

Next-Turn Repair Initiators in English Conversation between Korean Speakers*

Eun-a Cho

(Chung-Ang University)

Cho, Eun-a. 2007. Next-Turn Repair Initiators in English Conversation between Korean Speakers. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal*, 15(3), 141-160. In second language acquisition (SLA) studies, there has been much research that has dealt with the negotiation of meaning in conversation as a way of characterizing the nature of non-native speakers. This study attempts to explore the next-turn repair initiators (NTRIs) that function as questions to negotiate meaning in English conversation between non-native speakers whose native language is Korean. NTRIs are not only question types to negotiate meaning, but also initiate the repair organization in sequential and interactional contexts. Concerning the types of NTRIs in English conversation, NTRIs between Korean speakers (KSs) are frequently used in the following question types (i) *what*, *huh*, or *yeah*, (ii) echo question with partial or full repetition of the previous turn, (iii) appender question with candidate information. This study also shows that NTRIs perform the following functions: (i) requesting for repetition of the entire trouble-source (TS) turn, (ii) seeking confirmation from the previous speaker with the partial or full repetition of the prior turn, (iii) collaborating to manage conversation. Finally, this study of NTRIs suggest the need to explore the interaction between non-native speakers in pedagogical implications.

Key Words: next-turn repair initiators, negotiation of meaning, repetition, trouble-source, sequence, interaction

1. Introduction

There are many questions to understand and to be understood in

* I am grateful to the three anonymous reviewers for their invaluable comments on the first draft of this paper. All shortcomings are, of course, mine.

conversation. Particularly, the types of questions between non-native speakers (NNSs) differ from those between native speakers (NSs) or NS-NNS conversations, with respect to the negotiation of meaning when there has been an actual break down. In other words, because non-understanding always resides in both the speaker and the hearer, the participants have a shared incompetence. As Varonis and Gass (1985) points out, therefore, conversational interactions between NNSs can allow greater opportunity than NS-NS or NS-NNS conversations for the negotiation of meaning.

There are also a variety of problems in conversation such as hesitation, cut-off, and misunderstandings. Repair refers to the efforts of participants for the negotiation of meaning to deal with problems in speaking, hearing or understanding. The notion of repair developed by Shegloff, Jefferson, and Sack (1977) was to demonstrate and describe the general features of the organization of repair which allows participants to deal with the whole range of trouble-source (TS). Next-turn repair initiators (NTRIs) are used in the case when the current speaker has a problem or difficulty in understanding or hearing the previous speaker' utterance. NTRIs are not only question types for the negotiation of meaning, but also initiate the repair organization in interactional contexts.

The purpose of this study is to explore NTRIs for the negotiation of meaning which may be somewhat specific to non-native speakers of English whose native language is Korean. There has been much research that deals with the negotiation of meaning from functional perspectives in SLA studies. However, little attention has been paid to the features of the negotiation of meaning from sequential perspectives. In this regard, this study attempts to explore the sequential and interactional contexts of NTRIs that function to gain a better understanding in NNS conversation.

This study, which focuses on NTRIs for the negotiation of meaning between Korean speakers (KSs) will explore the following questions: (i) When are NTRIs used as questions for negotiation of meaning? (ii) How do KSs produce NTRIs in a way which is different from those of NS?, (iii) Based on frequency analysis, what types of NTRIs are most frequently used?, and (iv) what communicative strategies are involved in

the use of NTRIs? To explore these questions, this study will examine the forms and functions of NTRIs which are determined by negotiation between speaker and hearer. I will also show the properties of NTRIs in terms of sequential and interactional contexts, and explore communicative strategies that are responsible for the use of NTRIs. Finally, the outcomes from this study will be used to suggest some pedagogical implications in applying the findings to KSs' actual interactions.

2. Previous Research on NTRIs

2.1 Repair Organization in Sequential and Interactional Contexts

There are a variety of problems in conversation: hesitation, cut-off, incorrect word selection, slips of the tongue, misunderstandings, and so forth. Repair refers to the efforts of participants for the negotiation of meaning to deal with these troubles in speaking, hearing or understanding. This repair system may be operated by interactional and interpersonal contexts and also connected with sequential aspects of conversations.

Since conversation relates to the negotiation of meaning between speaker and hearer, it is difficult to isolate one speaker's utterance without examining other utterances in contexts. Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) refers to the fact that the turns in conversation are not just serially ordered, but they are sequentially ordered. They refer to talk-in-interaction rather than conversation because the term 'talk-in-interaction' encompasses far more than the term 'conversation'.

Repair is one of the most distinguishing characteristics in conversation. Repair has received its most extensive attention within the field of conversation analysis (CA) (e.g., Jefferson, 1974; Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks, 1977; Schegloff, 1992; Schegloff, 1996; Schegloff, 2000). CA is the systematic analysis of the talk produced in human interaction. Repair used in CA is a generic term to cover a broad scope of phenomena that we call a correction. The term 'correction' suggests that people only engage in repair when something has clearly gone wrong. However, repair in conversations can operate

even when there is no audible error or mistake, and an audible error does not always result in correction. The term 'repair' is largely preferred to the term 'correction' in CA studies.

The repair organization provides methods in order to identify errors and execute corrections. It represents a distinction between the initiation of repair, and the actual repair itself. More specifically, the repair system can be analyzed in terms of who initiates repairs: either "self" (i.e., the speaker who produced the TS) or "other" (i.e., the other speaker), - and who resolves it (analyzed in terms of "self" or "other" speaker). Self-initiated repairs use various initiator techniques such as pause, 'uh', cut-offs, and sound stretches, to signal the possibility of repair initiation. Other-initiated repairs also use various initiator techniques called NTRIs (Schegloff et al., 1977).

2.2 NTRIs in Sequential and Interactional Contexts

NTRIs have been explained as echo questions in the linguistic literature. They operate as echo questions to seek or confirm information when the current speaker has a problem or difficulty in understanding or hearing the previous speaker's utterances. Cruttenden (1986) states that echo questions are the most common questions that ask the whole or some parts of the previous utterances of another speaker.

From the perspectives of CA, NTRIs initiate a repair sequence. Repair is initiated in order to clarify or to correct the problematic communication or grammatical error. Particularly, NTRIs are related with other-initiated repair. NTRIs not only initiate a repair sequence but also withhold a potential completion of the repair by other speaker. They facilitate the speaker of the to TS repair their own utterance. More repair work extends over several further turns and results in either self or other-completion.

Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) mentions types of NTRIs used to initiate repair in English: (i) *Huh, What?*, (ii) question words *who, where, when*, (iii) partial repeat of the trouble-source turn, plus a question word such as *what, who, or where?*, (iv) partial repeat of the

trouble-source turn, and (v) *Y'mean* plus a possible understanding of prior turn, among others. Weber (1993) reorganizes types of NTRIs in English based on Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) into: (i) *what, huh*, (ii) *wh*-word, (iii) partial or full repeat plus *wh*-word, partial or full repeat plus candidate referent, (iv) partial repeat alone, (v) *you mean* plus candidate understanding, (vi) *wh*-word used to request more information, (vii) appender question with candidate referent, (viii) appender question with *wh*-word, and (ix) candidate substitution. This research explores the types and functions of NTRIs in the aspects of the negotiation of meaning between KSs.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Participants

The data analyzed in this research stems from forty audio files of pairs between KSs. The participants in this research included eighty students of varying majors at a university located in Seoul, Korea. Two levels were examined including forty students of lower proficiency and forty students of higher proficiency. All eighty students were native speakers of Korean.

3.2 Data Collection Procedures

Data collection started in the fall of 2004 and was completed in the spring of 2006.¹⁾ Before recordings took place, the students were divided into two groups by their oral proficiency levels after a brief survey. Most researches on NTRIs focus on contexts in sequential organizations, oral proficiency levels need not be divided into the several levels (Schegloff, 1992; Schegloff, 2000; Schegloff et al, 1977; Wong, 2002). Participants were paired with other participants of similar English oral proficiency. They were recorded in an informal conversation with no instructions other than

1) This research is an extension of Cho's research (2005) on data which I did for my dissertation in linguistics.

to talk in English with each other. The conversations were casual and relatively spontaneous. Between 5–15 minutes were allocated to each group.

3.3 Data Analysis

The researcher in this study recorded forty audio-taped face-to-face conversations. The total amount of time of the forty audio-taped files was approximately 380 minutes of speech with, 112 pages of transcription (higher(65), lower(47)), and approximately 21916 words (higher(12808), lower(9108)). This number is an approximation only due to the difficulty of making transcription of the complete spoken text. Audio-taped conversational data was transcribed by the researcher. In order to produce high quality transcripts, the researcher used transcription software, “Voicewalker Program.” Each conversation was transcribed according to the transcription conventions proposed by Du Bois et al. (1993). For the purpose of this study, the transcriptions were designed to capture the details of question-answer structures in conversation. From this corpus, forty excerpts were built and analyzed, and the total number of NTRI tokens amounted to 267 in the forty excerpts. The excerpts presented in this research are representatives of the NTRI types for this study.

4. NTRIs in English conversations between KSs

Various NTRI patterns emerged in audio-taped files for the negotiation of meaning. Table 1 is a list of types of NTRIs in English conversation between KSs. The NTRI types follow Weber (1993), and are completed in the aspects of the interactions between KSs in this data. The data show that KSs produce similar sorts of NTRI as NSs do, indicating that NTRI type is similar across NS-NS and NNS-NNS interactions in other-initiated repair environments. One of the specific NTRIs in KSs is the overt indication of non-understanding. As shown in Table 1, unlike NTRIs in NSs, KSs often express non-understanding explicitly because they have a shared incompetence. In order to find a general pattern of NTRIs between

KSs, frequency analysis was conducted, and Table 2 shows the results.

Table 1. Categories of NTRIs in English Conversation between KSs

Number	NTRI Types
1	<i>What, huh</i>
2	<i>Wh</i> -word
3	Partial or full repeat + candidate information
4	Partial repeat alone
5	Full repeat alone
6	<i>You mean</i> + candidate understanding
7	<i>Wh</i> -word used to request information
8	Appender question with candidate information
9	Candidate substitution
10	Overt indication of non-understanding

Table 2. Frequency and Percentage of NTRIs by Lower and Higher Proficiency in English Conversation between KSs

NTRI Types	Higher		Lower		Total	
	Frequ ency	Perce ntage	Frequ ency	Perce ntage	Frequ ency	Perce ntage
1. <i>What, huh, or yeah</i>	8	5.4	7	5.8	15	5.6
2. <i>Wh</i> -word	2	1.4	1	0.8	3	1.1
3. Partial or full repeat + candidate information	9	6.1	6	5.0	15	5.6
4. Partial repeat alone	91	61.9	79	65.8	170	63.7
5. Full repeat alone	9	6.1	5	4.2	14	5.2
6. <i>You mean</i> + candidate understanding	6	4.1	0	0	6	2.2
7. <i>Wh</i> -word used to request more information	5	3.4	3	2.5	8	3.0
8. Appender question with candidate information	7	4.8	6	5.0	13	4.9
9. Candidate substitution	8	5.4	5	4.2	13	4.9
10. Overt indication of non-understanding	2	1.4	8	6.7	10	3.7
Total	147	100	120	100	267	100

Both the category and frequency of NTRIs used are very similar between the higher- and lower-proficiency groups. Table 2 shows very similar categories of NTRI use by the two groups. Higher proficiency groups used 10 different NTRIs and lower groups used 9 different NTRIs. The most frequently used NTRI type in KSs is partial repeats of the prior turn. A total of 170 (63.7%) in NTRIs is used. NTRIs such

as “*huh*”, “*what*” are the most general initiator in English conversation. They only contributed, however, 5.6% in conversation between KSs. Examining more closely the distribution of NTRIs used in the higher-proficiency groups vs. the lower-proficiency groups, it was founded that discourse marker ‘*you mean*’ plus candidate information was used in only the higher-proficiency groups. On the other hand, the lower-proficiency groups used NTRI which expressed overt indication of non-understanding more than four times as often in conversation higher-proficiency groups, HP,n=2 ; LP,n=8. Both the higher- and lower-proficiency groups used NTRIs almost an equal number of times in other NTRI types. The following excerpts are representative examples of the types of NTRIs in conversation between KSs.

4.1 *What, Huh, and Yeah*

The most basic type of NTRI is *what*, *huh*, or *yeah* in English conversation. With rising intonation, these NTRIs target the entire previous utterance as TS and request to repeat the entire TS turn. Excerpt (1) provides the example of the NTRI *yeah* between KSs. With rising intonation, the current speaker K18 produces an NTRI *Yeah* after a period of pause, targeting the entire prior utterance as TS turn. K19 repeats the TS turn at line 6.

- (1) 1 K19: ...Have you ever been to any English speaking countries?
 2 K18: Oh, No never.
 3 K19: ..Never?
 4 **TS** .. Have you ever been to any foreign countries?
 5 K18: → ...(0.7) Yeah?
 6 K19: (0) Have you ever been to any foreign countries?
 7 K18: Foreign country?
 8 No, never.
 9 K19: Never? Um.
- (2) 1 K78: I have to umm ..write report writing report next well until
 2 the next week,

- 3 **TS** So, are you help me? ...may I help me.
 4 K77: → What?
 5 K78: ..Oh sorry.
 6 I want you help me, so a report writing. Okay?
 7 Report is about law?

Excerpt (2) is the example of the NTRI *what*. At line 4, K77 utters an NTRI *what* with rising intonation demonstrating some trouble with hearing after K78's utterance. K78 excuses himself and repeats the TS turn in a distinct way at line 6.

4.2 *Wh*-word

Another type of NTRI is the question words such as *who*, *what*, *where*, *when*, *why*, or *how*. These *wh*-words may be used as NTRIs to ask some part of the TS turn with level or falling intonation (Selting, 1992). They locate the TS as a referent, an event, a place, a time, a reason or an adverbial modifier.

- (3) 1 K11: **TS** Oh..., what your's MOS's?
 2 K10: → What's that.
 3 K11: MOS. When you guys were in the army.
 4 K10: Mos?
 5 K11: Yeah
 6 K10: What is MOS?

Excerpt (3) is an example of the KSs' modified *wh*-word type in comparison with NSs' *wh*-word NTRIs. In this example, K10 produces the NTRI "what's that" with level intonation, demonstrating some trouble in identifying of the referent *MOS*, and K11 tries to explain the meaning of the referent *MOS*.

4.3 Partial or Full Repeat plus Candidate Information

- (4) 1 K10: So what did you usually do in your ... where did you work at?
 2 K11: **TS** ...(0.7) I was in Information.
 3 K10: → ..Information room?
 4 K11: Yeah. It was kinda- ..it's sort of comput- computer room.
 6 K10: Ok.

A partial or full repeat plus a candidate information is another type of NTRI between KSs. In (4), K11 begins a story about army situation involving information, K10 produces an NTRI which is a partial repeat of the prior turn “information” and candidate information “room.” K10 produces an NTRI by giving a partial repeat of the prior turn and a candidate information, and K11 responds to the NTRI with an affirmative repeat token “Yeah.”

4.4 Partial Repeat Alone

The most frequent type of NTRIs between KSs is a partial repeat of the previous turn. These NTRI forms are completely designed by the recipient who has received the speaker's previous utterance.

- (5) 1 K48: Yeah yeah yeah I have an advantage in English .. so if ..I
 2 studied English more maybe .. I can take a good grade in
 3 Toefl or Toeic .. and I think maybe I have more I can be,
 4 **TS** more easy to enter have a job.
 5 K49: → .. have a job?
 6 K48: Okay.
- (6) 1 K37: **TS** I plan, I will go to China.
 2 K36: → China ? Why ?
 3 K37: **TS** Just trip.
 4 K36: → Trip?
 5 K37: Trip..... I like travel.
 6 K36: Oh, yes. Me, too. I want to go China, too.

In (5), there is a partial repeat of the previous turn. K49 produces a partial repeat of K48's prior turn with rising intonation at line 5. K48 responds to the NTRI with an affirmative token "Okay" at line 6. Excerpt (6) is an example of a lower-proficiency participant. Lower-proficiency groups show many partial repetition in inter- and intra- turns due to their incompetence in target language. K36 produces a partial repeat of K37's prior turn with rising intonation at line 2. However, before K37 answers the K36's question, K36 again asks *wh*-question in the same turn. K37 answers the question at line 37. Then, K36 again produces a partial repeat of K37's utterance at line 4. K37 responds to the NTRI at line 5.

4.5 Full Repeat Alone

- (7) 1 K6: **TS** How about you?
 2 K5: → ...How about me?
 3 K6: Yeah.
 4 K5: uh I have know no special special expressing college r- but
 5 ... uh= actually I try to enjoy the socc- soccer club but
 6 um= due to the fact that I had uh I next I had so many
 7 buzi some
 8 K6: ...(0.7) um I major in English language and it literature yeah
 9 and isn't it your major is business so are you planning to
 10 get MBA in the future?
 11 K5: No actually I'm not sure yet but ... I have planned but= uh
 12 **TS** this day ...(1.2) this day are I feel I feel more
 13 K6: → ...(0.8) You feel more?
 14 K5: **TS** I feel more um like to be uh ... (0.8) the confident person,
 15 K6: → What kind of confident person?
 16 K5: ..Confident person is a have ability to= to pace pace the
 17 environment
 18 K6: Mhm.

In (7), there is a full repeat of the previous turn. Excerpt (7) also

shows that the conversations between KSs are the continuum of NTRIs in sequential contexts. First, K5 produces a full repeat of K6's prior turn with rising intonation at line 2. However, K5 substitutes pronoun *me* for *you*. K6 responds with an affirmative token at line 3. Second, K6 produces a full repeat of K5's prior turn with rising intonation at line 13. K6 substitutes pronoun *you* for *I* this time. In line 14, after K5 utters "the confident person," K6 produces *wh*-word NTRI to request more information "What kind of confident person."

4.6 *You mean* Plus Candidate Understanding

- (8) 1 K27: Of course. where is your house?
 2 K26: I live in Gaepo-dong, so the... you can just follow me after
 3 class.
 4 K27: Ah, how about? ahh, so which which transportation do you
 5 do your home? .. Uh What what ahh@@ what do you
 6 transported to your-?
 7 K26: Yeah,
 8 K27: TS Ahh:: subway or bus,
 9 K26: → Ah:: you mean, ..the public transportation, right?
 10 K27: Yeah.

Another type of NTRI is the discourse marker, "*Y'mean*" plus a candidate understanding. This is a type of NTRI which requires a sufficient understanding to clarify or rephrase. The current speaker produce candidate understanding to be confirmed by the previous speaker. These types of NTRIs are usually found in the higher-proficiency groups. In (8), K27 produces TS turn at line 8. K26 produces an NTRI with the discourse marker "*you mean*" and a possible understanding of *vehicle* as "the public transportation." K27 responds with an affirmative token at line 10.

4.7 *Wh*-word Used to Request More Information

- (9) 1 K6: TS Umm ... Anyway can you do me a favor?
 2 K5: → how what? what kind of a favor you want?
 3 K6: ..Um I'm taking this semester I'm taking subject something
 4 to to do with business, but I dont' really understand about it
 5 so, could you please please help me do my homework
 6 please?

There is a type of NTRI which refers to the need for additional information in order to achieve a complete understanding of the utterance. Excerpt (9) is an example of an NTRI which used *wh*-word to request more information. In (9), K5 produces an NTRI with the *wh*-word “what kind” to request more information about the kind of the favor which K5 utter and K6 responds with the word “my homework”.

4.8 Appender Question with Candidate Information

An appender question is syntactically integrated with the previous turn, and it can be interpreted as forming the terminal constituent of the previous turn (Shapley, 1983). It also can be found as NTRIs in co-construction contexts where current speaker's utterance completes prior speaker's projected utterance as a way of collaborating with each other.

Co-construction demonstrates collaborative achievement of projected constructive schemas through co-constructed interaction between speaker and hearer. In conversation, the current speaker, who has shared knowledge with the previous speaker, often coordinates with the prior speaker in constructing the constructive schemas, resulting in jointly produced utterances between the speakers (Goodwin, 1995).

- (10) 1 K1: You know um% and .. the other college I used to go to .. I
 2 took a jazz class about .. it was about the evolution of jazz
 3 .. so I um study like different types of jazz before music to
 4 me like jazz music was jazz just jazz but when I took that
 5 class I @@@ ...(0.8) I um .. I was I go to tell the different
 6 TS between big band and heard bap be bap and==

- 7 K15: → ...(0.7) Swing?
 8 K1: (0)Um Swing and different types of jazz before as you know same was good,

Excerpt (10) shows an example of appender question with candidate information in collaborative sequences. In (10), after hearing about K1's talk about a jazz music, K15 produces an NTRI in the form of an appender question as forming terminal constituent of K1's previous turn. The previous turn "between big band and heard bap be bap and==" are completed by the completion of the current speaker "Swing." In other word, K1 and K15 collaboratively manage their conversation with an appender question in co-construction sequences.

- (11) 1 K44: the think perhaps she XXX or meet boyfriend are not. @@@
 2 TS he's very very nervous to me and @@@
 3 K45: →Suspect you?
 4 K44: Ouh, suspect me very very .. and so we separate bye-bye.

Excerpt (11) is another example of an appender question. K45 produces an NTRI in the form of an appender question as forming terminal constituent of the previous turn "he's very very nervous to me and @@@". The utterance of K44 are completed by the co-construction with the current speaker in a sequential context. That is, K45 adds to a unit spoken by K44, and this addition is accepted by K44.

4.9 Candidate Substitution

- (12) 1 K43: You why did you choose me why don't you change your partner?
 2 K42: TS Uh I'm shame. I'm shame.
 3 K43: → A little bit shy?
 4 K42: I'm man is really XXXX well comfortable
 5 K43: Ah yeah man is more com- comfortable ... than woman?

This is a type of repair initiator which the current speaker rephrases what the previous speaker had said. In (12), K42 produces “shame”, and then K43 produces an NTRI which is a candidate substitution “shy” with rising intonation. KSs comprehend the other speaker’s utterance, by using NTRIs which rephrase the previous utterance with candidate substitution.

4.10 Overt Indication of Non-understanding

The following excerpts (13) and (14) are examples of overt indication of non-understanding. Overt indication of non-understanding are not included in Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks’ NTRI categorie, many KSs express explicit non-understanding. With rising intonation, ‘Pardon?’ or ‘What are you saying?’ signals that the current speaker is having a problem either in hearing or understanding.

- (13) 1 K62: **TS** Yesterday...(1.0) I’m very fatigue, so I go home...(1.5) I go
 2 home (2.5) I go home and I go sleep,
 3 K63: → (0) Pardon?
 4 K62: Ah I’m very fatigue so I go home I go home.
 5 What do you do yesterday?
 6 K63: I did report and I do do not have sleep after last week.
- (14) 1 K50: What’s your birth?
 2 K51: My birthday is December one .. you?
 3 K50: **TS** My birthday is October 21
 4 K51: → Huh? .. what are you saying?
 5 K50: ..October 21
 6 K51: Oh my brother birthday is too. @@Oh same.

In (13), K63 produces an NTRI which shows overt non-understanding. K62 responds K63’s NTRI with repetition of her previous turn. Excerpt (14) shows the two kinds of NTRI in the same turn. K51 initiated NTRI ‘*Hhh*’, and then he again initiated with an explicit statement of non-understanding ‘What are you saying?’. K10 repeats the TS turn in line 5.

5. Discussion

Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) argues that self-repair predominates over other-repair in ordinary conversation. The reason for this is that if a current speaker understands the previous speaker's utterance well enough to continue the conversation without repairing it, the speaker does not correct the previous speaker's utterance, because other-repair can be seen as embarrassing to participants who supposedly have equal power in speech exchange systems. However, the authors also refer to the fact that other-repair may be more frequent in unequal power in speech exchange systems such as adult-child interaction, or NNS-NNS interaction.

The data in this study show that when speakers use many NTRI questions, the addressers respond without embarrassment. In addition, even though they cannot understand the previous speaker's utterances, KSs do not stop conversation, but instead manage their conversation with these NTRIs in sequential and interactional contexts. It needs to be mentioned here that many KSs use a NTRI which repeats a prior turn's part to understand the other speakers' utterances. A total number of 170 (63.7%) tokens of NTRI were used as partial repeats of the prior turns in the present data. This finding demonstrates that KSs show their own communicative strategies in maintaining their interactions.

Wong (2000) shows how NNS, whose native language is Chinese, raised delayed next turn repair initiation between NS and NNS in English conversation. NTRIs in NNSs in her data differ from those between native speakers. She demonstrates that NNSs need more comprehension time, and that delayed next turn repair initiation is one of the ways in which they can achieve it. KSs who have shared incompetence also need more comprehension. These previous utterances' repetitions can allow more comprehension time, and continue to talk without stopping. That is, KSs create more comprehension time with NTRIs, and initiated other-initiated and self-completed repair without embarrassment.

Another NTRI, an appender question with candidate information should

also be noted here. This NTRI type is integrated with the previous turn, and it can be interpreted as forming the terminal constituent of the previous turn. This type of NTRI can be interpreted as co-construction structures between speaker and hearer in interactive and sequential contexts. That is, many KSs who have a shared incompetence can collaboratively manage their conversation in co-construction sequences.

6. Conclusion

This research has explored the NTRIs as a way of the negotiation of meaning in English conversation between KSs in sequential and interactional contexts. The findings of this study involving NTRIs in KSs show that NTRIs are not only question types for the negotiation of meaning, but that they also initiate the repair organization in sequential and interactional contexts. NTRIs between KSs are frequently used in the following question types: (i) *what*, *huh* or *yeah* (ii) echo question with partial repetition of the previous turn (iii) appender question with candidate information.

The data in this study also revealed that KSs produce similar sorts of NTRI as NSs do, indicating that NTRI type is similar across NSs and KSs in other-initiated repair environments. Unlike NTRIs in NSs, KSs often express explicit indication of non-understanding as a negotiation process. Both the range and frequency of NTRIs used are very similar between the higher- and lower-proficiency groups. The most frequently used NTRI type by KSs is partial repeats of the prior turn. In other words, Many KSs use NTRIs which repeat a prior turn's part to understand other speakers' utterances. In addition, even though they cannot understand the previous speakers' utterances, KSs did not interrupt conversation. They constantly manage their conversation utilizing NTRIs in sequential and interactional contexts.

KSs can interact with one another in sequential contexts to understand and to be understood constantly and collaboratively. NTRI studies in KSs demonstrate the need for describing and analyzing what is happening between KSs sequentially, which in and of itself is valuable as an area of

spoken discourse studies and can contribute to a better understanding of NNSs' use of English.

This study also demonstrated that KSs can learn more from one another than they think they can learn through verbal interactions. KSs use NTRI questions in their conversations by negotiating with each other to come to an agreement of meaning. Here I make some suggestions in regard to pedagogical implications arising from the results of this study about the use of NTRI questions in authentic interactional conversations between KSs. KSs interact consistently and collaboratively in a sequential and interactional context, and can complete sentences collaboratively. Many NTRIs can perform a social action of constructing schemas which are achieved through a negotiating interaction between speaker and hearer. Therefore, these actual contexts should be presented in language teaching. The use of co-construction structures in actual conversation between KS may apply to the collaborative learning such as peer teaching and learning and group work.

References

- Cho, E. (2005). *A conversation-analytic approach to talk-in-interaction between Korean learners of English*, Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Chung-Ang University. Seoul.
- Cruttenden, A. (1986). *Intonation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Du Bois, J., Schuetze-Coburn, S., Paolino, D., & Cumming, S. (1993). Outline of discourse transcription. In J. A. Edwards & M. D. Lampert (Eds.), *Talking data: Transcription and coding methods for language research* (pp. 45-89). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Goodwin, C. (1995). Co-constructing meaning in conversations with an aphasic man. *Research on Language and Social interaction*, 28, 233-260.
- Hutchby I. & Wooffitt R. (1998). *Conversation analysis*. Oxford: Polity Press.

- Jefferson, G. (1974). Error correction as an interactional resource. *Language in Society* 2, 181-199.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50, 696-735.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97, 1295-1345.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochas, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 1-51), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2000). When 'other' initiate repair. *Applied Linguistics*, 21, 205-243.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repairs in conversation. *Language*, 53, 361-382.
- Selting, M. (1992). Prosody in conversational question. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 17, 315-45.
- Shapley, M. (1983). *Some constraints on fragments*. Unpublished master's thesis. University of California. Los Angeles, CA.
- Varonis, E. M. & Gass, S. M. (1985). Non-native/non-native conversation: A model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, 6, 71-90.
- Weber, E. G. (1993). *Varieties of questions in English conversation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Wong, J. (2000). Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/nonnative speaker English conversation. *Applied Linguistics*, 21, 274-297.

Transcription Symbols

Intonation unit	{carriage return}
Truncated intonation unit	--
Truncated word	-

Speaker identity / Turn start	:			
Transitional Continuity	Final .	Continuing ,	Appeal ?	
Terminal Pitch Direction	Fall \	Rise /	Level _	
Speech Overlap	[]	
Pause	Long ...(N)	Medium ...	Short ..	Latching(0)
Laughter	@@@			
Lengthening	=			
Inhalation	(H)			
Exhalation	(Hx)			
Indecipherable syllable	X			
Uncertain hearing	<X X>			
Glottal stop	%			

Eun-a Cho

Department of English Language & Literature

College of Liberal Arts, Chung-Ang University

221 Heukseok-dong, Dongjak-gu,

Seoul 155-756, Korea

Phone: 016-354-9806

Email: 7silvergirl@hanmail.net

Received: 20 Jun, 2007

Revised: 1 Sept, 2007

Accepted: 10 Sept, 2007