*영어어문교육 12*권 1호 2006년 봄

Pedagogical Functions of Teachers' Conversational Repair Strategies in the ESL Classroom

Guiboke Seong
(Korea University)

Seong, Guiboke. (2006). Pedagogical functions of conversational repair strategies in the ESL classroom. *English Language and Literature Teaching, 12*(1), 77-101.

The present study examines various pedagogical functions of conversational repair strategies employed by the teacher in the ESL classroom. As part of interactional resources, conversational repair is defined as the treatment of trouble occurring in interactive language use and is originally designed to deal with communication problems. Research on conversational repair has focused on ordinary conversation and organization of repair practices. Studies on more pedagogical functions of repair sequences initiated by the teacher are very few. The data were from five hours of ESL structure classes in an intensive English institute at a large U.S. university. They were closely transcribed and microanalyzed following the conversation-analytic methodology. The analysis found that ESL teachers' repair techniques not only resolve communication problems but they are also designed to serve several important instructional purposes of teaching the target language. They include creating opportunities of comprehensible input, inducing modified comprehensible output from students, guiding and controlling student output, and initiating corrections by initiating repair.

[conversational repair/teacher talk/ESL classroom discourse analysis, 대화교정/교사언어/ESL 교실 담화분석]

I. INTRODUCTION

The functions of teacher talk and verbal interactions between teachers and students in the classroom have been one of the major topics in educational research. We can hardly imagine a class without some kind of talk. The objectives of schooling are achieved through various types of communication, most typically verbal communication in the classroom between teachers and students and among students. Thus the nature of communication problems and how they are treated in the language classroom bear great significance in the second language classroom.

This study examines how the mechanism of dealing with such problems, called repair, contributes to learners' second language development. Studies on practices of conversational repair originated from those on native English-speaking ordinary conversation by a group of scholars using the conceptual and methodological framework of conversation analysis (CA). Its adherents focused on describing the organizational structure in terms of sequence, turn-taking, and repair practices of mundane, ordinary conversation (e.g., Goodwin, 1981; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977).

The majority of the studies on repair in conversation have dealt with naturally occurring casual conversations such as dinner table talk or telephone conversation, but recently repair organization in institutional talk (such as classroom talk, courtroom talk, doctor-patient talk, etc.) and talk between native and nonnative-speakers of many different languages has been investigated. Research on second language classroom talk has reported that second language teachers strategically use a variety of repair techniques to deal with different kinds of communication problems occurring in the course of instruction in the classroom (Seong, 2004). This paper aims to analyze and describe such techniques in the light of second language theories to see how they carry out different kinds of pedagogical functions in the ESL classroom besides its original function of initiating and resolving communication trouble. Below we will first briefly review the fundamental concepts and major findings from research on conversational repair especially in pedagogical contexts.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1. Conversational Repair

Conversational repair is defined as an organization of practices of talk and other conduct by which participants can deal with problems or troubles in speaking, hearing, or understanding talk (e.g., Schegloff, 1997, p. 503; Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 361). The following excerpt illustrates a kind of repair sequence.

(i)
1 D: Wul did'e ever get married?
2 C: Hu:h?
3 D: Did jee ever get married?
(Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 367)

A one word utterance of "huh" or "what" with a rising intonation indicated by the question mark as in (i) is one of the most frequently used repair techniques in ordinary conversation among native speakers of English. It is targeting "unspecified trouble" in the previous turn. This means that when C initiated repair in line 2, it is not clear to D if the problem C is having is a hearing problem, an understanding problem, or any other problem. In this case, D, the trouble-source turn speaker rephrases or clarifies most likely the whole turn as in line 3.

Repair is distinguished from correction in that correction involves "replacement" of an error or by what is "correct" but repair is neither contingent upon error nor limited to replacement. Repair includes a "word search" or other phenomena that do not involve hearable errors, mistakes, or faults (Schegloff et al., 1977).

2. Studies on Repair in the Pedagogic Contexts

Repair studies in pedagogic contexts have addressed two main questions: a) how is its organization different from that of ordinary conversation? b) how is it related to language acquisition and development in the classroom? Studies by

Gaskill (1980), Schwartz (1980), and McHoul (1990) reported that there was preference for self-completion, though not necessarily self-initiated, in repair practices in NS-NNS and NNS-NNS talk and in geography classroom talk, respectively. Some studies have found that repair organization in classroom talk is contingent on members' conversational accomplishment of structurally different phases during a lesson (Kasper, 1985). Other researchers reported that each context with a different pedagogical focus produces a particular organization of repair (Seedhouse, 1999) and elicits from the teacher preference for particular types of repair strategies appropriate to that focus (Seong, 2004). According to Jung (2005) repair structure in ESL class may also be influenced by the roles of participants.

Some people have tried to establish categories of repair in the L2 classroom for better understanding and analysis. For example, van Lier (1988) first identified three different major trouble sources in repair in the L2 classroom, which he calls goal-orientations: medium-oriented repair, message oriented repair, and activity oriented repair. Boulima (1999) expanded these categories 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. Boulima (1999) further elaborated these into several different sub-types to include a number of specific cases of orientations (trouble-sources) of repair strategies. None of these studies, however, provided specific accounts of pedagogically facilitating functions of repair work.

There are not many studies particularly on the acquisitional benefits of repair practices in the classroom. Markee (2000) presented how conversational negotiations initiated and completed by nonnative speaking students can facilitate the acquisition of target language vocabulary. Yet his findings only concern the interaction between nonnative learners (NNS-NNS), not the conversational negotiations caused by repair initiations between the teacher (NS-NNS) and the students. Some other researchers (e.g., Pica 1987; Varonis & Gass, 1985) brought up potential benefits of repair work for learning new language as conversational adjustments to basically make complex language accessible to learners. However, so far no explicit pedagogical connections have been established on how teacher-initiated repair or teacher's repair techniques,

to be more specific, facilitate SLA. Upclose, categorized, and comprehensive descriptions on how the teacher's repair strategies actually contribute learners' acquisition of new language will help us better understand the functions of teacher talk in the second language classroom. Therefore, the purpose of the study is examining exactly how ESL teachers' repair strategies facilitate SLA development in the ESL classroom.

III. METHODOLOGY

1. The Class and the Participants

The data for the present study came from five hours of videotaped ESL grammar class in an intensive English institute at a large university in the US. At the beginning of each semester the institute administers a placement test that consists of multiple-choice grammar questions, a dictation test, and an oral interview. Based on the results of this placement test, students are divided into five levels, the first level being the highest. The videotaped class was level 3. These intermediate level students have 4 hours of class a week. Grammar/structure class was chosen on the assumption that they would produce more repair sequences during the classroom interaction as the subject matter deals with explicit linguistic elements. The teacher was a male Caucasian native speaker of American English in his mid 30s with around 10 years of adult ESL teaching experience in the same institute. There were 12 adult students in the class. Seven of them were from Korea, three of them were from Japan, one from Turkey and one from Columbia.

2. Data Collection

After the students and the teacher signed the human subject forms, each class was audio-taped and video-taped. One video camera was positioned in front of the classroom mainly to tape the students' activities and the other one was set in the middle of the back of the classroom to tape the teacher's

movements. Three audio recorders with additional microphones were placed among the students and one was set on the teacher's table. In order to minimize the influence of the presence of the cameras and the recorders upon the teacher's and the students' repair behaviors, very small digital video cameras were used and the recorders were taped under students' tables. The teacher mainly stood in front of the classroom and used an overhead projector during each class period. The students were randomly seated on the other side of the classroom. The five hours of data were closely transcribed analyzed following the transcription conventions of conversation analysis (e.g., Sacks et al., 1974; see the Appendix).

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis showed that the repair strategies used by the teacher are designed to play various important pedagogical roles in addition to their intrinsic conversational functions of repairing or initiating repair of hearing or understanding problems in verbal communication. Teachers' repair strategies were contributing to serve institutional objectives of the talk in interaction in the ESL classroom. They include a) creating opportunities for comprehensible input, b) creating opportunities for comprehensible modified output, c) guiding and controlling student output, and d) initiating corrections.

1. Creating Comprehensible Input

Creating comprehensible input is probably one of the most important functions of ESL teacher talk for students. In SLA theoretical perspectives, comprehensible input comes from negotiated interaction and conversational modifications. The facilitative effect of comprehensible input has been discussed intensively in SLA. The most representative people are Krashen (e.g., 1980, 1982, 1983 with Terrell) and Long (e.g., 1980, 1983) although their positions toward comprehensible input are different. Krashen thinks of comprehensible input as both a necessary and sufficient condition for second language acquisition while for Long it is just a necessary condition but not a sufficient

one by itself.

Dealing with conversations between NSs and NNSs, Pica (1987) illustrates the functions of repair sequences in terms of clarification requests, confirmation checks, and comprehension check. See the following excerpts modified from Pica (1987, pp. 6-7). In excerpt (ii) below, the NS is initiating repair in lines 2 and 4 and make clarification requests.

(ii)
1 Learner (NNS English): and they have the chwach there
2-> Interlocutor (NS English): the what
3 Learner (NNS English): the chwach ___ I know someone that-
4-> Interlocutor (NS English): what does it mean

In excerpt (iii), line 3 is a repair initiator as confirmation check in Pica's term,
and a comprehension check is going on in line 3 as a repair initiator in (iv).

(iii)
1 Learner (NNS English): like us three months ago that the SEPTA doft doft
2 doft
3-> Interlocutor (NS English): dropped?

(iv)
1 Learner (NNS English): Can't speak girl. and why? Because this this girl
2 very angry also.you know what I mean
3-> Interlocutor (NS English): yes

The examples clearly illustrate Pica's point that in order for the learners to move beyond their current interlanguage capacity, they need to understand unfamiliar linguistic input and produce a comprehensible message through opportunities to modify and restructure their interaction with their interlocutor until mutual comprehension is reached.

In the present data the teacher's repair strategies were observed to involve other features that can contribute to creating comprehensible input. In his repair devices the teacher provided additional information, rephrased initial questions, brought up previously learned information, and used foreigner talk elements

such as slow speech, enunciation, simple grammar, and so on (Long & Sato, 1983).

1) Providing Additional Information

One of the best pedagogical strategies for providing more comprehensible input was bringing in additional relevant information to facilitate students' learning. By bringing up additional information in the repair initiation turn, the teacher was able to help the students see the problem in their original utterance more clearly, widen their current knowledge level by providing comprehensible input (i + 1) and later induce comprehensible modified output. Example (v) below illustrates this case.

(v)

1 SH: how about was elec-elected.
2 SK: select?
3->T: ok, hang on, because these are not simple things.
4-> Ok. did somebody just ask what about Was elected?
5-> Sure, I mean, the Verb tense. Can be all kinds of
6-> things. It can be present, it can be future, it
7-> can be is going to be (.) elected.
8-> <Should have been (.) elected.> <Could have been
9-> (.) elected.> it could be all forms of BE.

In line 1 the student SH is offering her answer "was elected" for a blank in a sentence they are working on. Another student SK is offering his version of the answer, "select." The teacher, facing to deal with multiple answers, is initiating repair to their answers by first offering a lengthy explanatory turn of additional information regarding the grammar point in question. His explanations basically deal with the fact that any tense or aspect is possible in the given blank, prompted by the two different answers by SH and SK with different tenses (the past 'was elected' and the present 'select').

2) Elaborating the Initial Question

The teacher sometimes initiated repair by rephrasing or elaborating the nature of the initial question. See the following excerpts.

(vi-a)
1 SO: (he) remember?
2 (1.5)
3->T: <he remembered,>
4 (1.0)
5 T: um:
6 SH: passive.
7->T: well, we want a passive one,
-----
24 SH: °how about w[as](0.5) expected.

The prompt for this instructional sequence was a sentence with a blank "He _____ to have been part of the crime syndicate." When SO student in line 1 gave an answer "remember?" for the blank in the sentence, the teacher repeats his answer with a slight change in the tense to the past tense from the present with a continuing intonation ("remembered,") in line 3. The answer is not satisfactory so he is initiating repair again in line 7 by a rephrased prompt with a hint "passive" ("well, we want a passive one,"). The original prompt, which is the sentence itself, was without explicit instruction beside the sentence to use the passive voice although it was mentioned on the top of the worksheet.

(vi-b)
1 T: um, anda Kazu, what was your=
2 SK: =forgot.
3->T: ah- he- ahee, now, You did the same thing. you
4-> did the same thing. forgot. forgot will be
5-> active. And it's Good. he forgot to Take the
6-> money to the bank.that's a coRrect grammar.
7-> that's a Good sentence. but, i was trying,i was
8-> asking you to try to think about the passive one.
9-> <like someone did something to the employee.

10-> like assign him. Or:>

In (vi-b), the prompt question was "The employee _____ (passive) to take money to the bank." When the student SK gives his answer "forgot" for the blank, the teacher starts initiating repair from lines 3 to 10. Through this lengthy repair initiation attempt, the teacher is trying very hard to rephrase the initial question and say that the required verb form for the blank is a passive one.

When the teacher rephrases or elaborates the initial question, the language produced not only on its own offers comprehensible input to the students in that the initial question or the question and answer sequence might not have been comprehensible to the students, but also induces a sequence where comprehensible input is generated. Besides, this way the teacher gives the student another chance to modify his/her answers and can produce comprehensible output. In line 24 in excerpt (vi-a) above, the student SH was finally able to produce correct output.

3) Bringing up Previously Learned Information

Sometimes the teacher brought in what he had taught in previous classes to remind the students of the relationship between that material and the current problem. This process makes the present question directly relevant to the students' existing knowledge therefore helps them understand the current problem better. This category directly addresses what the students had learned particularly in that class before whereas the strategy of Elaborating the Initial Question also makes use of any general information or knowledge gained any time of their lives that makes the initial question more specific. The arrowed sequence in the excerpt (vii) illustrates that.

(vii)

1 T: .hh they were <challenged.>
2 ((looks at the students))
3-> T: you remember the meaning of challenge?=
4-> =what's the meaning of challenge.
5 (0.5)

6-> SH: get ei.
7-> T: tehh, ((short outburst of laughter)) [well?
8 SK: [hehehe
9-> T: I used the example, yes, I challenge you to get
10-> an ei. ((shakes his pen and makes hand gestures))
11-> So it means: (2.0) like I- I- someone (1.0) sets
12-> or gives you a goal. right you try to reach the
13-> goal. Challenge someone. (.) to do something.
14-> So:, (.) u:m:, (.) seria (right gave me) her
15-> answer they were challenge to (1.8) get ei's on
16-> their quiz. A:nd I do. I challenge you to get an
17-> ei on the quiz.

In line 3 the teacher is refreshing the students' memories on what they learned about the meaning of the word "challenge" by asking "you remember the meaning of challenge?" When the student SH brings up a specific challenge that he must have talked about as an example of challenge in his class (line 6), he goes on and talks more about what he talked about regarding the word challenge (lines 9-17). This type of repair initiation technique certainly gives more context for the students to connect their previously-learned information to the new information and creates input that is easy to comprehend.

4) Using Foreigner Talk

The teacher frequently used foreigner talk elements such as slow speech, enunciation, and simple grammar in repair initiators to make the repair initiators and subsequent repair sequences more comprehensible. All these elements can be found in excerpt (vii) above. The teacher is trying to initiate repair in a long turn, and you can see frequent intra turn pauses (lines 11, 13, 14, 15) simple sentences and phrases with lots of emphasis on each syllable and word indicated by transcript notations like underlines and capital letters. Also the content of the repair initiation turns showed the aspect of foreigner talk where he tries in many ways to explain the definition of challenge and to relate to relevant information to the students like gaining high scores on the upcoming quiz.

In sum, the ESL teacher was performing pedagogically beneficial functions of

providing students with opportunities for comprehensible input through different repair techniques primarily in the course of making the context more comprehensible. Such function of comprehensibility of input in interaction has been repeatedly illustrated in my data shown earlier.

2. Inducing Modified Comprehensible Output

Among many people who noticed that comprehensible input alone is not enough for second language acquisition, Swain (1985, 1995) was the one who first argued and documented that producing output may facilitate L2 learning in a number of ways. In fact, this input/output controversy has a long history in applied linguistics. Based on her research dealing with Canadian immersion students, Swain observed that although they received extensive comprehensible input, they did not acquire native-like productive skills. This made her realize that it is probably because the students were not given adequate opportunities to use the target language in the classroom context and that they are not "pushed" in their output (Swain, 1985, p. 249).

Swain originally discussed three functions of output in SLA, which are noticing, hypothesis testing, and metalinguistic awareness. Noticing indicates making the students notice their gap in the knowledge, which "may trigger cognitive processes which might generate linguistic knowledge that is new for the learner or consolidates their existing knowledge" (Swain, 1995, p. 126). Hypothesis testing indicates serving language learning through hypothesis testing and metalinguistic awareness means output serves to control and internalize linguistic knowledge.

Other researchers have recognized the importance of output in SLA, especially that of modified output (e.g., Gass, Mackey & Pica, 1998). They maintain that output encourages syntactic processing, promotes automaticity and pushes learners to move to the "cutting edge"of their interlanguage abilities. Recently plenty of empirical research has been done to explore the effects of interaction on learning, and it has indicated a positive relationship between modifications that learners make to their output after receiving feedback during interaction and their L2 learning outcomes (e.g., Ellis & He, 1999; Gass et al., 1998; Iwashita, 2001; Izumi, 2002; Izumi & Bigelow, 2000; Peres, 2002; Shehadeh,

1999).

In the analysis of my present data, several different ways of inducing students' comprehensible output or modified output have been observed in teacher's repair initiators. Basically almost all repair initiator by the teacher "force" the students to modify their output, but here three will be discussed as representatives: recast, request for confirmation and elaboration, using collaborative completion type initiators.

1) Recasts

A good deal of research has been done on recasts recently (Kurhila, 2001; Mackey & Philip, 1998; Nicholas, Lightbown, & Spada, 2001). Recasts are defined as "utterances that repeat a learner's incorrect utterance, making only the changes necessary to produce a correct utterance, without changing the meaning" (Nicholas et al., 2001, p. 732f) and are often talked about as one of the alternative correction techniques in second language classrooms. Since the corrections by recasts are done implicitly, the teacher using recasts as strategies for giving negative feedback is making the student pay more attention to the meaning rather than the form. Although most studies found these recasts pedagogically beneficial as implicit corrective feedback, but some research supported explicit focus on form (e.g., Park, 2002).

The teacher's remark "was appointed?" in excerpt (viii) below is one of the few recast-like examples found in the present data in which the teacher first gives the correct grammatical form as a recast but later points out that it was semantically incorrect. Induced by the lengthy repair turn by the teacher, a large amount of student output was produced as you can see in lines 16, 17, and 18 below in excerpt (viii).

(viii)

1 SJ: appointed.
2->T: um, was appointed? Now, (1.0) that's
3 graMmatically correct. And the meaning is Oka:y,
4 but. (0.5) what's the meaning of appointment?
5 thority person(.) says you do it. it's your
6 job. remember appoint ((pointing with fingers

7 made a gun shape)). so it's not a selection.
---
16 ST: was ( )?
17 SH: how about was elec-elected.
18 SK: select?

2) Request for Confirmation and Elaboration

The teacher often repeats or rephrases a student's answer with a rising intonation, asking for his/her confirmation and/or elaboration. When the teacher repeats the student's answer with a rising intonation, the teacher is letting the student know how he understood the response and if it is not what he/she said, the student will try to repeat it and in the course of this, the student can realize the wrong form of the original answer and correct it. This means, by making the student respond to this request, the teacher helps the student see more clearly what he/she said and gives him an opportunity to modify it and produce better comprehensible output. In excerpt (ix) the teacher is initiating repair repeatedly in lines 2, 4, 6, 8 to request student B for confirmation and elaboration of his own turns.

(ix)
1 SB: °same.°
2->T: same thing as sando?
3 SB: yes. same.
4->T: same thing?
5 SB: yeah, almost same.
6->T: Almost the same?
7 Ss: hahahahaha((laughter))
8->T: it is blank (.) almost the same? ((smiling))

3) Collaborative Completion

This format consists of a partial repeat of the trouble-source turn and vowel elongation and/or continuing intonation as in the following excerpts.

(x)
1 SS: °was [commanded?]°
2 SM: [howabout-]
3->T: was, sorry. Was,
4 SS: was commanded.

(xi)
1 SP: remind ei ov be.
2->T: remi:nd?::
3 SP: °ei ov be.

In line 3 in excerpt (x) the teacher is asking the student SS to make a very specific repair by leaving a blank after "Was" indicated by the continuing intonation (,). The student completes the repair by producing turn 4. Likewise line 2 in (xi) shows that by targeting the rest of the trouble-source turn indicated by the sound elongation (::), the teacher is making the student produce modified output (line 3).

3. Guiding and Controlling Student Output

This function can be interpreted as part of the above function, but I would like to discuss it separately as it is a teacher's pedagogical organizational strategy. Consciously or unconsciously, the teacher was controlling the students' output via their repair initiation strategies. The following are some examples.

(xii)
1 T: well, that's a Bad way to get a Girl friend, =
2 ((in an exaggerated and funny voice))
3 [because- because- of the challenge-]
4 SP: = I [mean iz: native girlfriend.]
5->T: pardon?
6 SP: native girlfriend. I mean.=

(xiii)
1 SP: remind ei ovu be.
2->T: remi:nd?::
3 SP: °ei ovu be.

(xiv)
1 SA: the present tense.
2->T: the Present tense, or the present progressive?
3 SA: present progressive.

(xv)
1 SB: °same.°
2->T: same thing as sando?
3 SB: yes, same.
4->T: same thing?
5 SB: yeah, almost same.
6->T: Almost the same?

Comparisons of the arrowed teacher's turns in each excerpt above show how a teacher utilizes the repair initiating strategies to induce different response from the students. In excerpt (xii) the teacher's repair initiator (line 1) is targeting the most unspecific trouble-source in the trouble-source turn, so the student gets to rephrase the whole turn or at least repeat it (line 2). In line 3 in excerpt (xiii) the student had to simply complete the teacher's repair initiation turn as the initiator in line 2 requires the students to do only so much. This means that the teacher designed his repair initiator in a way that the student only had to repeat the rest of the initial turn (ei ov be) and did not have to rephrase or repeat the whole sentence. The teacher could have asked "what do you mean remind ei ov be?" in which case the student would have to do the repair of his original problematic turn in a lengthier manner such as rephrase or explanation, which is usually harder for lower level students to do than just having to repeat the "ei ov be" part.

Excerpt (xiv) illustrates a case where the teacher is asking the student to repair in a way that he/she only has to pick one of the two alternatives that the teacher is offering in her repair initiation turn (line 2). An interesting thing is that for this strategy the correct answer that the teacher has in mind is always the second option after "or" and the student's original answer, which is wrong, is quoted as the first option.

In excerpt (xv) consecutive repair initiation sequences are occurring and the teacher's repair strategies are designed in a way that the student can complete

the repair by simply saying yes or no, although, here the student tried to do more than that. If the teacher is more aware and trained to use these repair initiators more strategically, it will be extremely beneficial for students in varying stages of interlanguage development to produce more comprehensible output.

4. Initiating Correction

The last pedagogical function of the teacher's repair strategies that I recognized from the analysis of my data is initiating corrections by initiating repair. Let us consider the following excerpts first.

(xvi)
1 SS: (ov him)?
2->T: sorry?
3 °SS: was (o:vd),
4 (1.0)

In (xvi), the teacher is initiating repair by "sorry?", which he might have intended to initiate repair for a hearing problem or understanding problem he is having in the student's initial turn (line 1). However the student SS changes her answer in line 3. The "ov" or "ovd" in the later sequence turned out to be "urged" and considering that the exercise they were going through was on the passive and active voices, it is clear that the student took the teacher's repair initiator as a correction initiator. Another indication of this is a drastically softened voice in the student's response to the teacher's initiator as illustrated in excerpt (xvii).

(xvii)
1 SM: as fo:ced?
2 *T: was forced?
3 SM: °yeah?
4 (2.5)

We do not know whether the teacher wanted to initiate repair for a

hearing/understanding problem or if he was trying to correct the wrong answer. In conversation-analytic methodologies, all inferences are based on what one sees in the transcript and the turn organizations and no consideration is taken from interviews with the participants. If you see line 3 in the above excerpt, the student SM's confirmation ("yeah?") is extremely softened, indicated by a little circle before "y." It is inferred that she might have thought that her answer was wrong so that the teacher is initiating correction of it. Actually it is clear from the video because the girl's face looked embarrassed. Sometimes the student's turn after such a repair initiator by the teacher even yields a gap as shown in line 4 in excerpt (xviii) below.

(xviii)

1 SH: °how about w[as](0.5) expected.
2 SK: [( )]
3->T: was expected?
4 (2.5)
5 T: I think that works,

As the teacher initiated repair in line 3 to the student's turn in line 1, line 3 is definitely the student SH's turn, but he did not respond. In this case as well, the video showed that he was embarrassingly putting down his face with only his eyes looking up the teacher.

In CA, such cases like these that can be characterized as two different cases from the participants' perspectives are considered boundary cases (e.g., Schegloff, 1997). That is, for example in excerpt (xvi), the teacher's repair initiator "sorry?" can be understood as pure repair initiator for a hearing problem or a correction initiator for the wrong answer the student SS gave in line 1. Likewise, in some cases, "what?" can be understood as a repair initiator for a hearing or understanding problem but at the same time in the same conversation, it can be understood as an expression of disapproval. We do not know the speakers' intentions unless it is expressed somehow in the later sequence of the conversation by the same speaker's further utterances or by the response of their interlocutors. All we know is that those repair initiators can be understood more than one way and do more than one thing in the on-going conversation.

This is another important pedagogical function of teachers' repair initiators because in this particular institutional context correction has a strong functional value that repair in any other context cannot serve. Thus this type of boundary case repair strategies are characteristics of the practices of repair in the second language classroom and can potentially serve a pedagogical role of mitigating face-threatening impact of correction initiation to the students by doing it like a repair-initiation, as recasts do.

It is a widely known belief that maintaining face in conversation is a fundamental need of participants (Goffman, 1967). Brown and Levinson (1978) said "face-threatening acts" are acts that have a strong potential for disturbing the state of personal relationships, which is in Speech Act terms as "complaints" do (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969, 1976). In the classroom context, a similar situation occurs when the teacher has to initiate correction of the student's wrong answers as it indicates a negative evaluation of the student's cognitive ability. The teacher has to take into consideration the students' face while leading them to achievement of the proposed class objectives. In second language acquisition research, a number of people (e.g., Krashen, 1982; Krashen & Terrell, 1983; Schumann, 1978) have emphasized the importance of affective factors in second language acquisition. Krashen's statement (1982) is probably one of the most well-known remarks with regard to this when he said for acquisition to take place the learner's affective filter has to be low, because it supposedly makes a learner receptive to the comprehensible input.

V. CONCLUSION

The present study aimed to examine how the ESL teacher's conversational repair strategies perform a variety of pedagogical functions to achieve instructional goals as well as communicative goals. The repair techniques employed by the teacher were creating various opportunities for comprehensible input through providing additional information. elaborating the initial question. bringing up learned information. and using foreigner talk. They were also eliciting modified comprehensible output through recasts. request for confirmation and elaboration. and collaborative completion. The teacher's repair strategies

were also observed to guide and control student output and initiate correction.

This study brings attention to communication problems in the ESL classroom and the importance of teacher's initiatives in taking actions for the problems from pedagogical perspectives. The study also offers some practical guidelines and theoretical rationales of them for training Korean English teachers who are strongly advised to be able to teach English through English.

In the ESL classroom and the EFL classroom where the teacher uses only the target language, English is both the language of communication and the subject matter, with the teacher being the major source of input and the class manager. Thus it is natural that how the teacher organizes and executes his/her conversational resources for communication and instruction plays an important role in achieving instructional goals in the language classroom. However, these various attempts initiated by the teacher cannot be successful without students' collaborative efforts. Both parties in fact work together to repair the breakdown of the flow of classroom talk and to reestablish symmetry, work for conversational adjustments, interact, and negotiate. That way they promote communication and induce pedagogical opportunities for input and output that have been proven to be facilitative in second language development in the classroom.

As the analysis is based on one teacher and his grammar class, more teachers and different classes may provide different perspectives on teachers' repair behaviors. Many more studies should be done on repair practices in the L2 classroom. Effective management of classroom discourse and communication practices in the second language classroom can not only lead to better communication but also facilitate the acquisition of the target language itself. Therefore second language teachers need more careful training and awareness in using the language of instruction than teachers of other subject matters.

REFERENCES

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Boulima, J. (1999). *Negotiated interaction in target language classroom*

discourse. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R., & He, X. (1999). The roles of modified input and output in the incidental acquisition of word meanings. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21,* 285-301.

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

Gass, S., MacKey, A., Pica, T. (1998). The role of input and interaction in second language acquisition: Introduction to the special issue. *Modern Language Journal, 82,* 299-307.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays in face-to-face behavior.* New York: Anchor Books.

Goodwin, M. H. (1981). *Conversational organization: Interaction between speakers and hearers.* New York: Academic Press.

Iwashita, N. (2001). The effect of learner proficiency on interactional moves and modified output in nonnative-nonnative interaction in Japanese as a foreign language. *System, 29,* 267-287.

Izumi, S. (2002). Output, input enhancement, and the noticing hypothesis: An experimental study on ESL relativization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 24,* 541-577.

Izumi, S., & Bigelow, M. (2000). Does output promote noticing and second language acquisition? *TESOL Quarterly, 34*(2), 239-278.

Jung, E. H. (2005). Second language classroom discourse: The roles of teacher and learners. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 11*(4), 121-137.

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

Krashen, S. D. (1980). The input hypothesis. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Current issues in bilingual education* (pp. 168-180). Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. D., & Terrell, T. D. (1983). *The natural approach.* Hayward, CA:

The Alemany Press.

Kurhila, S. (2001). Correction in talk between native and non-native speaker. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33,* 1083-1110.

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

Long, M. (1983). Native speaker/nonnative speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics, 4,* 126-41.

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.

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.

Mackey, A., & Philip, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings? *Modern Language Journal, 82*(3), 338-56.

Nicholas, H., Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2001). Recasts as feedback to language learners. *Language Learning, 51,* 719-758.

Park, Hye-Sook. (2002). The Effects of Explicit Focus on Form on L2 Learning. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 8*(1), 39-53.

Peres, T. J. (2002). Promoting the "output" hypothesis. *CTJ Journal, 40,* April, 33-38.

Pica, T. (1987). Second language acquisition, social interaction and the classroom. *Applied Linguistics, 8,* 3-21.

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.

Schegloff, E. (1997). Practices and actions: Boundary cases of other-initiated repair. *Discourse Processes, 23,* 499-545.

Schumann, J. (1978). The acculturation model for second language acquisition. In

R. Gingras (Ed.), *Second language acquisition and foreign language teaching* (pp. 27-50). Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.

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.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society, 5,* 1-23.

Seedhouse, P. (1999). The relationship between context and the organization of repair in the L2 classroom. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 17*(1), 59-81.

Seong, G. (2004). *Conversational repair strategies of teachers of English as a second language.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

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

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass and C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & A. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H. .G. Widdowson* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Varonis, E. M., & Gass, S. M. (1985). Non-native/non-native conversation: A model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics, 6,* 71-90.

APPENDIX

Transcription Notations

A fuller glossaries can be found in Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974).

( )	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 roughly aspiration	the letter "h" is used to indicate hearable aspiration, its length proportional to the number of "h"s. If preceded by a dot, the 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 or self interruption of the sound in progress indicated by the preceding letter(s) (the example here represents a self
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

Examples in: English
Applicable Language: English
Applicable Levels: Elementary/Secondary/Tertiary/Adult

Guiboke Seong
Dept. of English Language Education
Korea University
Anam-Dong 5-Ka 1 Seongbuk-ku
Seoul 136-701
Tel: (02) 3290-2350
CP: 010-2242-9763
Email: gseong@korea.ac.kr

Received in Jan. 2006
Reviewed by Feb. 2006
Revised version received in Mar. 2006