Speaking Proficiency of Non-native English Teachers: Constructing Multiple Utterances

Yo-An Lee

(DePaul University)

Lee, Yo-An. (2006). Speaking proficiency of non-native English teachers: Constructing multiple utterances. *English Teaching, 61*(3), 189-212.

Speaking proficiency is part and parcel of the professional life of non-native teachers of English and yet, the limited speaking competence often constrains their pedagogical options. Unfortunately, there are very few empirical studies that examine the actual spoken discourse produced by nonnative teachers. Thus, the task of developing English proficiency seems largely left to these teachers themselves. The present study investigates the speech of nonnative teachers of English to identify what they are capable of and what becomes problematic in their discourse construction. Particularly critical is the ability to produce multiple utterances because it allows teachers to carry out various classroom tasks in English such as explaining concepts, giving directions, offering examples, leading discussions and/or modeling language forms and functions. Following conversation analysis, this study demonstrates a range of procedural and strategic choices nonnative teachers of English make when constructing multiple utterances. The analysis is based on the transcribed discourse of nonnative teachers of English generated from interviews or presentations. The findings illustrate the type of real-time analyses that nonnative English teachers may need if they use English as a primary instructional language.

I. INTRODUCTION[1]

For a nonnative teacher of English (NNTE henceforce), English speaking proficiency is one of the critical factors that affects their pedagogical choices. Many NNTEs admit that it is very challenging to teach 'language use' because their lack of oral proficiency constrains their ability to implement communicative language teaching (Tang, 1997). As a result, some teachers persist in using traditional grammar translation methods (Brown & Yamashita, 1995; Scholefield, 1997). One nonnative Korean English teacher in Li's study (1998) commented, "I am good at English grammar, reading, and writing. But my oral English is very poor. Since I can't speak English well, how can I teach it to my students?"

---

[1] The earlier version was presented at KATE (2004) held in Seoul.

(p. 686). The recent phenomena in Asian countries where native English speakers are imported into their school systems reflects this sentiment (Group, 1989; Koike & Tanaka, 1995; Normile, 2003).

For those NNTEs who work in non-English speaking countries, it is a daunting task to reach a level of proficiency that would allow them to use English as a primary instructional language due to relatively limited resources and absence of consistent training opportunities (Grabe, 2004; Tucker, 2000). Very little is known about teacher training programs across EFL (English as a Foreign Language) contexts, and much less about language training programs for English teachers.[2] Analytically, there have been very few empirical studies that examine the speaking proficiency of NNTEs. With little academic and professional support, the task of developing English proficiency is largely left to NNTEs themselves, a linguistic handicap to be overcome on their own (Medgyes, 2001). Accordingly, in evaluating speaking proficiency, NNTEs simply use common sense knowledge that focuses on accuracy of grammar, native-like pronunciation and ease in speaking English (Koike & Liskin-Gasparro, 1999).

One of the first steps in addressing this challenge is to identify the types of discourse tasks NNTEs perform while using English. Many teachers aspire to use English as a primary instructional language, but the question is if it is possible to specify the types of proficiency this task entails. Some applied linguists speak of advanced proficiency (Grabe, 2004) but what does this proficiency look like in empirical terms? Does the proficiency of native speakers serve as the appropriate target norm (cf. Cook, 1999; White & Genesee, 1996)? Are there any alternative models that could fit better for NNTEs?

In light of these challenges, I propose that one barometer for the speaking skill required at this level is the ability to produce a series of coherent multiple utterances in real-time discourse. Being able to say multiple utterances in the course of interaction is essential in carrying out various classroom tasks: For example, asking questions (Yo-An Lee, Forthcoming), describing concepts, telling stories, providing examples (Yo-An Lee, 2004), leading discussions, and/or explaining homework. Accordingly, the present study offers descriptive analyses of actual speech by NNTEs to illustrate what producing multiple utterances looks like in spontaneous speech production, instead of relying on common sense or speculative estimation.

These analyses are expected to render various analytic and pedagogical implications. First, this research offers a production account of nonnative discourse in order to illustrate a range of lexical and discourse choices nonnative speakers make when building multiple utterances. Second, the study of actual discourse exemplifies what NNTEs are capable of and what becomes problematic in constructing multi-turns; this paper therefore brings into view the type of analysis NNTE speakers perform when using English as a primary

---

[2] See TESOL Quarterly (1998) volume for the recent teacher education in TESOL. See Swaffer (1991) for similar problems in foreign language teachers in the US.

instructional language.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1. NNTEs in Language Education Field

Although the majority of English teachers across the world are nonnative speakers, the close research into NNTEs has only recently begun. Early research into NNTEs situated their research in the context of language teacher education (Freeman, 1989; Johnson, 1996; Richards & Lockhart, 1996). Since the majority of ESL (English as a Second Language) teachers are native speakers, initial research into NNTEs emphasized discernable and distinctive characteristics of nonnative teachers of English. Based on surveys and interviews, these early studies examined nonnative teachers' own accounts of the challenges and accomplishments in their respective professional contexts (Braine, 1999; Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 1999; Liu, 1999). This led some to postulate the uniqueness of NNTEs in reference to the postmodern concern for identity and power (e.g., Simon-Maeda, 2004; Tang, 1997). While informative in bringing out important issues of nonnative professionals, this line of research largely remains sketchy and speculative about actual language proficiency of NNTEs.

Another line of research has used a large scale survey initiated by Medgyes in various publications (Medgyes, 1992, 2001; Reves & Medgyes, 1994). Based on the survey of 216 teachers in 10 different countries, this research showed that while being confident in their teaching ability, the majority of the NNTEs in the survey (80%) expressed language related difficulties. The challenging areas they mentioned included vocabulary, fluency and speaking and proficiency. The NNTEs from this study consider these language difficulties to be one of the most distinguishing features of nonnative teachers in comparison to their native counterparts. Though confident in their content knowledge, their ambivalence toward English proficiency resonated in a more recent study by Nemtchivona (2005) who asked a number of native teachers to evaluate teaching performance of NNTEs; these native teachers recognized the competent teaching skills by NNTEs but expressed concerns with their speaking skills.

Another large scale survey is conducted by Butler (2004) with a focus on NNTEs in Asian countries such as South Korea, Japan and Taiwan. The teachers in Butler's study also expressed that their production skills such as speaking and writing do not reach the minimum levels they deem necessary to teach English. Similarly, the study of South Korean high school English teachers by Liu et al (2004) noted that these teachers do not use English sufficiently enough for their own satisfaction. In her study of 53 in-service teachers in Korea, Sung-Yeon Kim (2002) found that students' inability to understand English is another major factor that discourages NNTEs from using English more often.

One notable finding in Sung-Yeon Kim's study is that the more the teachers use English in their teaching even for simple classroom routines, the less anxious they will be about using English in all aspects of their classroom teaching.

In summary, the prior research into NNTEs yields three important implications for the present study. First, NNTEs in the above studies expressed confidence in their pedagogical content knowledge but they were concerned about a lack of English skills, particularly speaking. Second, the main research methods in the prior research included interviews and surveys. While these methods can display perceptual views on the issue, they did not examine the actual spoken language of NNTEs. Particularly missing is the analysis of spoken discourse produced by NNTEs. As a result, the issue of language proficiency remains more conceptual and speculative than empirical and evidentiary. That is to say, the research literature has yet to establish any baseline data that illustrate the types of speaking skills required when using English as an instructional language. Only with detailed descriptions of discourse, can adequate learning strategies be generated to help NNTEs develop speaking skills. In this regard, the research into nonnative discourse gives us relevant analytic resources, to which we now turn.

2. Nonnative Discourse Studies

The investigation of discourse construction by NNTEs covers a litany of often overlapped fields of studies in applied linguistics. McCarthy's informative review of research in L2 speaking (2004) identifies several important trends in this area. First, there has been an increasing use of spoken corpus in speaking research, which embraced a wide range of language varieties as the target model for language learning. This expansion raises an important question, namely, if and to what extent NNTEs need a native norm as the target proficiency. Some researchers such as Prodromou (2003) or Cook (1999) argue that nonnative speakers do not have to rely on native norms for various reasons. First, there is a litany of English varieties and cultures and it may be too complex to fit into one model. Second, there has been a deliberate attempt to move away from the monolithic native norm on the ground that there are many "expert nonnative" English users whose language skills may not necessarily correspond with those of their native counterparts. In addition, this nonnative "expert users of English" might provide useful information about the developmental path proficient nonnative speakers go through.

Despite the consistent attempts to broaden the scope of target skills, the native norm still persists. Seidhofer (2001) argues that this is due to a lack of descriptive research that examines the expert uses of English by nonnative speakers. Christie (1999) ascribed this lack of research to a tendency to separate language skills from the content they express. This separation becomes significant in linguistic analyses because the analytic focus is placed on identifying structural and functional patterns in nonnative discourse without recognizing the situational choices the speaker manifests in their speech.

This separation of interpretive choices by the speaker from language patterns is well illustrated in the bulk of second language acquisition research. Nonnative discourse is often identified for their distinctive linguistic regularities that are classified into the external categories researchers impose. For example, several L2 researchers have examined if and to what extent the type of planning L2 speakers use (e.g., pre-task planning, no-planning or on-line planning) influences fluency, complexity and accuracy of their speech (Foster & Skehan, 1996; Wendel, 1997; Yuan & Ellis, 2003). The language produced by L2 speakers in these studies is then evaluated in reference to pre-determined categories such as fluency or accuracy. These categories are operationalized for statistical analysis: For example, fluency is measured by the number of syllables produced per minute whereas accuracy is measured according to the number of lexical errors. When we read a reported finding that says, pre-task planners produced more fluency than on-line planners, for example, our understanding is based on the consensual agreement on the operationalized categories, such as, how fluency is measured and what on-line planning means (Yuan & Ellis, 2003).

This is not a complaint that the above research studies are at fault. Rather, it simply points out that nonnative speech is treated independently of the speakers who make interpretive choices when they produce their speech (Yo-An Lee, 2006). The primary goal in the prior research has been to distill regularities of speech to draw underlying variables that are considered to generate these regular features, not the communicative acts the speakers manifest. The formulation by Gass is illustrative in the context of input and interaction study;

> The goal of my work has never been to understand language use per se, but rather to understand what types of interaction might bring about what types of changes in linguistic knowledge. Nevertheless, it is true that in order to examine these changes, one must consider language in context. But in some sense this is trivial; the emphasis in input and interaction studies is on the language used and not on the act of communication (1998, p. 84).

In this research tradition, how language is used in discourse context is trivial because the analytic goal is to identify underlying relations between independent and dependent variables. As a result, researchers in this analytic tradition do not even have to report the actual discourse produced by nonnative speakers.[3]

Accordingly, nonnative discourse recedes into the background without examining the choices a speaker makes, and the consequences of those choices in the course of interaction.[4] While this might allow one to characterize and categorize language features

---

[3] For example, Yuan and Ellis do not report any discourse produced by the participants in their study (2003).

[4] The choices here refer to the decision the speaker makes at a given moment, whether it is linguistic or instructional.

into the formal categories, it does not show how discourse is produced in the evolving sequence of interactional contingencies or how particular utterances are occasioned and made relevant to next utterances by the speakers.

Considering that our interest here is to learn what NNTEs do at the time of their speech production, it does not seem plausible to consider 'language use' independently of the communicative works of the speakers. For those NNTEs who want to use English as an instructional language, then, it becomes significant to learn what is involved and what become problematic in building discourse in the evolving sequence of talk. The task of building multiple utterances offers an excellent illustration of what kinds of decision making the speakers make and how several turns are made relevant in spontaneous speech.

One of the distinctive ways to retrieve NNTEs interpretive choice is to follow sequential organization of their speech. Initiated by conversation analysts (Sacks, 1992; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977), the sequential analysis attends to the phenomena in natural conversation in which speakers are oriented to the prior talk, most commonly, to immediately preceding talk because turns at talk are tied to each other in temporally evolving sequence of talk. In effect, the next turn at talk reveals how the speaker of that turn understood the previous one (Moerman & Sacks, 1971/1988); what it means, what it calls for, and/or what work it is doing (Macbeth, 2001). Looking into the sequential contexts of discourse production allows us to retrieve the members' interpretive work of understanding because the character of and import of each turn at talk embed their choice in real-time speech. Speakers are engaged in a constant moment-by-moment decision making as every next turn opens up new possibilities of meaning and potential responses.

This type of analysis intends to demonstrate the choices speakers make during each turn and what action it accomplishes. It is at this level of details where we can retrieve kinds of analysis NNTEs make. This, in turn, presents NNTEs with empirical illustrations of what it looks like using English in extended speech.

III. RESEARCH DESIGN

1. Research Questions

The present study offers a base-line analysis of English discourse produced by NNTEs, particularly the way in which they produce multiple utterances. The ability to extend their turn into multiple utterances allows NNTEs to carry out a vast array of classroom tasks such as explaining concepts, leading class discussions, asking questions or even reproaching. The question is how to gain access to this ability and how to analyze them informatively. One way to address this task is to follow the qualitative tradition of research (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Lazaraton, 2003) that, instead of testing hypothesis the researchers impose in advance, focuses on the process of building

multiple utterances as the members experience it. The following questions served as analytic guides in the effort to bring out discourse choices the speaker makes in the course of their speech;

1. When NNTEs are engaged in impromptu speech production, what are some ways for them to expand their speech into multiple utterances? What kinds of decisions do they make in the course of their speech?
2. Unlike native speakers whose lexical or grammatical choices are often taken-for-granted and automatic, nonnative speech calls for conscious choice and deliberation over alternatives. What kinds of lexical and grammatical choices do NNTEs make when forming multiple utterances in the course of speech? how do they contribute to the discourse formation?
3. In reference to the multiple utterances NNTEs produce, what are some exemplary features that are mark of fluent language proficiency of NNTEs?

2. Participants

Twelve nonnative speakers participated in this project. Seven of the participants were pursuing master's degree in TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) at a Midwestern US university. They are from Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan and their length of stay in the US ranges from eighteen months to two years. There were five female participants and two male participants; all were in their twenties with teaching experience of less than 1 year. All of the participants expressed that they had had more than 10 years of experience learning English in their home countries. They all noted that their conversational skills are sufficient enough to carry out daily interactional tasks. However, they were less confident about doing tasks that required extended speech such as class presentations or debates.

The remaining five participants were also from Asian countries; however, these individuals were foreign language instructors for the East-Asian language department at the university. Three participants were instructors of Chinese while the other two were Japanese and Korean instructors, respectively. One male Chinese instructor was in his late 30s with more than 10 years of university teaching experience, including 4 years in the US. The other two female Chinese instructors were in their early 30s; one teacher joined the program a year earlier while the other two had taught in the program for 3 years. The Korean and Japanese instructors were both female in their late twenties with less than two years of teaching experience.

3. Data Collection Procedure

The primary focus of the present study was to document NNTE's discourse as they are

engaged in constructing multiple utterances. The seven participants who were in the TESOL master's program were part of a study group that regularly met in order to practice speech. During each meeting, the participants completed 15 minutes of uninterrupted speech in a topic of their choice; their topics included their lives in the US, their family at home countries, movies they saw to their teaching philosophies. Seventeen sessions were audio taped for the present study. The amount of time the participants stayed in the study group, at the time of data collection, varies from 4 months to 6 months.

Since presentations in the study group were mostly uninterrupted speech, the presentation portions of the data produced a vast amount of multiple utterances. Some participants in the presentation sessions brought a short memo for their presentations while others spoke without referring to any notes but none of the presenters memorized their speech in verbatim.

The interview data consists of an hour long interview sessions. There were two interviewers; one was the researcher of the project while the other was a native speaker of English. Since the primary focus was to examine spontaneous multiple utterances from the nonnative speakers, only the sections that had multiple utterances were included in the report. In the interview, the participants were asked about their teaching responsibility, their English proficiency, and their language learning experience.

All sessions were audio/taped and transcribed to capture the actual speech as accurately as possible. This generated twenty two hours of discourse data: 17 hours of presentation and 5 hours of interviews. The transcribed data produced a 250 page document on which the following analysis is based.

The taped-recorded discourse offers a practical solution to those who wanted to describe actual social events in detail (Heritage, 1984; Sacks, 1984) because it allows the researchers to return to the data over and over again for an in-depth analysis. While there is a variety of theoretical positions and practical recommendations as to how to interpret and report transcribed discourse (Lapadat & Lindsay, 1999; Mishler, 1991; Ochs, 1979), I take the transcripts to be records of participants' interpretive choices they make in producing their utterances following the convention of Conversation Analysis (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984).[5]

4. Analysis

Once the recordings were transcribed, the entire corpus was closely examined in order to find common characteristics as prescribed by the guiding research questions. This adheres to the principles of qualitative research (Glesne, 1999; Holliday, 2004; Lazaraton, 2003) that traces participants' perspectives revealed in the discourse outcomes, rather than imposing the pre-given and operationalized categories. Accordingly, the analysis traces,

---

[5] See appendix for transcript notations.

not simply structural and functional regularities of the discourse, but the relations of discourse to the actions speakers perform and the choices they reveal in the sequential context of talk (Sacks, 1992) at each given moment. This process required several rounds of reviewing the entire corpus to evaluate the credibility of the findings collected in the analysis.

Through this process of bottom-up analysis, I selected several groups of telling cases (Mitchell, 1984) that demonstrate the procedural aspects of discourse constructions, particularly the types of choices speakers make in the contingency of real-time speech. That is to say, this analysis brings out 'emic' perspective (Pike, 1967) that retrieves real-time discourse as the participants experience them.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Ways of Extending the Talk

One of the immediate and contingent tasks that face NNTEs in natural speech is to make multiple utterances that are coherent and thus intelligible (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). What one says at one moment has to be relevant to what has been said before and what comes next. Then, the instantaneous decision at each juncture of speech becomes critical. This task addresses the first research question, namely, 'what are some ways for NNTEs to extend their speech?"

The following excerpt shows this type of instantaneous decision makings in an interview setting. The speaker in this session (N) works in a Japanese high school and she is describing the time she first started teaching.

Excerpt 1
69.	I:	Was it challenging when you started teaching there?
70.	N:	At that time, I had forty students in my class, but now, I have
71.		only aha:: twenty students in my class at maximum level, which
72.		is good for me, but bad for school, so my school is not in a good
73.		condition in terms of financial (.) aspect, that's why we are out
74.		of, I mean we don't have many students in my two classes, but
75.		that was good for me, so I didn't feel much pressure from
76.		students, (.) bu:t I got overwhelmed by what I have told, have
77.		been told and what to do in class.
78.	I:	What did they tell you?
79.	N:	Like, aha- the first thing they told me is that I have to teach 19
80.		hours.

The teacher begins her answer with describing the number of students in class and compares it to when she first started. This is followed by a remark concerning how this change influences her personally "..which is good for me" (71-72).

Notice that she could have finished the discussion there but she decides to continue. The nature of her decision at this juncture is what we want to examine; here, the teacher offers an additional comment on how this change impacts the school (72-73); it is one of the reasons that she had the reduced number of students. Juxtaposing the personal view with the school's financial troubles is the speaker's topical choice and this allows her to produce multiple utterances. This discussion is followed by her summative answer to the question about the challenge "but that was good for me, so I didn't feel much pressure from students." (75-76), another strategy to expand her turns.

Again, her answer could have ended there but the speaker decides to continue building more turns by bringing up a new topic. There are two notable methods in how the speaker accomplishes this task. First, her summative remark about "pressure from students" (75-76) seems to indicate that there is more to the issue, (for example, 'Now that I discussed the pressure from students, I will tell you about other pressures'). Second, notice how she begins her next topic in line 75 while continuing her turns, "bu:t I got overwhelmed." This remark is different from how she began her prior topic in line 70-71. Her prior discussion started with describing situational contexts by referring to the number of students, and then, she offered her feelings as a concluding remark "so I didn't feel much pressure from students" (75-76). Here, in contrast, the teacher begins with a remark on how she felt first, "but I got overwhelmed... by what I have been told" (76-77). This is a distinctive method of talk that sets up an anticipatory set about what is to come (Sacks, 1972); she will give the details of what made her feel overwhelmed. This is exactly what her interviewer asks in the next turn (78) and she continues her talk to explain (79).

This excerpt, therefore, demonstrates that building multiple turns involves various procedures on the speaker's part in determining what to say next, based on what was said before to make theses turns connected. Pre-given categories such as fluency measured through the number of syllables in prior research (e.g., Yuan & Ellis, 2003) can not retrieve this type of interpretive choices each speaker makes in their discourse although these decisions shape the content of the speech.

The following sequence shows another example of multiple utterances by a NNTE from China. In this excerpt, the speaker compares two language programs she has been involved.

Excerpt 2

      156.   I: Do you feel a lot of differences teaching aha:: teaching there and
      157.   teaching here?
      158.   Z: Hum:: yeah, I think hum:: first of all, the program, yea, it's aha::
      159.   very well organized I should say, especially first year, like
      160.   everything is very well scheduled, and the:: you have a kind of

161.   theory behind the:: teaching and whatever you do, you have a
162.   theory to back it up. But the: when I was in China, hum, teaching,
163.   teaching Chinese, we didn't have much theories, just like, you
164.   know, from, from, I would draw from my experience, my own
165.   experience of learning English as a second language, so and also,
166.   most of the teachers in, in our center back in China, they didn't
167.   have any, you know, background or training in teaching, you
168.   know, we, especially not in teaching Chinese as a second
169.   language, so:: and also the students I think aha:: somewhat
170.   different too, here I, I found that, to my surprise that the students
171.   are, most of the students are very well motivated, yeah, in China
172.   it was different..

The speaker begins with "first of all" (158) which signifies more to come (i.e., second, and third..), thus securing the floor for extended talk (Sacks, 1978). In her description, the speaker focuses on two features of the program, namely, "being well organized" and "teaching is based on theory." When she begins to discuss the second program, this speaker uses one of these two features in her next remark "when I was in China… we didn't have much theories" (162-163). That is to say, this speaker uses the issue of theoretical support for teaching as a resource to tie her description of the first and second program.

Later in the sequence, the speaker decides to elaborate on what she has said; the original statement is "we didn't have much theories" and she goes on to add, "I would draw from my experience" (164). This comment is also supported by her subsequent rationale detailing why she and others had to rely on their own experience, namely, their lack of teacher training in China (166-167). There is a logical thread, realized in multiple utterances, that pulls several utterances together sequentially in the course of her speech; there was a lack of theoretical support and teacher training, which led them to rely on personal experience. This discussion could have ended at this point, but she ventures into a new topic, students, as another example of the differences between the two programs she is comparing.

My intention in following the speaker's topical choices is to demonstrate that saying more than one utterance requires the speaker's immediate decision: The decisions to elaborate, summarize and even shift the topic. The prior studies on nonnative discourse did not emphasize the contingent choices speakers make in the course of interaction; knowing discourse regularities is not sufficient to teach us how these utterances are organized sequentially.

2. Lexical, Grammatical and Topical Tie

The second guiding research question was to identify the lexical and grammatical

choices NNTEs make in the course of interaction and how they accomplish the topical coherence. In constructing multiple turns, the speaker has to make the current turn relevant to the prior and next turn in the course of speech. Every word, phrase, clause or sentence might contribute to this sequential tie by supporting, modifying, or restricting turns in progress. The following passage, from a native Korean speaker is an example of this point.

Excerpt 3

46. Q: What is the population of Pusan?
47. N: Three millions, or about, about that number, I must say, but you
48.   know, Seoul, that's the biggest most populous…city in Korea, its
49.   population is well over ten millions.

As discussed in the previous section, the first thing to notice in this excerpt is the speaker's topic choice in building her multiple utterances; she offers more than what was asked for as she moves from "Pusan" to another city, "Seoul." This speaker might have thought that Seoul is more recognizable and thus mentionable than Pusan to the interviewer. The question is what kinds of lexical and/or grammatical choices the speaker makes in accomplishing the task of shifting topics.

First, the speaker maintains the continuity of the underlying theme, namely, 'population,' in discussing these two cities; therefore, she discusses 'Seoul' in reference to 'population.' Second, in explaining the population of Seoul, the speaker uses two superlatives, namely, 'biggest' and 'populous'; these two words entails two different inflectional endings ("the biggest" and "the most populous").[6] Modifying the word 'city' using two different types of superlative shows that this speaker is not only aware of the grammatical properties each superlative requires but also that she is able to produce them with accuracy. It is also notable that these utterances are produced without extensive gap or hesitation in her speech, which shows some degree of her practiced familiarity with this type of discourse. Her lexical choice "well over ten millions" in line 48-49 also demonstrates her proficiency to support why 'Seoul' is mentionable in this context. The task of constructing multiple turns then involves the decision not just about the topical issue of what to say but also the competence to support it with adequate lexical and grammatical details.

The following excerpt shows a NNTE from Japan discussing his experience as a language teacher. This excerpt demonstrates a conversational repair: Repair is a conversational practice in which the speaker fixes the turn at talk (Schegloff, 1992; Schegloff et al., 1977).[7] Rather than errors to be corrected, his repair in this excerpt

---

[6] The following kind of mistake is not uncommon in L2 speech

  137. N: I think aha:: Columbus is *more clean.*

[7] From a psycholinguistic point of view, self-repair is considered to be a self-monitoring process on the part of the speaker (Kormos, 1999; Shehadeh, 1999). Most L2 studies on repair have centered on two party talk between the teacher and his/her students and therefore, implicates heavily the

demonstrates the choice this speaker makes to emphasize his point.

Excerpt 4

371. J: Yeah, teachers should be really flexible, very flexible, you should

372.   have many ways to solve the questions ready, right, and to be able

373.   to do that, I found, I came, I need more experience, trial and errors,

374.   that's the only way I feel, I can not, I could, I could never learn that

375.   kind of stuff from textbooks.

Topically, the speaker begins with the comment about how 'teachers should be flexible.' This is followed by his examples of what flexibility could mean ("you should have many ways to solve the question ready" in line 371-372) as one way to extend his turn. Next, the speaker offers how he came to realize that point in line 373-374. In this way, the speaker builds multiple utterances that are logically tied and thus intelligible; beginning with 'one needs to be flexible,' then, 'flexibility comes through experience' and finally, 'one cannot learn the flexibility from textbooks.'

In line 374, this speaker offers a summative remark of what he has described, "That's the only way." This is followed by a series of repairs. The first comment "I can not" is repaired to "I could"; the second "I could" involves a different kind of reasoning because he is projecting the conditional sentence. In addition, the second repair to "I could never learn.." uses a negative sentence to bolster this argument projected in the conditional sentence emphatically (e.g., 'Even if I try, I could never learn this.'). By projecting his point in a conditional sentence, this speaker makes his case about the flexibility in a distinctive way and his choice is reflected in the grammatical and lexical choice embedded in this series of repairs.

In summary, the excerpts above show the range of choices speakers make during speech formation, whether it is lexical, grammatical or topical. These choices are not randomly selected; they are made logical in the sequential context of multiple turns as each is recognizing what is being said and relating to the next turn at talk. The lexical, grammatical and topic choices are then should be understood, not for their independent regularities for linguistic categorization, but in reference to the communicative acts the speaker performs in each sequential context. What otherwise looks like ordinary utterances are in fact manifestations of deliberate and conscious choices that NNTEs make of lexical, grammatical and topical alternatives.

---

presence of semantic and syntactic errors and its remedies as a part of the work of teaching (Kasper, 1985; Seedhouse, 1999; van Lier, 1988). Yet, the organization of repair in a classroom setting does not limit its scope to correcting errors (Macbeth, 2004; McHoul, 1990).

3. Organizational Level

The third research question focuses on examples that mark fluency of NNTEs in constructing multiple utterances. It goes without saying that the proficient speakers are able to punctuate their discourse, making adequate transitions and coordinating the syntactic and semantic relations among components of speech. This ability gives the organizational integrity of speech to the multiple utterances; this becomes a mark of NNTE's proficiency. The question is how NNTEs accomplish this task. The current section offers examples of choices NNTEs make so that their multiple utterances are organizationally adequate. For example, note in the following excerpt, how a simple remark 'let's say' shows the speaker's organizational logic.

Excerpt 5
>   139. R: People are nicer here.
>   140. I: Why do you say that?
>   141. R: Aha:: actually when I meet people, when I meet people on the
>   142.   street, they are really nice, *let's say*, if I meet, if I have some
>   143.   problems, like I am looking for some special place:::

The speaker's utterance in line 142, 'let's say' indicates a shift in the discourse, preparing the interlocutor for an example. Analytically, this indicates that the speaker is aware of what she has described so far and thus projects what she is going to say next. Punctuating one's discourse this way is essential in making extended turns coherent.

The following remark provides another example of coherent organization in which the speaker uses adequate time references. This nonnative speaker talks about her brother who studies at a different US university:

Excerpt 6
>   385. A: How often do you talk to your brother?
>   386. T: Brother- *at first* he called me everyday because he wanted to check
>   387.   how am I doing, you know, *nowadays*, we talk once a week or
>   388.   twice a week on the phone, then, once a month he visits me.

The above remark is punctuated by two time references, 'at first' in line 386 and 'nowadays' in line 387. These adverbs help the interlocutor process what to expect in the subsequent turns; when she says 'at first' we can see that she offers how she plans her speech, namely, she would discuss more recent action by her brother later. With the adequate transitional and organizational remarks in place, her interlocutor comes to see what comes first and next as well as how the two are relevant.

In the following excerpt produced by another Korean speaker, the speaker's turns

display the distinctive proficiency in organizing his multiple utterances. This is from a 15 minute presentation in which the speaker discusses a wireless technology.

Excerpt 7

627. L: This is about current status about wireless technology, digital
628.   technology. You know, things like, digital is quite different from
629.   analog, you know, analog is like this, the tape recorder, but if you
630.   are making digital, you can sort of erase it and then, do it again,
631.   like CD Rom and computers, things like that. So I know there is
632.   technical difference between digital and analog system, but you
633.   know, there is a lot more to it, in terms of digital technology.

The notable thing about the above excerpt is that the talk is revealing about what he is going to say. First, the speaker begins with introducing the topic in line 627-628. Next, he moves to discuss the difference between digital and analogue. This is an impromptu decision to offer an actual example using the tape recorder his audience can see. Then, in line 631, the speaker characterizes what he has just described, indicating that the difference between an analog and digital system is just one possible issue with the wireless technology. Accordingly, his next comment "there is a lot more to it" (633) sets up an expectation on what he is going to talk about next. That is to say, the entire turns shown in the excerpt works as a preliminary to what he is about to say, an interesting way to characterize his turns to come (Goodwin, 1990/1991).

The above excerpts show the speaker's proficiency to understand how their talk is organized and communicate to the audience how these utterances should be understood. These speakers do not simply list things linearly; rather, they interpret how to connect, revise, repair, characterize and emphasize them in the course of their talk. The structural and functional regularities alone do not show sufficient information about how these multiple turns are organized to reflect the aforementioned choices. The knowledge and skill to design their multiple utterances organizationally offers an important mark of English proficiency, which is useful when using English to teach English in classroom settings.

4. Formulation

During their speech, speakers often characterize their own talk during the course of speech. This formulation offers evidence that the speaker is capable of managing his/her own speech, and adjusting the content based on a judgment of how the speech is (to be) heard by the interlocutors. This is loosely based on Garfinkel and Sack's proposal (Garfinkel & Sacks, 1970) as follows.

A member may treat some part of the conversation as an occasion to describe that conversation, to explain it, or characterize it, or explicate, or translate, or summarize, or furnish the gist of it, or take note of its accordance with rules, or remark on its departure from rules. That is to say a member may use some part of the conversation as an occasion to formulate the conversation (pp. 350-351).

Formulating is a routine linguistic action that people use to clarify, identify, define and/or describe what they are doing. This is another mark of language proficiency one can identify in real-time speech. For example, the following segment shows one example of formulation.

Excerpt 8

235. L: How language should be learned:: well, first of all, it can not be
236.   learned only inside the classroom, *that's for sure*, I think::

The speaker's comment "that's for sure" in this context refers to what she has talked about before, conveying her certainty. This formulation then offers evidence that speakers are capable of overseeing the progress of their speech and adjusting their talk in the course of interaction.[8]

Note in the following remark how the speaker characterizes her previous remark as she says, 'the western ideal of teaching' in line 200-202:

Excerpt 9

198. I: Did you know anything about communicative language teaching?
199. C: When I was in China in 1990s, let's see, 1996 to 1997, I attended
200.   the teacher training program, it was, it was connected by British
201.   counsel, we had two British teachers, so I, I had some knowledge
202.   about, you know, about *the western idea of teaching* at that time.

Note that this speaker's comment is designed to be a response to the question about communicative language teaching. However, the speaker began her answer with a narrative about an experience during the mid 1990s when she had training with British counsel. This is a distinctive formulating practice as she ties 'communicative language

---

[8] The formulation is often directed to the remark by other speakers as is seen in the following example.

    28.   R: The new school term will begin in September.
    29.   Y: September the first, oh, yeah, you got only two weeks.
    30.   R: *Back to work*, that's right.

'Back to work' is an interesting way of characterizing what the interviewer said in the previous turn in line 29.

teaching' to her experience with the British counsel. Second, this speaker formulates this experience as "western idea of teaching" (202). Again, the question was about communicative language teaching, but she formulates it as the western idea of teaching.

Through this formulation, this teacher offers her distinctive choice as to how she sees communicative language teaching, one that represents the western idea. This 'western idea of teaching' also refers to her own status at that time, as a teacher coming into contact with the method for the first time. That is to say, this formulation brings out the choices this speaker makes of many possible alternatives; she could have formulated communicative language teaching as the British idea of teaching or even a new idea of teaching. Thus, the formulation demonstrates how the speaker highlights particular features of her experience to convey her understanding of the question.

Formulation can also characterize what is yet to be said, thus informing the interlocutors of how to hear what is to come in the subsequent turns. Consider the following example in which the speaker makes a commentary on what she is going to say next. The speaker is describing her EFL (English as a Foreign Language) students at her school in Japan.

Excerpt 10

372. J: My students are very brave, and then, they are very:: they are risk
373.   takers I would say, they are not afraid to make mistakes, but:: they
374.   are very weak in grammar, reading and:: I would say, writing too,
375.   and their vocabulary is very limited, they use words they need when
376.   they talk, so we are not sure, if they really get it or not, I mean, they
377.   could speak in class, but we don't know if they really, will be, ever
378.   to handle it outside the classroom, we are not sure, I feel like it's
379.   very superficial, not very stable way.

First, this teacher characterizes her students as 'brave' and then, 'risk takers,' which becomes a formulation of what she is going to say next. In the next turn, she offers examples by adding "they are not afraid to make mistakes" (373). In this way, her formulation and examples become coherent as multiple turns. Similarly, in the next turns, the teacher offers a different description of the same students by referring to her students' writing skills and knowledge of vocabulary (374-376). This is followed by an example (375: 'they use words they need when they talk') to illustrate her point.

Since two opposing views are provided about her students, this speaker offers a summative remark for what she has described so far ('So we are not sure… I feel like it's very superficial, not very stable way'). This series of formulations shows that this speaker is well aware of what she said in the prior turns and organizes her next turns accordingly by characterizing what she is going to say, offering examples and summarizing it in the course of action.

In this regard, formulating practice offers an excellent demonstration that the speaker

has a firm grasp of what goes on during a talk as she specifies what was/is said, predicts what is to come, and takes the discourse in a particular direction. The contingent nature of real time discourse involves the speaker who attends to an immediate task of connecting utterances. Whatever structural and functional features are uncovered in the given discourse, they have to be understood in reference to speaker's interpretive choices; whether it is a choice of vocabulary, grammatical structure or discourse patterns. When language utterances are understood in reference to the interpretive choices they carry, then, we can tap into the actual communicative acts the speaker performs. The analytic challenge for NNTEs is how to recognize those choices embedded deeply into the nonnative discourses. Unfortunately prior research on nonnative discourse has not been helpful in this regard as they impose external categories in making sense of the nonnative discourse.

V. CONCLUSION

The organization of nonnative discourse reported above is something that emerges from the data corpus through in-depth bottom-up analysis. A particular focus was paid to trace the speakers' choices embedded in each subsequent turn, following conversation analytic framework. The above findings demonstrate how speakers extend their turns, what kinds of choices they make and indicate some evidence of their proficiency. For nonnative speakers, this can present a unique challenge because what they can do is reduced relative to numerous resources that their first language would permit. In addressing this issue, the present analysis did not follow a quantitative-hypothesis testing that projects the categories of analysis prior to the data analysis. Instead, this study brought out emic perspective collected from naturally occurring speech data (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003).

The literature on second language use has seen an increase in research that examines advanced learners of second language and their language production (Kasper & Rose, 2002; Wesche & Paribakht, 1999). The bulk of research has been directed towards searching for more effective approaches to helping learners develop skills for language use. What is missing in this literature are, however, the details of the communicative acts involved in each speech performance. Regardless of what learning approaches are adopted to improve speaking proficiency, spoken discourse always involves the works of understanding by those who hear and produce the discourse. In this regard, sequential organization of talk offers an interesting alternative in informing the interpretive choices that contribute to the process of generating multiple turns at talk.

Within this context of real-time talk organization, there is a need for nonnative teachers to develop a certain degree of analytic skills as to how language is used in real-time discourse and what become problematic in that process. Understanding the character of their speech in the contingent context of real-time discourse eventually leads to knowledge of what types of input is necessary and how to use it. It also allows them to evaluate the

progress of their language production, not in reference to distant conceptual categories, but rather in the concrete details of choices embedded in the sequential organization of their talk. This, in turn, will give them the ability to trace their own developmental process.

By offering analyses of the actual discourse produced by NNTEs, the present paper demonstrates what NNTEs can do with their own speech. For example, the section on "the ways of extending the talk" exemplifies choices any speaker has to make if they want to extend their talk. We can imagine various classroom situations where extending the talk becomes critical such as elaborating on some concepts, telling stories or answering students' questions. Similarly, the section on "Organizational level" demonstrates how speakers of multiple turns organize their multiple turns. Without any organizational integrity, any multiple utterances would not make sense. The analyses presented in this paper are therefore beneficial for NNTEs in that it brings out concrete examples of speech decisions that are being made in the middle of speech production.

Considering the vast number of nonnative English teachers across the world, there is an urgent need for more descriptive analyses (Seidlhofer, 2001) to offer base-line data. The collections of spoken discourse presented in this paper are designed to offer the type of analyses that highlight the procedural aspects of discourse production and the communicative acts that result from them.

Once nonnative teachers recognize the contingent natures of speaking discourses, they will be able to appreciate the intricate ways in which the components of speech become constitutive of the actions that language utterances display. Speaking proficiency involves an array of distinctive skills which requires nonnative teachers to maintain their observational skills in order to recognize how different components of speech are interrelated in their input, and how their own speech becomes problematic. Understanding what they are capable of and what becomes problematic in their speech is a useful way to start improving proficiency. This paper will provide useful resources for determining what needs to be done to improve their English.

REFERENCES

Atkinson, J., & Heritage, J. (1984). Transcript notation. In J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. ix-xvi). New York: Cambridge.

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and method*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Braine, G. (Ed.). (1999). *Non-native educators in English language teaching*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Brown, J., & Yamashita, S. (1995). English language entrance examinations at Japanese universities: What do we know about them? *JALT Journal, 17*(1), 7-30.

Brutt-Griffler, J., & Samimy, K. (1999). Revisiting the colonial in the postcolonial: Critical praxis for nonnative-English-speaking teachers in a TESOL program. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(3), 413-431.

Butler, Y. G. (2004). What level of English proficiency do elementary school teachers need to attain to teach EFL?: Case studies from Korea, Taiwan, and Japan. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*(2), 245-278.

Christie, F. (1999). Genre theory and ESL teaching: A systemic functional perspective. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(4), 759-763.

Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(2), 185-209.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.). (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Foster, P., & Skehan, P. (1996). The influence of planning and task type on second language performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18*, 299-323.

Freeman, D. (1989). Teacher training, development, and decision making: A model of teaching and related strategies for language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*(1), 27-45.

Garfinkel, H., & Sacks, H. (1970). On formal structures of practical action. In J. C. McKinney & E. A. Tiryakian (Eds.), *Theoretical sociology: Perspectives and development* (pp. 338-366). New York: Appleton Century Crofts.

Gass, S. (1998). Apples and oranges: Or, why apples are not orange and don't need to be - A response to Firth and Wagner. *Modern Language Journal, 82*(1), 83-90.

Glesne, C. (1999). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. New York: Longman.

Goodwin, M. (1990/1991). Retellings, pretellings and hypothetical stories. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 24*, 263-276.

Grabe, W. (2004). Perspectives in applied linguistics. *AILA Review, 16*, 105-132.

Group, R. (1989). *Expatriate English language teachers pilot scheme: Final Evaluation Report*. Hong Kong: Education Department.

Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299-345). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Holliday, A. (2004). Issues of validity in progressive paradigms of qualitative research. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*(4), 731-734.

Johnson, K. (1996). The role of theory in L2 teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*(4), 765-771.

Kasper, G. (1985). Repair in foreign language teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7*(2), 200-215.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kim, Sung-Yeon. (2002). Teachers' perceptions about teaching English through English. *English Teaching, 57*(1), 131-148.

Koike, D., & Liskin-Gasparro, J. (1999). What is a Near-Native speaker? Perspectives of job seekers and search committees in Spanish. *ADFL Bulletin, 30*(3), 54-62.

Koike, I., & Tanaka, H. (1995). English in foreign language education policy in Japan: Toward the twenty-first century. *World Englishes, 14*(1), 13-25.

Kormos, J. (1999). Monitoring and self-repair in L2. *Language Learning, 49*(2), 303-342.

Lapadat, J., & Lindsay, A. (1999). Transcription in research and practice: From standardization and technique to interpretive positionings. *Qualitative Inquiry, 5*(1), 64-86.

Lazaraton, A. (2003). Evaluative criteria for qualitative research in applied linguistics: Whose criteria and whose research? *Modern Language Journal, 87*(1), 1-12.

Lee, Yo-An. (2004). The work of examples in classroom instruction. *Linguistics and Education, 15*(1/2), 99-120.

Lee, Yo-An. (Forthcoming). Respecifying display questions: Interactional resources for language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(4).

Lee, Yo-An. (2006). Towards respecification of communicative competence: Condition of L2 instruction or its objective? *Applied Linguistics,* 27(3), 349-376

Li, D. (1998). It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine: Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*(4), 677-703.

Liu, D., Ahn, G., Baek, K., & Han, N. (2004). South Korean high school English teachers' code switching: Questions and challenges in the drive for maximal use of English in teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*(4), 605-638.

Liu, J. (1999). Nonnative-English-Speaking professionals in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(1), 85-102.

Macbeth, D. (2001). On "Reflexivity" in qualitative research: Two readings, and a Third. *Qualitative Inquiry, 7*(1), 35-68.

Macbeth, D. (2004). The relevance of repair in classroom correction. *Language in Society, 33*(5), 703-736.

McCarthy, M., & O'Keeffe, A. (2004). Research in the teaching of speaking. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24*, 26-43.

McHoul, A. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in Society, 19*(3), 349-377.

Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: Who's worth more? *ELT Journal, 46*(4), 340-349.

Medgyes, P. (2001). When the teacher is a non-native speaker. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 429-442). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Mishler, E. G. (1991). Representing discourse: The rhetoric of transcription. *Journal of*

Narrative and Life History, 1, 255-280.

Mitchell, C. (1984). Case studies. In R. F. Ellen (Ed.), *Ethnographic research: A guide to general conduct* (pp. 237-241). New York: Academic Press.

Moerman, M., & Sacks, H. (1971/1988). On understanding in the analysis of natural conversation. In M. Moerman (Ed.), *Talking culture: Ethnography and conversation analysis* (pp. 180-186). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Nemtchinova, E. (2005). Host teachers' evaluation of nonnative-English-speaking teacher trainees-A perspective from the classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 39*(2), 235-262.

Normile, D. (2003). New Asian schools look west for high-quality instruction. *Chronicle of Higher Education, March 21*, 1832-1833.

Ochs, E. (1979). Transcription as theory. In E. Ochs & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Developmental pragmatics* (pp. 43-72). New York: Academic Press.

Pike, K. (1967). *Language in relation to a unified theory of structure of human behavior* (2 ed.). The Hague: Mouton.

Prodromou, L. (2003). In search of the successful user of English. *Modern English Teacher, 12*, 5-14.

Reves, T., & Medgyes, P. (1994). The non-native English speaking EFL/ESL teacher's self-image: An international survey. *System, 22*(3), 353-367.

Richards, J., & Lockhart, C. (1996). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (1972). On the analyzability of stories by children. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 325-245). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Sacks, H. (1978). Some technical considerations of a dirty joke. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 249-269). New York: Academic Press.

Sacks, H. (1984). Notes on methodology. In M. J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 21-27). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation*. Cambridge: Blackwell.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50*(4), 693-735.

Schegloff, E. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology, 97*(5), 1295-1345.

Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language, 53*(2), 363-382.

Schegloff, E., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica, 7*, 289-327.

Scholefield, W. (1997). An overview of the teaching and learning of English in Japan since 1945. *Babel, 32*(1), 16-21, 37.

Seedhouse, P. (1999). The relationship between context and the organization of repair in

the L2 classroom. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 37*(1), 59-80.

Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a Lingua France. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 11*, 133-158.

Shehadeh, A. (1999). Non-native speakers' production of modified comprehensible output and second language learning. *Language Learning, 49*(4), 627-675.

Simon-Maeda, A. (2004). The complex construction of professional identities: Female EFL educators in Japan speak out. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*(3), 405-436.

Swaffar, J. (1991). Articulating learning in high school and college programs: Holistic theory in the foreign language curriculum. In S. Magnan (Ed.), *Challenges in the 1990s for college foreign language programs* (pp. 27-54). Boston: Heinle.

Tang, C. (1997). On the Power and Status of Nonnative ESL Teachers. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(3), 577-580.

Tucker, G. R. (2000). Concluding thoughts: Applied linguistics at the juncture of millennia. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 20*, 241-249.

Tyler, A. (1992). Discourse structure and the perception of incoherence in international teaching assistants' spoken discourse. *TESOL Quarterly, 26*(4), 713-729.

van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner*. London: Longman.

Wendel, J. N. (1997). *Planning and second language narrative production.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, Tokyo.

Wesche, M., & Paribakht, S. (1999). Introduction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21*(2), 175-180.

White, L., & Genesee, F. (1996). How native is near-native? The issue of ultimate attainment in adult second language acquisition. *Second Language Research, 12*(3), 233-265.

Yuan, F., & Ellis, R. (2003). The effects of pre-task planning and on-line planning on fluency, complexity and accuracy in L2 monologic oral production. *Applied Linguistics, 24*(1), 1-27.

APPENDIX
Transcript Notations

(2.0)	Timed silence within or between adjacent utterances.
( )	An uncertain hearing of what the speaker said.
(.)	A short untimed pause.
-	A halting, abrupt cutoff
,	Falling intonation but not necessarily final.
.	Final intonation. e.g., sentence final.
:	A prolonged stretch

Applicable levels: Teacher Education
Key words: Nonnative teachers of English, Speaking, Discourse analysis, Conversation analysis,
           Ethnomethodology, Teacher Education

Yo-An Lee
Bilingual-Bicultural Education (BBE)
2320 N. Kenmore
Chicago, IL 60640
USA
Email: ylee19@depaul.edu