UC Riverside
Issues in Applied Linguistics

Title
The Organization of Second Language Classroom Repair

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0xk595z3

Journal
Issues in Applied Linguistics, 10(2)

ISSN
1050-4273

Author
Jung, Euen Hyuk (Sarah)

Publication Date
1999-12-30

DOI
10.5070/L4102005020

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

The Organization of Second Language Classroom Repair

Euen Hyuk (Sarah) Jung
Georgetown University

ABSTRACT

This paper presents an analysis of the repair mechanism in second language classroom talk. More specifically, the current paper focuses on how co-participants (i.e., the teacher and the learners) carry out repair operations on the trouble source produced by the learner in the second language instructed talk-in-interaction. The present findings show that participation frameworks (i.e., types of activities) play an important role in constructing repair sequences in the instructional context. When learners engage in role-playing activities with one another, a wide variety of repair sequences are manifested, such as self-initiated and self-completed, self-initiated and other-completed, and other-initiated and other-completed repair sequences. The collaborative nature of repair sequences is also manifested in learner role-playing activities, in which self-initiation of the trouble source by the learner is collaboratively completed with co-participants in the form of word search and try-marking. Other-initiated and other-completed repair in learner role-playing activities is manifested in the form of cluing, which is accompanied by the sequence of teacher's initiation, learner's response, and teacher's evaluation (i.e., IRE sequence). Teacher-fronted activities, on the other hand, in which a teacher asks a question to learner(s), are mainly characterized by other-initiated and other-completed repair structures in the form of IRE sequence and unmodulated "no." Furthermore, a close examination of learners' responses to the teacher's repair (e.g., recast) reveals the key role of activity types operating in L2 instructional discourse.

INTRODUCTION

This paper examines how repair is carried out in an institutional setting, specifically in the second language classroom context. The machinery of repair has long been regarded as one of the most fundamental practices employed in talk-in-interaction. A comprehensive and thorough investigation of repair in everyday conversation was initially carried out by the Conversation Analysts Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) (hereafter Schegloff et al.), in which participants actively engage in monitoring and adjusting to each other to create and interpret messages. Repair addresses problems in hearing, speaking, and understanding the talk (Schegloff et al., 1977). It is triggered by a trouble source, or a repairable in a speaker's utterance and can be identified by the speaker of the trouble source (referred to as "self-initiated") or by the listener (referred to as "other-initiated"). According to Schegloff et al. (1977), a distinction can be made between self-re-

Issues in Applied Linguistics
ISSN 1050-4273
© 1999, Regents of the University of California
Vol. 10 No. 2, 153-171

pair, that is, repair completed by the speaker of the trouble source (which can be either self-initiated or other-initiated) and other-repair, that is, repair completed by the listener (which can be self-initiated or other-initiated).

Self-initiated and self-completed repair involves the originator of the trouble source realizing the problem and making repairs, usually in the same turn (Excerpt (1)). In other-initiated and self-completed repair, the hearer locates the trouble source and initiates the repair sequence, and the originator of the trouble source completes it (Excerpt (2)). Self-initiated and other-completed repair takes place when the originator of the trouble source initiates the repair sequence, and the hearer completes it (Excerpt (3)). Other-initiated and other-completed repair occurs when the hearer locates the trouble source, and he or she both initiates and completes the repair sequence (Excerpt (4)). Schegloff et al. (1977) use the following examples to illustrate each of these four repair trajectories (Excerpts (1)-(4)):

(1) self-initiated and self-completed repair
N: She was givin me a:ll the people that
—> were go:ne this yea:r I mean this
—> quarter y'// know
J: Yeah

(2) other-initiated and self-completed repair
Ken: Is Al here today?
Dan: Yeah.
(2.0)
Roger: —> He is? hh eh heh
Dan: —> Well he was.

(3) self-initiated and other-completed repair
B: —> He had dis uh Mistuh W-whatever k- I can't
think of his first name, Watts on, the one that wrote // that piece.
A: —> Dan Watts.

(4) other-initiated and other-completed repair
B: Where didju play ba:sk//etbaw.
A: (The) gy:m
B: In the gy:m?
A: Yea:h. Like grou(h)p therapy. Yuh know=
B: [oh::.
A: =[half the group that we had la:s term wz there en we jus playing
arou:nd.
B:—> Uh- fooling around.
A: Eh- yeah ... (Schegloff et al., 1977, pp. 364-365)

A trouble source of any kind, whether of factual knowledge or of language use on the part of the speaker, when pointed out by the hearer, is potentially face-

threatening to the speaker of the trouble source since it reveals his or her incompetence (Goffman, 1974; Goodwin, 1983). To lessen the face-threat to that speaker, the hearer tends to take the blame for miscommunication as if there were problems with hearing or understanding the talk. Opportunities for self-repair are also given prior to those for other-repair in ordinary conversation in order to avoid abrupt interruptions from the hearer for the repair work (Schegloff et al., 1977). Thus, when other-repair occurs, it is usually preceded by a pause in order to provide "extra" opportunities for the speaker of the trouble source to self-repair. If that speaker fails to self-repair, the hearer has to carry out the repair work for him or her. This is usually carried out in a "modulated" way, displaying uncertainty such as "I think," and "You mean X?," rather than in the form of both bold and direct "no and correction" (i.e., in a "unmodulated" way without any redressive actions) (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 379). Unmodulated other-repair usually takes place in the turn, following a modulated other-repair or understanding checks.

In addition to informal conversation, Schegloff et al. (1977) briefly note that interactions between teachers and students and those between parents and children are primarily characterized by other-repair. They also briefly mentioned that other-repair might prove to be instrumental in socialization and to function as a device for "dealing with those who are still learning or being taught to operate with a system which requires, for its routine operation, that they be adequate self-monitors and self-correctors as a condition of competence" (p. 381).

Several studies have been carried out on repair machinery in the second language classroom context, using Conversation Analysis methodology (Kasper, 1986; van Lier, 1988; Seedhouse, 1997). Repair in the second language classroom generally includes "statements of procedural rules, sanctions of violations of such rules, problems of hearing and understanding the talk, second starts, prompting, cluing and helping, explaining, and correction of errors" (van Lier, 1988, p. 183), which is used in a slightly different way from the original definition of repair in Conversation Analysis as "problems of hearing or understanding."

Kasper (1985) compared repair organization in two types of foreign language teaching: (i) a language-centered phase; and (ii) a content-centered phase of foreign language lessons. The language-centered phase emphasizes grammatical correctness in learners' oral translation task, while the content-centered phase focuses on learners' abilities to understand and express their attitudes toward the literary text content during the oral translation task. It was found that the teaching goals of the two phases play a decisive role in entailing particular repair patterns: the language-centered phase was predominantly characterized by other-repair, while the content-centered phase was mainly characterized by self-repair.

Seedhouse (1997) analyzed numerous extracts from second language classroom repair studies which used Conversation Analysis. His analysis showed that in order to avoid bold (unmodulated) and overt corrections on the learners' errors, teachers generally tend to use a variety of methods, such as using mitigated negative evaluation, repeating erroneous utterances with a rising intonation, and ac-

cepting the incorrect forms and supplying the correct ones. Van Lier (1988), on the other hand, maintained that such repairs made by the teacher in the classroom, including error-replacements and cluing do not necessarily constitute floor-threats and/or face-threats to the learners in the same way that such interruptions might in mundane conversation. He also claimed that such repair work actually functions to facilitate the ongoing construction of the turn.

Furthermore, van Lier claimed that it is important to examine "activities carefully in terms of the kinds of repair they demand by virtue of their construction" (van Lier, 1988, p. 208) and to keep in mind that "*certain types of activity naturally lead to certain types of repair, and that therefore the issue of how to repair is closely related to the context of what is being done*" (van Lier, 1988, p. 211, italics added). However, few studies have specifically examined repair structures within various participation frameworks (types of activities) in the second language classroom. This paper aims to provide further insight into repair mechanism in instructed interactions by investigating the organization of second language classroom repair within different participation frameworks (i.e., learner role-playing activities vs. teacher-fronted activities).

In this paper, I will show how a variety of repair sequences are manifested within different participation frameworks in the second language classroom. First, I will analyze repair structures in learner role-playing activities. Then, I will examine how repair sequences are constructed in teacher-fronted activities. Next, I will further discuss the role of different participation frameworks, focusing on learners' different responses to the teacher's repair (e.g., recast). Lastly, I will conclude the paper with a brief summary of the findings and a suggestion for future research in L2 classroom repair.

METHODOLOGY

The present data came from a video recording of a 60-minute adult beginning ESL class at an American university. There were eleven adult ESL learners in their early 20's, who were from Africa (Algeria), Middle East (Qatar and Saudi Arabia), East Asia (Republic of China, Thailand, and Indonesia), and South America (Argentina, Colombia, Peru, and Chile). The teacher was a female Caucasian native speaker of American English in her late 30's. With respect to the spatial organization of the classroom, the teacher stood in front of the blackboard, and the students sat in a semi-circle facing the teacher. There was a tape-recorder for listening activities on the teacher's desk. The video camera was positioned at the back of the classroom in order to record the lesson. The teacher taught her class as usual, and she did not revise her lesson for the purpose of this particular study.

The focus of the class was on listening/speaking skills with an aim to develop the communication skills of ESL learners. The objectives for the lesson included: (i) learning new vocabulary words such as "popular," "typical," and "favorite"; (ii) making restaurant reservations over the phone; and (iii) using count

and non-count nouns appropriately.

The lesson consisted of activities in the following sequence:
(i) The teacher explained new vocabulary and elicited responses from the learners either by asking questions to the whole class or calling on individuals;
(ii) Learners silently read their textbooks, while the teacher circulated the classroom, answering the learners' questions about the information they were reading;
(iii) Learners listened to the tape activities and engaged in role play activities related to what they have heard on the tape (making a restaurant reservation over the phone);
(iv) The teacher explained count and non-count nouns and elicited responses from the learners by asking questions to the whole class;
(v) The teacher gave the learners a bag with different products, and the learners were asked to identify count and non-count noun products in the bag; and
(vi) The teacher assigned homework for the next class.

The present data will be discussed in terms of participation frameworks (i.e., learner role-playing activities vs. teacher-fronted activities). The transcription conventions are described in the Appendix and are based on the transcription conventions in Sacks et al. (1974). Points relevant to the discussion are indicated by arrows in the excerpts.

REPAIR OF LEARNER'S TROUBLE SOURCE WITHIN DIFFERENT PARTICIPATION FRAMEWORKS

Learner Role-playing Activities

In learner role-playing activities, a wide variety of repair sequences is manifested, including self-initiated and self-completed, self-initiated and other-completed, and other-initiated and other-completed repair sequences.

Self-initiated and self-completed repair in the form of word replacement

Self-initiated and self-completed repair is manifested in learner-learner interactions, which involves word replacement. This repair sequence is demonstrated in Excerpt (5) below[1]:

(5) ((Role play: making a restaurant reservation over the phone))
1 L1: Alright, what's your request?
—> 2 L2: E::r, I need e:r a table for uh- a <u>seat</u> for children for two.

In Excerpt (5), L2 uses word replacement, in which one item (e.g., a word) is replaced by another in combination with nonlexical utterances such as "uh" (i.e., repair initiator).

Self-initiated and other-completed repair in the form of word search and try-marking as a collaborative enterprise

In the second language classroom, where less competent second language learners and a more competent teacher interact with each other, it is not unusual to find that second language learners appeal to the teacher for help to carry out smooth interactions. Self-initiation by the learner is found to be collaboratively completed by others (i.e., the teacher and the other learners) in the current study. These repair structures show relevance to turn allocation, as Schegloff (1992) discussed, "Because the organization of repair is mapped onto a turn-based organization of talk, variation in the setting or context, or anything that can involve some transformation of the turn-taking system by which the talk is organized . . . may well carry with it differences in the organization of repair . . ." (p. 1337).

Self-initiated and other-completed repair sequences are shown to involve:

(i) a word-search sequence, in which the other participants cooperatively provide the speaker with a word or a phrase for which the speaker is searching, collaboratively completing the speaker's turn (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Lerner, 1995, 1996; Murata, 1994; Sacks, 1992); and

(ii) a try-marking sequence, a self-initiation by the speaker producing a suspected trouble source with a rising intonation, preceded by some hesitations (van Lier, 1988), which also involves the collaborative completion of the ongoing turn by the other participants in the classroom. The excerpt below demonstrates these points:

(6) ((Role play: making a restaurant reservation over the phone))
((phone rings))

	1	L1:	Allo::.
	2	LL:	((laughs))
			(1.0)
	3	L1:	Hello. E::r Ale- Alexander's hard, hard rock? Hard rock. May I help you?
—>	4	L2:	Yes, e::r, can I ma:ke? E::r ((L2 shifts her gaze to the teacher)) what's the::?
—>	5	T:	Um, [a reservation.
—>	6	LL:	[A reservation.
	7	L2:	Reservation for the e:r e:r e:r f, Friday the, the ninth for e:r five people?=
—>	8	LL:	=For five=
	9	L1:	=At what time?
	10	LL:	((laughs))
	11	L1:	At what time?
	12	L2:	E::r at six o'clock, at six o'clock. (0.3) at six o'clock.

In Excerpt (6), L1 and L2 engage in the role play activity, in which L1 plays

the role of a restaurant host and L2 plays the role of a guest making a reservation over the phone. Not being able to complete the sentence on her own in line 4, L2 engages in a word search, in which she stretches the sound "ma:ke." She then shifts her gaze to the teacher for help, and this word search is further carried out by asking a wh-question "*What*'s the::?" At this point in line 5 and line 6, both the teacher and the other learners collaboratively help L2 by supplying her with the appropriate item "a reservation" needed to complete the sentence-in-progress. L2 accepts this item "a reservation" and incorporates in the following.turn in line 7. Again in the same line, L2 offers a suspected trouble source with a rising intonation in the format of try-marking "five people?," indirectly asking for help. Consequently, in line 8, the other learners promptly provide her with the suitable item in a supporting manner with "for five," cooperatively completing the ongoing turn. Then L1 asks L2 about other information needed to make a reservation, such as the time of the reservation, "at what time?" in line 9, and the talk continues smoothly.

Excerpt (6) also illustrates that more than one speaker completes the repair sequence on the same trouble source when the producer of the trouble source self-initiates, a phenomenon demonstrating that the number of participants plays a role in creating the "context" of interaction (Schegloff, 1991). Either the teacher and the other learners, as in line 5 and line 6, or the other learners among themselves, as in line 8, concomitantly provide the repair work for the learner of the trouble source, displaying "collectivity," "association," or "conjoined participation" of individuals as a single party. That is, members of the association participate in the ongoing discourse as "ensembles" (Learner, 1993).[2] Lerner (1993, p. 221) discussed that "[by] casting themselves as representative of an association[,] speakers can demonstrate their co-partcipation . . . by joining in the production of an ongoing action."

The joint productions provided by co-participants indicate their high involvement and receptive listenership in the co-construction of discourse (Ferrara, 1992). Joint productions as rapport-oriented interruptions are different from power-oriented interruptions in that they do not intend to seize the floor and that they are "viewed as acts of collaboration, cooperation, and/or mutual orientation providing the interruptee with immediate feedback, filling in informational gaps, and elaborating on the interruptee's topic or theme"(Goldberg, 1990, p. 890). Such joint productions are also referred to as "team talk" (Francis, 1996; Kangasharju, 1996; Lerner, 1993), in which participants align as a team in interactions in order to collaborate in continuing the conversation. In addition, a team is interaction-bound in that members of a team are formed spontaneously. The creation of team is not fixed, but flexible. In line 5 and line 6, other learners and the teacher align as a team themselves and jointly complete the L2's ongoing turn, while in line 8, other learners create their own team and demonstrate a team membership by jointly producing the utterance to complete L2's sentence-in-progress.

Other-initiated and other-completed repair in the form of cluing plus IRE sequence

The next data show that repair is initiated by the teacher in the form of cluing, in which the hearer can repeat the trouble source item with a rising intonation (i.e., correction-invitation format). Instead of opportunities being left for the speaker of the trouble source to self-repair, the repair sequence is completed by another learner who is participating in the talk. Other-initiation is always carried out by the teacher, and the teacher provides an opportunity for another learner to complete the repair sequence by redirecting a question to the whole class (i.e., "delegated repair," Kasper, 1985). In addition, the repair sequence completed by another learner is accompanied by the teacher's evaluation which completes the three-part instructional sequence (i.e., IRE sequence): (i) teacher's question; (ii) learner's response; and (iii) teacher's evaluation (McHoul, 1978, 1990; Mehan, 1979, 1982, 1985; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975, 1992).[3]

This IRE sequence accompanying cluing is not so surprising considering the institutional role and its accompanying discursive rights and obligations in this particular instructed context. As Drew and Heritage (1992, p. 49) have suggested, "Institutional interactions may be characterized by role-structured, institutionalized, and omnirelevant asymmetries between participants in terms of such matters as differential distribution of knowledge, rights to knowledge, access to conversational resources, and to participation in the interaction." Unlike the symmetry of interactions observed in everyday conversation, the classroom talk asymmetry is characterized by the institutional incumbent's (teacher's) means, such as his or her capacity to direct the talk, assign the turn, and evaluate learner's response (see Markee, 2000 for discussion on repair in different power speech exchange systems).

Another important feature that characterizes other-initiated repair by the teacher is a systematic use of the particular intonation contour (i.e., rising intonation) in order to signal a problem with the previous learner's utterance. Intonation is utilized as a contextualization cue (Gumperz, 1982) or as an organizational cue (Selting, 1988), and it functions to display the status of the particular utterance in talk-in-interaction. More specifically, it indicates the problematic status of the particular utterance (Goodwin, 1983; Gunter, 1974; Selting, 1988). In this interaction, the recipient is expected to react appropriately to such a cue. "[R]ecipients perceive the difference between prosodically unmarked [i.e., normal intonation contour] and marked [i.e., high intonation contour] utterances fairly accurately, and interpret the respective utterances as activities with different sequential implications" (Selting, 1988, p. 295). Excerpt (7) illustrates this point:

(7) ((Role play: making a restaurant reservation over the phone))

1	L1:	Your telephone number and your address?=
2	T:	=Your addr<u>ess</u>?
3	LL:	((laughs))

			(1.0)
	4	T:	Alright. You need a telephone number and what else do you need? ((shifting her gaze from L1 to the whole class))
—>	5	L8:	Name.
	6	T:	Name, su:re.
	7	L1:	Oh, yes, your name.
	8	T:	Okay.
	9	L2:	Here's my name. Joyce, J, O, Y, C, E. My phone number is e::r nine, nineteen two ((laugh)) ninety three three five.
	10	T:	Nine::
	11	L2:	Nine fifty five.
	12	T:	Nine three three.
	13	L2:	Uh, nine three three five.
	14	T:	Okay.
	15	L1:	See you later.=
	16	T:	=See you later?
	17	LL:	((laughs))
—>	18	L9:	No.
—>	19	L10:	No.
	20	T:	Alright. Uhh, what can Hamza say really if he's gotten the information? What does he say? ((looking at the whole class)) Well, this is formal e:r it's hard rock, a semi-formal situation.
—>	21	L:	That's the table.=
	22	T:	=That's a table. You can repeat the information to confirm that you understood.

In Excerpt (7), L1 is playing the role of a restaurant host taking a reservation over the phone from L2 who is playing the customer. In line 2 the teacher repeats L1's previous utterance "Your address?" with a rising intonation as an indication that this specific word is in need of repair. The other learners are quick to understand the teacher's intention and start to laugh. Instead of providing an opportunity for L1 to self-repair, the teacher shifts her gaze from L1 and directs her question to the whole class in line 4 (the question act). Then another learner promptly provides the appropriate item "Name" in line 5 (the response act). In line 6 the teacher confirms the learner's response by repeating the correct item, "name" with an evaluation marker, "sure" (the evaluation act). As discussed by Cook (1999), such an evaluation marker indexes the teacher as an authority in this instructed interaction. In line 7, L1 then readily accepts and repeats the correct item, "name." A similar phenomenon is observed in line 15, when L1 ends the phone call by saying, "See you later," which is an inappropriate closing for such a context. In line 16 the teacher repeats "See you later?" with a rising intonation as an invitation for correction. In line 17 the other learners immediately pick up on the teacher's prosodic cue, which prompts them to laugh at the error. This time, some learners even say "no" in line 18 and line 19. This is an interesting point to note in that unlike what Sinclair and Coulthard (1975, p. 47) have claimed "the pupil has no

right to contribute to the discourse . . .," the present ESL classroom shows that contributions to the structuring of classroom discourse, including repair sequences are not restricted to the teacher alone. That is, not only the teacher but also learners play the role of evaluator of another learner's remarks (Cook, 1999; Lewis, 1988). In line 20 the teacher again directs her question to the whole class (question act). Then one learner provides "That's the table" as a candidate item in line 21 (response act), which is not a completely correct answer. In line 22 the teacher then provides the correct item "That's a table" (evaluation act).

As seen in the above excerpt, intonation plays a significant role in constructing repair sequences. That is, a rising intonation is often associated with signaling the problem of the ongoing talk: A repetition with a rising intonation functions as an invitation for correction. In contrast to the use of rising intonation, when the repetition is used with a falling intonation, it functions to provide encouragement, display understanding, or acknowledge the correctness of the speaker's previous utterance, building solidarity between the speaker and the hearer (Day et al., 1984; Gaskill, 1980; Goodwin, 1981; Stubbs, 1983). The following segment demonstrates this point:

(8) ((The teacher is asking about the learner's typical breakfast in his country in class))

	1	T:	Um, if I say, uh, Big, in your country, what's a typical, a typical breakfast in your country?
	2	L8:	Um, e:r, e:r, maybe, e:r, coffee.
	3	T:	Coffee=
	4	L8:	=Bread
—>	5	T:	Coffee and bread, ok. Coffee and bread. Coffee and bread are two examples of beverages,[4] beverages. Something to drink. Coffee and bread. Anything else besides coffee and bread? (0.5)
	6	L:	Fried egg.

In Excerpt (8), in explaining the new vocabulary words, the teacher designates L8 and asks him about the typical breakfast in his home country. L8 provides the answers "coffee" in line 2 and "bread" in line 4. The teacher repeats his utterance with a falling intonation, indicating her understanding of his previous utterance "coffee" in line 3 and "coffee and bread" in line 5. Then she expands on his utterances to ask another question in line 5 with "Anything else besides coffee and bread?".

TEACHER-FRONTED ACTIVITIES

Unlike a variety of repair sequences manifested in learner role-playing activities, teacher- fronted activities (i.e., a teacher asking a question to learner(s)) is

predominantly characterized by other-initiated and other-completed repair sequence in the form of IRE sequence and unmodulated "no."

Other-initiated and other-completed repair in the form of IRE sequence

In other-initiated and other-completed repair sequence manifested in the form of IRE sequence, the teacher does not supply the speaker of the trouble source with an opportunity to self-repair. Instead she provides opportunities for another learner to repair by eliciting responses from the entire class (i.e., "delegated repair," Kasper, 1985). This instance involves a three-part sequence; (i) the teacher's initiation, (ii) the learner's response, and (iii) the teacher's evaluation sequence (i.e., IRE sequence). The teacher acknowledges the speaker's trouble source and provides an explanation before giving another learner opportunities to complete the repair sequence.

In addition to the teacher's systematic use of the particular intonation contour, as illustrated in the previous section, another important aspect of repair sequences found in this data is her systematic use of gaze. Studies show that gaze plays a central role as one of the turn-allocation techniques in conversation (Criag & Gallagher, 1982; Goodwin 1979, 1981; Sacks et al., 1974). In ordinary talk-in-interaction, when the current speaker casts his or her gaze to a particular hearer (i.e., a potential next speaker), this speaker gaze is interpreted by the hearer as a signal to be the next speaker. In the current instructional setting, when there is a problem with the learner's utterance, the teacher does not provide the learner of the trouble source with an opportunity to self-repair, but shifts her gaze from him or her to the whole class in order to allocate the turn to complete the repair (delegated repair). Then other learners become the next speakers. The following excerpt demonstrates this repair sequence:[5]

(9) ((The teacher is asking the learners about types of meat))

	1	L5:	Fish.
—>	2	T:	A:lright. We usually divide fish into a different category, but the:: ((shiftingher gaze from L5 to the whole class)) what's another popular meat in the United States?
	3	LL:	E::r, e::r
	4	T:	((making a pig sound))
	5	L7:	Pork, pork.
	6	L8:	Turkey, turkey
	7	T:	Ok, pork. Ok, pork is another popular meat.

In Excerpt (9), the teacher asks the learners about types of meat. L5 provides "fish" as the correct item in line 1, which is not correct. Instead of providing self-repair opportunities for L5, the teacher first acknowledges the learner's utterance ("A:lright") and then indicates that "fish" is not a type of meat when she says, "We usually divide fish into a different category." She then immediately shifts her gaze from L5 to the whole class to elicit the correct answer from the other learners and

reiterated the question "but the::, what's another popular meat in the United States?" (question act). Sensing that the learners are having difficulty coming up with the right answer, the teacher gives them a hint by making a pig sound in line 4. Responding to this, L7 and L8 simultaneously provide the candidate items "pork, pork" in line 5 and "turkey, turkey" in line 6, respectively (response act). In line 7 the teacher picks up the L7's candidate response and provides positive feedback on L7's remarks (evaluation act), ignoring L8's response for the moment.

Other-initiated and other-completed repair in the form of unmodulated "no"

An other-initiated and other-completed repair sequence in learner-teacher interactions is also demonstrated in the form of unmodulated "no," as illustrated in Excerpt (10):

(10) ((The teacher is asking the learners about kinds of grain product))

	1	T:	Another grain product?
	2	LL:	Ummmm . . umm . .
	3	L3:	Beans.=
	4	L4:	=Sugar.
	5	T:	E:r=
	6	L6:	=Sugar?=
	7	T	=Sugar, we don't think of sugar as a grain.
	8	L3:	Beans?
	9	LL:	((unint))
–>	10	T:	No, actually I'll bring you some examples tomorrow.
	11	L5:	Spaghetti?
	12	T:	O::ats, barle::y. ((turning her back and starting to write "oats, barley" on the board at the same time))
	13	T:	Err, you've got several, I think, in your Oxford Picture Dictionary, you got some pictures of them. But, I'll bring some, er, in the class tomorrow. Milk products? More milk products?

In Excerpt (10), the teacher asks about other grain product to the whole class. In answer to the teacher's question, L3 provides the candidate item "beans" in line 3. Then L4 immediately provides another candidate item "sugar" in line 4. L6 also provides "sugar" as the candidate item in line 6. In line 7 the teacher picks up the candidate item provided by L4 and L6, ignoring L3's candidate item for the time being. However, neither of these candidate responses are correct. In the same line, the teacher comments on the L4 and L6's answer "sugar," indicating that it is not correct. L3 persists in offering "beans" as the candidate response in line 8, and other learners also try to provide the correct item, to which the teacher boldly says "no" and says she will bring some examples of grain products next class in line 10. However, L5 jumps in with "spaghetti" as a candidate item in line 11, which she ignores, turning her back and starts to write "oats, barley" on the blackboard in-

stead. Observing that eliciting grain products from the learners proves to be too difficult for them at this point, the teacher decides to switch to a different topic, as in line 13 "Milk products. More milk products?"

Learners' Response to Teacher's Recast within Different Participation Frameworks

Another form of repair manifested in the current second language classroom data is a teacher's recast. A recast is a replacement of the learner's error with the correct linguistic form (McHoul, 1990). Learners' responses to the teacher's recast also reveal the key role of activity types operating in the second language instructional discourse. More specifically, the learner's responses to the teacher's recast are found to vary according to the types of activities in which they engage. As Norrick (1991, p. 80, italics added) suggested, classroom interaction "represents but one possible instantiation of a more basic order-*one that depends on how interlocutors perceive their (differential) roles and the goals of their ongoing interaction*." Participants in the second language classroom assume a variety of participatory roles within different participation frameworks. The roles of the teacher and the learner seem to be changing, depending on the particular participation frameworks in which they engage, which affects every aspect of interactions including repair trajectories and their interactional imports. This phenomenon will be demonstrated in the following section.

Learner Role-playing Activities

In learner role-playing activities, the learner of the trouble source tends to immediately incorporate the teacher's recasts entirely or partially in his or her following turn. This repair sequence is illustrated in the following excerpt:

(11) ((Role play: making a restaurant reservation over the phone))

1	L1:	Alright, what's your request?
2	L2:	E::r, I need e:r a table for uh- a seat for children for two.
—> 3	T:	I need a seat for two children=
4	L2:	=a seat for two children.
5	L1:	Yes, yes, that's guarantee.
—> 6	T:	O:h, we guarantee it=
—> 7	L1:	=Yes, we guarantee it.

In Excerpt (11), L1 the restaurant host, and L2 the guest, engage in the role play activity, making a restaurant reservation over the phone. In responding to L1's question, L2 does not provide the correct response. The teacher starts to model the L2's utterances in line 3 "I need a seat for two children," and this is partially incorporated into L2's following turn in line 4 "a seat for two children." The conversation is carried on, and L1 responds to L2's utterances "Yes, yes, that's guarantee" in line 5, which is not completely correct. The teacher provides recast "Ah,

we guarantee it" in line 6. L1 accepts and reiterates this recast "Yes, we guarantee it" in line 7. In this repair structure, the teacher's role is *a modeler*, that is, a person who makes sure that the learners follow the model dialogue in their role plays and provides actual corrections in order for the learners to repeat after her.

This segment of talk also shows that repair patterns found in learner-learner interactions are characterized by "embedded" correction, as opposed to "exposed" correction. "Exposed" correction involves isolating the correction and is accompanied by "accountings." Accountings are discussed by Jefferson (1987, p. 89, italics added) in the following way:

> In the course of the business of correcting we can find such *attendant activities* as, e.g., 'instructing' ('you speak electric motor and a gasoline engine'), 'complaining' ('you always say kil'), 'admitting' ('I didn't get it right'), 'forgiving' ('that's alright, I forgive you'), and in other materials, 'accusing', 'apologizing', 'ridiculing', etc. That is, the business of correcting can be a matter of, not merely putting things to rights, but of *specifically addressing lapses in competence and/or conduct*. Call this class of activities '*accountings.*'

Exposed correction also makes it "interactional business" on its own right, interfering with the ongoing talk at hand. Embedded correction, on the other hand, is not accompanied by accountings or does not involve the business of correcting per se, therefore not disrupting the ongoing course of talk. The teacher's recastings of the L2's incorrect utterances in Excerpt (11) constitute a continuation, rather than a disruption of the current interaction.

Teacher-Fronted Activities

In teacher-fronted activities, the learner does not tend to repeat or incorporate the teacher's recasts into his or her next utterances, but rather tries to collaboratively finish her recasting turn, resulting in a cooperative overlap with the teacher's utterance. Excerpt (12) illustrates this point:

(12) ((L6 describes to the teacher the process of making ice cream "araki" from his own country))

—> 1 L6: And, e:r e:r change uh- change the color ((making circles with his fingers in order to show something is being changed)).
2 T: And it changes [the color], yeah.=
—> 3 L6: [The color].
4 L6 =The milk no: white.=
5 T: =The milk isn't (0.2) [white].
6 L6: [White]. The milk change brown.=
—> 7 T =Alright, the milk becomes (0.2) [brown].
8 L6: [Brown].
9 T: Hum, this is an ice cream?
10 L6: E:r, yes. it's, it's e::r e::r a [kind] of ice cream.=
—> 11 T: =It's a kind [kaind] of ice cream.

In Excerpt (12), in response to the teacher's question about the ice cream that he previously mentioned "araki," L6 is trying to describe to the teacher the process of making it, in which the teacher continuously provides recasts to him. L6 does not incorporate any of these recasts provided by the teacher into his subsequent turns, but rather tries to collaboratively finish her recasting turn, resulting in cooperative overlaps with the teacher's utterances. L6 still smoothly continues with his description of the ice cream without being interrupted. In this repair sequence, the teacher seems to be showing her understanding as *a listener* rather than merely trying to correct the learner's errors by recasting. The learner does not repeat it because he seems to understand the interactional process. He understands that the purpose of the teacher's recast is not for him to repeat, but for the teacher to show him her understanding of his talk; something like "Oh, what you're saying is . . .".[6]

This cooperative overlap does not violate 'one-speaker-at-a-time' turn-taking rules (Sacks et al., 1974), but rather it functions to cooperatively sustain or extend the current speaker's floorholding (Stubbe, 1998; Tannen, 1990). It also functions to signal the listener's active involvement and solidarity with the current speaker's talk, as opposed to minimal responses from the listener (Stenstrom, 1994). Such a cooperative overlap should be distinguished from other types of overlapping in that it is collaborative in nature. That is, it shows the interactive involvement of the listener in the co-construction of discourse, and it is employed by co-participants as a means of support in order to maintain the continuous stream of talk (Stubbe, 1998).

CONCLUSION

The purpose of the current study was to examine how the organization of repair is constructed in the second language classroom talk. This study shows that participation frameworks play a crucial role in constructing repair sequences in second language instructional discourse.

The present findings can be summarized in the following way:[7]

First, in learner role-playing activities, a variety of repair sequences are manifested, including self-initiated and self-completed, self-initiated and other-completed, and other-initiated and other-completed repair sequences.

Second, the collaborative nature of repair sequences is also displayed in learner role-playing activities in which self-initiation by the speaker of the trouble source is collaboratively completed by co-participants in the form of word search and try-marking.

Third, other-initiated and other-completed repair in learner role-playing activities is manifested in the form of cluing, which is accompanied by an IRE sequence.

Fourth, teacher-fronted activities are predominantly characterized by the

other-initiated and other-completed repair sequences in the form of an IRE sequence and unmodulated "no."

Lastly, a close examination of learners' responses to the teacher's repair (e.g., recast) also reveals the significant role of activity types operating in second language classroom talk. In learner role-playing activities, the learner who has produced the trouble source tends to repeat the teacher's recast entirely or partially in his or her next turn. In teacher-fronted activities, on the other hand, the learner of the trouble source does not tend to incorporate the teacher's recasts into his or her subsequent utterances, but rather tries to collaboratively finish her recasting turn, resulting in cooperative overlaps.

This study offers a contribution to the area of the repair organization in the instructional talk by examining the machinery of repair in a beginning ESL classroom. This analysis is based on a video transcription of a sixty-minute ESL class, and to that extent, the analysis presented here is necessarily limited, which points to further research for more thorough investigation of classroom repair. In order to gain a deeper understanding of the repair mechanism in the second language classroom setting, more research is clearly needed, involving a larger corpus of data, a longer time period of observations, different levels and age groups of ESL/EFL learners, and so forth.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Leo van Lier for his helpful suggestions on the very first draft of this paper. My thanks also go to the three anonymous IAL reviewers, as well as two IAL editors, Kathy Howard and Leah Wingard for their helpful comments and suggestions on this paper. Last but not least, I also wish to thank the previous IAL editor, Tanya Stivers for her assistance on handling the manuscript. Possible errors in this paper are all my own.

NOTES

[1] There was no other-initiated and self-completed repair in the corpus of the present data.

[2] Egbert (1997) discussed "collectivity" (i.e., "association") in multiperson interaction in ordinary conversation, focusing on other-initiated repair by multipersons, whereas the present study analyzes other-completed repair by multipersons in the second language instructed setting.

[3] Sinclair and Coulthard (1975, 1992) refer to this interactional sequence as IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback). McHoul (1978, 1990) refers to it as QAC (Question-Answer-Comment) sequence.

[4] As previously noted in McHoul's (1990) repair study of first language content classroom, the present data also show errors being made by the teacher that remain unrepaired ("Coffee and bread are two examples of beverages").

[5] As previously mentioned, repair in the second language instructional talk also includes error correction on factual knowledge as well as linguistic knowledge, in addition to ad-

dressing problems of speaking, hearing or understanding the talk (van Lier, 1988).

[6] This particular analysis was partly suggested by one of the anonymous reviewers of this paper.

[7] Another interesting phenomenon found in the current second language classroom repair is that, as Schegloff (1992) has suggested about classroom instructions, there is no self-initiated third-position repair found in the present data. However, Lerner (1995) noted instances of third-turn repair in his analysis of instructional activities.

REFERENCES

Cook, H. M. (1999). Language socialization in Japanese elementary schools: Attentive listening and reaction turns. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31,* 1443-1465.

Craig, H., & Gallagher, T. (1982). Gaze and proximity as turn regulators within three-party and two-party child conversation. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 25,* 65-74.

Day, R. R., Chenoweth, N. A., Chun, A. E., & Luppescu, S. (1984). Corrective feedback in non-native discourse. *Language Learning, 34,* 19-46.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). Analyzing talk at work: An introduction. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in instructional settings* (pp. 3-65). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Egbert, M. M. (1997). Some interactional achievements of other-initiated repair in multiperson conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 27,* 611-634.

Ferrara, K. (1992). The interactive achievement of a sentence: Joint productions in therapeutic discourse. *Discourse Processes, 15,* 207-228.

Francis, D. W. (1986). Some structures of negotiation talk. *Language in Society, 15,* 53-79.

Gaskill, W. H. (1980). Correction in native speaker-nonnative speaker conversation. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.), *Discourse analysis in second language research* (pp. 25-37). Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis.* New York: Harper and Row.

Goldberg, J. A. (1990). Interrupting the discourse on interruptions: An analysis in terms of relationally neutral, power-, and rapport-oriented acts. *Journal of Pragmatics, 14,* 883-903.

Goodwin, M. H. (1979). The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology.* New York: Irvington Press.

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

Goodwin, M. H. (1983). Aggravated correction and disagreement in children's conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics, 7,* 657-677.

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

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gunter, R. (1974). *Sentences in dialogue.* Columbia, SC: Hornbeam Press.

Jefferson. G. (1987). On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee. (Eds.), *Talk and social organization* (pp. 86-100). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Kangasharju, H. (1996). Aligning as a team in multiparty conversation. *Journal of*

Pragmatics, 26, 291-319.
Kasper, G. (1985). Repair in foreign language teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7*, 200-215.
Lerner, G. H. (1993). Collectivities in action: Establishing the relevance of conjoined participation in conversation. *Text, 13,* 213-245.
Lerner, G. H. (1995). Turn design and the organization of participation in instructional activities. *Discourse Processes, 19,* 111-131.
Lerner, G. H. (1996). On the 'semi-permeable' character of grammatical units in conversation: Conditional entry into the turn space of another participant. In E. Ochs, E. A. Shegloff & S.A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 238-276). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lewis, C, (1988). Japanese first-grade classroom: Implications for U.S. theory and research. *Comparative Education Review, 32,* 159-172.
van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner*. London: Longman.
Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
McHoul, A. W. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in Society, 7,* 183-213.
McHoul, A. W. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in Society, 19,* 349-377.
Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: The social organization of classroom behavior*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Mehan, H. (1982). The structure of classroom events and their consequences for student performance. In P. Gilmore & A. Glatthorn (Eds.), *Children in and out of school: Ethnography and education* (pp. 59-87). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
Mehan, H. (1985). The structure of classroom discourse. In T. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis (Vol 3.)* (pp. 120-131). London: Academic.
Norrick, N. R. (1991). On the organization of corrective exchanges in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 16,* 59-83.
Murata, K. (1994). Intrusive or co-operative? A cross-cultural study of interruption. *Journal of Pragmatics, 21,* 385-400.
Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation.* Oxford: Blackwell.
Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50,* 696-735.
Schegloff, E. (1991). Reflections on talk and social structure. In D. Boden & D. H. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk and social structure* (pp. 44-70). Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
Schegloff, E. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology, 97,* 1295-1345.
Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language, 53,* 361-382.
Seedhouse, P. (1997). The case of the missing "no": The relationship between pedagogy and interaction. *Language Learning, 47,* 3, 547-583.
Selting, M. (1988). The role of intonation in the organization of repair and problem handling sequences in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 12,* 293-322.
Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Toward an analysis of discourse.* London: Oxford University Press.
Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1992). Toward an analysis of discourse. In M. Coulthard

(Ed.), *Advances in spoken discourse analysis* (pp. 1-34). London: Routledge.
Stenstrom, A. (1994). *An introduction to spoken interaction*. London: Longman.
Stubbe, M. (1998). Are you listening? Cultural influences on the use of supportive verbal feedback in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 29,* 257-289.
Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. New York: Ballantine Book.

APPENDIX

Transcription Conventions (based on Sacks et al. (1974) with a few additions and simplifications for the convenience of transcribing classroom interaction)

T	Teacher.
L1, L2, etc,	Identified learner.
L	Unidentified learner.
LL	Several or all learners simultaneously.
(0.0)	Pause lengths measured in tenths of a second .
=	No intervals between adjacent utterances, the second utterance latched immediately to the first.
:	Extension of the prior sound or syllable.
?	Rising intonation, not necessarily a question.
[	Simultaneous start or the beginning of an overlap.
]	The point at which two overlapping or simultaneously-started utterances end.
(( ))	Comments about the transcript, including non-verbal information.
__	Indication of stress.
-	Cut-off, self-interruption.
.	Fall in tone, not necessarily the end of a sentence.
[si:m]	Square brackets indicate phonetic transcription.
—>	Pointing out features of interest.
((unint))	unintelligible.

AUTHOR'S INFORMATION

Euen Hyuk (Sarah) Jung is a Doctoral Candidate in Applied Linguistics Program in the Linguistics Department at Georgetown University. Her research interests include second language discourse analysis, listening comprehension, assessment, interlanguage pragmatics, and CALL.