Choices They Make: How ESL Teachers Initiate Repair in the Classroom

Guiboke Seong

(Korea University)

Seong, Guiboke. (2006). Choices they make: How ESL teachers initiate repair in the classroom. *English Teaching, 61*(1), 227-255.

This study examined conversational repair strategies of teachers of English as a second language (ESL) and how the strategies are used as conversational resources to deal with communication breakdown and to initiate correction in the classroom. The landmark research on feedback by Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Panova and Lyster's (2002) tried to establish a framework of teacher response types and student uptakes but did not address factors that may be associated with teachers' decisions. This study investigates how student proficiency levels and instructional foci may be related to the patterns of second language teachers' use of conversational repair strategies in the classroom. The data consisted of 24 hours of ESL classes from four different courses taught by two teachers in an intensive English institute in the United States. The data were closely transcribed and microanalyzed following the conversation-analytic methodology. The results established a typology of second language teachers' conversational repair strategies. Findings showed that the teachers displayed different preferences for repair strategies in different classes and that the types and distribution of the teachers' strategic decisions on classroom repair techniques may be influenced by the student proficiency levels and the instructional foci of each class.

I. INTRODUCTION

Teacher talk and strategies of teacher talk have long been discussed in classroom research. In the L2 classroom in particular teacher talk research has primarily been concerned with what kinds of modifications are made to what extent to accommodate the students' limited proficiency in the target language and to best serve the instructional goals (e.g., Cazden, 1988; Ellis, 1989; Ferguson, 1975, 1981; Freed, 1978, 1980; Long, 1980, 1981; Snow, 1976, 1977). Studies have examined modifications in phonology (e.g., Dahl, 1981; Hakansson, 1986; Henzl, 1973, 1979; Ishiguro, 1986; Mannon, 1986; Wesche & Ready, 1985), vocabulary (Chaudron, 1982; Henzl, 1973, 1979; Kliefgen, 1985; Mizon,

1981; Wesche & Ready, 1985), syntax (e.g., Early, 1985; Gaies, 1977, 1979; Hyltenstam, 1983; Long & Sato, 1983; Mannon, 1986; Pica & Long ,1986), length of utterance (e.g., Hakansson, 1986; Kliefgen, 1985; Mizon, 1981), and grammatical well-formedness (e.g., Henzl, 1973; Hyltenstam, 1983; Ishiguro, 1986; Pica & Long, 1986).

However, not much research has been done to actually describe how teacher talk functions when a communication breakdown occurs between the teacher and students in the second language classroom and to investigate what factors may be associated with teachers' preferences for talk. What does the teacher do to repair such conversational blockages? What may influence the teacher's decisions on how to repair each blockage? The landmark research on feedback by Lyster and Ranta (1997) tried to establish a framework of teacher response types and student uptakes in immersion settings and communicative classes but left more questions than answers. Panova and Lyster's (2002) follow-up study of one ESL class also did not address potential factors influencing teachers' decisions. What teacher-initiated repair is like in the second language classroom is still largely unknown.

This study is an attempt to better understand teachers' conversational resources and identify the factors associated with their decisions in strategic planning and execution in using those resources to deal with breakdowns of discourse in the second language (L2 hereafter) classroom. In other words, it is to investigate how native speaking teachers manipulate their teacher talk to deal with communication problems and correction situations caused by different trouble sources in the utterances of the nonnative students and best accommodate their nonnativeness, that is, their limited linguistic and discourse competence.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1. Conversational Repair

Repair is a mechanism that operates in conversation to deal with problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding the talk in conversation (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977). Thus studying repair is to investigate organized ways of dealing with various kinds of trouble in the process of interaction (Have, 1999). Repair covers a wide range of actions, including statements of procedural rules, sanctions of violations of such rules, problems of hearing and understanding talk, second starts, prompting, cluing and helping, explaining, and correction of errors. According to Schegloff et al. (1977), repair is a more general domain than correction as they define correction as one type of repair that involves "replacement" of an error or mistake by what is "correct."

Therefore, repair in this paper is used as the generic term that includes correction of errors and the treatment of speaking, hearing, and understanding problems as is in the seminal studies and literature on repair in classroom settings (e.g., Kasper, 1985; Kinginger, 1995; McHoul, 1990; van Lier, 1988) although, in some studies the two terms appear interchangeably (e.g., Gaskill, 1980; Lyster, 1998; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Schwartz, 1980).

2. Repair Techniques of Native Speakers in Ordinary Conversation

Studies on practices of repair, especially the early ones, have been done mostly on conversations among native speakers, in particular, native speakers of English. Schegloff et al. (1977) identified several types of repair techniques ((1)-(5) below) that native speakers of English most frequently use when they have trouble hearing or understanding their interlocutor's utterance in various situations. These are all, so called, *other-initiated* repair techniques, which means repair initiated by an interlocutor other than the speaker of the trouble-source turn. These findings are particularly relevant to the present study, which examines repair initiated by the teacher as *other* in the ESL classroom.

(1) Huh, what, etc.
  1 D: Wul did'e ever get married?
  2➔ C: Hu:h?
  3 D: Did jee ever get married?

(2) Who, where, when, etc. (question words)
  1 F: This is nice, did you make this?
  2 K: No, Samu made that.
  3➔ F: Who?
  4 K: Samu.

(3) Partial repeat of the trouble-source turn plus a question word
  1 Bea: Was last night the first time you met Missiz Kelly?
  2 (1.0)
  3➔ Marge: met whom?
  4 Bea: Missiz Kelly.

(4) Partial repeat of the trouble-source turn
  1 A: Well Monday, lemme think. Monday, Wednesday, an'
  2   Fridays I'm home by one ten.

3➔ B: One ten?

4   A: Two o'clock. My class ends one ten.

(5) Y'mean plus a possible understanding of prior turn

1   A: Why did I turn out this way.

2➔ B: You mean homosexual?

3   A: Yes.

(Schegloff et al., 1977, pp. 367-8)

One of the most frequently used repair strategies in ordinary conversation among native speakers of English is a one word utterance of "huh" or "what" with a rising intonation (indicated by the question mark) as in line 2 in example (1) above. It is targeting "unspecified trouble" in the previous turn. In this case, the trouble-source turn speaker will most likely have to rephrase or clarify his whole turn as in line 3. Using a single question word such as who, when, and where as in example (2) is another common technique. This type orients to more specific trouble in the trouble-source turn. In example (2), F in line 3 is initiating repair on the noun "Samu" part in K's turn in line 2.

Sometimes this question word is used with a partial repeat of the trouble-source turn as in example (3). In line 3 Marge is initiating repair for the phrase "Missiz Kelly" in the trouble-source turn uttered by Bea and combining the verb "met" with a question word "whom" followed by a rising intonation. Marge is indicating to Bea more clearly where the trouble source is. Bea is thus self-repairing in the next turn in line 4. An interlocutor may also just repeat part of the trouble-source turn to initiate repair. In this case, the speaker is indicating that the repeated part is the trouble-source. In example (4) above, B is repeating the phrase "one ten" of the trouble-source turn uttered by A (lines 1 and 2). A clarifies in the next turn (line 4) and the repair is completed.

The last repair technique that Schegloff et al. (1977) listed is "Y'mean plus a possible understanding of prior turn," which is exemplified in (5). In this example B in line 2 is initiating repair to the trouble-source he/she detected in line 1 by giving an alternate understanding of the trouble-source. A in line 3 confirms and the repair sequence is completed.

3. Repair Involving Non-Native Speakers and/or Pedagogic Contexts

Talk in ordinary conversation among native speakers is the locus of default practices of talk in interaction. However, researchers have recently been trying to find what the practices of conversational repair are like in institutional or functionally specified contexts such as the classroom, courtroom, doctor's office, etc. Early studies involving nonnative

speakers include Gaskill (1980) and Schwartz (1980). Gaskill focused on NS-NNS talk and Schwartz focused on NNS-NNS talk, but both found that the preference for self-completed repair found in L1 ordinary conversation also held for L2 talk. McHoul (1990) investigated the organization of repair in a traditional geography class in an Australian secondary school, and noted that the preference for self-completion was also found in his data for instructed talk-in-interaction. When redirections, reformulations of questions, or clues failed to elicit a self-completion from the student, other students tended to complete the repair.

On the other hand, some studies have found that repair organization in classroom talk is contingent upon members' conversational accomplishment of structurally different phases during a lesson. For example, Kasper (1985), studying an EFL class in Denmark, found that during the language-based phrase there was a strong tendency that other students completed repair initiated by one student. In the content-based phase, preference for self-correction held. The learners often asked the teacher for help.

Some people have tried to identify different orientations of repair in the L2 classroom. For example, van Lier (1988) claimed that repair in the L2 classroom can either focus on the forms and/or functions of the target language (medium-oriented), on the transmission of thoughts, information, and feelings (message-oriented), and on the organization and structure of the classroom environment and rules for the conduct of activities (activity-oriented). Van Lier (1988) also suggested that certain types of activity naturally lead to certain types of repair, and that therefore the issue of how to repair is closely related to the context of what is being done. Yet he did not provide empirical evidence to support his claims.

Boulima (1999) expanded van Lier's orientation types of repair in her study of Morrocan elementary school EFL classes. She looked at repair initiators as devices of negotiated interaction in the classroom and categorized them into two major orientation types of negotiation: didactic and conversational. Didactic negotiations were further subcategorized into medium-oriented, comprehension check-oriented, turn-taking oriented, and complete sentence-oriented negotiations. Conversational negotiations included hearing-oriented, meaning-oriented, content-oriented, general knowledge-oriented, agreement-oriented, and surprise display-oriented negotiations. Boulima's (1999) types include much more specific cases of orientations of repair strategies. However, Boulima did not examine the actual types of repair strategies employed by the teachers nor the factors that may be associated with them.

Some researchers have reported functions of gesture in repair organization (e.g., Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Taleghani-Nikazm, 2001). Taleghani-Nikazm (2001), in her study of German as a foreign language class, observed that foreign language teachers use gestures to indicate to students that their answers are incorrect, to display the exact location of the trouble-source in their utterances to students and as cues to give them the chance to

self-correct.

One of the recent attempts to discuss the pedagogical potential of repair sequences in second language classrooms is Markee (2000). He presented an extensive analysis of ESL learner-oriented classroom data. He emphasized how conversational negotiations initiated and completed by nonnative speaking students can facilitate the acquisition of target language vocabulary. Lyster and Ranta (1997), focusing on other-initiated repair, established six types of corrective feedback moves employed by teachers in response to student errors in content-oriented immersion classes in Canadian elementary schools.

1. Explicit correction: teacher supplies the correct form and clearly indicates that what the student had said was incorrect (7%)
2. Recasts: teacher implicitly reformulates all of part of the student's utterance (55%)
3. Elicitation: teacher directly elicits a reformulation from students by asking questions such as "How do we say that in French?" or by pausing to allow students to complete teacher's utterance, or by asking students to reformulate their utterance (14%)
4. Metalinguistic clues: teacher provides comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the student's utterance (8%)
5. Clarification requests: teacher uses phrases such as "Pardon?" and "I don't understand" (11%)
6. Repetition: teacher repeats the student's ill-formed utterance, adjusting intonation to highlight the error (5%)

As seen above, the overwhelming majority of the teachers' repair types were recasts. The last type shows the importance of prosodic elements in teacher talk. Panova and Lyster (2002) used the same categories and research methods as Lyster and Ranta (1997) but in an ESL setting this time. Their data were 10 hours of audio recording of one adult ESL class with 25 students in a beginning level general course taught by one female teacher. Their study examined the range and types of feedback used by the teacher and their relationship to learner uptake and immediate repair of error. The results showed a clear preference for recasts (55%) and translation (22%), while clarification requests (11%), metalinguistic feedback (5%), elicitation (4%), explicit correction (2%), and repetition (1%) were relatively scarce. However, Panova and Lyster's data sources were limited and they did not investigate the possibility that preferences for certain repair types might depend on classroom variables. In addition, their categories are not clearly defined and in fact are too broad to facilitate the incorporation of some of the findings from other research projects (e.g., Seong, 2003).

The present study attempts to fill in some of these gaps in the literature. The research

questions are: a) what are the types and frequency distributions of conversational repair strategies that ESL teachers employ in the classroom? b) How do differences in students' proficiency levels relate to the use of the teachers' repair strategies? c) How do different instructional foci of classes relate to the use of the teachers' repair strategies?

III. METHODS

1. Class and Participants

The data were collected from a small-scale English language institute located near a large Midwestern University campus in the U.S. The classes in which this research was conducted were chosen based on the two factors: students' proficiency levels and the instructional objectives of the class. These emerged from the preliminary study as potential variables that might affect ESL teachers' practices and choices of repair strategies. A High Level Listening class and a Low Level Listening class taught by the same teacher using the same materials were chosen to investigate the factor of proficiency levels. In order to compare the teachers' practices of repair in two classes with different foci in the learning of a target language, a High Level Conversation class and a High Level Reading/Vocabulary class taught by another teacher were selected for the research.

The students in all four classes were adults over 20 years old, and most were new arrivals from all over the world. A few had been in the U.S. for varied periods of time as ESL learners, visiting scholars, or spouses of new graduate students of the nearby university. Most of the students attended the institute to improve their English proficiency for their current jobs and future jobs, and to prepare for graduate schools in the U.S. The participating teachers for the study were one male teacher (Teacher A, TM) and one female teacher (Teacher B, TF). They were both Caucasian and native speakers of American English in their late 40s. They both had a Master's degree in Teaching English to speakers of other languages and had over ten years of adult ESL teaching experiences in various settings.

2. Data Collection and Analysis

1) Data Collection

Each of the four classes was videotaped for eight hours using digital video camcorders and external wireless microphones. Other information such as placement tests, policies of the institute, student profiles, teacher credentials, and the materials used for each class has

been collected through surveys, several informal interviews, and e-mail exchanges with the Director of the institute, the teachers, and the students.

2) Transcription and Identification

The videotaped data were closely transcribed and microanalyzed using a set of transcription conventions developed by Sacks et al. (1974) (see the Appendix). These transcription conventions are appropriate for the present research as they are suitable for describing detailed speech elements including those of prosody and paralinguistic characteristics that contribute to meaning such as silence, pitch, intonation, speed, cutoffs, and the like. The computer software, Transana, was used to process and organize the data.

The operational definition of repair strategies for identification and coding in this study has been set as follows:

1. Teachers' verbal or nonverbal response to students' wrong, incomplete, or silent responses
2. The student's response has to be one prompted or elicited by the teacher, another student, or a class activity that is explicit in the sequence in question or inferable from earlier activities or sequences.
3. Teachers' responses that either repair the trouble directly in the same turn or that initiate repair in expectation that the student, another student, or the whole class will complete the repair.

3) Categories, Reliability, and Analysis

Since repair here is defined to include the characteristics of both resolving pure communication breakdown and correction in the institutional setting, Schegloff et al.'s (1977) five repair techniques in ordinary conversation and Lyster and Ranta's (1997) six corrective feedback techniques discussed earlier were used as the initial coding categories. As the analysis of the data progressed, it became necessary to add new categories to the combined list in order to account for new strategies with different functions and/or orientations. Table 1 is the final coding system with the newly established categories of 24 types of ESL teachers' repair strategies. The abbreviations of the category titles used for coding are included within the parentheses as in CR for Clarification Request. A brief definition of each category is given.

Inter- and intra-rater reliability were established after evaluating the consistency of one's rating over time and through checking the agreement rates of two coders coding the same set of data. After all 24 hours of classroom data were coded, the types and frequencies of

each category in each class were totaled. Qualitative and quantitative comparisons were made between the two classes taught by Teacher A to examine whether and how his choices and preferences of repair strategies are different in two classes of students with different proficiency levels. Comparisons were also made between the two classes taught by Teacher B to see whether she makes different choices of repair techniques in types and frequencies for classes with different objectives and instructional foci, that is, communication oriented versus accuracy oriented class.

TABLE 1
The Coding System of Teachers' Repair Strategies for the Present Study

Repair strategies	Subcategories and explanations
Clarification Request (CR)	1. Offering a possible understanding or interpretation of S's utterance or gesture
	2. Repeat of the student's response (noncorrective), Partial Repeat (+Question word), huh? what? I'm Sorry? pardon?
	3. Intentional CR for other students by offering interpretations or asking to spell
	4. Completing student's word search
	5. Explicitly saying "I don't know" or "I don't understand."
Nonverbal strategies (NV)	Gesture, eye gaze, writing, silence
Asking information (AI)	Asking for more information (non-corrective)
Recast (RC)	Implicit reformulation of part or all of the student's utterance
Or question (OC)	Teacher offers possible understanding/answer plus 'or' usually with a continuing intonation or vowel lengthening
Repetition (RP)	Repetition of S's turn usually with a rising intonation (corrective)
Elicitation (EL)	1. Repeating initiation turn or question
	2. Rephrasing initiation turn or question usually to an easier-to-answer one
	3. Request to complete by pausing usually with a continuing intonation
	4. Request to correct the form in a specific way
	5. Offering additional information (partial answer, examples, synonyms, details), asking questions leading to them, comparison questions, or asking reasons
Metalinguistic clues (MC)	Providing comments, information, questions about well-formedness of S's utterance, including negation of it without supplying the correct form
Explicit correction (EC)	Teacher supplies the correct form (also to silence) and clearly indicates that what the student had said was incorrect:
	1. Pronunciation, stress
	2. Grammar, syntax, morphology
	3. Vocabulary meaning, usage of words, phrases, expressions
	4. Content of conversation
	5. Listening comprehension
Calling on another student (AS)	Teacher changes from a whole class to a particular student or from one student to another
Asking the whole class (WC)	Teacher changes from an individual student to the whole class
Display sympathy (DS)	Teacher makes remark recognizing difficulty, partial approval, or encourages trials by raising confidence. This usually accompanies another RS.

IV.   RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Typology of L2 Teachers' Repair Strategies

The first research question of the present study was to identify the types and frequency distribution of conversational repair strategies that ESL teachers employ in the classroom. The new typology in Table 1 is more extensive and includes previously ignored aspects of teachers' conversational treatments in the classroom. Some of the definitions of the previous feedback categories needed to be redefined as conversational repair strategies. The existing feedback categories needed more fine-tuning because they did not reflect the complex and diverse characteristics of teacher's repair behaviors. Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Panova and Lyster (2002) examined corrective feedback only. Form-focused error correction behaviors are highly characteristic in the second language classroom, but communication oriented problems and corresponding repair sequences also occur frequently in the classroom. Investigating both will better describe L2 teachers' strategies of discourse management.

Another advantage of this system is that it includes nonverbal, nonlinguistic aspects that have been neglected in previous research. Their functions in classroom interactions between the teacher and the students were noted. Nonverbal repair strategies (NV) include teachers' gesture, eye gaze, writing, and even silence. In line 8 in excerpt (6) below Teacher A is initiating repair by his eye gaze, which prompts J3 to redo his turn in a louder voice in line 9. The teacher's utterance in line 6, humm?, is the CR2 strategy.

(6)

    1   TM: vic's name giogolli married with two children, (1.0)

    2   drives a black lincoln navigator, (1.5) then what

    3   does he say.

    4   (3.5)

    5   J3:   (chu guys and chu)

    6   TM: humm?

    7   J3:   (chu guys and chu)

    8➜TM: ((looking at J3 with widened eyes))

    9   J3:   ((louder)) (Chu (.) guys (.) and Chu)

    10   (3.0)

    11 TM: ((looking at J3 for a while and suddenly says)) Two

    12   guys in chopper, Right.

This new category also included turn-taking moves such as calling on another student

(AS) and opening the question to the whole class (WC) as part of highly viable repair strategies that can be employed by the teacher in the case of discourse blockages in the classroom. Displaying sympathy (DS) is a new category as well. In the cases coded for this category, the teacher initiates repair by making remarks that recognize the difficulty of a question, by giving partial approval, or by encouraging attempts thus raising the students' confidence. It has been observed in the present data that this strategy usually accompanies other repair strategies such as ELs, ECs and MC. Look at the following excerpt.

(7)

   1 TM: and four?

   2 J3:   um: on average day, i watch about two hour a day. but

   3   i'm not sure.

   4➜TM: i can understand why you would pick that. but that's

   5➜   not the word that you want.

In excerpt (7), the teacher in line 4 is initiating repair by displaying sympathy to the student J3 regarding his answer in lines 2-3. This strategy is combined with another strategy, Metalinguistic clues (MC) as the teacher adds "but that's not the word that you want." to his earlier remark.

In addition this new typology has expanded the inclusive Clarification request (CR) strategies into five sub-categories, Elicitation (EL) strategies to five and Explicit correction (EC) to also five different sub-categories. These sub-categories of CR, EL and EC have different functions, thus, needed to be coded separately. For example, the three strategies of Repetition of the initiation turn, Rephrase of the initiation turn, and Hinting are all EL strategies but they work differently and often have different consequences in a given repair sequence. Rephrasing makes the prompt more comprehensible to the student than simple Repeating of the initial question. Hinting also does that but in a different way, which is by offering relevant information rather than rephrasing the initiation prompt. The student will respond differently depending on which strategies the teacher chooses to use for his/her previous utterance. The choice the teacher makes can either increase or decrease the student's opportunities for better understanding, self-repair, and learning. Therefore this new typology is more inclusive, more explanatory, and possibly provides more specific resources and guidelines to pre-service and in-service second language teachers.

This model of repair can also function as a chart to indicate the kinds and frequency distribution of trouble-sources that cause repair sequences in each class. The order of the listed strategies is not random. Communication oriented strategies such as CRs were placed toward the top of the list and correction or more pedagogy oriented strategies were placed in the later part of the list. CR is a set of more communication oriented repair

strategies than that of EL, and EL is more so than EC because sometimes the teacher can use elicitation strategies to encourage the students to participate more in communication oriented classes. Although this continuum does not apply to the subcategories within CR, EL, and EC, the frequency table itself, once completed with the numbers, can broadly show the distribution of major causes of trouble in interactions of a particular class.

2. Student Proficiency Levels and the Practices of L2 Teachers' Repair Strategies

The second research question was how the differences in students' proficiency levels may be related to the use of the teachers' repair strategies. This was examined by comparing types and distribution of repair strategies that Teacher A used in his Low and High Level Listening comprehension classes. The teacher used the same materials, methods, and activities in the High Level class and the Low Level class, which was helpful for the design of the present study because methods and materials were consequently excluded from being the potentially confounding variables.

The materials used in both listening comprehension classes included video clips from cartoons, TV programs such as CSI, pre-recorded lectures and listening comprehension tests, transcripts of the video clips prepared by the teacher, and a variety of worksheets and vocabulary test sheets. Class activities included listening to the audiovisual materials and discussing them in terms of content, vocabulary, expressions, pronunciation, etc. The students often used transcripts prepared by the teacher to compare and check their comprehension. They also went over test sheets of fill-in-the-blank types and multiple-choice questions for comprehension, vocabulary, and phrases.

The conversation between the teacher and the students in the Low Level class was characterized by frequent multiple repair sequences and students' silent responses. The flow of the conversation and activities of the High Level class was much smoother in this class than in the Low Level class. Sometimes there were lengthy discussions without frequent silence turns from the students. In many cases repair was initiated because of misunderstanding or lack of accuracy not because of frequent silence as in the Low Level class. Another interesting aspect in the High Level class was that the students helped each other in responding to the teacher's questions or joined in the repair work initiated by the teacher.

Table 2 below shows the types and frequency distributions of Teacher A's repair strategies in his Low and High Level Listening Comprehension classes. Some similarities were observed but let us focus on the differences here. Several differences were observed in the types and frequency distribution of Teacher A's repair strategies used between the two Listening Comprehension classes. The first difference that stood out was the total number of repair strategies used. The teacher used repair strategies more than twice (376 vs.

181) as many in the Low class. Student proficiency level seems to play a part in this frequency difference in that students in the Low class frequently responded to the teacher's initiation or a question with silence, which naturally prompted the teacher initiate repair over and over again.

Another difference was that the frequency of the repair strategy involving DS was higher (22 vs. 4) in the Low Level class. This difference may also be explained from a proficiency level perspective. Low Level students may need more encouragement and approval in order to build confidence to participate fully in class conversation. The frequent silence in the Low Level class may have influenced the teacher to use more of this strategy to mitigate inhibition and enhance students' verbal responses.

TABLE 2
Total Number of Occurrences and Percentages in the Low and the High Level Listening Classes by Strategies

Repair strategy	Low level listening class		High level listening class	
	n	%	n	%
CR1 (Offering possible understanding)	11	(2.9)[a]	16	(8.8)[a]
CR2 ((Partial) Repeat, question word, or pardon?)	41	(10.9)	17	(9.4)
CR3 (Clarification request for other students)	2	(0.5)	1	(0.6)
CR4 (Completing word search)	1	(0.27)	0	(0.0)
CR5 (Explicit I don't know's)	2	(0.5)	0	(0.0)
NV (Nonverbal strategies)	4	(1.1)	0	(0.0)
AI (Asking information)	2	(0.5)	0	(0.0)
RC (Recast)	2	(0.5)	0	(0.0)
OC (Or question)	4	(1.1)	0	(0.0)
RP (Repetition)	10	(2.7)[a]	19	(10.5)[a]
EL1 (Repeating initiation)	13	(3.5)[a]	15	(8.3)[a]
EL2 (Rephrase)	39	(10.4)	18	(9.9)
EL3 (Request to complete)	17	(4.5)	8	(4.4)
EL4 (Request to correct)	4	(1.1)	1	(0.6)
EL5 (Hinting)	94	(25.0)	46	(25.4)
MC (Metalinguistic clues)	3	(0.8)[a]	11	(6.1)[a]
EC1 (Pronunciation, stress)	15	(4.0)	2	(1.1)
EC2 (Grammar, morphology)	8	(2.1)	2	(1.1)
EC3 (Vocabulary, phrase usage)	40	(10.6)[a]	5	(2.8)[a]
EC4 (Content)	11	(2.9)	3	(1.7)
EC5 (Listening comprehension)	13	(3.5)	1	(0.6)
AS (Calling on another student)	16	(4.3)	11	(6.1)
WC (Asking the whole class)	2	(0.5)	2	(1.1)
DS (Display of sympathy)	22	(5.9)[a]	4	(2.2)[a]
Total	376	(100.0)	181	(100.0)

Note. The percentages have been rounded off.
[a]Percentages of strategies occurred in meaningfully different frequencies

A much higher frequency was observed in the use of the strategy EC3 in the Low Level class, than in the High Level. Specifically, 10.6% (40 cases out of 376) of the total repair strategies in the Low Level class was EC3 and only 2.8% (5 cases out of 181) was EC3 in the High class. This difference may be explained by the difference in the proficiency levels of the students in the classes. It is not surprising that instructional sequences in the Low Level class require more repair work involving explicit correction of vocabulary and phrase usage. See excerpts (8) and (9) below. These sequences involve the same phrase, "no acc," dealt with in the 2nd hour in the Low Level class and the 2nd hour in the High Level class. Although it is not a common phrase in English, it appeared in the video clip the students had watched, and the teacher is trying to have the students guess what the phrase meant from the context. Notice how the same teacher has to use a lot of EC3 strategies in the Low Level class but not in the High Level class.

(8) "no acc" in the Low Level class

1		((TM turns on the video to play the part "what's with
2		the no acc man?"))
3	TM:	what's with the no acc man? and he is doing this.
4		((imitating a phone with a hand and put it around ear))
5	K1:	°no acc? °
6	TM:	what do you think? what's with the no acc man?
7		(2.0)
8	TM:	the idea is where have you been?
9		(0.5)
10	TM:	i tried to call you i couldn't get you.
11		(0.5)
12➜	TM:	so acc has to be something like ((writing))
13➜		accessible,
14	J2:	accessible.
15	K1:	°ah
16➜	TM:	Or ((writing)) Access, or: accept,
17		(2.0)
18➜	TM:	maybe phone not accepting (.) calls or something
19➜		like that.
20		(0.5)
21	TM:	maybe you weren't accessible, i try to get you and
22		the guys says oh i had my phone on vibrator. okay? (.)
23		i was busy.

(9) "no acc" in the High Level class

1 TM:	what do you think no acc is.
2 K3:	no:: what?
3➜TM:	what's with the no acc man. what do you think it is.
4 K3:	accident? acc?
5➜TM:	no. (.) read the next line.
6	(3.0)
7 K3:	((murmurs reading the transcript))
8 TM:	((rewinding the videotape to show them the part with
9	no ac))
10	(11.0)
11 TM:	okay watch. watch this. ((playing the clip)).
12	man in the video: what's with the no ac, man.
13➜TM:	((turns off the video)) no acc. he tried o call him.
14➜	but the guy wasn't (.) ACC. what could that be.
15	(3.0)
16➜TM:	what's with the no Acc, man. how come i can't reach
17➜	you. how come i couldn't call you.
18 K1:	no accepting?
19 TM:	okay↑
20 TM:	accept, he wasn't- his phone wasn't accepting calls,
21	maybe.
22 K3:	( )
23 TM:	or what?
24 K3:	no answer.
25 TM:	no answer, yeah but that wouldn't- the ei cee cee,
26	that's short for some word. okay↑ so some word that
27	means i couldn't call you. so it might be Accept, or it
28	might mean Accessible↑
29 all:	Aha::
30 TM:	no accessible, you weren't accessible↑ i couldn't
31	get you, okay?

In (8) the teacher fails to elicit a response from the students in the Low Level class after multiple attempts in lines 6, 8, and 10. Therefore he is giving the correct answer to the students in lines 12-13, 16, and 18-9 to resolve the trouble and complete the repair himself. On the other hand, in the High Level class, some of the students are actively participating in finding out what "no acc" means as evidenced in lines 2, 4, 7, 18, 22, and 24. So the

teacher used Repetition (RP, line 3), Metalinguistic clues (MC) and Offering relevant information or pointing to resources (EL5) in line 5, providing more context (EL5) in lines 13 and 14, and Repetition (lines 16-7). Thus he used only one EC3 strategy in this lengthy sequence in the High Level class while he did it three times in the Low Level class for the sequence resulting from the same trouble source. One possible explanation is that due to their higher proficiency the students in the High Level class responded to the teacher's initial question, so the teacher used a lot of EL strategies rather than using EC strategies multiple times.

Differences were also found in the frequency of the use of Metalinguistic clues strategy (MC). The category of MC includes repair strategies where the teacher, without offering the correct answer, gives information about the correctness of the form in the student's utterance. This includes cases where the teacher says "no" to the student's answer. In the Low Level class only 3 cases of this strategy use were observed (0.8%) whereas in the High Level class 11 cases (6.1%) were found. As we have noted before, considering that the High class has only around half of the total number of repairs that occurred in the Low Level class, the comparison would be 3 cases to 22, which is in fact a striking difference. Then what made the teacher employ this MC strategy at a higher rate in the High class than in the Low class? The following excerpts from both classes illustrate typical cases of MC given by the teacher.

(10) MC used in the Low Level class

1		((talking about notetaking, abbreviations))
2	TM:	for example, ar ee, what does that mean.
3		(1.0)
4	K1:	repeat?
5	TM:	about. or regarding. ((writing them on board))
6	TM:	so, let's talk, uh, so the- the- the- professor gave
7		a lecture, about tv violence. you could say the lecture,
8		(0.5) um:, um: (2.0) what was the- oh, i don't know how
9		to say this. that just tells you the topic. don't you
10		get this ((pointing "re: TV violence" that he wrote)) on
11		e mail?
12	K1:	oh:
13	TM:	or on letters? formal letters?
14	K1:	reply?
15➔	TM:	no, it doesn't mean reply, it means the topic. this
16		is- this shows you the topic.

In (10), line 15 contains a case of MC at the beginning of the turn, but then it is immediately followed by explicit correction of the vocabulary or expression (EC3) in the same turn. All MCs observed in this class were employed like this, and again there were only three cases of it for the entire six hours. In the High Level class, on the other hand, as seen in line 7 in excerpt (11) below, the teacher is simply saying "no."

(11) MC used in the High Level class
    1 TM: and six?
    2 K4:   ei, close together?
    3 TM: ei. tight. close together.
    4   (3.0)
    5 K2:   seven, i'm not sure, but i guessed ei?
    6   (2.5)
    7➜TM: no.
    8 K2:   °no,
    9 TM: what is seven.
    10   (2.0)
    11 K3:   C:::ee.
    12 TM: cee. <Molest (.) used to mean (.) just to bother
    13   somebody. (2.0) like to molest someone meant to bother
    14   them, but Now almost exclusively used for sexual crime.
    15   (1.0) either a woman or a child.>

Careful examination of all the occurrences of this MC strategy in both classes revealed that the reason why the teacher was found to be using much more of this strategy in the High Level class is because he tends to say "no" directly to the students' wrong answers in the High Level class but not in the Low Level class. In fact, 8 out of 11 total cases of MC in the High class were cases of the teacher's saying "no" without any additional conversational devices. This comparison indicates that the teacher uses a more direct approach bearing more potential face-threat in repairing the students' turns in the High Level class. The teacher may find it acceptable and effective because of the stronger self confidence observed in the High Level students.

3. Instructional Foci and the Practices of L2 Teachers' Repair Strategies

The third research question asked was how the different instructional foci of classes may relate to the use of the teachers' repair strategies. Instructional foci refer to the foci and the objectives of the language class such as target language form and accuracy or

communication and fluency. This was examined by analyzing the types and frequency distribution of the strategies used in the High Level Conversation class and those in the High Level Reading/Vocabulary class taught by one female teacher, Teacher B. Table 3 summarizes the findings.

There were practically no similarities between Teacher B's repair techniques in the two classes except for the similar total number of strategies found in both classes. In the Conversational English class she used 72 repair strategies and 81 in the Reading/Vocabulary class. None of the 24 strategies was found to have high frequencies in both classes and many categories were infrequently observed in both classes. For CR4, CR5, NV, AI, RC, OC, RP, EL1, EL3, EL4, MC, EC2, EC4, EC5, AS, and WC. neither of the two classes yielded more than five counts.

TABLE 3
Total Number of Occurrences and Percentages in the Conversation and the Reading/Vocabulary Classes by Strategies

Repair strategy	High level conversation		High level reading/vocabulary	
	n	%	n	%
CR1 (Offering a possible understanding)	20	(27.8)[a]	9	(11.1)[a]
CR2 ((Partial) Repeat, question word, or pardon?)	14	(19.4)[a]	7	(8.6)[a]
CR3 (Clarification request for other students)	9	(12.5)[a]	1	(1.2)[a]
CR4 (Completing word search)	2	(2.8)	3	(3.7)
CR5 (Explicit I don't know's)	3	(4.2)	0	(0.0)
NV (Nonverbal strategies)	3	(4.2)	1	(1.2)
AI (Asking information)	2	(2.8)	2	(2.5)
RC (Recast)	1	(1.4)	4	(4.9)
OC (Or question)	1	(1.4)	4	(4.9)
RP (Repetition)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)
EL1 (Repeating initiation)	4	(5.6)	1	(1.2)
EL2 (Rephrase)	7	(9.7)	5	(6.2)
EL3 (Request to complete)	2	(2.8)	0	(0.0)
EL4 (Request to correct)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)
EL5 (Hinting)	4	(5.6)[a]	11	(13.6)[a]
MC (Metalinguistic clues)	0	(0.0)	1	(1.2)
EC1 (Pronunciation, stress)	0	(0.0)[a]	9	(11.1)[a]
EC2 (Grammar, morphology)	0	(0.0)	1	(1.2)
EC3 (Vocabulary, phrase usage)	0	(0.0)[a]	14	(17.3)[a]
EC4 (Content)	0	(0.0)	2	(2.5)
EC5 (Listening comprehension)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)
AS (Calling on another student)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)
WC (Asking the whole class)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)
DS (Display of sympathy)	0	(0.0)[a]	6	(7.4)[a]
Total	72	(100.0)	81	(100.0)

Note. The percentages have been rounded off.
[a]Percentages of strategies occurred in meaningfully different frequencies

In six out of the twenty four strategies the total number of occurrences and percentages appeared meaningfully different. They can be placed in three groups: higher rates in CR1 and CR2 in the Conversation class, higher rates in EL5, EC1, and EC3 in the Reading/Vocabulary class, and a higher rate in DS in the Reading/Vocabulary class.

The fact that both CR1 and CR2 Clarification request categories occurred much more frequently (the high rate of CR3 is purely due to a non-typical task type employed during the sixth hour in the Conversation class thus excluded from discussion) in the Conversation class than in the Reading/Vocabulary class is in fact quite easily explained from the perspective of instructional foci. As the focus of the Conversation class is communication, it is natural for the participants to be situated in interactional contexts where they experience more hearing and understanding related trouble than in corrective instructional situations. Let us see some of the actual excerpts from the Conversation class, which illustrate these contexts.

(12) CR1 in the Conversation class

   1   K1:   when i arrived in the mikonos, there were a lot of

   2   dolphin gifts.

   3� TF: oh, oh, souvenirs?

   4   K1:   yeah. they said that dolphin is their symbol.

In excerpt (12) the teacher and the students are talking about their travel experiences. K1 is talking about her trip to Greece, and when she says "dolphin gifts" the teacher initiates repair by offering a possible understanding and asks "oh, oh, souvenirs?" (CR1) in line 3. In excerpt (13), line 5 is the repair initiator. The teacher is having a hearing or understanding problem with the part "sixtieth birthday" in K1's turn, and she is initiating repair using a question word "which" orienting only to that problematic part of the trouble-source turn. From the sequential organization, it is clear that Teacher B in line 5 is not initiating correction of the pronunciation. Teacher B's repeated CR strategy in line 8 clearly indicates that the use of CR2 in line 5 was to initiate repair for trouble that is from a pure communicative intention and not for correction initiation.

(13) CR2 in the Conversation class

   1   K1:   is there any special: birthday: (.) special

   2   birthday:, or the Age. because in korea we think about-

   3   consider very: (1.0) important? as the the first

   4   birthday of the baby? and the sixtieth birthday.

   5➤TF: which one?

   6   K1:   sixty. ((with six fingers up))

7   (1.0)
8   TF: one six? ((writing 16 in the air with her finger))
9   K1:   sixty.
10   K3:   six zero.
11   TF: sixty. Oh, okay.
12   J: ((nods))

It was also observed that Teacher B's strategy use displayed higher rates of Hinting (EL5), Explicit correction of pronunciation and stress (EC1), and Explicit correction of vocabulary and phrase usage (EC3) in her Reading/Vocabulary class than in the Conversation class. These striking differences in the frequencies of these three strategies in the two classes can also be accounted for in the differences of instructional foci in the two classes. Reading/Vocabulary classes are basically accuracy-focused classes. Interactions in reading and vocabulary classes gravitate around getting the contents of the reading materials correct and using/choosing the correct/appropriate words and phrases in the given sentences and contexts. Reading/Vocabulary classes are certainly much more accuracy oriented than conversation classes. For this reason, it is not surprising to note that greater percentages of EL strategies and EC strategies were employed in the Reading/ Vocabulary class than in the Conversation class. In many cases the teacher had the correct answers in mind and wished to elicit or correct the student's response. In the Conversation class, on the other hand, almost all conversational exchanges involved topics that did not require correct answers but needed the students' opinions, examples or different experiences. Let us see these characteristics in actual excerpts from the two classes.

(14) EL5 in the Conversation class
    1   TF: have you heard i'm sorry or been- said- anybody said
    2   to you in a situation you didn't expect, or:
    3   (1.5)
    4   TF: any:
    5   (3.5)
    6➔TF: you get bumped on the bus or in the elevator and
    7➔   somebody says i'm sorry?
    8   S: [ye:s
    9   J: [((nods))
    10   K1:   Yeah.

(15) EL5 in the Reading/Vocabulary class
    1   K1:   i think the- the- i think he say the origin, origin

```
2            of town?
3   TF:      yeah, he is giving it. so it's- and do you get the
4            part about teary town?
5            (2.0)
6➔TF:        the- the name of it is (greensburg). (1.0) but the
7➔           local people call it teary town. do you understand
8➔           that?
9   K1:      [umum.]
10  K2:      [((nods))]
```

In her Conversation class in excerpt (14) the teacher wants her students to talk about their experiences with the expression "I'm sorry." When she fails to elicit a response, as evidenced by the silence in line 3 and her second attempt in line 4 that yields a longer silence in line 5, she is giving the students some examples of the kind of experiences they might have in lines 6 and 7. That is, she is using the EL5 (hinting) strategy to draw more student output on the subject for which there is no known answer. Only four cases (5.6%) of this strategy were observed in the Conversation class.

In the Reading/Vocabulary class, in contrast, the teacher more frequently (13.6%) used EL5 to initiate repair in a corrective way as the nature of the class with an accuracy orientation contextually demands it. In lines 1 and 2 in excerpt (15), student K1 is giving the teacher her idea of the main idea of the paragraph that they just read. The teacher, partially approving the answer in line 3, tries to redirect the students' attention to the part in the text where the author talks about why the town is called the teary town. As shown by the silence in line 5 no student answers to the teacher's question. The teacher in lines 6, 7, and 8 is eliciting more accurate answers by offering hints (EL5).

As for EC1 and EC3, not a single case of either strategy was observed in the Conversation class. On the other hand Teacher B employed 11.1% of EC1 and 17.3% of EC3 strategies in the Reading/Vocabulary class. Let us examine excerpts (16) and (17).

(16) EC1 in the Reading/Vocabulary class
```
1            ((After a long problem-solving session the students are
2            now taking turns to tell their answers))
3   K1:      number three, gy- letha-((/le/)) (2.0) lethe ((/li/))
4            lethargy ((/li/ with stress on thar))?
5➔TF:        LEthargy ((/le/))
6   K1:      lethargy.
7   TF:      °yeah. ((nods))
8   K2:      number four? i, re- rinkquish
```

        9➔TF: reling, quish, yeah.
        10 K2:   relinquish.
        11 TF: yeah. exactly. (1.0) relinquish.

In line 5 in excerpt (16), the teacher is correcting K1's pronunciation and stress of the word "lethargy" at the same time, in an explicit manner (EC1). In line 9 she is also correcting K2's pronunciation of "relinquish" uttered in line 8 (EC1). In (17) below, the teacher is asking the students if they know the meaning of the expression, "there is a sucker born every minute." After a short silence in line 4 the teacher gives hints, that is, the meaning of the word "sucker." When it did not succeed in eliciting the correct answer, evidenced by the unfruitful and silent responses from the students in lines 6, 7, 9, and 10, the teacher is giving the correct answer for the target phrase in lines 11, 12, and 13.

    (17) EC3 in the Reading/Vocabulary class
        1   ((activity: read it and fill in the words))
        2   TF: it said that there was a sucker born every minute.
        3   are you familiar with this expression?
        4   (.)
        5   TF: okay, sucker is someone who can be easily fooled.
        6   K2:   fo[ol
        7   K1:   [Ah: easily fooled,
        8   TF: yeah.
        9   (1.5)
        10   K2: not good word.
        11➔TF: it's a (.) way of saying that there are a lot of
        12➔   foolish people in the world. people who can be (.)
        13➔   taken in.

    The teacher's turn in lines 11, 12, and 13 above is EC3, explicit correction of vocabulary and usage of phrases. The frequent appearances of this strategy in the Reading/Vocabulary class would be natural because vocabulary and phrases are some of the major objectives of the Reading/Vocabulary class. Reading/Vocabulary class deals with accuracy in vocabulary and content thus the teacher is in interactional grounds to orient the students to expected answers than to let them freely talk about open-ended topics as in the Conversation class.
    The third major difference observed was a higher rate in DS in the Reading/Vocabulary class. No case of this strategy was found in the Conversation class but 7.4% of the total strategy counts in the Reading/Vocabulary class were those of DS. This may also be explained by the phrase, "differences in treatment of face-threat in the classrooms with

different instructional foci." The Reading/Vocabulary class often involves activities requiring the students to answer targeted questions, or so called, display questions, where the teacher already knows the correct answer and repairs the student's answer in that direction. Thus the conversation inevitably involves correction and thus students' face can potentially be threatened. Trying to minimize this face-threat, the teacher may sometimes use the DS strategy. See excerpt (18) below.

(18) DS in the Reading/Vocabulary class

    1   TF: an oil find, we would all agree, would blank a

    2   skyrocketing of land prices.

    3   (3.0)

    4   K1:   poised.

    5   (3.0)

    6➔TF: i can see why you would think that, but-

    7   K1:   an oil find?

In excerpt (18) the task or the question is to choose a word that is appropriate in the place of the blank in the sentence "an oil find, we would all agree, would _____ a skyrocketing of land prices." Student K1 volunteers an answer "poised" in line 4, which turns out to be not the one the teacher is expecting. The teacher in line 6 initiates repair, a corrective kind, starting with a sentence displaying sympathy and understanding to the K1, "I can see why you would say that, but-." The teacher could have chosen to say "no" (MC) instead. By showing understanding and sympathy, the teacher was observed to often elicit immediate further attempts from the student (as in line 7) for improved answers. Accuracy-focused classes yield more DS repair strategies perhaps in an attempt to reduce face-threat in the course of arriving at a correct answer. In the Conversation class there is almost no face-threat as the focus of the class is communication with open-ended conversation and most of the time there is no correct answers for the given task/question. Thus no need exists for the strategy involving partial approval or recognizing difficulty (DS) of the prompt or the question. In short, the differences in observed numbers of CR1, CR2, EL5, EC1, EC3, and DS in the two classes taught by Teacher B can be explained by the difference in instructional foci of the two classes.

V. CONCLUSION

This study contributed to the development of a taxonomy of ESL teachers' conversational repair strategies in the classroom. The two ESL teachers were employing

a variety of verbal and nonverbal repair techniques as conversational and instructional resources. They were observed to use different types of strategies in varying frequencies for groups of students with different proficiency levels and for classes with different instructional foci. Certain aspects of trouble sources in classroom communication were found to be related to second language teachers' practices of repair in the classroom.

The findings of the study offer several important pedagogical implications. First has to do with the importance of teachers' awareness in the process and the product of effective communication in the second language classroom. Repair is not always a good repair. Done in an insensitive manner or without knowledge of the instructional variables such as students' proficiency levels and backgrounds and the objectives of class, teacher's repair initiation can worsen the communication problem or confuse students. By describing what is going on in the classroom, why discourse breakdowns of some sorts happen and how they are fixed and in what particular ways, this study raises awareness in language teachers, researchers and students regarding what the second language teacher should expect, why conversational troubles occur in the classroom, and enables us to recognize why it is extremely important to understand why communication and correction sometimes fail in the classroom and how successful communication happens.

Secondly, another pedagogical implication regards ESL/EFL teacher education. The findings of the study may function as practical guidelines and baseline resources for the development of conversational classroom management skills of pre-service and in-service teachers of English as a second or foreign language. Conversations with students are an inevitable part of second language instruction. Language teachers always need tangible conversational resources for dealing with the frequent and often challenging situations in the classroom, that is, correction and communication breakdown. For instance, many students, especially students with low proficiency in the target language often respond to questions and prompts in silence, as this study reported. Teachers will be able to deal with such responses much more effectively if they are prepared and have received some discourse training on repair than when they have not.

The present study is necessarily limited in that the data were drawn from only two teachers' classes. These two particular teachers' individual variables might have influenced their decisions and preferences on the repair techniques and therefore some other teachers with different personalities and age levels may show different tendencies of selections of repair strategies for the taxonomy. Also the students were mostly from Asian countries, especially Korea and Japan. The same teachers may find themselves employing different strategies for students from different cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds.

The methodology of the present study focuses more on qualitative descriptions than

providing statistical accounts for the relationships between the teachers' preferred types of repair strategies and student proficiency levels and instructional foci. However, findings of the study can be stepping stones toward investigations of how to repair in a more effective and facilitative way in the second language classroom. Certain types of repair strategies may be more acquisitionally beneficial than some others under certain circumstances. Further study on these issues is warranted.

REFERENCES

Boulima, J. (1999). *Negotiated interaction in target language classroom discourse*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Chaudron, C. (1982). Vocabulary elaboration in teachers' speech to L2 learners. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 4,* 170-180.

Cazden, C. B. (1988). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Dahl, D. (1981). The role of experience in speech modifications for second language learners. *Minnesota Papers in Linguistics and Philosophy of Language, 7*, 78-93.

Early, M. M. (1985). *Input and interaction in content classrooms: Foreigner talk and teacher talk in classroom discourse*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. UCLA.

Ellis, R. (1989). Are naturalistic and classroom acquisition the same? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 11,* 305-328.

Ferguson, C. A. (1975). Towards a characterization of English foreigner talk. *Anthropological Linguistics, 17,* 1-14.

Ferguson, C. A. (1981). Foreigner talk as the name of a simplified register. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 28*, 9-19.

Freed, B. (1978). *Foreigner talk: A study of speech adjustments made by native speakers of English in conversation with non-native speakers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pensylvania.

Freed, B. (1980). Talking to foreigners versus talking to children: Similarities and differences. In R. C. Scarcella & S. D. Krashen (Eds.), *Research in second language acquisition* (pp. 19-27). Rowly, MA: Newbury House.

Gaies, S. J. (1977). The nature of linguistic input in formal second language learning: Linguistic and communicative strategies in ESL teachers' classroom language. In H. D. Brown, C. A. Yorio & R. H. Crymes (Eds.), *Teaching and learning English as a second language: Trends in research and practice* (pp. 204-212). Washington, D. C.: TESOL.

Gaies, S. J. (1979). Linguistic input in first and second language learning. In F. R. Echman & A. J. Hastings (Eds.), *Studies in first and second language acquisition* (pp.

185-193). Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Gaskill, W. H. (1980). Correction in native speaker – nonnative spearker conversation. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.), *Discourse analysis in second language research* (pp. 125-137). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Goodwin, M. H., & Goodwin, C. (1986). Gesture and coparticipation in the activity of searching of a word. *Semiotica, 62,* 51-75.

Hakansson, G. (1986). Quantitative aspects of teacher talk. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Learning, teaching, and communication in the foreign language classroom* (pp. 83-98). Aarhus, Denmark: Aarhus University Press.

Have, P. ten. (1999). *Conversation analysis: A practical guide.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Henzl, V. M. (1973). Linguistic register of foreign language instruction. *Language Learning, 23,* 207-222.

Henzl, V. M. (1979). Foreign talk in the classroom. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 17,* 158-167.

Hyltenstam, K. (1983). Teacher talk in Swedish as a second language classrooms. Quantitative aspects of markedness conditions. In S. W. Felix & H. Wode (Eds.), *Language development at the crossroads* (pp. 173-188). Tubingen, Germany: Gunter Narr.

Ishiguro, T. (1986). *Simplification and elaboration in foreign language teacher talk.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Stanford University.

Kasper, G. (1985). Repair in foreign language teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7,* 200-215.

Kinginger, C. (1995). Task variation and repair in the foreign language classroom. In M. Haggstrom, L. Z. Morgan & J. A. Wieczorek (Eds.), *The foreign language classroom: Bridging theory and practice* (pp. 55-70). New York: Garland Pub.

Kliefgen, J. A. (1985). Skilled variation in a kindergarten teacher's use of foreigner talk. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 59-68). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Long, M. (1980). *Input, interaction, and second language acquisition.* UnPublished doctoral dissertation, UCLA.

Long, M. H. (1981). Input, interaction and SLA. In H. Winitz (Ed.), *Native language and foreign language acquisition* (pp.259-278). New York: New York Academy of Sciences.

Long, M. H., & Sato, C. J. (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse: Forms and functions of teachers' questions. In H. W. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition* (pp. 268-285). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error

types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning, 48*(2), 183-218.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquistion, 19,* 37-66.

Mannon, T. M. (1986). *Teacher talk: A comparison of a teacher's speech to native and nonnative speakers*. Unpublished MA in TESL thesis, UCLA.

Markee. N. P. P. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum.

McHoul, A. W. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in society, 19,* 349-377.

Mizon, S. (1981). *Teacher talk: A case study from the Bangalore/Madras communicational ELT project*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Lancaster, England.

Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*(4), 573-595.

Pica, T., & Long, M. H. (1986). The linguistic and conversational performance of experienced and inexperienced teachers. In R. R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 85-98). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, M., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language, 50,* 696-735.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language, 53,* 361-382.

Schwartz, J. (1980). The negotiation for meaning: Repair in Conversations between second language learners of English. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.), *Discourse analysis in second language research* (pp. 138-153). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Seong, G. (2003). *ESL teachers' repair strategies*. Paper presented at Annual TESOL Convention, Baltimore, MD.

Snow, C. (1976). The language of the mother-child relationship. In S. Rogers (Ed.), *They don't speak out language* (pp. 63-79). London: Edward Arnold.

Snow, C. (1977). Mothers' speech research: From input to interaction. In C. Snow & C. Ferguson (Eds.), *Talking to children, language input and acquisition* (pp. 31-49). Cambridge: Combridge University Press.

Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (2001). *The organization of teacher-initiated repair in German language classrooms*. Unpublished manuscript.

van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner: Ethnography and second-language classroom research*. New York: Longman.

Wesche, M. B., & Ready, D. (1985). Foreigner talk in the university classroom. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 89-114). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

APPENDIX

Transcription Convention Adapted from Sacks et al. (1974)

Notations	Meaning
( )	Empty parentheses indicate talk too obscure to transcribe. Letters inside such parentheses indicate the transcriber's best estimate of what is being said.
(0.7)	Numbers in parentheses indicate periods of silence, in tenths of a second.
(.)	A discernible pause which is too short to be timed mechanically is shown as a micro pause.
[ ]	Square brackets indicate overlaps between utterances. The point of overlap is marked with a single left-hand bracket. Right-side brackets indicate where overlapping talk ends, or marks alignments within a continuing stream of overlapping talk.
= =	Equal signs (ordinarily at the end of one line and the start of an ensuing one) indicates a "latched" relationship where there is no discernable interval or silence between turns.
.	A period indicates a falling intonation.
,	A comma indicates a continuing intonation.
?	A question mark indicates a rising intonation (not necessarily a question).
:::	Colons indicate a lengthening of the sound just preceding them, proportional to the number of colons.
.h	Inhalation is shown by a stop, followed by 'h', the length of the inhalation being indicated by the number of h's.
h.	Outbreath is shown by 'h' followed by a stop, the length being indicated by the number of h's.
Hhh	The letter "h" is used to indicate hearable aspiration, its length roughly proportional to the number of "h"s. If preceded by a dot, the aspiration is inbreath. Aspiration internal to a word is enclosed in parentheses. Otherwise "h"s may indicate anything from ordinary breathing to sighing to laughing, etc.
Hi	Underlining indicates stress or emphasis.
OH	Particularly emphatic speech, usually with raised pitch, is shown by capital letters (other than as conventionally at the beginning of turns).
.Tch	Other audible sounds are represented as closely as possible in standard orthography.
->	Arrows in the margin point to the lines of transcript relevant to the point being made in the text.
((points))	Words in double parentheses indicate transcriber's comments, not transcriptions.
becau-	A hyphen indicates an abrupt cut-off or self-interruption of the sound in progress indicated by the preceding letter(s) (the example here represents a self-interrupted "because").
Dr↑ink	A "hat" (^) or upward arrow indicates a marked pitch rise. A downward arrow indicates a pitch fall.
°why	A small circle on the upper right corner of a word indicates that it is spoken distinctively softly.
< >	When talk is markedly slowed, it is indicated by these brackets around them.
> <	These brackets mean that the talk between them is rushed.

Guiboke Seong, Ph.D.
Department of English Language Education
Korea University
Anam-dong 5-ga 1, Seongbuk-gu
Seoul 136-701, Korea
H.P.: 010-2242-9763
Email: gseong@korea.ac.kr