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要旨

イギリスの大学で留学している日本人学生のチュートリアルに関するデータ（観察、
観察記録、面談調査、アンケート）に基づき、大学教育における異文化間コミュニケーションの問題点について分析する。イギリス人教員と日本人学生とのコミュニケーション上の問題は、教育に関する文化的側面の理解の違いに基づいていることが多い。イギリス人にとっては仮定的の前提であり、日本人にとっては未知の前提がある。またこの違いが立つ、教育に関する日本文化的期待の違い、教師と学生との関係の把握の仕方、学習の進め方の違いに関する仮定的な捉え方に関連して生じている。

本論では「達成度」「分析力」「問題識識」という教授基準によって動かされたチュートリアルのやりとりに焦点をあて、日本人留学生のコミュニケーションの問題点の具体例を報告する。イギリスの大学における教師と学生の会話の仕組みを理解し、コミュニケーションを成功させるためには、その結果説明している文化的前従や社会的ルールに照らして発話行為の意図を読み取ることが不可欠であることを示し、現行論文に基づいた外語教育の重要性を示唆する。
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1. PRAGMATIC DIFFICULTIES

This paper looks at the difficulties of pragmatic understanding faced by Japanese students studying in Great Britain. In illustrating areas of pragmatic difficulty, this study draws on a specific theoretical perspective, relating the performance and uptake of speech acts to their location within a particular genre, i.e., tutorial sessions between Japanese students and British tutors. It is argued that the difficulties stem mainly from two areas of sociopragmatic structuring of the genre: tutor-student interaction and the implicit value system operating differently in the assessment of students’ development in British and Japanese academic settings.

Pragmatic difficulties are usually classified into two levels: pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic. The distinction was first made by Leech (1983) and Thomas (1983), and Kaspar (1994) sums it up as follows: "pragmalinguistics" concerns the relationship between linguistic forms and their functions as speech acts and expressions of interpersonal meaning, whereas "sociopragmatics" concerns the relationship between linguistic action and social structure. Differences in mapping of the form and the force in certain speech act manifestations can pragmalinguistic difficulties. It is particularly true when the mapping in Second Language (L2) is more indirect than in Native Language (L1) and when the students transfer their knowledge of mapping in L1 to that in L2. The pragmalinguistic level and sociopragmatic level are closely related in such indirect speech acts. An awareness of the sociopragmatic factors functioning in the L2 culture in general and the specific L2 genre in particular is germane to the ability to understand the illocutionary force of indirect speech acts and to respond to them appropriately at the pragmalinguistic level.

Most studies in cross-cultural pragmatics have been concerned with single speech acts in a number of different situational settings, such as requests and apologies (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989), or refusals and corrections (Boeke, Takahashi and Ulissi-Weltz 1990, Takahashi and Boeke 1993). One problem often voiced in the speech-act oriented approach to cross-cultural pragmatics is the difficulty in eliciting authentic data. Discourse completion tests used extensively in the large-scale cross-cultural pragmatics research fulfil a useful function but a limited one (Kasper and Dahl 1991, Rose 1994). For this reason, we have adopted a genre-analytical approach to our data. Genres are social practices, moulded into a particular shape by habitual patterns of language use. Genre analysis seeks to describe the commu-

The genre perspective has a multi-disciplinary pedigree. Within the pragmatics literature, this theoretical notion was perhaps most prominently voiced by Levinson (1979), although Levinson himself used the term 'activity type', making reference also to its similarity to the term 'speech event' used by Hymes (1972) and 'episode' used by

2. THE TUTORIAL GENRE

Most of the work done on genre analysis in academic discourse has focused on written materials (Swales 1990, Bhatia 1993). Works done by Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (1980, 1990), and by He (1993) on the academic advising session, and by Rudolf (1994) on the interaction between graduate students and their supervisors are one of the few instances of research on interlanguage pragmatics relating to the one-to-one tutorial.

The one-to-one tutorial we have chosen, that of the fine art tutorial, is an optimum vehicle for analysing tutor-student interaction, as it is a central means of the teaching process in that discipline. In a previous paper, Turner (in press) analysed the fine art tutorial as a genre with a three-phase structure, motivated by the assessment of development in the students’ work. The emphasis on development was seen as commensurate with a deeply embedded value system operating in British academic culture, which took its cues from the concept of 'educare', drawing on the students’ inner resources, to help her/him reach her/his full potential. What we are focusing on in this paper is speech act exchanges motivated by this value system, and relating them to the different value system operating in Japanese tutor-student interaction.

The salient values are: i) achievement processed by quantity and quality; ii) emphasis on critical analysis; and iii) inquiry as a positive impetus to development.

These three values concur with the structural organization of the tutorial on the one hand, and interact with the sociopolitical power structure operating between the tutor and the student, on the other. For example, the extent of achievement since a previous tutorial session is a typical issue discussed in the opening phase of a tutorial; critical analysis of the work and expressions of doubts, questions, worries, etc. concerning the present work are encouraged in the central phase; and the tutord

Gumper's (1972). In his use of the term 'activity type', Levinson was concerned to include a variety of activities including those where language played a less prominent role, such as a soccer match or a game of cricket. His point was that the communicative acts linguistically encoded in these contexts were only decipherable in conjunction with an understanding of the rules of the game. More recently, the notion of genre has loomed large in educational linguistics in Australia, e.g., Christie (1984), Martin (1985) and Kress (1989).
often ends with a reformulation of what has been discussed and/or confirmation of what is the best course of future action. These values and structures shape the main communicative purpose of the tutorial, i.e., to encourage and assess development in the work of the individual student.

The main communicative purpose determines the functions assigned to the tutor and the student. The function of the tutor is two-fold: to encourage the student and help him/her develop the work by making suggestions; or to help them clarify analytically what it is they are attempting to do. The principal function of the student is to justify what he/she is working on, in terms of its purpose and anticipated development, and to respond to the tutor's comments and advice. The speech acts appropriate to each of the purposes differ, as do their responses.

These functions are carried out against the backdrop of ideational topics germane to the discipline of the tutorial. Those recurrent topics include:

1) the state of development of the work predicated on the amount of it, and the procedures used;
2) reference to other work in the field;
3) the student's own evaluation of his/her work;
4) possible future development of the student's work.
5) confirmation of mutual agreement between tutor and student on what should happen next.

Table 1 summarises the correspondence among the constitutive factors of the tutorial: the structure, guiding principles, values, speech acts, and recurrent topics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRUCTURES</th>
<th>ASSUMPTIONS</th>
<th>COMMUNICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T&gt;S relation</td>
<td>tutorial session</td>
<td>dominant values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institution</td>
<td>opening</td>
<td>achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>states</td>
<td>central</td>
<td>analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>membership</td>
<td>development</td>
<td>inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T=S closing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T=Tutor, S=Student

TABLE 1: Constitutive Factors of the British Tutorial

All the above is tacit knowledge for the British tutor. However, it is not for the Japanese student, who has in most cases different knowledge about the power structure and values in education in general and in one-to-one tutorials in particular. Tutorials are not very common in the Japanese educational system, in which instruction is more directive than interactive in nature. There is a larger power distance between teacher and student in Japan, where students expect teacher not only to guide the path to follow but also to initiate communication. Education is more teacher-centred than student-centred, with structured learning schemes, clear goals, strict schedules, and detailed assignments. In the British academic context, the tutors hold the power in terms of the institutional or political status, but students are treated as participant members in the discourse community from the beginning of their studies. This leads to a mismatch of sociopragmatic assumptions about what is going on, as shown in the following examples.

3. EXAMPLES AND ANALYSIS

3.1 Data Collection

Data for the following analysis was gathered primarily by 21 videotaped fine art tutorial sessions between 3 British tutors and 20 Japanese and 1 British students. The length of the tutorial session varied from 15 minutes to 45 minutes. The English proficiency of the Japanese students ranged from intermediate to advanced level. The duration of their stay in England ranged from six months to two years. To substantiate further the analysis and explication, three other data elicitation methods were employed. They were retrospective interviews conducted with the informant students in their native language; separate focus group recordings on their understanding of the nature and purpose of the fine art tutorial made by Japanese and British fine art students; and discourse completion tests contextualising recurrent topics and conversational exchanges, administered to 23 Japanese and 15 British informants in English and 27 Japanese informants in Japanese.

The specific examples of difficulties discussed below were selected on the basis of the values which constitute the sociopragmatic background and which are manifested in the recurrent topics described in Section 2 and summarised in Table 1. Exchanges between the British tutor and the British student will be shown to point up differences where necessary.

3.2 Achievement

The opening phase of the tutorial usually hinges on recapitulation of the previous session (e.g., 'Remind me what we discussed last time', or 'So, let's just
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Quantity in the discipline of fine art is not an end in itself, but a means of furthering the process of development. The inter-relationship between quantity, development, and hence quality forms the sociopragmatic backdrop to the giving of compliments, which as well as referring to the amount of work, also refer to time taken, e.g., 'mama, that must have taken you a long time'; personal evaluation on the part of the tutor: 'I like this very much'; or probe further the physical process of creating the work: 'I'm interested in this piece. What material did you use?'

These utterances are ambiguous as they could just work as simple statements or questions. For this reason, Japanese students tended not to acknowledge the compliments.

The sociopragmatic understanding of this type of question can easily be lost in the cross-cultural situation where it may be interpreted simply in its morpho-syntactic manifestation as an information question as indicated in Example 2a, or it may be interpreted as a criticism of some sort but not as an implicit request for explanation as shown in Example 2b.

EXAMPLE 2a
Discussing with the tutor the essay you have written about the work of a certain author.

T: When you wrote this [pointing to a particular sentence], were you implying that you agreed with the author or were you criticizing him?

JS: I was criticizing him. (discourse completion test)

EXAMPLE 2b (with the same question by T)

JS: I'm sorry. I had written to intend to agree with him. (discourse completion test)

The contradiction formed by the alternative options in the either-or question suggests that the meaning of the student's sentence in his/her essay is unclear. Japanese students often make an appropriate linguistic response by saying which of the alternatives they meant, but they tend not to take up the indirect illocutionary force of a criticism (Example 2a), nor the implicit request for analytical explanation about why the sentence sounded ambiguous (Example 2b).

It became apparent from the discourse completion tests and subsequent discussion with British students that they felt uncomfortable responding to compliments from tutors. They did not wish to appear over-confident if they took up the compliment, and yet had to make response. This was often a simple 'yes', successfully completing the exchange without dwelling on it.
Failure to take up implicit criticism has more far-reaching effects than the failure to take up compliments. Whereas tutors may be content with no further elaboration on the theme of the compliment, possibly in recognition of students’ embarrassment (see fn. 5), they do expect criticism to be met with some kind of redress. This is usually a defence, such as the existence of mitigating circumstances; a justification, i.e., some inherently plausible reason why something was not done, done differently, etc.; or an apology, often in combination with mitigating circumstances. One of the most obvious reasons why such expectations are often not met by Japanese students operates at the pragmalinguistic level. They do not take up criticism because they have not understood the illocutionary force of the indirect speech acts promoting it.

This pragmalinguistic difficulty, however, is compounded by wider sociopragmatic ramifications. What makes implicit criticism more difficult to take up by the Japanese students is that in the British academic context, despite holding the power, tutors are unlikely to express it directly or if they do make a matter-of-fact statement, it is softened with a tag, implying shared knowledge, as in the above example. The implicit expression of criticism is ultimately a face-saving device for the student, and may even be put across in a jocular manner. In the terminology of Brown and Levinson (1987: 70), an utterance such as ‘you might want to try from a different angle’, or ‘it seems to me you need to do a lot of drawing’ is an ‘on-record face-threatening act with positive politeness ddefensive action’. The student’s positive face wants are attended to in so far as their in-group membership of the fine art discourse community is not threatened.

This egalitarian understanding of tutor-student roles whereby the student is treated as a responsible, although inexperienced, member of the discourse community, conflicts with the hierarchical instantiation of tutor-student roles in Japan, an instantiation that Japanese students will be familiar with and therefore schematically expect in their encounters with tutors. Japanese students are likely to be working on the assumption that tutors will give more direct instruction about the development and more explicit evaluation of the product such as, ‘you should change here like this’, or ‘this isn’t good enough’. This conforms to the findings of Takahashi and Beebe in their study of the speech act of correction in Japanese speakers (Takahashi and Beebe 1993: 144). Their evidence showed that when a person of higher status (a professor) is correcting someone in a lower position (a student), the Japanese tend to use a direct speech act of correction with less frequent use of internal modifiers or positive remarks, and therefore the correction sounds much more authoritarian than the American counterpart.

As well as the mismatch of expectations in terms of how tutors will linguistically express their authority, there is the additional difficulty of sociopragmatic transfer of familiar communication strategies. In this case, Japanese students are unlikely to have the communicative strategy of responding to criticism by giving excuses or analytical explanations because such response strategies themselves are generally not regarded as appropriate in Japanese social interaction. This conforms to the results of the Japanese discourse completion test, in which Japanese students tend not to give reasons, justifications, or analytical elaboration when responding to criticism. Hiraga and Turner (1996), by looking at the responses to criticisms and suggestions in the British and the Japanese academic settings, also showed that while the British students are primarily defenders, dealing with their own face wants by giving justifications based on analytical elaboration, the Japanese students are conciliators, showing more concern for attending the positive face of the tutor by admitting their shortcomings with no strong inclination to self-defence. This tendency of withholding justifications or reserving excuses in a response to criticism may be seen as a politeness strategy of maintaining one’s position in relation to others in the group. In Japan giving justification is considered too defensive of one’s own territory, thereby jeopardising the maintenance of one’s relative position with regard to other members of the group.

3.3. Analysis

In the central phase of the tutorial, the tutor persistently attempts to elicit the students’ critical analysis of their own work, because it is presupposed that analytical thinking and its verbalisation are required for development in Britain. The grammatical forms of the prompts addressed by the tutor may vary from imperatives, wh-questions, yes/no questions, tag questions, either/or questions, hypothetical questions, to comments, and they realise various speech acts including invitations, requests, compliments, implicit criticisms, suggestions and advice. These speech acts determine to a great extent the kind of pragmalinguistic elaboration that is required. Yet, their main purpose in the tutorial on the sociopragmatic level is to elicit elaboration, what might be broadly termed critical appraisal. This means that

---

9The concept of Japanese face in terms of the discernment of one’s relative position in a group is explained in more depth in the politeness literature, e.g., Matsumoto (1988) and Ide (1992), in which they claim that acknowledgement and maintenance of the relative position of others, rather than preservation of an individual’s proper territory, governs all social interaction (Matsumoto 1988: 405) in Japanese culture.
practically every question or comment by the tutor, no matter how simple, is eliciting analysis and evaluation, in the interests of development.

However, as the purpose of elaboration for critical appraisal is mostly implicit rather than explicitly outlined in the prompts, it is an area of particular difficulty for Japanese students, who have been educated under different educational systems. In Japanese academic settings, the focus of learning puts more emphasis on gaining factual knowledge or following the teacher's instruction. Traditionally, the learning process tended to be one of following the master. The follower watched and imitated the master. The point is that careful examination and analysis of the master's way, that is doh or 'tao', would accumulate development, and as a result, the 'following' student would gradually become a full member of the particular academic community. This is well characterised in the word 'apprenticeship'. 'Apprentice' in 'apprenticeship' is literally 'minarai' in Japanese, which is a compound word of miru 'to watch, or to observe' and nurari 'to learn, or to follow'. This is still a latent undercurrent in many phases of teacher-student interactions (see Rudolph 1994, for example), and we see it break out in a rather extreme form in cross-cultural situations.

The expectation of critical analysis in the British tutorial is at work in exchanges where the tutor is making alternative suggestions for the presentation of the work, or references to work by other artists, as well as when students are evaluating their own work. As with criticism, suggestions and recommendations tend to be made implicitly rather than explicitly. Students also have an inherent right to reject any suggestions made, providing they can give arguments for the approach they wish to follow. The implicit nature of suggestions is often realised in hypothetical scenarios, as in Example 3.

**EXAMPLE 3**

You are not very happy with the suggestion your tutor makes regarding your work.

T: It might be a good idea to suspend it from the ceiling rather than fix it to the wall. You would then be able to walk all the way round it and see it from different angles.

JS: That sounds good, but I would like to fix my work to the wall.

(discourse completion test)

---

For discussion on the relationship between cognitive models and sociopragmatic dynamics, see Turner and Hiraga 1996a. For the underlying cognitive models in Japanese learning, see Hiraga 1995.
critically analyse her work by using a hypothetical question. Here the tutor is attempting to get the student to pin down which of the twelve painted canvases she thinks are better than the others. She is reluctant to do this, seeing the twelve as one work. However, the tutor's question is not about itemising the canvases, but about the visual processes that are realised in them, for example, their relationship with space and depth. She wants her really to make a judgment on that level, and to this end concocts a rather elaborate scenario about a threat to put all but four of them on a bonfire.

EXAMPLE 5
T: Which is the best one?
JS: Mm, I can't say that because.-
T: Which is the worst one?

T: Are there any that are not here because they were no good?

T: Are there any of these which have not been put on the wall because you did not think they were very good? Have you done any that failed?
JS: Just ... these...
T: I'm really trying to find out how you can distinguish between something which enables you to say, 'I like this more than that; this is the way for ward, this is the way to go'.
JS: Mm-m.
T: They're not all of the same value.
JS: Yeah?
T: Understand? ... Mm, if we were to say, I'm going to ask you to choose four...
JS: Mm-m.
T: Let's say. And I've got a big bonfire over here, I've got a big fire, over here.-
JS: Mm, right.
T: And I'm going to put eight of them on the fire. And save four.
JS: Mm-m.
T: Right, and you're going to be very sad.
JS: MM.
T: Because your work is going on the fire. Which four would we keep?
JS: Mm-m.
T: Which four? Show me.
JS: I cannot choose.
T: Yes, you can. You must.
JS: Why do you know, why do you want to know that? Because, ...

The demand for elaboration comes from the sociopragmatic values of the genre which presuppose the demonstration of process and critique. In the cross-cultural situation with Japanese students, it is a strategy that seldom succeeds. If the student in the above example, although her personality of stubbornness is more or less related to the problem here, was conscious or aware of the values of taking other perspectives and giving a critical analysis and evaluation of her own work, the communication would have been more successful and would have led to the point of the tutor.

After four moves where the tutor prompts elaboration by carefully targeted questions which implicitly leave the student space, to be filled in a way appropriate to the student, that is in terms of her justification for her answer to the question, the fifth move is more direct by a 'bald-on-record' statement about the motivation for the question: 'I'm really trying to find out how you can distinguish...'. The importance of distinguishing the 'best' or the 'worst' or the already discarded work is not in the identification of a particular work, although this is the immediate face value of the question, but in the opportunity it affords the student to make a visual analysis and determine how the work should progress. For example, should it be to work more specifically in three dimensions, or to look at different means of treating perspectives? The tutor makes a further explicit statement about the work: 'They're not all of the same value.' After making this bald statement, he resumes his quest of getting the student to evaluate the different paintings by setting up the bonfire scenario and inviting her to save four of the twelve paintings. When the student still resists, he eventually reveals the rationale for his questioning, which encapsulates the rationale for the fine art tutorial: The development of a critique. The fact that this 'revelation' works as a kind of dramatic denouement in this extract, bears witness to the extent that the expectation of critique is taken for granted. The tutor does not really expect to have to spell it out. What it also reveals is the importance of the student being able to make the evaluation. It is obvious that the tutor is clear about which ones he thinks are better, but that is not as important as the student being able to see for herself, by understanding the visual criteria at stake.

We have also analysed the ways in which the British and the Japanese students
elaborate in response to their tutor's prompts for elaboration addressed in the form of comments and questions. Their results showed that the British students elaborated differently from the Japanese counterparts in terms of the type, the frequency and the choice of strategies. The British students employed analytical elaboration strategies, such as delimiting, comparative, and evaluative strategies, up to more than four times as much as the Japanese students, per person, per situation, whereas the British group used at least 50% fewer non-analytical strategies, such as technical, personal, informative, reconciling and committing strategies, than the Japanese groups in most situations. The notable differences in the choice of strategies were a wider and a more frequent use of the comparative strategy by the British informants, and a wider use of technical and personal strategies by the Japanese informants. Moreover, the reconciling and the committing strategies were deployed exclusively by the Japanese informants. These results suggest that the lack of analytical elaboration by the Japanese students in the British context is a transfer from their native sociopragmatic assumptions (for further discussion, see Hiraga and Turner 1985, Turner and Hiraga 1990a).

3.4 Inquiry

A useful strategy of inquiry is to locate areas of uncertainty and attempt to voice them. Voicing uncertainty is consonant with the generally dialectical process of development. For example, clarity can result from an awareness of what is not clear. In verbalising problems, issues become clearer and the tutor can also help this process of clarification by suggesting other possibilities or reducing a proliferation of interests by suggesting that the student concentrate on one particular aspect or mode of presentation. Unlike the above instances in 3.3, where the speech acts requiring analysis are usually indirect, the invitation to voice uncertainty may be made explicitly.

Japanese students seldom take the initiative to ask clarification questions of a developmental or exploratory sort, possibly because they are not accustomed to this kind of tutor-student interaction. The tendency to nod, or affirm what the tutor is saying, conforms to a different patterning of tutor-student exchanges in Japanese, where the likelihood is that the tutor will be instructing or imparting information which the student is acknowledging, without a great necessity to say very much. In cases where Japanese students do have questions, they tend to be of a technical nature, inquiries about opening times of the studio, or availability of the workshops and so on. More fundamental questions about the future development of their work such as 'my ideas seem very divided, does that matter?' or 'do you really think I should continue with my installation project?' seldom occur. This would seem to suggest that they are not fully aware of the sociopragmatic value of uncertainty and the acceptability of voicing it.

The importance of uncertainty in the dialectical process of development in the British context, and the reluctance to voice uncertainty in the Japanese context, seems to correlate with the measure of 'uncertainty avoidance' in different cultures researched in organisational sociology (Hofstede 1986, 1991). Whilst Japan rates as a high 'uncertainty avoidance' culture, Britain rates as a low one. It would seem that behavioural aspects of avoiding uncertainty bear some relationship to the kinds of speech acts expected in negotiating certainty and uncertainty. While the negotiation of uncertainty is prevalent in tutor-student interaction in the British academic context, to the extent that uncertainty itself appears prominently as a topic, Japanese tutor-student interaction appears to be predicated on certainty, the one who knows is 'followed' by the one who wants to know.

This difference in emphasis is reflected also in questions encouraging students to anticipate future developments. This is particularly apparent as the tutorial winds down. At this stage, tutors tend to ask such questions as 'is there anything else that you need to tell me about?' 'do you have anything to ask me?' or simply, 'do you have any questions?' Both cultures use the same closing strategy or a variant thereof as in Example 6 but its function in the Japanese setting is purely formulaic, whereas in the British setting it can be either formulaic, that is functioning as a pre-closing move, or a genuine inquiry, as although the student has had ample opportunity to voice any anxieties during the main part of the tutorial, there may be a residual query.

**EXAMPLE 6**

T: Is there anything that you want to tell me?
JS: No.
T: Are you sure?
JS: Yes.

[Intermediate; 6 months] (videotaped tutorial)

The most typical response of the Japanese students is just to say 'no' to the question. This response often gives the tutor the impression that s/he does not understand the implication of the question and leads him to further seek the agreement from the student by saying, 'Are you sure?' Or it may suggest a lack of commitment, even though the students may simply be stating the truth. This, however, depends very much on what has gone on in the tutorial up to this point. The sociopragmatic import of the question is that it is an opportunity, and not just a

---

1The measure of 'uncertainty avoidance' is defined as 'the extent to which the members of a culture feel threatened by uncertain or unknown situations' (Hofstede 1991: 113).
4. CONCLUSION

In this study, we have looked at the pragmatic difficulties deriving from two relevant areas of sociopragmatic structuring: the patterns of interaction generated by tutor-student power relationship and the differing emphasis placed on achievement, analysis and inquiry in the assessment of students' development. \(^9\)

Firstly, tutor-student interaction patterns in the two cultures reflect the differing power distance between tutor and students. Although tutors have a higher institutional status than students in both cultures, British tutors tend to regard students as full members of the discourse community, whereas their Japanese counterparts treat them as non-members. This leads to an egalitarian interaction in the British context, in which face-threatening acts towards students are addressed implicitly and students are encouraged to exercise their critical appraisal and to voice inquiries, worries, and doubts; on the other hand, an authoritarian interaction is more prevalent in the Japanese context, where students' face is not attended to as much as the tutors' and they are expected to follow instructions rather than to criticize or to explore on their own.

Secondly, the dominant values behind the assessment of students' performance and progress are interpreted differently in Britain and Japan. Three values we have isolated in relation to tutorial interaction – achievement, analysis, and inquiry – are differently perceived in the British and the Japanese contexts. Therefore, they tend to manifest themselves with a different focus or emphasis in the sociopragmatic dynamics of tutorial interaction. In Britain, achievement is measured by dialectical development, whereas in Japan by cumulative mastery. Analysis is evaluated through independent evaluation and critique in Britain, and through careful execution of requirements in Japan. Inquiry is encouraged in Britain as uncertainty is a positive process and the students are expected to question, while in Japan on the whole certainty is preferred and the students are expected to concur.

The study has shown that for an understanding of the sociopragmatic assumptions operating in spoken interaction in the British academic context, it is necessary to draw on and interrelate the working of deep-set cultural proclivities with the speech acts used. Where these sociopragmatic assumptions are operating in a situation of cross-cultural communication with Japanese students, a different set of deep-set cultural proclivities are operating for the students, and sometimes, these are diametrically opposed to what is expected. It is claimed that framing the speech acts within structures operating differently in each culture, and in turn framing those structures within a specific genre, with its own communicative rationale, is a valid means of gaining access to explanations at the sociopragmatic level. It is further claimed that the genre analytical approach with its potential for making

\(^9\)This conforms to what the students described in retrospective interviews and in the focus group recordings on their understanding of the nature and purpose of the fine art tutorial.
clear both the pragmalinguistic demands of recurring speech acts and their sociopragmatic motivation, could be profitably introduced into the mainstream of second language acquisition pedagogy.
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