developed which centralised the role and responsibility of the learner in the language-acquisition process. The shift in the focus of teaching priorities, in which a call was made for a closer examination of the speech occasion or event (Swales, 1981; Peng, 1987; Marshall, 1987), was accompanied by learner-centred theories such as those elaborated upon by Hutchinson and Waters (1987) and Nunan (1990).

Nunan emphasizes the role which the learner might play in setting forth a learner-centered approach to language study:

In recent years, the incorporation into curriculum development of information about the subjective needs of learners, relating to their perceptions of what they want to learn and how they want to learn it, has added an important dimension to needs analysis. . . .
(Nunan, 1990, p. 18)

Learner-centred instruction is exemplified by the recent interest in case study methodology. Current thinking which emphasizes the importance of contextualizing

language instruction in order to add greater depth and applicability to the content taught is clearly reflected in the case study method, which has been widely used over the last decade. This method provides a framework for integrating a number of different activities within a particular content-oriented task.

The case study method is able to integrate such activities as teaching language and business-related concepts, principles, and theories into a task governed by a specific context (Goodale, 1987; Grosse, 1988). The approach has become popular in classrooms over the last decade as a result of its effective ability to bridge the gap which sometimes exists between business theory and content, including negotiations. The use of case studies is relevant to this study, since the starting point for the simulations was the sale and purchase of a computer - a typical example of the application of this particular methodology to a student-directed learning task.

Using the case study method in English for Specific Purposes courses raises several interesting issues, including the selection of criteria for designing and determining appropriate case study tasks and the relation between the real-world context of the NNS student and the orientation of the specific case study.

In a teaching manual used by the United Nations, Goodale (1987) carefully explains that the simulations which he has chosen are "as close to real life as possible" (p. 4). The language tasks presented to the participants are designed to enhance their problem-solving skills, improve fluency, increase self-confidence levels to an "overall ability to communicate in English" (p. 4). Goodale acknowledges the fictional nature of case studies, but justifies using imaginary countries, for example, for two explicit reasons: to ensure that all

participants are on an equal footing, and to include any necessary information relevant to the task. Goodale further justifies his methodology by arguing that the relationship between real-world interests and "other" world concerns is less important than the activity itself.

Grosse (1988) identifies the components essential for success in business English proficiency as including relevant context-specific material, a process approach to learning in which language skills are developed through the performance of a real-world task, and teacher knowledge and competence of both subject and approach. According to Grosse, the benefits of using the case study method to teach business English are substantial. In order to effectively teach negotiating skills the teacher must be aware of theories and principles of negotiations, understand the setting in which such negotiations are to take place, be comfortable with the product, goods, and services in the negotiations, and understand the dynamics of a learner-centred classroom. In other words, the teacher must recognize the critical role played by the learners themselves in case study analysis.

In the classroom, activities associated with a case study approach related to a business environment might include pre- and post-reading strategies such as skimming and scanning, critical thinking questions, vocabulary development, role plays, simulations, peer review, and problem-solving activities. Using a case study method to teach negotiations is, of course, a technique which has been proven successful. It is used in prestigious international business schools such as Harvard University. It therefore represents one method among many which might be built into an English for Business Purposes curriculum. However, the teacher of English for Specific Purposes may need to be cognizant of specific social contexts and learner needs in order to use it.

In regard to the development of material, both Wardell (1987) and Williams (1988) were at pains to point out the lack of availability of relevant material at the time of writing.

Williams was among the early researchers to challenge the simplistic functional approach to teaching Business English language. This critique questioned whether the language currently taught for business sessions was in fact the language used in business meetings.

Although English for Business Purposes material has now moved away from an almost exclusive focus on business lexis and "useful phrases", the textbooks indicated by Williams tended to present lexical items which they suggest students commit to memory and plan to retrieve at the negotiating table. This approach, according to Williams, neglects to take into consideration the dynamics of negotiations, including timing, setting, key, cultural considerations, and conversational features.

As an applied linguist, Williams questioned the relevance of business textbooks to Business English students. In examining 30 textbooks purported to teach Business English, she noted little correspondence between the exponents introduced and those actually used in business meetings. Although her study was based on a limited sample of business meetings, making generalization difficult, other writers have also examined the issue of teaching language authentic to a business setting.

Wardell (1987), for example, raised the issue in his article on choosing materials for Business English. He went so far, in fact, as to state that, although many texts contain the catch phrase "Business English" in their title, his review revealed that little other than some business lexical items differentiates such material from a general English approach:

Although there are a lot of texts on the shelf which have *business* in their titles, a review of many of these reveals that generally, apart from vocabulary, there is little to support their claims that they are business related. Frequently, only a slight difference exists between the materials in these "business" texts and lessons in other English course books which aim at broader and more general audiences.

(Wardell, 1987, p. 25)

Furthermore, Wardell suggested that a strong argument exists against what is referred to as a "vocabulary by definition" approach to language instruction (p. 26). As Williams (1988) also pointed out, linguistic segments presented as typically Business English phraseology are often unnatural and stilted. Wardell argued that although learning definitions is a part of many technical and training classrooms, his research demonstrates that this type of activity is of little practical value for the student in the real-work environment. A student may be quite capable of defining a particular object, event, or occurrence without the proper lexical grasp normally expected for language proficiency.

Formal linguistic knowledge, such as vocabulary lists, may equally often be less helpful than context-specific usage. Wardell thus called for language instructors and materials developers to "shift attention away from word lists" towards real situations where such words become work tools. Such pedagogy, he asserted, will better prepare students for "the linguistic challenges of the real world" (p. 26), a concern which has been addressed to a considerable extent by materials writers in the 1990's.

Over the past decade, with the introduction of computers into the classroom and greater interest in the potential of interactive distance learning, the field of language teaching has undergone dramatic change. Further material can thus be expected to be added to the teaching curriculum. The impact of new technology on the teaching of English also includes

the production and development of materials, a topic which will be addressed in the final chapter (Chapter 8).

3.3 Issues Related to Negotiations within an ESP Perspective

As noted in the previous section, this study recognizes the relatively limited empirical data made available by researchers up until recently and its restricted usefulness to practitioners. The negotiating setting is a specific case in point in this regard. Although topics related to academic, business, legal, and other professional fields are widely recognized and addressed in English for Specific Purposes courses, the skills necessary for successful negotiating have been relatively neglected. Negotiations have traditionally been examined from the perspective of conflict theory (Putnam and Roloff, 1992). However, as Putnam and Jones (1982) remark:

Although we typically associate bargaining with labor-management disputes, the process of negotiations occurs in a number of settings. Specifically, companies bargain with suppliers, customers bicker with sales personnel, politicians and diplomats make international trades, and lawyers bargain case appeals with clients and judges. In effect, we rely on bargaining in a variety of interpersonal and organizational contexts.
(Putnam and Jones, 1982, p. 171)

Negotiations, in other words, are not the sole property of economico-political disputes but represent a specific area of social interaction. Putnam and Jones consequently shift the focus of research in negotiations from conflict theories to communication. This focus, they claim, "extends an important and growing area of bargaining research - the content and interaction analysis of negotiations" (p. 191).

The present study aims to further contribute to this recognition of the central role of communications in negotiations. It examines how understanding the function of conversational features, specifically interruptions, and designing English for Specific Purposes courses in the light of empirical and qualitative analyses of their usage may lead to increased chances of successful negotiating outcomes by NNSs by relating to negotiators as a distinct "speech community" (Hymes, 1989).

The lack of attention paid to the discourse of negotiations has in fact been noted by several researchers. Grimshaw (1988), Firth (1990), and Barley (1991) all deplore the absence of adequate empirical data for teaching students the skills necessary for successful negotiations.

In his paper on research on the discourse of international negotiations, Grimshaw (1988) comments that while much has been written by negotiators and social scientists on international negotiations, the spoken discourse through which goals are achieved has rarely been directly examined. He presents three reasons for studying the discourse of international negotiations.

The first reason - the "continuing massive and immediate threat of war" - he considers to be "self-evident". Understanding discourse in an international framework, he posits, may make "the relation between conflict and discourse understandable".

The second reason he proposes for studying such discourse is in order to determine whether social conflict and the associated discourse are the same or different. He suggests that, when studied, the discourse of interpersonal and intergroup conflict will show variation from the discourse of international conflicts.

Thirdly, he indicates that discourse examination may help to validate claims that discourse strategies have universal applications. Empirical investigation of such claims requires actual records of international negotiations. Grimshaw parenthetically suggests that such validation may be possible through the use of "simulations" or "nonofficial" discourse, as he calls it.

Grimshaw makes a strong case for investigating actual talk in a negotiation, reprimanding those whom, he says:

. . . should know better than to accept the idea that what goes on in interaction is simply common sense and easily accessible to any modestly attentive investigator It is no less true that there are many things about talk that we think we know that may not hold in the world of reality. Close study of actual talk permits us to distinguish the intuitively sensed, but empirically nonobtaining from the deeply covert but demonstrable regularities in talk, and to identify the pragmatic uses of the latter.
(Grimshaw, 1988, p. 98)

In his article on contextualizing conflict, Barley (1991) similarly wonders ". . . why organizational studies of negotiations have ignored social and cultural forces" (p. 191). Barley questions the view that negotiators are presumed to be "asocial, utilitarian, cognitive decision makers who aspire to maximize their gains and cut their losses" (p. 191). He sets forth the contrary position that when negotiations fail something better could be gained by viewing the process as interactive and interpretive rather than looking at the failure as a result of "poor analytic precision". The process, in his opinion, should also include "values, emotions, beliefs, and interpretations". Spoken discourse, he suggests,

. . . shapes the interpretation interactants make of their situation and each other. Yet even though such culturally embedded micro-processes are likely to shape the tenor and outcome of negotiations, aside from work by a handful of scholars in organizational communications (Putnam, 1988; Putnam and

Poole, 1987), they have been completely ignored by researchers who study bargaining and negotiation in organizational contexts.
(Barley, 1991, p. 190)

As discussed in the literature, understanding what speakers mean generally refers to the cultural and linguistic knowledge shared by a target population (Tripp, 1969; Levinson, 1983; Coulthard, 1985; Hymes, 1987; Taylor and Cameron, 1987; Gumperz, 1988; Fasold, 1990). As Firth (1990) points out, however, although a substantial body of literature exists on the link between cultures and negotiating styles, research in the area of native/non-native negotiations has been largely overlooked. The material which does exist is largely anecdotal rather than empirical. Firth considers how language is used "interactively" to achieve goals in international negotiations where English is the *lingua franca*, referring to the way in which meaning is conveyed by the interaction of the participants. He specifically points out that although conversation analysis has looked at classrooms, law courts, interviews and meetings, very little work has been carried out in negotiation settings.

Firth suggests that long-term negotiation may eventually develop a specific set of norms and characteristics unique to the setting, including its own standards for spoken interactions and phases of negotiations. English, he asserts, has become internationalized with its own linguistic style, transcending cultural and linguistic limitations. Until more transcripts of such international negotiations as the current Middle East Peace Talks or the late Israeli Prime Minister Rabin's discussion with President Mubarak of Egypt are made available, however, the verification of such a theory must be put on hold. What is clear from Firth's discussions, nonetheless, is that flouting maxims and the effect of such flouting on a

negotiation can result in ill will or even in a breakdown of the negotiation. A NS' own pragmatic knowledge of his own culture is not enough to insure against tactlessness or inappropriateness when negotiating with a NNS.

A good example of a business English study based on real data from a business negotiation is provided in the research on business negotiations conducted by Lampi (1986). Describing its aim as confined to the "generation of ideas and hypotheses which could function as the bases for further research", he states that due to the severely restricted nature of the data its role remains illustrative. He consequently cautions against allowing for a great deal of generalization.

Lampi's study is based on a 40-minute audiorecording of an encounter which took place in an anonymous United Kingdom subsidiary of a Finnish company in December, 1983. An experienced Finnish seller negotiated with a buyer, the encounter being represented by two people on both sides, one of whom did the actual talking and one who acted in the role of observer. Lampi elaborates on negotiation theory from this example, and describes specific approaches to negotiations which the participants utilize to reach their goals. He painstakingly presents models of social interactions, describes research in conflict- and problem-solving behaviour, and elaborates on current game theory. Concurrently, he looks at turn taking, moves, and exchanges in order to describe features of the interaction and illocutionary structure of the negotiation event. He applies such act categories as informing, eliciting information, emphasis, mitigation, acknowledgement, support, and query to the negotiation data in light of the particular negotiation phase in order to describe varying negotiation styles.

Act categories specifically developed for classroom discourse, casual conversation, and drama, Lampi claims, do not suffice for a business negotiator. He consequently develops his own topic-oriented act categories, claiming that such categories provide a more useful tool for a linguistic description of negotiation strategy. He falls short, however, of actually demonstrating the utility of such a claim due to unclearly defined categories and limited data.

This restriction on the data - the use of one encounter rather than a large sampling of the population - makes Lampi's assertions that, for example, the more important the topic, the less spontaneity in the verbal exchange (p. 213), difficult either to accept or refute. Lampi recognizes this, calling for further research to validate such claims:

Further research is required to detail the significance and frequency of occurrence of the aspects here identified. In particular, research attention should now be focused on other types of negotiations, mainly competitive ones, to verify the hypotheses made about them indirectly through theoretical conclusions as well as findings from the present, limited empirical data. (Lampi, 1986, p. 213)

Leech (1983), too, maintains that research on the knowledge and effect of intercultural differences in the sphere of interpersonal rhetoric - such as in negotiations - is largely anecdotally-based:

So far, our knowledge of intercultural differences in this sphere is somewhat anecdotal: there is the observation for example, that some eastern cultures (eg. China and Japan) tend to value the Modesty Maxim much more highly than western countries; that English-speaking culture (particularly British?) gives prominence to the Maxim of Tact and the Irony Principle; that Mediterranean cultures place a higher value on the Generosity Maxim and a lower value on the Modesty Maxim. These observations assume, of course, that such principles, being the general functional 'imperatives' of human communication, are more or less universal, but that their relative weights will vary from one cultural, social, or linguistic milieu to another. (Leech, 1983, p. 150)

While a linkage between discourse and negotiating outcomes might well exist, conclusions based on sound theory and a conceptual framework are still relatively lacking. Grimshaw (1988) and Barley (1991) attribute this deficiency to the limitation of data, leading to a situation in which the conclusions drawn may be based on a lack of interest or of research perspectives rather than on issues directly related to security and confidentiality in international business negotiations.

In response to the above critiques of the current state of research, this study is based on empirical data gathered from a representative sample of simulated business negotiating encounters. These encounters involve Israelis for whom English is a second language negotiating with NSs. The findings might be found to have some bearing on the development of English for Specific Purposes courses. Until recently, few English for Specific Purposes specialized courses such as English for Business Purposes were promoted in Israel. The common thinking prevalent amongst business or government personnel needing to acquire English skills was that business acumen transcended language skills. That is to say, if one appeared to be an effective negotiator in his native tongue, employing similar strategies in English merely involved translation from Hebrew into English.

As Israel refines its image among the industrial countries in such fields as international finance, diplomacy, and trade, however, combined with the awareness that a negotiated peace with all of its presently hostile neighbours is becoming a distinct possibility, a greater cognizance may well emerge of the need to refine and polish English language skills. Ever pragmatic, the native Hebrew-speaker appears more eager and willing to commit energy, resources, and time to English language studies if the connection between his work

requirements and the language are clear and specific. This study may provide some of the connections which may be made, especially related to the specific area of negotiating.

3.4 Conclusions

This chapter has set out some of the issues addressed by the development and expansion of English for Specific Purposes courses. Such settings may serve as an appropriate framework in which to understand and examine the use of conversational features. The genre-based approach advocated by Swales and others, for example, opens up possibilities for perceiving negotiations as a distinctive (recognized) event, governed by specific rules and conventions. It also raises issues related to process- and product-based methodologies, approaches which, linked and blended together, can strengthen the teaching of negotiating skills to international students.

The present study aims to make a modest contribution towards resolving the lack of adequate empirical data for teaching the language skills necessary in negotiating settings noted in this chapter. It is designed to contribute data through a representative sample of simulated business encounters. In this way, the study looks towards contributing in some way to future needs of both researchers and practitioners by providing an example of how the use of interruptions may be effectively explained to NNS students, thus enabling them to acquire some of the skills for achieving successful outcomes. Simultaneously, the study itself will furnish data for future studies in the practical application of research.

On this basis, the study proceeds in the following chapters to examine the usage of conversational features of spoken discourse by NNSs and NSs in a negotiating setting in

order to provide insights and guidelines into pedagogic methodology. The statistical findings and a discourse analysis of interruptions will, it is hoped, suggest ways of understanding interruptions which, when communicated to NNS students, might possibly lead to a more successful negotiating outcome.

CHAPTER 4

NEGOTIATIONS

4.1 Introduction

As illustrated in the previous chapter, the lack of theoretical studies and data on negotiations has left practitioners of English for Specific Purposes with very little useful teaching material. This chapter examines the implications of this situation by addressing the "missing link" between a sociocultural theory of (business) negotiations and the integrated and multilayered negotiating process, specifically examining the role and function of interruptions in negotiations.

The first part of the chapter is thematically built around a discussion of the various theories of negotiations which have been proposed, including anthropological, cultural, psychological, and sociocultural perspectives. It also includes a survey of phrasal theories which address the processes involved in negotiations. The second part centers on studies of the cross-cultural and sociolinguistic aspects of negotiations.

This study investigates the usage of interruptions by NNSs and NSs in simulated business negotiation encounters through complementary quantitative and qualitative analyses. One of its basic premises is the existence of politeness as a universal feature of human interaction. While significant cross-cultural similarities exist in "the abstract principles which underlie polite usage" (Brown and Levinson, 1987, p. 57), cross-cultural differences are expressed at the level of usage in politeness behaviour as well as in the

linguistic realization of politeness according to varying cultural norms (Brown and Levinson, 1987; Scollon and Scollon, 1995).

The present study examines the linguistic expression of politeness codes through the lens of negotiations. It therefore looks, for example, at the display of specific conversational features and investigates what similarities they share and what differences they display cross culturally in terms of negotiating behaviour, which includes expressions and usage of conversational features. The study investigates the frequency of predicted usage of certain features without, however, positing the existence of a language universal.

4.2 Negotiation Theories

A general consensus amongst researchers (Grimshaw, 1988; Anton, 1990; Barley, 1991; Bercovitch, 1991; Minodkin, 1993) holds that negotiations include the following features:

- * two or more partners
- * a mandate to make decisions regarding an outcome
- * definable objectives
- * facts
- * potential agreement
- * incompatible interests
- * plans to promote self interest
- * lack of independence, i.e., what one party achieves depends on the achievement of the other party
- * constraints on the interacter
- * talk used to define goals and promote the process

Negotiations may thus be defined as direct or indirect verbal communication in which parties to a conflict of interest discuss any joint action they may take together for the

purpose of reaching agreement. The process of give and take or perform and receive is an effort to do this, to the exclusion of arbitration or any other legal means.

The negotiating process might therefore be said to include the following features: parties, power, goals, information, outcome, conflict, strategies, mutual dependency constraints, and interactive language. These features are interpreted and given varying emphases according to the perspective of researchers in different disciplines. These disciplines include anthropology, social psychology, sociology, communications, and sociolinguistics. The following review of the different perspectives is premised on the notion that although negotiations seem to represent a field of study in the research literature, little work has been conducted directly linking linguistic studies to negotiation theory or examining socio-rhetorical relationships between performance and outcome. This study is intended to partially fill an existing gap which might link current linguistic research and negotiation models.

Like the development of the field of discourse analysis which, as Schiffrin (1994) observes, "is one of the most vast, but also least defined, areas in linguistics" (p. 42), the study of negotiations encompasses research data from a variety of disciplines, as noted above. The approaches, research models, and paradigms reflect the perspective of each particular researcher.

Barley (1991), for example, works from an anthropological approach to negotiations. He presents three anthropological methods for examining negotiations, the first of which he defines as the ethnography of disputing. This is embodied in the body of literature on resolution conflict drawn from anthropologists, and is distinguished by the focus placed by

field research on how various cultures "handle grievances". This view of negotiations concentrates on understanding the "social dynamics of disputing and how these are keyed to aspects of the social context" (Barley, 1991, p. 172). Barley describes this perspective on negotiations as emerging from an understanding of the social networks, status, and power of the partners in influencing the outcome or success of a negotiation.

The second approach, which he refers to as "negotiated order theory", was stimulated in the early 1960's by the work of University of Chicago sociologists trained in the sociology of organization and occupations. These theorists assumed that "patterns of social organization reflect people's definitions of the situation they occupy" (Barley, p. 173), a premise which led them to focus their analysis on the clashes resulting from different value orientations. Barley points out that this negotiation process entails:

strategies and tactics that the actors employ, the identities they assume, their mode of speech, the emotional tension of the interaction, and even the negotiator's implicit theories of negotiation.
(Barley, 1991, p. 174)

The third line of research examines the "micro-properties" of negotiations, and includes detailed field notes on behaviour exhibited by negotiating partners. This analysis focuses on "how verbal and nonverbal acts give rise to agreements, understanding, situated roles and courses of action" (Barley, p. 174). Barley includes in his discussion of micro-properties descriptions of plea-bargaining exchanges and an account of how co-conversationalists understand and interpret meaning in verbal interaction. He points out that these concerns and interests overlap with communication theories such as that proposed by Putnam and Jones (1982) and Putnam and Roloff (1992).

In his concluding discussions, Barley suggests that the three approaches differ on the basis of their identification of the object of study and their definition of what forms the "negotiator's relevant social and cultural context":

Despite these differences in level of analysis, each literature is primarily concerned with understanding how social contexts, social processes, and interpretations shape grievances, disputes, definitions of situations, and the outcome of negotiations.

(Barley, 1991, p. 175)

The political scientist Bercovitch (1991, p. 8), on the other hand, views the field of negotiations as emerging from a need to "resolve conflicts peacefully". In contrast to Barley, Bercovitch perceives negotiation theory as a process designed to help parties agree on distribution of values, resources, goods, and services. He maintains that other considerations also need to be taken into account in defining that process. These considerations, he asserts, include:

. . . activities, statements, and postures that purport to modify a relationship, to define new parameters for it, and to establish norms that can effectively deal with the change, risk and unpredictability of a conflictual relationship.

(Bercovitch, 1991, p. 10)

According to Bercovitch, negotiation is a process of defining and redefining a relationship and responding to changes to create a new order. The process of conflict management demands that the "complex conflictual relationship" as a "conduct of relations" be enacted across the negotiating table (p. 18). This requirement places great importance upon the pre-negotiation period, the stage which lays the groundwork for relational commitment and thus for long-term conflict resolution. Bercovitch's emphasis on the importance of confidence-building measures at an early stage of the negotiating process

reinforces the premise of the current study that relational issues form one of the central elements for successful negotiating.

Redding (1991) works from the psychological perspective of negotiation theories. He suggests that negotiators attribute success in negotiations to personal favourable negotiating traits and styles, while failures are attributed to situational factors and outside influences such as cultural differences. In listing the personal and social characteristics which an international negotiator should possess in order to be successful, Redding indicates that such qualities may override cross-cultural differences. The successful negotiator, according to him, might be extroverted, emotionally stable, intuitive, accepting of differences in others, people-oriented, open-minded, empathetic, non-judgmental, and socially sophisticated.

He proposes that while the substantive issues of the negotiations are certainly consequential, understanding the process itself is equally important, and argues that "due to the lack of attention given to the process itself, no comprehensive theory of negotiation has been developed from which one could draw prescriptive advice" (p. 1). He further suggests that the outcome of a negotiation can be better controlled if negotiators understand group dynamics, decision-making strategies, and processes operating within the framework of negotiations:

Advances in psychology, particularly in the areas of cognitive and social psychology, offer implications for conducting effective international negotiations. Applications include, for example, applying decision-making theory to understand biases or perceptual "sets" inherent in the negotiating positions of the parties, predicting likely tactics and negotiating strategies on the basis of group/institution dynamics, and improving the opportunity to

control the outcome of the negotiations through an understanding of the analytical styles of opposing negotiators.
(Redding, 1991, p. 7)

Negotiations may be viewed through the lens of interrelational and interactional behaviour. For the purposes of this study it is useful to examine some of the concepts raised by writers addressing sociocultural issues. Such issues related to negotiations include relationship building, bargaining behaviour, face, and image, as discussed by Hendriks (1991), Wilson (1992) and Donohue and Ramesh (1992). These researchers discuss the effect of communication styles on the process and outcome of negotiations, taking into consideration cross-cultural and socio-rhetorical issues.

Thus Hendriks (1991) focuses on the role which cultural issues play in negotiations. Referring to the advent of 'Europe 1992', he notes that, "Many international negotiators express the need for information on the influence of culture on negotiations" (p. 170). In this light, he suggests some ways to provide insights into "how to do" research on intercultural negotiations. He proposes that the influence of culture on intercultural business negotiations might be studied using four approaches.

The first of these examines recurrent themes in negotiations, such as geopolitical concerns. The second approach looks at surveys based on questionnaires and interviews. Although potentially less accurate, according to Hendriks, such data might in fact be quite useful. Questionnaires and interviews give evidence different in kind, rather than in degree, from that obtained from products. Their data give access to subjects' reported self-perceptions, which are, however, quantifiable through the use of statistical instruments.

The third method is the use of simulations to analyze negotiations. Hendriks refers to this

third approach as experimental but valuable for yielding information on various styles of negotiations. He maintains that simulations provide an authentic imitation of a real-life situation while at the same time controlling external and extraneous variables irrelevant to the analysis itself - a position endorsed in this study. The fourth approach involves collecting and analyzing data from "real life negotiations". Hendriks notes that during American/Egyptian negotiations the Egyptians tended to conduct the negotiations using indirect, exaggerated language, and valued personal more than formal contacts, while the Americans understated the situation using more direct language and adopted a more impersonal yet informal posture. However, he adds, little data exists which makes this analysis of real life negotiations possible.

The current study draws on Hendriks' third approach, on the premise that simulated business negotiating encounters focus on, enrich, and clarify linguistic features in order to better analyze their interrelationship with other variables, such as face issues. One of Hendriks' particularly interesting findings in this regard is that while in a more successful negotiation cultural factors were considered to be more negligible, in less successful negotiations participants considered cultural factors as actively contributing to the failure.

Hendriks consequently concludes that cultural factors can easily be turned into a scapegoat for failed negotiations, a position which echoes Redding's (1991) suggestions, albeit from a different perspective.

Writing in the field of identity management communication, Wilson (1992) emphasizes the role played by face in negotiations. He presents an historical overview of socio-psychological studies of face and facework in negotiations, beginning with Tjosvold

and Huston's (1978) study on social face and resistance to compromise through to Brown and Levinson's (1987) study on face-restoration in negotiations. Calling for cross-fertilization among researchers and writers in the area of negotiations, Wilson suggests that much could be gained if scholars working in social psychology shared their insights with those working in the discourse analysis tradition, although he readily recognizes the weakness of discussions based solely on Western participants:

An important limitation of the research just reviewed is the exclusive use of American participants. Cultural background undoubtedly influences how bargaining behaviors are perceived. . . .
(Wilson, 1992, p. 184)

Wilson further sets forth the challenge that more insight into face is needed in negotiations, and suggests that discourse scholars undertake analyses both of cycles of face saving and face threatening acts and of how "linguistic resources" can be effectively used in such cycles (Wilson, 1992, p. 200). He thus also takes issue with the tendency to generalize when discussing negotiating styles, rights, and obligations during the management of outcomes and moves in negotiations.

Consequently, he proposes that researchers consider the following three questions:

- * How do negotiators co-ordinate face and substantive concerns?
- * How does culture influence the role of face in negotiations?
- * How are face issues related to negotiation outcomes?

The present study directly addresses Wilson's questions by examining the function of interruptions in relation to face issues in the setting of international negotiating encounters between NNS/NS negotiators; interruptions are a conversational feature which has

traditionally been related to conflict-conducive behaviour and less positive negotiating outcomes. A detailed discourse analysis of the findings of the study will be presented in Chapter 7.

The issue of conflict resolution is central to Donohue and Ramesh's (1992) emphasis on cultural sensitivity and interpersonal relationships related to face issues in negotiations. From their perspective within relational communications, they suggest that negotiations in cultures placing a higher value on the collective - such as Israel - require a more intensive relationship-building phase than those cultures which place the individual as the focal point. Relationship messages are highly valued in this context. According to Donohue and Ramesh, an attack on the message becomes an attack on the relationship; message and relationship are so intertwined that separation becomes difficult:

Ting-Toomey (1985) points out that relationship information and message content are highly intertwined in collectivist cultures as a result, attacking a person's position in the culture is the same as attacking the person. (Donohue and Ramesh, 1992, p. 215)

Thus, for example, relationship issues as part of the decision-making process can pose a challenge to Westerners, who view extended openings in negotiations as an effort to stall or to waste precious time. Closings which rely on consensus or turning to another person in the hierarchy to make decisions might be viewed by the Western negotiator as a sign of weakness or lack of empowerment.

The present study supports the importance attributed to the establishment of a relationship between the two partners - the student and the teacher - well before the actual simulation took place, as suggested by researchers in relational communications. Trust and

rapport appear to be prerequisites in order for the role play to proceed beyond the initial relationship building and move into the structure and message phase. It is interesting to note that in the present study, NNSs, regardless of position as buyer or seller, often closed the negotiations by suggesting that consultation with colleagues was in order before the deal could be finalized. As noted, the Western-oriented negotiator might perceive this behaviour as indicating a lack of decision-making power. In this study, however, delaying a final settlement was acceptable, since a sense of trust had been developed and the delay was not seen as a tactic to avoid a negative decision.

Turning from relational issues in negotiations to the structure of a negotiation, theories will be presented which examine the negotiating process as related to goal achievement. The principles of negotiation theory as studied from the perspective of processes include tactics, manoeuvres, and strategies employed by negotiating partners. Phasal theories of negotiations focus on the processes which negotiations involve, and researchers in this field have tended to pay little direct attention to spoken discourse and conversational features as a basis for categorizing their various models of negotiations, except as noted below. They also differ from the models proposed by Barley (1991) and Bercovitch (1991) in that they focus on the structure and process rather than the orientation of negotiations.

Those studies which have related business negotiations and interactions to spoken discourse within the phasal theory approach include Douglas (1957), Putnam and Jones (1982), and Tutzauer (1992). These researchers shed light on the potential role of spoken discourse. Consideration of their studies here is based on the view that they may function

as a springboard for later discussion of the role of conversational features as represented in this study.

Writing from the perspective of conflict resolution, Douglas' (1957) discussions of settlements of industrial and intergroup disputes provide a rare, if perhaps early and less sophisticated, look, at a labour-management negotiation which was referred to mediation after stalemating. Douglas identifies a three-phase model in her negotiations. She denotes phase one, which is often the longest phase, as establishing the bargaining range, since at first glance it appears to define the wide differences which exist between the negotiating partners. She describes this stage as filled with "dogmatic pronouncements" (p. 72), seemingly firm and intractable positions, vehement demands and equally vehement counter-demands, exposures, derision, discreditations, and critiques.

According to Douglas, the bargaining range is determined by the very range of tough positions articulated. When the outer limits are established, the factors of contention are clarified. Douglas suggests that this early emphasis on differences, although apparently paradoxical, in actual fact sets the stage for later concessions and points of agreement. How much movement from the original starting position, and when such shifts occur, is unknown at this early stage, but Douglas maintains that the more resistance the negotiators can maintain to moving away from their earlier positions, the fewer concessions are likely to be needed in the negotiations process. Too hasty movement results in a weakening of positions.

Douglas suggests that a show of strength, vigour, determination, and intractability during phase one is an important signal of resilience. She takes issue with the points of view presented by psychologists and conflict management theorists who maintain that such

outbursts and denunciations evidence hostility and anger. She argues, on the contrary, that the conflict should be accentuated in order to allow room for the dynamics of developing interpersonal relationships, which for her are essential to the settlement of differences.

Phase two involves engaging in interpersonal relationship-building through jockeying for position, and can be as long as phase one. Although the rhetoric and posturing in this phase appear to be similar in form and structure to the first phase, phase two actually represents a pulling back from previously held positions - moving from an extreme position towards a more modified one.

Phase three is the decision-making and final stage in the negotiations. When both parties recognize that a continuation of the process will result in greater loss than gain, or in diminishing returns, a verbal halt is called for while the parties summarize and clarify what will become their final positions.

Douglas asserts that the most important part of the dynamics of negotiations is the establishment of harmony and synchrony between the negotiating partners in each phase. Ideally, final decision-making is a result of proper timing and processing. Douglas concludes that orderly and progressive movement during negotiations results in agreement. If the common interests on both sides are clarified and firmed up, the co-operative aspect of the negotiation rather than the competitive side will be favoured. She points out that well-trained and seasoned negotiators understand that the posturing characteristic of the first phase is a necessary step towards later modifications of position, assuming that negotiations are carried out "in good faith".

Although Douglas' model is strengthened by her examples of management labour disputes, generalizing to international business negotiations which are clearly distinguishable by sets of different values might be problematic. On the other hand, her discussion is of particular interest to persons working in the area of negotiations precisely because so little empirical data is available due to restrictions of access, availability of actual proceedings, and issues of security and confidentiality. Indeed, researchers in the field of negotiations including Grimshaw (1988), Fisher (1989), and Bercovitch (1991) all draw their findings and observations from what Grimshaw describes as "treatises of various sorts that purport to characterize what goes on" (Grimshaw, 1988, p. 97) rather than from authentic data.

Putnam and Jones (1982) write in the tradition of conflict resolution and base their theory on the golden rule in negotiations: "Do unto others what you would have others do unto you". They maintain that a set of mutual rewards guides negotiating principles, positing that the most important element in negotiations is the message conveyed to the negotiating partner throughout each phase of the negotiations. Putnam and Jones specifically examine the role of reciprocity in the sequential structure of labour/management negotiation through the use of trade-offs, proposals, counter-proposals, and compromises to reach a mutually-rewarding outcome. They secondarily address the effect of gender on the event.

Putnam and Jones refer to the concept of subprocesses of negotiations, which include a win/lose approach and a win/win approach. In practice, they suggest, most negotiations reflect a unique combination of both processes, or what is commonly referred to as "mixed bargaining"; that is, strategies, tactics, and language displaying offensive as well as defensive mechanisms. They note, for example, that labour negotiators employed more offensive

strategies and were more aggressive in the types of messages used, while management used more defensive tactics and relied heavily on commitment messages.

In international negotiating interactions, Putnam and Jones report that the parties involved employed disagreement tactics, task-oriented behaviours, and what they call soft strategies, which included initiating a compromise, promises, and accommodations. They concluded that a high rate of soft to hard tactics was linked to the probability of reaching a settlement. In emphasizing the role and function which status, power, and negotiator role have in labour/management negotiations, they present a strong case that stereotypes, perceptions, and attitudes towards either position influence the ultimate outcome of the negotiations. According to their findings, labour and management displayed particular negotiating strategies consistent with their role in negotiations, and it was the assumption of the role which proved important.

In terms of conflict resolutions, Putnam and Jones present convincing evidence to suggest that there is greater value in focusing on communicative strategies as the essence of negotiations than in advocating a particular conflict or problem-solving approach, such as co-operative or competitive interactions. The latter, according to Putnam and Jones, can stalemate into round-robin, attack/defend, defend/attack positions. In fact, they contend, reaching a mutually-agreeable solution is more frequently jeopardized when both parties reciprocate each other's tactics than when each party employs mixed bargaining strategies.

They further suggest that more research yielding rich data in the area of negotiations might give even greater support to their claim that negotiators need training in communication skills as much as instruction in tactical manoeuvres. However, the trend of teaching

international negotiators to apply specific models of conflict resolution - years after the results of this study were established - is still strong (Westerfield, 1989; Firth, 1990; Bercovitch, 1991).

In contrast, Tutzauer (1992) focuses his research on the role played by offers in negotiations. He posits that offers presented by the negotiator influence and are influenced by the dynamics of the negotiations. Communicating offers is a dynamic process in and of itself. Internal forces such as time pressures, as well as external forces such as economic needs, determine whether or not a negotiator modifies an offer. In claiming that concession-making is interactive and is influenced by negotiating partners, Tutzauer suggests that the process of giving and accepting offers forms the pivotal point of negotiations:

Although other types of communication, for example, threats and promises, arguments and counter arguments, or other message strategies, undoubtedly influence the course of the negotiation, it is likely that offers exert the most profound effect on the process. The nature, timing, and pattern of offers and the concessions they elicit, constitute the very essence of bargaining and negotiation. Indeed, it can be argued that if there are no offers, there is no bargaining.

(Tutzauer, 1992, p. 67)

Tutzauer describes the language of offers as first of all generally numerical, usually requiring some form of a response. This is likely to be tentative and to reflect issues pre-considered before the presentation of an actual offer. He suggests that offers should be examined through a "communication lens" (p. 72) embodying three assumptions: a) that the communication of offers is a process; b) that this process is interactive, meaning that the negotiators mutually exert influence; and c) that internal and external forces are both contributive to the interactive process. Although he acknowledges that the "various models

and theories of concession making are among the most sophisticated in the bargaining literature" (p. 79), he nonetheless claims that gaps remain, and calls for "modifications of current research" (p. 80) to increase understanding of the role which offers assume in the process of negotiations.

Sociolinguistic competence in a language refers to the ability to produce and understand utterances appropriate to the context. In the setting of negotiations, sociolinguistic competence is sometimes signalled by lexically-appropriate negotiation tactics during specific phases of a negotiation session, although such competence obviously does not only reside in the expression of negotiation strategies. Nunan's observation that "verbal strategies which are called into play in order to repair conversation breakdowns, and otherwise keep an interaction going" (Nunan, 1992, p. 85) may more specifically and accurately describe the concept of strategic competence as expressed during a negotiating phase.

Discoursal competence may be demonstrated by the combination of meaning and form to achieve unity. Quite obviously, problems exist with labelling competence, as suggested by McCarthy and Carter:

First, will *discourse* be a separate section or layer of the syllabus, grafted on to existing ones? All our arguments so far have suggested that such a choice gives a false picture of the integrated nature of language: grammar is not something separate from discourse, nor is vocabulary, nor are the language 'skills' and 'strategies', nor is cultural competence.
(McCarthy and Carter, 1994, p. 199)

The above review demonstrates that the differing disciplines offer various theories of negotiations. In general, however, they vary according to their emphasis on specific

aspects and processes of negotiations rather than offering competing models. The exceptions of Hendriks (1991) and Redding (1991), who suggest that it may be simplistic to view cultural differences as the cause of failure, stand out against a general recognition that cultural issues are directly relevant to successful negotiations. What is clear is that common knowledge and cultural tuning-in to the settlement of disputes differ across cultures and therefore also across the negotiating table. The following section addresses cross-cultural issues raised by theories of negotiations.

4.3 Cross-cultural Aspects of Negotiations

Several researchers directly relate to the issues which NNSs might confront when faced by the challenge of negotiating with partners whose culture differs from their own. Although these researchers do not ignore other aspects such as anthropological or psychological concerns, for example, they place cross-cultural issues at the centre of their agenda in the framework of English for Specific Purposes considerations.

Cross-cultural issues specifically related to interruptions will be discussed in Chapter 7. The following presentation summarizes various points of view regarding the implications of cultural awareness in training for international communication competence. The premise will be developed in the discourse analysis in Chapter 7 that politeness features as expressed cross-culturally within a negotiation go far in building bridges towards co-operation. The tentative conclusion appears to suggest that cross-cultural differences might possibly be de-emphasized in the training of international negotiators. Victor (1987), Almulla (1988),

Robinson (1988), and Riley (1991), however, tend to emphasize the importance of cross-cultural differences in their broad approach to negotiations theory.

Knowing how to be polite, to argue, and to negotiate, according to Riley (1991) in his article on the sociocultural dimensions of language use, is an important aspect of sociocultural and linguistic competence. Such knowledge influences both what is said and what is left unsaid. Strategies and techniques used in negotiations, for example, reflect the cultural knowledge of the participants, as the expression of politeness is similarly determined by the cultural knowledge which the partners do or do not share.

In his study of cross-cultural misunderstandings in international diplomatic language, Almulla (1988) contends that attention should be paid to ways in which such misunderstandings and misinterpretations can be minimized, even among seasoned diplomats. He proposes that more attention in training be given to the "elements of the language of diplomacy as well as the principle of conducting successful diplomatic communications" (Almulla, 1988, p. 60). Unfortunately, Almulla does not specify a precise category of elements of the language of diplomacy.

In contrast to Almulla, Victor (1987) emphasizes the need to sensitize students to cultural differences when teaching international students to negotiate. He promotes the idea that trainers and teachers would serve the best interest of their international business students if they promoted a cross-cultural perspective by training students to observe cultures and to ask questions. Describing the international business communication course which he designed and taught at Eastern Michigan University, Victor presents a "two-tiered instructional approach", both of which levels rest on the asking and answering of questions.

Students are taught which factors are most likely to shift in a cross-cultural business setting, including language, environment and technology, social organization, attitude towards authority, non-verbal communication, and behaviour and time parameters. Teaching students to apply those factors to a conflict-management model, according to Victor, should lead to success at the negotiating table.

Writing from a slightly different perspective, Robinson (1988) makes a call for a greater emphasis on training for negotiations cross-culturally by focusing on *similarities* rather than on *differences* between cultures. He suggests that much can be gained by appreciating the universal aspects of different cultures - those themes which cross cultural boundaries.

Other researchers have studied ways to train students towards competence in international business negotiations while stressing the awareness of cross-cultural differences. Writers and trainers such as Fisher (1980), Neu (1986), Van Hoorde (1991), Gorman (1992), and Beamer (1992) suggest various approaches which might be used to raise the level of awareness of cultural differences among negotiating partners.

Thus Beamer (1992) offers a learning process model in describing the process by which intercultural communication competence is learned. According to her, while the value of such competence has been increasingly stressed, and curricula reflect the growing interest in this area, "business communication educators are left without a basis for a pedagogical posture" when they lack an adequate idea both of what constitutes competence and the process by which the learner achieves the goal of intercultural communication competence (Beamer, 1992, p. 285). Beamer posits that communication can best be understood from the

perspective of the receiver, not the sender or the channel. She argues, like Bowman and Targowski (1987), that "communication does not occur without the perception that communication is taking place" (p. 285). Her position is based on the assumption that intercultural communication competence involves the ability to both decode and encode meaning corresponding to meanings held by the co-conversationalist. Acquiring such competence, she suggests, is based on a five-level learning model which includes acknowledging diversity, organizing information, posing questions, analyzing communication episodes, and generating "other culture" messages.

While Beamer offers a reasonable learning process model, she does little to advance her call for understanding the process of acquiring what she refers to as intercultural communication competence. She neither defines nor discusses specific components of such competence, which seems to detract from what otherwise appears to be an interesting learning process model. Her statement that ". . . competence means being able to generate and respond to communication messages as if from within another culture" (p. 302) is a weak, if not patently unattainable, goal.

In directly addressing the issue of cross-cultural questions, Van Hoorde (1991) maintains that an accurate communication model is necessary in acknowledging problems in cross-cultural communication:

Most existing communication models oversimplify the reality of human communication and therefore mislead people in their communicative behavior. This misleading is mainly due to the fact that they emphasize the transmission skills of the sender and the quality and capacity of the channel, while they ignore or obscure the activities of the receiver and the influence of the contextual network in which communication takes place.
(Van Hoorde, 1991, p. 293)

Van Hoorde proposes a revised communication model, describing the existing models as based on "communication as a linear process" (p. 294) by which a message is transmitted by steps through a channel from sender to receiver. Previous models, he contends, are no better than "defective maps of the territory of human communication" which simply replicate the original message while ignoring or obscuring both the activities of the receiver and the importance of the context of the message.

He notes the defect by drawing a comparison with a rugby game in which the players must succeed by passing on the ball. Unlike the ball, the message is not a "neatly packed, complete entity" (p. 294) but should rather be understood as "reflecting information". Reflecting information is composed of "all sorts of information" supplied by both receiver and sender (p. 295). This influences and modifies the message because the information is associated with possible cultural differences between the co-conversationalists or receiver and sender. The message which is transmitted, then, is a product of the original message plus the reflecting information. Van Hoorde calls his theory a "revised Targowski and Bowman model of the communication process" in which their original linear description is adapted by the addition of a layer-based pragmatic model (p. 296).

Researchers have also looked at the possibility that training international marketing negotiators to be more effective should involve cross-cultural activities (Gorman, 1992). While most academic marketing programmes incorporate communication theory and skills, Gorman maintains, there is little recognition that "international marketing has language, cultural and systemic differences that affect the communication process" (Gorman, 1992, p. 49). She proposes that students working in international marketing need to learn how to

distinguish between "perceptions and descriptions of events", how to clarify and seek clarification when there is a breakdown or potential breakdown in communication, and how to deal with what she calls "ambiguity experienced in cross cultural communications" (p. 49).

Gorman provides a list of exercises related to teaching these skills, including role plays, simulations and case studies. Although her article is more practically-oriented in terms of presenting lesson models to incorporate into classrooms, she does suggest that language and cultural issues might be more in evidence in curriculum design.

Additional issues in training for cross-cultural negotiations might include lexico-grammatical awareness to avoid potentially embarrassing cross-cultural misunderstandings. As discussed by Neu (1986), violations of cultural and linguistic patterns when negotiating cross-culturally can in fact lead to embarrassment and failure at the negotiating table.

It is interesting to note in the literature on cross-cultural issues in negotiations that researchers have tended to select Middle Easterners' business transactions as a counter point to analyses of discussions between Westerners and negotiators from other parts of the world (Fisher, 1980; Redding, 1991). For example, the high value placed on such characteristics as trust, hospitality, respect, and social graces among the Mediterranean population sharply contrasts with Western-style business approaches to negotiations, which regard such traits as efficiency, order, formality and analysis as more important. While it is undoubtedly difficult to ascertain the strength of this tendency to use the Middle Eastern culture as a counterpoint in studies on international negotiations, it forms an interesting phenomenon in the literature under review.

Fisher's study (1980) provides a very meticulous conceptual framework for better understanding the process of participating in international negotiations and for managing that process more effectively, at the same time as acknowledging and accounting for cross-cultural differences between partners. His account is unique in that he addresses issues such as translators, internationalized culture, and motive attribution in a challenging and informative manner. The following detailed review of his work is made in order to strengthen the argument of the present study, namely that an overview of the negotiation process including sociocultural as well as discourse issues will provide a clearer and more precise context for examining the conversational elements which are the subject of the study.

Although differences exist between Fisher's focus on international diplomacy and this study of business negotiations, the present study assumes that the disparities are bridged by the international aspect of negotiations and by factors affecting the negotiating process.

In the introduction to his book *International Negotiation* (1980), Fisher states that while his work has been:

. . . carried out for the Department of State's Foreign Service Institute to support training activities, it is being published for its more general applicability to a wide range of professionals who work internationally: business executives, educators, scientists, technical assistance specialists and those who manage the linkage of an increasing variety of trans-national organizations and institutions.
(Fisher, 1980, p. 9)

Fisher bases the findings of his study on interviews conducted with 30 US Foreign Service Officers who had conducted negotiations with Japanese, Mexican, and French counterparts.

Dividing the negotiating process into categories, he examines the negotiations from the perspective of what he calls the players and situations, including differing styles of decision-

making, effect of national character on the negotiations, and coping with cross-cultural dissonance.

Given the nature of high-tech culture and the intensity of international negotiations, he posits the existence of an internationalized negotiating culture, and asserts that this culture not only includes the English language as the basis for negotiations but also an accommodation to Western-style types of negotiations.

He first acknowledges that the term "cultural factors" is a vague and unclear concept not easily transferrable to practical application for purposes of training competent and skillful negotiators. To believe that people are pretty much alike everywhere in the world, he cautions, is a naive and potentially troublesome trait when applied to negotiations. He thus warns against the cavalier attitude adopted by some Western negotiators when conducting international negotiations, and suggests instead that respect should be given to cultural issues which may have a strong impact on the process and outcome of negotiations.

Fisher consequently contends that when dealing with international negotiations, one must be made aware of the potential for falling into communication traps. He notes instances, for example, when a hesitation during a negotiation may be attributed to a partner not understanding the message when such attribution may in fact be incorrect (p. 15). (See Chapter 7 in the present study for a discussion of the function of hesitations which supports Fisher's findings.) As Fisher suggests, projecting attribution of motive to a person from a different culture may lead to a misinterpretation of motive with potentially great damaging effects on the negotiating outcome.

Fisher balances his argument by cautioning against placing too high a value on what he calls "National Character" (p. 37). He addresses the issue of personality traits in negotiations, noting that these may reflect the fact that negotiators are the product of their own society. These traits can be perceived through the American negotiator's valuation of time and efficiency, emphasis on the individual and his achievements, and attention to orderliness and practicalities, for example. Stressing his contention that while people may be alike due to their common human qualities, they do not necessarily think alike, he calls for greater awareness of cultural differences when conducting international negotiations:

The counsel of the psychological anthropologist applies: while people may be alike in basic human qualities, they do not necessarily think alike. Even if sophisticated international negotiators could do so because of their immersion in an internationalized culture, their clients would still reflect the special emotional and cognitive patterns of their respective societies.
(Fisher, 1980, p. 38)

Fisher's well-stated claim that styles of negotiating should in fact be recognized as tied to culturally-bound ways of viewing the world agrees with recent research on Japanese negotiating styles. Fisher himself notes (p. 55) that some of the important social and cultural principles which are not only patently different from Western negotiations but which can also potentially derail a negotiation include the Japanese attitude toward silence, smiling, laughter, and seemingly contradictory remarks - saying yes when, for example, the Japanese negotiator means no. Appreciating such differences can be of obvious benefit to all parties.

This raises the controversial question of whether and how cultural differences are logically- and rationally-based, and thus how the different sides in a negotiation process pursue different paths of thinking. Although the debate whether cultures impart to their

members distinctive ways of putting together ideas, seeking knowledge and answers, associating cause and effect, and using evidence to support positions is very important, it must remain outside the scope of the present study.

Fisher himself makes a strong case against attempting to use anything other than the native language during negotiations. He goes so far as to suggest that this may result in acquiescence on the part of the non-native English speaker, as well as inaccuracies in communication. When complicated ideas and issues are at stake, he says, NNSs whose command of English as a foreign language is weak may well contribute to a communication breakdown. However, his suggestion to extensively use interpreters (p. 65) seems, in my opinion, to represent a controversial and less than satisfactory approach to the issue of language choice during negotiations. Moreover, business negotiations are in reality very often conducted without the aid of translators and sometimes translators are not an available option for a variety of reasons. In the real world, therefore, Fisher's suggestion is not likely to become a universal practice.

Clearly, therefore, cultural misunderstandings obviously do arise during a negotiating encounter. The present study adopts the position, however, that in the interests of training successful international negotiators it may be valuable to focus on the function of linguistic similarities which cross cultural boundaries. In this way, attention may be drawn away from negative propensities towards those conducive to positive outcomes. It is assumed that teaching international students to become effective negotiators requires raising the level of awareness of cultural and linguistic distinctiveness so that reasonable,

appropriate, and good decisions can be made at the table. Fostering respect for such distinctiveness ultimately serves the best interest of both parties.

4.4 Linguistic Features In Negotiations

The analysis of the organization of spoken discourse in a negotiation might be looked at according to the following criteria suggested by Schegloff (1987) and Gumperz (1989):

- a) topic organization such as subject shifts, closings, and openings.
- b) overall structure such as phases of a negotiation.
- c) utterance by utterance such as turn taking, back channels, and overlaps.

This study adopts the first and third criteria, examining both the structure and the function of spoken discourse in a negotiating setting by analyzing interruptions as an example of the "utterance by utterance" approach, as well as opening up subjects. By isolating and identifying features and by placing the features within the structure of a negotiation, it is expected that patterns will emerge which might contribute to our understanding of cross-cultural negotiations.

As noted earlier in the chapter, some researchers in the field of negotiations have addressed the role and function of spoken discourse in negotiating encounters, notably Douglas (1957), Putnam and Jones (1982), and Tutzauer (1992). These writers have attempted to link phases, tactics, and concessions to aspects of spoken discourse. They have not directly examined the role of such discourse in the framework of practical applications for teaching, however.

Among the researchers who have directly examined the role of discourse for teaching towards real-life language settings, Goke-Pariola (1990), Cheng-Geok (1991), and Micheau and Billmyer (1992) each offer their own contribution to the study of discourse in negotiations from their own particular area of interest.

The relation between perception and cultural issues is examined by Cheng-Geok (1991), whose investigation looks at language features which might account for people of different cultures feeling as though they are on different wavelengths when conducting business negotiations cross-culturally. Cheng-Geok suggests that their different perceptions of the negotiations may well lie in the way they acknowledge face and the way they realize pragmatic ambivalence; that is to say, how they express their positions through their word choice. For example, instead of saying "we will never agree", the phrase "in its present form" might be added. The complete phrase could then be interpreted to mean "change your position and I might consider changing mine".

Cheng-Geok also looks at the number of back channel devices in discussing distribution of talk. His findings indicate that back channelling devices were used 6.6 times more frequently by NNSs than by NSs, while NSs held the floor double the time than NNSs. In addition, silences (longer than 2 seconds; under 2 seconds he refers to as "gaps") were often followed by the use of back channel devices by NNSs. Cheng-Geok presents these findings as part of his discussion of the usage of features of language during business negotiations. However, he does not appear to draw any conclusions regarding their possible application to teaching NNSs how to be successful negotiators, nor is it easy to analyze the generalizability of his study.

The call for the international business community to seek to understand, as well as to use, linguistic forms dictated by non-native English-speaking environments is taken up by Goke-Pariola (1990). He suggests that the course syllabus for teaching business English skills to the international learner should cover both productive and receptive language skills, as well as the structure and function of language. By looking carefully at the types of interactions which the NNS student might encounter and categorizing problems encountered, he suggests that the learner should be enabled to cope better with situations requiring fluency:

By studying specific instances of these kinds of interactional settings, [corporate board meetings, negotiations with government officials . . .], we may be able to come up with a number of principles of a high level of generalization, and determine those situations that are most frequent as well as those likely to elicit communication problems. . . .

(Goke-Pariola, 1990, p. 9)

At the same time, he proposes that both NNSs and NSs need to learn particular target communication skills necessary in an international negotiating situation. He appears to suggest that NSs might need to be trained to accommodate to the communication skills required in international NS/NNS negotiations, and that concentrating solely on the needs of NNSs may oversimplify learner needs.

The need to consider refocusing curriculum design by paying closer attention to linguistic features in negotiations is addressed by Micheau and Billmyer (1992). Calling for increased use of case analysis, interactive video taping, and analysis sessions, as well as open discussions with native English speakers, they report preliminary findings on discourse strategies used by NS participants in a graduate business course. A comparison of these with

NNSs' strategies used in a similar setting demonstrated differences in turn allocations, nomination techniques, and moves:

Although competition for turns was lively, students generally showed concern for a) making their contributions fit into a cohesive overall framework and b) showing a certain degree of solidarity with fellow students. . . .
(Micheau and Billmyer, 1992, p. 1)

In characterizing NNS turns, Micheau and Billmyer maintain that "by co-ordinating gestures . . . and by increasing the tempo across phrase boundaries . . . the NNS was able to extend his/her turn" (p. 13). Compared with the NSs' preference for relatively short turns, they conclude that this NNS strategy "is likely to be regarded as an inappropriate, uncooperative discourse strategy" (p. 13), a difficult generalization to demonstrate. Micheau and Billmyer do acknowledge, however, the research limitations of their findings, with only 6 NNS participants, and call for a follow-up longitudinal and ethnographic study of rules of speaking in different business contexts.

It is suggested in this study that specific linguistic research contextualized in the setting of negotiations has been limited, particularly as pertaining to relational issues. Several studies which argue, support, or extend this position have in fact noted that the role assumed by the researcher working within the linguistic tradition is perhaps less clearly defined in relation to negotiations. Wilson (1992), for instance, notes that studies of face have either been related to the social psychological dimension, which examines tactics threatening face, or linked to the domain of discourse, which analyzes how negotiators use lexical, syntactical, and pragmatic features to negotiate rights and obligations. He further points out that while much of the work on face is based on Brown and Levinson's (1987)

politeness theory, few studies have been conducted which apply some of their insights to the process of negotiations. Even Goffman's well-known early works (1963, 1967) on negotiations only summarily relates to the issue of face. He identifies two qualities of face, the first of which focuses on the potential discrediting of an identity which is desirable in the eyes of others, and the second on contextual identity. On this basis, he notes, for example, that negotiators may wish to be perceived as tough, fierce, or fair, depending on the situation.

One of the most prominent researchers who directly relates discourse issues and linguistic concerns to negotiations is Putnam (1982). Ten years after her initial research in conflict resolution strategies and labour management negotiation, Putnam and Roloff (1992) turn their joint attention to the specific role played by language in a negotiation:

In fact, negotiation and communication are inherently intertwined. Logically, negotiation cannot occur without some means of communication. Although negotiation theorists recognize this fact, surprisingly little research centers directly on the role of communication in bargaining. . . .
(Putnam and Roloff, 1992, p. 1)

Strategies used in negotiations, Putnam and Roloff maintain, are expressed through the use of such language as demands, threats, offers, compromise, conditions, and concessions. They assert that the fine-tuning of these strategies and the use of the language employed at the negotiating table are the major factors which guide and determine the outcome.

Putnam and Roloff directly point to earlier work from the 1960's and 1970's in such disciplines as psychology, political science, marketing, and industrial relations which focused on linguistic coding schemes to support their claim that linguistic concerns had previously been neglected in the research on negotiations:

These studies, even though they highlight significance of social interaction in negotiation, typically place communication in a secondary role to other interests, for example, levels of aspiration Moreover, the coding systems used to analyze interaction often fail to capture the subtle nuances. . . . (Putnam and Roloff, 1992, p. 6)

Thus the areas accorded priority had generally included power relationships, settlements, and international conflict to the exclusion of what Putnam and Roloff refer to as "communication in negotiations" (p. 3). Communication, they assert, includes multiple factors, such as "vocal overtones, information exchange, language, communication media, symbols and meaning" (p. 3).

Only in the 1990's, Putnam and Roloff maintain, were earlier issues replaced by a new focus on authentic language used in actual negotiations. This development shifted attention towards examination of regularities, sequences, and patterns in language so that essential features of negotiating interactions could be identified. Such features as turning points in negotiations, for example, might be noted by paying closer attention to word choice and conversational structures.

Putnam and Roloff suggest that a linguistically-oriented communications perspective on negotiations - one that includes looking at patterns of bargaining interactions, as well as the dynamics of negotiations which shape and influence the process - can add to the deepening of our understanding of negotiations. While they present an excellent design for promoting this perspective, this author believes that their aim is somewhat obscured by their inclusion of so many different elements under the rubric of "communication". This unfortunately causes their original aim of presenting negotiations from a fresh new perspective to get lost in their discussions.

The present study acknowledges the contribution Putnam and her partners have made to advancing linguistic studies of negotiations, and adapts their model by taking a more focused look at the usage of conversational features in negotiations, specifically an interruption contextualized within an interactional business negotiation, as presented in the following section.

4.5 Interruptions within the Framework of Negotiations

The widely-accepted definition of interruptions as based on the "single speakership code" (see Chapter 2 for a discussion of the definition of interruptions) has reinforced the notion of evaluating interruptions as a sign of aggressive volitional intent to take over the conversational turn or content:

Interruptions have traditionally been viewed as reliable and objective indicators of such personal and relational attributes as domineeringness and dominance. . . . Whether successful or not, it is the imputation of volitional intent - intent to disrupt, to take over the turnspace occupied by another, and to generally interfere with the projected form, content, and/or 'ownership' of what is said - which leads to the assumption that interruptions are interactional strategies for exerting and overtly displaying power or control over both the discourse and its participants. . . .
(Goldberg, 1990, p. 884)

Since, however, anthropologists and sociologists also write about cultures which value talking together or simultaneous talk, the notion that interruptions form an attempt to assert dominance, maintain control, or violate a speaker's rights can equally be considered to be culturally determined (Ulijin and Li, 1995). Consequently, for example, when negotiating with native English speakers, NNSs need to be aware of the no gap/no overlap custom prevalent amongst English speakers.

In this regard, Ulijn and Li (1995) examined speech overlaps and interruptive behaviour in negotiations conducted between Chinese, Finnish, and Dutch negotiators. Their preliminary findings indicate that the Chinese tended to interrupt as a matter of convention, while the Finns and Dutch attempted to accommodate the Chinese by being more interruptive than they would normally be. Ulijn and Li concluded that the perception of interruptions as impolite awaits further observations and demonstration. In examining the issue of whether interruptive behaviour is impolite, they report that Chinese and Italian interruptions might indicate "an offer to help or an eagerness to do business, neither of which is impolite" (Ulijn and Li, 1995, p. 621). Issues which Ulijn and Li propose for forthcoming research will test their provisional hypothesis that differences in overlaps exist between Chinese and Western cultures, the Chinese using interruptions in order to be "co-operative" (p. 621).

Although social scientists have put forward theoretical negotiating models, little attention has been given to the linguistic aspects of the interaction. These models have been reviewed by Julian (1990), who remarks that "linguistic investigation is a valuable key to the complexities of negotiation" (Julian, 1990, p. 59). In the light of this, she looks at the control of commissive speech acts such as threats, warnings, and promises, and their perceived potential for enhancing effect. According to Julian, threats are less useful than warnings, since "caving into threats may entail a degree of loss-of-face . . ." (p. 69). Aggressive talk may have the unwanted effect of creating "despair or fury" (p. 69) or an environment leading to a confrontational tone in the negotiations and the eventual breakdown of the process. Promises, on the other hand, may be perceived as a commitment designed "to make friends"

(p. 70). Julian suggests qualifications of conditionality as options to soften a negotiation and prevent the development of hostilities and confrontation.

In discussing the potential for conflict, Julian proposes that interruptions as a discourse strategy may lead to a potentially damaging effect on the outcome of a proposal, since they may disrupt the partners' interest in adding a final concession; such tagging would be halted by the interruption. Conflict in negotiations appears to make negotiators prone to "jump in with their version before the others have a chance to say what they were going to, a practice universally condemned" (p. 71). Julian suggests that the atmosphere of hostility, confrontation, and aggression in negotiations rests not just in the proposition of commissives but "in the way its pragmatic force is interpreted" (p. 71), and also promotes the systemization of what hearers interpret as threats and warnings. In fact, she concludes:

. . . the ability to moderate and control the pragmatic force of utterances seems from the literature surveyed to be the most valued linguistic skill for negotiators.
(Julian, 1990, p. 73)

The "chicken and egg" dilemma posed in analyzing the tone of a negotiation is also addressed by researchers (Barley, 1991, p. 181). It is difficult to neatly separate out the cultural and structural influences which shape and guide a negotiation because the structural differentiation gives rise to cultural differences which in turn reinforce cultural differentiation.

Examining interruptions in the light of politeness issues within a negotiation adds a further dimension to the common trend of viewing them on a conflict-theory model. Although temporal, personal, and conversational aspects of interruptions may all point to

important aspects of the feature, this study proposes that regarding the similarities shared by such conversational features as interruptions across cultural boundaries is more instructive in training international negotiators. As Brown and Levinson themselves point out, their central thesis:

attempts to show in considerable detail how certain precise parallels in language usage in many different languages can be shown to derive from certain assumptions about 'face' - individual's self-esteem. . . . If this account is even approximately along the right lines, we believe it has important implications for a number of issues and disciplines. . . . In the case of *sociolinguistics*, the theory argues for a shift in emphasis from the current preoccupation with speaker-identity, to a focus on dyadic patterns of verbal interaction as the expression of social relationships; and from an emphasis on the usage of linguistic forms, to an emphasis on the relation between form and complex inference. Further, interest in cultural detail, as in the ethnography of speaking, should be supplemented with attention to crosslinguistic generalizations. In the case of *linguistic pragmatics* a great deal of the mismatch between what is 'said' and what is 'implicated' can be attributed to politeness, so that concern with the 'representational functions' of language should be supplemented with attention to the 'social functions' of language, which seem to motivate much linguistic detail; applications of linguistics, whether to second language learner or to interethnic communication difficulties, need to pay proper attention to these essential 'social functions'.

(Brown and Levinson, 1987, pp. 2-3)

Interruptions can be seen to be related to politeness issues, in as much as they may be regarded as constituting face threatening acts. Since "face", as Brown and Levinson maintain, is "something which can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to in interaction" (1987, p. 61), it can play a central role in the negotiation setting.

In its further relation to the "positive" and "negative" aspects of politeness - expression of solidarity and expression of restraint - face directly links to modes of self-esteem and self-defence expressed by language functions in negotiating encounters.

Thus Tannen (1989), for example, posits a functional perspective on discourse in negotiations when she asserts that among certain populations, overlapping speech builds co-operation, demonstrates involvement and participation, and enhances rapport. As Schiffrin (1994) remarks in describing a functional approach to discourse analysis:

functions are not limited to tasks that can be accomplished by language alone; rather they can include such tasks as maintaining interaction or building social relationships. Thus functional analyses focus on how people use language to different ends.
(Schiffrin, 1994, p. 39)

Norms of language usage suggest that the context for interruptions may be determined by the style used by the speaker and can be specified in order to inform the NNSs (Gumperz, 1988). This notion has potentially interesting applications for preparing NNSs to be effective negotiators. When a NNS participates in a negotiation, some of the preparation might thus include recognition and understanding of roles and rules, including the right to speak and the right time to maintain silence, as well as inferences based on speaker usage.

Interruptions may therefore not only reflect a demonstration of power but also demonstrate solidarity, or even represent an essentially neutral act (Goldberg, 1990). Goldberg's distinction between interruptions as a display of relational power (face threatening), relational rapport (positive politeness), and non-relational 'neutrality' is of especial interest to the sociopragmatic negotiation setting, as presented in earlier chapters. NNS learners can specifically benefit from curricula which instruct them in ways to identify, interpret, and practice the appropriate act in order to produce a successful outcome to a negotiation.

In light of the emergence and development of ESP courses and the contributions made by practitioners and researchers, this study suggests that a specific contribution to syllabus and curriculum design may lie in directly looking at some of the conversational features impacting NS/NNS exchanges. Specifically, the study proposes that the findings presented in the following chapters might serve as a good point for bringing heightened awareness, understanding, and appreciation of the multiple layers of meaning communicated in a negotiating encounter. Moving in the direction of developing a model of how negotiation discourse works, the goal is to help the language learner confront the challenges posed by language usage at the international negotiating table. With this objective in mind, the following chapter sets forth the specifics of the study itself.

CHAPTER 5

THE STUDY

5.1 Introduction

As indicated in the previous chapters, this study is based on a number of interrelated sociolinguistic, ethnographic, and theoretical perspectives. Some of the issues raised by these approaches form the basis for the methodological decisions of the study. These include the justification of the students' reported self-perceptions as valid data for analysis, the use of an observer's checklist to validate or refute perceptual data, the complementary use of quantitative and qualitative analyses, the unavoidable use of simulations rather than authentic data, and a discourse analysis of one selected conversational feature.

The approach adopted by this study assumes that a valid and complementary connection exists between quantitative and qualitative analysis. As linguists, sociologists, anthropologists, and philosophers have noted for years, all research is influenced (to a greater or lesser degree) by the researcher's own approach. Both subjective and objective elements are therefore valid factors in research concerning human learning, interaction, and conduct.

Combining quantitative and qualitative perspectives can contribute to understanding the different aspects of the matter under investigation. As Allwright and Bailey (1991) suggest, value exists in studies which conjoin subjective and objective elements. Such investigations "quantify only what can be usefully quantified and . . . utilize qualitative data collection and analysis procedures whenever they are appropriate" (Allwright and Bailey, 1991, p. 68). This approach presents a compelling argument for combining the two methods while cautioning

that such a "marriage of approaches" should not develop as an overarching design on a wide scale.

This study follows the tradition which Schiffrin (1994) refers to as interactional sociolinguistics in order to shed light on the function of conversational features in international business encounters:

Despite the different sets of interests reviewed above there are two central issues underlying the work of Gumperz and Goffman that provide a unity to interactional sociolinguistics: the interaction between self and other, and content.

(Schiffrin, 1994, p. 105)

Schiffrin refers to Gumperz's focus on the importance of understanding a speaker's "intention and/or discourse strategy", and to Goffman's work on the organization of social life as a context for "the conduct of self and communication" (Schiffrin, p.105), while making a strong case for viewing language as "indexical to a social world". This study similarly uses an interactional model to support and demonstrate the claim that a subject's self-perception is a valid form of response which can be legitimately investigated, since language may be perceived as the window to a speaker's social world.

In light of the major differences in approaches to language research, namely qualitative or quantitative, this study maintains that the traditions of the British school of qualitative research and the American tendency towards quantification are not necessarily mutually exclusive. The question is asked whether these different approaches cannot be seen as representing two different but linked perspectives, given that the search for truth guides the research of both traditions. The question of whether "truth" is defined in terms of

objective reality or in terms of a subjective notion needs to be considered in defining the language research approach adopted.

Seliger and Shohany (1990) posit that "qualitative [research] . . . [is] concerned with providing descriptions of phenomena that occur naturally . . ." (p. 117). They maintain that qualitative research is not deductive, since few decisions regarding research questions are actually made before the research begins. Based on methodologies developed by anthropologists and sociologists, the goal of qualitative research is to present data from the perspective of the groups under observation in such a way as to minimize the biases of the researcher. Qualitative research methods do not necessarily control for variables but do adopt rigorous methods for data collection and analysis, producing results not generally possible through experimental design. The specific goal of qualitative research is thus:

. . . to discover phenomena such as patterns of second language behavior not previously described and to understand those phenomena from the perspective of participants in the activity.
(Seliger and Shohany, 1990, p. 120)

As in most discussions of dichotomies, terminology such as qualitative or quantitative tends to oversimplify the issues involved. This study endeavours to combine elements from both research approaches in order to provide a complementary research design.

The autumn 1992 edition of the *TESOL Quarterly* presented an interesting discussion of validity and reliability in second language research and general issues related to qualitative and quantitative research. In their contribution, Johnson and Saville-Troike (1992, p. 602) maintain that while their own research tended to be qualitative in nature, "potential utility of

auxiliary quantitative procedures in achieving these standards" does exist. They further strengthen this claim by suggesting that neither quantitative nor qualitative research can assure the absoluteness of validity, stating rather that "a high level of validity is a goal to strive for" (Johnson and Saville-Troike, 1992, p. 603). They conclude that potential strengths and deficiencies exist in the use of both research approaches, but that the ultimate commitment should always be to "research of quality".

As Fasold (1987) has pointed out in his discussion on statistical procedures, although quantified research in sociolinguistics leads to conclusions based only on numbers, the use of statistics does enable the researcher to draw conclusions concerning significant distinctions between two populations based on the testing of hypotheses.

Brown (1991) indicates that EFL/ESL teachers who currently avoid statistical studies on language learning might better serve their needs and the needs of their students by understanding the language of statistical studies. He suggests that practitioners use what he calls "attack strategies" to help them understand and apply statistical information to language studies. The five attack strategies which he advocates include using the abstract to determine whether the information is pertinent to the teacher's needs; examining the structure and organization of the report; understanding the statistical approach through such ideas as key concepts; and evaluating the information in light of developing familiarity with statistics and research design. He begins by asserting that it is important to accept:

. . . statistical language studies for what they are: legitimate investigations into phenomena in human language learning/teaching which include the use . . . of numbers as part of their argument.
(Brown, 1991, p. 569)

In their introduction to second-language research methods, Seliger and Shohany (1990) refer to the rather unlikely source of Agatha Christie's *Death on the Nile* (1938) in underscoring the importance attached to the starting point chosen for research studies. They describe how some people:

conceive a theory and everything has to fit into that theory. If one little fact does not fit it, they throw it aside. But it is always the facts that will not fit in that are significant.

(Seliger and Shohany, 1990, p. 5)

In the light of the debate between quantitative and qualitative methods, this study adopts the position that something valuable may be gained by examining the spoken discourse of negotiations using methods and procedures from both research perspectives. In applying quantitative research procedures together with interpretive, evaluative discussions, an effort was made to conduct what Brown (1991) refers to as a legitimate investigation into phenomena in spoken discourse.

The combined use of the complementary perspectives may serve research interests in presenting data on learning tools and experiences. The quantitative analysis of the students' self-perceptions of their performance in the encounters compared with the findings of the observer's checklist can provide statistics for future research in an area where empirical data has up until now been relatively scarce. This analysis can also serve the interests of teachers and practitioners in its presentation of the students' responses as a learning experience. By looking at the subjects' attitudes towards their performance and how they described it, the study also examines the value placed by the population on appropriate training for a particular event.

The two analyses presented are therefore to be regarded as complementary rather than comparative. They are not intended to be compared as more or less adequate instruments for analyzing the data, but are used conjunctively in order to further both research aims and practicing goals. Furthermore, the complementary aspects specifically refer to the data collected and analyzed by means of the observer's checklist (see Chapter 6) - a quantitative investigation - and the qualitative discourse presented in Chapter 7.

The study examines NS/NNS spoken discourse in order to draw practical and theoretical conclusions regarding conversational phenomena in business negotiations. The native and non-native speakers' reported self-perceptions of their utilization of conversational phenomena during the various phases of negotiations is examined in terms of the five selected features reviewed in previous chapters: interruptions, paraphrases, repetitions, self repairs, and subject openers. This analysis is examined and compared with data from the observer's checklist.

It is proposed that an examination of authentic spoken discourse within the sociolinguistic and interdisciplinary framework set out in the preceding chapters may increase our understanding and appreciation of the complex dynamics of negotiations. The negotiating process by definition contains predetermined goals and objectives. As Bercovitch (1991) suggests, the final outcomes are neither predetermined nor random but are the result of a process of information exchange, social influences, learning, mutual adjustment, and joint decision making. Spoken discourse analysis, as we have indicated in previous chapters, forms a significant tool in this process.

The starting point of this study is therefore the assumption that by the act of participating in a negotiation, the non-native speaker implicitly acknowledges an ability to negotiate. The failure or success of a negotiation is taken to relate to capacity to confront and transcend potential barriers to communication, in contrast to a focus on formal language competence and business acumen. In other words, the functional aspects of the negotiations themselves serve as a useful beginning which allows the non-native speaker the right and privilege to participate, in spite of the commonly-held belief that the non-native speaker is linguistically disadvantaged in conducting business negotiations in English with a native English-speaker.

5.2 Methodology

5.2.1 Subjects

The practical decision for the selection of the five features, namely the fact that these specific features appeared particularly troublesome to students, was discussed in the Introduction. It was not unusual for students to ask the teacher, for example, if interrupting a speaker was considered rude or acceptable since in high speaker/listener involvement societies such as Israel, constant interrupting behaviour was perceived as a positive sign - a bond of solidarity on the model proposed by Tannen and Schiffrin. The selection for these five features is based on the rationale discussed in Chapter 2, namely that such features are illustrative of conversational phenomena closely associated with discussions on conflict resolution (Putnam and Jones, 1982), management of negotiations (Bercovitch, 1991), and relationship building within a conflict setting (Tannen, 1989; Schiffrin, 1994).

The sample for this study was composed of 60 subjects: 30 NNSs and 30 NSs. Thirty negotiations were observed, in each of which two subjects took part. Among them, 15 of the NNSs and NSs were the "buyers" and 15 of the NNSs and NSs were the "sellers". Since gender issues were not examined in this study no attempt was made to control this variable in the selection of subjects. Out of the 15 NNS buyers, 6 were females and 9 were males; out of the 15 NNS, sellers 5 were females and 10 were males. Out of the 15 NS buyers, 14 were females and 1 was male; out of the 15 NS sellers, 10 were females and 5 were males.

	BUYER		SELLER	
	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE
NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS	6	9	5	10
NATIVE SPEAKERS	14	1	10	5

Table 1.1 $N = 30$

The planned, organized, and systematic investigation of conversational phenomena in a simulated negotiation setting took place over a one-year period from the Spring of 1992 to the Spring of 1993. Settings included banks, multi-national corporations, private and public organizations, professional associations, and governmental institutions, including hospitals and service authorities. To protect the confidentiality and security of the individual institute, the setting and participants were coded. The following partial list of settings demonstrates the depth and breadth of this study, although the aim is not to single out any particular organization as a model or sample.

Among the settings were:

- * The Israel Bar Association
- * The Bank of Israel
- * Motorola Inc.
- * The Israel Lands Authority
- * The Jewish Agency
- * The Israel Postal Authority, Ministry of Communications
- * The Tax Administration Authority, Ministry of Finance
- * Hadera Public Hospital, Ministry of Health
- * Teva Pharmaceuticals
- * News Datacom
- * Rosh Intelligence Systems

The institutions represent a representative cross-section of public and private institutions in the State of Israel, and in no instance was any company or organization excluded or included due to factors of location, role within the country, status, profitability, size of staff, or work functions.

Simulations were conducted in Jerusalem, Be'er Sheva, Tel Aviv, and Hadera, industrialized growth centres representative of the demographic distribution within Israel and containing both urban and rural populations. Classes were held in morning, afternoon, and evening sessions within the work settings, and conducted in conference rooms, teaching centers, and available offices. Classrooms were typical of a standard classroom environment, with desks and chairs, proper lighting and ventilation, as well as teaching aids.

Permission to record was granted by the students, who were associates of the organizations and companies. Participants were told they were participating in a research project designed to shed light on the language acquisition process, particularly as it pertained to their role as potential negotiators representing their particular organizations.

Students were enrolled in courses designed to improve their English language skills offered by the Ringler English Language Institute. Participants had achieved a high intermediate to advanced level, according to the criteria governing eligibility for these courses, which include placement and assessment tests. Group size varied from five to ten participants, and the age range was from the late twenties to the early sixties. Company rank, status in class, and comparative global English fluency within the class setting were excluded as factors in this study. Participants volunteered for the project.

The Hebrew-speaking NNSs in fact came from various language-speaking backgrounds, including Romanian, French, Russian, Arabic, German, and Spanish. A questionnaire indicating age, educational background, gender, and years of residency in the country was completed by both native and non-native speakers, and an explanation of the simulation was presented to each participant, as will be discussed in the next section.

The participating teachers were native English-speakers from the United States, England, Australia, and South Africa, university-trained teachers of English as a Second Language with no exceptional formal training in business or commerce. They thus represent a reasonably homogeneous teacher population in terms of training and education, and possess a high level of language adaptability. Their average residency in Israel was nine years. They are employed as citizens of the State, and work alongside native Israelis in occupational settings. Their interactions with the native Israeli population would be no greater or less had they been Israeli-born. Thus their rapport with the population under study was not influenced by the contacts in either a work or social setting.

The average age of the NNSs was 38 and that of the NSs 43. The average years of education among the NNSs was 16.0, compared with nearly the same average, 16.76, among the NS population.

The population sampled represents the population of the Institute in age, gender, educational background, and native tongue. To achieve this representativeness, larger sampling from the pool of potential subjects, i.e., enrollees in the language courses offered by the Institute, was also implemented. Thirty subjects participated in the study selected from the enrolment at any given time of between 500 and 750.

A feasibility study was conducted during the preliminary stages of the project, feasibility being determined according to the following questions:

- * Can the conversational features under investigation be quantifiably documented?
- * Are available samples representative of a global population of students and teachers?
- * What research tools are suitable?
- * What logistic and practical problems can be anticipated and how can they be overcome?

Consideration of these issues is presented in the discussions below.

5.2.2 Data Collection

The data collected consists of spoken discourse from simulated negotiations between business people and EFL teachers. Fundamental questions posed by the research were presented in pre- and post-questionnaires relating to how the conversational feature variables varied according to their reported self-perceptions across the NNS and NS populations under

study and their quantification. The instruments used for the study were the pre- and post-questionnaires and the observer's checklist, copies of which appear in Appendices B-G.

A simulation was set up which might parallel situational requirements in the real world of business in Israel. The method of simulated encounters was chosen in light of issues of confidentiality, security, and availability of data and due to the impossibility of controlling such variables as topic and timing when the study is conducted in a natural and authentic setting. The study thus lies in the tradition of experimental paradigms rather than ethnographic models regarding methodological decision-making. The sale and purchase of a product - a computer - was selected, since almost every company has access to or owns a computer. An agent would be likely to come to Israel to examine the possibilities of purchasing a computer, or a high-tech company abroad would normally come to Israel to sell such a product. Both scenarios are possible, given the current economic trends in the country. A real-life event which required no prior knowledge of a specialized area of business was thus set up for a negotiation.

Data collection took place in real time, i.e., during scheduled classes, rather than at a different appointed time and place in order to provide additional motivation for the students. Researchers in the field of language acquisition (Hatch, 1992; Lazaraton, 1991) claim that not only should data collection experts allow the subject to give their best performance, but also that such performances can serve as motivational factors, adding greater validity to the findings.

Fiksdal (1986), in her study of cross-cultural gatekeeping interviews, suggests that by choosing events in which partners - in her case, interviewers and students - have a great

deal of pre-existing obligations towards each other, their level of response would be higher in spite of the researcher's presence. It is assumed that reliability is thereby strengthened, since real-life negotiations may tend to be as anxiety producing as one could claim an observation might be. The research environment in this study thus appears to be suitable ground for recording and collection of the data.

While the size of the subject population in studies of language acquisition may not always be a relevant factor (Seliger and Shohany, 1990), thirty encounters appear to meet the criteria of population randomness, convenience of sampling, and adequate population representativeness, within the bounds of practical constraints.

Video equipment was not used since it was unavailable in most of the settings. Most companies - whether public or private - do not own such high-tech equipment, nor do they have access to equipment to support its function. While a developed country in many aspects of its economic, industrial, social, and political growth, Israel is not sufficiently technologically advanced for video equipment to be standard in training programmes. Given the highly intrusive nature of a video system, especially to a population unaccustomed to its presence, no video camera was used in this study. While this may be considered a shortcoming regarding a more balanced picture of a negotiation and role play, the strengths of video data appeared to be outweighed by the shortcomings of introducing an intrusive and possibly inhibiting and intimidating instrument. Seliger and Shohany (1990) go a step further in this respect, in declaring that use of a video camera in a classroom may directly alter the behaviour of both teacher and student:

Video tapes provide more elaborate data, although they are also dependent on the capability of the camera and what it focuses on; they may also be even more intrusive than audio tapes.
(Seliger and Shohany, 1990, p. 165)

By its very nature, data collection creates some effect on the data itself. Unfortunately, as in the case of business negotiations, the data was collected under conditions of simulation, limiting the reliability of the study. Given this limitation, however, efforts were made to enhance its reliability. Language researchers such as Hatch and Lazaraton (1991) and Saville-Troike (1989) comment on the effect of what in research is called the observer's paradox: ". . . so called because the observer cannot observe what would have happened if he or she had not been present . . ." (Saville-Troike, 1989, p. 113).

Steps taken to minimize this effect and to increase reliability included reliability checks of the audio recordings by a native speaker, sufficiently large population samples, accuracy and consistency in data collection procedures, and formalized data collection tools. In addition, the decision to conduct the study during class time and in the classroom setting served to mitigate the problem of the "observer's paradox". The validity of the data and the data collection system were checked by means of initial piloting of the questionnaires and revisions. Evidence of reliability was obtained by an item analysis in the questionnaires. In addition, giving clear directions and checking for comprehension appeared to increase the validity of the results of the simulation.

Five targeted conversational features were defined for this study, and one of them for the qualitative analysis. The five features were:

interruptions

repetitions

opening up subjects

self repairs

paraphrases

Each of the five features had to meet two specific statistical criteria. The first criterion was quantifiability, meaning the ability to numerically count or quantify the occurrence of a variable. Participants selected responses by choosing from a rank scale which indicated their self-perceptions of how often a variable was used. The responses were numerically coded and the arithmetic codes were tallied on the computer.

The second criterion was operationability. An operational definition is an equation which "describes how a variable will be measured" (Kerlinger, 1966, p. 34). Each variable was operationally defined by listing characteristics typical of the feature and eliciting a numerical response from the subject. While many possibilities of rank selection clearly exist for a variable, the frequently-to-never scale appeared to provide a general base of discrimination. Although according to Kerlinger (1966), "no operational definition can ever express all of a variable" (p. 35), an operational definition is important not only because it enables the researcher to measure the variables but also because operational definitions are "bridges between the theory-hypothesis construct level and the level of observation" (p. 35).

5.2.3 Negotiation Simulation

The researcher began the data collection phase by posing the following question: How many people in this room own a computer? A positive response was given, and the stage was set as the topic interested and was familiar to the class members. Students and teachers self-selected as either supplier or customer. The two populations had contact in the classroom before the simulation; however, their roles as teacher and student were well-defined and different from the positions as buyers or sellers which they assumed during the negotiation. Each subject was asked to read a brief explanation of the negotiation simulation (Appendix A). They were then given the negotiation simulation customer role play (Appendix B) or supplier (Appendix C), depending on which role they had selected. The pre-negotiation targets were designed by the researcher and included: delivery time, warranty period, penalty clause, delivery and installation, credit period, and price.

The negotiating partners were asked to be seated at a table at a 90-degree angle, with the tape-recorder placed in an unobtrusive location. The remaining class members, none of whom were participants in past or future simulations, were asked to pay attention to the content, rather than to the grammatical structure of the negotiations. This comment was intended to distract the partners from the focus of the study and help encourage a more natural and flowing interaction. If the students perceived an evaluative aspect regarding their fluency in English in the simulation, they might be less spontaneous and more intimidated by the threat of the possible judgment of their performance. Only one recording was made in each class. After reading the negotiation simulation, the researcher asked each participant to complete the pre-negotiation questionnaire (Appendix D). On rare occasions, the

researcher was asked to clarify some of the questions, and this information was provided. The recorder, which was shown to the partners before they read the simulation, was then activated.

No time limits were set, although in the best interests of the non-participants it was suggested that the negotiation be completed before the end of the academic teaching session. After data collection, the planned lesson continued, although some discussion did follow this phase.

5.3 Perceptions of Data

The following discussions are informed by an examination of the data related to the subjects' reported self-perception of their usage of the features through the research instruments - the pre-negotiation and post-negotiation questionnaires.

5.3.1 Pre-negotiation Questionnaire

The pre-negotiation questionnaire was the research instrument used to quantify the subjects' self-perceptions of their performance. It was composed of 5 identical questions, reversed to address both NS and NNS participants. The first question related to the participant's reported self-perception of his/her use of conversational features in English, specifying repetitions, opening up subjects, paraphrasing, self repairs, and interruptions. The second question related to the participant's self-perception of English language proficiency in the negotiating setting. The third question, the only one explicitly differentiated between NSs and NNSs, referred to the participant's self-perception of his/her awareness of language

difference (NNS) and of a non-native English partner (NS). The fourth question asked the participant to evaluate his/her language proficiency for negotiating purposes, while the last asked the participant to evaluate his/her success in the actual negotiation.

Both the pre- and post-negotiation questionnaires were piloted in classes which did not participate in the study and were subject to minor modifications. Lexis, syntax, and presentation of text were modified after the initial piloting. In addition, consideration was given to translating the questionnaires into Hebrew. However, as noted, not all non-native speakers of English were native Hebrew-speakers. As translation might have given the native Hebrew-speaker an unfair advantage, English was used for the questionnaires. English is also the target language of the courses, giving an additional reason for using it in the questionnaire.

The interests of the study were thought to be best served through eliciting responses to the questionnaires at the data collection stage, since, as noted by Hatch and Lazaraton (1991), the longer and more complicated the questionnaire, the less chance of return exists. In fact, this procedure ensured 100% return of data. After several revisions, both the pre- and post-negotiation questionnaires most suitable for collection of data were selected.

In order to quantify the variables from the questionnaire a scale was set up and numbers assigned as codes. According to Hatch and Lazaraton (1991), "Most researchers who use scales prefer to use a 5-point The wider range encourages respondents to show greater discrimination in their judgements" (p. 57). The numbers in both the pre- and post-questionnaires were based on this Likert-type scale, 5 representing most frequent or maximum presence of a variable and 1 the complete absence of a variable. The numbers thus

act as codes to represent levels of the variable. A strength in using a Likert-type scale lies in the fact that the scales have ordinal arithmetic value. During the data analysis stage, a frequency tally was performed on both questionnaires. The results are presented in the following chapter.

A limitation of using scales in measurement is that their value is imprecise. Measurement orders responses relative to one another in order to demonstrate rank or strength. Nor are the points on the Likert-type scale of equal intervals. In addition, a rating error identified as the 'halo effect' may threaten the validity of the rating scale. The halo effect is the tendency to rate an object in the direction of a general impression. The rating of one characteristic tends to influence the ratings of other characteristics (Kerlinger, 1966, pp. 516-517). According to Kerlinger, "Halo is extremely difficult to avoid" (p. 517). While avoidance may be difficult, researchers such as Kerlinger and Hatch suggest that the halo effect is particularly strong in traits not clearly defined. The pre- and post- questionnaires used in this study specify the conversational features by statement and example. In this way, an effort is made to minimize the halo effect.

Given these limitations, this scale was adopted for the pre- and post-negotiation questionnaires in light of the following considerations. Israelis seldom participate in data collection as part of their daily work, nor are such surveys conducted with the same degree of frequency as in Western countries - the United States or England, for example. Since these research instruments are unfamiliar to the NNS population but more familiar to the NS population, the researcher attempted to simplify the instrument. In addition, each item was

presented in a direct way in order to minimize any misunderstandings due to language barriers.

5.3.2 Post-negotiation Questionnaire

The post-negotiation questionnaire (Appendix F) was completed after the simulation. A personal profile was filled out, and the participant was asked the same questions as in the pre-negotiation questionnaire in direct response to the simulated negotiating encounter.

The justification for the design of this questionnaire applied to the pre-negotiation questionnaire since the items were the same, except for the information obtained in the personal profile. The profile data was added to the analysis in order to obtain information of interest and was analyzed in terms of the population under study.

5.4 Observer's Data

The data which will be examined in Chapter 6 is based on a quantitative analysis of the subjects' reported self-perceptions of their prediction and performance of the five features. A full discussion of both perceptual data and actual occurrences will be developed in Chapter 6. The observer's checklist described in the following section is a tool which was designed to verify or refute the perceptual data and is intended to add a complementary perspective to the quantitative analysis. Both kinds of data, thus, are regarded as equally useful, valid, and complementary in the endeavour to reach a better understanding of how negotiations proceed.

5.4.1 Observer's Checklist

An instrument used for the analysis of the features was the observer's checklist (Appendix G). The checklist was composed of conversational categories. It initially comprised 12 categories, including back channels and placeholder; code switching; repetition; turn taking initiatives; paraphrasing; self repairs; change of register; closings; acknowledgment of agreement; signalling of hesitation; interruptions; and direct statement of a successful outcome. It was subsequently modified to focus on the five features selected for analysis and the explicit statement regarding success.

These features were regarded as a reasonable representative sample because they represent interactional variables generally accepted in the literature as potentially interesting features of negotiation discourse. A code (A-D) was provided which identified the participant's role as NNS in N1 role, NNS in N2 role, NS in N1 role, and NS in N2 role. NNS in N1 role refers to the non-native speaker in the role as seller, NNS in N2 role refers to the non-native speaker in the role as buyer. The NS in N1 role refers to the native speaker in the role as seller and NS in N2 role refers to the speaker in the role as buyer. The checklist is based on the tapescripts of the recordings. The quantified data obtained from the observer's checklist was used as a starting point for the development of the qualitative analysis, as discussed in Chapter 7. In addition, a discussion is presented in Chapter 6 in which the perceptual data is compared with their actual occurrences.

The data from the observer's checklist was tabulated and analyzed by the researcher by playing back the audio recording at a separate time and place, following each encounter. Each encounter was independently analyzed. At no time was the analysis conducted during

the encounter itself, as this might have been perceived by the subjects as intrusive and/or offensive.

Data from the observer's checklist was ordered and ranked according to relative number of occurrences, and is presented in detail in 6.3. The researcher used the observer's checklist to identify and quantify each conversational feature identified in the study. The tally was confirmed by a native speaker, and ambiguous cases were discussed. The researcher and additional native speaker agreed on the correct tally. Categories were established for each variable and the number of times every subject used a specific variable in each category was quantified. The specific categories are provided in the presentation of the results for each variable in Tables 5.1-5.6, pages 164-69.

Cut-off points were set up according to the frequency in each category. The categories included in the observer's checklist were set up according to the number of times the particular variable was identified in the authentic tape, as described above. A range from 0 to the highest numbers actually noted on the checklist was established. The text of each simulation was then transcribed; six tapescripts are presented in Appendix H. Using both an audio and a written text, the results were rechecked by a native speaker trained to identify each of the features.

The two research questions under investigation in this study were, firstly, what quantifiable differences, if any, existed between the two populations under investigation in their expression of the five selected conversational features, and, secondly, what effect, if any, the particular feature interruption had on the outcome of a negotiation.

The choice of methodology adopted in this study can be seen to derive from some of the issues raised by the theoretical, sociolinguistic, and ethnographic perspectives upon which it draws. These factors directly influenced the methodological decision-making of the study in three main areas:

- a.) The subjective nature of the participants' reported self-perceptions of prediction and performance is recognized, although such self-perceptions do provide data regarding NNS and NS language awareness, a topic of interest in language research not explored at depth in this study. The study is cognizant of the limitation posed by this fact throughout. At the same time, these self-perceptions are presented as quantitative data which are statistically analyzed by the questionnaire instrument and compared with the results of the observer's checklist. The study features a qualitative analysis of the conversational phenomenon of interruption in the context of cultural, phasal, interpersonal, relational, and pragmatic issues related to negotiations.
- b.) The complementary use of quantitative and qualitative analyses is based on consideration of the value both of the perspective given by the specified partners and by interpretive and evaluative discussions of the data, notably the observer's checklist. It is proposed that the study may gain usefulness in providing data for theoretical research, where

such data is relatively scarce. On the practical side, it may yield information and insights which could assist teachers to more effectively train potential international negotiators. The qualitative discourse analysis will be presented in Chapter 7, where it is developed within the tradition of interactional sociolinguistics.

c.) The unavoidable use of simulated encounters in place of real-life settings was based on the value placed on the confidentiality, security and availability of data, although it might be noted that simulations may allow for better control of the variables, despite their limitation as non-authentic data. The study therefore represents a more experimental paradigm than an ethnographic model.

CHAPTER 6

QUANTITATIVE ANALYSES - RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

6.1 Introduction

The research questions were, firstly, what quantifiable differences, if any, existed between the two populations under investigation in their perceptions of the expression of the five selected conversational features, and, secondly, what effect, if any, the particular feature interruption had on the outcome of a negotiation. The second question will be taken up in Chapter 7. The expectation that differences did exist between NSs and NNSs was reasonable, given earlier extensive writing and research which highlighted, emphasized, and described such linguistic differences across domains (Fiksdal, 1986; Lampi, 1986; Neu, 1986; Brown and Levinson, 1987; Almulla, 1988; Murray, 1988; Ervin-Tripp, 1989; Fisher, 1989; Goldberg, 1990; Lim, 1991; Hawkins, 1991; Scott, 1991; Shahar and Kurz, 1995).

This study is explanatory in focus and approach. It examines the variables in a particular business context and frames the findings within a discourse analysis tradition. The study was set up to explore the subjects' perceptions and to indicate how far, if at all, perceived differences might be validated. Another level of examination is provided through an investigation and comparison of the variables as confirmed by the observer's checklist. The quantitative analyses of the subjects' perceptions and actual usage as documented by the observer's checklist are discussed in detail in this chapter.

The aim of the research was to examine the five features using both quantitative and qualitative analytical tools. This method was intended to increase an understanding and

appreciation of the role which the features may play in the discourse of negotiations. Such a comprehension may lead to greater insights into how interlocutors negotiate meanings, reach decisions, and create an atmosphere conducive to a successful outcome.

In the earlier chapters, issues regarding the development, implementation, and evaluation of the effectiveness of English for Special Purposes courses were examined in light of teachers' interest in and commitment towards providing a meaningful framework for training future negotiators. Williams (1988) and other writers (Wardell, 1987; Nunan, 1990; Jones, 1990; Gorman, 1992) describe the current situation regarding curriculum development as somewhat lacking in meaningful and authentic teaching aids. Williams' observations concerning the relevance of business textbooks to the teaching situation is outlined in detail in Chapter 2.

Relatively limited empirical data exists which might assist the teacher who is training students to become articulate, effective, and successful negotiations in today's "global village" training environment. Research which might indicate differences or similarities between the NS/NNS population, as expressed by the perceived use of specific conversational features, may contribute to the training methods of the practitioner. If NNS students were better able to predict the expression of conversational features within an international negotiating setting, and the prediction was based on research data which examines the usage of the features in both populations, the NNSs would be in a stronger negotiating position. Understanding differences and similarities across both populations would serve the interests of the practitioner in search of methods, strategies, and approaches used in the classroom, a situation which would in turn benefit the student.

The results of the findings of this study in relation to the perceptions of NSs/NNSs as noted in the pre- and post-negotiation questionnaires and the observer's checklist may enable both students and teachers to predict and evaluate the expression of features with greater accuracy. Similarly, more accurate predictions may lead to greater awareness of the dynamics of the negotiating encounter, thus encouraging those NNSs engaged in the process to become more able negotiators.

The reason for the comparisons of the five features thus relates to the practical considerations of learning more about a process which might contribute to the development of effective training methods. As Bygate (1988) notes:

The use of formulaic expressions, hesitation devices, self-correction, rephrasing and repetition can also be expected to help learners become more fluent.
(Bygate, 1988, p. 20).

The results of the study reported refer to the following data-collection instruments:

- A Pre-negotiation Questionnaires
 - A-1 Native - Appendix D
 - A-2 Non-Native - Appendix E
- B Post-negotiation Questionnaire - Appendix F

The questionnaires A-1 and A-2 specify the five conversational features embedded in the questions. It might be noted that although the parenthetical references to the feature are provided for clarification for the reader, they were not included in the questionnaires distributed to the respondents. The observer's checklist (found in Appendix G) will function as a point of reference in this chapter.

The hypothesis under examination was that a statistically-significant difference obtains between the profiles of the NNSs and the NSs regarding the frequency distribution of each isolated and identified variable. The null hypothesis, that no statistically-significant differences obtains between NSs and NNSs results on each variable, would be accepted if any p value was greater than 0.05. This means that the social science convention of 5% level could be used. The chi square test was applied.

6.2 Analysis of Perceptions: the Five Conversational Features

6.2.1 Prediction

The first questionnaire analyzed is the pre-negotiation questionnaire. The results relating to the repetition variable are presented in Table 2.1. Note that for the following tables, values 4 and 5 are grouped together as "high" and similarly 1 and 2 are grouped as "low". The reason for this is to facilitate operation of the chi-square test, one of whose requirements is that very few cells should have low scores. Technically, the "expected value" (EF) in each cell should not be lower than 5 in more than 20% of the cells. By grouping, the small numbers of subjects who reported frequent use of repetition at positions 4 or 5 on the scale in Appendix D are presented together, reducing this problem to an acceptable minimum: the sixty informants are presented in six cells, giving a likely distribution of expected values around 10 per cell.

	NS	NNS
High (4, 5)	5 (16.7%)	5 (16.7%)
Medium (3)	17 (56.7%)	14 (46.7%)
Low (1, 2)	8 (26.7%)	11 (36.7%)

Table 2.1 *Expectations of the use of repetitions in the pre-negotiation stage. N= 30 for each group*

The participants in general reported that they expected to use the variable repetition during the negotiation. As noted in Table 2.1, there was a range of expectations in both groups, although in each case about half were centred on the middle category. The differences between the NSs and NNSs did not reach statistical significance (chi square = 0.764, $p= 0.682$), although the data suggested slightly greater prediction among the NNSs that they would use little or no repetition.

The results of the variable opening up new subjects in the pre-negotiation questionnaire are given in Table 2.2.

	NS	NNS
High (4, 5)	3 (10.3%)	11 (36.7%)
Medium (3)	10 (34.5%)	12 (40%)
Low (1, 2)	16 (55.2%)	7 (23.3%)

Table 2.2 *Expectations of the use of subject openings in the pre-negotiation stage. N=30 for NS, N=29 for NNS*

It was somewhat surprising to note that nearly 90% of the NSs believed that they would occasionally-to-never open up new subjects, compared with 60% of the NNSs who believed that they would occasionally or seldom open up new subjects. The difference between the two groups reached statistical significance (chi square = 8.26, $p = 0.016$). In both groups, about 30% were concentrated in the middle, suggesting that both groups shared a greater belief that they would occasionally open up new subjects. Approximately 40% of the NNSs expected to open up new subjects, compared with nearly 60% of the NSs who predicted a low rate of opening up new subjects. Given that one would expect more self-confidence in using language to introduce new subjects among the NSs, it would have been expected that the reverse would have been the case, with a higher level of prediction among the NSs that they would be more aggressive in opening up new subjects. Whether or not this trend indicates an intentional strategy on the part of the NS negotiators would be difficult to ascertain, although the data do show a statistical difference.

The third variable examined was paraphrases. The predictions during the pre-negotiation phase of the negotiations among the population under study are shown in Table 2.3.

	NS	NNS
High (4,5)	21 (70%)	15 (51.7%)
Medium (3)	6 (20%)	9 (31%)
Low (1, 2)	3 (10%)	5 (17.2%)

Table 2.3 *Expectation of the use of paraphrases in the pre-negotiation stage. N=30 for NS, N=29 for NNS*

The participants in general reported that they expected to use paraphrase more often than not at all during the negotiation, with the highest concentration - nearly 3/4 - among the NSs, compared with slightly more than half of the NNSs expecting to paraphrase more often than occasionally. Few in both groups indicated a low usage of paraphrase. The expressed difference between NSs and NNSs was not statistically significant (chi square = 2.84, $p = 0.35$). The groups were remarkably similar in their belief that they would paraphrase during the negotiation at an medium-to-high predicted rate.

The findings for the self repairs variable are presented in Table 2.4.

	NS	NNS
High (4, 5)	7 (23.3%)	13 (44.8%)
Medium (3)	9 (30%)	8 (27.6%)
Low (1, 2)	14 (46.7%)	8 (27.6%)

Table 2.4 *Expectations of the use of self repairs in the pre-negotiation stage. N=30 for NS, N=29 for NNS*

Although the data suggest that the difference did not reach statistical significance (chi square = 3.47, $p = 0.17$), there appeared to be a trend in the opposite direction between the two groups. The NNS population believed that they would self repair more frequently (nearly 50%) than the NSs, who expected a low rate (nearly 50%) of self repair. This trend is not surprising given that it would be expected that the NNSs would predict a greater need to self correct, while the NSs would assume that native-level fluency would suggest little need for self repair. It was somewhat surprising that in spite of native-level fluency, nearly 10% of the NSs indicated that they would predict self repair (at a rather high rate) during the negotiation. The opposite trend among the NNSs was equally surprising, with a little over 25% of the NNSs suggesting that self repair would occur only occasionally during the negotiation. One would have expected the NNSs to predict a higher self repair rate than indicated, although as noted in the study, the self-described NNS negotiator would be possessed of greater confidence in negotiating than among any given non-business-oriented NNS population. This trend supports the notion of a NNS negotiator profile, described in Chapter 4 as a person inclined towards exhibiting such characteristics as self-confidence and self-assurance (Fisher, 1989; Redding, 1991). Thus the results may be more generalizable to a NNS negotiator profile than to a NNS general population.

The results for the interruption variable are given in Table 2.5.

	NS	NNS
High (4, 5)	2 (6.7%)	5 (16.7%)
Medium (3)	9 (30%)	8 (26.7%)
Low (1, 2)	19 (63.3%)	17 (56.7%)

Table 2.5 *Expectations of the use of interruptions in the pre-negotiation stage. N= 30 for each group.*

In general, both groups of participants reported that they expected a low rate of interruptions during the negotiations. Table 2.5 shows that there was a range of expectations in both groups, although in each case over half centred on the low category. The 10% difference between the two groups in the high category was the greatest difference between the two groups. The two groups displayed remarkable similarity in expectations regarding interruptions, achieving no statistical significance (chi square 1.45, $p = 0.48$). The hypothesis that significant differences in terms of the subjects' predictions of their use of interruptions would be displayed was therefore not supported by the data, a surprising finding which is examined from a qualitative perspective in the subsequent chapter. Although the statistical differences were not significant, the type, expression, and display of interruptions varied among both populations.

The results relating to attitude towards task are shown in Table 2.6.

	NS	NNS
Much more confident (A)	11 (36.7%)	3 (10.00%)
More confident (B)	14 (46.7%)	1 (3.3%)
Less confident (C)	2 (6.7%)	19 (63.3%)
Much less confident (D)	1 (3.3%)	6 (20.0%)
No difference	2 (6.7%)	1 (3.3%)

Table 2.6 *Expectations of attitude towards task in the pre-negotiation stage. N=30 for each group.*

In nearly every category (with the exception of the category of no difference) the expectation of the level of confidence between the two groups was dissimilar, reaching statistical significance (chi square = 33.50, $p = 0.001$). Note that 10% of the cells did not reach an EF of 5, which means that the results, although interesting, must be treated with caution. The NSs expressed a high rate of confidence in negotiating, with over 80% of the participants predicting "much more" to "more confident" as compared with over 80% of the NNSs believing that they would feel "much less" to "less confident" in negotiating with a NS. The finding is somewhat surprising, since both groups report attitudes towards task of negotiating in terms of level of self-confidence moving in opposite directions. Although it might be expected that the two groups would display differences it was interesting to find the strong trends moving in opposite directions at similar rates. The NNS believed that s/he would have much less confidence in his/her role of negotiator conducting the negotiation in

English, compared with the NSs, who predicted increased confidence. It was a little surprising that the "more confident" category among the NSs was significantly more than the "much more confident" category, although the difference - 10% - was perhaps too slight to suggest any significance. It might also be pointed out that the fact that the NS population are not business people might mean that they could be expected to be less confident, despite possessing a greater command of the language.

The results pertaining to awareness of language differences are presented in Table 2.7.

	NS	NNS
Very aware (A)	15 (50.0%)	10 (34.5%)
Aware (B)	14 (46.7%)	16 (55.2%)
Not aware (C)	1 (3.3%)	3 (10.3%)

Table 2.7 Expectation of awareness of language differences in the pre-negotiation stage. N=30 for NS, N=29 for NNS.

The participants reported that they would be aware of the language differences between themselves as negotiators and their negotiating partners but although the data suggest a slightly higher level of awareness among the NNSs, the difference did not reach statistical significance (chi square = 2.11, $p = 0.34$). As noted, not all cells reached an EF of 5.

The findings regarding self-assessment ability are given in Table 2.8.

	NS	NNS
Excellent (A)	10 (33.3%)	1 (3.3%)
Above average (B)	12 (40%)	6 (20%)
Average (C)	8 (26.7%)	16 (53.3%)
Below average (D)	0 (0.00%)	6 (20.0%)
Poor (E)	0 (0.00%)	1 (3.3%)

Table 2.8 *Expectation of self assessment ability in the pre-negotiation phase. N=30 for each group.*

The data suggests a greater optimism among the NSs in terms of predicting negotiating abilities as compared with the NNSs and thus, not surprisingly, the differences are statistically significant (chi square - 19.03, $p = 0.001$). This finding extends and confirms the findings presented in Table 2.6, with both categories displaying the same p value ($p = 0.001$). Once again, it must be pointed out that the results must be treated with caution since not all cells reached an EF of 5.

The results concerning prediction of evaluation of outcome are shown in Table 2.9.

	NS	NNS
Successful (5)	5 (16.7%)	4 (13.3%)
Somewhat successful (4)	16 (53.3%)	5 (16.7%)
Less successful (3)	8 (26.7%)	14 (46.7%)
Not successful (1, 2)	1 (3.3%)	7 (23.3%)

Table 2.9 Pre-negotiation frequency distribution of outcome evaluation. N=30 for each group

The data in Table 2.9 supports the findings in Table 2.6 and 2.8 which display statistical significance (chi square =12.0, $p = 0.007$), although, as noted above, caution should be taken with these findings. It is thus not surprising that the NS group which predicted a high level of confidence and ability in conducting negotiations would believe that the outcome would be successful, while the NNSs predicting a lower level of confidence and ability would believe in a less successful outcome. An obvious conclusion from these findings might suggest that the greater the predicted ability to negotiate and the higher the level of self-confidence the higher the likely rate of success in negotiations, while the opposite might also hold true. How far one might extend these findings would be difficult to determine, although the findings indicate a clear and unsurprising trend given that they are based on predictions and perceptions amongst two distinct populations.

6.2.2 Performance

The post-negotiation questionnaire included both demographic information and the five selected variables under examination. Other items on the questionnaire included the use of language specific to negotiation discourse (language choice), the effect of native-speaker language on the process of negotiations (language difference), satisfaction with the outcome of the negotiation, and perceived success of the negotiations. As with the pre-negotiation questionnaire, the parenthetical descriptions included in the post-negotiation questionnaire were inserted for purposes of clarifying the features under examination but were not in the questionnaire distributed to the participants. The respondents were asked to complete the questionnaire immediately following the simulation and prior to any discussions which might have influenced the rank selection. Thus the item predictions from the pre-negotiation are repeated in the post-negotiation but are based on perceived performance rather than on prediction.

The variable repetition is presented in Table 3.1.

	NS	NNS
High (4, 5)	9 (30%)	11 (37.9%)
Medium (3)	14 (46.7)	7 (24.1%)
Low (1, 2)	7 (23.3%)	11 (37.9%)

Table 3.1 Perceived performance of the use of repetitions in post-negotiation stage. N=30 for NS, N=29 for NNS.

The participants reported perceived use of repetitions through the negotiation. Table 3.1 indicates that there was a range of reported use of repetition among both groups. Although the data display no statistical significance (chi square = 3.40, $p = 0.18$), the NSs believed that their use of occasional repetition was nearly double the reported use in the same category among the NNSs. Approximately one third of both populations in the post-negotiation reported remarkably similar usage of repetition on both the high and low ends. After the negotiation, both NSs and NNSs were more liable to recognize a high rate of repetition. Approximately half of the "mediums" in the pre-negotiation stage moved to the "high" category in the post-negotiation stage. About half as many NNSs, therefore, perceived very occasional use of repetition as compared with NSs. This is an interesting finding and may be explained by the lack of ability on the part of the NNSs to recognize more usage of repetition. Thus the perception of performance may differ, although when compared to the results in Table 2.1 there is no statistically-significant difference between the prediction and the performance.

The variable opening up subjects is shown in Table 3.2.

	NS	NNS
High (4, 5)	10 (33.3%)	5 (17.2%)
Medium (3)	13 (43.3%)	11 (37.9%)
Low (1, 2)	7 (23.3%)	13 (44.8%)

Table 3.2 *Perceived performance of the use of subject openings in the post-negotiation phase. N=30 for NS, N=29 for NNS.*

Unlike the prediction of the use of opening up new subjects as reported in Table 2.2, Table 3.2 shows that there was no statistical difference between the two groups (chi square = 3.16, $p = 0.16$). Thus the prediction of differences was not confirmed by the perception of performance. It was not surprising to note that nearly 50% of the NNSs reported seldom opening up new subjects, compared with nearly 50% of the NSs reporting occasionally opening up new subjects. What was perhaps more surprising was that among the NS population the prediction of seldom opening up new subjects (over 50%) was reduced to 25% in the reporting of performance. The reverse held true in the category of frequently opening up new subjects in the NS group, with 1/3 reporting frequent performance compared to 10% in prediction. Thus the NS determined after the negotiation that s/he was more aggressive in opening up new subjects than predicted. The difference between prediction and performance in the NNSs was less, somewhat surprisingly indicating that the NNSs' prediction and perceived performance are more closely related than is the case with the NSs.

The variable paraphrase is presented in Table 3.3.

	NS	NNS
High (4, 5)	12 (41.4%)	7 (23.3%)
Medium (3)	8 (27.6%)	12 (40.0%)
Low (1, 2)	9 (31.0%)	11 (36.7%)

Table 3.3 *Perceived performance of the use of paraphrases in the post-negotiation phase. N=29 for NS, N=30 for NNS*

Approximately 1/3 centred in the low category, although Table 3.3 shows a range of reported performance in both populations. It was surprising to note that nearly 25% of the NNSs reported frequently paraphrasing, compared with nearly the same percentage of the NSs in the medium category. Although the differences did not reach statistical significance (chi square = 2.3, p = 0.31), the greater difference in the medium and high use of paraphrasing reported may be attributed to lower language proficiency among the NNS population.

Comparing the pre- and post-questionnaires, we find that among the NNSs the number reporting a high rate of perceived prediction of paraphrase was double the perceived performance (52% reduced to 23%). This trend of predicting a higher rate of paraphrase among the NNSs appeared to be similar to the NS population, who reported a high rate of perceived predicted use of paraphrase - nearly 3/4 compared with less than half at the post-negotiation stage. Predictably, the opposite trend in direction appeared at the low end of use of paraphrase, with the rate of increase between both populations increasing. Both populations perceived a low level of paraphrase at a greater rate in the post-negotiation stage than at the pre-negotiation stage. The populations appear similar in their perception of prediction and performance, with the greatest similarity occurring at the medium level.

The variable self repairs is presented in Table 3.4.

	NS	NNS
High (4, 5)	0 (0%)	6 (20.7%)
Medium (3)	5 (16.7%)	12 (41.4%)
Low (1, 2)	25 (83.3%)	11 (37.9%)

Table 3.4 *Perceived performance of the use of self repairs in the post-negotiation stage. N=30 for NS, N=29 for NNS*

It was not surprising that a statistically-significant difference was obtained between NSs and NNSs (chi square = 14.31, $p = 0.001$). Given the differences in the two populations, one would expect that fewer repairs were needed among the NS group. It was somewhat surprising, however, that over 1/3 of the NNSs indicated a low level of self repair, although over 40% reported medium self repair.

Comparing the perceptions of prediction and performance in both NS and NNS populations, both populations adjusted their rates at the high level in a similar fashion, with a trend towards fewer self repairs (from 7 to 0 among the NSs and from 13 to 6 among the NNSs), while the opposite trend predictably occurred at the lowest rate of perception of use of self repairs (from 14 to 25 among the NSs and from 8 to 11 among the NNSs). The trend between both populations was similar. The NS population perceived an increase in use of self repairs by nearly 50% (from 14 to 25).

The variable interruptions is presented in Table 3.5.

	NS	NNS
High (4, 5)	9 (30.0%)	8 (26.7%)
Medium (2, 3)	12 (40.0%)	10 (33.3%)
Low (1)	9 (30.0%)	12 (40.0%)

Table 3.5 *Perceived performance of the use of interruptions in the post-negotiation stage. N=30 for each group.*

As with the prediction of interruptions, the performance of the two groups was remarkably similar, with no statistical significance reached (chi square = 0.66, $p = 0.71$). The greatest difference (10%) was reported in the low category, with the NNS group reporting more frequent interruptions than the NSs.

Comparing Table 3.5 (post-negotiation) with Table 2.5 (pre-negotiation), the two populations remain similar. In the high category, both NSs and NNSs reported greater use of interruptions in the perception of performance (post-negotiation) than the perception of predicted use (pre-negotiation), although in neither case did a statistically-significant difference obtain; nor was the rate of increased use statistically significant. Thus both populations displayed a tendency to perceive use of interruptions more frequently after negotiating than predicted, but the rate between the two populations was not statistically significant - an interesting finding further developed and supported in the following chapter, where a discourse analysis is applied to the feature.

Language choice is presented in Table 3.6.

	NS	NNS
High (4, 5)	22 (73.3%)	8 (27.6%)
Medium (3)	6 (20.0%)	8 (27.6%)
Low (1, 2)	2 (6.7%)	13 (44.8%)

Table 3.6 *Reported language choice in the post-negotiation stage. N=30 for NS, N=29 for NNS.*

The participants reported their perceptions that they had used language specific to negotiations and Table 3.6 shows that there was a range of usage according to self-reflection in both groups. It was not surprising, however, that the differences reached statistical significance (chi square = 14.87, $p = 0.001$) as the NSs reported that in almost 3/4 of the reported negotiations they were able to use negotiation-specific language, as compared with approximately 25% of the NNSs, whom it would appear were less able to be language specific. The differences ran in the expected direction.

Effect of native-language differences is presented in Table 3.7.

	NS	NNS
High (4, 5)	12 (40.0%)	12 (40.0%)
Medium (3)	6 (20.0%)	7 (23.3%)
Low (1, 2)	12 (40.0%)	11 (36.7%)

Table 3.7 *Reported effect of native language differences in the post-negotiation stage. N=30 for each group.*

On reporting the effect of native language differences during a negotiation, both groups displayed very similar distributions, with the greatest concentration in both the high and low categories. The minor differences did not reach statistical significance (chi square = 0.12, $p = 0.94$). It would appear that the differences in native language backgrounds did have some effect on the negotiations: 60% of each group reported that language proficiency had affected the encounter.

Outcome is presented in Table 3.8.

	NS	NNS
High (4, 5)	8 (26.67%)	10 (33.3%)
Medium (3)	14 (46.7%)	11 (36.7%)
Low (1, 2)	8 (26.7%)	9 (30.0%)

Table 3.8 Reported satisfaction with outcome in the post-negotiation stage. N=30 for each group.

In both populations, over 1/3 centred in the middle category, indicating some degree of satisfaction with the outcome of the negotiation, although there was no statistically significant difference (chi square = 0.64, $p = 0.72$). In general, the participants reported a higher level of satisfaction - approximately 75% - than a lower level. This finding is not surprising as the group participants would appear to be expressing some degree of optimism about their ability to conduct a successful negotiation, or they may not have self-selected to

be an informant. Thus their self-evaluation of success may be slightly more optimistic than one might expect of any given population.

Evaluation of perceived success is reported in Table 3.9.

	NS	NNS
High (4, 5)	9 (30.0%)	8 (26.7%)
Medium (3)	13 (43.3%)	11 (36.7%)
Low (1, 2)	8 (26.7%)	11 (36.7%)

Table 3.9 Reported perceived success in the post-negotiation stage. N=30 for group.

The finding in this Table confirms the finding in Table 3.8, with no statistically-significant difference between the two groups (chi square = 0.69, $p = 0.70$). The similarity between the two groups regarding their reporting of satisfaction and success with the negotiation is surprising, and no statistically-significant differences could be demonstrated.

On the other hand, the fact that one variable confirms the other and that success brings with it satisfaction with the negotiation is understandable. One would not expect a subject to report success and at the same time report dissatisfaction with a successful outcome. The two Tables (3.8 and 3.9) confirm and support the findings that there is no statistical difference between the groups regarding their perceived satisfaction and success in a negotiation.

6.2.3 Discussion

The following table shows the statistical results of the pre-negotiation and the post-negotiation for the NNSs and NSs. It should be noted that the five specified features (repetitions, subject openers, paraphrases, self repairs, and interruptions) were included in both the pre- and post-negotiation questionnaires.

Attitude towards task, awareness of process, and self-assessment were included only in the pre-negotiation questionnaire, since they were expectations of perceptions of performance, while language choice, language differences, and satisfaction with the outcome were included only in the post-negotiation questionnaire, since they were related to assessment of performance. A discussion of the findings related to these issues is presented in section 6.4.

Variable	Pre-negotiation	Post-negotiation
Repetitions		
Subject Openings	(-)	
Paraphrases		
Self Repairs		(-)
Interruptions		
Attitude Towards Task	(+)	
Awareness of Process		
Self-Assessment	(+)	
Evaluation of Outcome	(+)	
Language Choice		(+)
Language Difference		
Outcome - Satisfaction		

Table 4.1 Differences between NSs and NNSs

+, - = There is a statistical difference between NSs and NNSs

+ = NSs > NNSs

- = NNSs > NSs

Looking first at the results obtained from the pre-negotiation questionnaire, the following observations can be made:

- i) A statistically-significant difference obtains in opening up new subjects (chi square = 8.26, $p = .016$).
- (ii) A statistically-significant difference obtains between NNSs and NSs regarding attitude towards task (chi square = 33.505, $p = 0.001$). The data appear to indicate that regarding attitude towards negotiating, 83% of the NSs were "much more or more" confident of their ability to negotiate, while 83% of the NNSs were "less or much less" confident of negotiating ability. The confidence level was in the opposite direction.
- (iii) The prediction of ability to use spoken English for purposes of negotiations indicated significant statistical differences between NNSs and NSs, as shown in Table 2.8 (chi square = 19.03, $p = 0.001$). 73% of the NSs indicated an excellent-to-above-average ability, while 73% of NNSs indicated an average-to below-average ability.
- (iv) The perception of prediction of the success or lack of success in negotiations was statistically significant (chi square = 12.009, $p = 0.007$). NSs predicted success (70%), compared with 30% of the NNSs predicting success. The NSs predicted

a successful outcome in favour of themselves more often than the NNSs.

Regarding the results obtained from the post-negotiation questionnaire, statistically-significant differences obtained between the NSs and the NNSs regarding self repairs and choice of language as follows:

- (i) NSs indicated that during the negotiations, 83% perceived that they self repaired at a low-to-medium level, compared with the statistically-significant differences in response from the NNSs, 62% of whom indicated that they perceived that they self repaired at an medium-to-high level (chi square = 14.314, $p = 0.001$). Some doubt exists regarding the reliability of the self-assessed performance of the NSs, as it would seem unlikely that over 3/4 of the NS population hardly ever self repaired, even if the population was business trained, which it was not.
- (ii) A statistically-significant difference obtained between the NNSs and the NSs regarding the choice of language used for negotiations (chi square = 14.87, $p = 0.001$). The NNSs indicated that, according to their perception, 27% used language specific to negotiations, while among the NSs approximately 73% indicated that they used language specific to negotiations.

In summary, although in post-negotiations (perceptions of performance) statistically-significant differences between the NSs and the NNSs occurred regarding the self repair feature, no statistically-significant differences obtained among the remaining identified conversational features in the perceived prediction and performance in either the pre- or post-negotiation questionnaires. Similarities thus appear to exist in the two populations regarding perceptions of prediction and performance.

Since both populations exhibit similarities, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected, with exceptions as noted. Statistically-significant differences obtained regarding attitude, self-assessment, evaluation of outcome, and language choice but not, as noted, among the five selected conversational features, with the exception of self repair.

The only negative correlation obtained was among the NSs regarding opening up new subjects. The NSs predicted fewer uses than they later reported having, according to their perceptions, indicating possibly more aggressiveness in perceived performance regarding opening up new subjects than initially predicted.

6.2.4 Effect of Role

Each subject was directly asked how they perceived that they had behaved in the role either of buyer or seller. The hypothesis was tested that the role (seller, buyer) influences one's "behaviour", i.e., sellers and buyers do not use conversational phenomena in the same way. The null hypothesis was that the role did not influence behaviour.

The hypothesis for NNSs and NSs was tested separately, using the pre-negotiation questionnaire. For the NSs, no statistically-significant results obtained; i.e., NSs thought that

they "behaved" in the same way in both roles. For the NNSs, a statistically-significant difference obtained between buyers and sellers only for the variable concerning the attitude towards task ($P = 0.037$).

The majority of NNSs felt "less confident" according to the rate of 53.33% in the role of buyers and 73.33% in the role of sellers. 33.33% of the buyers felt "much less confident", while 20% of the sellers felt "much more confident" compared with 0% of the buyers who felt "much more confident". Thus it seems that there is a tendency for NNSs to feel less confident as sellers than as buyers.

6.3 Analysis of Observer's Data: the Five Conversational Features

The data from the negotiation encounters was collected through the observer's checklist and quantitatively presented, as discussed in 5.4.1, in order to add an additional layer of analysis to the study. The categories were established according to the number of times a particular feature was identified in the audio replay. A range of 0 to the highest number of occurrences was set for each variable.

Statistically-significant differences in the use of the five conversational features between the two populations under study were checked by the use of the t-test. Results indicated that a statistically-significant difference obtained only regarding the self repairs variable ($t = -3.4237$, $P_v = 0.0016$). It is interesting to note that in the post-negotiation questionnaire, a statistically-significant difference also obtained regarding the use of self repairs, although the prediction of self-correction among the two populations showed no statistically-significant difference.

Repetitions

Both populations displayed remarkable similarity in terms of the repetition variable in the observer's checklist. The results are shown in Table 5.1.

Frequency Category	NS	NNS
4 -17	43%	53%
0 - 3	57%	47%

Table 5.1 Observer's Checklist of Frequency. Variable: repetitions

The greatest number of usages by one speaker of this variable recorded was 17 times. This occurred among the NNSs and was observed once. The highest number among the NSs was 11 times. The repetitions variable demonstrated no statistically-significant difference between the two populations. 47% of the NNSs and 57% of the NSs repeated themselves from 0-3 times during the negotiations, indicating that repetition appears to be infrequently used among both populations. The average usage of this variable was 4 times in both populations.

Only 7% more of the NNSs repeated more frequently than the NSs, indicating a close similarity between the two populations. The difference may be explained by the need of the NNSs to use repetitions as points of clarification to ensure that the NSs understood the intended meaning of the message; NSs might feel less need to worry over conveying sense. The actual usage of the variable at both the high and low rates was closer to the subjects' post-negotiation (Table 3.1) than to their pre-negotiation (Table 2.1) perceptions, in both NNS and NS populations. Thus the subjects' post-negotiation perception of the use of this variable may further be regarded as a good indicator of actual usage.

Initiates New Subject

The findings for initiating new subjects are presented in Table 5.2.

Frequency Category	NS	NNS
5 - 11	47%	40%
0 - 4	53%	60%

Table 5.2 *Observer's Checklist of Frequency. Variable: opening up new subjects*

The usage of this variable was recorded among both the NS and NNS populations, where one subject (NS) was noted opening up new subjects 11 times. Fewer NSs (1) never opened up new subjects compared with 3 among the NNSs; however, 60% of the NNSs were at the lowest categories of opening up subjects - from 0-4 times, compared with 53% at 0-4 times among NSs. A higher percentage of the NSs compared with NNSs initiated new subjects more frequently, although the chi square test indicated that no statistically-significant differences obtained between the two populations under study. Such a result corresponds to the assumption that NNSs would be less likely to be as confident in initiating new subjects as NSs.

This finding compares interestingly with the perceived performance of the NNS population, which noted that according to their perception of their performance in Table 3.2 nearly 50% (44.8%) indicated a low rate of initiating new subjects, compared with 25% of the NSs. In the checklist, the populations are even closer in terms of their profile of opening up new subjects, on an average of 5 times for the NSs and 4 times for the NNSs, although in both prediction and performance no statistically-significant difference obtained. Thus, as with the variable repetition, the subjects' perceptions match the occurrences.

Paraphrases

Table 5.3 indicates the findings for paraphrases.

Frequency Category	NS	NNS
6 - 9	13%	3%
4 - 5	14%	27%
0 - 3	73%	70%

Table 5.3 Observer's Checklist of Frequency. Variable: paraphrases

According to the table, a majority of both NS (73%) and NNS (70%) subjects used paraphrases three times or less, indicating that no statistically-significant difference obtained between the two populations. However, the NS population exhibited a slight trend to paraphrase more frequently, 13% of the NSs paraphrasing between 6 and 9 times, compared with only 3% of the NNSs. A comparison of Tables 2.3 and 3.3 indicates that the subjects appear to be more accurate in their perceived usage of paraphrases following the negotiation than preceding it. The post-negotiation tendency to perceive reduced usage conforms more favourably to the usage as obtained by the observer's checklist, although the predictions were not as accurate as those regarding repetition and opening up new subjects. NSs paraphrased on an average 2.5 times, compared with NNSs, who paraphrased on the average 3 times during the negotiating encounter. The NNSs were slightly more accurate in perception of performance, reporting a low-to-medium usage at nearly 77%, compared to the NSs who indicated usage at a low-to-medium usage at 60%. Although not statistically significant, it is interesting to note that perceptions of usage of paraphrase in the post-negotiation phase was slightly more accurate among the NNS population, possibly indicating that the NNS population is slightly more self aware than the NS population of the need to reinforce a point by restating or restructuring it. These perceptual data compare favorably with the data from

the observer's checklist: both indicate a low rate of usage of the variable paraphrase. The NNSs perceived a lower rate of usage following the negotiation than preceding it, a finding which conforms with the actual occurrence; the NNSs paraphrased on an average of 3 times, compared with the NSs, who paraphrased on an average of 2 times.

Self Repairs

Table 5.4 reports the results regarding self repairs.

Frequency Category	NS	NNS
6 - 15	0%	23%
3 - 5	13%	27%
0 - 2	87%	50%

Table 5.4 Observer's Checklist of Frequency. Variable: self repairs

As can be seen from Table 5.4, the vast majority (87%) of NSs performed two or less self repairs, compared with only 50% of the NNS speakers who performed two or less self repairs. At a higher level of self repair, 23% of NNSs self repaired between six and fifteen times, while none of the NSs did so. The results clearly show that the NSs were considerably less likely to self repair than were the non-native speaker subjects. The average number of self repairs among the NSs was 1, compared with an average of 3 among the NNSs. A statistically-significant difference obtained regarding self repair ($p = 0.0016$). This finding confirms the subjects' perceptions of usage of self repairs in the post-negotiation phase, as presented in Table 3.4. The NSs were slightly more accurate at predicting usage, with 0% in both the checklist and post-negotiation data predicting a high rate of usage, although the NNSs appeared to be good at perceived usage, with an medium-to-low rate of self repairs of 81%, compared with 77% of actual occurrences. The perceptual data of the use of self

repairs in both the pre- and post-negotiation phases closely match the actual occurrences, as noted by the observer's checklist. As indicated in the discussions in 6.2.2, a statistically-significant difference obtained between the NSs and NNSs ($p = 0.001$), confirming the data in the observer's checklist, which also notes a statistically-significant difference ($p = 0.0016$). As with the variables of repetition, opening up new subjects, and paraphrases, the perceptual data are confirmed by the observer's checklist.

Interruptions

Table 5.5 shows that nearly half of both populations used interruptions 4 times or less, indicating that no statistically-significant difference obtained between the two populations.

Frequency Category	NS	NNS
10 - 55	30%	27%
5 - 9	27%	26%
0 - 4	43%	47%

Table 5.5 Observer's Checklist of Frequency. Variable: interruptions

The NNSs showed a slight trend towards fewer interruptions (4% difference between both populations) as compared with a slightly higher trend in the direction of more frequent interruptions among the NS population (3% higher rate among the NSs). As demonstrated in the following table, however, the populations are more alike than different in terms of interrupting behaviour. The profiles of the two populations appear to be remarkably similar, with the highest percentage (17%) of both NNSs and NSs interrupting from 0-11 times, as seen in Table 5.6.

Frequency Category	NS	NNS
0 - 11	17%	17%

Table 5.6 Observer's Checklist of Frequency. Variable: interruptions

The results suggest that with few exceptions, the feature displayed remarkable similarity across both populations under observation. It should be remembered that the observer's checklist does not claim that interruptions directly influence the success or failure of a negotiation, since reaching a successful outcome can generally be evaluated only by the participants. Thus, while participants were asked to suggest whether or not they succeeded in reaching their goals, it would be difficult to accept or reject their self-analysis as a critical judgment and to generalize from it to the feature interruptions.

As with the perceived prediction of interruptions (Table 2.5) and the perceived performance of interruptions (Table 3.5), which indicated no statistical significance, the number of occurrences documented by the observer's checklist are similar across the two populations. The average use of interruptions in both populations was 8 times during a negotiating encounter. It is interesting to note that, as with the other variables, the perception of usage of interruptions following the negotiation is more accurate than the initial perceived prediction of usage when compared with the observer's checklist.

Although statistically-significant differences did not exist between the two populations regarding their perceptions of the expression of interruptions across the negotiating table, the question may be asked whether any relationship can be demonstrated between perceptions of interruptions and perceived outcome. The suggestion that an interruption may possess the potential to act as a constructive factor in resolving differences

and working towards a mutually acceptable resolution, or quite possibly be a negative feature contributing to an unsuccessful negotiation, will be developed in the discourse analysis in the following chapter. The perceptual data in this chapter was set forth in order to highlight similarities and/or differences across both populations.

The interruption data as presented in the discussions on both the pre- and post-questionnaires did not account for the relationship between the data and the outcome of the negotiations. What effect, if any, the feature had on the success or failure of the negotiating encounter will be discussed in detail in Chapter 7, where the expression of the variable is related to the overall tone and outcome of the negotiation. Such characteristics as may be used to identify harmonious negotiating encounters may also be delineated in their relationship to the outcome of the negotiation. The issue under examination will be how interruptions affect a negotiating outcome by creating an atmosphere either conducive to co-operation or competition.

It is interesting to note, however, that in the pre-questionnaire data, fewer than 50% across both populations explicitly predicted that the negotiation would be a success, compared with a 20% increase following the encounter; 70% of the reported data indicated a successful outcome. Greater self-awareness of the use of conversational features was evident following, rather than preceding, a negotiation. Post-simulation, both populations appeared to be more optimistic (50% compared with 70%) regarding the possibility of reaching a successful outcome, as noted. Increased self-awareness following a negotiation was also demonstrated by the close similarity between the perceptual data from the post-negotiation questionnaire and the data from the observer's checklist. The population

was more accurate in its reportage of the usage of interruptions following the encounter, a fact which was also true in the subjects' reportage of their perceptions of success in negotiating. Compared with the observer's checklist, greater accuracy appears to occur in post-simulation perception than in pre-simulation perception.

It would be difficult to generalize, however, and assume that greater accuracy of reportage of perceptual data occurred following a negotiation or that such heightened awareness increased the possibilities of negotiating a successful outcome. Nevertheless, an interesting trend in this direction does appear to exist, which might be the fruitful object of future research. Using the data obtained from this study as a starting point, it might also be of interest to conduct research into the relationship between the feature interruption and a successful negotiating outcome. The establishment of such a relationship cannot be demonstrated in the current study, due to the limitations of the data obtained from the design of the questionnaires. However, the discourse analysis in Chapter 7 will examine issues related to the atmosphere of a negotiating encounter and the role of interruptions in its creation, whether it be positive or negative in character.

The discussion comparing the perceptual data with the actual occurrences indicates that the subjects' perceptions of the usage of the five features are confirmed by the observer's checklist. In addition, both populations appear to be more self aware of usage following a negotiating session than preceding it. These are both interesting findings, which will be elaborated in the discussion of findings in Chapter 8.

The final category in the observer's checklist addressed the issue of whether the participants explicitly stated that success was achieved. 12 out of 30 NSs directly stated that

the negotiation was successful (40%), while 10 out of 30 NNSs made a similar statement (30%). As with the variables discussed above, both populations appear surprisingly similar in their explicit reference to achieving success at the negotiation table. Correspondence between success and the variables cannot, however, be established, given the limited range of the data and the research instruments. Nevertheless, this would prove a fascinating issue for future research.

6.4 Perceptions of Goal Achievement

Since negotiations are specifically goal-oriented, this study examined some of the considerations relating to the achievement of a goal. These included attitude towards task, awareness of language differences, and context-specific lexical choices. The following discussion is presented in order to suggest certain pedagogical applications relevant for the practitioner.

This study enabled the researcher to look at how the NSs and the NNSs valued or judged success in terms of their perceptions of the outcome of the negotiations. It appeared that the NSs generally set higher goals and had greater expectations regarding success at the negotiating table than did the NNSs. The latter generally expressed a sense of feeling less in control and in a less favored position regardless of the role assumed (buyer or seller). Attitudes towards negotiations and the role that self-fulfilling prophecy may have played are, however, difficult to quantify. It was not unusual in follow-up discussions immediately following the actual encounters for the NNSs to express some frustration at what they

perceived to be language limitations and perception of lack of success at the negotiation session.

The category of success was obtained from the post-negotiation questionnaire rather than from the pre-negotiation questionnaire, since it is clear that the perceived success of a negotiation could better be determined after rather than before the negotiation took place. The subjects had then performed the task of negotiating and were in a better position to evaluate whether or not the negotiation was a success. As noted in the discussion on the statement of success in the observer's checklist, both populations exhibited similar tendencies in explicitly acknowledging success.

Two cells were set up as follows:

CATEGORY 1 = unsuccessful	CATEGORY 5 = successful
levels 1, 2	levels 3, 4, 5

An interesting finding in the pre-negotiation questionnaire (Table 2.9) was that among the NS population only one who did not succeed reported much less confidence, while the majority (97%) reported success in the negotiation - 83% noting confidence-to-much-confidence. Regarding the NNSs' attitude towards the task of negotiating, the higher percentage of those who perceived themselves as unsuccessful (67%) (Table 2.9) was reported among the population which reported much less confidence (83%) (Table 2.6).

These data suggest that a relationship appears to obtain between the attitude towards task in terms of confidence (as noted in Table 2.6) and success at negotiation (statistically

$P_v = 0.033$) (Table 2.9), which constitutes a major finding. Self-confidence appears to be a positive factor in obtaining success in negotiations among the NNS population according to their perceptions, an interesting although perhaps somewhat predictable finding. Some obvious issues which might be raised regarding this finding include the participants' definitions and expressions of self-confidence, the influence of attitudes towards the task from the cultural perspective of the participant, the impact of a strong motivation to succeed, and the view of level of self-confidence. Although the important question of the linkage between self-confidence in the role of negotiator, together with functional linguistic competence, was not under consideration in this study, it is a finding worthy of further research.

Partnership with a NS appeared to have some (although not statistically-significant) effect on the NNSs' ability to negotiate a successful outcome (Tables 2.7 and 3.7). While it cannot necessarily be concluded that negotiating in a non-native language reduces the potential for success, the findings very interestingly appear to suggest that NNSs' perceptions of themselves as being in a dis-preferred position regarding native-language fluency may have a negative effect on the outcome of the negotiations. While an obvious approach might be to propose, like Fisher (1980), intensive use of translators or insistence on a monolingual framework for negotiations, it seems that such a solution would deny the reality as described by practitioners in the field of negotiations (Donohue and Ramesh, 1992; Hilton, 1992; Leal and Powers, 1992). These writers note that the trend towards negotiating internationally using English as the *lingua franca* will continue.

It might be pointed out, however, that a greater awareness of differences may not result in lowered expectations of success if that awareness is linked to determination, a positive attitude towards the native-language differences, and an acceptance that while native-language differences do exist they need not necessarily present a barrier to achieving success. The attitude held by the NNSs towards such differences, then, rather than the difference itself, may well determine the success or failure of a negotiation. Such a finding would appear to possess relevance for students and practitioners.

This study further supports the recognition based on findings made by some language researchers (Van Hoorde, 1991; Beamer, 1992; Gorman, 1992; Wilson, 1992) that assisting students to perceive and accept differences between negotiating partners is a reasonable and worthy instructional objective. It would thus encourage the setting forth of other similar process models for training in negotiations.

A trend appears to exist among the NNS population (Tables 2.6, 2.8, and 2.9) who predict that their ability to use English for negotiating purposes is at least average, that they achieve perceived success at the negotiating table - a finding worth investigating in future research. The notion that the NNS who predicts that s/he is able to negotiate in English with at least an average level of self-described competency has a better chance of succeeding than does the NNS who rates his/her ability as below average has implications for training future international negotiators and constitutes a major finding of this study.

Among the NS population, those reporting success (97%) indicated in their predictions that their ability to use English for negotiating was excellent-to-above-average.

Only one NS reported a lack of success, and that subject reported an average ability.

The data demonstrated that nearly 75% of the NSs used negotiation-specific language during the encounter (Table 3.6). A confirming finding in the pre-negotiation questionnaire indicated that the NS was much more confident of his/her negotiating ability, predicting a statistically-significantly higher success rate than the NNSs (Table 2.6). The NNSs, on the other hand, while indicating greater confidence in using English, also predicted greater success than actually occurred in the outcome of the negotiation. A trend thus appeared according to which greater ease with the specific language appropriate to the context resulted in increased self-satisfaction with performance. Although it would be difficult to describe this finding as indicative of a causal relationship, a trend in that direction may be perceived.

The finding that the more confident the participant felt regarding his or her communicative competence in English, the higher is his/her level of perceived self-confidence in achieving a predetermined goal (such as negotiating a successful outcome) is yet to be demonstrated as reliable and valid through extended research. Nonetheless, it is interesting to consider the tentative, though fairly predictable, finding that self-confidence appears to play a role in bringing about success in international business negotiations.

Prediction of performance is based on self-evaluation of performance. As with most learning tasks, the more frequently a task is performed, the greater is the refinement towards the ultimate goal of its perfection. Those researchers and trainers calling for case study analysis, simulations of business negotiations, and training by peer feedback, video analysis, and role plays in "real world" settings appear to understand the importance of a student's positive self-assessment in achieving success in negotiations. Bygate (1988), for example,

calls for increased awareness of the possible connections between small group oral interactions and language learning.

"English used for negotiations" as presented in the questionnaires includes self-assessment of lexico-grammatical competence, as well as situated discourse. An approach to training might, then, be multilayered and include knowledge of process and lexical competence, as well as opportunities for self-evaluation. Such a finding would suggest that trainees should re-evaluate some of their goals to assimilate this information.

One finding of primary importance emerging from this study is the recognition that multiple sociocultural, sociolinguistic, and socio-rhetorical, as well as interrelationship, factors, combined to play a role in influencing the outcome of negotiations. Such features as paralinguistic phenomena need to be considered within a conceptual and practical framework in order to give both the teacher and student a better advantage in training for business competence as a negotiator. What is striking is that conversational phenomena appear to express themselves in a manner more alike than different across cultures, while such factors as levels of self-confidence may have either a positive or a negative affect on goal attainment.

6.5 Conclusions

As noted in the introduction to the chapter, a reason for comparing NSs/NNSs' perceptions in the pre- and post-questionnaires and the observer's checklist was to enrich an understanding of perceived similarities or differences, thus increasing the awareness of NNS student negotiators of the perceived use of conversational features and possibly the

achievement of a successful negotiating outcome. Increased awareness may lead to more accurate prediction of the form, function, and usage of the identified features in an international negotiating setting. If, for example, the results indicated that statistically-significant differences existed between NSs/NNSs' perceptions of the predictions and performance regarding the usage of the five conversational features, such a result might suggest that greater attention in the classroom should be paid to analyzing such differences. An important consideration in this study regards what role perceived similarities or differences may play in establishing obtainable and realistic teaching objectives.

Achieving near-native fluency in a second or foreign language is both a realistic and an attainable objective according to writers engaged in curriculum design (Fiksdal, 1986; Neu, 1986; Westerfield, 1989; Fitzgerald, 1989; Nunan, 1990; Allwright and Bailey, 1991; Barron, 1991; Beamer, 1992; Martin and Chaney, 1992; Hilton, 1992; Gorman, 1992; Micheau and Billmyer, 1992; Shahar and Kurz, 1995). This is particularly appropriate if one of the goals of NNS students is to become more "normal in their use of the foreign language" (Bygate, 1988, p. 21).

The results of the study indicate that, with the exceptions noted in opening up subjects in the pre-negotiation phase and self repairs in the post-negotiation stage, no statistically-significant differences could be demonstrated. As quantitatively perceived by the subjects, the features appear to occur in a similar fashion in both NS and NNS oral discourse. This finding leads to the tentative conclusion that both populations were statistically more alike than different in their perceived usage of the five conversational features under examination. Confirmation of this conclusion awaits further research. Such

a similarity may possess implications for how NNS students negotiate meaning and how teachers evaluate the spoken discourse of the NNS student.

Such provisional findings are encouraging, as they suggest that, given their self-predictions, NNSs may need to be far less worried about their usage of the conversational features in the context of achieving near-native fluency in a second language. NNSs studying to be international negotiators may benefit more from classroom interactions focused on case studies, simulations, and other interactional activities and strategies. Such students may become more competent in using their acquired speaking skills and develop greater flexibility in their usage of the features.

Research claims that differences exist between NSs and NNSs regarding the five features relate to the formal properties and characteristics of such features as displayed in spoken discourse between two culturally-distinct populations. Commonly, they adopt a qualitative analytic approach similar to the discourse analysis of interruptions presented in Chapter 7; they do not generally address the issues of differences from the perspective of a quantitative analysis (Duncan, 1972; Edelsky, 1981; Schegloff, 1987; Moerman, 1988; Tannen, 1989; Hymes, 1989; Ervin-Tripp, 1989; Goldberg, 1990; Hawkins, 1991; Talbot, 1992; Micheau and Billmyer, 1992; Langford, 1994; Schiffrin, 1994; Stenstrom, 1994; Ulijin and Li, 1995). It was thus assumed that if the formal characteristics of conversational features differed between the two populations, the quantifiable expressions from both the observer's checklist and perceptual data would demonstrate significant differences. This claim was not substantiated by the results of this study, however.

The research basis for the assumption that quantitative differences exist across NS and NNS populations was Brown and Levinson's (1987) seminal work on politeness codes. Brown and Levinson construct a universal model of polite speech and set out the abstract principles which underlie the expression of politeness usage across cultures. The model of politeness codes, including a discussion related to conversational phenomena, is posited as a tool for analyzing and understanding social interaction cross-culturally (Brown and Levinson, 1987, p. 2). Using examples derived from such diverse cultures as the Tamil of India and the English spoken by Americans, Brown and Levinson were able to draw conclusions regarding the diversity of polite behaviour across cultures.

Adopting this model of politeness codes, this study raised a similar supposition regarding conversational features. Since all languages display conversational phenomena (Goffman, 1967; Stubbs, 1983; Coulthard, 1985; Bygate, 1987; Moerman, 1988; Hymes, 1989; Fasold, 1990; Thompson, 1994), it was assumed that, from a statistical perspective, the quantitative display of the features would differ across cultures just as their expression differed cross-culturally. This assumption of differences is based on such studies as Swales and Woken's (1989) work on opening up subjects, Fiksdal's (1986) research on how native speakers' paraphrasing tactics differed from that of NNSs, and Tannen's (1989) description of repetitive devices expressed by NS/NNS populations.

The argument presented in this study, that quantifiable differences exist in the expression of conversational features, is supported by the alternative definitions of interruptions put forth by Goldberg (1990), Talbot (1992), and Schiffrin (1994). According to the findings presented in Table 4.1, no statistical differences obtained between the two

populations, with the exceptions noted. Consequently, differences in the perception of the expression of the five features cannot be statistically supported. However, as taken up in Chapter 7, qualitative analysis reveals differences in *actual* usage of the feature interruption by subjects.

The study was guided by the hypothesis that differences do exist between NNSs and NSs in the frequency, realization, and distribution of conversational features at the negotiating table as perceived by the subjects. The fact that no statistically-significant differences obtained among the conversational features examined in both pre- and post-questionnaires (except for self repairs) and supported by data from the observer's checklist, would seem to suggest that greater similarities than differences exist regarding the perception of the prediction of performance as well as performance itself between the two populations under study. How far one could extend this trend and generalize it to other issues is not clear, however. More specifically, it cannot automatically be assumed that NNSs view their use of the specified conversational features in a similar manner to the view taken by the NSs, given the setting, for example, of an international diplomatic mission. Nor can it be assumed that NNSs perceive that they utilize these discourse features with greater or lesser frequency compared to the NSs' perception in other contexts.

The discovery that the presumed differences were not statistically supported, that is to say, that no significant statistical differences (except as noted in the results reported in Table 4.1) obtained, led this researcher to conclude that the focus of future research might lie in the direction of promoting an understanding and recognition of commonalities among the NS and NNS populations engaged in spoken discourse in a particular setting. As the

responses represent the participants' perceptions, the commonality may reflect attitudes and impressions rather than actual use, although the observer's checklist suggests that both perceptions and actual usage of the features are similar among both populations.

Although this approach intends neither to minimize nor to ignore either lexico-grammatical or sociocultural differences, it suggests the importance of focusing on features which partners in a negotiation may hold in common, in order to foster understanding and develop an atmosphere of shared interest and mutual respect and reward. As sociolinguists (Tannen, 1989), researchers on spoken discourse (Fiksdal, 1986; Lampi, 1986; Almulla, 1988), and negotiation theorists (Bercovitch, 1991) have all pointed out, languages are more alike than they are different.

If the five features examined in this study can be considered as expressions of a form of linguistic universals, this attribution may add credence to the results. Perhaps future research could extend this preliminary conclusion. Recognizing such similarities across the negotiating table might encourage negotiating partners to view one another with less suspicion and intimidation and with a greater awareness that both parties "behave linguistically" in a similar fashion.

As mentioned, the initial questions posed were, firstly, what quantifiable differences, if any, existed between the two populations under investigation in their perceptions of the expression of the selected five conversational features, and, secondly, what effect, if any, the particular feature interruptions had on the outcome of a negotiation. The research question focused on examining the empirical data collected and analyzed in the framework of this study in order to see whether some of the emergent conclusions and insights might provide

background information which could influence training among NNS students in English for Business Purposes courses.

The aim of this study was to examine five identified conversational features utilized by NS-NNS populations during a simulated business negotiation. Presentation of a discourse analysis on one feature - interruptions - in the following chapter complements the discussion of the subjects' perceptions regarding their prediction and performance and their actual performance. By applying quantitative research procedures, an effort was made to conduct what Brown (1991) refers to as a legitimate investigation into phenomena in spoken discourse.

CHAPTER 7

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

7.1 Introduction

The discussions in earlier chapters examined five selected conversational features within the context of negotiations as a speech event. Methodologically speaking, although an in-depth analysis of all five features might have provided interesting results, it might well also have overburdened the reader's assimilative capabilities. The choice of the variable interruption as the focus for a discourse analysis was made in light of the sociopragmatic setting of negotiations. The fact that business negotiation theories consistently address conflict issues seemed to make interruptions a particularly pertinent feature for analysis - more so, perhaps, than paraphrases, subject openers, repetitions, and self repairs. Interruptions further interface with issues related to face and co-operation, concepts which will be examined in some detail in this chapter.

The chapter presents a discourse analysis of the interruption feature. It does so by focusing on conversational discourse in keeping with the mode of development of the thesis of discerning, namely that of examining the role of interruptions as a feature of a business negotiation. Conversational analysis bases its ideas, among other things, on the fact that conversation displays its own order and unique sense of structure.

The discourse analysis of the feature interruption is intended to complement the analysis of the subjects' reported self-perceptions about their performance and the observer's checklist, standing as further confirming evidence of the similarities of both populations in their expression of certain conversational features. Conversational analysis will be used to focus in greater detail on the observer's data, relating

interruptions to such pragmatic issues as emerge.

This chapter sets out to examine the use, function, and pattern of interruptions between both partners engaged in negotiating, at the same time as identifying and describing interactional aspects associated with interruptions such as co-occurrences with pauses and turn taking. The study thus posits the notion that by examining how interruptions are exhibited over the negotiation table, a pattern may emerge which can be identified and correlated with broader patterns of interaction.

The use and meaning of an interruption as a feature in a negotiating encounter is introduced as an extension of the data presented in Chapter 6. Thus, the presentation may be seen as part of CA's treatment of context as indexical to meaning. As Schiffrin (1994) in her presentation of conversational analysis as an approach to discourse analysis says:

. . . what is said provides not only the data underlying analysis, but also the evidence for hypothesis and conclusions: it is participants' conduct itself that must provide evidence for the presence of units, existence of patterns and formulation of rules. To this end, CA searches for recurrent patterns, distributions and forms of organization. . . .
(Schiffrin, 1994, p. 236)

The study of the feature stands as another tool or device which can be used to describe and understand the structure and organization of negotiation. It is intended to add another perspective to the study by taking as its starting point the premise that in CA "the relevance of context is grounded in text" (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 236). Inferences about the relevance of the feature interruption are thus grounded in the CA tradition, which suggests that expectations regarding form and meaning may be specified. The author further posits that looking closely at the display of interruptions within a business negotiating context may provide insights into the expression of a feature frequently

associated with conflict. This can benefit the student who is bringing to the negotiation a language other than his native tongue.

The following discourse analysis of interruptions is intended to provide the teacher and students with another tool to use in training future negotiators. The analysis is intended to complement the findings of analysts such as Jefferson (1987), who writes about the role of silence in the organization of a conversation, and Thompson (1994), who notes in her analysis of laughter in a business meeting that various aspects of discourse are relevant for the study and examination of the management of conversation.

The CA approach to discourse as applied in this chapter to the feature interruption considers the way negotiators construct, devise, and implement solutions to issues in negotiations such as warranty periods, delivery dates, and price categories. Patterns which were identified as the negotiators worked through to a mutually acceptable solution included the role of interruptions as part of the problem/solution pattern. Solutions to the issues raised in a negotiation are viewed through a CA perspective in order to provide a depth of analysis as to just how such problems are presented and resolved and the role that interruptions might play.

By closely analyzing and examining how interruptions are expressed and attended to by the negotiating partner it is suggested that another dimension to the analysis of features in a negotiation might be offered as a complementary way of understanding the discourse of negotiations and managing the tasks and challenges displayed in a negotiation. Thus, by discovering sequences and patterns of features, such as interruptions, general questions may be raised regarding the construction of a negotiation from the perspective of discourse analysis and applied sociolinguistics.

The two questions which the research addressed were, firstly, what quantifiable

differences, if any, existed between the two populations under investigation in their perceptions of the expression of the five selected conversational features, and, secondly, what effect, if any, the particular feature interruption had on the outcome of a negotiation. The hypothesis posed as related to the feature interruptions is whether or not interruptions may be associated with contributing to a positive negotiating atmosphere and thus assumedly encouraging a more successful negotiating outcome.

The presentation of the observer's checklist in Chapters 5 and 6, and specifically the findings as related to the variable interruption, provide a good starting point for a clear look at the qualitative aspects of interruptions among the two populations under observation. The following presentation is designed to isolate and examine this feature with an eye to discerning patterns of similarities and differences in order to deepen our understanding of the effect of this specific feature on the communication event - negotiations. A comprehensive review of the literature was presented in Chapter 4, establishing a categorical framework for identifying negotiation phases.

The paradigm for negotiations is based on Douglas' (1957) three-phase model of negotiations, since it includes those elements which negotiation theorists generally validate as viable components of negotiations. Douglas' phasal model serves as a conceptual prototype on which later models are built (Fisher, 1989; Bercovitch, 1991; Donohue and Ramesh, 1992), and is still considered a valid model for discussing negotiations.

As presented in Chapter 4, Douglas' formulation is supported by further descriptions of stages or processes through which a negotiator must move towards conclusion. Phase One, noted as the initial phase, is intended to exchange information related to the negotiation for purposes of establishing the negotiation range. Phase Two

functions to explore options, make concessions, discuss details, in order to reconnoitre the range. Predictably the most challenging, Phase Two involves interpersonal relationship-building through rhetoric which may be either hostile, aggressive, and non-compromising or harmonious, co-operative, and constructively compromising. Phase Two works towards modification and sets the stage for the third and final stage of negotiations, the conclusion or decision-making phase. This phase generally includes preclosing and closing discourse.

Predictably, a greater number of interruptions occurred consistently during Phase Two, according to the data compiled from the observer's checklist. The maximum number of interruptions took place during Phase Two of Encounter No. 28.

Observer's Checklist Encounter No. 28

Phase	One	Two	Three
NS	0	30	0
NNS	0	23	2

Interruptions

This encounter, which exhibited the greatest number of interruptions (55), serves to confirm the expectation that because of the characteristics of Phase Two, it was predictable that the greatest number of interruptions would occur during this phase. It also serves to illustrate the similarities in the interrupting behaviour between NSs and NNSs as described in the observer's checklist, as well as both the pre- and post-negotiation data.

7.2 Qualitative Analysis

The aim of the following discussion on interruptions is to discern patterns in the phenomenon in order to better understand some of the sociopragmatic implications of the feature. Brown and Levinson's concept of politeness issues, facesaving strategies, and

cultural notions, it is proposed, can serve as a model for investigating the sociopragmatic and interactional effects of the feature interruptions. The following presentation is designed to gain greater insight into the effect of an interruption on the total process of negotiations, as well as to examine its effect on the atmosphere of negotiations, leading to a positive outcome or a failed attempt at resolving differences.

The 6 encounters qualitatively analyzed in the chapter are representative of the 30 encounters discussed in Chapter 5 (see Appendix H). They were selected for the qualitative analysis because first of all, they provide a balance between NSs in positions as both buyers and sellers and NNSs in both positions.

Representative Encounters

NS - Buyer	2	NNS - Buyer	4
NS - Seller	4	NNS - Seller	2

In addition, the linguistic backgrounds of the NSs include native-English speakers from South Africa, Great Britain, and the United States, a population representative of the 30 encounters. The average general length of each encounter parallels the average length of the 30 encounters, and the balance between public sector organizations and private sector companies is 3/3 - again, a representative balance between public and private as displayed in the study and presented in the chapter on methodology. Thus the 6 encounters stand as a fair representation of the total encounters reported in the statistical, quantitative discussion.

The transcription conventions presented in this chapter were adopted to focus on the particular feature of interruptions, as well as to clarify the data for purposes of facilitating reading rather than listening to a recording. The transcription is set forth in sentence form using the standard mechanics of English, including capitals and

punctuation. This decision reflects the aim of "captur[ing] the characteristics of speech delivery" (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 422) and of highlighting the function of the feature. Interruptions are marked by the use of slashed brackets which indicate the precise point where the listener's utterance interjects itself into that of the speaker. This methodological decision is intended: a) to display the interruption as presented earlier in the chapter; and b) to focus attention on the sequence and/or co-occurrence of the interruption. In addition, the role assignment (Buyer/Seller), as well as NS/NNS, will also be referred to.

Interactional sociolinguists and ethnographers of communication emphasize the two-sided nature of conversation. Messages are developed as a result of the interaction between semantic information, i.e., the linguistic code, and contextual information. Thus Schiffrin (1994), for example, argues for a dual classification of "propositional meanings conveyed through the language" (p. 362) and context. The interpretation and analysis of the present findings takes into account context, including knowledge of the negotiation situation. Relational issues as presented in the discussions are additionally framed by the presupposition that while cultures differ in terms of expressions of politeness, these also serve as universals which create a bridge towards minimizing differences. Context is thus not only a matter of knowledge, i.e., what negotiators share regarding the event itself, but also defines, establishes, and constricts the social circumstances in which utterances are presented.

As has been discussed in many earlier presentations of negotiation styles, behaviour, goals, and expectations, it is generally conceded that the chances for achieving mutually-beneficial goals and interests are enhanced if the tone of the negotiation is harmonious, co-operative, and confirming (Douglas, 1957; Bercovitch, 1991; Barley,

1991; Wilson, 1992). Tone, on a scale of harmonious to discordant, can be taken as one measure of the success or failure of a negotiation. One of the elements in defining tone is the lexical choices of the partners. However, the analysis of lexis alone does not necessarily provide an accurate tool for the purposes of this study, given the fact that one participating partner is a NNS and thus possibly less adept at lexical choices (a premise addressed by the quantitative analysis, which demonstrated that the NNSs were less capable of using negotiation specific lexis than the NSs, according to their self-perceptions). Cultural differences further highlight the inaccuracies of using lexis as the sole measure of tone.

A more reliable evaluation of the role and importance of tone, this study suggests, may perhaps be seen through the result of an interruption on the overall goal achievement, although the research can only be tentative in proposing a relationship between the two variables. The close relation obtaining between tone and interruptions may indicate, in other words, how interruptions directly contribute to providing an atmosphere conducive either to the success or failure of a negotiation. Presupposing that harmony increases goal achievement, the following discussion examines actual interruptions in order to perceive how they affect the tone of the negotiating encounter.

The success of the negotiation is evaluated in light of the closing statements and indications by the participants that an agreement has either been reached, postponed, delayed, or rejected. Once again, while no attempt is made to draw conclusive statements regarding the influence of the variable interruptions on the realization of goals, the analysis is intended to provide information and insights regarding trends and directions which will require substantiation in future research, perhaps through a larger corpus of data.

It should be remembered that data from the observer's checklist, as discussed in Chapter 6, indicated that 40% of the NS population specifically stated that success was achieved, while 30% of the NNSs made a direct statement confirming success. In the 6 encounters analyzed in this chapter, satisfaction with the outcome was reported in 50% of the encounters - all from those encounters described as harmonious. Thus, although the data is limited there does seem to be some correspondence between tone and acknowledgement of success; however, lack of explicit acknowledgement does not preclude its presence in the form of a smile, nod, handshake, or other gestures, for example.

Tone and style may be characterized along a continuum from incompatible and competitive to harmonious and co-operative. These categories may be analyzed according to various criteria set forth by researchers and writers in the field of intercultural business encounters (Douglas, 1957; Victor, 1987; Julian, 1990; Goldberg, 1990; Martin and Chaney, 1992; Ulijin and Li, 1995).

As discussed in earlier chapters, it is assumed that the characterization of the negotiation in the literature generally reflects the orientation of the writers according to their area of interest. These writers have, as a rule, paid little attention to discourse features such as turn taking signals, choice of lexis, non-verbal signals and cues, and topic sequences or to tone and style. Some attention has been paid, however, to the context in which features are used, as well as the characterization of negotiations. An example can be found in Ulijin and Li's (1995) observations concerning temporal aspects of turn taking in Chinese/Western intercultural business encounters.

To objectively assess the tone and style of the negotiation would require a multi-strand analysis of several diverse linguistic and paralinguistic features which is

clearly beyond the scope of the present study. Rather, the categories ranging from harmonious to confrontational were adapted using specific criteria as discussed in Chapter 4 (Goldberg, 1990; Julian, 1990; Barley, 1995; Ulijin and Li, 1995). The criteria for the classification of the encounters include: turn taking signals, inferential meanings as displayed through lexis, tone and pitch of participants as evidenced through recordings, and sequencing of topics, subjects and points of agreement/disagreement. The following charts classify the encounters:

Style/Tone	Harmonious	Neutral	Mixed	Confrontational
Encounter No.	#22,#23,#28	#17	#3	#27

Interestingly, we can see that the type of company also blends into the profile, suggesting that private corporations, firms, and organizations may differ in terms of the representative negotiating style from the public/non-profit organization, although what, if any, significance should be attributed to this fact cannot be stated here:

Organizational Type	Multinational	Multinational	Multinational	Public	Private	Nonprofit
Goal Realization	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Delayed	Delayed	Delayed
Negotiating Style/Tone	Harmonious	Harmonious	Harmonious	Neutral	Mixed	Confrontational
Encounter No.	#22	#23	#28	#17	#3	#27

The realization of predetermined goals was acknowledged as achieved in those encounters which, according to the criteria noted above, were harmonious (#22, #23, #28). In those encounters where the achievement of a goal was delayed or not achieved, the style in negotiating as described by the stated criteria ranged from neutral to confrontational.

7.2.1 Function and Effect of Interruptions

Based on the discussions presented in Chapters 2 and 4, an interruption may be defined on the basis of specific formal characteristics and functional features. An interruption can be identified when it conforms to the following criteria:

- * Forms an utterance by the listener which has the immediate and sustaining effect of disrupting the speaker's turn.
- * Breaks the continuity of the speaker, leading to a loss of speaker turn.
- * Contravenes the no gap/no overlap conversational rule.
- * Cuts across more than one lexical constituent of the speaker.
- * The interrupting speaker does not necessarily complete the interrupting utterance. Unit completion does not play a role in defining what an interruption is or is not.
- * Prevents the interrupted speaker from completing his/her current utterance but does not necessarily restrain him/her from returning to the utterance for completion.

Examples of interruptions which display the characteristics noted can be seen from the following segments. These extracts have been selected from the six encounters as an indication of typical types of interrupting behaviour in different encounters. These examples will be used for elaboration in the discussion on the sociopragmatic implications of interruptions.

The examples cited in the follow-up qualitative analysis are provided in order to establish solid ground for the discussions later in this chapter on the pragmatic implications and effects of the variable.

ENCOUNTER NO. 22: 53-58

NNS-Seller So, can you tell me roughly what [unclear] purchases/
NS-Buyer /As/ I said
as I said, I am interested, er, in the purchase of a new computer from your firm . . .

ENCOUNTER NO. 23: 53-58

NS-Buyer /Do you/ feel ready to/
NNS-Seller /Yes, I will/
NS-Buyer /answer those/
NNS-Seller /all the/ question, er, for you, er, Would you like some coffee?

ENCOUNTER NO. 23: 204-208

NNS-Seller Usually we are not er, we are deliver er, on time, that's the reason why/
NS-Buyer /You do deliver on time?

ENCOUNTER NO. 27: 51-52

NS-Seller Oh, most of the parts/
NNS-Buyer /What/ country?

ENCOUNTER NO. 28: 108-110

NS-Seller Well, so we could let you/
NNS-Buyer /so three/ months
is the minimum [fades]

Researchers from various fields frequently assume that interruptions have an negative effect and that they form an explicit violation of a speaker's role. As discussed in Chapter 2, for example, Duncan (1972) presents a strong case in suggesting that interruptions constitute a direct face threatening act (FTA), a position endorsed by Goldberg (1990) and Hawkins (1991), while Langford (1994) argues that interruptions create an antagonistic, competitive, and hostile atmosphere. Clearly, interruptions may have a negative effect on the atmosphere, particularly in a negotiation setting, which is potentially conflictual by definition. However, interruptions may also serve a more constructive role.

Allowing for the characterization of an interruption as possessing the potential to create bonding during a negotiation, as discussed in Chapter 2 (Watson, 1975; Tannen, 1990; Schiffrin, 1994; Ulijin and Li, 1995), the following description of constructive interruptions may be adopted. Such interruptions are relational - rapport building, establishing, and maintaining; supportive - calming, reassuring, confirming; solidifying - bonding, committing, reaffirming; and co-operative - accommodating, compromising, agreeing. Constructive interruptions support relationship building, solidarity, and rapport-establishment behaviour. The interactants or negotiating partners work together towards common goals when positive rapport-oriented interruptions are evidenced. Constructive interruptions may be viewed as intentional acts of collaboration, co-operation, and shared orientation which serve some of the following functions as noted:

- provide reassurance, calmness, and support
- state and emphasize commitment and confirmation
- elaborate, clarify, and emphasize an important point or issue
- sustain confidence
- encourage thought processes which advance the negotiation
- establish solidarity and bonding
- demonstrate willingness to accommodate and compromise.

The present study suggests that the context and intent of an interruption in fact appear to play a role in effectively contributing to style, tone, and goal attainment. A tentative finding refutes the proposition that interruptions necessarily represent either aggressive tendencies on the part of the interrupter or a competitive atmosphere. On the contrary, it appears that interruptions frequently, if not exclusively, serve a constructive

purpose in moving partners towards a successful negotiating outcome. As noted earlier, however, caution is necessary in extending these assumptions beyond this study, although it is anticipated that these generalizations may point future research in the direction opened up by these preliminary findings.

7.2.2 Model of Constructive Interruptions - Encounter No. 22

The following analysis drawn from sample occurrences examines the function and effect of interruptions in contributing to the overall tone of harmony and goodwill which characterized the expression of goal satisfaction stated by the parties at the conclusion of the negotiation. Encounter No. 22 stands at the centre of the analysis as an outstanding illustration of the rapport-oriented type of interruptions, while examples from the other encounters will be cited as parallel examples of constructive interruptions.

With the exception of one interruption in the closing phase, all 14 interruptions in Encounter No. 22 took place during Phase Two of the negotiation, a characteristic typical of all 30 encounters examined in this study. The NS Buyer interrupted the NNS Seller 11 times, while the NNS Seller interrupted the Buyer 3 times during the session. In the majority of cases, the interruptions of the NS were directly linked to efforts to advance the position of the NNS or to guide the NNS to a conclusion both agreed upon in an effort to speed the session along in the best mutual interests of both parties. The NS also interrupts to display preference and agreement, as well as to repeat an earlier point in order to emphasize the point and to check to be certain that the issue was clearly understood by the NNS. On the other hand, the NNS interrupts twice to show that he agrees with the point put forward by the NS, and once to echo the position he supports which has been stated by the NS. At two junctures, the interrupting behaviour seemed

to evolve into a type of pattern. At the first juncture, both partners are working through the terms of the negotiation - delivery, warranty period, prices, and penalty clause. The NNS Seller appears eager to go through the terms in a rather off-hand style, but is interrupted by the Buyer and slowed down:

ENCOUNTER NO. 22: 108-131

NS-Buyer Um, the main question I have for you is this: um, if we could come to, er, some sort of compromise on the price, I would be prepared to come to some compromise on the warranty period, so I have to state outright that your price is too high, and that, um, I cannot, um, agree to, um, to that of sum of, of money, um, however, um, I've, I've mentioned to you I am certainly willing to, er, make a compromise on, on the other issues that I've mentioned like delivery time, warranty period/
NNS-Seller /O.K., so/
NS-Buyer /penalty clause, etc./
NNS-Seller /I understand, so, I understand that the delivery time of twelve weeks is fine then?

The second juncture again revolves around the specific terms of the negotiation, but at this stage in the negotiation, perhaps due to the earlier segments which appear to have established a positive rapport and mutual trust, the interruptions serve to clarify rather than to challenge:

ENCOUNTER NO. 22: 300-312

NNS-Seller (laughs) I don't remember what I said (Buyer: eight weeks) if I said eight weeks then I will, I will stick to eight (Buyer and Seller laugh), usually I write these things, write these things down, O.K. Um, six/
NS-Buyer /warranty/ period?
NNS-Seller We agreed about six months?/
NS-Buyer /Six/ months.
NNS-Seller O.K.

As a feature of the encounter, the interruption did not develop either into a *modus operandi* of the encounter or into a competitive struggle for control which was typical of the interrupting behaviour, for example, of Encounter No. 27. The tone of Encounter No. 22 could be described as polite, co-operative, and harmonious, with the interruptions acting as a lever to move the negotiation along and to signal acceptance, agreement, and confirmation.

Encounter No. 22 opens with pleasantries and greetings which are offered by both parties, who appear to be intent on establishing good will right from the start. Note that although the Seller is the NNS, he takes the initial turn by thanking the Buyer for the opportunity to meet and by acknowledging the effort extended by the Buyer to attend the session - a very friendly and thoughtful gesture. Moreover, the Seller directly states that he has been very satisfied with the last deal and hopes that the session will provide an opportunity for even greater business:

ENCOUNTER NO. 22: 1-18

- NNS-Seller Good morning, Sir. Thank you very much for the opportunity to offer you a product, and we really appreciate the fact that you came such a long way to visit us, and to allow us to present you with our products.
- NS-Buyer Ah hello, Avi, it's very nice to be here, I'm delighted to see you again, and, um, how are you?
- NNS-Seller (laughs) I'm doing O.K., and our business are doing O.K. and we are very happy from your, ah, last purchase, and we hope that we can offer you some better deals on your visit today.

This is a very smooth, coherent, easy, and pleasant opening of Phase One, setting the stage for the Buyer to open up the subject of the actual purpose of the meeting - thus advancing the negotiation from Phase One to Phase Two:

ENCOUNTER NO. 22: 19-37

NS-Buyer All right. Um, you know that I am interested in the purchase of a computer, and I'm particularly interested in, um, buying a real quality computer and that's the reason that I've come here, so, um, I would like to begin by asking a few questions. Um, you're aware of the type of computer that I, I'm interested in, and, um, I would like to know something about delivery time, um, whether you have, er, delivery and installation for example, whether you have a credit period. Could you give me as much information as possible before we go any further?

Note the striking difference in Phase One between the harmony of Encounter No. 22 and the rough, confrontational, almost angry opening of Encounter No. 27, which was categorized as confrontational:

ENCOUNTER NO. 27: 1-31

NNS-Buyer So, I'm the buyer, so, er, ahem, so, I came over here to, to try to buy, er, computers from you. I heard that you have a, um, a good, um, merchandise and er, can you tell me something about the computers?

NS-Seller Well, first of all, I'm delighted to have you visit us, and we would be very happy if you'd be our customer. Our computer is really the best and the most modern on the market, and from our previous discussions I'm sure it's exactly what you need.

NNS-Buyer Yes, but er, this, er, beautiful sentences we, I've heard in er, certain other places that I, er, I did chan-, I chanced to visit, and everybody tells me the same story, that he's the best and he's the best price, but you know there are many other er, um, companies who are trying to sell us, and because I'm a big buyer, I'm talking about the big money, so please, tell me what you can do for us, first of all tell me something about the computer, and later we will go, later on we'll go to the price.

The first example of an interruption in Encounter No. 22 follows a presentation by the NNS of the possibilities of purchasing a greater quantity of computers to the gain of the Buyer. The NNS appears to stumble and hesitate somewhat as he pitches for quantity:

ENCOUNTER NO. 22: 38-48

NNS-Seller Sure. Um, I would like just one quick question, er, we could offer a very good deal currently for a per-, for a quantity that is greater than one thousand computers. ah, and, er, for this quantity I am sure that we can, er, give you a very good deal, um, or a very good offer now, er,

The Buyer responds somewhat irritatedly to the suggestion of the purchase of quantities greater than what she wants:

ENCOUNTER NO. 22: 49-52

NS-Buyer Well, perhaps I should make it clear that, um, er, I'm not interested at this stage in the purchase of a great quantity.

The Seller drops the point and moves towards trying to understand his customer's needs. He is interrupted, however, by the Buyer, who displays some impatience at the need to reiterate a point she assumed was clear from the start and at his missing her cue that at this stage she is not interested in quantity. She repeats her simple statement twice, an uncommon cycle of repetition signalling by her tone some impatience. It might also be noted that she assumed that the point was clear, as it is directly stated "I should make it clear":

ENCOUNTER NO. 22: 53-58

NNS-Seller So, can you tell me rough what [unclear] purchases/

NS-Buyer /As/ I said,
as I said, I am interested, er, in the purchase of a new computer from you firm.

The interruption by the NS served to move the negotiation along and to focus more directly to the Seller just what her needs are. The Seller appears to ignore the potentially irritating interruption, taking it as an opportunity to demonstrate that he not only understands the Buyer's request for one computer only but is also interested in being certain that she knows that he now understands. The NNS' question:

ENCOUNTER NO. 22: 59

NNS-Seller One computer?

appears to be rhetorical, given the context of the earlier exchange. The NS may possibly have misunderstood the knowledge that the Seller had of her needs to purchase only one computer, and her interruption, accompanied by a repetition, could have signalled annoyance. Whether or not the NNS Seller understood the intention and chose to ignore it and not see the interruption as a FTA, or, quite possibly, did not pick up the irritation due to his limited assumptions or interest concerning the Buyer's needs, is not clear. What is evident, however, is that the interruption as a potentially confrontational tactic was turned around in the best interest of the negotiations and that the negotiation continued along the lines of having a goal well established in the opening phase. The speaker's reaction to the interruption was to ignore it. By choosing to disregard the interruption, he therefore did not allow a smooth negotiation to deteriorate.

In a fine example of a smooth turn transition, the Buyer and Seller then move along into a discussion of the points of purchase - warranty period, delivery, and sales price. The Seller forthrightly states what he has to offer:

ENCOUNTER NO. 22: 68-76

NNS-Seller Yes, sure, for, er, the system, the configuration that you asked, um, ah, our, er, customer price right now is, er, four hundred ninety thousand dollars, um, the

standard delivery is twelve weeks, and we offer the system with six months guarantee period.

The Buyer appears contemplative and raises a question of penalty clauses for late delivery. Acknowledging that no clause exists and confidently assuring the Buyer that they can "meet the delivery", the Seller then tries to understand the Buyer's delivery needs. Taking needs-interest as the opportunity to suggest that the competition offers both a better price and a better warranty, the Seller proposes that if an agreement can be reached on the price, the warranty period can be adjusted. The Buyer approaches the negotiation in the same manner - offering concessions if agreement can be reached - but very abruptly the NNS Seller interrupts with both an agreement and a call for greater elaboration of the topics under discussion:

ENCOUNTER NO. 22: 108-131

NS-Buyer Um, the, the main question I have for you is this: um, if we could come to, er, some sort of compromise on the price, I would be prepared to come to some compromise on the warranty period, so I have to state outright that your price is too high, and that, um, I cannot, um, agree to, um, to that sum of, of money, um, however, um, I've, I've mentioned to you I am certainly, er, willing to, er, make a compromise on, on the other issues that I've mentioned like delivery time, warranty period/

NNS-Seller /O.K., so/

NS-Buyer /penalty clause, etc./

NNS-Seller /I understand, so, I understand that the delivery of twelve weeks is fine then?

The mutuality of interrupting behaviour appears to function here to advance the negotiation and to reflect the Seller's effort to demonstrate an understanding of the Buyer's needs, although the sequence demonstrated that in fact the Seller once again

misunderstood his Buyer's needs:

ENCOUNTER NO. 22: 132-144

NS-Buyer No, th- that's not what I, I was, er, trying to convey, um, I think I should tell you that, um, although I mentioned we're interested in your company, um, there are, er, competitors out there whose price is more to our, um, budget and, er, I would like to be closer to a figure around four hundred thousand dollars, and then we can discuss the, um, other details.

Note that the NS refuses to give up the floor and in fact continues her serial requests, entirely ignoring the interruption:

ENCOUNTER NO. 22: 123-129

NS-Buyer the other issues that I've mentioned like delivery time, warranty period/

NNS-Seller /O.K., so/

NS-Buyer /penalty clause, etc./

NNS-Seller /I understand, so, I understand . . .

Perhaps it has become clear to the Buyer that the Seller is indeed struggling to understand her needs. Her ongoing description and insistence on holding on to the floor can then be perceived as representing efforts on her part to encourage him to pay further attention to what she is saying. The Buyer exhibits patience towards the Seller in spite of his missing her cue, while the Seller appears to be making an earnest effort at coming to terms with her needs.

It is this level of mutual trust and earnestness displayed by both partners which steers the negotiations on a clear path towards goal achievement. While the interruptions and the no reaction sequence could be a potentially FTA, the negotiation is in fact filtered through a lens of mutual support and relationship building. The interruptions consequently seem to further the cause of mutually satisfying their partner's needs. Potentially threats to status, role, and power, the interruptions actually serve to advance

the process of reaching an agreement.

As the partners talk through their points of agreements and disagreement and move towards a settlement phase, the Seller seems to require time to assimilate all the information in order to make concessions or to reject the offer made by the Buyer. As he seems to be thinking aloud, the NS Buyer interrupts to remind the Seller that if this deal can be settled, the potential for more business exists. The NS Buyer's interruptions serve as a type of control device, almost as though she thought of this strategy to convince the Seller. She is so eager to work out an agreement that her tag offer must be presented. The effect of the interruption is to emphasize a point of possible agreement, suggesting once more the harmonious tone of the encounter:

ENCOUNTER NO. 22: 248-281

NNS-Seller I see where you are coming from, and I can, er, assure you that we will be very happy if you will continue to be, er, er, consider (Buyer: [unclear]) our products as the first possibility, and, er, I would like to, er, offer you better deals or better offer than I've quoted you, so, er, I'm trying to work those issues up and, er, to sum up what we have agreed and to leave aside what we have not agreed upon, and let's see ho-, how can we progress. Is it agreed that we have a delivery of ten weeks? Leave aside the, the price (Buyer: um) for a few minutes/

NS-Buyer /Before we go into that, er, Avi, there is one, um, issue I'd like to mention, and that is, if we're satisfied, which I'm sure we will be, with your product, please keep in mind that in the future we're likely to be, um, greater clients of yours, and, er, we're also likely to make much larger orders than we are at the moment, so perhaps that would influence your considerations.

A good display of how interruptions serve to confirm and solidify arrangements and to clarify the issues under consideration is then once again demonstrated:

ENCOUNTER NO. 22: 300-312

NNS-Seller (laughs) I don't remember what I said,
(Buyer: eight weeks) if I said eight then I
will, I will stick to eight (Buyer and Seller
laugh), usually I write these thing, write
these things down, O.K. Um, six/
NS-Buyer /Warranty/ period?
NNS-Seller We agreed about six months?/
NS-Buyer /Six/ months
NNS-Seller O.K.

Both Seller and Buyer interrupt almost matter of factly, and the effect is to move along from one point to another in a productive and efficient manner. Even when the NNS Seller misunderstands or acknowledges that he has forgotten certain points made earlier, the Buyer does not take advantage but rather ignores and prompts her partner.

The final interruption takes place as the interlocutors depart. The NS appears to be flattered by the compliment that the business was good and she is eager to show her satisfaction:

ENCOUNTER NO. 22: 427-429

NNS-Seller O.K. It was very nice doing business with you/
NS-Buyer /Thank you./ Mutual.

This analysis of an encounter based on good will, harmony, and cooperation illustrates how an interruption can serve to contribute to the overall tone of the negotiation. Potential FTAs became positive prompts and supports. Speakership rights, status, and roles were neither thwarted nor compromised by the interruption, and it was within the context of a smooth negotiating session that the interruption seemed to move along the negotiation.

Eager to please and close a deal, both the Seller and the Buyer interrupted to

display agreement, solidify the bonds suggested in Phase One, and maintain the rapport-oriented tone of the negotiation. Relational considerations allowed each partner to manoeuvre and manipulate the negotiations in a friendly and positive manner. The interruption was a feature which served to promote this atmosphere of good will and harmony. Since the positive negotiating relationship was both reinforced and created during the negotiation itself, interruptions not only had interactive meaning but also suggested broader implications about the rights and responsibilities of the partner. Thus interruptions as a feature and discourse strategy created solidarity and contributed in a significant and positive way to the goal achievement of this negotiation.

7.2.3 Interruptions as a Positive Interrelational and Interactional Influence - Encounters Nos. 23 and 28

In the following excerpts, examples are brought to demonstrate how an interruption can broaden the positive interrelational aspect of a negotiation and have a potentially powerful effect on its tone, in the light of Schiffrin's (1994, p. 112) suggestions that the right to abdicate speakership may shift during a conversation and that speakership rights are dependent upon participant roles.

The interactional meanings displayed during a negotiation can be interpreted in the framework of Brown and Levinson's politeness notion that "the distribution of politeness (who has to be polite to whom) is socially controlled" (Brown and Levinson, 1987, p. 4). If politeness is thus communicated through conversational interaction, interruptions may be viewed as a discourse strategy which possesses the potential either of creating solidarity and rapport or of maintaining distance. That is to say, the feature may be positively or negatively glossed depending, as demonstrated earlier, on contextual

inferences and social interactions - what Goffman refers to as "the traffic rules in social interaction" (Goffman, 1963, p. 16).

A conversational feature such as interruptions may thus be interpreted as functioning as an index or barometer in a social or business relationship. This relationship is constantly evolving and continuously being constructed and defined throughout the interaction. This raises the question of what role an interruption may play in the relationship of self to others.

As noted in the earlier discussions on interruptions and supported by the observer's checklist, neither the pre- nor post-negotiation questionnaires demonstrated any statistically-significant difference of the feature between NSs and NNSs. Confirming the findings of the observer's checklist, both populations appeared remarkably similar in the cluster of frequency of interruptions between 0-11 (see Tables 5.5 and 5.6). The present analysis is intended to examine the sociopragmatic implications of the interruptions, within the framework of Brown and Levinson's, Goffman's, and Schiffrin's ideas relating to interactional sociolinguistics.

Schiffrin (1994) proposes that the role of the other be taken as a construct according to which, in the division of speaker/listener interaction, either one may be capable of subsuming the other's role. Perception of this situation may create a strong bond or almost empathic awareness of the existence of the other person. In the ritual of exchanges, one party takes up the position of the other. When such thought-completion or "speaking for others" (p. 109) occurs, an interruption can appear to serve the function of extending and strengthening the bond which was created.

Examples of this phenomenon can be seen in encounters where the speaker is interrupted as the listener takes up his subject, point, or position in an act of bonding and

solidarity. Although the reaction/interaction may differ, the intentional meaning is to demonstrate solidarity. Completing one another's thoughts reflects a confirming strategy which is most often welcomed and in fact may be picked up in reciprocating behaviour. Encounters Nos. 23, and 28 contain notable examples of this behavioural feature.

Encounter No. 23 serves as a particularly good example of thought-completion resulting in on-going harmonious exchange. This pattern recurs six times throughout the session, usually initiated by the NNS. The overall tone of this specific negotiation could be described as so harmonious that at times both partners seem to anticipate the other's needs. The pattern of interruptions enhances the overall style and tone of the encounter.

In the opening remarks of Phase One, the NS confirms the description of the hotel by interruption:

ENCOUNTER NO. 23: 11-17

NNS-Seller And, er, where are you staying?
NS-Buyer I'm staying at the Hyatt Hotel.
NNS-Seller Nice. It's very nice up there/
NS-Buyer /it's very comfortable.
NNS-Seller yes.

Another series of interruptions follows shortly. This time, however, the interruptions further function to support, confirm, and complete the other's thought - almost forming a synchrony of interrupting:

ENCOUNTER NO. 23: 53-58

NS-Buyer /Do you/feel ready to/
NNS-Seller /Yes, I will/
NS-Buyer /answer those/
NNS-Seller /all the/ question, er, for you, er. Would
you like some coffee?

This synchronizing behaviour, anticipation of ideas, and tolerance of interruptions is once again displayed within a minute of the previous interrupting behaviour:

ENCOUNTER NO. 23: 82-97

NSS-Seller /our company or er, when, when you er,
started to er, check all the other
companies/
NS-Buyer /No, I, I haven't/
NNS-Seller /you don't have/
NS-Buyer /from other
companies but not from yours
NNS-Seller and from our company you don't have/
NS-Buyer /nothing at all/
NNS-Seller /nothing/ about the delivery time and/
NS-Buyer /Nothing/ at all, no. So, um/
NNS-Seller O.K.

Prompting for the preferred response, the two partners anticipate questions and offer solutions in a most amicable and supportive fashion. Here again, the interruption serves as a type of thought-completing interactional process which contributes to the bonding and solidifying of the negotiation:

ENCOUNTER NO. 23: 198-215

NSS-Seller [pause] O.K. So er, I, I/
NS-Buyer /What/
are, what are your terms on that item?
NNS-Seller For late delivery?/
NS-Buyer /Yes./
NNS-Seller Usually we are not er, we are deliver er, on
time, that's the reason why/
NS-Buyer /You do deliver on time?
NNS-Seller The pardon?
NS-Buyer I said/
NNS-Seller /usually we are/ deliver our product on
time, it's part of our policy, and that's why
we are also, in that case, because of the/

As the negotiation progresses and each negotiable item is raised for consideration, the earlier displays of interruptions to complete thoughts, confirm, affirm, and substantiate a point continue. The pattern is set and acts as a type of confirming strategy. The consistency of the interrupting pattern and the similarity of responses create a picture of a unified, balanced, and synchronic negotiation, enhanced by what appears to be

intentional prompting and supportive interruptions:

ENCOUNTER NO. 23: 316-320

NSS-Seller er, in er, on, on the sign er/
NS-Buyer /of the contract/
NNS-Seller /contract. And/ er, other half on er, the day
that er, you . . .

ENCOUNTER NO. 23: 389-399

NNS-Seller But er, we are not selling only er, the
computer, as I said we selling the strength
of the company, the service and a
computer that er, when you get it you will
know that for a long time you will have a
company that's standing behind you, and
er/
NS-Buyer /That's/ the reason I'm here.

ENCOUNTER NO. 23: 448-458

NS-Buyer Um, the problem is that we want this
computer as quickly as possible and we
want this specific computer, so that I don't
think we can um, take any er, alternative
suggestion on that issue, but as I said to
you, we, we certainly would be prepared to
wait if um
NNS-Seller If the price/
NS-Buyer /price was/ right.

ENCOUNTER NO. 23: 473-481

NS-Buyer Mm-hm, O.K. fine/
NNS-Seller /and to see/
maybe we would able to shorten it in er,
three-four weeks, but no, not more/
NS-Buyer /O.K./ fine. So
instead of three months you're saying two
months/
NNS-Seller /Two months./

This encounter serves as a prominent example of the unifying and rapport-oriented potential of the feature. The interruption itself seems to characterize and define the whole negotiation, which concludes with a closed deal and expressed satisfaction on the part of both sides:

ENCOUNTER NO. 23: 598-602

NS-Buyer Thank you very much. Well I hope to er,
be doing business with you again soon,
and it was very good to meet you.
NNS-Seller It was my pleasure.

Encounter No. 28 contains a mixture of the interruption types characteristic of Encounters Nos. 22 and 23. Although it appears to close with mutual satisfaction, the path to goal achievement is neither as smooth nor as harmonious as in Encounters Nos. 22 and 23. It thus serves as a model of the "conflictual" potential of the interrupting feature. Although it stands on the edge of deteriorating into petty name-calling, several times on the verge of complete collapse due to expressions of hostility and anger, the NS and NNS appear to discover a workable conflict-resolution strategy, involving interruptions, which ultimately salvages the negotiation.

More than with any other negotiation recorded, the co-occurrence of interruptions with hesitations, unclear comments, and laughter is a frequent feature of the discourse. At times, as the tone appears to waver and struggle for balance between disappointment, impatience, surprise, and annoyance, this phenomenon is more pronounced. The smooth transition of which interruptions formed a solid and obvious fulcrum were not evidenced in this encounter. Rather, there appeared to be a hostile confrontation for positive advancements. The interruptions were less clearly defined as contributing to the tone of harmony; however, although potential disintegration threatened, both partners struggled for levity, maintaining a positive stance and a grasp of the need to finally agree in order to prevent failure. Because both partners seemed to display a good sense of humour throughout the session, their jocular styles at times complementing one another, the overall tone of the negotiation was finally mutually supportive.

Several features mitigated against anger and aggression. At the end of the

negotiation, a satisfactory bonding relationship appeared to develop, moulded as part of the session. The solidification of the relationship as a result of working through point by point areas of disagreement and contention seemed to create a good backdrop against which the Seller and Buyer finally agree that it was nice to do business with one another:

ENCOUNTER NO. 28: 569-576

- NS-Seller I've been to the Western Wall, I, I got this great suntan in the Negev, it's been great. Anyway, it's er, it's good to see you [unclear]/
- NNS-Buyer /Nice of you to have business with, with you.
- NS-Seller Nice to do business with you too.

Ambiguities appear throughout Encounter No. 28. Both Buyer and Seller tend to hesitate, fade, and restart and muffle their remarks, so that such ambiguities stand out against the backdrop of interruptions. Unclear comments by both partners seem to cluster around interruptions at various junctures in the negotiation:

ENCOUNTER NO. 28: 35-43

- NNS-Buyer They didn't say an exact figure but this is kind of [unclear]
- NS-Seller Aha.
- NNS-Buyer This is/
- NS-Seller /It's a/ [unclear]/
- NNS-Buyer /[unclear].
Probably you have to [unclear] awhile.
You shouldn't ask me [unclear].

ENCOUNTER NO. 28: 98-110

- NS-Seller [unclear] half a year/
- NNS-Buyer /for that/ amount of money/
- NS-Seller /half a year/ is er, that's a, that's a little, that's a long time to pay off your computer/
- NNS-Buyer /Well, it's/ customary to have the computer in, in, for a trial period for instance, and then can return it if we're not satisfied without payment [unclear].
- NS-Seller Well, we could let you/
- NNS-Buyer /so three/ months is the minimum [fades]

ENCOUNTER NO. 28: 274-277

NNS-Buyer /I mean/ there can be [unclear/
NS-Seller /one year
warranty yes/
NNS-Buyer /for twenty/ years.

ENCOUNTER NO. 28: 324-335

NS-Seller /yeah,/ I
remember. I came here myself/
NNS-Buyer /well, I [unclear]/
NS-Seller /I made a special trip on the Concord to
France, then I flew charter plane to get
here by myself to screw it in, that's our
warranty/
NNS-Buyer /it/ was one year and a, and a week after
we bought the computer

Although less dominant a feature in this encounter, laughter appears to co-occur with ambiguities and interruptions at various points:

ENCOUNTER NO. 28: 186-190

NNS-Buyer And fifty percent out of four hundred K.
NS-Seller Four fifty K. [unclear].
NNS-Buyer No, four fifty is far too high [laughter]

It may be noted that the laughter in these excerpts precedes interruptions but co-occurs with ambiguities. The tone of the discourse is almost playful and jocular, and the slight laughter appears to emphasize that tone:

ENCOUNTER NO. 28: 269-273

NNS-Buyer We haven't spoken about warranty period,
the usual five year years warranty?
NS-Seller No. There's no usual five year warranty
[laughs]/

ENCOUNTER NO. 28: 278-290

NS-Seller I'm in the computer business, my father's in
the computer business, my grandfather,
before there was even computers, was in
the computer business.
NNS-Buyer I never said [laughter] revolution, you'll
make a revolution.
NS-Seller That's right.
NNS-Buyer [unclear] logical terms [unclear]

NS-Seller My dad-, my great-great-great-grandfather
ran George Washington's computer.
[laughter]

In this extract, laughter follows a playful comment from the preceding comment of the Buyer:

ENCOUNTER NO. 28: 337-339

NS-Seller I'll give you one year and a week then
[laughter]. What? One year and a week.

Commissives as threats and promises or warnings appear to be mitigated by a sprinkling of interruptions:

ENCOUNTER NO. 28: 111-118

NS-Seller I think we could let you, we, we, could let
you try their computer over a period say,
you know six months or so.

NNS-Buyer Six months with er full er charge and
return/

NS-Seller /Well, I mean/

NNS-Buyer /if we're/ not satisfied

ENCOUNTER NO. 28: 125-130

NNS-Buyer So let's say we pay fifty percent in er, one
month and the other fifty percent after half
a year. Sounds more/

NS-Seller /How about/

NNS-Buyer /sensible/

Although interruptions serve to emphasize the differences in the negotiating terms, the interruptions themselves mitigate any hostile misunderstandings as the parties work through reasonable terms in rapid fire succession. Once again, the interruptions co-occur with commissives, but the negotiation moves along as though the commissives are neutralized by the interruptions themselves:

ENCOUNTER NO. 28: 302-323

NNS-Buyer No, I can't accept that. This is a standard thing/

NS-Seller /It is not a/ standard thing/

NNS-Buyer /it, it/

NS-Seller /I've, I've
 looked back over all your warranties,
 they're all one-year warranties.

NNS-Buyer No.

NS-Seller But that, this is/

NNS-Buyer /They're all/ five years

NS-Seller This is one year, I mean if there's a sc-, they
 are not, you're, I, if, if there's even a screw
 that's loose on it, it's covered by our
 warranty, no other warranty is like that,
 there's a screw, if there's a screw loose.
 Not that there would ever be a screw loose
 on one of our computers.

NNS-Buyer It's happened er, before. We paid, you, you
 remember well/

ENCOUNTER NO. 28: 352-372

NNS-Buyer Let's, let's meet in the middle/

NS-Seller /No./

NNS-Buyer /Three years/

NS-Seller /Forget it, there's/ no three-year warranty,
 there's no three-year warranty. It's one, it's
 one-year warranty.

NNS-Buyer A one-year warranty isn't acceptable, I'm
 sorry. Present-, we if, if, as I say before
 we have your computers in our company
 and if, for seven years, and if I could say
 that your complete-, computers are reliable
 and had no problems/

NS-Seller /Then why/ d'you keep doing
 business with us? Why do you keep, if
 you seem to think our computers/

NNS-Buyer /Because your [unclear]/

NS-Seller /are so unreliable.

Once again, an ambiguous comment co-occurs with laughter and laughter with
 an interruption:

ENCOUNTER NO. 28: 413-421

NNS-Buyer I guess I helped you [laughter] [unclear]
 know enough about computers.

NS-Seller No such luck. I said, I've been in
 computers, my father's been in computer's,
 grandfather is in computers/

NNS-Buyer /My mother/ is in I.B.M. [laughter]

7.2.4 Interruptions as a Mixed Influence - Encounters Nos. 3 and 17

Encounters Nos. 3 and 17 may be characterized as "mixed", in the sense that neither party expressed genuine satisfaction with the outcome and bonding and rapport-building relationships were very limited during the session. In Encounter No. 17, for example, two interruptions are noted, compared with Encounter No. 22 where 11 interruptions occur in Phase Two alone. Business-like, persistent, and questioning throughout the encounter, both parties struggled for clarity and understanding of issues of disagreement before attempting to move on to other points. Little was compromised by either party, and the best that either side achieved was the willingness to defer the final decision to the management and decision makers. Agreement/disagreement turns were characterized by impatience and a sense of annoyance that one party was gaining at the expense of the other. Even when an agreement was reached it was done so somewhat grudgingly, punctuated by hesitations and back channelling:

ENCOUNTER NO. 3: 770-882

NNS-Buyer /No,/ I want to have the, a clause about *unavoidable delay*, and what will they [unclear]/

NS-Seller /unavoidable delay?

NNS-Buyer Yuh, because any delay, any delay will er (Seller: any delay will?), give us the right to cancel the, er/

NS-Seller /Yeah, well,/ I don't think a delay of twenty-four hours or forty-eight hours or even two to three weeks should give you the right to/

NNS-Buyer /Two or three/ weeks are, are very significant to us.

NS-Seller We have agreed to give you a computer for your purposes/

NNS-Buyer /Let's/ say that a delay of one week won't, er, give us the right to s- to, er, cancel the contract, more than that is, I mean, I told you, we could buy it, er, in another company and get it immediately,

- so/
 NS-Seller /I sug/gest that we would leave it that, we would agree that the delivery date (Buyer: yuh) would be a fundamental term of the contract. What that means is it would be breach of fundamental term of the contract, delivering after a certain date would give you the right to cancel the contract. And we can leave it to our lawyers to decide exactly what period of time would constitute a fundamental breach of the contract.
- NNS-Buyer O.K. then, er, um, I'll have to, of course, to bring all this, er, to the decision (Seller: right) of my management, and you have to (Seller: that's right) ask your management, I guess, er, so I suggest that we'll meet again, or speak on the phone (Seller: right), and if, er, the managements agree, then we can, you know, have a meeting with the lawyers and (Seller: right) the accountants, etcetera.

Interruptions in this encounter seemed to function to emphasize a point of doubt:

ENCOUNTER NO. 3: 52-66

- NS-Seller Uh, in fact you'll find that that is one of our more successful lines, it's er, it's been proving very popular, I could show you some trade journals that have given it a very, very favorable write-up, and, er, I think you'll find it, it's the new generation of computers, you'll find that you/
 NNS-Buyer /well, I,/ have you read the article in the Times today? Because you know, there is doubt, the doubt is in this information that you give me, because, you know

The NNS changes the topic and subject, using an interruption to forge ahead and re-focus in a self-serving direction:

ENCOUNTER NO. 3: 68-88

- NNS-Buyer They say that the one of IBM is, er, quite better and cheaper so um,
 NS-Seller Well, once again/

NNS-Buyer /I mean, we/
came to you because you know, once we
were customers/

NS-Seller /For instance/ the IBM
computer is, of course, a fourth generation
computer, and this is a sixth generation
computer, so we're talking about quite
considerable advance in technology, and
there are some people that are, that are
very obviously sceptical about it, but we
can put you in touch with a number of
plants who have been using this computer
for a while already, it's shown a significant
increase in their productivity.

Actually apologizing for interrupting, the NNS acknowledges the attempt to switch
topics:

ENCOUNTER NO. 3: 143-158

NS-Seller /Well, /once again, is it, as you, as when
you use our computer you'll find that it is
catered for the particular setup of your
company, we've sat down with you, we've
taken down your specific needs, we can
arrange that it's available (Buyer: well)
with instructions in the particular language
that you're using/

NNS-Buyer /I'm sor/ry to interrupt
you, we don't have much time, so if you
could please kindly tell me how long it
will take for your company to s-, deliver
the computer/

ENCOUNTER NO. 3: 176-182

NS-Seller Um, I, I understand, but um, once again,
the reason it takes so long is not simply
because of the programming that's
involved/

NNS-Buyer /Is there/ a problem to make a
special effort for, er, special clients like
us?

ENCOUNTER NO. 3: 226-236

NS-Seller Once again, our computer is tailor-made
for you, if you come from Israel we can
give you a computer, we'll have its

instructions in Hebrew/
NNS-Buyer /Is it pos/sible to borrow a computer before we buy it, I mean, if your want to [look right], I mean, if you give us a computer for the next five weeks and then send us the new computer.

ENCOUNTER NO. 3: 426-450

NS-Seller Once again, the, the, the, the the delivery time, as I explained to you, the only way we can shorten it would be by cutting the quality of the product, and that's something that we're not prepared to do. It may be possible/

NNS-Buyer /So maybe you/ I'll think of something/

NS-Seller /it may/ be that we can come to some arrangement as far as the cost is concerned. The fact is the price of the product is four hundred and fifty thousand dollars. Additionally there is/

NNS-Buyer /What does it/ include, I mean, to/

NS-Seller /Four hundred and/ fifty thousand dollars includes the computer, all the software programming, one year's technical warranty, and training for all of your staff who you wish to use the computer

Sometimes, as the Seller urges the negotiation to advance, the NNS Buyer interrupts in order to remind the Seller that the deal has not yet been closed and that areas of disagreement continue to linger:

ENCOUNTER NO. 3: 659-710

NS-Seller Well you are in the meantime getting a computer that meets all your needs.

NNS-Buyer Well, I'm not sure we're going to do that because we have our own computer back in, back home, so, er,

NS-Seller But we are, we are prepared to/

NNS-Buyer /but, and,/ we are not going to pay with getting the, er/

NS-Seller /We are/ committing our full team of software analysts and technicians to working on your programme now for the

next eight weeks, we are putting you to the top of our list of our priorities as you've requested.

NNS-Buyer Working on our computer?

NS-Seller Working on the software for your computer/

NNS-Buyer /Yes, but,/ we can't pay without getting the goods, I mean, er (Seller: uh). What hap-, what happens, I mean, do you, c-, can you give us, er, guarantees, or, I mean, we can pay you the money and then/

NS-Seller /You will see/

NNS-Buyer /I'm/ sure that your company is a very safe one, very respectable one, but you know, what happen to other companies who were successful, one day they disappeared, and we don't want our money just to/

NS-Seller /Your, your/ money will not disappear, you will have all the guarantees that our contract, and obviously a contract has to be negotiated between our lawyers, all this [unclear]/

NNS-Buyer /So this is/ what I say, let's split the money and we'll, let's say that one payment will be given in, let's say two months, and the other payment when we receive the, er, new (Seller: um) computer. Well let's say in one month, I mean, eight weeks is two months.

Doubts, suspicion, and exaggerated concerns continue to plague this negotiation.

The interrupting feature appeared to calm and reassure the ever-doubting Buyer. Thus interruptions can be seen to play a positive role in elaborating, clarifying, and confirming topics. They further serve as a device frequently utilized by the Buyer in order to divert attention from a subject which she is not yet ready to address. Whenever she does change the topic, the Seller accommodates and indeed makes no effort to return to the original topic. Instead, he raises other topics.

Thus, although the unpleasant topic is delayed by the interruption, it frequently gets addressed at a future point during the negotiation. The delaying tactic, however,

appears to serve neither the best interest of the Buyer or the Seller, since final arrangements and agreements are withheld. In a sense, the interruption simply serves to place control of the negotiation where the Buyer wishes.

7.2.5 Interruptions in a Confrontational Encounter - Encounter No. 27

Negotiations carrying overtones of harmony and trust are offset by those which are characterized by mutual scepticism. Describable as confrontational and based on petty misgivings and initial distrust, Encounter No. 27 appeared to falter, disintegrate, and fail. It is, in fact, one of the shortest encounters (under 6 minutes in length). As in most of other encounters, the majority of interruptions occurred during Phase Two. From the opening comments, the niceties and amenities are put aside, with the NNS, in the preferred/Buyer position, stating his reason for the visit. The NS Seller tries to demonstrate both her awareness of his mission and her desire to please him, thereby retaining him as a customer:

ENCOUNTER NO. 27: 8-31

NS-Seller Well, first of all, I'm delighted to have you visit us, and we would be very happy if you'd be our customer. Our computer really is the best and the most modern on the market, and from our previous discussions I'm sure it's exactly what you need.

NNS-Buyer Yes, but er, this er, beautiful sentence we've, I've heard in er certain other places that I, er, I did chan-, I chanced to visit, and everybody tells me the same story, that he's the best and he's the best price, but you know that there are many other er, um, companies who are trying to sell us, and because I'm a big buyer, I'm talking about the big money, so please, tell me what you can do for us, first of all tell me something about the computer, and later we will go,

later on we'll go to the price.

ENCOUNTER NO. 27: 69-90

NS-Seller Well, because it's such a very big unit, and, er, it takes some time to, to, actually get it into the country and put everything together for you, it would take us approximately ten weeks to deliver it.

NNS-Buyer Mm-hm. So the prices are very high, and er, you're are very um, um, stubborn, and er, to make business today when er, you can, er, buy it all over, er, you have to speak about another price because, you have to, you have to, you have to tell me, er, first of all, the price and then we'll go, we'll go, er, we'll see what, er, kind of discount we can get from you.

NS-Seller Well the price that we/

NNS-Buyer /I'm talking/ about er/

Here, the NNS returns to the price issue both by reminding the Seller that stubbornness may not be productive and by threatening to leave the negotiation. The NS maintains her dignity and calmness by essentially ignoring the Buyer's threats and accusations, and continuing to try to keep him focused on the matter at hand:

ENCOUNTER NO. 27: 105-143

NNS-Buyer Yuh. And, er, five hundred thousand dollars. Five hundred thousand dollar, and, er, what I was allowed pay is only three hundred thousand dollar. So, er, what you offer me to do, what you suggest me to do? Er, you spoke about, er, compet-, er, the compet-, er, the competitors that you are not, er, you are not afraid, you are very strong and you're, but after all, you want, er, to sell, your, er, er, product/

NS-Seller /Quite/

NNS-Buyer /and you/ want, er, you don't want to live with your expensive, er, computers forever, so/

NS-Seller /Quite right/

NNS-Buyer /let's come/ and speak about the price and don't be stubborn.

NS-Seller Let me be/
NNS-Buyer [chuckles]
NS-Seller /quite clear that the difference
between our computer and our
competitors' and if we think [unclear] a
model was around the three hundred
thousand range it's like buying a/
NNS-Buyer //The last price, my last price/
NS-Seller /Volkswagen or a
Cadillac, there's a huge difference/
NNS-Buyer /my, my last/ price,
it's er,
NS-Seller [chuckles]
NNS-Buyer three hundred and seventy-five hundred
dollar, and [laughs] that it, er, and er, and
er, please go down.

Even where interruptions occur at contentious points, the NS continues to struggle to make her point, almost oblivious to the interruption itself:

ENCOUNTER NO. 27: 144-159

NS-Seller Mr. Katz, with due respect, we're not, we're
not offering you the service and the
Cadillac model. If you wish to buy
something/
NNS-Buyer /I want/ three hundred thousand/
NS-Seller /in the/ range of something smaller, er, that
doesn't really do all these things that we're
offering, then you may well have to, er,
consider a different model. But for what
we're offering, our price is, I think, really
fair and you wouldn't find an [unclear]
deal on this stand at anywhere else.

The interrupting behaviour thus becomes an extension of the tone of the encounter. The use of patronizing and aggressive terms such as "don't be stubborn", "you don't want to live with your expensive computers forever", "you're very stubborn", contribute to the sense that the NNS Buyer as negotiator uses insults and threats to coerce the Seller. This behaviour does not in fact succeed either in convincing her through intimidation or in achieving a victory based on a fair discussion and presentation of the

Buyer's needs.

This encounter is strikingly different from the others under investigation in that the early tone set and retained by the Buyer is unyielding and uncompromising. In light of this tone, the recurring interruptions displayed by the NNS appear to emphasize this tone, serving to stress his need to dominate, control, and overpower the NS Seller. Exhibiting preference for power over rapport, and signalling from the initial opening remarks that relationship-building is of little interest to him as it merely serves to highlight his distrust of a Seller, the NNS rejects the efforts at compliments displayed by the NS as a rapport-building strategy and demonstrates impatience with topics other than price issues.

What is interesting to note is the on-going struggle the NS has to undertake in order to maintain equilibrium, balance, and face throughout the session. The efforts of the NNS to degrade and insult her are thwarted over and over by the Seller's reaction, who remained polite and dignified, refusing to engage either in namecalling or in disruptive interrupting behaviour. Each time the NNS interrupts to inject an unpleasant comment, the NS struggles to hold the floor, basically paying little attention to the Buyer's manipulations and carrying on with the presentation:

ENCOUNTER NO. 27: 123-125

NS-Seller /Quite right/

NNS-Buyer /let's come/ and speak about the price and
don't be stubborn.

The Seller appears to be well protected and defended against the Buyer's interrupting strategy designed to gain power and demonstrate subject-control. Thus although the interrupting pattern possesses the potential for insulting the negotiating partner and becoming a negative FTA, it fails precisely because the NS ignores the

strategy. If the intent of the interruption was a bid for control, it failed precisely because of the poorly-established interpersonal relationship. Interruptions as a power bid also did not succeed since the effort towards taking command was virtually ignored.

7.3 Relationship of Interruptions and Outcome

Brown and Levinson (1987), as well as Fisher (1980), Moerman (1988), Lampi (1986), Hymes (1987), Tannen (1989), Firth (1990), Cheng-Goek (1991), Barley (1991), and Schiffrin (1994) all relate to politeness issues in the context of various linguistic expressions across cultures. Brown and Levinson begin from the premise that universal politeness phenomena exist in all cultures and societies. Rules of politeness are used to establish categories related to relationships, interactional and face issues, self esteem, agreement/disagreement features, and accommodation. The expression of such phenomena, however, differs according to the rules, roles, and assumptions of each specific culture.

The present study suggests that such linguistic expressions as conversational features may be modelled after politeness issues. Like politeness codes, conversational features exist in all societies; also like politeness codes, their expression differs across cultures. In particular, the feature interruption may itself be identified as playing a role in politeness codes themselves. Although this role, according to Brown and Levinson, is essentially destructive, other studies, including the present one, suggest that interruptions can function in contributing towards the establishment of a positive atmosphere.

Brown and Levinson refer to West and Zimmerman's (1983) study which argued that high status individuals tend to interrupt low status individuals. On the basis of these

findings, they stated that: “P is the important factor here” (p. 30). They further assert that interruptions may be defined as a face threatening act (FTA) in both negative and positive face issues. They consequently classify interruptions with complaints and threats, together with other face threatening behaviour and conclude that:

turn taking violations (interrupting, ignoring selection of other speakers, not responding to prior turns) are all FTAs in themselves, as are violations of opening and closing procedures.
(Brown and Levinson, 1987, pp. 232-33)

Given their observations that interruptions may be subcategorized as a feature which violates politeness codes, it may be assumed that Brown and Levinson understand interruptions as possessing the potential to contribute to a negative atmosphere leading to a less than successful negotiating outcome. Since they, and similar studies, clearly did not link their discussion of interruptions as a conversational feature with the outcome of a negotiation, it would not be prudent to draw conclusions from their description in regard to this issue. Nevertheless, their identification of the feature interruption as a potential face threatening act suggests that this categorization supports descriptions set forth by other researchers who define interruptions as a violation of the rules of turn taking (Duncan, 1972; Murray, 1988) or as a potentially negative factor in spoken discourse (Ulijin and Li, 1995).

Both West and Zimmerman (1983) and Hawkins (1991), for example, as noted in Chapter 2, indicate that an interruption possesses the function of breaking into a speaker’s turn, so that it may therefore be perceived as an effort to assert control, dominance, and power. In the literature on negotiations (Douglas, 1957; Rankins, 1982; Neu, 1986; Julian, 1990; Firth, 1990; Barley, 1991; Bercovitch, 1991; Lim, 1991; Wilson, 1992) these factors are identified as contributing towards a negative atmosphere, thus

possibly leading to a breakdown in interpersonal relationships and consequently to a collapse of negotiations.

West and Zimmerman (1983) early on remarked that little was known about perceptions of interruptions, either those of the interrupter or those of the person interrupted. They defined interruptions as either “shallow” or “deep”, categories which do not adequately describe their effect. The two writers conclude, along with Hawkins (1991) and Ulijin and Li (1995), that the feature may possess a negative effect in relationships and that positive interpersonal characteristics of a communication event may be compromised when interruptions are perceived as bids for power and control. However, the link between the creation of a negative atmosphere through the use of interruptions and a less than successful negotiating outcome is tentative and awaits confirmation in further research.

The potential of interruptions for solidifying, bonding, and reinforcing a positive interpersonal relationship is also recognized in the literature on interruptions in which the variable is subcategorized as a conversational feature (West, 1982; Tannen, 1989; Goldberg, 1990; Talbot, 1994; Schiffrin, 1994). Although Brown and Levinson (1987) themselves consider interruptions as face threatening acts, the recognition that interruptions form part of the politeness code also permits the suggestion that they may equally possess the potential to enhance interpersonal relationships, leading to a positive atmosphere and thus to a successful negotiating outcome.

Writers in the field of negotiation theories assert that a fairly accurate prediction of a successful outcome may be made on the basis of a positive atmosphere created and supported during the successive phases of a negotiating encounter (Douglas, 1957; Barley, 1991; Bercovitch, 1991; Fisher and Ury, 1991). Thus, for example, Fisher’s

(1980) description of a negotiation as a self-contained entity with its own institutionally-oriented behaviour and goals supports the assumption that a negotiation built on mutual trust, support, and positive interpersonal relationships may lead to a more successful outcome. Tannen (1989) and Schiffrin's (1994) subcategories of interruptions, as described in Chapter 2, also serve to complement the findings of this study, which indicate that a close relationship may exist between the function and form of an interruption as a conversational device. Within this framework, interruptions may be understood as reinforcing positive relationships, a factor which in turn tends to lead to a positive negotiating outcome.

A tentative conclusion which may be drawn from the above discussion points in the direction of distinguishing between the potential positive and negative effects of the feature interruption. It is similarly proposed that the consequent creation of either a negative or positive atmosphere may lead, respectively, to a less than satisfactory outcome or to a successful outcome. This conclusion awaits confirmation in future research.

It would appear that when interruptions are associated with negative characteristics such as face threatening acts, the tentative conclusion might be drawn that a less than satisfactory outcome at the negotiating table might be expected. However, as Goldberg (1990) maintains, the impact and effect of an interruption is defined, described, and understood by the person who is interrupted. This leads to the demand for consideration and a fuller understanding of the perception of the act when endeavouring to categorize interruptions. The relation between perception (intent), expression, and atmosphere-creating role in the use of the feature interruption would appear to be a very promising field for development in future research. The present study would seem to

support the view that a close association exists among these factors and that future research could fruitfully examine the role of interruptions - and of other conversational features - from the perspective of outcomes to conflicts such as negotiations.

7.4 Conclusions

The interruptions feature may serve as one of several devices by which we can evaluate, examine, and deepen our understanding of negotiation rhetoric. If a negotiation succeeds and is based on mutual trust, support, and good will, then an interruption can enhance the general tone, promote greater bonding, and confirm rapport-building - all in the best interest of achieving a positive atmosphere and thus a positive outcome. If a negotiation is premised on suspicion, distrust, and power bids, interruptions serve no useful purpose as a feature except to carry with them the potential to become one more contributing factor to the failure to achieve a goal.

Thus as an index of intentional, complex, and multidimensional speaker roles, the use of interruptions may serve to reasonably reflect, mirror, and confirm the tone and atmosphere of a business negotiation. Paying attention, therefore, to this feature within such a speech event as a negotiation may provide a useful strategy for better understanding the dynamics and dimensions of international negotiations. It should be noted that the aggression expressed by interruptions can be deflected if it is ignored by the listener. It may be assumed that had the listener in the confrontational encounter represented here acknowledged and responded to the hostile intent of the speaker, a different reaction might have occurred. The excerpts indicate, therefore, that the intention behind constructive interruptions clearly supports the harmonious overall tone of a negotiation. No similar claim can be made regarding the effect of aggressive

interruptions, since, in the only confrontation encounter of the 30, the disruptive intention was ignored. However, it might be reasonable to assume that, here also, the intention would coincide with the (negative) outcome.

An important conclusion can consequently be drawn: namely, that harmonious intent promotes a harmonious outcome. Whether hostile intent leads to a less successful outcome cannot be proved on the basis of this study. Nevertheless, this finding is significant in light of the fact that interruptions have commonly been perceived as having a generally negative influence. This tentative conclusion extends Tannen's (1989, 1990), Goldberg's (1990), and Schiffrin's (1994) claims and reinforces their call to re-examine relationship building in the framework of discourse analysis. It should be noted that, given the size of the sample and research tools and instruments, definitive claims regarding differences in the patterns of interrupting behaviour between NSs and NNSs would be difficult to substantiate, although this would be an interesting area to explore in future research.

The following chapter will return to the central issue of the thesis by taking a broad look at the research questions, themes, and findings.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

8.1 Restatement of Themes

The aim of the study was to isolate, identify, and examine five selected conversational features as used in an international negotiation context. The two questions asked were, firstly, what quantifiable differences, if any, existed between the two populations under investigation in their perceptions of the expression of the five selected conversational features, and, secondly, what effect, if any, the particular feature interruption had on the outcome of a negotiation. A concomitant aim was to analyze whether and how a particular feature - interruptions - played a role in creating an atmosphere in which the outcome of the negotiation was likely to be more or less successful.

The early chapters (2-4) provide a survey of the theoretical background as provided in the literature. This background forms the underpinnings for the subsequent formulation and development of the research study and reflects the complex, multi-layered nature of the examination. The theoretical section of the study was designed to construct a viable framework within which to conduct complementary quantitative and qualitative analyses, on the basis of which a paradigm might be set forth which may be applied to the training of future international negotiators. The development of the thesis from a broad-based research perspective to a presentation of research findings which may have applicability to the English for Specific Purposes practitioner engaged in teaching and training allowed for the

contextualization of the key concepts early in the study, leading to an investigation of pedagogic themes relevant to the practitioner.

The general theme of the study is grounded in broad-based research findings in social scientific studies which lend credence to the thesis that while meaning in language is bound to and implicit in the cultural heritage of a given society, common links can be found across languages which act to unite them rather than to distinguish them from one another. This serves as a starting point for the development of the theme that international negotiators may have much to gain by appreciating and understanding what is shared rather than what differs between the negotiating partners.

The relationship between international business negotiators and spoken discourse was identified as a research gap in earlier writings and the study set out to formally investigate the multi-disciplinary setting of applied discourse analysis against which the examination and contextualization of five selected conversational features of spoken discourse might be developed. A further aim was to indicate specific tendencies of the particular features within a sociopragmatic research framework and to examine their potential implications for teachers and students.

Sociopragmatic issues including interactional relationships, themes related to face, and politeness norms were brought directly to bear on negotiation theories and the practical training of international negotiators. Such research could initiate trends of interest to those involved in curriculum design and instruction. Tendencies such as the juxtaposition of interruptions and laughter modes were described, interpreted, and examined in light of the development, pace, and momentum of the negotiating encounter. Tentative conclusions were

posited and findings submitted in order to further discussion on how an understanding of the usage of a particular feature might assist a negotiator in positioning himself/herself for a successful outcome.

The examination of the pragmatic functions of a specific feature - interruptions - and its relationship to a particular event - negotiations - focused attention on the interdependence and interconnectedness between spoken discourse and sociopragmatics. This study moves beyond descriptions and classifications into an examination of conversational features in order to look at the effect and significance of interactional and relational issues for contextualized spoken discourse. The extension of the discussion to additional features and speech events not examined in the present study may further constitute an area for future research.

The foundation for research into interactional negotiating encounters was laid by sociolinguistic research into real-life settings such as medical interviews, courtroom testimonies, and counselling sessions. This increased interest in studying situationally-located spoken discourse provided the basis for the thesis to open up negotiations as a potentially enriched pragmatic setting in which specific learning needs and tasks might also be suggested. Observing selected conversational features in a real-life context and attempting to describe patterns constituted an effort to formulate clear instructional objectives for the teacher and student. The interpretation of the appearance of such patterns in negotiating sessions opened up possibilities for charting a more discernible structure in which the NNS student might understand and apply his newly-acquired skills.

The study not only considered conversational features using a quantitative research model but also isolated a particular feature - interruptions - for a discourse analysis in order to demonstrate and describe specific themes and tendencies of practical interest for designers of English for Business Purposes curricula. In recognizing that context carries conventionally-ascribed meanings, the study also suggests that conversational features might be perceived as culturally organized. The notion is put forward that context relevancy is critical in any discussion of conversational features. Additionally, relational issues may be considered in discussions on negotiations regarding the perception that such issues can contribute to layers of meaning.

A major aim of the study was to examine the connection between spoken discourse as expressed through a selected feature - interruptions - and the outcome of a negotiating encounter. The challenge was to re-examine the traditional role ascribed to interruptions. In the review of the literature, a gradual shift was noticeable away from describing interruptions within the conflict resolution model towards recognizing the potential of interruptions to affirm and bond in the context of a negotiation. Although the use of interruptions to convey hostility and aggressiveness appears to have adequate justification in the conflict management model, the study raised the importance of effectively examining the direct role the conversational feature may play in leading to more affirmative negotiating outcomes.

Examples were adduced to illustrate the richness of the feature, and tentative findings were presented which indicated that interruptions cannot be defined according to a single dimension but possess multi-dimensional characteristics which may be directly context

oriented. The investigation of interruptions supported the position of the thesis that the multiple layers of meaning communicated in a negotiating encounter can best be appreciated through understanding the function of conversational features. Such insight may enhance the student negotiator's knowledge as s/he begins to appreciate the complexity of a business negotiation.

The survey of research in international business negotiations presented in the early chapters attempts to focus on studies related to the issue of how linguistic features may function in promoting and enhancing rapport-building strategies leading to a mutually-successful outcome of a negotiation; or, conversely, may enhance and promote divisive and aggressive strategies leading to the failure of a negotiation. Whether or not it can be stated that certain interrupting behaviour creates an atmosphere which may lead to a particular negotiating outcome is still unclear. However, some predictions can be made which increase the possibility of succeeding in a negotiation based on the type of interruptions which occurs throughout the negotiating phases.

The speaker's awareness of his/her linguistic behaviour regarding the features under consideration constitutes an authentic learning objective which could be presented in an English for Specific Purposes curriculum as a reasonable and attainable goal. By suggesting that practitioners look closely at language learning tasks within a sociolinguistic tradition, the study attempts to forge a bridge by means of which language learning theory and practical applications can merge to provide a rich learning environment and experience for adult learners eager to succeed in the business world. The call to address the discourse of

negotiations may form a way to inspire teachers to appreciate that they are training students for real world challenges.

8.2 Summary of Findings

The two major research questions examined in this study were, firstly, what quantifiable differences, if any, existed between the two populations under investigation in their perceptions of the expression of the five selected conversational features, and, secondly, what effect, if any, the particular feature interruption had on the outcome of a negotiation.

8.2.1 Differences in Conversational Features

It could not be demonstrated that statistically-significant differences between the two populations regarding their perception of the usage of conversational phenomena existed, except as noted in Chapter 6. This was an interesting finding, given the culturally-divergent backgrounds of the subjects and the assumption that language differences would correspond to differences in expression of conversational features (Tannen 1990; Schiffrin, 1994).

Regarding the use of conversational features from the reported perception of the subjects under investigation, the findings indicated that only in the pre-negotiation stage did a statistically-significant difference obtain - in opening up subjects, with nearly 90% of the NSs perceiving that only occasionally would they open up new subjects. It might have been expected that the NSs would more frequently open up subjects than demonstrated, although even with a lower predicted rate among the NSs a statistically-significant difference obtained between the two populations. In the post-negotiation phase, 83% of the NSs indicated that

during the negotiations they never self-repaired, compared with 62% of the NNS populations indicating greater self repair. As noted, however, some doubt might be cast on this finding of statistical differences, as it would seem unlikely that almost half of the NSs hardly ever self repaired. In summary, although differences did exist in pre-negotiation opening up subjects and in the post-negotiation phase regarding self repairs, statistically-significant differences did not obtain among the five conversational features in the perceived prediction and performance either in the pre- or post-negotiation stages.

Relational issues such as politeness strategies and face threatening acts were also expressed across the negotiating table in remarkably similar fashion. Extending this finding and analysis to additional discourse features might provide interesting issues to be considered when training NNS students to perform language tasks specifically oriented towards negotiations.

8.2.2 Effect of Interruptions on Outcome

Table 4.1 summarized the findings from both pre- and post-negotiation questionnaires, including variables related to attitudes towards negotiating, language awareness, language choice, and language difference, together with levels of satisfaction with the negotiating outcome. In the pre-negotiation questionnaire, the findings indicated perceptual levels of self-confidence in conducting business with either NSs or NNSs. The NS reported a much higher level of perceived self-confidence (80%) in negotiating with a NNS, compared with a NNS report of much less perceived self-confidence (80%) in negotiating with a NS.

Both populations reported a high level of perceived awareness (90%) of the native language background of the negotiating partner, a finding which indicates that such perceived awareness might be acknowledged, described, and presented in training potential NNS negotiators. The subjects' self-described ability to use negotiation-specific language indicated that the NSs were much more confident (75%), compared with the NNSs, who perceptibly felt much less confident (80%), an interesting, although somewhat predictable, finding.

The NSs reported a high level of perceived success, compared with the NNSs, who self-reported a lower success rate. A trend could thus be identified according to which a higher level of reported self-confidence in negotiating, combined with a high level of perceived language-specific usage, may lead to greater success at the negotiating table and greater satisfaction with the outcome. The assumption that a similar trend in the opposite direction might be predicted awaits confirmation in future research.

In the findings related to the post-negotiation questionnaire, the self-reported usage of language-specific features was higher among the NSs (75%) than the NNSs (25%), a rather unsurprising finding. Following the negotiation, however, reported levels of perceived satisfaction with the outcome and negotiating success were similar across both populations. A tendency thus appeared to exist according to which NNSs felt more optimistic concerning the possibilities of conducting a successful negotiating outcome than anticipated. Such a finding indicates that practice of a task may lead to improved performance.

Since explicit acknowledgement of success as demonstrated by the observer's checklist was closer to 50%, it might appear that both populations self-evaluate success at

a moderate level. This is an interesting finding which awaits further confirmation, but which also indicates that both populations appear to be modest in their self-described ability to negotiate a successful outcome. Although it would be difficult to ascertain whether or not these perceived expectations regarding success were actually met, a trend appeared to exist according to which greater expectations of success were perceived preceding the negotiation than self-reported following the encounter. This is also an interesting finding which awaits further confirmation. It does, however, suggest that students' perceived self-awareness and expectations of success are modified following their participation in a negotiation. Whether or not such modification more closely corresponds to reality, however, cannot be demonstrated, since the data is self reported and cannot be verified by the observer's checklist.

More interruptions occurred during Phase Two of the negotiation, a finding which confirms the remarkable similarity between NSs' and NNSs' perceived interrupting behaviour. Phase Two was predictably the longest phase in all the encounters and displayed greater interpersonal characteristics than either Phase One or Phase Three. Interpersonal relationship building (described in Chapter 7) included interruptions which were described as contributing either to a hostile and non-compromising negotiation with a less than satisfactory outcome or to a harmonious and co-operative encounter resulting in a more satisfactory goal achievement.

While researchers have generally agreed that the chances for success at the negotiating table were enhanced if the tone of the negotiation was co-operative (Barley, 1991; Wilson, 1992), none have as yet examined the discourse of the negotiation in light of

a particular conversational feature such as interruptions. Writers have tended to perceive success or failure within a cultural context, with Hendriks (1991) going so far as to suggest that cultural misunderstandings are frequently cited as a contributing factor bringing about the failure of a negotiation. Hendriks asserted on this basis that such factors could be turned into a scapegoat for failed negotiations, a position endorsed by Redding (1991). This study suggests that although cultural differences are acknowledged they cannot be assumed to constitute a major contributing factor in the failure of a negotiation.

A further finding of interest was that the expression of interruptions, both as self-reported and as confirmed by the observer's checklist, was similar across both populations. This similarity might provide insights into how conversational features within a particular context might constitute themselves and may be factors to predict or suggest outcomes in context-dependent settings such as courts of law - a challenging research endeavour within the field of sociopragmatic discourse analysis.

As reported in Chapter 7, the variable interruption as expressed within an interactional business setting may be among several devices useful for enhancing our understanding of the discourse of negotiations. An examination of Encounters Nos. 22, 23, and 28 provided examples of interrupting behaviour juxtaposed with hesitations, unclear comments, and laughter. Although caution should be exercised in maintaining that a direct correspondence exists between the contiguity of interruptions and other conversational features, the discernment of a trend in this direction may be confirmed by future research.

Understanding the duality of the potential of interruptions to contribute towards the creation of an atmosphere which may facilitate either more successful negotiations or less

satisfactory outcomes is a finding of great interest. As presented in the discourse analysis, this finding indicated that interruptions carry the potential to be both injurious and constructive factors in the process leading to the outcome of a negotiation. The importance of this finding lies in its identification of the constructive potential of interruptions, in contrast to the aggressive and hostile function typically ascribed to the feature in conflict resolution theories. The finding also demonstrates the significance of applying discourse analysis for an increased understanding of the negotiating process. Although this field of research is still in its preliminary stages, the findings of this study will hopefully encourage further investigation based on the use of conversational features within the framework of linguistic research.

8.3 Limitations

The limitations encountered in this study relate to both quantitative and qualitative aspects. They include the use of simulations; data collection and analysis; transcription procedures; research bases; the generalizability of the study; factors related to cultural issues; and limitations inherent in the selection of specific features to the exclusion of other equally interesting variables.

The most significant limitation of this study would appear to be the use of simulation rather than authentic encounters in providing the research basis and presenting conclusions. As researchers in the discourse of negotiations have suggested (Fisher, 1980; Bercovitch, 1991; Barley, 1991; Wilson, 1992), however, much of the study of tactics, strategies, and spoken discourse in international negotiations is based on anecdotal reportage rather than

direct observation. Frequently filtered through the lens of a third party observer, such reportage generates weaknesses and difficulties characteristic of selective reporting. Many of the agenda items, points under negotiation, and compromises reached in international business negotiations are kept confidential in the interests of the sponsoring trade and commerce agencies - similar to diplomatic negotiations, in which politically and socially sensitive issues are explored and far-reaching geo-political decisions and goals reached through the phases of negotiations.

It would be unwise for negotiators representing the interests of their firm or company to discuss the manoeuvres, tactics, and negotiating strategies used during a negotiation with an outside observer for fear of leaking industrial "best-kept secrets" and thus jeopardizing further high-level negotiations. Thus historically, authentic data regarding negotiations is limited indeed. While this study acknowledges the limitation of this weakness it is quite typical of research on negotiations.

Simulations can, however, avoid some of the pitfalls engendered by actual negotiations. The generation of data and variables under observation in simulated encounters is not dissimilar from authentic encounters, although certainly nothing can ultimately replace the value of presenting authentic data. The analysis of the research data does not of itself provide the answer to the research question regarding the conversational features, which still need to be interpreted. This interpretation is drawn from the combined quantitative presentation and the discussions and explanations in the qualitative analysis. By analyzing the data using both quantitative and qualitative instruments, an effort was made to provide the research with greater analytical depth and a richer, more complex standard for

interpreting the results. In the final analysis, the researcher herself is ultimately responsible for the interpretation of the findings, their meaning and implications, as well as for acknowledging the limitations.

An additional limitation relates to the choice of questionnaires as the preferred form of data collection. One of the most difficult tasks facing the researcher was to specify and develop appropriate research tools which would not intimidate the participants or create undue anxiety. The selection and development of the questionnaire appeared to be suitable to this population, since the questions asked were clear, straightforward, objective (as far as possible), and attempted to minimize worries related to the participants' role as students and as negotiators.

The researcher consulted with specialists in educational psychology in order to create the most suitable questionnaire, given the population. The decision to use a modified Likert scale was based on the recognition that the subjects' responses would be independent and unlinked to other items. The questionnaire was thus designed to allow the participants to respond freely from within a range of available options. Such a questionnaire, however, suffers from a response set bias. One subject might give a similar or identical response to each item due, perhaps, to language comprehension difficulties. The issue of language limitation is openly acknowledged. It was felt, however, to be unavoidable in circumstances in which data collection takes place across cultures.

Further limitations of the study derive from the sampling and subject assignment inadequacies (see Chapter 5) and the methodological weaknesses linked to this difficulty. The sampling - i.e., place and location of the encounters - limits the generalizability of the

conclusions, thus casting doubt on the adequacy of the variables. As noted, however, sociolinguistic studies in negotiations tend to focus on Western participants negotiating in a Western country and using English as the common language for negotiating. This study can be seen as unusual in that the subjects were both Western and non-Western, native and non-native English speakers, negotiating a business deal in a Middle East country. This factor suggests a greater, enriched international and global perspective.

The lack of writers and researchers in the field of discourse and comparative cross-cultural analysis of business negotiations constitutes an additional limitation. The present study cannot be compared and contrasted with other studies with true adequacy. Researchers of negotiation theories typically emphasize those aspects of negotiating encounters which function as a process towards which goal achievement is attuned. Much less attention is paid to the conversational features which form the focus of this study.

In this respect, the present work can be regarded as pioneering the examination of conversational phenomena, with both the advantages and limitations inherent in pioneering efforts. A deliberate attempt was made to interpret and synthesize relevant studies from a broad, multidisciplinary perspective in order to provide greater applicability and depth to the findings. The limited researched support from interactional analysis and sociolinguistic findings on negotiation models, however, restricted the degree to which such a synthesis could be achieved. The lack of a solid research basis from relevant disciplines further limited the thematic development of the study, although such a limitation did not necessarily constrict or reduce assumptions put forward regarding the socio-rhetorical implications of cross-cultural negotiations.

Researchers such as Grimshaw (1988), who have called for greater sharing of themes amongst scholars and increased cross-fertilization with those writing in the discourse analysis tradition, acknowledge that without a broad base in research in spoken discourse analysis, future linguistic research will be somewhat limited. This assertion is directly applicable to the field of negotiation theories. Negotiation research, for example, has tended to pay close attention to the product or outcome while neglecting or ignoring the process. Such an approach is understandable where the focus lies on attempting to evaluate the success or failure of a negotiating encounter, but neglects to pay attention or endeavour to understand the dynamics according to which the final outcome is achieved.

Indeed, it is acknowledged that reaching a pre-determined goal is of far greater interest to those training for success at the negotiating table than the process of negotiation. Spoken discourse, and specifically conversational features, on the other hand, forms an integral part of the negotiating process - a process whose dynamics are vital to the end result. This study attempts to remedy the limitations of such approaches as the much-favoured and discussed win-win theory pioneered by Fisher and Ury (1991) by introducing and examining the role of spoken discourse in the negotiating process.

An additional limitation is acknowledged regarding both the design and the data analysis derived from the observer's checklist. The analysis of data using a procedure which possesses a low degree of explicitness is a recognized limitation. The decision to use the observer's checklist as designed, however, was felt to be justified by the fact that it directly focused on understanding the selected conversational features within an interactional framework in which these variables were displayed in a negotiation setting.

The researcher worked with additional native speakers trained in distinguishing among the features, in an effort to objectify as far as possible the responses as noted in the audio recordings. Each feature was noted in each encounter in an attempt to enhance the reliability of the data reportage. Each encounter was separately analyzed and each checklist was reviewed by the trained NSs. It is acknowledged, however, that observations based on a research design with a low level of explicitness raise the role of interpretations in deciding the placement and identification of the particular feature. This circumstance may lead to data reported with a reduced degree of reliability.

The qualitative collection and analysis of data leads to a further limitation regarding the strength of the theoretical claims upon which the research is based. The discourse analysis presented in Chapter 7 is thus open to the limitations of qualitative analysis in the area of doubts concerning the reliability and/or validity of data interpreted by specific researchers who are necessarily, to a lesser or greater degree, subject to personal prejudices, biases, and agendas. While such limitations may restrict the generalizability of the findings described in Chapter 7, the data is nevertheless presented in the hope that it might provide findings which might be fruitfully developed in future research.

A further limitation appears regarding the issue of transcription. Transcription of tapescripts provided an accurate and thorough way of analyzing the data to be examined. As Stubbs states (1983), however, the complexity of spoken discourse is not evident to the co-conversationalists. By imposing another layer of analysis - i.e., written analysis - the complexity and multilingual meanings became available for the researcher to interpret. At the same time, however, moving from one analytical tool to another imposes its own

limitations. In terms of the findings this limitation is difficult to ascertain, although the limitation is acknowledged in the data itself.

Cultural issues between NNSs and NSs negotiators present another of the study's limitations. It is acknowledged that it would indeed be difficult to claim that the study actually successfully factored in distinctive cultural features of the NNSs in terms of negotiating style and expression of conversational features. After all, the definition of culture is of itself an act of organizing patterns of belief systems, values, and behaviour into identifiable units which can be examined according to the specific task at hand. Since the NNS subjects in this study, while living in the Middle East, were not necessarily native to the culture in which they currently reside, it would also be inappropriate to organize them into identifiable groups for the purpose of commenting on the impact of culture on the language task.

Researchers into the process of negotiations (Westerfield, 1989; Redding, 1991; Hilton, 1992; Ulijin and Li, 1995) have tended to refer to issues related to cultural distinctiveness from within the framework of their own perspective. Thus Noguchi (1987), for example, raises questions concerning Brown and Levinson's (1987) assertion that conversational rules exist across cultures. In this respect Noguchi maintains that while the contention may in fact be true, not all cultures value or stress the rules to the same extent. The question might therefore be asked whether the breakdown of such rules might affect, influence, or impact the successful outcome of a negotiation. This researcher surmised that even if a breakdown in rules leads to a collapse of the negotiations, human decency and goodwill would act to override the breakdown. The effect on the negotiation encounter

would thus be assumed to be minimal. However, this assumption cannot be supported from the study and the addressing of specific cultural factors is consequently acknowledged as a limitation.

The selection of the feature interruption out of the five conversational features quantitatively examined was made on the basis of its frequent occurrence in potential conflict situations and proposed significance in contributing to the success or failure of a negotiation.

Although a case might be made for choosing subject opening as a strategy to deflect a point in a negotiation, for example, the decision to qualitatively analyze interruptions was taken in light of the current work on conflict resolution and discourse analysis by writers such as Tannen (1989, 1990) and Schiffrin (1994). These studies, relatively few though they may still be, provide a research framework for the focus on the rich and fascinating character of interruptions.

8.4 Application of Findings

The current discussions on developing, implementing, and conducting English for Specific Purposes courses focus on the role and function of communication techniques as applied to NNSs' training. In a broad, general sense this study, which was presented in the field of applied linguistics, attempted to identify and explore a real-world-oriented challenge: namely, to pinpoint conversational features which are exhibited during a negotiation while attempting to distinguish their patterns of usage.

The goal was to investigate a particular study domain in order to examine language in a specific contextual environment. In addition, an attempt was made to comprehend the

function of particular features. Understanding the function of these variables may improve communications between international negotiating partners, and thus clearly also the communication of real people functioning in a real-world business.

Pedagogical implications may derive from a comprehensive examination of specific features as presented in the following discussion. The study thus endeavoured to present a viable examination of real-world-oriented issues through an application of DA and CA theories and ethnology of communications. It set out to examine, integrate, synthesize, and apply the concepts of social setting and contextualization, discourse communities and conversational features, and discourse analysis and negotiations.

The identification of NNS and NS negotiators as discourse communities which share rules for conduct extends Hymes' (1989) position that the discourse community may be used to postulate descriptions based both on social and linguistic entities. Negotiating, or the competence to negotiate, is not only to *say* something but, as Taylor and Cameron (1987) assert, also to *do* something with language; or, as Hymes states, "how something is said is part of what is said" (p. 59). Self-described competence in using English or *how something is said* leads to goal achievement. Outcome satisfaction as part of *what is said* may be an important issue for consideration by the practitioner. The findings of the study, as discussed in Chapter 6, suggest that specific spoken discourse and identified conversational features play an active role in shaping the *process* of a negotiation through their influence upon self-confidence, leading to positive goal achievement in the form of a successfully negotiated outcome.

A central finding which emerges from this study, and one which has implications for the teaching of negotiation skills, is the constructive relation between the potential student negotiator's self-confidence and use of conversational features leading to a positive outcome. The study demonstrates that a causal relationship appears to exist between the level of self-confidence of both NS and NNS populations and their reported perception of prediction of success at the negotiating table. The student's attitude towards the process of negotiations should therefore perhaps be considered equally as important as developing strategies to influence the outcome of negotiations. This factor comes to expression not only in selecting and developing materials designed to train negotiators but also in shaping an instructional framework and setting instructional goals for the teacher. This study suggests that developing greater student self-confidence as a language-training component is a valuable and worthy educational objective, one which is regrettably all too often overlooked or undervalued by theorists and teachers alike.

The teacher possesses a key role and function in the enhancing of students' self-confidence during preparation and instruction for the role of international negotiator. It is therefore suggested that the teacher might assume greater responsibility for monitoring the self-confidence level of students studying English for negotiating purposes.

Some of the practical considerations which a teacher may consider when training students for business negotiations include: creating an environment conducive to achieving success in language tasks and assignments; motivating students to perform in the role of negotiator which will ultimately result in a productive negotiation and a positive outcome; and increasing the learner's awareness of the posited positive connection between

self-confidence and success. The student's self-confidence may further be increased by instructing him/her as to how certain features are expressed in a negotiation in a similar fashion in cross-cultural settings. Such training may enhance their chances of success, at the same time as decreasing the apprehension which striking differences may signal to individual students.

In discussing the issue of development of materials for courses which focus on business English and specifically an improvement in negotiating skills, it might be assumed that predictability and success in training students might be increased by providing accounts through which learners might practise and rehearse their newly-acquired language skills. Courses designed to train for international communications might benefit from greater use of case study methodology implemented by activities such as role plays, as well as the use of equipment such as videos to allow for self- and peer-evaluation and telecommunications conference systems. When training is regarded as preparation for the demands of negotiating within a "global village" setting, students who are provided with greater opportunities to practice their English and who are made aware of the finding from this study that NNSs and NSs use conversational features more similarly than dissimilarly might receive more effective instruction.

The utilization of high technology in teaching English is a relatively recent trend. More questions than obtainable answers exist at present concerning issues such as classroom effectiveness, realistic goals, learning objectives, teacher training, resources, transference of skills to real-life situations, and materials development. However, the potential for using high tech aids should not be overlooked. One of the challenges facing materials developers

is to create and customize language materials, taking into account linguistically-specific items such as conversational phenomena. Williams (1988) and others have written forthrightly concerning both the inadequacy and inappropriateness of business English textbooks - an oversight which hopefully will be corrected as we move closer to the high tech demands of the next century.

It might be a fruitful activity, for example, for teachers to set up simulations and role plays, taping the sessions for replay in the classroom in order to enable students to recognize linguistic features. This might also generate discussions regarding the sociopragmatic roles an interruption might play during a negotiation. The finding of this study suggests that viewing the function of interruptions as potentially binding and solidifying might perhaps encourage a more reluctant negotiator to employ interruptions as an aid intended to strengthen a bonding with his partner.

Through listening to a taped recording, for example, a student might be able to pinpoint his partner's reaction if s/he could identify the emergence of patterns which cluster around specific features. S/he would then be in a better position to control her/his negotiating behaviour and be more appropriately responsive to certain aspects of the negotiating process. This might also involve incorporating models of relevant information regarding what Nunan (1990) calls the "subjective needs of learners" (p. 18) into curriculum development and implementation.

In addressing the formal characteristics of the five conversational features examined in this study within a learning context, the features are considered not only as theoretical constructs but also as devices central to the *process* leading to negotiation outcomes. The

student may well benefit from appreciating the fact that he shares a common linguistic denominator with his culturally-distinct negotiating partner. Such awareness, it is proposed, enhances NNS students' self-esteem and self-confidence, enabling them to perceive themselves as equals rather than as situated in a subordinate or inferior position within an international negotiating context. The goal of informing the NNS learner of the finding that the form and function of interruptions (perhaps as representative of other conversational features, a fact awaiting confirmation) can be characteristically expressed in similar ways across cultures may increase the student's ability to negotiate through raising his self-confidence. This has a direct effect on the final outcome of a negotiation.

Extending these findings further still, it is suggested that students receive some exposure to the notion that conversational features in a negotiating setting need to be identified and their functional appreciation elaborated. Contextualizing the examination of the features identified in the study allowed for greater elaboration and exploration of their formal properties and functional usage. As noted in the research on negotiation theories, partners engaged in negotiations may create new realities through the process of negotiations. The reality created includes a discourse identifiable by linguistic features such as interruptions. Thus teaching students, for example, the potential pragmatic function, force, and effect of an interruption may be just as valid an activity as teaching appropriate business lexis. Appreciation for the role of a "constructive" interruption during a negotiation might encourage increased verbal interactions.

It would seem effective in this respect to examine various conversational features in the framework of face issues and politeness codes. The present exploration of the

cross-cultural implications of face and politeness issues suggests that the latter concepts might also be appropriately integrated with a presentation of the use of conversational features. The fact that these issues emphasize similarities across culturally-distinct languages rather than differences may assist students to recognize their capabilities as potential negotiators.

This study suggests that a realistic balance can be struck between viewing cultural differences as obstacles to language learning and assuming that such differences can be bridged, reduced, or eliminated once students are engaged in the language acquisition process. Students may benefit from a learner-centred and oriented environment in which the language components and learning tasks are recognized as integrated within a particular context yet also possess cross-cultural significance.

Distinct cultural factors need to be incorporated into the language learning process but need not become the central feature of language instruction. Cultural enrichment in terms of the learning environment might include a presentation of the art, literature, music, and folklore associated with a particular country.

Turning to commercial and economic areas, international communications are increasingly conducted in English, even between non-English speakers of different native languages. English proficiency is thus seen as possessing an economic advantage for adults seeking employment in international trade, commerce, diplomacy, and law. Language teachers may note the implications of recognizing that language competence transcends cultural sophistication in terms of international communications among peoples of the world. Rather than highlighting differences among negotiators, it would seem to be far more

productive to emphasize similarities. This study has taken the latter route and may stand in support of the notion that languages are more alike than dissimilar, a position also confirmed by the similarities displayed in the usage of the five conversational features examined in the study.

It is now a widely-accepted educational tenet that effective English for Specific Purposes training needs to go beyond the framework of the classroom in endeavoring to train students capable of competing in an increasingly competitive and demanding world trade market. When it is acknowledged that the teacher has to draw upon theoretical models to create teaching materials which would enable the student to move into the global employment market, it becomes incumbent on researchers and academics in a variety of disciplines to accelerate and promote theoretical research models which can inform practice.

As we approach the 21st century, it becomes obvious that the communications revolution is real, profound, and has far-reaching implications in such areas as material development and teacher training. There appears to be an urgent need to heed the call for English-language practitioners to begin to understand and relate to this new reality. Conservatism and technophobia in the English teaching field inhibit students' growth potential and learning opportunities.

Future English instruction which is reasonably cost effective, student centred, and task specific may herald a new era of video-based instruction. Material developers who are eager to introduce new technologies into the classroom may need to refocus their resources and energies towards "virtual classroom" settings where students enact roles under the critical eyes of a video hook-up. Clarifying the role and balance between teacher and

technology is one issue among many others, including the reliability and availability of new technology, teacher confidence, student trust, and resources.

Although little research data exist to validate the effectiveness of "virtual classroom" settings, this area is still being developed and modified. Video and high tech media challenge the role of the teacher, which has evolved into that of facilitator or guide rather than frontal instructor. With the emerging teacher role comes a greater responsibility for preparing teachers to understand their important contribution to building students' self confidence. Virtual classroom experience may possibly provide the opportunity for the student to succeed in learning English for negotiation purposes.

Teachers may also be encouraged to recognize that CA can function as a bridge or linkage between theory and practice. This can occur when the theoretical framework of conversational patterns is understood and speech patterns and regularities emphasized. Such discussions focused within an English for Specific Purposes environment may stimulate students to value the contributions of theoretical bases and research analyses for their classroom learning experience. Additionally, such an approach as CA serves the practical interests of practitioners who view English for Specific Purposes as a process-supported and product-oriented methodology.

8.5 Future Research

The five conversational features presented for examination in this study constitute one among several available tools for the researcher who is investigating the discourse of negotiations. Future research into the discourse of business negotiations might select other

tools in order to further understand this field using discourse analytical methodology. Since the focus of the present qualitative analysis accounted only for the expression of interruptions, additional conversational variables, such as back channels, might be isolated for examination and a comparative/contrastive study might indicate patterns or tendencies to support, confirm, validate, or question the findings of the present study. Centring such future research would add a depth to the existing study in that an additional feature might be held up as supporting evidence to confirm the finding that the expression of five features among the NNS/NS populations was more alike than different in a negotiation setting.

Moreover, it is suggested that future research explore the co-occurrence of similar or additional features with identified and specific relational issues in a context other than that of negotiations, which tended to be influenced by conflict resolution issues and perspectives.

Although interruptions appeared to become a barometer in predicting an outcome, the issue of the precise function of an interruption in a different context - such as a medical interview - might suggest other functional traits or characteristics.

As noted in the study, the major findings are presented as tentative since the study utilized simulations rather than authentic business encounters - a regrettable but unavoidable constraint. It is thus proposed that future research in CA to investigate conversational phenomena be conducted in a setting which would allow for collection and analysis of authentic encounters in different circumstances.

It is also suggested that future research focus on the function of conversational features between NS/NS populations or NNS/NNS populations using English as the *lingua franca*. Thus the many issues related to cultural misunderstandings might be de-emphasized

and attention focused on potentially interesting contrasts of simultaneities, clusters, and sequences of politeness strategies with specific features. Parallels in language usage may thereby be demonstrated to derive from assumptions concerning politeness codes and face issues.

Although the study addressed central tendencies of a set of the aggregate data and commented accordingly, it was not possible to approach the issue of cultural differences as relevant except to demonstrate certain similarities between global NNS populations and representative NS populations. Thus it would not be appropriate to apply the findings of the study to particular traits identified with specific groups negotiating a business interaction in a Middle East country. It is suggested, however, that the application of the major findings be broadened to a context other than the Middle East if it is to make a contribution to research in applied linguistics. It is proposed that despite this limitation it becomes a broader research study with possibilities for future research, learning, and teaching in today's "global village".

Collaboration amongst researchers in language learning within the tradition of DA and CA may provide useful insight for materials developers. Future teacher trainers and academic programs, with more broadly-based educational programs, may be more effective if training takes into account interdisciplinary findings. Finally, more studies of interest to the practitioner might focus on the discourse of telecommunications, taking into account the role of high technology and speech events. The opportunities provided by the expansion and development of new technologies and the linkage of such technologies to language instruction suggest that future research into the analysis of spoken discourse may lead to

exciting challenges for the practitioner and student learning English. Such influences on the methods of training would suggest concomitant changes in research fields, directions, and paths.

REFERENCES

- Agrawal, A. 1976. 'Who will speak next?' *Papers in Linguistic Analysis 1*. Delhi: University of Delhi Press.
- Allwright, R.L. and Bailey, K.M. 1991. *Focus on the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Almulla, M. 1988. *Cross Cultural Misunderstanding in the Language of International Diplomacy*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Wales.
- Anton, R. 1990. 'Drawing the line: an exploratory test of ethical behavior in negotiations'. *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, Vol 1, Number 3, pp265-280.
- Austin, J.L. 1962. *How To Do Things With Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Barbara, L. and Scott, M. (eds.). 1994. *Reflections on Language Learning*. Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Barley, S. 1991. 'Contextualizing conflict: notes on the anthropology of disputes and negotiations'. *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, Vol 3, pp165-199.
- Barron, C. 1991. 'Material thoughts: ESP and culture'. *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol 10, pp173-85.
- Baumen, R. and Sherzen, J. (eds.). 1974. *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beamer, L. 1992. 'Learning intercultural communication competence'. *Journal of Business Communication*, Vol 29, Number 3, pp285-303.
- Bennett, A. 1981. 'Interruptions and the interpretation of conversation'. *Discourse Processes*, Vol 4, pp171-88.
- Bercovitch, J. 1991. 'International negotiations and conflict management: the importance of prenegotiations'. *Jerusalem Journal of International Relations*, Vol 13, Number 1, pp7-21.
- Block, E. 1992. 'See how they read: comprehension monitoring of L1 and L2 readers'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 26, Number 2, pp319-44.
- Bower, R. and Brumfit, C. (eds.). 1991. *Applied Linguistics and English Language Teaching*. London: Modern English Publications.
- Bowman, J.P. and Targowski, A.S. 1987. 'Modeling the communication process: the map is not the territory'. *The Journal of Business Communication*, Vol 24, Number 4, pp21-34.
- Braecke, C. and Cuyckens, H. (eds.). 1991. *Business Communication in Multilingual Europe: Supply and Demand*. Antwerp: UFSIA.
- Brown, G. and Yule, G. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, J. 1990. *Understanding Research in Second Language Learning: A Teacher's Guide to Statistics and Research Design*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, J. 1991. 'Statistics as a foreign language - Part 1: What to look for in reading statistical language studies'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 25, Number 4, pp569-86.

- Brown, P. and Levinson, C. 1987. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bugelski, B.R. 1964. *The Psychology of Learning Applied to Teaching*. New York: Bobbs - Merrill Co., Inc.
- Button, G. and Lee, J.R.E. 1987. *Talk and Social Organization*. Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bygate, M. 1987. *Speaking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bygate, M. 1988. 'Units of oral expression and language learning in small group interaction'. *Applied Linguistics*, Vol 9, Number 1, pp59-82.
- Canale, M. 1981. 'On some dimensions of language proficiency'. In Oller, J. (ed.), 1981.
- Candlin, C.N. 1985. 'Preface'. In Coulthard, M., 1985.
- Cheng-Geok, R. 1991. 'Explaining different discourse strategies in cross cultural business negotiations'. Paper presented at the Eastern Michigan University Conference on Language and Communications for World Business and the Professionals. Eastern Michigan University, July, 1991.
- Chomsky, N. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: Longman.
- Cole, P. and Morgan, J. (eds.). 1975. *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press.
- Coulthard, M. 1985. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. 2nd ed. London: Longman.
- Donohue, W. and Ramesh, C. 1992. '>Negotiator-opponent relationships'. In Putnam, L. and Roloff, M. (eds.), 1992.
- Douglas, A. 1957. 'The peaceful settlement of industrial and intergroup disputes'. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol 1, pp69-81.
- Duncan, S. 1972. 'Some signals and rules for taking speaking turns in conversation'. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol 23, Number 2, pp 283-93.
- Edelsky, C. 1981. 'Who's got the floor?' *Language in Society*, Vol 10, Number 5, p383-421.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. 1989. 'On sociolinguistic rules: alternation and co-occurrence'. In Gumperz, J.J. and Hymes, D. (eds.), 1989.
- Fairclough, N. 1992. *Discourse and Social Change*. New York: Polity Press.
- Fasold, R. 1987. *The Sociolinguistics of Society*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Fasold, R. 1990. *Sociolinguistics of Language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Ferguson, N. 1977. 'Simultaneous speech, interruptions and dominance'. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, Vol 16, Number 4, pp295-302.
- Fiksdal, S.R. 1986. *The Right Time and Pace: A Microanalysis of Cross Cultural Gatekeeping Interviews*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Michigan.
- Firth, A. 1990. 'Lingua Franca negotiations: towards an interactional approach'. *World Englishes*, Vol 9, Number 3, pp269-280.
- Fisher, G. 1980. *International Negotiation: A Cross Cultural Perspective*. Washington, D.C.: Intercultural Press.
- Fisher, R. 1989. 'Negotiations in concert'. *Foreign Service Journal*, Vol 5, pp25-50.
- Fisher, R. and Ury, W. 1991. *Getting to Yes*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Fishman, J.A. 1987. 'The relationship between micro and macro - sociolinguistics in the

- study of "who speaks what language to whom and when". In Pride, J. and Holmes, J. (eds.), 1987.
- Fitzgerald, M. 1989. 'Industrial Language Training'. *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol 8, pp60-75.
- Goffman, E. 1963. *Behavior in Public Places*. New York: Free Press.
- Goffman, E. 1967. *Interaction Ritual: Essays in Face to Face Behavior*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Goke-Pariola, A. 1990. 'Theoretical and pragmatic issues in the use of ESL for cross-cultural business communication'. Paper presented at the Eastern Michigan University Conference on Language and Communications for World Business and the Professionals. Eastern Michigan University, July, 1990.
- Goldberg, J. 1990. 'Interrupting the discourse on interruptions'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol 14, pp883-903.
- Goodale, M. 1987. *Meetings*. Brighton: Language Teaching Publications.
- Goodwin, C. 1981. *Conversation Organisation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Gordon, L. 1994. *Talking and Interrupting: A Look at Behavior and Judgment*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Delaware.
- Gorman, V. 1992. 'Custom-designing foreign language courses for business people'. In Voght, G. and Schaub, R. (eds.), 1992.
- Graddol, D., Cheshire, J. and Swann, J. 1994. *Describing Language*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grice, H.P. 1975. 'Logic and conversation'. In Cole, P. and Morgan, J. (eds.), 1975.
- Grimshaw, A. 1988. 'Rhetoric'. Paper presented at the Research Council of the International Sociological Association Meeting, Ljubljana, September, 1988.
- Grosse, C.U. 1988. 'The case study approach to teaching business English'. *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol 7, pp131-35.
- Gumperz, J.J. 1988. *Language and Social Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J.J. 1989. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J.J. and Hymes, D.H. (eds.). 1989. *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Halliday, M. and Hasan, R. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hamachek, R. 1965. *The Self in Growth, Teaching and Learning*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Hatch, E. 1992. *Discourse and Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hatch, E. and Lazarton, A. 1991. *The Research Manual: Design and Statistics for Applied Linguistics*. New York: Newbury House Publishers.
- Hawkins, K. 1991. 'Some consequences of deep interruption in task oriented conversation'. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, Vol 10, Number 3, pp185-203.
- Hendriks, E. 1991. 'Research on international business negotiations: an introduction'. In Braecke, C. and Cuyckens, H. (eds.), 1991.
- Hilton, E. 1992. 'Business communication'. *Japanese International Business Communication: The Place of English*, Vol 29, Number 3, pp253-65.

- Holden, S. (ed.). 1977. *English for Specific Purposes*. Rowley, Mich.: Newbury House.
- Holmes, J. 1990. 'Hedges and boosters in women's and men's speech'. *Language and Communication*, Vol 10, Number 3, pp185-209.
- Hutchinson, J. and Waters, P. 1987. *English for Specific Purposes: A Learning-Centred Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hymes, D.H. 1987. 'On communicative competence'. In Pride, J. and Holmes, J. (eds.), 1987.
- Hymes, D.H. 1989. 'Models of the interaction of language and social life'. In Gumperz, J.J. and Hymes, D.H. (eds.), 1989.
- Jefferson, G. 1987. 'On exposed and embedded correction in conversation'. In Button, G. and Lee, J.R.E. (eds.), 1987.
- Johns, A. and Dudley-Evans, T. 1991. 'English for specific purposes: international in scope, specific in purpose'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 25, Number 2, pp297-314.
- Johnson, D. and Saville-Troike, M. 1992. 'Validity and reliability in qualitative research on second language acquisition and teaching: two researchers comment'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 26, Number 3, pp490-506.
- Jones, G. M. 1990. 'ESP textbooks: do they really exist?' *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol 9, pp89-90.
- Julian, M. 1990. 'Tales: what negotiators think drives a hard bargain'. *Edinburgh Working Papers in Applied Linguistics*, Number 1, pp59-77.
- Kerlinger, F.A. 1966. *Foundations of Behavioral Research*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Labov, W. 1970. 'The study of language in its social context'. *Studium Generale*, Vol 23, pp30-32.
- Labov, W. 1978. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, W. 1989. 'On the mechanism of linguistic change'. In Gumperz, J.J. and Hymes, D. (eds.), 1989.
- Lakoff, R. 1973. 'The logic of politeness; or minding your P's and Q's'. Paper from the Ninth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society, March, 1973.
- Lampi, M. 1986. *Linguistic Components of Strategy in Business Negotiations*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Jyväskylä.
- Langford, D. 1994. *Analyzing Talk*. London: Macmillan.
- Lazaraton, A. 1991. 'Power, effect size and second language research'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 25, Number 4, pp759-66.
- Leal, R. and Powers, T. 1992. 'Internationalizing the business curriculum: an application of the Fulbright scholar experience'. In Voght, G. and Schaub, R. (eds.), 1992.
- Leech, G. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman.
- Levinson, S. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lim, C. 1991. 'Explaining different discourse strategies in cross-cultural business negotiations'. Report submitted by the English Language Proficiency Unit, National University of Singapore.
- McCarthy, M. 1991. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- McCarthy, M. and Carter, R. 1994. *Language and Discourse: Perspectives for Language Teaching*. London: Longman.
- Marshall, H. 1987. 'Quantity Surveying Reports'. *ELR Journal*, Vol 1, pp117-54.
- Martin, J. and Chaney, L. 1992. 'Determination of content for a collegiate course in intercultural business communication by three delphi panels'. *Journal of Business Communication*, Vol 29, Number 3, pp267-81.
- Mead, G. 1934. *Mind, Self and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Micheau, C. and Billmyer, K. 1992. 'Discourse strategies for foreign business students: preliminary research findings'. Unpublished manuscript.
- Minodkin, R. 1993. 'Why negotiations fail: an exploration of barriers to the resolution of conflict'. *The Ohio State Journal on Dispute Resolution*, Vol 8, Number 2, pp235-49.
- Moerman, M. 1988. *Talking Culture: Ethnography and Conversation Analysis*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Murray, S. 1988. 'The sound of simultaneous speech. The meaning of interruptions'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol 12, pp115-16.
- Murray, S. and Covelli, L. 1988. 'Women and men speaking at the same time'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol 12, pp99-111.
- Natale, M., Entin, E., and Jaffe, J. 1979. 'Vocal interruptions in dyadic communication as a function of speech and social anxiety'. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol 37, pp865-78.
- Neu, J. 1986. 'American English business negotiations: training for non-native speakers'. *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol 5, Number 1, pp4-57.
- Nunan, D. 1990. 'Using learner data in curriculum development'. *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol 9, pp17-32.
- Nunan, D. 1991. 'Communicative tasks and the language curriculum'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 25, Number 2, pp279-96.
- Nunan, D. 1992. *Research Methods in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nuttall, C. 1982. *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Oller, J. (ed.). 1981. *Current Issues in Language Testing Research*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Olsen, L. and Huckin, T. 1990. 'Point-driven understanding in engineering lecture comprehension'. *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol 9, pp33-44.
- Orasanu, P., States, R. and Adler, S. (eds.). 1979. *Language, Sex and Gender*. New York: The New York Academy of Sciences.
- Peng, J. 1987. 'Organizational features in chemical engineering research articles'. *ELR Journal*, Vol 1, pp79-116.
- Poussaint, A.F. 1967. 'A Negro Psychiatrist Explains the Negro Psyche'. *New York Times Magazine*, August 20.
- Pride, J. and Holmes, J. (eds.). 1987. *Selected Readings: Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

- Putnam, L. and Holmes, M. 1992. 'Framing, reframing and issue development'. In Putnam, L. and Roloff, M. (eds.), 1992.
- Putnam, L. and Jones, T. 1982. 'Reciprocity in negotiations: an analysis of bargaining interaction'. *Communication Monographs*, Vol 49, pp171-191.
- Putnam, L. and Roloff, M. (eds.). 1992. *Communication and Negotiation*. London: Sage Publications.
- Rankins, O. 1982. 'North and Latin American business negotiations: an assessment of differences in interpersonal perception'. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Louisville, Kentucky, July, 1982.
- Ranney, S. 1992. 'Learning a new script: an exploration of sociolinguistic competence'. *Applied Linguistics*, Vol 13, Number 1, pp25-27.
- Redding, R.E. 1991. 'Training American businessmen to meet the psychological challenges of international negotiation'. U.S. Department of Education Information Analysis Paper.
- Reisman, K. 1974. 'Contrapuntal conversations in an Antiguan village'. In Bauman, R. and Sherzen, J. (eds.), 1974.
- Riley, P. 1991. 'Having a good gossip: socio-cultural dimensions of language Use'. *ELR Journal*, Vol 2, Number 1, pp57-63.
- Riley, P. (ed.). 1985. *Discourse and Learning*. London: Longman.
- Robinson, S. 1988. *Cross Cultural Understanding*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.
- Sacks, H. 1987. 'On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation'. In Button, G. and Lee, J.R.E. (eds.), 1987.
- Sacks, H. and Schegloff, E. 1974. 'Opening up closing'. In Turner, R. (ed.), 1974.
- Saville-Troike, M. 1989. *The Ethnography of Communication*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Schegloff, E. 1968. 'Sequencing in conversational openings'. *American Anthropologist*, Vol 70, Number 6, pp1075-95.
- Schegloff, E. 1987. 'Recycled turn beginnings: a precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn taking mechanism'. In Button, G. and Lee, J.R.E. (eds.), 1987.
- Schiffrin, D. 1994. *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Scollon, R. and Scollon, S. 1995. *Intercultural Communication*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Scott, J. 1991. 'Helping students to better understand business sub-cultures: an effective way to facilitate cross-cultural business communication'. Teacher Guide, Department of Business Information Systems and Education, Utah State University.
- Searle, J.R. 1969. *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seliger, H. and Shohany, E. 1990. *Second Language Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shahar, L. and Kurz, D. 1995. *Border Crossings - American Interactions with Israelis*. Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.
- Shih, M. 1992. 'Beyond comprehension exercises in the ESL academic reading class'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 26, Number 2, pp289-318.
- Sinclair, J. and Coulthard, M. 1975. *Towards an Analysis of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Stenstrom, A. 1994. *An Introduction to Spoken Interaction*. London: Longman.
- Stubbs, M. 1983. *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Swales, J. 1981. 'A genre-based approach to language across the curriculum'. Paper given at 1981 RELC Seminar, May, 1981.
- Swales, J. 1990. *Genre Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. (ed.). 1985. *Episodes in ESP*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall International.
- Swales, J. and Woken, M. 1989. 'Expertise and authority in native-non-native conversations: the need for a variable account'. In Gass, M., Madden, R., Preston, R. and Selinker, G. (eds.), 1989.
- Talbot, M. 1988. 'The operation was a success, unfortunately the patient died: comments on Murray and Covelli's "Women and men speaking at the same time"'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol 12, pp113-14.
- Talbot, M. 1992. 'I wish you would stop interrupting me! Interruptions and asymmetries in speaker-rights in equal encounters'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol 18, pp451-66.
- Tannen, D. 1989. *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tannen, D. 1990. *You Just Don't Understand*. New York: Balantine Books.
- Taylor, T. and Cameron, D. 1987. *Analyzing Conversation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Thompson, S. 1991. 'Needs analysis in LSP: research based approaches'. In Braecke, C. and Cuyckens, H. (eds.), 1991.
- Thompson, S. 1994. 'Laughter and interpersonal management in a business meeting'. In Barbara, L. and Scott, M., 1994.
- Thorne, B., Kramarae, C., and Henley, M. 1983. *Language, Gender and Society*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Tjosvold, D. and Huston, T. L. 1978. 'Social face and resistance to compromise in bargaining'. *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol 104, pp57-68.
- Tripp, S.M. 1969. 'Sociolinguistic rules of address'. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol 4, pp93-107.
- Turner, R. (ed.). 1974. *Ethnomethodology*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Tutzauer, F. 1992. 'The communication of offers in dyadic bargaining'. In Putnam, L. and Roloff, M. (eds.), 1992.
- Ulijin, J. and Li, X. 1995. 'Is interrupting polite? Some temporal aspects of turn taking in Chinese-Western and other intercultural business encounters'. *Text* 15, Vol 4, pp589-627.
- Van Hoorde, J. 1991. 'Cross cultural communication and the "revised" Targowski and Bowman communication model'. In Braecke, C. and Cuyckens, H. (eds.), 1991.
- Victor, D. 1987. 'Teaching cross-cultural conflict management skills'. Proceedings of the Annual Eastern Michigan University Conference on Languages and Communications for World Business and the Professions. Eastern Michigan University, July, 1989.
- Voght, G. and Schaub, R. (eds.). 1992. *The Professions*. Michigan: Eastern Michigan University.
- Wardell, D. 1987. 'Materials for teaching business English'. *The Language Teacher*, Vol

- 11, Number 2, pp25-33.
- Watson, K. 1975. 'Transferable communication routines'. *Language in Society*, Vol 4, pp53-72.
- West, C. 1979. 'Against our will: male interruptions of females in cross sex conversations'. In Orasanu, P., States, R. and Adler, S. (eds.), 1979.
- West, C. and Zimmerman, D. 1977. 'Women's place in everyday tasks: reflections on parent-child interaction'. *Social Problems*, Vol 24(5), pp521-29.
- West, C. and Zimmerman, D. 1983. 'Small insults: a study of interruptions in cross-sex conversations between unacquainted persons'. In Thorne, B., Kramarae, C. and Henley, N. (eds.), 1983.
- Westerfield, K. 1989. 'Improved linguistic fluency with case studies and a video method'. *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol 8, pp75-83.
- Williams, M. 1988. 'Language taught for meetings and language used in meetings: is there anything in common?' *Applied Linguistics*, Vol 9, Number 1, pp45-58.
- Williams, J. and Hoekje, B. 1992. 'Communicative competence and the dilemma of international teaching assistant education'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 26, Number 2, pp243-70.
- Wilson, S. 1992. 'Face and facework in negotiation'. In Putnam, L. and Roloff, M. (eds.), 1992.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams Smith, D. E. 1987. 'Variation in field-related genres'. *ELR Journal*, Vol 1, pp10-22
- Adamson, H.D. 1990. 'ESL students' use of academic skills in content courses'. *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol 9, pp67-87.
- Agar, M. 1991. 'The biculture in bilingual'. *Language in Society*, Vol 20, Number 2, pp167-81.
- Albert, E. 1989. 'Culture patterning of speech behavior in Burundi'. In Ervin-Tripp, S. (ed.), 1989.
- Alexander, L. 1992. 'Grammar in the classroom'. *ELR Journal*, Vol 2, Number 1, pp125-27.
- Alexander, R. 1988. 'Examining the spoken English of students of European business studies: purposes, problems and perspectives'. *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol 16, Number 1, pp41-48.
- Ashworth, A. 1991. 'Internationalism and our "strenuous family"'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 25, Number 2, pp231-44.
- Atkinson, D. 1997. 'A critical approach to critical thinking in TESOL.' *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 31, Number 1, pp71-94.
- Behrens, S. 1983. *From the Classroom to the Workplace: Teaching E.S.L. to Adults*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics Press.
- Belcher, D. 1991. 'Nonnative writing in a corporate setting'. *The Technical Writing Teacher*, Vol 18, Number 2, pp104-114.
- Bensoussan, M. 1990. 'EFL reading as seen through translation and discourse analysis: narrative vs. expository texts'. *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol 9, pp49-66.
- Bower, R. and Brumfit, C. (eds.). 1991. *Applied Linguistics and English Language Teaching*. London: Modern English Publications.
- Boyle, J. 1981. 'Texts from business journalism for ESP courses in Hong Kong'. *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol 9, Number 2, pp99-105.
- Bright, W. and Ramanujan, A.V. 1987. 'Sociolinguistic variation and language change.' In Pride, J. and Holmes, J. (eds.), 1987.
- Brown, D., Lewicki, R., Hall, D., and Hall, F. 1982. *Experiences in Management and Organizational Behavior*. 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Brown, D. 1991. 'TESOL at twenty-five: what are the issues?' *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 25 Number 2, pp245-60.
- Brown, J. 1991. 'Do English and ESL faculties rate writing samples differently?' *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 25, Number 4, pp587-604.
- Button, G. 1987. 'Moving out of closings'. In Button, G. and Lee, J.R.E. (eds.), 1987.
- Button, G. and Lee, J.R.E. 1987. *Talk and Social Organization*. Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Button, G. and Lee, J.R.E. 1987. 'Preface'. In Button, G. and Lee, J.R.E. (eds.), 1987.

- Cameron, D. 1990. 'Integrating conversation?' *Language and Communication*, Vol 10, Number 3, pp219-227.
- Candlin, C.N., Leather, J.H., and Bruton, C.J. 1978. *Doctor-Patient Communications Skills*. Chelmsford: Graves Audio-Visual Medical Foundation.
- Carroll, P. 1991. 'Rhetoric'. University of Akron Presentation to Hebrew University Faculty, Jerusalem, Israel, October, 1991.
- Carroll, S. and Meisel, J. 1990. 'Universals and second language acquisition'. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol 12, Number 2, pp201-8.
- Carter, R. 1991. 'Lexis'. *ELR Journal*, Vol 2, Number 1, pp85-86.
- Celce-Murcia, M. 1992. 'Adapted from teaching issues: formal grammar instruction, an educator comments . . .'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 26, Number 2, pp406-12.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Dornyei, Z., and Thurrell, S. 1997. 'Direct approaches in L2 instruction: a turning point in communicative language teaching?' *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 31, Number 1, pp141-52.
- Clahsen, H. 1990. 'The comparative study of first and second language development'. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol 12, Number 2, pp135-54.
- Comrie, B. 1990. 'Second language acquisition and language universals research' *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol 12, Number 2, pp209-18.
- Crago, M. 1992. 'Communicative interaction and second language acquisition: an Inuit example'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 26, Number 3, pp487-502.
- Davis, K. 1992. 'Validity and reliability in qualitative research on second language acquisition and teaching: two researchers comment'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 26, Number 3, pp542-44.
- Dixon, P. 1987. 'The processing of organizational and component step information in written directions'. *Journal of Memory and Languages*, Vol 26, pp24-34.
- Dupont, C. 1988. 'International negotiations: communication, language and cross cultural aspects'. Notes for presentation at ESP Conference, Eindhoven, Holland, April, 1988.
- Eastman, C. 1990. 'What is the role of language planning in post-apartheid South Africa?' *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 24, pp9-25.
- Egbert, J. 1989. 'Prison ESL: building a foundation for teaching English in unconversational settings'. *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol 8, Number 1, pp51-63.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. (ed.). 1989. *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Fashola, J. 1989. 'Discussions and research notes: evaluation, feasibility and relevance'. *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol 8, Number 1, pp62-72.
- Finocchiaro, M. 1986. *English as a Foreign Language: From Theory to Practice*. New York: Regents Publishing Co.
- Fotos, S. and Ellis, R. 1990. 'Communicating about grammar: a task based approach'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 25, Number 4, pp605-28.
- Gass, M., Madden, R., Preston, R. and Selinker, G. (eds.). 1989. *Variation in Second Language Acquisition: Discourse and Pragmatics*. Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Gasser, M. 1990. 'Connectionism and universals of second language acquisition'. *Studies*

- in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol 12, Number 2, pp179-200.
- Gibbons, P., Bradac, J., and Busch, J. 1992. 'The role of language in negotiations: threats and promises'. In Putnam, L. and Roloff, M. (eds.), 1992.
- Gleason, H.J. 1955. *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Goffman, E. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Gorman, V. 1992. 'Cross cultural communication activities for the international marketing classroom'. Proceedings of the 10th Annual Eastern Michigan University conference on Languages and Communication for World Business. Eastern Michigan University, July, 1992.
- Gottlieb, E. 1991. 'Academising non academic teacher education: a discourse analysis'. First International Conference on Rhetoric and Culture. Tel Aviv University, Israel, April, 1991.
- Green, J., Franquiz, M., and Dixon, C. 1997. 'The myth of the objective transcript: transcribing as a situated act'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 31, Number 1. pp172-76.
- Gumperz, J.J. 1987. 'Sociolinguistics and communication in small groups'. In Pride, J. and Holmes, J. (eds.), 1987.
- Gumperz, J.J. and Hymes, D.H. (eds.). 1989. *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Hailman, C. 1991. 'Kassandra and no end? An effort at rhetorical analysis'. First International Conference on Rhetoric and Culture. Tel Aviv University, Israel, April, 1991.
- Hall, C. 1990. 'Managing the complexity of revising across languages'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 24, Number 1, pp43-58.
- Hanson, K. 1989. 'Building international bridges through communication teaching'. Proceedings of the Annual Eastern Michigan University Conference on Languages and Communications for World Business and the Professions. Eastern Michigan University, July, 1989.
- Harris, M. 1981. *America Now*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Haugen, E. 1987. 'Dialect, language, nation'. In Pride, J. and Holmes, J. (eds.), 1987.
- Hayes, C., Ornstein, J., and Gage, W. 1977. *A.B.C.'s of Language and Linguistics*. Maryland: Institute of Modern Languages.
- Hellweg, S. 1989. 'Cultural variations in organizational negotiation styles'. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association, Spokane, WA, July, 1989.
- Hewing, A., and Henderson, W. 1987. 'A link between genre and schema: a case study of economics text'. *ELR Journal*, Vol 1, pp156-75.
- Hirvelua, A. 1990. 'ESP literature: a reassessment'. *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol 9, pp237-52.
- Hoey, M. 1991. 'Some properties of spoken discourse'. In Bower, R. and Brumfit, C. (eds.), 1991.
- Holden, S. (ed.). 1977. *English for Specific Purposes*. Rowley, Mich.: Newbury House.
- Howe, P.M. 1990. 'The problem of the problem question in English for academic legal

- purpose'. *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol 9, pp215-36.
- Hubbard, P., Jones, H., Thornton, B. and Wheeler, R. 1983. *A Training Course for TEFL*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hudson, T. 1991. 'A content comprehension approach to reading English for science and technology'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 25, Number 1, pp77-104.
- Jacoby, S. 1989. 'References to other researchers in literary research articles'. *ELR Journal*, Vol 1, pp33-79.
- Johns, A.M. 1988. 'Discussion and research notes: the discourse communities dilemma: identifying transferable skills for the academic milieu'. *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol 7, pp55-59.
- Johnson, D. 1992. 'Compliments and politeness in peer-review texts'. *Applied Linguistics*, Vol 13, Number 1, pp51-53.
- Johnson, K. 1992. 'Learning to teach: instructional actions and decisions of preservice ESL teachers'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 26, Number 3, pp507-29.
- Johnson, R.K. 1990. 'International English: towards an acceptable, teachable target variety'. *World Englishes*, Vol 9, Number 3, pp301-16.
- Katz, E. 1991. 'Rising and Falling in the Book of Esther'. First International Conference on Rhetoric and Culture. Tel Aviv University, Israel, April, 1991.
- Keough, C. 1992. 'Bargaining arguments and argumentative bargainers'. In Putnam, L. and Roloff, M. (eds.), 1992.
- Kirkland, M. and Saunders, M. 1991. 'Maximizing studies and performance in summary writing: managing cognitive load'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 25, Number 1, pp105-22.
- Kirschner, M., Wexler, C., Spector-Cohen, E. 1992. 'Avoiding obstacles to student comprehension of test questions'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 26, Number 3, pp537-42.
- Klein, W. 1990. 'A theory of language acquisition is not so easy'. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol 12, Number 2, pp219-32.
- Kobayashi, T. 1992. 'Native and non native reactions to ESL compositions'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 26, Number 1, pp81-112.
- Ladousse, G. P. 1989. *Role Play*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Landry, E.M., Kolb, D. and Rubin, J. 1991. *Curriculum for Negotiation and Conflict Management*. Boston, Mass.: The Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School.
- Larsen, R. and Stroup, D. 1976. *Statistics in the Real World*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. 1991. 'Second language acquisition research: staking out the territory'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 25, Number 2, pp315-50.
- Lee, J. and Jablin, F. 1992. 'A cross cultural investigation of exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect as responses to dissatisfying job conditions'. *Journal of Business Communication*, Vol 29, Number 3, pp203-27.
- Levi, A. 1991. 'Lingual stereotypes and ethnic prejudice'. First International Conference on Rhetoric and Culture. Tel Aviv University, Israel, April, 1991.
- Littlewood, W. 1991. 'Curriculum design'. *ELR Journal*, Vol 2, Number 1, pp45-50.
- Locastro, V. 1990. 'The English in Japanese university entrance exams: a sociocultural analysis'. *World Englishes*, Vol 9, Number 3, pp343-54.

- Long, M. and Crookes, G. 1991. 'Three approaches to task-based syllabus design'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 26, Number 1, pp27-56.
- McIntosh, A. 1987. 'Language and style'. *Durham University Journal*, Vol 55, Number 3, pp116-23.
- McLaren, M. and Gatenby, B. 1992. 'A comment and a challenge'. *Journal of Business Communication*, Vol 29, Number 3, pp305-8.
- Maier, P. 1992. 'Politeness strategies in business letters by native and non-native English speakers'. *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol 2, pp1-17.
- Mangubhai, F. 1991. 'The processing behaviors of adult second language learners and their relationship to second proficiency'. *Applied Linguistics*, Vol 12, Number 3, pp268-70.
- Mason, D. 1989. 'An examination of authentic dialogues for use in the ESP classroom'. *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol 8, Number 1, pp85-91.
- Mettler, S. 1989. 'Recognizing and resolving ESL problems in a corporate setting'. Proceedings of the Annual Eastern Michigan University Conference on Languages and Communications for World Business and the Professions. Eastern Michigan University, July, 1989.
- Milroy, L. 1987. *Language and Social Networks*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Morrow, P. 1989. *Varieties of Business English: A Linguistic Analysis of Written Texts*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Mulholland, J. 1991. *The Language of Negotiation*. London: Routledge.
- Myers, G. 1991. 'Politeness and certainty: the language of collaboration in an AI project'. *Social Studies and Science*, Vol 21, pp37-73.
- Nayer, P. 1997. 'ESL/EFL dichotomy today: language politics or pragmatics?' *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 31, Number 1, pp9-38.
- Noguchi, R. R. 1987. 'The dynamics of rule conflict in English and Japanese conversation'. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, Vol 25, pp15-23.
- Oller, J. and Richards, J. 1973. *Focus on the Learner: Pragmatic Perspectives for the Language Teacher*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.
- Olshtain, E. and Blum-Kulka, S. 1989. *Happy Hebrish: Mixing and Switching in American Israeli Family Interactions*. Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Parrott, M. 1991. 'Teacher education: factors relating to programme design'. *ELR Journal*, Vol 2, Number 1, pp35-40.
- Pearson, B. and Lee, K.S. 1992. 'Discourse structure of direction giving: effects of native/non native speaker status and gender'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 26, Number 1, pp113-28.
- Philipsen, G. 1975. 'Speaking like a man in teamsterville'. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, Vol 61, pp14-22.
- Pinker, S. 1994. *The Language Instinct*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Prabhu, N.S. 1992. 'The dynamics of the language lesson'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 26, Number 2, pp225-42.
- Pride, J. and Holmes, J. (eds.). 1987. *Selected Readings: Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

- Putnam, L. and Roloff, M. (eds.). 1992. *Communication and Negotiation*. London: Sage Publications.
- Richards, J. 1985. *The Context of Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roberts, C. 1997. 'Transcribing talk: issues of representation'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 31, Number 1, pp167-71.
- Roberts, J. and Forman, M. 1989. 'Riddles: expressive models of interrogation'. In Gumperz, J.J. and Hymes, D.H. (eds.), 1989.
- Roller, C. and Matambo, A. 1992. 'Bilingual readers' use of background knowledge in learning from text'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 26, Number 1, pp129-42.
- Rothman, J. 1991. 'Conflict solving and political dialogue between adversaries: setting an agenda for peace'. First International Conference on Rhetoric and Culture. Tel Aviv University, Israel, April, 1991.
- Rubin, J. 1975. 'The good language learner'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 9, Number 1, pp141-44.
- Savignon, S. 1991. 'Communicative language teaching: state of the art'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 25, Number 2, pp261-78.
- Scheiber, H.J. 1987. 'Consciousness raising and collaboration: the one day professional writing seminar'. *American Business Communications Bulletin*, Vol 25, pp12-16.
- Schleppergrell, M. and Royster, L. 1990. 'Business English: an international survey'. *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol 9, pp3-16.
- Scott, J. 1992. 'Unions between foreign language and business: British patterns'. In Voght, G. and Schaub, R. (eds.), 1992.
- Scott, M. 1984. 'Self access in ESP'. Working Paper, Number 12. Pontificia Universidade Catolica De Sao Paulo, Projeto Nacional Ensino de Ingles Instrumental em Universidades Brasileiras.
- Sharrock, W. and Angerson, B. 1987. 'Work flow in a paediatric clinic'. In Button, G. and Lee, J.R.E. (eds.), 1987.
- Sharrock, W. and Anderson, B. 1987. 'Epilogue: the definition of alternations. Some sources of confusion in interdisciplinary discussion'. In Button, G. and Lee, J.R.E. (eds.), 1987.
- Shaw, P. 1992. 'Variation and universality in communicative competence: Coseriu's model'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 26, Number 1, pp9-26.
- Shor, I. 1980. *Critical Teaching and Everyday Life*. Boston: Southend Press.
- Siegel, S. 1956. *Non Parametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Smith, F. 1978. *Reading Without Nonsense*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Stark, L. 1991. 'Teachers are researchers'. *TESOL Matters*, Vol 1, Number 6, p4.
- Stembeck, E. 1991. 'Chattering again . . . thematisation, placing and shifting the theme in talks'. First International Conference on Rhetoric and Culture. Lausanne: University of Lausanne, June, 1991.
- Stern, H.H. 1994. *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Suarez, J. 1992. 'Is research in languages for business scholarly?' In Voght, G. and Schaub, R. (eds.), 1992.
- Swales, J. 1993. *Discourse Communities, Genres and English as an International Language*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Swan, M. 1991. 'The textbook: bridge or wall?' *ELR Journal*, Vol 2, Number 1, pp21-33.
- Takahashi, T. 1989. 'The influence of the listener on L2 speech'. In Gass, M., Madden, R., Preston, R. and Selinker, G. (eds.), 1989.
- Tarvin, W. and Al-Arishi, A. 1991. 'Rethinking communicative language teaching: reflection and the ESL classroom'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 25, Number 1, pp9-28.
- Tomlin, R. 1990. 'Functionalism in second language acquisition'. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol 12, Number 2, pp155-78.
- Ury, W. 1991. *Getting Past No: Negotiating Your Way From Confrontation to Co-operation*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Voght, G. and Schaub, R. (eds.). 1992. *The Professions*. Michigan: Eastern Michigan University.
- Watts, F. 1992. 'The cultural implications of international business: three French experiments in the U.S. and their classroom dimension'. In Voght, G. and Schaub, R. (eds.), 1992.
- Weinreb, B. 1986. 'Cultural reflections in multinational corporations: a comparison between Israeli and U.S. subsidiaries'. Unpublished Technical Report, Jerusalem, Israel.
- Wennerstrom, A.K. and Heiser, P. 1992. 'ESL student bias in instructional evaluation'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 26, Number 2, pp271-88.
- White, L. 1990. 'Second language acquisition and universal grammar'. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol 12, Number 2, pp121-34.
- Wiegand, R. 1989. 'Negative adult student behavior in consulting classes in business'. *American Business Communication Bulletin*, Vol 33, pp7-18.
- Worth, M. and Marshall, G. 1987. 'Organizing in-company language training'. *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol 9, Number 3, pp123-41.
- Yates, S. 1977. 'Commercial English - some notes'. In Holden, S. (ed.), 1977.
- Yeschua, S. 1991. 'Rhetoric in disguise: the cases of midrash and psychoanalysis'. First International conference in Rhetoric and Culture. Tel Aviv University, Israel, April, 1991.
- Yim, K. and Wong, I. 1990. 'A course in business communication for accountants'. *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol 9, Number 3, pp253-63.
- Zuengler, J. 1989. 'Performance variation in NS-NNS interactions: ethnolinguistic difference or discourse domain?' In Gass, M., Madden, R., Preston, R. and Selinker, G. (eds.), 1989.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Negotiation Simulation

EXPLANATION

To be read by each partner, native and non-native.

Introduction :

A simulation is an event which is as close to real life as possible. During the negotiating phase, please keep in mind that you are a negotiating partner rather than a student or teacher in the classroom. We hope that this negotiation simulation will provide you with a unique opportunity to use English in a natural, spontaneous manner. Before the simulation the leader will ask you to complete a brief questionnaire.

Advice on participation in the negotiation simulation:

1. During the simulation, be yourself. Do not “act”. A simulation is not a role play and you will not be asked to be someone else.
2. Do not ask for help during the negotiations. Do the best that you can without any assistance.
3. Your first task is to understand what is being negotiated. Before the simulation begins, you may ask any questions. But remember, once the negotiation process begins, you may not ask for any help.
4. You will have a few minutes to become familiar with the negotiations. Do whatever you feel is necessary to prepare yourself. Your simulation leader will tell you at what point to start the negotiations.
5. There are no time limits. Your simulation leader will ask you to designate when you have completed the simulation.
6. To conclude the negotiation simulation, your leader will ask you to complete a brief post-negotiation questionnaire.

Thank you for your participation and good luck!

APPENDIX B

Negotiation Simulation

Role Play: Customer

You are working for a multinational company. You have been asked to negotiate the purchase of a new computer. You will need to travel outside of your country to negotiate with your supplier. Your company understands that you will need to compromise if you want to make a deal.

After discussions within your company purchasing department, the following have been set up as your targets for the negotiations.

	Pre-Negotiation Target	Post-Negotiation Agreement
Delivery Time	4 weeks	
Warranty Period	2 years	
Penalty Clause	Late delivery penalty - 10% reduction of cost for each week of delay	
Delivery and Installation	No charge	
Price	\$430,000.00	
Credit Period	90 days	

You have been introduced to the supplier. You are now ready to begin the negotiations.

APPENDIX C

Negotiation Simulation

Role Play: Supplier

You are a supplier which sells computers to multinational companies outside of your country. You have been told that a customer will be arriving from outside your country to purchase a computer.

Your company understands that you will need to compromise if you want to make a deal.

After discussions within your company with the sales department, the following have been set up as your targets for the negotiations.

	Pre-Negotiation Target	Post-Negotiation Agreement
Delivery Time	8 weeks	
Warranty Period	1 years	
Penalty Clause	Cancellation penalty: 90% of total price	
Delivery and Installation	\$1,500.00 (\$1,000.00 delivery and \$500.00 installation)	
Price	\$450,000.00	
Credit Period	30 days	

You have been introduced to the customer. You are now ready to begin the negotiations.

APPENDIX D

Pre-Negotiation Questionnaire
Native Speakers A-1

1. While speaking in English to a non native speaker of English, do you

(repetition)

a. repeat words?

Frequently 5 4 3 2 1 Never

(open up new subjects)

b. minimize your initiative in opening up new subjects or taking your turn in the discussion?

Frequently 5 4 3 2 1 Never

(paraphrase)

c. find that you rephrase your point in a different way to clarify meaning?

Frequently 5 4 3 2 1 Never

(self-repairs)

d. correct your errors while speaking?

Frequently 5 4 3 2 1 Never

(interruptions)

e. interrupt the person who is speaking?

Frequently 5 4 3 2 1 Never

(attitude toward task)

2. When you must use English to conduct business with a native Hebrew speaker, do you feel

a. much more confident

b. more confident

c. less confident

d. much less confident

e. no different

(awareness of language differences)

3. When you negotiate with a non-native speaker are you
- a. very aware
 - b. aware
 - c. not aware
- that your negotiating partner is a non-native speaker?

(self assessment)

4. Which of the following would best describe your ability to use spoken English for negotiating purposes?
- a. excellent
 - b. above average
 - c. average
 - d. below average
 - e. poor

(evaluation of outcome)

5. In negotiating in English, how would you rate your success?

successful 5 4 3 2 1 not successful

APPENDIX E

Pre-Negotiation Questionnaire
Non-Native Speakers A-2

1. While speaking in English with a native speaker of English, do you

(repetition)

a. repeat words?

Frequently 5 4 3 2 1 Never

(open up new subjects)

b. minimize your initiative in opening up new subjects, or taking your turn in a conversation?

Frequently 5 4 3 2 1 Never

(paraphrase)

c. find that you rephrase your point in a different way to clarify meaning?

Frequently 5 4 3 2 1 Never

(self-repairs)

d. correct your errors while speaking?

Frequently 5 4 3 2 1 Never

(interruptions)

e. interrupt the person who is speaking?

Frequently 5 4 3 2 1 Never

(attitude toward task)

2. When you must use English to conduct business with a native English speaker, do you feel :

- a. much more confident
- b. more confident
- c. less confident
- d. much less confident
- e. no different

(awareness of language differences)

3. When you use English to conduct business, are you :
- a. very aware
 - b. aware
 - c. not aware
- of the fact that English is not your mother tongue?

(self assessment)

4. Which of the following would best describe your ability to use spoken English for negotiating purposes?
- a. excellent
 - b. above average
 - c. average
 - d. below average
 - e. poor

(evaluation of outcome)

5. In negotiating in English, how would you rate your success?

successful 5 4 3 2 1 not successful

APPENDIX F

Questionnaire

Post Negotiation Questionnaire

Profile

1. Name :
2. Date :
3. Facility :
4. Sex :
5. Age :
6. Years of formal education :
7. Last diploma or degree earned
8. Number of years residing in Israel :

I

(Repetition)

1. During the negotiation, did you find yourself repeating words, ideas and suggestions?

Frequently 5 4 3 2 1 Never

(Opening up new subjects)

2. Did you open up new topics?

Frequently 5 4 3 2 1 Never

(Paraphrasing)

3. Did you find yourself rephrasing your point in a different way in order to clarify your points?

Frequently 5 4 3 2 1 Never

(Self-Repair)

4. How often did you feel you corrected errors?

Frequently 5 4 3 2 1 Never

(Interruption)

5. Did you interrupt the other speaker?

Frequently 5 4 3 2 1 Never

(Language Choice)

6. Did you find yourself using language in a way that is suitable for negotiations and different from your daily use?

Frequently 5 4 3 2 1 Never

(Language Difference)

7. In your opinion, how much did the language difference between you and your negotiating partner affect the negotiation process?

Very 5 4 3 2 1 Not at all

(Satisfaction with Outcome)

8. Were you satisfied with the outcome of the negotiation?

Very 5 4 3 2 1 Not at all

(Perceived Success)

9. In your opinion, was the outcome of the negotiation successful?

Very 5 4 3 2 1 Not at all

APPENDIX G

Observer's Checklist

Code	Role
A	NNS in N1 role
B	NNS in N2 role
C	NS in N1 role
D	NS in N2 role

Number of moves

Total:

1. repetition
.....
2. initiates new subject
.....
3. paraphrasing
.....
4. self repairs
.....
5. interruptions
.....
6. outcome successful - explicitly stated
.....

Negotiating partner N1 - Seller

Negotiating partner N2 - Buyer

Date:

Code:

APPENDIX H

Tapescripts

Transcription Notations

The transcript notations are based on an adaption of the symbols developed by Gail Jefferson that are generally used in conversational analysis transcripts.

These features take into account the naturally occurring speech during a negotiation role-play simulation. The notations remain fixed for both native and non-native speakers. Whether or not cultural variations play a role in the distribution of the identified conversational phenomena is not the focus of the study, although an examination of such a role might be indicated in later research.

The following key has been designed to allow the reader to identify, in context, the specific conversational features quoted in the study. Signalling features by type-script rather than symbols was an effort to simplify and clarify each feature.

KEY

<u>Print</u>	<u>Feature</u>	<u>Example</u>
Bold	Repetition (phrase, term, or segment)	ninety percent of the , the
<i>Italics</i>	Opens Subject	<i>We hope we can offer you some better deals</i>
<u>Underline</u>	Paraphrase (phrase, term or segment)	We <u>have to act within our budget. Our budget defines our needs.</u>
<u>Double Underline</u>	Self-repair	There will not be any <u>penal</u> , ah <u>penalty</u>
<u>/TT/</u>	Interruption	/O.K. So/ /Penalty Clause/

ENCOUNTER NO. 3

NNS-Buyer	Hello, I'm, er, Mrs., um,	1
NS-Seller	I'm pleased to, er (Buyer chuckles), pleased to meet you. I heard you were coming. I understand you are <i>interested in buying a computer.</i>	2 3 4 5 6
NNS-Buyer	Yes, we're interesting in buying a computer, but I'll tell you the truth, that, er, we're <u>not so</u> interested, I mean, er, we came <u>here also for.</u> I came here also for <u>business</u> also in other matters, and, this computer is a possibility, but you know, it's quite, er, expensive, and we might check other opportunities.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16
NS-Seller	No (Buyer: here), I understand, I'd, I'd, I'd be pleased if you <u>looked around because we believe our computer is the best on the market, and I think it's advisable that you should look at others,</u> and we feel confident you'd come back to us/	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24
NNS-Buyer	/No, this is why, this is why I came to you, I just wanted to know, I mean, what's (Seller: right) <i>what are the advantages that your computer has, and the others don't.</i>	25 26 27 28 29 30 31
NS-Seller	But I'm sure as you know us, er, and because you came to us, <u>our computer is tailor-made to a particular customer, and obviously we take details from you as to your particular needs.</u>	32 33 34 35 36 37

NNS-Buyer	For what kind of company, is, is this/	38 39
NS-Seller	/Well, we have/	40
NNS-Buyer	/this computer [fit], what?	41 42
NS-Seller	We have a, a wide range, I mean, tell me what sort of work you'll, you do, and I'll tell you whether unclear]/	43 44 45 46
NS-Buyer	/I heard that you had some problems, uh, <i>marketing this new computer.</i> We are interested in, we are interested in, er, XTAW-700.	47 48 49 50 51
NNS-Seller	Uh, in fact you'll find that that is one <u>of our more successful lines,</u> <u>it's, it's been proving very</u> <u>popular.</u> I could show you some trade journals that have given it a very, very favourable write-up, and, er, I think you'll find it, it's the new generation of computers, you'll find that you/	52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60
NNS-Buyer	/well, <u>I, have you</u> read the article in the Times today? Because you know, there is doubt, the doubt is in this information that you give me, because you know,	61 62 63 64 65 66
NS-Seller	Um, but in fact, the um	67
NNS-Buyer	They say that the one of IBM is, er, quite better and cheaper, so, um,	68 69 70
NS-Seller	Well, once again/	71

NS-Buyer	/I mean, we/ came to you because you know, once we were customers/	72 73 74
NNS-Seller	/For instance,/ the IBM computer is, of course, a fourth generation computer, and this is a sixth generation computer, so we're talking about quite considerable advance in technology, and there are some people that are, that are very obviously sceptical about it, but we can put you in touch with a number of plants who have been using this computer for a while already, it's shown a significant increase in their productivity.	75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88
NNS-Buyer	Yeah, I'm sorry, I just don't have, er, <i>much time because I came only for a few days, and I have to make a decision, I mean/</i>	89 90 91 92
NS-Seller	/Right.	93
NNS-Buyer	I mean if I don't come back with a computer, that's fine also. If you told me what are your, ah, terms, er, selling this computer, you know we are a very famous company, and (Seller: right) <i>selling a computer to us will do you good, (Seller: um) <u>I mean,</u> <u>give lots of,</u> er, publication and so on, but</i>	94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103
NS-Seller	We-, I think you'll find (Buyer: [unclear] once again, our terms match the terms of other computers of the same quality on the market, very favorably indeed, er, as far as delivery time is concerned, um, it obviously takes slightly longer than some other computers because we,	104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112

	particularly, um, particularly	113
	cater our computers to the needs	114
	of the client.	115
NNS-Buyer	Well, this is not good because I	116
	was, I was intending to come	117
	back with a computer, then I buy	118
	it, because, look I, I <i>got an offer</i>	119
	<i>from another company, I, I can't</i>	120
	<i>say the name of this company,</i>	121
	and they promised, er, to, er, send	122
	it with me.	123
NS-Seller	I'm sure, I'm sure it is possible	124
	that you will find some company,	125
	I can't say how reputable, that	126
	will send a computer back with	127
	you, <i>without paying any attention</i>	128
	<i>to what your particular needs</i>	129
	<i>are. But you would of course pay</i>	130
	<i>a price</i> for that when you come to	131
	use it. Our hope is that when you	132
	come to use our computer, you'll	133
	find it user friendly/	134
NNS-Buyer	/You speak,/	135
	you speak very nicely, but this is	136
	quite general, why particularly	137
	your computer particularly is	138
	better than the others, <i>I mean,</i>	139
	<i>why should we wait? I, I don't</i>	140
	know how long, could you tell	141
	me/	142
NS-Seller	/Well, /once again, is it, as you,	143
	as, when you use our computer	144
	you'll find that it is catered for	145
	<u>the particular setup of your</u>	146
	<u>company, we've sat down with</u>	147
	<u>you, we've taken down your</u>	148
	<u>particular needs, we can arrange</u>	149
	that it's available (Buyer: well)	150
	with instructions in the particular	151
	language that you're using/	152

NNS-Buyer	/I'm sor/ry to interrupt you, we don't have much time, so if you could please kindly tell me how long will it take for your company to <u>s-</u> <u>deliver</u> the computer/	153 154 155 156 157 158
NS-Seller	/Well our, our delivery, ah, our delivery usually takes between um, between eight and ten weeks, and that's because um, that's because we obviously <u>tailor make</u> <u>it, that's quite a lot of work</u> <u>involved in changing the</u> <u>program</u> , in introducing all the new elements that our clients need/	159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168
NNS-Buyer	/I um, I/ understand all your problems, but you know, we also, we, we need the computer sooner then, because if, we, after the elections then we, er, can't do anything with it, I mean it's supposed to serve our,	169 170 171 172 173 174 175
NS-Seller	Um, I, I understand, but um, once again, the reason it takes so long is not simply because of the programming that's involved/	176 177 178 179
NNS-Buyer	/Is there/ a problem to make a special effort for, er, special clients like us?	180 181 182
NS-Seller	Uh, we, all of our clients are special clients/	183 184
NNS-Buyer	/I'm sure/ (Seller: er, and we work [unclear], but there are , there are more special than others, no?	185 186 187 188
NS-Seller	Um, we can try and put it towards the, the minimum amount of time which would be eight weeks, possibly seven weeks at the	189 190 191 192

	minimum. If you ask us to be any shorter than that, then what it will mean is cutting short on some of the testing that we subject the programs to, and I think at the end of the day you'll pay a price in the quality of the program that's available for our computer/	193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200
NNS-Buyer	/But/ if I ask you to do this, how long will it take then?	201 202 203
NS-Seller	If you are prepared to take a, a sub-standard program, we may be able to do it in as short as six weeks, but I personally would not feel confident giving a guarantee on a computer that hasn't been subject to all the rigorous testing that we like to test our computers.	204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211
NNS-Buyer	Er, is it possible to make it even shorter, I mean,	212 213
NS-Seller	No-, er, one again, <u>there's. we have</u> , as you know, a good name in the business, and we're not prepared to jeopardize that by, by selling sub-, sub-standard goods. If you want sub-standard goods, you've already pointed out that there's companies that are prepared to give you computers that [unclear]/	214 215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223
NNS-Buyer	/Do you have any computer in stock?	224 225
NS-Seller	Once again, our computer is tailor-made for you, if you come from Israel we can give you a computer, we'll have its instruction in Hebrew/	226 227 228 229 230
NNS-Buyer	<i>//Is it possible to borrow a computer before we buy it, I</i>	231 232

	<i>mean, if you want to [look right],</i>	233
	I mean, if you give us a computer	234
	for the next five weeks and then	235
	send us the new computer.	236
NS-Seller	What would you do with this	237
	computer for the next five	238
	weeks?/	239
NNS-Buyer	/We/ need it very urg-, very	240
	urgently, we need it to, the	241
	elections in our country, we are	242
	involved with some polls and er,	243
	we must predict the er, the	244
	results/	245
NS-Seller	/We have a/ very simple model	246
	of, we have a very simple model	247
	of a computer all purpose	248
	available, which we would be	249
	prepared to loan you while the	250
	major computer, if we had a	251
	contract for the purchase of the	252
	computer for your company, we	253
	would be prepared for the next	254
	four weeks until the election to	255
	loan you a statistical analysis	256
	computer.	257
NNS-Buyer	What do you mean, simpler	258
	computer?	259
NS-Seller	Er, this is which is simply for the	260
	purposes of the most rudimental	261
	statistical analysis. It's a	262
	computer which we don't	263
	generally market, and we would	264
	be prepared to offer it for you on	265
	the understanding that the	266
	computer that was appropriate for	267
	your needs/	268
NNS-Buyer	<i>/Would you al/so send a,</i>	269
	<i>a technician with the [unclear],</i>	270
	<i>because we, we/</i>	271

NS-Seller	/We/ can put you in touch, we can put you in touch with our agents who are available, er, in your country for the servicing and the tech-, technical advice/	272 273 274 275 276 277
NNS-Buyer	/What, and then,/ um, <i>what period would you send us the, um, real computer/</i>	278 279 280 281
NS-Seller	/And/ then, and then, the, the major computer, the [unclear] proper computer would be available after the full period of eight weeks.	282 283 284 285 286
NNS-Buyer	Eight weeks. I see. Um, <i>for how long do you give your warranty?</i>	287 288
NS-Seller	Um, um, our warranty is generally given for a period between eight months and one year.	289 290 291 292
NNS-Buyer	This is quite surprising, because you, you spoke of your computer as something, er, so wonderful that I would expect such a computer to have a warranty period of ten years, at least/	293 294 295 296 297 298
NS-Seller	/Well, we do, we do have a, um, a longer warranty period, but that's available for a particular price. <u>We have a warranty package, where you pay a certain amount each year, and we can give you a longer warranty.</u> As you, as/	299 300 301 302 303 304 305 306
NNS-Buyer	/Well, you/ know, this, this doesn't have much a significance because my country is very far from yours, and, er/	307 308 309 310

NS-Seller	/As, once/ again, we have agents who <u>represent us, we have</u> <u>people who are trained to come</u> <u>and visit us and who are, receive</u> all the technical expertise that we could make available to you/	31 312 313 314 315 316
NNS-Buyer	<i>/So is/ it possible to buy the same computer in my (Seller: no) country, I mean/</i>	317 318 319 320
NS-Seller	<i>/We, we/ manufacture the computers here, and train people in the maintenance, as you know we sell computers all over the world. Um, we sell computers across the world, they are all made here so that we can keep a check on the standards of the computers and make sure that they all reach the same high standards.</i>	321 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331
NNS-Buyer	What happens if you have a strike and you're not, er (Seller: uh) be ready on time with, er (Seller: uh) your computer/	332 333 334 335
NS-Seller	<i>/That's something we'll make sure in the contract, we undertake to provide a computer by a particular date, and if we don't, then you have all the resources that would be available to you for us not meeting the contract.</i>	336 337 338 339 340 341 342 343
NNS-Buyer	<i>I see. and how much will it cost? How much will the computer cost, you know, the one, the XT? [unclear]/</i>	344 345 346 347
NS-Seller	<i>/The,/ the computer will cost, um, once again, there may be some fluctuation in price as a result of the instructions that you</i>	348 349 350 351

	give us, but the basic price of the computer is four hundred and fifty thousand dollars.	352 353 354
NNS-Buyer	And the price for us?	355
NS-Seller	The price for you is four hundred and fifty thousand dollars/	356 357
NNS-Buyer	<u>/No, it/ is too much, this is too much</u> , I've been just a few hours ago with, I met with the director of the other company, and he told me they can give us something better than what you suggest [end of side of tape] than four hundred and fifty thousand dollars.	358 359 360 361 362 363 364 365 366
NS-Seller	I'm afraid the price that we/	367
NNS-Buyer	<u>/And/</u> you know, the director there was also very nice, like you, uh (Seller: well) he recommended his computer very much/	368 369 370 371 372
NS-Seller	<u>/uh, I'm, abs-, I'm absolutely certain, and er, and it's not my professional practice to, to make any aspersions on the quality of a competitor's product, um, but in this business you, you get what you pay for. And if the standard price is higher, there is a reason for it, it's very possible the computers have been manufactured, uh, at, at lesser cost, but perhaps in the research and development stages, uh, shortcuts were taken in the testing process, shortcuts-, shortcuts were taken/</u>	373 374 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 382 383 384 385 386 387 388 389
NNS-Buyer	<u>/Well, it's/</u> better that I tell you now that, er, I have my	390 391

	instructions, and four hundred and fifty thousand dollars, er, is, no/	392 393 394
NS-Seller	/then/ perhaps, perhaps there is room for flexibility here, because in addition to <i>the price of the computer there's also a charge for delivery and installation</i> , and on the issue of delivery and installation it may be that we would be able to flex [unclear]/	395 396 397 398 399 400 401 402
NNS-Buyer	/Well, this I took for granted that this will not cost us any money, I mean/	403 404 405
NS-Seller	/No,/ the delivery and installation of/	406 407
NNS-Buyer	/I told you/ I go <u>to</u>	408 409
	<u>f-</u> I went <u>to a few companies</u> and they don't charge anything for the delivery and installation.	410 411 412
NS-Seller	<u>I find that very strange, I find that, that very hard to believe that the delivery of (Buyer: maybe you'll think) a large, main-[crane] computer to a Middle East/</u>	413 414 415 416 417
NNS-Buyer	/Maybe/ you'll think of something else, I mean maybe, er, make shorter the time of the delivery so that we can be more flexible, I mean,	418 419 420 421 422
NS-Seller	Um	423
NNS-Buyer	This way, I mean, my company won't approve of, er such terms.	424 425
NS-Seller	Once again, the, the the, the, the delivery time, as I explained to you, the only way we can shorten	426 427 428

	it would be by cutting the quality of the product, and that's something that we're not prepared to do. It may be possible/	429 430 431 432 433
NNS-Buyer	/So maybe you/ I'll think of something/	434 435
NS-Seller	/it may/ be that we can come to <i>some arrangement as far as the cost is concerned.</i> The fact is the price of the product is four hundred and fifty thousand dollars. Additionally there is/	436 437 438 439 440 441
NNS-Buyer	<i>/What does it/ include, I mean, to/</i>	442 443
NS-Seller	<i>/Four hundred/ and fifty thousand dollars includes the computer, all the software programming, one years' technical warranty, and training for all of your staff who you wish to use the computer,</i>	444 445 446 447 448 449 450
NNS-Buyer	For how long?	451
NS-Seller	This, this entire package is for one year, and can be/	452 453
NNS-Buyer	<i>/The train/ing for one year?</i>	454 455
NS-Seller	The, the training is, um, just an initial training with a follow-up package after six months, if there are any new members of the staff who want to be introduced to how to use the software. Further packages can be arranged through our agents in the Middle East. Now what I suggest as far as the price is concerned, that we can show a certain flexibility here. As I mentioned, the price of the	456 457 458 459 460 461 462 463 464 465 466 467

	computer is four hundred and	468
	fifty thousand dollars. The, um,	469
	the cost of delivery is one	470
	thousand five hundred dollars.	471
	we could waive the cost of	472
	delivery, and we can perhaps	473
	lower the cost of the computer,	474
	including the cost of delivery,	475
	and, er, installation, to four	476
	hundred and forty thousand	477
	dollars.	478
NNS-Buyer	No. I have another suggestion. I	479
	mean, we don't need the training	480
	and we don't need actually the,	481
	er, software (Seller: mh-mm). So	482
	maybe you can reduce, reduce	483
	this from the price, because it's	484
	quite unnecessary for us. And we	485
	can get to, er, the same four	486
	hundred er, thousand dollars I've	487
	suggested before.	488
NS-Seller	Er, once again, <u>the</u> we would not	489
	be prepared to give a warranty for	490
	our computer if it was being used	491
	with somebody else's software,	492
	or if it was being used by people	493
	who haven't been trained by us as	494
	to how to use the computer, we're	495
	talking about a very large item/	496
NNS-Buyer	/So/ you mean that the terms of	497
	the warranty aren't, we can't use	498
	any other software with this	499
	computer, this, you know (Seller:	500
	no. the), this is a great limitation	501
	on the ways we can use it/	502
NS-Seller	/You will find/	503
	that the software available on this	504
	computer, because it's been	505
	designed in connection with your	506
	requirements, will perform all the	507
	functions that you require, and in	508
	fact, many more, uh, and in fact,	509

	if in the period of one year, this is	510
	one of the conditions of the	511
	warranty, you find there are	512
	functions that are not included in	513
	the software, we will free of	514
	charge send a technician who will	515
	introduce new elements into the	516
	software, so it meets/	517
NNS-Buyer	/What/ will you do	518
	with it?	519
NS-Seller	We will send a technician	520
	(Buyer: oh) who will amend the	521
	software, make changes in the	522
	software so it meets all your	523
	requirements. But once again, <u>we</u>	524
	<u>are talking about a package, it's a</u>	525
	<u>very sophisticated package, it's a</u>	526
	<u>sixth generation computer</u>	527
	<u>package that contains software,</u>	528
	training and the hardware to meet	529
	all your computer needs. The	530
	price is four hundred and fifty	531
	thousand dollars with an addition	532
	for delivery and installation/	533
NNS-Buyer	/Well, I must/	534
	tell you/	535
NS-Seller	/We are/ prepared to include the	536
	delivery and installation and to	537
	give a significant reduction, I	538
	must tell you it's not our usual	539
	policy, but we are prepared to	540
	give a significant reduction of	541
	four hundred and forty thousand	542
	dollars including delivery and	543
	installation, and that includes, of	544
	course, all the technical training	545
	and the warranty for one year.	546
	And I would be very surprised if	547
	you found, er, a deal that bettered	548
	that with an equivalent quality	549
	computer and [unclear].	550

NNS-Buyer	Well, explaining this to my, um, bosses, I might convince them to pay four hundred and ten thousand dollars, but I don't believe that they would pay more than that, I mean, considering all the others, <u>off- the other offers</u> that are here, and considering the fact that the others can deliver this computer immediately.	551 552 553 554 555 556 557 558 559 560
NS-Seller	Well, once again, we, we have agreed to deliver a computer immediately, we feel that it's a sub-standard computer, we wouldn't feel happy for you to carry on with that computer for a long period/	561 562 563 564 565 566 567
NNS-Buyer	/Yes, but I/ would have expected a <u>company like you to have computers like this in the stock, I mean, computers</u> like, a co-, companies like your company should have a few computers for/	568 569 570 571 572 573 574
NS-Seller	/you've/ been working in your business for quite some time now, you must know all the difficulties and the complications that arise, all the sophisticated calculations that you are involved in, and, um, and in order to design a computer that meets all those needs with the maximum amount of efficiency, a computer that is simply taken out of a warehouse could not hope to serve you efficiently and, um	575 576 577 578 579 580 581 582 583 584 585 586 587
NNS-Buyer	I'm no-, not so, so, sure, I'm sorry to tell you, I mean, we don't have, er, special demands, er, we just need a computer. If you ask me, I think we could, er, you	588 589 590 591 592

	know, get along with a computer	593
	which isn't much, much good,	594
	but er, they want a more	595
	expensive computer, this is why	596
	I'm here. But in order to	597
	convince them to buy it, I have to,	598
	er, I have to show them, er,	599
	<i>significant, that I got a significant</i>	600
	<i>reductions (Seller: um) [unclear].</i>	601
NS-Seller	At the end of the day, you don't	602
	buy a computer because you get a	603
	significant reduction, you buy a	604
	computer because you buy the	605
	best computer for your needs.	606
	Um/	607
NNS-Buyer	/I'm/ not so sure, I mean, there is	608
	no limit for that, and, you know,	609
	our demands are not so, er, big,	610
	we can settle up with something	611
	much much cheaper.	612
NS-Seller	You've indicated that you would	613
	be prepared to pay four hundred	614
	and ten thousand dollars for this	615
	computer/	616
NNS-Buyer	/Well, with a lot/ of effort	617
	that I need to (Seller: um)	618
	convince my, er/	619
NS-Seller	/I'm not,/ it's not our practice	620
	to generally, to go below our,	621
	our, our price of four hundred	622
	and fifty thousand dol-, and fifty	623
	thousand dollars, I have	624
	indicated that we can go down to	625
	four hundred and forty thousand	626
	dollars. Between us there is	627
	three-, thirty thousand dollars.	628
	If you are prepared to make	629
	payment in accordance with our	630
	credit arrangement, I think that I	631
	might be able to, er, persuade our	632
	management, and once again, this	633

	is a management decision because	634
	this is a significant reduction, to	635
	split the difference between us.	636
	That means you would meet our	637
	credit arrangements and we	638
	would make the deal at a cost of	639
	four hundred and twenty-five	640
	thousand dollars for this	641
	computer.	642
NNS-Buyer	And what would be the <i>terms of</i>	643
	<i>the payment, I mean,</i>	644
NS-Seller	The credit period would be thirty	645
	days, and there would be no way	646
	that we could be flexible on that,	647
	we're giving you a significant	648
	reduction of twenty-five thousand	649
	dollars on the price of the	650
	computer. We haven't made, er,	651
	we're putting you to the top of	652
	our priority as far as/	653
NNS-Buyer	/Yes, but don't/ forget that we	654
	are getting the computer only in	655
	eight weeks and so why should	656
	we pay before we get a	657
	computer?	658
NS-Seller	Well you are in the meantime	659
	getting a computer that meets all	660
	your needs.	661
NNS-Buyer	Well, I'm not sure we're going to	662
	do that, because we have our own	663
	computer <u>back in, back home</u> , so,	664
	er,	665
NS-Seller	But we are, we are prepared to/	666
NNS-Buyer	/but, and,/ we	667
	are not going to pay without	668
	getting the, er/	669
NS-Seller	/We are/ committing our full	670
	team of software analysts and	671
	technicians to working on your	672

	programme now for the next eight weeks, we are putting you to the top of our list of our priorities as you've requested.	673 674 675 676
NNS-Buyer	Working on our computer?	677
NS-Seller	Working on the software for your computer/	678 679
NNS-Buyer	/Yes, but/ we can't pay without getting the goods, I mean, er (Seller: uh). What happens, I mean, do you, c-, can you give us, er, guarantees, or, I mean, we can pay you the money and then/	680 681 682 683 684 685 686
NS-Seller	/You will see/	687
NNS-Buyer	/I'm/ sure that your company is very safe one, very respectable one, but you know, what happen to other companies who were so successful, one day they disappeared, and we don't want our money just to/	688 689 690 691 692 693 694
NS-Seller	/Your, your/ money will not disappear, you will have all the guarantees that our contract, and obviously a contract has to be negotiated between our lawyers, all this [unclear]	695 696 697 698 699 700 701
NNS-Buyer	/So this is/ what I say, let's split the money and we'll, let's say that one payment will be given in, let's say two months and the other payment when we receive the, er, new (Seller: um) computer. Well let's say in one month, I mean, eight weeks is two months.	702 703 704 705 706 707 708 709 710

NS-Seller	I would be prepared to accept that, on, on the basis that you are prepared to accept our cancellation provisions, which, in view of a computer s-, a computer program which is as specialized as this, is ninety percent of the total price/	711 712 713 714 715 716 717 718
NNS-Buyer	/A what?/	719
NS-Seller	Ninety percent of the total price. We are/	720 721
NNS-Buyer	/What are we/ talking about?	722
NS-Seller	They, the, er, the cancellation penalty. If, (Buyer: ah) in the period between now and the provision of the computer, (Buyer: yes) you cancel this order/	723 724 725 726 727 728
NNS-Buyer	/After/ the first payment (Seller: we) or before the first payment?	729 730 731
NS-Seller	At any time (Buyer: yes) between signing the contract (Buyer: yes) and delivery of the computer, we will have devoted significant resources to the creation of a large computer/	732 733 734 735 736 737
NNS-Buyer	/Well, let's leave/ this to, to our lawyers, I mean, this is not something/	738 739 740
NS-Seller	/Well, no, this is, this is, er, this is, I, I'm not at liberty to agree to a split payment/	741 742 743 744
NNS-Buyer	/Let's/ also think what happens if you don't delivery the computer in eight months, because you know, the damage	745 746 747 748

	that you, that you cause us is far beyond this percentage that you keep.	749 750 751
NS-Seller	Um, I suggest that we leave it as this: the basic terms of our agreement will be that cancellation penalty, and in the same measure I can agree to, to, er, to a split payment of fifty percent/	752 753 754 755 756 757 758
NNS-Buyer	/let's also say/ that if the computer is not delivered in eight months, we can cancel the, er, the agreement and also charge you for damage.	759 760 761 762 763
NS-Seller	The, once again, the, if <u>the computer is not delivered, if there has been unavoidable delay, there will be</u> penalties, and these penalties will be decided by the, er/	764 765 766 767 768 769
NNS-Buyer	/No,/ I want to have <u>the, a clause</u> about unavoidable delay, and what will they [unclear]/	770 771 772
NS-Seller	/un- avoidable delay?	773 774
NNS-Buyer	Yuh, because any delay, any delay will er (Seller: any delay will?), give us the right to cancel the, er/	775 776 777 778
NS-Seller	/Yeah,/ well, I don't think a delay of twenty-four hours or forty- eight hours or even two or three weeks should give you the right to/	779 780 781 782 783
NNS-Buyer	/Two or three/ weeks are, are very significant to us.	784 785

NS-Seller	We have agreed to give you a computer for your purposes/	786 787
NNS-Buyer	/Let's/ say that a delay of one week won't, er, give us the right to, to s- to, er, cancel the contract, more than that is, I mean, I told you, we could buy it, er, in another company and get it immediately so/	788 789 790 791 792 793 794 795
NS-Seller	/I sug/gest that we would leave it that, we would agree that the delivery date (Buyer: yuh) would be a fundamental term of the contract. What that means is it would be a breach of fundamental term of the contract, delivering after a certain date would give you the right to cancel the contract. And we can leave it to our lawyers to decide exactly what period of time would constitute a fundamental breach of the contract.	796 797 798 799 800 801 802 803 804 805 806 807 808 809
NNS-Buyer	O.K. then, er, um, I'll have to, of course, to bring all this, er, to the decision (Seller: right) of my management, and you have to (Seller: that's right) ask your management, I guess, er, so I suggest that we'll meet again, or speak on the phone (Seller: right), and if, er, the managements agree, then we can, you know, have a meeting with the lawyers and (Seller: right) the accountants, etcetera.	810 811 812 813 814 815 816 817 818 819 820 821 822
NS-Seller	At the same time I would like you to meet our technical staff, I think you'd be very impressed, and obviously they'll want to know how your firm operates, and I	823 824 825 826 827

	think you'll find they're very	828
	receptive, and they can design a	829
	computer that's very appropriate	830
	for your needs.	831
NNS-Buyer	Thank you. Have a nice day	832
	(both laugh)	833

ENCOUNTER NO. 17

NS-Seller	Welcome to Israel.	1
NNS-Buyer	Thank you.	2
NS-Seller	I believe you've been here before, but this time <u>we're really going</u> <u>to, we're going to be able</u> to do some business.	3 4 5 6
NNS-Buyer	Well [unclear] to do some business, and, er, before I will go to business, I understand that, er, your company is doing, er a good year this year.	7 8 9 10 11
NS-Seller	Yes, we've been very lucky, <u>I</u> we take credit for for good service and a very good product, but there's also a bit of luck in it, I'm, I'm quite happy to say that.	12 13 14 15 16
NNS-Buyer	Yes, but we were a bit surprised that, er, <u>the last shipment we get</u> <u>from you</u> was a bit, er, we find some, er, defects in the, in the installation.	17 18 19 20 21
NS-Seller	Well/	22
NNS-Buyer	/but any/way, I just, er, want to mention that, er, I just came back here to try to see what we can, er, do in the future, and we are going, we are going to ask you to propose us, er, a, um, a contract or something we can negotiate about in buying a new computer to our, ah, factory.	23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31
NS-Seller	Very good, we're very interested in continuing to do business with you, and we'd be very happy to, to provide you with, er, the computer that you require.	32 33 34 35 36

NNS-Buyer	<p>O.K. Um, as we already know what type of computer you are, I am asking to buy, I, why don't we <i>discuss the terms of the contract?</i> Um, in this matter I would like discuss <u>few, a few things</u>, such as the delivery time, a warrant, etcetera, installation, and of course the, the big one is the price and credit rate. Um, Um, bef- er, not to put us in a situation that we will spend too much time, let's see that the price that, er, you can offer us is in the region we can negotiate, negotiate.</p>	<p>37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51</p>
NS-Seller	<p>Well, I think as you know, our price is four hundred and fifty thousand (Buyer: mm hm) which is ex-, very reasonable for a computer of this nature. It really does everything you could possibly want and it suits your type of business, er, precisely.</p>	<p>52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59</p>
NNS-Buyer	<p>Yeah, Well it's look like that the price will not be a big problem, and, er, why don't we see what other, ah, benefit we can get, er, from, er, buying this, er, computer from you.</p>	<p>60 61 62 63 64 65</p>
NS-Seller	<p>Fine. I just want to mention that our credit period is, er, exactly a month, that's thirty days (Buyer: mm-hm) and you'll take delivery in exactly eight weeks time.</p>	<p>66 67 68 69 70</p>
NNS-Buyer	<p>mm-hm. O.K. Well, at, for the moment I think, er, delivery is a <u>cruc-, crucial</u>, er, thing, and, er, and, er, we will got back to the price and credit rate later on, but before, I must, er, insist that, er, delivery will be in one month, and er, <u>we will get guarantee, we</u></p>	<p>71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78</p>

	<u>w-</u> , the guarantee will be for two,	79
	two years, this, er, computer is,	80
	er, this buying is, er, connect to	81
	other thing we are doing, and, er,	82
	if you cannot supply this, er,	83
	computer in four weeks, aah,	84
	there's no, er, no, er, no need to	85
	continue this, er, negotiation.	86
NS-Seller	Well, seeing we're really	87
	interested in having your custom,	88
	and I'm a little disturbed to hear	89
	that in previous purchases you've,	90
	ah, haven't been a hundred	91
	percent satisfied in what we've	92
	offered, we're prepared to adjust	93
	the <u>warran, warranty</u> period, and	94
	we would give you a warranty for	95
	eighteen months without any	96
	problem whatsoever. When it	97
	comes to delivery time, that is	98
	somewhat of a problem, we may	99
	be able to do it in seven weeks,	100
	but I really can't offer you, um,	101
	<u>much, much, m, a much</u> better	102
	deal on the delivery time.	103
NNS-Buyer	O.K. In this case I think this is	104
	time to call this negotiation, and,	105
	er, because I have another	106
	meeting here in the, in the	107
	[unclear - out of town], I will, er,	108
	I will do my best there, and	109
	maybe you can give me a call	110
	later on if you find out that you	111
	can, er, ship this, er, computer in	112
	four weeks, because as I said, it's,	113
	er, crucial as is no negotiat-, and	114
	as, I don't have any limit, any, er,	115
	limit to, to change this four	116
	weeks.	117
NS-Seller	Look, let's, let's not, um, close	118
	the deal too hastily, if you're	119
	happy with the price, with the	120
	credit period, and you're a	121

	customer of long standing, then	122
	I'll do my very best to do	123
	something about delivery time. If	124
	all the other deals are, are you	125
	satisfied with, then we will make	126
	every effort to, er, to adjust the	127
	delivery time and see that you	128
	have it within four to five weeks,	129
	um,	130
NNS-Buyer	Four weeks I said is crucial, and	131
	it's nothing connect to the price at	132
	all, because, er, if, if you have it	133
	you can supply it, if not, you're	134
	not, and as I said four weeks this	135
	is, a, important, and if <u>you w-</u>	136
	<u>you cannot supply</u> it in four	137
	weeks, why , why to bother us	138
	with this all argument about price	139
	and credit, so/	140
NS-Seller	/O.K./ (Buyer: so) As long as	141
	you're happy with all the other	142
	terms of the contract that's, er,	143
	may I just remind you that there's	144
	a penalty clause of cancellation,	145
	that's nine percent of the total	146
	price, and you're going to pay us	147
	the one and a half thousand for	148
	the delivery and installation, then	149
	we will be able to so it in, in four	150
	weeks, we'll make a supreme	151
	effort for a special customer and	152
	you'll have your computer on	153
	time.	154
NNS-Buyer	So I can understand from you that	155
	we are, we are going to get this	156
	four week from the time I'm/	157
NS-Seller	/Yes,/	158
	(NNS-Buyer; I sign the contract)	159
	once you give the check for the	160
	four hundred and fifty thousand,	161
	and, er, we will be quite happy	162
	(NNS-Buyer: mm-hm) to ensure	163

	that er, [unclear] er, <u>guarantees</u>	164
	<u>your, the arrival of</u> the computer	165
	within four weeks.	166
NNS-Buyer	O.K. Ah, let's go to the, er, the	167
	much important thing, after we	168
	discussed this delivery, and now	169
	we can actually go to real	170
	business, because now <u>we, all</u>	171
	<u>both</u> of us know that you can	172
	supply this computer at the	173
	correct time, ah, because my firm	174
	finds some problem with	175
	installation, er, in the last time we	176
	bought, er, we insist to get it, er,	177
	warrant at least for two years,	178
	maybe more, but at least for two	179
	years, and, er, and of course as	180
	usual for, for, ah, the amount of	181
	our buying in your company,	182
	there's no change in the rules,	183
	and we will <u>not char-, we will not</u>	184
	<u>er pay</u> for installation and	185
	delivery.	186
NS-Seller	Ah, no, I think that we have to	187
	just clarify something, we will	188
	make a special effort to deliver	189
	within four weeks, on condition	190
	that you accept, er, all the other	191
	terms. I've extended the	192
	warranty period for another six	193
	months, but there's no possibility	194
	that we will cancel the delivery	195
	fee. That is given to outside	196
	contractors and, er, there's no	197
	way that that can be, er,	198
	cancelled.	199
NNS-Buyer	Well, it look like that it will be	200
	very difficult for me to convince	201
	somebody in our company to buy,	202
	er, another computer from you	203
	after we have this problem, er,	204
	unless I will come, will come	205
	<i>back with some benefit that I can</i>	206

	<i>negotiate</i> in my company, as you	207
	know that's a lot of, er, er, the,	208
	the competition now is a bit	209
	thirsty, and, and, er, people are	210
	tend to jump from one side to	211
	another, and, ah, don't because	212
	we managed to, er, develop a	213
	quite nice relationship, I don't	214
	want to get in situation that, er, <u>I</u>	215
	<u>can. I have to,</u> er, go to, to, er,	216
	other company, but this is of	217
	course, this, <u>if you don't,</u> if you	218
	not mean that we will <u>not do. we</u>	219
	<u>will do business</u> in the future, we	220
	might come back and ask in the	221
	next, another time, er, in the next	222
	time we can discuss it, er, later	223
	on. But at the moment because	224
	this, it's very close to the last	225
	time we did, er, this installation	226
	with a problem, I think, er, this	227
	will be very difficult to not get	228
	these, er, delivery and installation	229
	and, er, and warrant period at	230
	least two year, and a warrant	231
	period for two years is very	232
	important, and the installation is,	233
	that's give some something to the,	234
	er, treasury in our our factory.	235
NS-Seller	Fine.	236
NNS-Buyer	I, <u>so what I'm suggesting</u> that	237
	now <u>you have the time to discuss</u>	238
	this what you can in your, uh, er,	239
	company and come <u>back me.</u>	240
	<u>come back to me</u> with an answer,	241
	because I mentioned two years,	242
	two years is very important, and	243
	delivery and installation, er,	244
	without paying is something that	245
	everybody give us, so I don't	246
	think (chuckles) anyone will, will	247
	decide to choose you, uh, even if	248
	your prices will be competitive.	249

NS-Seller	May I just remind you that the price of four hundred and fifty thousand is an extremely competitive price, as you know.	25 251 252 253
NNS-Buyer	Well I can discuss it, er, with you later on, but, er, I don't want to jump to the, er, er, the last line before we will solve this problem of, er, delivery installation and warrant period. As I mentioned before, warrant period is very, very crucial, and we need two year at least. But, er, you said that is not in your charge, so why don't you, ah, discuss it, er, and give me a call later on, I have some meeting in, er, outside the city.	254 255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267
NS-Seller	O.K. Thank you very much. I look forward to speaking you again.	268 269 270

ENCOUNTER NO. 22

NNS-Seller	Good morning, Sir. Thank you very much for the opportunity to offer you a product, and we really appreciate the fact that you came such a long way to visit us, and to allow us to present you with our products.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
NS-Buyer	Ah hello, Avi, it's very nice to be here, I'm delighted to see you again, and, um, how are you?	8 9 10 11
NNS-Seller	(laughs) I'm doing O.K., and our business are doing O.K. and we are very happy from your, ah, last purchase, and <i>we hope that we can offer you some better deals on your visit today.</i>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18
NS-Buyer	All right. Um, you know that I am interested in the purchase of a computer, and I'm particularly interested in, um, buying a real quality computer and that's the reason that I've come here, so, um, I would like to begin by asking a few questions. Um, you're aware of the type of computer that <i>I, I'm interested in, and, um, I would like to know something about delivery time, um whether you have, er, delivery and installation for example, whether you have a credit period. Could you give me as much information as possible before we go any further?</i>	19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37
NNS-Seller	Sure. Um, I would like just one quick question, er, we could offer a very good deal	38 39 40

	currently for a <u>per-</u> , for a	41
	<i>quantity that is greater than</i>	42
	<i>one thousand computers.</i> ah,	43
	and, er, for this quantity I am	44
	sure that we can, er, give you a	45
	very good deal, um, or a very	46
	good deal, um, or a very good	47
	<u>offer</u> now, er.	48
NS-Buyer	Well, perhaps I should make it	49
	clear that, um, er, I'm not	50
	interested at this stage in the	51
	purchase of a great quantity.	52
NNS-Seller	So, can you tell me roughly	53
	what [unclear] purchases/	54
NS-Buyer	/As/ I said,	55
	as I said, I am interested, er, in	56
	the purchase of a new	57
	computer from you firm.	58
NNS-Seller	One computer?	59
NS-Buyer	Yes.	60
NNS-Seller	I see. O.K. [pause] O.K. um/	61
NS-Buyer	/any	62
	other information that you	63
	could give me about the	64
	computer, er, as I mentioned,	65
	concerning those issues of	66
	delivery time and installation.	67
NNS-Seller	Yes, sure, for, er, the <u>system</u> ,	68
	the <u>configuration</u> that you	69
	asked, um, ah, our, er,	70
	customer price right now is, er,	71
	four hundred ninety thousand	72
	dollars, um, the standard	73
	delivery is twelve weeks, and	74
	we offer the system with six	75
	months guarantee period.	76

NS-Buyer	Mm-hm. <i>Do you have a penalty clause for late delivery?</i>	77 78 79
NNS-Seller	Um, no, we don't have, but, but, but , I'm sure that we can, er, meet the delivery. What is the delivery that you are currently interested in?	80 81 82 83 84
NS-Buyer	Mm-hm. Well, um, we are interested in quick delivery, um, when you mentioned twelve weeks, that's far longer than, than we are prepared to, to wait. We need this rather urgently. <i>And, um, I should also tell you that I know that your, er, competitors, er, offer a better warranty period, and, um, a better price.</i>	85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95
NNS-Seller	Oh, warranty and price goes together, and, er, if, if, er, if we can, er, agree about the price that I offer, then I'm sure I can improve on the, er, warranty, so, er, if you are willing to pay more [laughs] then, then we can im-, improve our warranty period. (Buyer: well,) What, what, what type of warranty period will we, er, will you, er, be interested to see?	96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107
NS-Buyer	Um, the, the main question I have for you is this: um, if we could come to er, some sort of compromise on the price, I would be prepared to come to some compromise on the warranty period, so I have to state outright that your price is too high, and that, um, I cannot, um, agree to, um, to that sum of, of money, um,	108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118

	however, um, I've, I've mentioned to you I am certainly er, willing to, er, make a compromise on, on the other issues that I've mentioned like delivery time, warranty period/	11 12 121 122 123 124 125
NNS-Seller	/O.K., so/	126
NS-Buyer	/penalty clause, etc./	127
NNS-Seller	/I understand, so, I understand that the delivery time of twelve weeks is fine then?	128 129 130 131
NS-Buyer	No, th- that's not what I, I was, er, trying to convey, um, I think I should tell you that, um, although I mentioned we're interested in your company, um, <i>there are, er, competitors out there whose price is more to our, um, budget</i> and, er, I would like to be closer to a figure around four hundred thousand dollars, and then we can discuss the, um, other details.	132 133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144
NNS-Seller	Mmm, can you tell me a little bit about what you, ah, thought of the delivery and the warranty that you are interested in, and ah, I will be able to tell you about the price if those would come near our, er, ability. I must say that, that , er, it's not that we have such hug- huge computer in stock, it's something that we build per customer, and delivery is a major issue, er, for us, so, er, I would <u>unders-</u> <u>like to understand</u> (Buyer:	145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158 159

	mm-hm) what is your expectations.	160 161
NS-Buyer	As I said, um, we, we do want the, the computer as soon as possible and twelve weeks seems like an awfully long time, but if you could, um, come closer towards me in terms of price, I would be prepared to extend delivery time to, um, six weeks?	162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170
NNS-Seller	O.K. I see. Uh, six weeks is ah, is something that I cannot com-, commit to, especially that you are asking for a <u>penalty clause to be in, in this agreement, um, I can commit to something around ten weeks, ah, which will</u> er, force us to ah, to work <u>sec-, second</u> shift and we may, ah, increase our costs, so, ah, how strong do you feel <i>about his penalty clause then?</i>	171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183
NS-Buyer	If we've agreed on the price, at four hundred thousand, then I'm prepared to, er, compromise on the penalty clause, and to, er, exclude the, um, late delivery pe-, er, penalty er, for each week of delay, simply to have a global figure.	184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192
NNS-Seller	O.K. if we, er, ignore this penalty, er, then what I can offer on delivery is delivery of eight weeks, um, and we'll leave the warranty period of six months, and, er, this will bring me to, er, the best target price that I can offer, and if you, will allow, allow (laugh)	193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200 201

	me to calculate er, for a few seconds, [pause] er, (Buyer: [unclear]) the best price that I can offer right now is four hundred and fifty thousand dollars, for, ah, ten weeks delivery and six months warranty, um,	202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209
NS-Buyer	<i>What about a credit period? I would discuss that.</i>	210 211
NNS-Seller	Um, if, if, if/	212
NS-Buyer	/What do, what/ do you offer?	213 214
NNS-Seller	O.K., if we (laughs) can agree about the other terms, we can go to credit. Credit is not the major factor in our company (Buyer: I see, I see), We can er, offer you a good credit, er, but, but for, er, credit that will be longer than ah, <i>payment at delivery, we will ask</i> for er, for er, a penalty on cancel- cancellation of the order.	215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 225
NS-Buyer	Mm-hm	226
NNS-Seller	So	227
NS-Buyer	Um, Ari, I should tell you that, um, your price is higher than, um, we intended to pay, and that, um, I cannot agree to four hundred and fifty thousand, it's simply um, in spite of the fact that we know your product and that, um, your firm is reliable, we have <u>to act within our budget and, er, that amount is simply beyond our means.</u> So, as I mentioned earlier, I would be interested in compromising on the, um,	228 229 230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237 238 239 240 241

	other factors, if you could	242
	come to a compromise on the	243
	price, a further compromise. I	244
	may, in, in the case that you do	245
	not agree to that, have to go	246
	elsewhere.	247
NNS-Seller	I see where you are coming	248
	from, and I can, er, assure you	249
	that we will be very happy if	250
	you will continue to be, er,	251
	our favorite customer, and	252
	we'll, er, continue to, er,	253
	consider our products as the	254
	first possibility, and, er, I	255
	would like to, er, offer you	256
	better deals or better offer than	257
	I've quoted you, so, er, I'm	258
	trying to work those issues up	259
	and, er, to sum up what we	260
	have agreed and to leave aside	261
	what we have not agreed upon,	262
	and let's see <u>ho-</u> <u>how</u> can we	263
	progress. Is it agreed that we	264
	have a delivery of ten weeks?	265
	Leave aside the, the price	266
	(Buyer: um) for a few	267
	minutes/	268
NS-Buyer	<i>/Before we go into</i>	269
	<i>that, er, Avi, there is one, um,</i>	270
	<i>issue I'd like to mention, and</i>	271
	<i>that is, if we're satisfied,</i>	272
	<i>which I'm sure we will be,</i>	273
	<i>with your product, please keep</i>	274
	<i>in mind that in the future <i>we're</i></i>	275
	<i>likely to be, um, greater clients</i>	276
	<i>of yours, and, er, we're also</i>	277
	<i>likely to make much larger</i>	278
	<i>orders than we are at the</i>	279
	<i>moment, so perhaps that would</i>	280
	<i>influence your considerations.</i>	281
NNS-Seller	Yeah, it should, thank, thank	282
	you for, for your kind words,	283
	as a matter of fact if you can	284

	place an order for larger quantity right now, I'm sure I can, er, give you a better terms, but since you mention one computer, then, my hands are really tied, but, but I'm sure we can <u>wor- reach</u> an agreement so let's see where we have come so far and see where we, er, still (Buyer: mm-hm) need to er, to er, compromise. Ah, on delivery time we agreed on ten (Buyer: [unclear]) weeks?	285 286 287 288 289 290 291 292 293 294 295 296 297 298
NS-Buyer	Eight weeks?	299
NNS-Seller	(laughs) I don't remember what I said, (Buyer: eight weeks) if I said eight then I will, I will stick to eight (Buyer and Seller laugh), usually I write these things, write these things down, O.K. Um, six/	300 301 302 303 304 305 306 307
NS-Buyer	/Warranty/ period?	308
NNS-Seller	We agreed about six months?/	309
NS-Buyer	/Six/ months.	310 311
NNS-Seller	O.K.	312
NS-Buyer	Because I know your product is reliable.	313 314
NNS-Seller	O.K. We agreed about, er that there will not be any, er, <u>penal-</u> <u>penalty</u> on er, on er, late deliveries, and, er, we will, er try to do our best to meet this aggressive eight weeks target.	315 316 317 318 319 320
NS-Buyer	Yes.	321

NNS-Seller	Um,	322
NS-Buyer	<i>Installation and delivery?</i>	323
NNS-Seller	O.K. Our charges for installations and, er, are, um, one thousand five hundred dollars for installation and delivery (Buyer: mm-hm) of the system. (Buyer: mm-hm). However, the quoted price of four hundred and, er fifty thousand dollars that I've mentioned earlier does include the installation (Buyer: mm- hm) and delivery) (Buyer: mm-hm).	324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 332 333 334 335 336
NS-Buyer	Good. And the credit period	337
NNS-Seller	and the credit period/	338
NS-Buyer	/[unclear] you say isn't a problem.	339 340
NNS-Seller	I don't think that it will be a <u>prob-, a problem/</u>	341 342
NS-Buyer	/So you, so/ you could give me ninety days.	343 344
NNS-Seller	Uh, I cannot (laughs) give you ninety days, but I can offer you is thirty days, er, credit period, but then again for any period credit we will ask for, uh, er, ninety percent of the, the, total price in case you cancel the order, er, more than, er, er, four weeks prior to delivery, (Buyer: aha), so, er,	345 346 347 348 349 350 351 352 353 354
NS-Buyer	So can we then agree on, um, a price that's, er, suitable to both of us, or more of a compromise to both of us than the four	355 356 357 358

	hundred and fifty that you quoted me?	359 360
NNS-Seller	As I mentioned, the four hundred and fifty is include the, er, delivery and installation, and it goes with a credit period of thirty days.	361 362 363 364 365
NS-Buyer	I realize that, but as I mentioned, it is still beyond our means, so if you could come down to four hundred and thirty-five thousand, er, then we can close the deal.	366 367 368 369 370 371
NNS-Seller	Mm-hm. Four hundred and thirty-five?	372 373
NS-Buyer	Yes. And I'd be happy to guarantee you that you would most certainly be our suppliers in the future.	374 375 376 377
NNS-Seller	(laughs) I, I, I, your request present a, a problem to me, er, and the problem is, uh, with the credit period and the delivery and installation, as I mentioned the credit should not be a problem to us for the numbers that I've quoted, er, if, er, if you will insist on four hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars, then the credit becomes a issue and then I would like to see payment at delivery. (Buyer: [unclear]). Does this present a problem to you?	378 379 380 381 382 383 384 385 386 387 388 389 390 391 392 393
NS-Buyer	I'll have to check on that. I, I hope not.	394 395
NNS-Seller	O.K. [pause] O.K. And, er, what about delivery and installation?	396 397 398

NS-Buyer	Yes, I think we've agreed on, on those factors, it's, it's now a question of, uh, whether you are prepared to, uh, make that compromise on the overall price.	399 400 401 402 403 404
NNS-Seller	O.K. In that case I will make the compromise, and now, can we finalize the details?	405 406 407
NS-Buyer	Very good.	408
NNS-Seller	Delivery time of eight weeks, a warranty period of six months, no cancellation penalty, we will get a ninety percent of the system price in case you will cancel your order, um, after four weeks prior to the delivery, we will, will agree on delivery and installation price of one thousand five hundred, and a system price of four hundred thousand and, four hundred thirty-five thousand dollars, and, uh, the, er, payment will be at delivery.	409 410 411 412 413 414 415 416 417 418 419 420 421 422 423
NS-Buyer	Right.	424
NNS-Seller	Against delivery.	425
NS-Buyer	Right.	426
NNS-Seller	O.K. It was very nice doing business with you/	427 428
NS-Buyer	/Thank you./ Mutual.	429
NNS-Seller	Thank you	430

ENCOUNTER NO. 23

NS-Buyer	[Seller starts speaking simultaneously] Good afternoon, Mr. Retter.	1 2 3
NNS-Seller	Good afternoon, er	4
NS-Buyer	How are you?	5
NNS-Seller	Very well, and you?	6
NS-Buyer	Very well, thank you.	7
NNS-Seller	You just came here from, er, [unclear]	8 9
NS-Buyer	Um, I arrived yesterday.	10
NNS-Seller	And, er, where are you staying?	11 12
NS-Buyer	I'm staying at the Hyatt hotel.	13
NNS-Seller	Nice. It's very nice up there/	14
NS-Buyer	/it's very comfortable.	15 16
NNS-Seller	yes.	17
NS-Buyer	Convenient. Er, you know that, er, my main objective is to, er, purchase a new computer from your firm, and, um, the reason for our meeting is in fact to negotiate the terms. So I'd be interested in some of the details of this computer and, um, if you don't mind have a few questions I will have to ask you.	18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28
NNS-Seller	What sort of, er, details, er, of the computer exactly, er, do you need because maybe I will have, er, to ask one of our, er, technical, er, division to come to give you more details and	29 30 31 32 33 34

	maybe to show you er, how <u>the computer is working</u> . What is <u>the ability</u> of the computer/	35 36 37
NS-Buyer	/Aha./ Um, I'm interested in, er, <i>warranty period and delivery time and penalty clause</i> .	38 39 40 41
NNS-Seller	Just a moment. [unclear] Mm? I have it I know [chuckles].	42 43 44
NS-Buyer	Um, I said delivery time, warranty period, a penalty clause, the, er, delivery and installation, credit period and of course the price.	45 46 47 48 49
NNS-Seller	Mh-mm. O.K./	50
NS-Buyer	/So/	51
NNS-Seller	/this seems/ very, I/	52
NS-Buyer	/Do you/ feel ready to/	53
NNS-Seller	/Yes, I will/	54
NS-Buyer	/answer those/	55
NNS-Seller	/all the/ question, er, for you, er. <i>Would you like some coffee?</i>	56 57 58
NS-Buyer	Thank you very much, yes [laugh]	59 60
NNS-Seller	[unclear] Pearl, please arrange some, some coffee for our guest. I would take it with one sugar.	61 62 63 64
NS-Buyer	Um, um, as you know we have a very high regard for your firm and er, for your products, and we're very interested in purchasing a computer, from you. However we do have	65 66 67 68 69 70

	certain, um, budgetary	71
	restrictions, and um, that's the	72
	reason that I'm going to ask	73
	you whether we can make um,	74
	compromise er, on factors such	75
	as the um, delivery time and	76
	er, er, warranty period. So	77
	<i>should we start with the first</i>	78
	<i>one the delivery time/</i>	79
NNS-Seller	/mm-hm,	80
	did you er, already er, got er,	81
	some er, answer from our	82
	company or er, when, when	83
	you er, started to er, check all	84
	the other companies/	85
NS-Buyer	/No, I, I haven't/	86
NNS-Seller	/you	87
	don't have/	88
NS-Buyer	/from/ other companies	89
	but not from yours	90
NNS-Seller	and from our company you	91
	don't have/	92
NS-Buyer	/nothing at all/	93
NNS-Seller	/nothing/ about the	94
	delivery time and/	95
NS-Buyer	/Nothing/ at all, no. So, um	96
NNS-Seller	O.K.	97
NS-Buyer	We are keen to take delivery as	98
	soon as possible, of this	99
	computer, er, [stumbles] it's an	100
	<u>urgent</u> er, er, request, and um,	101
	<i>I'd be interested to know how</i>	102
	<i>long it would take you to</i>	103
	<i>deliver the computer.</i>	104
NNS-Seller	OK. Um, the computer that	105
	your company er, um, are	106
	buying from er, our company,	107
	it's, it's, er, a very popular	108

	model, er, models, and there is	109
	a lot of er, clients that er, put	110
	their order er, in the last two	111
	months, er, so the [unclear]	112
Other voice	[says something 'our best man']	113 114
NS-Buyer	Thank you very much.	115
NNS-Seller	So the delivery time it's, er, it's quite a problem, we're, we are trying to do our best to er, and er, working twenty-four hours around the clock	116 117 118 119 120
NS-Buyer	Yes.	121
NNS-Seller	We try to er, supply all er, the computers, I think we will be able to er, delivery it in about er, three months.	122 123 124 125
NS-Buyer	That sounds like an awfully long time to wait, but, um, but, perhaps we can get, back to that. Er, I have a note here, <u>I, as I say</u> it is urgent and three months seems too long. Um, <i>what is your warranty period?</i>	126 127 128 129 130 131 132
NNS-Seller	[pause] I have to check the , the number. [pause] Our warranty er, period it's er, nine months.	133 134 135 136
NS-Buyer	Now if we were to, um, come some compromise on some of <u>the other issues</u> , on some of <u>the other items</u> , perhaps we could um, extend that one, er, that, that issue. Er/	137 138 139 140 141 142
NNS-Seller	/What/ issue?	143
NS-Buyer	The warranty period.	144
NNS-Seller	Why, er	145

NS-Buyer	Because your/	146
NNS-Seller	/That's/ the warranty period/	147
NS-Buyer	/time	148
	seems/	149
NNS-Seller	/we're,/ we're giving, er, all/	150
NS-Buyer	/shorter/	151
	than most of your competitors.	152
	For example I know that a lot	153
	of your competitors give up to	154
	a few years er, warranty. So	155
	tha-, that might become u, a	156
	point to discuss further.	157
NNS-Seller	It depends on the warranty	158
	because we are giving, a w-,	159
	er, the nine month guarantee	160
	it's er, it's a full warranty on	161
	all parts of <u>all er, with all</u> the	162
	problems that er, might be,	163
	because there is other er,	164
	companies giving er, warranty	165
	but it's not include parts or, er,	166
	if you have a problem we will	167
	send you from here er, er,	168
	technician and it doesn't	169
	matter how much <u>he time he</u>	170
	will have to er, spend at your	171
	company/	172
NS-Buyer	/Aha, aha/	173
NNS-Seller	/and er, the/ price of	174
	the ticket and er	175
NS-Buyer	well supposing we are to come	176
	to some kind of <i>compromise</i>	177
	on that issue because I know	178
	that um, you have a very good	179
	reputation in this company,	180
	and that issue um	181
NNS-Seller	O.K./	182

NS-Buyer	/obviously is/ of great concern to me. Um, <i>about the penalty clause for late delivery</i> , could you give me some details of that?	183 184 185 186 187
NNS-Seller	The penalty er, clause it's er, you, you talking about er, the, cancellation er, er penalty, if you will er, cancel the order after er,	188 189 190 191 192
NS-Buyer	I'm talking about delay in the delivery, and a penalty clause that would be included.	193 194 195
NNS-Seller	Not what I have here.	196
NS-Buyer	<u>I'm talking about late delivery.</u>	197
NNS-Seller	[pause] O.K. so er, I, I/	198
NS-Buyer	/What/	199
	are, what are your terms on that item?	200 201
NNS-Seller	For late delivery?/	202
NS-Buyer	/Yes./	203
NNS-Seller	Usually we are not er, <u>we are deliver er, on time</u> , that's the reason why/	204 205 206
NS-Buyer	/You do deliver on time?	207 208
NNS-Seller	The pardon?	209
NS-Buyer	I said/	210
NNS-Seller	/usually we are/ deliver our product on time, it's part of our policy, us, and that's why we are also, in that case, because of the/	211 212 213 214 215
NS-Buyer	/mm-hm/	216

NS-Buyer	/obviously is/ of great concern to me. Um, <i>about the penalty clause for late delivery</i> , could you give me some details of that?	183 184 185 186 187
NNS-Seller	The penalty er, clause it's er, you, you talking about er, the, cancellation er, er penalty, if you will er, cancel the order after er,	188 189 190 191 192
NS-Buyer	I'm talking about delay in the delivery, and a penalty clause that would be included.	193 194 195
NNS-Seller	Not what I have here.	196
NS-Buyer	<u>I'm talking about late delivery.</u>	197
NNS-Seller	[pause] O.K. so er, I, I/	198
NS-Buyer	/What/	199
	are, what are your terms on that item?	200 201
NNS-Seller	For late delivery?/	202
NS-Buyer	/Yes./	203
NNS-Seller	Usually we are not er, <u>we are deliver er, on time</u> , that's the reason why/	204 205 206
NS-Buyer	/You do deliver on time?	207 208
NNS-Seller	The pardon?	209
NS-Buyer	I said/	210
NNS-Seller	/usually we are/ deliver our product on time, it's part of our policy, us, and that's why we are also, in that case, because of the/	211 212 213 214 215
NS-Buyer	/mm-hm/	216

NNS-Seller	/comp/uter is very popular	217
		218
NS-Buyer	mm-hm.	219
NNS-Seller	We need three, three months to er, deliver. Usually we are not er, er, in our contract with er, the people that we sell the er, er, the computer we are not putting a penalty on er, delivery. Er, what we are putting er, penalty it's on er, <i>cancellation</i>	220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227 228
NS-Buyer	/cancellation. I understand/	229
NNS-Seller	/if you will/ cancel er, the order after we will, er, put it in work	230 231 232
NS-Buyer	Yes, what is that penalty?/	233
NNS-Seller	/You,/ you will have to pay er, er, ninety percent of the price.	234 235 236
NS-Buyer	Ninety? I see. Right. Now, what do you er, <i>charge, if at all, for delivery and installation?</i> Because I know some of the competitors do not charge for that.	237 238 239 240 241 242
NNS-Seller	For delivery/	243
NS-Buyer	/Delivery/ and installation of the computer.	244 245
NNS-Seller	You know of, of company that they are not charging <u>the, this</u> price.	246 247 248
NS-Buyer	Yes.	249
NNS-Seller	Yes, because, er, <i>wha-</i> , what, you you can't er, deliver and installat-, er, <u>the, you</u> can't	250 251 252

	make the delivery and	253
	installation without spending	254
	money. To deliver the, the	255
	computer you have to pay er,	256
	to the company, to the cargo	257
	company, and to <u>installat-</u> , to	258
	<u>make the installation</u> you have	259
	to pay the technician that er,	260
	we are sending/	261
NS-Buyer	/Yes./	262
NNS-Seller	/So it's/ er, if	263
	a company are not charging for	264
	delivery and installation they	265
	er, putting it in the [unclear],	266
	they are putting it in the price	267
	of the, er, merchandise./	268
NS-Buyer	/Right. so/	269
NNS-Seller	/So, we, we	270
	are not/	271
NS-Buyer	/What is your/ fee?	272
NNS-Seller	We, we are er, <u>our</u> policy of	273
	the company is to charge the	274
	minimum/	275
NS-Buyer	/Yes, which/ is?	276
NNS-Seller	for er, delivery and er,	277
	installation, er, and er, we also	278
	decided <u>that every</u> , in <u>every</u>	279
	<u>part of the world</u> we would	280
	charge the same price, it	281
	doesn't matter if it's here in	282
	our country or er, overseas. So	283
	the, the price of the delivery	284
	and the installation er together	285
	it's er, two thousand dollar.	286
NS-Buyer	Two thousand dollars.	287
	[unclear]. Now, and our last	288
	point before we come to	289
	discuss the price is, um, <i>do you</i>	290

	<i>have a credit period, and if so what is it?</i>	291 292
NNS-Seller	The, the time from/	293
NS-Buyer	/in terms of/ payment.	294
NNS-Seller	The time from er, er, the if you getting the er, the merchandise till we are getting the money.	295 296 297
NS-Buyer	Yes. Or you could say since er, we aren't clear on that point, whether it's after the signing of the contract until delivery of the computer. Could be either.	298 299 300 301 302 303
NNS-Seller	What you mean, the time of	304
NS-Buyer	Payment could be made on delivery of the computer and I know that that too is um, an, er an/	305 306 307 308
NNS-Seller	/the/	309
NS-Buyer	/item that/ is, is considered/	310
NNS-Seller	/you,/ you, you can er, you will have to er, pay half of the price/	311 312 313
NS-Buyer	/O.K./	314
	Mm-hm.	315
NNS-Seller	er, in er, on, on the sign er/	316
NS-Buyer	/of the contract/	317 318
NNS-Seller	/contract. And/ er, other	319
	half on er, the day that er, you will get the, <u>we will</u> deliver the comput- er, computer to your company.	320 321 322 323

NS-Buyer	Mm-hm. Right. Um, I'd like to make an important point before we go any further, that is that um, <i>we are buying at this time only one computer</i> , as you see, but you know that we're potentially very good customers of yours, that um, we er have a great regard for your company, your company has a good reputation, and so if we're satisfied with the deal we will certainly be um, more er, involved in purchasing more computers and on a much larger scale. So would you take that into account when er/	324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 332 333 334 335 336 337 338 339 340
NNS-Seller	/[unclear]	341
NS-Buyer	/when/ er, when we come to discuss the, the final price, because er, obviously er, that's an important factor.	342 343 344 345
NNS-Seller	We, we are er, trying to er, to make all our customers er, satisfied with the, the computer that we are selling, with service that we are giving and er, of course we will be happy if it won't be the, the one and only one and that we will er, continue our er, relationship er, as a customer and a supplier.	346 347 348 349 350 351 352 353 354 355 356
NS-Buyer	Right. so that, um, if we were to come to some compromise um, on each of the items that we've spoken about, <i>would you also be prepared to come to a compromise</i> considering the fact that I said at the beginning that we are limited er, in terms of our budget. so that the price would have to come down.	357 358 359 360 361 362 363 364 365 366

NNS-Seller	You don't know the price, we didn't talk the price/	367 368
NS-Buyer	/I, I, no,/ er, I,	369
	er, read about the price in the catalogues.	370 371
NNS-Seller	What the price that you heard?	372
NS-Buyer	Um, I'm prepared to er, make compromises on the er, other items that we <u>discover-</u> er <u>discussed</u> so that um, we could come to a better agreement in terms of the final price.	373 374 375 376 377 378
NNS-Seller	We are selling the new model in er, in about er, er, a price er, a little higher that er, half a million dollar. We, you talking four, four er, hundred thousand/	379 380 381 382 383 384
NS-Buyer	/Right/	385
NNS-Seller	S-, er, very big er, gap.	386
NS-Buyer	There is a big gap, but your prices are competitive.	387 388
NNS-Seller	But er, we are not selling only er, the computer, as I said we selling the strength of the company, the service and a computer that er, when you get it you will know that for a long time you will have a company that's standing behind you, and er/	389 390 391 392 393 394 395 396 397
NS-Buyer	/That's/ the reason I'm here.	398 399
NNS-Seller	I know. And er, and I, I can try and er, to see what, what we can do in er, in all er, the, the other items that er, you talked about, er the item of	400 401 402 403 404

	delivery, it's, it's very	405
	important for you, er the time	406
	of delivery.	407
NS-Buyer	Er, as I said we, we are very	408
	keen to have delivery as soon	409
	as possible, but I could come	410
	to a compromise on that um,	411
	instead of er, say four weeks	412
	which was what we were	413
	hoping for, I could extend that	414
	period, and I would also be	415
	prepared to er, shorten the	416
	warranty period because we	417
	have great confidence in your	418
	company, and er, we know that	419
	er your nine month er warranty	420
	period can be guaranteed. So	421
	I'm prepared to come to a	422
	compromise on those two	423
	issues, and um, I'm also	424
	prepared to er, come to a	425
	compromise on the er, delivery	426
	and installation, I was hoping	427
	that that was included in the	428
	final price but um, if you can't	429
	come down from your quoted	430
	price, then I'll have to	431
	compromise on the er item	432
	itself and er, I have to er, go to	433
	one of your competitors, I'm	434
	afraid.	435
NNS-Seller	Yes. [pause] Let's er, we, we	436
	start on, on er, the the delivery	437
	time, can you, and, and <i>you</i>	438
	<i>talked about four weeks</i>	439
		440
NS-Buyer	mm-hm	
NNS-Seller	Can you explain me why, why	441
	it's so urgent, maybe we can	442
	er, solve the er, part of your	443
	company problem with er, with	444
	er an old computer that we	445
	have in in the, what, what the	446
	problem, let's er see what	447

NS-Buyer	Um, the problem is that we want this computer as quickly as possible and we want this specific computer, so that I don't think we can um, take any er, alternative suggestion on that issue, but as I said to you, we, we certainly would be prepared to wait if um	448 449 450 451 452 453 454 455 456
NNS-Seller	If the price/	457
NS-Buyer	/price was/ right.	458
NNS-Seller	O.K. Look, I talked about twelve er, week, but I, I can er, see and check with our er, how can we say, the [unclear: type] in er, English, it's the	459 460 461 462 463
A N O T H E R	[unclear]	464
V O I C E		465
NNS-Seller	[unclear] it's in English. Why? [unclear] is not in [unclear]?	466 467 468
V O I C E	[unclear]	469
NNS-Seller	The organization, the er, no, the <u>logistics</u> er, <u>logistics</u> <u>department</u>	470 471 472
NS-Buyer	Mm-hm, O.K. fine/	473
NNS-Seller	/and to see,/	474
	maybe we would able to shorten it in er, three-four weeks, but no, not more/	475 476 477
NS-Buyer	/O.K.,/ fine. So instead of three months you're saying two months/	478 479 480
NNS-Seller	/Two months./	481

NS-Buyer	Warranty period, um, you mentioned nine months.	482 483
NNS-Seller	Right/	484
NS-Buyer	<i>/could you/ give me an idea of whether you could extend that somewhat?/</i>	485 486 487
NNS-Seller	<i>/it's, it's a/ problem because it's er, it's er, company policy, and er</i>	488 489 490
NS-Buyer	I see/	491
NNS-Seller	<i>/you/ are customer and there is a lot of other customers, and er, I, I really want to give you er, the guarantee that, that everyone is getting, but, O.K., I , I will check, er, I will check it and er,</i>	492 493 494 495 496 497 498
NS-Buyer	I want to reiterate the fact that um, this is one computer for the moment, but er, we have	499 500 501
	<i>a-, plans to expansion in our company, and the likelihood is that <i>within the next year we'll be making many more orders/</i></i>	502 503 504 505
NNS-Seller	<i>/How many/</i>	506 507
NS-Buyer	<i>/so I/ hope you take/</i>	508
NNS-Seller	<i>/do/ you have any idea/</i>	509 510
NS-Buyer	<i>/that into account./</i>	511
NNS-Seller	<i>/how many orders?/</i>	512
NS-Buyer	<i>/I'm afraid/ I can't er, divulge that at the moment, but er, I can certainly,</i>	513 514 515

	er say that the, the likelihood is, is good.	516 517
NNS-Seller	Why, why you think your, your company will er, grow up, what, what er, basis?	518 519 520
NS-Buyer	We have er, intensive plans for expansion/	521 522
NNS-Seller	/Where, only in/ er, your country or er, other countries?	523 524
NS-Buyer	Worldwide.	525
NNS-Seller	Worldwide.	526
NS-Buyer	So, I', I'm saying this because um, I'm hoping that you will take into account when we come to discuss the um, the delivery er, question and the, in fact the price, which is the most/	527 528 529 530 531 532 533
NNS-Seller	/yeah, I, I, I/ see the price is, is the main er, problem/	534 535
NS-Buyer	/stumbling/ block	536 537
NNS-Seller	because er, all, all the other things it er, I, I sure we can compromise on/	538 539 540
NS-Buyer	/Right/	541
NNS-Seller	/but er, the price, the gap between four four hundred er, thousand to er, five hundred in the model that you want	542 543 544 545
NS-Buyer	Well supposing we came to a compromise in some of the other issues, which we already have. Would you be prepared to make a compromise on that er, price that you quoted me?	546 547 548 549 550 551

NNS-Seller	Yes.	552
NS-Buyer	Mm-hm. Would you come to a compromise of um, four fifty, which is um, a fair enough deal I would say.	553 554 555 556
NNS-Seller	[laughs] Huh? It's funny, four fifty, how, I, I, I wouldn't like your er	557 558 559
VOICES		560
NS-Buyer	Which means?	561
NNS-Seller	Huh?	562
NS-Buyer	Which means that?	563
NNS-Seller	I, I'm writing it, but er	564
NS-Buyer	Yes/	565
NNS-Seller	/I want to go back to the other er, part of the er, look, er, I think that we can er, I, I don't er, er, we don't have any problem with the, the credit, what we said about fifty percent on, on the/	566 567 568 569 570 571 572
NS-Buyer	/Right/	573
NNS-Seller	/signing/	574
NS-Buyer	/Right	575
NNS-Seller	So it's, it's O.K. And er, I think that when we talk about er, in half a million er, units, two thousand for delivery and installation it's also O.K.	576 577 578 579 580
NS-Buyer	Fine.	581
NNS-Seller	Er, the nine months guarantee I, I can try to er, bring it to er, one year/	582 583 584

NS-Buyer	/Fine./	585
NNS-Seller	Maybe I will er, change with this er, contract the er, all the policy of the company	586 587 588
NS-Buyer	O.K.	589
NNS-Seller	O.K. So now we only staying at er, the price of the unit.	590 591
NS-Buyer	Just about.	592
NNS-Seller	Just about. I think four sixty five it's a nice price.	593 594
NS-Buyer	Well, why don't we round it off at four sixty?	595 596
NNS-Seller	O.K.	597
NS-Buyer	Thank you very much. Well I hope to er, be doing business with you again soon, and it was very good to meet you.	598 599 600 601
NNS-Seller	It was my pleasure.	602

ENCOUNTER NO. 27

- NNS-Buyer So, I'm the buyer, so, er, ahem, 1
so, I came over here to, to try to 2
buy, er, computers from you. I 3
heard that you have a. um. a 4
good. um. merchandise and er, 5
can you tell me something about 6
the computers? 7
- NS-Seller Well, first of all, I'm delighted to 8
have you visit us, and we would 9
be very happy if you'd be our 10
customer. Our computer is really 11
the best and the most modern on 12
the market, and from our previous 13
discussions I'm sure it's exactly 14
what you need. 15
- NNS-Buyer Yes, but er, this, er, beautiful 16
sentences we. I've heard in er, 17
certain other places that I, er, I 18
did chan-, I chanced to visit, and 19
everybody tells me the same 20
story, that he's the best and he's 21
the best price, but you know there 22
are many other er, um companies 23
who are trying to sell us, and 24
because I'm a big buyer, I'm 25
talking about the big money, so 26
please, tell me what you can do 27
for us, first of all *tell me* 28
something about the computer, 29
and later we will go. later on 30
we'll go to the price. 31
- NS-Seller Well, Mr. Katz, may I quite er, 32
make myself quite clear. We 33
have absolutely no fear of our 34
competitors. Our computer is 35
way above the others in standard 36
and in the variety of things it can 37
do, and as you'll see our terms, 38
our selling terms are excellent. 39
Um, for example *our delivery* 40
time, we're spot-on, you'll have it 41

	within a few weeks, we give you an excellent, er, guarantee. We offer you, um, a very fair credit period, and as you'll see, even our price is highly competitive.	42 43 44 45 46
NNS-Buyer	M-mm. Er, er, er, er, the, the computers. <u>When, er where are,</u> er they produced. <i>Where's it come from?</i>	47 48 49 50
NS-Seller	Oh, most of the parts/	51
NNS-Buyer	/What/ country?	52
NS-Seller	Most of the parts are locally manufactured. We have some parts that we do have to import, but on the whole, er, the bulk of it is, is locally manufactured.	53 54 55 56 57
NNS-Buyer	American er, er, computer?	58
NS-Seller	Part of it is our, our head office. We do have some, er, components of the country in the United States	59 60 61 62
NNS-Buyer	Mm-hm.	63
NS-Seller	but a lot of it is locally made.	64
NNS-Buyer	Er, how many weeks, how many, how, er, er, <i>how much time it</i> <u>takes, er, to takes, er, to get, er</u> the computers?	65 66 67 68
NS-Seller	Well, because it's such a very big unit, and, er, it takes some time to, to, actually get it into the country and put everything together for you, it would take us approximately ten weeks to deliver it.	69 70 71 72 73 74 75
NNS-Buyer	Mm-hm. So the prices are very high, and er, you're are very um,	76 77

	um, stubborn, and er, to make	78
	business today when er, you can,	79
	er, buy it all over, er, you have to	80
	speak about another price	81
	because, you have to, you have	82
	to, you have to tell me, er, first of	83
	all, the price and then we'll go,	84
	we'll go, er, we'll see what, er	85
	kind of discount we can get from	86
	you.	87
NS-Seller	Well the price that we/	88
NNS-Buyer	/I'm talking/ about	89
	er/	90
NS-Seller	/quote	91
NNS-Buyer	er, a single one.	92
NS-Seller	The price that we quote/	93
NNS-Buyer	/A single one./	94
NS-Seller	/for this/ particular computer is	95
	five hundred thousand dollars.	96
NNS-Buyer	Five hundred thousand dollars,	97
NS-Seller	Yes.	98
NNS-Buyer	Look, it's er, it's er, it's er, we're	99
	talking about um, er	100
NS-Seller	The very latest model.	101
NNS-Buyer	[chuckle], y- [sigh] industrial	102
	computer?	103
NS-Seller	Indeed, indeed.	104
NNS-Buyer	Yuh. And, er, five hundred	105
	thousand dollars. Five hundred	106
	thousand dollar, and, er, what I	107
	was allowed to pay is only three	108
	hundred thousand dollar. So, er,	109
	<u>what you offer me to do, what</u>	110
	<u>you suggest me to do?</u> Er, you	111

	spoke about, er compet-, er, the	112
	compet-, er, the competitors that	113
	you are not er, you are not er,	114
	you are not afraid, you are very	115
	strong and you're, but after all	116
	you want, er to sell, your, your,	117
	er, er, product/	118
NS-Seller	/Quite/	119
NNS-Buyer	<u>/and you/ want, er you don't want</u>	120
	to live with your, er, expensive,	121
	er computers forever, so/	122
NS-Seller	/Quite right/	123
NNS-Buyer	/let's come/ and speak about the	124
	price and don't be stubborn.	125
NS-Seller	Let me be/	126
NNS-Buyer	[chuckles]	127
NS-Seller	/quite clear that the	128
	difference between our computer	129
	and our competitors' and if we	130
	think [unclear] a model was	131
	round the three hundred thousand	132
	range it's like buying a/	133
NNS-Buyer	<u>/The last price, my last price/</u>	134
NS-Seller	/Volkswagen	135
	or a Cadillac, there's a huge	136
	difference/	137
NNS-Buyer	/my, my last/ price, it's er,	138
NS-Seller	[chuckles]	139
NNS-Buyer	three hundred and seventy five	140
	hundred dollar, and [laughs] that	141
	it, er, and er, and er, and please,	142
	go down.	143
NS-Seller	Mr. Katz, with due respect, <u>we're</u>	144
	<u>not, we're offering</u> you the	145

	service and the Cadillac model.	146
	If you wish to buy something/	147
NNS-Buyer	/I want/ three hundred thousand/	148 149
NS-Seller	/in the/ range of something smaller, er, that doesn't really do all these remarkable things that we're offering, then you may well have to er, consider a different mode. But for what we're offering, our price is, I think really fair and <i>you wouldn't find and [unclear] deal on this stand at anywhere else.</i>	150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158 159
NNS-Buyer	So I think/	160
NS-Seller	/[unclear]/	161
NNS-Buyer	/that um, that er, you'll hear from me.	162 163
NS-Seller	Thank you very much.	164

ENCOUNTER NO. 28

NS-Seller	Well David, uh, you know I'm only in Israel for a short time, and then I go back to America and, and before I go I wanted to make sure I, I talk to you because I really want to <i>let you in on a, on a very special deal</i> uh, before I go back to the States.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
NNS-Buyer	Yes, we've checked several computers and, er, every one of them has some advantage and some [unclear], but er, I, I think that we would be interested in your computer if, um, could be er, a <i>little less expensive</i> , I hope that you have er, better suggestion than the one I heard from your office/	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18
NS-Seller	/Well, what did you/ hear from the office? 'Cos the office is the office, but you know, <u>I'm here, they're there</u> , right? I'm here, They can, they can , you know, what goes on here, they don't necessarily have to know so much, right? But, they're there. What did you hear from them?	19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27
NNS-Buyer	Um, I er, understood from them that the price er, would be at least er, <u>four forty, four fifty K.</u> And this is quite expensive. I heard that you can be more/	28 29 30 31 32
NS-Seller	/Yeah, they said/ four fifty K?	33 34
NNS-Buyer	They didn't say an exact figure but this is kind of [unclear]	35 36
NS-Seller	Aha.	37
NNS-Buyer	This is/	38

NS-Seller	/It's a [unclear]/	39
NNS-Buyer	/[unclear]. Probably you have to [unclear] awhile. You shouldn't ask me [unclear]	40 41 42 43
NS-Seller	And you thought four hundred and fifty K sounded a little expensive?	44 45 46
NNS-Buyer	It sounded a little expensive because we can buy computers in general er less expensive probably.	47 48 49 50
NS-Seller	Well you could buy less computer, which is less expensive. But I'm not sure you can buy a computer like the ones we have, you know	51 52 53 54 55
NNS-Buyer	The one you have is not er, unique. We had er, other propositions from other companies. <i>The reason we want your computer is that we had a good experience with er, your computers/</i>	56 57 58 59 60 61 62
NS-Seller	/Mm-hm/	63
NNS-Buyer	/We are quite/ satisfied with them.	64 65
NS-Seller	And, and I, I would think because of that satisfaction you would see that our computer would be more than worth the four hundred and fifty K.	66 67 68 69 70
NNS-Buyer	Yes, but if they are too expensive perhaps we should try to get this from another company/	71 72 73
NS-Seller	/Well you could/ try those computers, but I think what	74 75

	you'd end up discovering is that	76
	you're going to end up coming	77
	back to our computers, because	78
	first of all, <u>it its, first of all let's</u>	79
	<u>say</u> it's four hundred and fifty K.	80
	We still give you <i>thirty days to</i>	81
	<i>pay, O.K.?</i> we give you thirty	82
	days to pay/	83
NNS-Buyer	/in one payment/	84
NS-Seller	/and, and, and, I/ can	85
	guarantee you have that computer	86
	in <i>eight weeks</i> from all the way	87
	from America, <u>in eight weeks</u> .	88
NNS-Buyer	The plane does the way from	89
	America to here in twelve hours,	90
	so eight weeks sounds a lot of	91
	time. No, we need it in two or	92
	three weeks and we got a promise	93
	from another company to have	94
	their computer in two weeks, and	95
	er, about <i>your credit period</i> , we	96
	need at least half a year.	97
NS-Seller	[unclear] half a year/	98
NNS-Buyer	/for that/ amount of money/	99
NS-Seller	/half a year/ is er, that's a, that's	100
	a little, <u>that's a long time</u> to pay	101
	off your computer/	102
NNS-Buyer	/Well, it's/ customary to have the	103
	computer in, in , for a trial period	104
	for instance, and then can return	105
	it if we're not satisfied without	106
	paying [unclear].	107
NS-Seller	Well, we could let you/	108
NNS-Buyer	/so three/ months is the minimum	109
	[fades]	110
NS-Seller	I think we could let you, <u>we, we</u>	111
	<u>let you</u> try their computer over a	112

	period of say, you know six months or so.	113
		114
NNS-Buyer	Six months with er full er charge and return/	115
		116
NS-Seller	/Well, I mean/	117
NNS-Buyer	/if we're/ not satisfied/	118
NS-Seller	/it's gonna/ take, it's gonna take I mean, <u>we're gonna have to</u> pay some [unclear] of it, ninety percent, um, ninety percent full charge return, and ninety percent return.	119
		120
		121
		122
		123
		124
NNS-Buyer	So let's say we pay fifty percent in er, one month and the other fifty percent after half a year. Sounds more/	125
		126
		127
		128
NS-Seller	/How about/	129
NNS-Buyer	/sensible/	130
NS-Seller	/How/ about fifty percent after one month and then, [laughter]	131
		132
NNS-Buyer	Then the rest, when?	133
NS-Seller	Let's say in three, in, in, two months.	134
		135
NNS-Buyer	[unclear] This isn't acceptable. Perhaps/	136
		137
NS-Seller	/How about, how about a hundred percent, <u>how about a hundred percent</u> return after three months? and, but you pay fully fifty percent and then the remaining fifty percent by three months. And then it's a hundred percent return if you're not satisfied by the end of those three months.	138
		139
		140
		141
		142
		143
		144
		145
		146
		147

NNS-Buyer	Er, no I quite agree that er, return of only ninety percent, but the payment should be in two months, fifty percent and the other fifty percent in three months. Again ninety percent return in six months. That's that's/	148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155
NS-Seller	/[unclear] three months/	156
NS-Buyer	/O.K. return in three months/	157 158
NS-Seller	/that's/	159
NNS-Buyer	/if/ we are not satisfied, but the payment will be fifty percent in two months and another fifty percent in three months.	160 161 162 163
NS-Seller	Let's let's see, uh, four, four months is [unclear], right, I mean that's/	164 165 166
NNS-Buyer	/not four months, two/ and three months. Everything/	167 168
NS-Seller	/Five months/	169
NNS-Buyer	/No you have all/ the money in three months, so you, I'll pay you/	170 171 172
NS-Seller	/No, you said/	173 174
NNS-Buyer	/fifty per/cent in two months and after another month I'll pay you/	175 176
NS-Seller	/Fifty/ percent?	177 178
NNS-Buyer	Yes.	179
NS-Seller	After three months.	180
NNS-Buyer	Yes.	181

NS-Seller	That's right. and ninety percent return?	182 183
NNS-Buyer	Yes.	184
NS-Seller	O.K.	185
NNS-Buyer	And fifty percent out of four hundred K.	186 187
NS-Seller	Four fifty K, [unclear]	188
NNS-Buyer	No, four fifty is far too high [laughter]	189 190
NS-Seller	I, I would <u>cer-, you four fifty</u> , it was/	191 192
NNS-Buyer	/I, I'm sure/ that four fifty is the upper limit and you can pay for a small reduction for a company that's has been working with you for so many years.	193 194 195 196 197
NS-Seller	So, <u>I you've</u> worked with us for a long time, I don't think you've ever seen a <i>product</i> /	198 199 200
NNS-Buyer	/Ah, we saw/ a lot of <u>problems in, with</u> your product/	201 202
NS-Seller	/Well then, why/ are <i>you still working with us?</i>	203 204
NNS-Buyer	Er,	205
NS-Seller	Because you know/	206
NNS-Buyer	/this is why/	207
NS-Seller	/you/ know, [unclear] you know, the problems are, are, you know the problems are negligible compared to the quality of [unclear], I mean you said yourself, you've worked with us for a long time and er, we want to continue working with you, and	208 209 210 211 212 213 214 215

	we think we <i>never had a product</i> like we have right now. And/	216 217
NNS-Buyer	/I've saw/ that other companies had er, good alternatives, and we haven't yet checked <u>in, in depth</u> , because er, we haven't had yet er, need for it, but if the price/	218 219 220 221 222
NS-Seller	/By the time you/	223 224
NNS-Buyer	/is so high/	225 226
NS-Seller	/by the time you/	227
NNS-Buyer	/it's four hundred fifty, perhaps we should/	228 229
NS-Seller	/by the time you/ check on it, I'm gonna be back in America, and, and the next person who comes here is gonna want to charge five hundred K for it, because seriously, to most of the other people I go to, I'm, I'm asking five hundred K, <u>to most</u> <u>other companies I'm asking five</u> <u>hundred K</u> because we've done business for so long I'm saying four hundred and fifty K.	230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237 238 239 240 241
NNS-Buyer	I'm not worried that er, hearing that price has gone up because prices are always just going down, so we have the time to look for other computers and if this/	242 243 244 245 246 247
NS-Seller	/What er all right/	248
NNS-Buyer	/four hundred/ and fifty/	249 250
NS-Seller	/you're right, we've/ done bus- <u>we've done business a long time,</u>	251 252

	we've done business a long time.	253
	I can't go as low as four hundred.	254
	But how about four thirty, four thirty?	255 256
NNS-Buyer	Four thirty is er, fine.	257
NS-Seller	Four thirty?	258
NNS-Buyer	[unclear]	259
NS-Seller	O.K. And er/	260
NNS-Buyer	<i>/And delivery time/ in two weeks, as you said?</i>	261 262
NS-Seller	Two weeks? er, it's going to be really hard, four weeks.	263 264
NNS-Buyer	Four weeks.	265
	[laughter]	266
NNS-Buyer	Four weeks.	267
NS-Seller	Alright.	268
NNS-Buyer	<i>We haven't spoken about warranty period, the usual five years warranty?</i>	269 270 271
NS-Seller	No. There's no usual five year warranty [laughs]/	272 273
NNS-Buyer	<i>/I mean/ there can be [unclear]/</i>	274
NS-Seller	<i>/one year warranty yes/</i>	275 276
NNS-Buyer	<i>/for twenty/ years.</i>	277
NS-Seller	I'm in the computer business, my father's in the computer business, my grandfather, before there was even computers, was in the computer business.	278 279 280 281 282
NNS-Buyer	I never said [laughter] revolution, you'll make a revolution.	283 284

NS-Seller	That's right	285
NNS-Buyer	[unclear] logical terms [unclear]	286
NS-Seller	My dad-, my great-great-great-grandfather ran George Washington's computer. [laughter]	287 288 289 290
NNS-Buyer	You're such/	291
NS-Seller	/one year/ warranty/	292
NNS-Buyer	/such/ great computers, <u>you say they, your computers have no problems,</u> why can't you guarantee a five-years/	293 294 295 296
NS-Seller	/because/	297
NNS-Buyer	/warranty period?/	298
NS-Seller	/because <u>your-, one year,</u> there's no no five-year period warranty, one year.	299 300 301
NNS-Buyer	No, I can't accept that. This is a standard thing/	302 303
NS-Seller	/It is not a/ standard thing/	304
NNS-Buyer	/it, it/	305
NS-Seller	/I've, I've looked back over all your warranties, they're all one-year warranties.	306 307 308 309
NNS-Buyer	No.	310
NS-Seller	But <u>that, this is/</u>	311
NNS-Buyer	/They're all/ five years	312
NS-Seller	This is one year, this, I mean if there's a sc-, <u>they are not, you're,</u> <u>I</u> if, if there's even a screw that's loose on it, it's covered by our	313 314 315 316

	warranty, no other warranty is like that, <u>there's a screw, if there's a screw loose</u> . Not that there would ever be a screw loose on one of our computers.	317 318 319 320 321
NNS-Buyer	It's happened er, before. We paid, you, you remember well/	322 323
NS-Seller	/yeah,/ I remember. I came here myself/	324 325
NNS-Buyer	/Well, I [unclear]/	326 327
NS-Seller	/I made a special trip on the Concord to France, then I flew charter plane to get here by myself to screw it in, that's our warranty/	328 329 330 331 332
NNS-Buyer	/it/ was one year and a, and a week after we bought the computer	333 334 335
	[laughter]	336
NS-Seller	I'll give you one year and a week then. [laughter] What? One year and a week.	337 338 339
NNS-Buyer	I think that five years/	340
NS-Seller	/There's no/ way five years. I'm sorry, there's no way. I'm giving you, I'm giving you the price, the four hundred and thirty K, I'm giving you delivery time in four weeks <u>which is gonna, we're going to</u> lose money on that delivery time, I'll tell you right now, we're going to lose money. There's no way warranty is one year and a week.	341 342 343 344 345 346 347 348 349 350 351
NNS-Buyer	Let's, let's meet in the middle/	352
NS-Seller	/No./	353

NNS-Buyer	/Three years/	35
NS-Seller	/Forget it, there's/ no three-year warranty, there's no three-year warranty. It's one, it's one-year warranty.	355 356 357 358
NNS-Buyer	A one-year warranty isn't acceptable, I'm sorry. <u>Present-</u> <u>we</u> , if, if, as I say before we have your computers in our company and if, for seven years, and if I could say that your <u>complete-</u> <u>computers are reliable</u> and had no problems/	359 360 361 362 363 364 365 366
NS-Seller	/Then why/ d'you keep doing business with us? Why do you keep, if you seem to think our computers/	367 368 369 370
NNS-Buyer	/Because your [unclear]/	371
NS-Seller	/are so unreliable.	372
NNS-Buyer	No, they, they are.	373
NS-Seller	Cos, cos our salesmen are so/	374
NNS-Buyer	/They're not/	375 376
NS-Seller	/likeable.	377
NNS-Buyer	Er, I can't say that they are not at all <u>rel-, reliable</u> . Computers tend to make problems. Your computers/	378 379 380 381
NS-Seller	/They, they, I agree with that/	382
NNS-Buyer	/and another/ company's computers/	383 384
NS-Seller	/They have their problems./	385

NNS-Buyer	/And the solution is to give a long <u>period er warranty period.</u>	38c 387 388
NS-Seller	I, the the solutions <u>you are getting at, we're getting at,</u> I've/	389 390
NNS-Buyer	/a/ <u>company that trusts its products, trusts its product</u>	391 392 393
NS-Seller	How about the one year on everything, and then I'll go one more year on let's say, parts and labour.	394 395 396 397
NNS-Buyer	Parts and labour.	398
NS-Seller	You pay for parts, one year, one year on everything and then another year you have to pay for parts and labour.	399 400 401 402
NNS-Buyer	What is the meaning of warranty period? [laughter] You pay for parts and labour. Let's say another one year for the hardware with no warranty in, in the software.	403 404 405 406 407 408
NS-Seller	You're saying, well, <u>we don't do, we don't supply most</u> of your software so there's nothing more for us to gain, on that deal.	409 410 411 412
NNS-Buyer	I guess I helped you [laughter] [unclear] know enough about computers.	413 414 415
NS-Seller	No such luck. I said, I've been in computers, my father's in computers, my grandfather is in computers/	416 417 418 419
NNS-Buyer	/My mother/ is in I.B.M. [laughter]	420 421
NS-Seller	Uh,	422

NNS-Buyer	So, eighteen months? This is all we need/	423 424
NS-Seller	/Eighteen months. A/ year and a half?	425 426
NNS-Buyer	Eight.	427
NS-Seller	No, no, no. Eighteen/	428
NNS-Buyer	/O.K., eighteen/	429
NS-Seller	/Eighteen/ months.	430
NNS-Buyer	Eighteen.	431
NS-Seller	A year, a year and a half.	432
NNS-Buyer	Yes.	433
NS-Seller	O.K.	434
NNS-Buyer	O.K.	435
NS-Seller	And,	436
NNS-Buyer	And, we have still <i>to negotiate the penalty clause.</i>	437 438
NS-Seller	Well I though we'd, cancellation we said that, there's going to be, we said that, ninety/	439 440 441
NNS-Buyer	/No no, the pen/alty clause if you deliver the computer late because we, we will lose er, thousands of dollars for each day without a computer. so I think we must/	442 443 444 445 446 447
NS-Seller	/Well, I think <u>we have a. no we have a p-</u> , cancellation if you cancel./	448 449 450
NNS-Buyer	/Yes, but also/ a, er, late <u>deliv-</u> , <u>delivery</u> penalty if you deliver the computer late. Or did you	451 452 453

	think there's no chance of getting it late?	454 455
NS-Seller	There's no chance.	456
NNS-Buyer	So there should be no reason for you not to promise me er, say, twenty percent rate of the/	457 458 459
NS-Seller	/Twenty percent of what?	460 461
NNS-Buyer	Reduction of cost for each week of delay.	462 463
NS-Seller	Er I,	464
NS-Buyer	If it's going to be on time, so why	465
NS-Seller	I really, you know, I don't have that on my sheets, I don't know, I mean I, I have a list of things here that I can talk about, I have to get back to you on that one, I don't know, I don't have it on my sheet <u>I honestly don't know.</u> <u>I, I don't have that, so, I mean I</u> <u>have to get back to you on that.</u>	466 467 468 469 470 471 472 473 474
NNS-Buyer	Can't you make decisions by yourself?	475 476
NS-Seller	<u>I, we don't, you know, we're</u> <u>known/</u>	477 478
NNS-Buyer	/[unclear] you ask senior [unclear]/	479 480
NS-Seller	/we're known, we're known as the on-time company and so it rarely ever comes up, so let me, let me I have to get back to you on that. It rarely comes up/	481 482 483 484 485 486
NNS-Buyer	/O.K. we'll/ talk about this later/	487

NS-Seller	/Ah, yeah,/ we'll talk about that later, and er, but delivery and installation uh	488 489 490
NNS-Buyer	will be with no charge. We talk about it.	491 492
NS-Seller	No we didn't talk about it. We didn't talk about it/	493 494
NNS-Buyer	/Er, when, when we talked about the price it, er including delivery and installation, that's/	495 496 497 498
NS-Seller	/No, no,/ no, no, no/	499 500
NNS-Buyer	/Er, you can't/	501
NS-Seller	/no, no/	502
NNS-Buyer	/charge extra for delivery and installation?	503 504
NS-Seller	Well, whe-, we need to talk about that, because we're not just sending over the computer, we're sending over a trained computer expert.	505 506 507 508 509
NNS-Buyer	<i>You don't pay the trained computer expert.</i>	510 511
NS-Seller	Y-, yes, we do. Cos we have new features on this computer that your [unclear]/	512 513 514
NNS-Buyer	<i>/We read the/ manuals.</i>	515
NS-Seller	The manuals? You know how big the manual is? The manual's huge./	516 517 518
NNS-Buyer	/We read all/ the manual. All/	519
NS-Seller	/but all/	520

NNS-Buyer	/all [unclear] text.	521
NS-Seller	The manual's huge. The manual's huge.	522 523
NNS-Buyer	You don't have [unclear] on the [unclear]?	524 525
NS-Seller	Yeah we do.	526
NNS-Buyer	O.K. Yuh, it's no problem.	527
NS-Seller	We, we need to, but there's, there's gonna be questions that are gonna come up and you	528 529 530
NNS-Buyer	And you will answer them, you- we have a warranty period. We haven't had any delivery and installation charge for the other computers we got from you, except the present one.	531 532 533 534 535 536
NS-Seller	Because never have we had a computer, like this computer, you know, this computer requires our trained staff as experts who are flying here/	537 538 539 540 541
NNS-Buyer	/specially/	542
NS-Seller	/from New/ York to, to [unclear: inspire] your computer.	543 544
NNS-Buyer	Is it er, specially [unclear] computer.	545 546
NS-Seller	No, no, no, no. No, no. It's just there's er, there's, there's special things that you ought to know about if they, you know, get by meeting a trained computer genius/	547 548 549 550 551 552
NNS-Buyer	/special things/, perhaps we should consider the whole deal with it. [laughter] I got the impression/	553 554 555 556

NS-Seller	/Well, look, I/ mean, it's a negligible amount of money, for fifteen hundred dollars per delivery <u>it's neg-, it's negligible</u> against four hundred and thirty, I mean, forget it, it's fine.	557 558 559 560 561 562
NNS-Buyer	O.K.	563
NS-Seller	Wow. Has our host [unclear] pleasure? [laughter] God, <i>I love these trips to Israel.</i>	564 565 566
NNS-Buyer	Have you been, have you been to the Western Wall?	567 568
NS-Seller	I've been to the Western Wall, I, I got this great suntan in the Negev, it's been great. Anyway, it's er, it's good to see you [unclear]/	569 570 571 572 573
NNS-Buyer	/Nice of you to have business with, with you.	574 575
NS-Seller	Nice to do business with you too.	576