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This paper extends research on interactional forms of teacher repeats and their management in third turn by analyzing teacher-student interaction in Korean EFL classrooms. Research has shown that classroom interaction is characterized by an overwhelming number of teacher repetition in feedback moves following the Initiation-Response-Feedback sequence (Sinclair & Coulthard 1975); whereby the teacher controls the interaction through evaluation of the student answer. In the tightly controlled contexts of Korean EFL classrooms, the teacher appears to be constantly placed in a position of conflict. She has to follow a tightly scheduled lesson plan, which allocates a rather strict time frame and organization, at the same time attend to individual student learning. The focal practice is understood as these teachers’ attempt at resolving the obstacle through interactive practices of repeating the student response. The focal practice promotes the possibility of producing a socially harmonious, accepting response (i.e., intersubjectivity) without compromising lesson progressivity, despite the fact that the responses or part of the response produced by the student is not fully accurate. Finally, the interactive consequences of the focal practice are compared with other evaluative tokens that may also occur in the third turn.

I. INTRODUCTION

Past studies on classroom interaction have proved that the third position is an organic part of the instructional institution where known-answer question abounds; this is evident in Sinclair and Coulthard’s study on the initiation-response-feedback (IRF) sequence (1975), Mehoul’s study of classroom interaction (1978), and other interaction based studies of the third turn (Hall, 1998; Hellerman, 2003; Lee, 2007; Waring, 2008). This paper extends this research into L2 learning contexts by exploring a commonly employed method of teacher’s evaluative behavior in third turn – repetition practices – that exploits the positional specificity of the classroom institution (Heritage & Clayman, 2010;
By adopting a conversation analytic approach (CA), the aim of this paper is twofold: 1) to analyze the function of teacher’s third turn repetitional practices following conflicting responses and 2) to examine its relation to the overall objectives of the lesson and student learning. By doing so the article captures the dynamic and complex interplay of L2 classrooms that move beyond oversimplification of the interaction (Seedhouse, 2004) and contributes to prior CA work on SLA which view learning as rooted in the moment-by-moment deployment of locally accomplished, and interactionally organized courses of practical activities (Firth & Wagner, 2007; Markee, 2008; Pekarek Doehler, 2010) rather than as static, context independent, individual traits.

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The context of this study is Korean EFL secondary classrooms in which the interaction is conducted in English.¹ This particular context is chosen for the following reasons. First, interaction in these secondary learning locations is understudied in the research literature despite the important role it plays in EFL contexts. In foreign language learning contexts (such as ELT in Korea or Japan), the classroom is the main and sometimes only source of students’ exposure to the target language; therefore, their language use provides an important area for study (Kang, 2008). Second, the dynamics and characteristics of the context can only be captured through a detailed turn-by-turn analysis of teacher student talk afforded by CA methodology. The analysis may reveal important characteristics of these classrooms as well as ways for the L2 classroom institution in other countries with similar dynamics. Third, because teachers in these secondary school English classes follow a prescribed language learning curriculum and time frame provided by the larger institution (including but not limited to the Korean ministry of education and demands by the school administration), the interaction is more controlled and planned than in second language learning contexts, leading to more instances of IRF sequences which are frequently observed in controlled teacher fronted contexts (Waring, 2008).

In secondary school EFL classrooms, the teacher is constantly placed in a position of conflict. She has to follow the overall curriculum design and ensuing lesson plans, which allocate a rather strict time frame and organization, and at the same time attend to

¹ With the popularity of communicative language teaching in the late 20th century, the approach of teaching English through English in EFL contexts has been prescribed and advocated with the goal of raising students who can communicate in English, especially in countries such as Korea and Japan. In Korea, the Korean ministry of education established the Teaching English through English (TETE) policy with the seventh English curriculum in 2001. For general characteristics and proceedings of TETE classrooms, refer to Ko (2008).
individual learning as well. This may bring tension in achieving the two goals of L2 classrooms in particular, as individual learning of the foreign language (by attending to contingent student responses) and completing the required curriculum (including the textbook) in the limited time allocated (semester, year) are both important goals for the teacher (Cazden, 2001).

An important method for resolving this conflict may be found in the teacher’s interactional work during the lesson. Among various measures that may be employed, this article focuses on teacher repeats in the third turn of the IRF cycle where students provide conflicting answers in the second turn. Analysis of the feedback turn in these conflict situations shows the importance of the focal practice in managing a balance between progressivity and intersubjectivity between the speakers (Schegloff, 1992). Intersubjectivity, here, refers to a shared understanding of the situation between interlocutors (in this case teacher and student) (Wertsch, 1985). Before generally characterizing the focal practice a concrete example is shown in Extract 1 (See Appendix for transcription conventions). The teacher is holding a graduation cap in her hand in front of her middle school students. Students’ responses to the teacher’s question asking about the object in her hand (line 05, “what is it.”) is produced almost simultaneously at lines 17 and 18 – “Pretty”, “hat.” The focal practice is produced by the teacher at line 19 in the form of an acknowledgement token followed by a partial repeat, “Yes it’s a hat” (Hereafter, students’ responses are designated in the left margins of transcripts with a “b->”, and the focal practice with a “=>”).

Extract 1. HS_final

01 T: Hey everyone, what [am I wearing on my hea::d?
02 [((teacher puts on a graduation cap))
03 S1: Ye::[s.
04 Ss: [Yeah.
05 T: a->>What is it<.
06 Ss: Haha[ha((laughter))
07 S2: b-> [PRETT[y::.
08 S3: b-> [(hat)
09 T: => Yes it’s a ha::t. ((nods her head))
10 A::nd a special hat for::
11 When do you wear this.
At line 01, the teacher first asks the students for the name of the object she is holding with a wh-question that requires a noun form as a response, to which several students incorrectly answers "Ye::s" (lines 2-3). It may be that some students have confused wh-questions with yes-no questions, which are generally followed by either a yes or a no response. At line 05, the teacher re-issues her question using the pronoun "it" which refers anaphorically back to the object she is holding. This question may be analyzed as a form of other-initiated repair (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977) that identifies the previous response as interactionally inadequate (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979). At line 07, S2 responds to the reissued question with "Pretty." (line 07). The students' responses (lines 03-04, line 07) display trouble in providing an adequate answer to the teacher's question. However, in overlap, one student (S3) produces the correct answer "hat" (line 08). Following this turn the teacher provides acknowledgment using a 'yes' token and repeats the correct term in full sentence form: "Yes it’s a ha::t." along with a head nod. Therefore, it appears that the teacher tacitly rejects the incorrect responses ("Yes" and "Pretty") by not acknowledging them verbally in the third turn. On the one hand, the teacher's inclusion of the correct response ("hat") in full sentence ratifies that response and also serves as a model for students. It demonstrates the adequate language form to be used following the question. On the other hand, the teacher's rejection of incorrect responses occurs tacitly by not acknowledging them in the next turn although it would be a relevant next action to provide an explanation after a wrong response by a student (Cazden, 2001). This action effectively moves the instructional sequence forward – the hat leads to the topic of today’s lesson on ‘graduation and job aptitude.’ The teacher’s tacit rejection does not provide information that may facilitate other students’ ability to reconcile their errors, such as an explanation.

The focal interactional practice occurs at line 09, where the teacher produces "Yes it’s a ha::t" in the third turn of the IRF sequence, which is designed to be a possibly complete response (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974) through the use of final falling intonation. In ordinary conversation, these type of third-turn evaluations marks the final boundary of a sequence (Schegloff, 2007) and signals that it is time to move on to the next action. In classroom talk also, third turn evaluations have been characterized as marking ‘case closed' (Waring, 2008, p. 584). Indeed, in Extract 1, a new sequence that constitutes the next stage of the course of action in the instructional plan is initiated after the focal practice. The third turn repeat is followed by a question on the hat's usage that

---

2 A detailed lesson plan including lesson content and time line have been provided prior to each lesson recorded allowing the researcher to make claims on the teacher's next planned action. The topic of the lesson (for Extract 1), as described in the lesson plan is ‘Job Aptitude.’ The talk shown here corresponds to the ‘warm-up activity’ phase of the lesson whose goal is to "facilitate the atmosphere as if students were about to graduate from high school."
begins with “and” (line 10, “And a special hat for:”) which is reformulated into a question (“when do you wear this.”). And-prefaced questions have been analyzed as doing the activity of making the question to follow sustain an already ongoing activity rather than constituting a new departure in the talk (Heritage & Sorjonen, 1994).

This article examines an interactive practice for managing the pedagogical goal of the classroom when a conflict between lesson progress and individual student feedback occurs (i.e., Extract 1 T’s repeat: “Yes it’s a hat.” [line 19]). The remainder of this article describes the context in which the focal interactive practice occurs, and then describes the general nature and implication of this practice in Korean EFL classrooms.

III. THE INTERACTIONAL CONTEXT FOR THE FOCAL PRACTICE

The focal practice is positioned after a particular type of sequence of interaction (Schegloff, 2007) that makes relevant a particular action context. The first part of this sequence involves an action in which the teacher asks a question (the first pair part of a question-answer adjacency pair) whose answer is already known to the teacher. Such known-answer questions are conventionally understood as being tied to classroom settings (Mehan, 1979). They make relevant an answer from the students (the second pair part of a question-answer adjacency pair). For instance, in Extract 1, the teacher tests the students’ ability to answer the question as well as name the object in question: “What am I wearing on my head?” (line 01). The second part of the sequence in focus involves student responses to these known answer questions. For example, in Extract 1, S1’s “Ye::s” (line 03) and students’ “Yeah” (line 04) all constitute the second pair part of the question-answer sequence. The last part of the sequence and the focal practice itself involves repeating a portion or all of the student response, and ending the repeat with falling intonation. This third position repeat constitutes an organic part of such instructional sequence, and as will be demonstrated in the analysis, in these EFL classroom contexts, repeating actions tend to acknowledge only the correct portion of the student response; and excludes any mentioning of the incorrect ones when both are produced in the second turn.

It should be noted that repetition in third turn can serve different functions depending on sentence final intonation. When it is employed through sentence-fina rising intonation, its recipients may understand it as repair. In the classroom context, repeating the learner’s erroneous utterance with a rising intonation has been described as a strategy
for conducting repair without using direct negative evaluation (Seedhouse, 2004). On the other hand, when employed with sentence final falling intonation third turn repeats have been demonstrated to close the sequence (Hellerman, 2003). The focal practice is restricted to those instances in which teacher repetition occurs in feedback moves through sentence final falling intonation. They are not uncommonly preceded by repair initiations that share the same format through final rising tone (refer to Extract 3 for an example). Finally, the focal practice occurs in the wake of multiple responses by students that include incorrect ones.

The focal practice is positioned after student responses that include those that do not fit the teacher’s question and therefore, the teacher’s instructional plan. Prior work on the social organization of rejecting responses, denying, and disagreeing, have proved that these turns are frequently accompanied by additional talk that attempt to preserve social solidarity (Clayman, 2002; Ford, 2001; Ford, Fox, & Hellerman, 2004; Heritage, 1984; Schegloff, 2007). Rejecting incorrect responses without additional talk (i.e., explanation) may be seen as violating the aforementioned interactional norm on maintaining solidarity. In the classroom context, however, the teacher has to consider an additional component – class time (which ranges from forty to fifty minutes). For example, S1’s “pretty.” (line 07) is not a proper way of answering the teacher’s question (“What is it.”). However, in Extract 1, the teacher does not address the incorrect answer, only responding to the portion of the utterance (“hat”) that is correct and in line with the instructional focus. This allows the teacher to forward the lesson and follow the instructional time of five minutes allocated to this particular activity in the lesson plan (refer to footnote 2). This practice effectively avoids spending time on dealing with problematic responses, which may jeopardize the lesson plan as a whole.

IV. METHOD AND DATA

Conversation analysis (CA) inductively examines data that ranges from naturally occurring to institutional interaction and represents an emic approach that prioritizes interpretations that are displayed, and oriented to, by participants themselves (for review, see Heritage 1984). Institutional CA, in particular, builds on the findings about the

---

3 An example of this is provided in the following extract taken from Seedhouse (2004, p. 166, the line numbers have been modified):

01 Li: er and I: I am very good person, 
02 and [[[laughs]]] and give she another one 
03 LL: [[[laugh]]]
04 T: → give she?
05 Li: (.) give her another one.
institution of talk to analyze the operations of social institutions in talk (Heritage & Clayman, 2010). The analysis centers on how specific types of turns and actions are being employed to achieve institutional goals. This article is part of a larger project dealing with actions that get implemented through turns involving repetitions of others’ talk in classroom interaction. The larger data set is drawn from approximately 12 hours of classroom interaction in EFL contexts (7 high school and 5 middle school classrooms from various parts of Korea) over multiple time periods collected between the years 2008-2009. All of the collected classes have been videotaped for evaluation purposes; therefore, there is a high degree of planning in each of these settings. The teacher has an overall plan of how the interaction will proceed and a detailed lesson plan is submitted prior to the actual classroom. The teachers are all nonnative speakers of English and learners share the same L1 (Korean) with the teacher; however, the classroom lesson proceeds mostly in English (the target language) following the government’s recommendation of administering TETE classrooms in Korea.

The focal practice emerged inductively as part of an examination of a sub-collection of 80 cases of virtually identical, third turn evaluation repeats. The focal practice was found in 11 cases. There are two major reasons for the rarity of the focal practice. First, students in these EFL contexts tended not to respond when they were unsure of their answer. Therefore, it was relatively difficult to find occasions that contained incorrect answers. Furthermore, since these classes were videotaped to be evaluated by other teachers, they were highly rehearsed resulting in fewer student responses that were incorrect. However, the existence of the focal practice in these controlled contexts suggest that they will be more frequently observed in ordinary classroom talk free of cameras and observers. Second, evaluations through repeating student responses were rare because teachers would frequently use other tokens of positive evaluations such as “That’s correct” or “Very good” instead of repeating the student response. All cases were transcribed by the author using Jefferson’s notation system (in Atkinson & Heritage, 1984). The cases analyzed herein are particularly clear examples of the phenomenon, but are also representative of the cases in the larger collection; negative cases are included to avoid anecdotalism and ensure validity. The use of recorded data permits others to check the validity of the claims made in this study (Silverman, 2001).

V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section begins by documenting the existence and operation of the focal practice with four types of evidence, including the default operation of third turn repeats, two more cases of the focal practice (in addition to Extract 1), one boundary case (Schegloff,
1997), and one negative case (Silverman, 2001). Finally, the function of the focal practice is clarified by comparing it to others for evaluating student responses, such as rejecting them, and initiating repair.

1. The Social Organization of Third Turn Repeats: Progressivity as the Default Situation

This section demonstrates that third turn repeats, which evaluate the prior response, involve the institution’s goal of progressing the lesson. Evaluative actions in the form of repeats normally involve sequence connection by providing the other person with repeated information that adequately facilitates the progressivity of the lesson. The primary form of evidence for this claim is that these turns are followed by a sequentially separate but connected action. For example, see Extract 2, in which the teacher is previewing word meaning before reading the main text by asking students to provide the Korean equivalent of the English word. (Note that the cases in this section do not contain conflicting responses, which provides the context for the occurrence of the focal practice.)

Extract 2. MS-CT

01 T: a-->Mhm. A::h what’s the meaning of the first word season.
02 Ss: b-->kayce::[:]
03 T: => [Mhm okay kayce and. uh
04 a-->What about the second wo:rd?
05 Ss: b--> eimihata.
06 T: => Yes eimihata::,
07 a-->and the third one is::?
08 Ss: b--> = nalssi::
09 T: a--> A::nd the fourth one?
10 Ss: b--> ahnkay.
11 T: => >Aha<, ahnkay-kkin.
12 a--> And the last one special.
13 Ss: b--> thukpyelhan.
14 T: => thukpyelhan okay. Good.
15 So. With this vocabulary background,

---

4 Korean is romanized following the Yale system which represents the actual sounds rather than the standard orthography of Korean (Sohn, unpublished). The abbreviations used for the Korean transcript is provided in the Appendix.
What are we going to learn today?

In order to check the students’ vocabulary knowledge prior to reading the main text, the teacher employs a succession of question (a-›), answer (b-›) and evaluation (©-›) sequences. Except for lines 07-09 where the teacher moves on to the next question using an and-prefaced question after the students’ response, the evaluative turns include a repeat of the second turn and an acknowledgement token (e.g., okay, yes). After the series of IRF sequences that ask for word meaning ends at line 14, the teacher moves on to the next stage of the instructional sequence in the lesson by using an emphasized “so” (indicated by the underline) with final intonation. This term connects the prior IRF sequences on word meaning with a new IRF sequence on today’s topic. Through each third turn repeats, the teacher closes each sequence and sequence progressivity is achieved.

Evaluation in third position articulates a stance taken up by the teacher toward what the second pair part speaker (students) has said in the prior turn and repeats serve to acknowledge the answer through the very action of repeating it. This action of repeating is important in instructional settings, especially in language learning classrooms where the primary goal is to practice the L2. Repeats provide additional language input to students and act to validate the student answers by presenting them as jointly constructed courses of actions. Most importantly, third turn repeats serve the additional function of connecting IRF sequences and progressing the lesson as shown above.

2. The Focal Practice

This section provides two more examples of the focal practice. First, see Extract 3 taken from a middle school EFL classroom. At line 91, the teacher’s question (‘What is it’) queries about the topic of today’s lesson (“Different people and different food”) based on the talk that came before on fast food. Here, most of the teacher questions are addressed to the entire classroom rather than individual learners.

Extract 3. CN-NP

73 T:  a-› How about those foods from the- those three companies?
74  (0.5)
75 Ss:  b-› BA:: [D
76 T:  [Yes they are unhealthy food.
77  So::: we call them- ((clapping hands to call attention))
78  a-› What kind of food do we call them?
Instead of providing the topic of the lesson herself, the teacher stops mid turn ("today's topic is- ") and produces a question. The teacher's question in focus is repeated using different formats, "What is it? Food a:::nd?" (line 91), the second of which that provides the linguistic structure of the candidate answer. Koshik (2002) termed these kind of questions as a "designedly incomplete utterance" to enlist class participation in completing the phrase. The question leads to the chorus response in lines 93 and 94. After a brief pause students respond "health(y)" (lines 93-94) which is recycled from the teacher's previous mentioning of "healthy food" (line 85). The teacher repeats "Healthy?" (line 96), and ends the repeat with rising intonation. With this the teacher
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initiates repair, which undertakes to have ‘obstacles’ removed in the service of the production of a sequentially implicated next (Schegloff et al., 1977) and indeed this questioning repeat solicits a correct answer from one student (S1, line 97). The teacher first confirms this response with “yes” (line 98) and then asks the students to repeat the topic (“different people, different food”). Thus the teacher claims acceptance of S1’s answer without overtly rejecting the ones that are incorrect (lines 93-94, “health” and “healthy”) and therefore did not concede to the lesson plan. The focal practice occurs in line 99 (‘Let’s read it together different people different food’). This third turn repetition highlights what needs to be learned and what is acceptable in terms of relevant lesson goals. The repeat is followed by an introduction to the topic of lesson five in terminal overlap with the students’ choral repeat (which serves as a second pair part to the teacher’s request to repeat the sentence). For another example, see Extract 4. Extract 4 is drawn from a high school EFL classroom. The teacher has called on S1 to answer a question (line 01) about a story that the class has just read.

Extract 4. 1306 High school

01 T: And the next student please. A:h
02 a->How did I know what my parent said are not true?
03 S1: b->Because her neighbor.
04 (0.2)
05 T: Right. You’re (a) very smart student.
06 =>Because a-I kn- I knew my neighbor had no cabbage plants
07 at all okay?
08 (.)
09 T: -> Next- next please. An- what did I hear when my mother
10 came back from the hospital.
11 (0.5)
12 T: What did I hear when my mother came ba:ck from the
13 hospital. u::h I heard uh please look at (.) the sentence.

At line 1, the teacher asks S1 a reading comprehension question on how she (the narrator) came to know that her parents had lied. S1 answers by employing an ungrammatical sentence that includes the word “neighbor.” The final intonation indicates that this turn is complete for S1 although it is a grammatically incomplete sentence in English (‘Because her neighbor.’). The teacher accepts the response with “Right.” (line 5) which claims knowledge-based authority (Gardner, 2007), followed by a positive evaluation of the student – “You’re (a) very smart student (line 5).” She
subsequently repeats S1's answer in the same turn by re-constructing it into a complete sentence: "Because I knew my neighbor had no cabbage plants at all okay?" Through this partial repeat in third turn the teacher accepts the prior answer by treating it as unproblematic. As in the previous extracts, the teacher designs her third turn evaluation by including a repetition of the student's response. However, in this case, the teacher designs the focal practice as a question by adding "okay?" to the repeat. The students do not respond and the teacher moves on to the next question. The turn final "okay?" is evidence of the focal practice functioning as a learning tool by modeling the adequate language form, at the same time acknowledging the previous student response. As in the other cases, the focal practice is immediately followed by a next question therefore, moving the lesson forward.

In sum, in Excerpts 1, 3 and 4, the teachers' selective repeat of the students' response (at lines 09, 98-99, 06, respectively) possibly has negative consequences for individual student learning by not producing explicit explanation or rejection that may adequately facilitate the speaker’s ability to reconcile their error. In each case, the focal practice is understood as pursuing the progressivity of the lesson. Intersubjectivity is achieved by designing the third turn as a jointly constructed course of action (Schegloof, 2007) through repeating a correct student response. After the repeat, the speaker of the focal practice moves on to the next sequence in progress. This is demonstrated in the turn initial units that organize the following turns (e.g., and, so, next). While in most repair practices, progressivity is pitted against intersubjectivity (Heritage, 2007), these third turn repeats are ingeniously designed to achieve both through a single turn.

It can be argued that one way the teacher can bring solidarity to the classroom is through the use of the focal practice. The focal practice is affiliative in at least three ways. First, as a practice of third turn evaluation (Scheglof, 2007), the focal practice accepts the prior response by being composed as a partial repeat. At least syntactically, then the focal practice does not make concessions to the facticity of the student’s epistemic authority. Second, it can be preceded by a repair insertion that leads to a (partially)correct answer rather than direct correction or rejection. It also models the response for the whole class to repeat and take notice of. Third, the focal practice is frequently followed by a ‘yes’ token or a positive evaluation ("That’s great," "Good") that together with the repeat doubly acknowledges the response even when they are incomplete. Thus, we can say that the focal practice pursues solidarity with the student without disturbing the progressivity of the lesson. It is therefore, an effective practice for the teachers in promoting harmony in an institution specific situation; EFL classrooms.
3. A Boundary Case: Evidence from What Follows the Focal Practice

In the previous section, the evidence for the function of the focal practice was found in the placement and organization of the turn in the three turn IRF sequence. This section provides evidence that recipients of the focal practice orient to its function as well. The focal practice normatively closes the sequence (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). However, the following sequence also begins by teacher initiation. The teacher who produces the focal practice does not stop speaking, but rather continues to advance their turn by producing a related action that itself normatively requires a response.

This section provides a boundary case when the focal practice is followed by an initiating action by the student rather than the teacher. In the following extract, S3 is summarizing the story *Snow White*, which was assigned as homework in the previous week by the teacher. During the summery, the teacher has been interrupting S3 to check if the class knows the meaning of certain words by asking them to translate each word into Korean. In the following example, the teacher asks for the Korean equivalent of the word ‘faint’ at line 06; at the same time we can see the teacher correcting S3’s pronunciation of the first sound (‘f’) of the word ‘faint’.

**Extract 5. DG-middle school**

```
01 S3:      when snow white
02     (1.0)
03 S3:      ate the apple, she (f/p)aintaed.
04        The [dwarfs-
05 T1:     [Just a minute please.
06       a→She fainted.
07     (1.5)
08 SS: b→ssulec-ess[-
      fall.down-PST
    fell down-=
09 T1: =>  [e ssulec-ess-sumnita, kicelhay-ss-sumnita::, ca.
       yes fall.down-PST-POL fainted-PST-POL now
       Yes fell down, fainted::, now.
10     (1.0) ((T nods toward S3)
11 S3:    The dwarfs looked at snow white was dead.
```
At line 5, the teacher produces a first pair part question (‘she fainted.’), which asks for the Korean equivalent of the word ‘faint.’ through a declarative question format. When students begin to offer “ssulec-ess- (fell down)” as a candidate answer (line 08), the teacher produces a repeat in overlap (“ssulec-ess-summita”) and follows with a more accurate Korean translation “kicelhay-ss-summita:: (fainted).” Rather than continuing to speak, the teacher ends the third turn repeat turn with ca “now” in final-falling intonation. S3 orients to T1’s nod (line 11) as a cue to move on to the next part of the summary. The focal practice in line 09 is a social one for claiming the teacher’s acceptance of a student response, regardless of whether or not it is “objectively” adequate; possibly in order to demonstrate the meaning of the word ‘faint’ to the whole classroom. The focal practice is followed by a continuation of the previous activity by the student, which is reading the summary. This sequence containing the repeat acts as an insertion sequence, produced in overlap and in a rushed manner in order to aid other students’ comprehension of the summary production. It progresses the lesson forward and S3 orients to it in that way.

Extract 5 serves as a boundary case because it is different from the other cases analyzed before in terms of what follows the focal turn. The difference may be explained by the instructional context in which the sequence occurs. In the previous extracts, the teacher was responsible for how the lesson is organized; therefore, the sequence proceeded by teacher initiation. On the other hand, in Extract 5, the focal practice was inserted in a student activity context. Therefore, it is the student’s responsibility to proceed with the ongoing activity, and follow the overall lesson plan. Although the producers of the turns that follow the focal practice differ in these cases, they provide evidence for the nature of the action that their original unit was to accomplish; move the lesson forward.

4. A Negative Case: Evidence from Nonoccurrence

It is possible to find negative cases (Silverman, 2001) where the focal practice does not occur after conflicting responses. Rather, the third turn may question the student’s response rather than repeat it. Repair actions in the third turn are generally followed by further talk from the student, which blocks the teacher from progressing with the lesson. For a detailed example see Extract 6. Prior to this extract, the teacher has asked the class to make ‘there is-’ and ‘there are-’ sentences using objects and people present in the classroom.
Extract 6. HM middle school (group work)

282 T: a→Let’s have a team work.
283 You can make ‘there is there are’ sentences. So:
284 Each group make ‘There is’ TWO sentences.
285 (1.0) ((writes on board))
286 T: and ‘there are’ two sentences.
287 Look around this. classroom. Oka:y?
288 GO.
289 (2.0) ((teacher walks toward back of the classroom))
290 T: Discuss first.
291 If you finish. Please bring your board to the front.
292 Oka:y?
(8 lines omitted)
301 T: In the classroom. In the classroom.
302 (10.0) ((Students are engaged in group work))
303 S5: b→There is a monkey there is a monkey.
304 ON the tree? ((looks up at T2 who is standing nearby))
305 (1.2)
306 T: => In the classroom? (0.2) In here? ((gestures ‘here’))
307 S5: → On the tree? ((glances up))
308 T: => In- In the classroom.
309  A mon[key?
310 S5: → [Monkey on the tree. ON the tree.
311 T: [A::h okay. "Okay.
312 S5: You can make this kind of. [sentence.
313 [Um.
314 → (We can see.) ((points toward small board))
315 T: okay yes.
316 S5: → On the tree.
317 T: There is what and where. [There is a monkey and
318 S5: [Oh.
319 T: whe::re. where.
320 S5: → on on the- [on the
321 T: [we need.=
322 S5: → on the tree.
323 T:=> On the tree. Ye::s.
324 (0.2)
At line 302, the teacher walks toward a group located in the back of the classroom. Based on his observation of a picture on the back wall depicting a monkey playing on the tree, S5 produces “There is a monkey on the tree?” (lines 303-304) while looking upward toward the teacher standing nearby. S5 designs his answer as a question using final-rising intonation to be confirmed by the teacher. The 1.2 second delay at line 305 displays trouble by the teacher to respond. In the next line, the teacher initiates repair, “In the classroom?” possibly because she could not locate a monkey in the classroom (other students have produced sentences such as “There are fifteen girls in the classroom”). However, S5 repeats “on the tree?” again with final-rising intonation (the emphasis on the preposition ‘on’ suggests that he may be trying to check if “on” is the correct preposition to use). The teacher responds again with “In- in the classroom.” with final intonation indicating that the student should make sentence using an object ‘in’ the classroom. At lines 311-312, the teacher confirms the student’s response with “okay” and an acknowledgment of the sentence “you can make this kind of sentence” but this is followed by S5’s attempt to legitimize his answer (“we can see”) and another repeat of “on the tree”. In this way the student re-pursues a third turn from the teacher that includes a positive evaluation. In the following lines, S5 continues to repeat “on the tree” and at line 327 the teacher ultimately confirms this repeat with “Yeah” and repeats “on the tree” before moving on to another group. She has not yet located the monkey (which is evidenced by her confusion at line 325) but is willing to let this issue go in order to proceed to another group. The initial non-occurrence of a teacher’s repetition in the third turn after a student response brings trouble and delay lesson progression. The teacher ends up spending most of her time with this student and is unable to check how other groups are managing the task (which is what she has planned to do in her lesson plan). Evidence for the function of third turn repetition in bringing progress is its absence after problematic answers as shown in this example.

Earlier it was argued that third turn repeats can be used to bring solidarity between students and teacher. We also saw that in contexts of teacher-controlled and teacher-fronted EFL lessons, they can achieve progressivity. In contrast, when teacher’s repeat does not occur, it leads to repair as shown in Extract 6. Other third turn responses can be mobilized towards more repair ends. Specifically, they can be a practice for achieving repair for individual students to resolve their problem albeit unsuccessfully at the cost of time spent on other students.
5. Alternative Moves after Conflicting Responses

In the wake of multiple responses following teacher questions, the focal practice is only one of many conversational moves that speakers can make. Insofar as members understand the action accomplished by a practice of interaction by reference to relevantly alternative practices (Schegloff, 1996), examination of such alternatives provides additional insight into the nature of the focal practice.

As demonstrated earlier, teachers’ third turn repeats in the context of multiple student response brings sequence closing as well as lesson progressivity. Accepting the answer through repeat brings closure to the question-answer sequence by positive evaluation. Compared to the focal practice, one alternative move is to explicitly reject the student response through various practices of disapproval. For example, see Extract 8, where the teacher rejects student responses with “no” (line 09). The teacher and students are engaged in a line by line translation activity of a reading text (poem).

Extract 8. HM middle school

01 T: So: hanulalay-eykwulum-tul-iiss-ne::y.
    sky under-at cloud-PLR-NOM exist-DEC
    So: there are clouds under the sky::.
    ((while gazing at the projector screen))
02
03 T: a->Can you make this sentence?
04
05 T: a->In English?
06 Ss: b->mmm sky-
07 T: a->Uh hanulalay. Hanul [alay.
    sky under sky under
    Uh sky under. Sky [under.
08 S?: b->
    [Sky under.
09 T: => No:[:.
10 S: b1-> [Under sky?=
11 T: =>=under the sky. Okay? Under the sky.
12 S: under the sky.
13 T: kwulum-tul-iiss-ne::y. there [is or there are.
    cloud-PLR-NOM exist-DEC
    cloud exists::. there [is or there are.
14 Ss: [there are.
At line 07, the teacher asks the students to provide the English phrase corresponding to the Korean 
hamulalay. When the students incorrectly begin to produce the English phrase using the Korean word order (“sky under”), the teacher explicitly rejects it with a “no” in the third turn. When students immediately correct the word order and produce “under sky”, the teacher repeats the sentence; this time adding the definitive article “the.” The rejection “no” serves as repair initiation and ultimately leads to the correct answer followed by the focal practice – repeating the student response.

Another example containing a rejection in third turn is provided in Extract 9. The teacher has just finished giving instruction on how to complete a task (i.e., drawing your best friend’s face) and is checking students’ understanding by asking questions.

Extract 9. TM-09

01 T: Girl. From now on. What will you do.
02 S1: I will draw. Draw a face.
03 T: First. Thank you, Second?=
04 S1: =Then think about what I speak.
05 T: a-> How how long. Will.
06 S1: b-> Three minutes. ((holds up three fingers))
07 T: => No. not three minutes.=
08 S1: b1-> =Ah one minute speech.
09 T: => One minute speech. Good. You got it. Please start.

At line 7, the teacher rejects S1’s answer with a “no” followed by “not three minutes”. S1 immediately corrects the time and the teacher repeats the correct answer (“one minute speech”) following it with a positive acknowledgment (“good”). In both examples shown above, the rejection of a prior student answer is immediately followed by the desired response which is followed by the teacher’s repeat of the revised answer. Initially it appears that an explicit rejection of the student response occurs in contexts where it is relatively easy to correct the student response and where clarifying the response is an important precursor to the following task (i.e. in task instruction contexts,
such as Extract 9, it is important to clarify the details before proceeding with the task in order to avoid confusion.

There are alternative moves that lie “in between” the two poles of accepting and rejecting student response, and these alternatives tend to be mobilized toward managing the trouble in a more benign way. One such alternative is to provide an account of why the response is problematic followed by an explanation on how to fix the prior response. For an example, see Extract 9.

Extract 9. SDV_1305

127 T: a-> I want you to complete each sentence using since.
128 S3: Okay let’s take turns. From Jihoon?
129 T: a-> Yeah.
130 S3: b-> mhm can you read the first sentence and make a perfect sentence using since?
131 T: a-> Uhm I do not watch TV since I: :: am seven years old.
132 S3: b-> [I was I was
133 (0.7)
134 S3: b-> [I was I was
135 T: [hhhh
136 (0.2)
137 T: => Mmmm you’re quite there but please think about the tense. I do not watch TV because?
138 S3: Aaa::: because because because.
139 T: because or since.
140 S3: because I’m a student.
141 T: since I’m a student. Instead of because please use since.
142 (T turns toward S5)) How about next one?

In this extract, the student’s answer to the teacher’s question is not accepted immediately at line 133 (indicated by the 0.7 second pause) and lines 135-136 (in-breath another pause), which prompts the student to repair his earlier response. When all these attempts fail the teacher first acknowledges the effort of the response (“you’re quite there”) and gives another chance for the student to fix the problem on his own (lines 137-138 “please think about the tense”) instead of providing the answer herself.

Both of these alternative moves in the third turn can be seen as efforts of repair initiations by the teacher. These moves are followed by student’s repair of the previous response and lead to sequence expansion. They are not found frequently in the EFL classroom talk collected for this study and as shown above ultimately lead to third turn
repeats by the teacher. In this way, they can be analyzed as insertion sequences to the larger IRF sequence. Both practices impede the progressivity of the lesson in the sense that it expands the IRF sequence. In Extract 9, the teacher’s effort to help the student construct the correct answer on her own through repair questions and instructions leads to an elaborate sequence that ends with the teacher giving out the correct response in a rather frustrated tone. We can conclude that the reason for choosing repeats in the third turn rather than these alternative ones is an economical choice; third turn repeats can effectively manage the pedagogical goal when a conflict between lesson progress and individual student feedback occurs without further effort at achieving intersubjectivity unlike other repair practices.

V. CONCLUSION

Teachers are encouraged to ask many questions in L2 classrooms as this is an important way to bring about student production. However, in Korean EFL classrooms such as the ones examined above, students’ ability to answer questions appears to be limited to rehearsed responses or short utterances that are far from being spontaneous. Teachers should take this into account not only when they design their questions but also when they give feedback in the third turn. This paper analyzed the sequential context and function of third turn repeats by teachers following student responses that contain errors (e.g., grammatically or pragmatically inadequate utterances) to suggest that this is a method to achieve two important goals in the EFL context: progressivity and intersubjectivity. This is shown through detailed turn-by-turn analysis of talk available by videotaped materials and their transcript.

In conversation, very little of what we say or the order in which we do things is determined in advance. However, in classroom interaction the topics, actions and order are organized in a relatively explicit and predictive way (Heritage & Clayman, 2010). This article argues that the focal practice is one for achieving progressivity and affiliation that facilitates the teacher’s ability to manage the classroom effectively in a limited time frame. This argument is further supported by Extract 6, which represents a negative case in which the focal practice is missing from the same action context. In Extract 6, the absence of a repeat and a non-confirmation by the teacher is oriented to as an insufficient response by the student. Subsequently, the teacher produces the focal practice and re-pursues reconciliation through final falling repetition in the third turn position. The analysis empirically supports the notion that learning a language involves a continuous process of adaptation of patterns of language-use-for-action (Firth & Wagner, 2007) in response to locally emergent communicative needs, in this case, the teacher’s
need to progress the lesson, and the resulting competencies are shown to be highly context-sensitive and sensitive to the contingencies of use (Pekarek Doehler, 2010). This paper also shows that classroom institution may be best understood not by global reference to professional control or status but through close examination of how practical actions get organized through talk.

The teachers in these Korean EFL contexts follow a controlled lesson plan and have prepared for how to proceed with the lesson after a student provides a correct response. Constructing any other answer as deviant and ignoring alternative answers may be the teacher’s way to control the flow of the classroom as planned. However, progressivity at the cost of attending to individual learning may result in students losing interest in the material and therefore, lower motivation. According to McKeachie (2006), one of the biggest mistakes made by teachers is that they try to cover too much in their lecture instead of attending to what the student is learning. The study suggests for a more empirical way of designing a lesson plan; that sets aside time to answer students’ questions and to deal with problematic responses. Also, we suggest that teachers should employ third turn repeats in this sequential environment with caution as the focal practice may reduce learning opportunities for students whose answer has been neglected or whose answer has only been partially correct. For example, in Extract 4, the student who responded “Because her neighbor” will have a hard time agreeing with the teacher’s praise (“You’re a very smart student”) and will have difficulty understanding the makings of the correct answer (“Because I knew my neighbors had no cabbage plants) without any explanation from the teacher.

Based on the findings we can make the following suggestions for Korean EFL teachers who have to make these choices in numerous occasions of their lesson. First, when time is pressed, third turn repeats of the desired response may be a highly effective choice when compared to giving corrective feedback or initiating repair. Not only does it save time, but it also achieves solidarity between students and teacher by appearing affiliative (by the nature of being formed as a repeat) rather than being a ‘corrective’ action. Second, teacher repeats allow students additional exposure to the target language form and provide opportunities for students to correct their mistakes on their own, in their own time. However, as mentioned above, there are certainly occasions when students need explicit correction or explanation of the language form when misunderstandings occur. Finally, although teachers are advised to contextualize and embed all their explicit teaching about forms in activities designed around meaningful context in L2 teaching contexts, actual analysis of Korean EFL classroom data shows that this may be an idealized advice. These type of generalized advice does not take into consideration the proficiency level of EFL students where student response are limited to one or two word utterances (e.g., Extracts 1, 2, 3) and where any spontaneous
(unplanned) responses contain many errors (e.g., Extracts 4, 9). In these contexts, third turn repeats may be one highly affiliative practice which can expose students to the target language without giving them too much negative feedback or grammatical explanation to digest. Further CA studies in Korean EFL contexts can reveal valuable information on what is going on in actual classroom talk to give practical suggestions geared to the specific context rather than handing out idealized advice that are difficult to implement.

This article relied on an analysis of classroom data that is rehearsed to argue that third turn repeats appear to be systematic and recognizable to students and teachers. A description of this practice in natural settings would be an investigation in its own right. Future studies on the functions of positive evaluation in the third turn may also be fruitful in providing a full picture to the teacher’s use of interactional tactics in this context.
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**APPENDIX.**

Transcription Conventions and Abbreviations

→ arrows in the margin point to the lines of transcript relevant to the point made in the text  

 oo talk between symbols is quieter than surrounding talk  

 **BOLD** talk in both bold text and underlining indicates stress or emphasis  

 >> talk between symbols is faster than surrounding talk  

 .hh inbreath, the length of the inbreath is roughly proportional to the number of ‘h’s.  

 (h) laughter within a word  

 (0.4) numbers in parentheses indicate period of silence, in tenths of a seconds  

 . silence of less than 0.2 second  

 - a hyphen indicates an abrupt cut-off or self-interruption of the sound in progress indicated by the preceding letter(s)  

 [ ] beginning and end of overlapping talk  

 = latching of talk to the immediately preceding talk (can be between two words or between two turns)
colons indicate a lengthening of the sound just preceding them, proportional to the number of colons

? rising intonation
. falling to low intonation
, falling to mid-level intonation
(guess) problematic hearing
(( )) comments on talk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTR</th>
<th>Attributive particle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMM</td>
<td>Committal suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Declarative suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>Nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QP</td>
<td>Quotative particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP</td>
<td>Topic-contrast particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRCUM</td>
<td>Circumstantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONN</td>
<td>Connective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HON</td>
<td>Honorific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>Negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLU</td>
<td>Plural marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>Resultative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNASSIM</td>
<td>Unassimilated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicable levels: Secondary education
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