

# A Study of Repair Sequences in Pre-Service EFL Teachers' Mock-Teaching\*

Jina Lee

## [Abstract]

Adopting a Vygotskian view of language and cognition, this study raises the following issues: how is the repair mechanism constructed in pre-service English teacher interactions; what are the cognitive functions of the repair sequences; and lastly, is there any correlation between the use of pre-service teachers' self-repair and their mock-teaching proficiency. Three sets of fifteen-minute video recorded mock-teaching data were transcribed and sorted by the types of repair. We found that the recurrent types of repair in mock-teaching data were other-initiated self-repair (OSR: teacher-initiated student-repair), self-initiated self-repair with repetition (SSR: teacher-initiated teacher-repair), and SSR without repetition (teacher-initiated teacher-repair). More interestingly it seemed that there is a correlation between the proficiency of mock-teaching and occurrence of SSR. Considering the unique features of mock-teaching, it was concluded that the utmost crucial function of repair found in the data was cognitive function, i.e., self-regulation and self-monitoring effects.

---

\* This study was supported by Sangmyung University research grant.

**Key Words: Self-repair, other-repair, repetition, regulation, pre-service EFL teachers, mock-teaching**

## 1. Introduction

Drawing upon Vygotsky's statement that learning is increasingly being recognized as a fundamentally social process, classroom interaction has been studied in various ways for decades. Although the studies of L2 classroom interaction have focused on interactions among professional teachers and students, it is hard to find classroom interactions describing L2 pre-service teachers' talk. Pre-service English teachers are learning to become teachers though they still make mistakes and errors in their teaching and in their L2 use. Therefore, it is quite meaningful to look at their mock-teaching—a practice teaching performance—to understand their L2 learning and teaching processes.

One commonly known way of analyzing classroom interaction is discourse analysis (DA). In terms of pre-determined structure of discourse analysis, two of the most common and important features of classroom interaction are called IRF and IRE sequences comprising three parts: a teacher initiation, a student response, and a teacher feedback or evaluation. This three-part structure was first put forward by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) and is known as the IRF exchange structure. Following Vygotsky's (1978) and Schegloff's (1991) claims that cognition is socially distributed, Markee (2000) and Seedhouse (2004) take a conversation analysis (CA) approach in their second language acquisition (SLA) studies. Markee (2000) demonstrates how CA contributes to SLA research. He analyzes L2 classroom interaction based on features of turn-taking organization, such as repair, the

relationship of power difference and the speech exchange system, and collaborative learning. Seedhouse (2004) focuses on the organization of turn-taking and sequence in four different types of institutional settings. As in such studies, the CA approach has been applied in second language acquisition (SLA) studies in emic perspective to uncover the moment-to-moment actions of talk-in-interaction and provided detailed analyses of how action sequences are generated in classroom interaction.

Assuming the importance of pre-service teacher's talk in the classroom and adopting the emic perspective of CA, my analysis of the repair mechanism of pre-service English teachers' talk in classroom interactions raises two main and one minor research questions underpinning the analysis of repair sequences as follows:

1. How is the repair mechanism constructed in pre-service English teacher discourse?
2. What are the cognitive functions of each type of repair sequence in the frame work of Vygotskian sociocultural theory?
3. Is there any correlation between the use of teachers' self-repair in mock-teaching and the proficiency of their mock-teaching performance?

## 2. Analytic Rationales

### 2.1 Sociocultural Theory

Sociocultural theory developed by Vygotskians and neo-Vygotskians refers to several related traditions in psychology and education research. According to Vygotsky's theory, learning is the development of human mental activity. Development is revealed on two levels in the sociocultural setting: first, on the social level, and later,

on the individual level. That is, first, between people (interpsychological) and then inside the individual learners' heads (intrapsychological) (Vygotsky, 1978). Therefore, successful learning involves a shift from inter-mental activity to intra-mental activity. In this process of human development, language is considered to be a critical tool that mediates the world and one's thoughts. In such a manner, Vygotsky viewed the introduction of a psychological tool (language) into a mental function (like memory) as causing a fundamental transformation of mental functioning. He asserted that individuals have access to psychological tools by virtue of being part of a social milieu—individuals 'appropriate' such mediational means.

In his discussion of the child developmental process, Vygotsky (1978) proposed that all developmental functions, such as regulation, arise first on the social or interpsychological plane and then on the individual or intrapsychological plane, as noted earlier. Regulation refers to control over the self. According to Vygotsky, the child is guided by adults or other experts through goal-directed activities, which is termed *other-regulation*. At this level, the child is responsive to the direction of other people. Then, the child eventually becomes independent in problem-solving and capable of internalizing thinking skills to resolve difficulties. This highest developmental level is termed the *self-regulation* stage.

CA studies of L2 classroom interaction (Markee, 2000; Seedhouse, 2004) also state the point of learning as a combination of social and cognitive procedures in interaction. Similar to the Vygotskian aspect of language, Levelt (1983) analyzes the relevance between self-monitoring and repair in speech, adopting Schegloff's viewpoint on repair. Adopting the Vygotskian aspect of language, Lee (2018) indicates that repair sequences in both interpersonal interaction (talk-in-interaction) and intrapersonal interaction (self-talk, so called private speech) contribute to the cognitive process as interactional and psychological mediation. This aspect of the

repair mechanism in intrapersonal interaction is relevant to the Vygotskian notion of self-regulation. Agreeing with these existing studies, my argument of repair also takes the Vygotskian view of language as a interactional and cognitive mediational means in the process of regulation.

## 2.2 Repair Mechanism

According to Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977), repair is defined as “a sequential phenomenon involving repair segments in the course of ongoing talk” (365). They suggest that repair involves not only error-corrections but also the search for a word and the use of hesitation pauses; lexical, quasi-lexical, or non-lexical pause fillers; immediate lexical changes; false starts; and instantaneous repetitions. Repair consists of three components: trouble source, repair initiation, and the repairing segment (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977). Repair can be found in many different sequential positions: (1) within the same turn as the trouble source (same turn repair); (2) in the transition space following the turn containing the trouble source (transition space repair); and (3) in the turn following the trouble source (next position repair).

Assuming this, four types of repair can be defined as follows:

1. Self-initiated self-repair: one that is both initiated and carried out by the speaker of the trouble source turn
2. Other-initiated self-repair: one that is carried out by the speaker of the trouble source turn but initiated by the recipient

3. Self-initiated other-repair: whereby the speaker of the trouble source may try to get the recipient to repair the trouble source, for instance if a name is proving troublesome to remember
4. Other-initiated other-repair: whereby the recipient of a trouble source turn both initiates and carries out the repair—this is closest to what is conventionally understood as ‘correction’

Within the current literature on repair organization a number of issues predominate, including the question of self (over) other-repair (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks, 1977); the interdependence of repair organization and turn-organization (Schegloff, 1982, 1991, 1992); non-native speaker repair/correction practices (Wong, 2000, 2005); exposed versus embedded correction (Jefferson, 1987); and the relationship between intersubjectivity and repair organization (Schegloff, 1992).

### 2.2.1 Self-Repair

Self-initiation of repair is one in which a speaker identifies a trouble in his or her own talk and initiates a repair procedure to resolve it, such as replacing an incorrect word with a correct one. Sparks (1994) states that self-initiated repair can be viewed as self-interruption, as the speaker of the current turn cuts off his or her speech and then he or she goes back to repair what has been said in the prior or same turn. The evidence for a preference for self-initiated repair is: “the structural features of the repair system are ‘skewed’ in favour of self-repair” (Hutchby & Wooffitt 66–67).

The self-initiated repair structures have been classified as expansion of the turn, hesitation, repetition of the previous word(s), replacement of a word or structure, abort and restart, abort and abandon, insert, delete, meta-repair and modify order.

Repetition, deletion and insertion are the three basic repair operations; Sparks (87) refers to them as 'primitive operations,' as they may all be employed in the same repair. Schegloff, et al. (1977) observe that opportunities for self-initiation of repair come before other-initiation, speakers tend to take up same-turn and transition relevance place (TRP) for self-initiation of repair, and the trajectory of same-turn repairs leads them to be more successful.

Besides first language studies, second language research has also deal with the practices of repetition and repair. Research in SLA frequently treats self-repair as a process that a learner performs automatically as a result of monitoring and error-detection, partly due to the tendency for L2 speakers themselves to attend more to errors than L1 speakers (Temple, 1992).

### 2.2.2 Repetition

Tannen (1987) claims that the functions of repetition in conversation can be subsumed under four categories: production, comprehension, connection and interaction. All of which contribute to the creation of meaning in conversation as follows:

- (1) Repetition enables a speaker to produce language in a more efficient manner, because repetition allows a speaker to set up a paradigm in new information—where the frame for the new information stands ready.
- (2) The automatic nature of repetition and variation facilitates comprehension by providing semantically less dense discourse. This redundancy in spoken discourse allows a hearer to receive information at roughly the rate the speaker is producing it.
- (3) Repetition of sentences, phrases, and words shows how new utterances are linked to earlier discourse, and how ideas presented in the discourse are related to each other.
- (4) Repetition not only

ties discourse to other parts as discussed, but ties participants to the discourse and to each other, linking individual speakers in a conversation—e.g., showing listenership, getting or keeping the floor, etc. (581-83)

As the above, Tannen argues that repetition plays various roles in communication such as ensuring participation in multi-party conversation, ratifying listenership, humor, and expansion, thereby yielding a cohesive tie in a discourse process by linking certain parts of an utterance to others. However, Tannen does not make clear the distinction between same or other-speaker repetition. Schegloff (1996, 1997) deals with next-speaker repetition. His interest here lies in the expansion of the repetition phenomenon in conversation, mostly in terms of initiating repair and confirming allusions. Sparks (1994), Wong (2000), and Rieger (2003) also point out that repetition is one of the three basic repair operations. In agreement of these studies, the repetition data in the current study of pre-service teacher talk shows a similar pattern in that speakers initiate repair involving repeats of a trouble source in a prior or the same turn.

### 3. Method

#### 3.1 The Focal Participants and Data Corpus

Among forty-five students, three participants were randomly chosen from a group of college students taking a teacher-training course at a school of education in Seoul, Korea. The pseudonyms of the three participants are Jeong, Yang, and Lee. Each of the three participants gave a fifteen-minute-long mock-teaching performance, which



was video recorded, as part of the students' term project in their course work for 'EFL teaching in practice.' The pre-service English teachers' mock-teaching was conducted as a part of course requirements in preparation for their teaching practicum and the national teachers' examination to be secondary school teachers in Korea. In order to observe the correlation between teaching proficiency and the use of 'repair sequences,' each participant was chosen from one of three different teaching proficiency groups: high, intermediate, and low. The levels were scored considering reviews from peer evaluators and the professor at the end of the semester, and the score criteria of the performance is based on the national teachers' examination for secondary school teachers. All of the conversation data were transcribed adopting CA transcription conventions (see appendix).

### **3.2 Pre-Planned and Improvisatory Natures of Teacher Talk in Mock-Teaching Context**

Although the data in this study are from authentic classroom mock-teaching discourses, *teaching English through English* (TETE) mock-teaching performance in EFL situations is recognized as a tough task by the Korean pre-service teachers. For this reason, the TETE mock-teaching interactions and the teacher-talk in the data are based on pre-written English scripts, and thus they are quasi-naturally occurring classroom interactions. However, they also involved improvisatory and authentic features of naturally occurring talk in the sense that the pre-service teachers often did not follow their pre-written scripts. Thus, quite an amount of discrepancy was found between the transcribed data and pre-service teachers' pre-written scripts, thereby revealing the improvisatory nature of teacher talk in mock-teaching.

## 4. Analysis

Given the potential ambiguity over the question of a repair in mock-teaching data, the following analysis aims at identifying and exploring the nature of repair and cognition with sequence organization of repair mechanisms. For better understanding of the excerpts, the CA transcription convention is given in the appendix.

### 4.1 Other-Initiated Self-Repair (OSR) and IRF

Sequences of other-initiated repair were observed in a typical IRF structure. Repair in an IRF structure specifically locates a source of trouble in a prior turn, and this trouble source is characterized in the data as one of ‘linguistic accuracy.’ Extracts 1 and 2 exemplify this structure. A description of the repair is noted in the left column of transcript, and for the convenience of CA analysis, acronyms are used in describing OSR sequences: ‘T’ stands for trouble source; ‘OI’ for other-initiation; and ‘SR’ for self-repair.

Excerpt 1 shows a very good example of other-initiated self-repair sequences, i.e., the teacher-initiated student’s-repair completion. In line 2, Lee indicates a trouble source in the student’s incorrect answer “let’s do swimming together.” Then she initiates a repair by repeating the student’s answer as a type of feedback with louder volume to emphasize the incorrect part, “DO,” in line 3, “oh, let’s DO swimming together.” By Lee’s repetition of the student’s answer, a repair was initiated. As Tannen (1987) notes, repetitions are resources for maintaining collaborative meaning-making actions in talk and repair sequences.

Interestingly enough, we can also easily recognize IRF patterns—I (initiation of interaction), R (response), and F (feedback or follow-up)—in excerpt 1. This

other-initiated self-repair sequence occurs in typical types of IRF: firstly, a teacher initiates (I) the interaction; secondly, a student responds (R) to the teacher's initiation, and finally the teacher gives feedback (F) on the student's response. Here in excerpt 1, utterances from line 1 to line 7 display IRF sequence marked in squared brackets at the end of the sentences.

Excerpt 1. Lee: Repetition of student's response

- |   |  |     |
|---|--|-----|
| 1 | T: who wants to try number two? okay Joomi?    | [I] |
| 2 | T → S: let's do swimming together.             | [R] |
| 3 | OI → T: oh, let's DO swimming together?        | [F] |
| 4 | can you think about it again? (asking nicely)  |     |
| 5 | let's DO swimming together?                    |     |
| 6 | SR → S: mhm (0.4) let's GO?                    | [R] |
| 7 | → T: great job. let's GO swimming together.    | [F] |
| 8 | we should use GO with swimming. okay? alright. |     |

One more point that catches our eyes is the use of repetition, especially a teacher's repetition of the student's response as in lines 3 and 7. The teacher's repetition in line 3, "let's DO swimming together," becomes an other-initiation pair part in repair, and the other repetition in line 7, "let's GO swimming," emphasizes the student's success in self-repair completion. This makes repetition special in repair sequences in classroom interaction, as noted in Seedhouse (2004).

In excerpt 2 below, two different sets of repair are noted. One is other-initiated self-repair by the student and the other is self-initiated self-repair by the teacher named Jeong. Let us now look at the detailed pattern.

## Excerpt 2. Jeong

- 1            T: what is the answer?  
2 T1 →    S: this is..  
3 OI →    T: oh good job, but look at the sentence in detail.  
4            the question mark is at the at the a- end of the sentence, right?  
5            then what is the answer?  
6            or It (.) This is your pencil?  
7 SR1 →   S: is this your pencil.  
8            T: oh: good job.

In excerpt 2, the other-initiated self-repair sequence is beginning from line 2 the student's utterance. The student's turn in line 2 is an incorrect answer to the teacher's question. The correct answer in line 2 should be an interrogative sentence, such as, provided in line 7. Therefore, line 2 becomes a trouble source (T)—the student's wrong answer for the teacher's question. Indicating the student's problem, the teacher, Jeong prompts repair initiation (I) in line 3 by providing a turn beginning with feedback to encourage the student, "oh, good job, but look at the sentence in detail." Then from line 4 to line 6, Jeong continues her initiation by re-asking the question and giving a hint, "the question mark is at the at the a- end of the sentence, right? then what is the answer? or it (.) this is your pencil?" The student's next turn in line 7 is a completion of repair sequence 1 (SR1). Therefore, this becomes a typical example of other (the teacher) initiated self (the student) repair leading again to IRF as well.

The next repair is Jeong's self-initiated self-repair. In line 4, noted as T2, Jeong uses repetition of "at the" as a filler to complete her utterance of "at the end of the sentence." Here the trouble source is not even uttered before repetition resulting in so called same turn repair. A similar pattern was noted in Schegloff's (1977) data as in

excerpt 3 below. A more detailed description of this type of self-initiated self-repair will continue in the following section.

Excerpt 3. Example of same turn repair

Schegloff, et al. (366)

- 1            Deb:        Kin you wait til get home? We'll be home in five mi  
 2            Anne:        Even less th'n that.  
 3 SSR → Naomi:    But c'd we- c'd I stay u:p?

## 4.2 Self-Initiated Self-Repair (SSR) with Repetition

Most SSR, with or without repetition, in our pre-service teacher data appeared in the pattern of same-turn repair. As mentioned earlier, repetition in conversation initiates repair and confirms allusions. Wong (2000) provides evidence for the existence of same-turn repair with repetition accompanying turn-medial 'yeah' as well as other same-turn repair cases in non-native English conversation. Rieger (2003) notes that repetition is a self-repair strategy in English and German conversations. He claims that repetition of one or several lexical items is part of the self-repair organization when its function is to gain linguistic and/or cognitive planning time for the speaker, or when used to postpone the possible TRP. Bada (2009) also finds repetitions were made (1) as vocalized fillers and (2) as self-repairs.

The same turn repair was observed in our pre-service teachers' talk as shown below. Same turn repair with repetition comes with repetition of syllable(s), word(s), and phrase(s) at the possible TRP as shown in our pre-service teachers' excerpts 4, 5, and 6. Although transcribed on separate lines to distinguish the pair parts in each excerpt, all sequences of SSR are examples of same-turn repair.

Excerpt 4. Yang: Repetition of a phrase for a word substitution

- 1 T: yes, we are going to look at this two aims.
- 2 okay, so let's take a look with the first aim 'should.'
- 3 Does anyone know what should means? No?
- 4 S: ((silence))
- 5 T: okay, then I'll give you a hint.
- 6 T, SI → It's very similar with (0.4)
- 7 SR → similar to 'must.'

In line 6 in excerpt 4 above, Yang, the teacher, uses repetition as a trouble source, initiation, and repair all at the same time in the same turn. She repeats “similar” and prepositions in line 6 by uttering “similar with” and “similar to” after a 0.4 second pause, thereby making the self-initiated self-repair successful. SSR here can be a repetition of a phrase or a word substitution.

Excerpt 5. Lee

1. T: so::, our first activity is a pair activity.
2. okay, I'll tell you how to do this and listen carefully.
3. I have two papers here.
4. → T: so, here's student, oh, ((changing the handout))
5. SR → T: here's a paper,
6. SR → here's student ei's paper, and here's student bi's paper

Slightly different from excerpt 4, Lee in excerpt 5 recognizes the trouble source in line 4 with the non-verbal cue of “changing the handout,” which means that she realizes that she is distributing the wrong handout. Then line 5, “here's a paper,” becomes her immediate attempt of SR with repetition, but again appears to be

another trouble source at the same time. She finally proceeds to a successful second SR, “here’s student ei(A)’s paper,” in line 6 and completes the SSR same-turn repair.

Excerpt 6. Jeong

1. SSR → T: ther- there are many pictures on the paper.
2.           These pictures are words that we learned today, okay?
3. (SSR) → and corre- ah write down correct answer
4. (SSR) → they, which matched this picture on this picture okay?
5.           T: for example, look at the number one.

Jeong’s first SSR among three series of SSR in excerpt 6 begins with repetition of a syllable in line 1. Again all three sequences are same-turn SSRs. One peculiar point here is that Jeong uses abrupt cut-offs with or without repetition in line 1 and line 3. Then one more interesting point in Jeong’s utterance is that a tentative candidate for a trouble source, “the number one,” was not even noticed by Jeong, herself. She got a very poor mock-teaching score, and quite an amount of uncorrected grammar errors were indicated in her utterance, which may reflect the relationship between the proficiency of mock-teaching and tendency of SSR sequences.

### **4.3 Self-Initiated Self-Repair (SSR) without Repetition**

The sequences of SSR without repetition in the data tend to occur with pauses, hesitations, restarts, and fillers, just as Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) stated. SSR without repetition occurs more in low scored mock-teaching, thereby leading our curiosity and careful conclusion as to the relevance of the frequency of SSR to the

proficiency of mock-teaching. Let us explore the examples first before moving on to the overall discussion.

Excerpt 7. Jeong: Pause and hesitation

- 1 SSR1 → T: then, huh? whe- (.) when you pick up a (.) one's missing item,  
2           how can you find its owner? you can find its owner by  
3           asking some questions. how can you make (.) the question  
4           sentence? does anybody know it? nobody?  
5 SSR2 → T: I will explain the sent.. how can you make the sentence in  
6           today's class. ok? Then before the class let's check today's aim.  
7 T → let's read together. and, and, good job. Then now before we- (.)  
8 SR3 → learn about the question sentence, we will learn about (.) the  
9 SSR4 → vocabulary first. there are many words on the s- screen.

Like the characteristics of Jeong's tendency for SSR, excerpt 7 displays lots of pauses and abrupt cut-offs with SSR. Of course, there are similar patterns of SSR by two other pre-service teachers, but much less frequency was found.

#### 4.4 Quantification of Repair in Frequency

The repair mechanism can be summarized as the quantification of the total data in table 1. As aforementioned, all occurrences of SSR were teacher-initiated teacher-repair patterns, which elicited the teachers' monitoring of their own utterances as well as teaching procedures.



Table 1. Quantification of types of repair sequences

<b>Name of Participants</b>	<b>Lee</b>	<b>Yang</b>	<b>Jeong</b>
Score of Mock-teaching	High	Mid	Low
Total utterances	236	254	130
Total IRF sequences	43	28	12
OSR in IRF	22	9	2
Repetition of Student's Response	13	9	2
SSR with Repetition	7	16	15
SSR without Repetition	6	21	29

In table 1, Lee, who got a high score, shows a high frequency of OSR (22), whereas Yang, mid score, deploys a relatively low frequency (9), and Jeong, low score, shows even a lower frequency (2) than Yang in her use of OSR that can be treated as a part of teacher's scaffolding process. As shown in table 1, therefore, more frequent occurrences of SSR were observed in the low level pre-service teacher. Given this result, it was surmised that there is an asymmetric correlation between the proficiency of mock-teaching and the occurrence of SSR. As such, higher frequency of occurrence in lower level students led to the assumption that a lack of mock-teaching practice and low-level English proficiency may cause more frequent SSR. It is, however, still necessary to investigate a larger dataset to generalize this result.

## 5. Summary and Conclusion

We examined the repair sequences in mock-teaching data in order to investigate three issues: (1) the way repair mechanisms are constructed in pre-service English teacher interactions; (2) the cognitive functions of the repair sequences; and (3) any possibility of correlation between the use of pre-service teachers' self-repair and their mock-teaching proficiency. Considering the first issue, this analysis can be summarized as follows. The recurrent types of repair in the mock-teaching data were other-initiated self-repair (teacher-initiated student-repair), self-initiated self-repair (teacher-initiated teacher-repair) with repetition, and SSR (teacher-initiated teacher-repair) without repetition. The most commonly occurring self-repair operation was repair with repetition, and minor operations were initiated by pauses, abrupt cut-offs, hesitations and fillers, which may be employed together within the repairing segment.

In regards to the second research issue, we can argue that the function of self-repair in terms of Vygotskian sociocultural theory is mainly *regulation* and *monitoring*. Most of the self-repair occurrences were SSR with or without repetition. Similar cases of SSR were found in Levelt's (1983) study of self-repair. In cognitive perspective, Levelt studied the relevance between monitoring and self-repair in speech, adopting Schegloff's viewpoint on repair. In cognition, he claims that monitoring one's own or an interlocutor's speech may provide the speaker with structural constraints to be implemented in the next utterance, a repair. That is, "self-correction in speech results from a complicated interplay of perceptual and productive processes. In order to make a repair, the speaker must, firstly, notice some trouble and interrupt his or her flow of speech, and, secondly, create a new utterance, which takes care of the trouble and its potential consequences for the listener" (45). In this process, Levelt explains that repairing speech involves a *perceptual loop* as

follows:

The self-produced inner or overt speech is perceived, parsed and checked with respect to intentional and contextual appropriateness, agreement of intended and delivered message, and linguistic correctness. When trouble is detected, central corrective action is taken. This action is based on the character of the trouble, the still available parsing results (such as wording and constituent structure of the original utterance), and the estimated consequences for the listener. (50)

In Levelt's model of repair and monitoring in speech, the notion of a perceptual loop is applied in analyzing intrapersonal interaction. This perceptual loop refers to how the self monitors his/her own speech. In intrapersonal interaction, the phenomenon of self-initiated self-repair can furnish evidence of how individuals monitor their own speech intrapsychologically. Lee's (2018) study supported this aspect of self-repair in her analysis of intrapersonal talk by ten L2 speakers.

The function of *self-regulation* was also found in Choi's (2002) study of repetition. Embracing Vygotsky's socio-cognitive perspective, Choi (2002) observed functions of repetition in the talk of EFL learners at a computer. She claims that repetition has a number of communicative functions, namely involvement, pointing out the answer, and manipulation of English expression. She also explains that it has two major cognitive functions. The cognitive functions are: (1) practice and memorization—when the students practice English words and phrases and try to memorize them, they use repetition; and (2) scaffolding—when they externalized their understanding and knowledge related to the problems at hand, they often repeat words or phrases to find answers. These functions of repetition can be considered as serving the intrapsychological plan in one's cognitive work. Therefore, repetition mediates students' interactions both within (intrapsychological phase) and between

individuals (intepsychological phase). The same result was found in our mock-teaching data. Being a speaker and a listener at the same time, the three pre-service teachers were monitoring their own language during their rehearsals of mock-teaching. Therefore, we can conclude that the main function of self-repair in mock-teaching is regulation: other-regulatory function in OSR, and teachers' self-regulatory function in SSR.

Answering the third research question, it was also meaningful to compare the tendency of repair and the proficiency level of the participant's mock-teaching. Although it may not be firm enough to generalize due to the limited data corpus, there was quite a difference among each of three participants' use of repair. The lower-scoring participants in mock-teaching showed more frequent use of SSR. To carefully infer the causes, it may be due to a couple of reasons, such as their lack of mock-teaching practice or poor English proficiency in the performance of a TETE lesson. However, for a more in-depth understanding of repair organization and generalization of a quantitative result, a larger corpus of mock-teaching data should be collected for future research.

## Works Cited

- Bada, E. "Repetitions as Vocalized Fillers and Self-Repairs in English and French Interlanguages." *Journal of Pragmatics* 42 (2010): 1680-88. Print.
- Choi, H. "Function of Repetition in the Talk of EFL Learners at the Computer." *Language Research* 38.1 (2002): 83-115. Print.
- Hutchby, I., and Wooffitt, R. *Conversation Analysis*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. 1998.
- Jefferson, G. "On Exposed and Embedded Correction in Conversation." *Talk and Social Organisation*. Ed. Graham Button and John R. E. Lee. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1987. 86-100. Print.
- Lee, J. "Rethinking Self-Repair: L2 Users' Intrapyschological Interaction in Comparison to Talk-in-Interaction" *English Language and Linguistics* 24 (2018): 101-24. Print.
- Levelt, W. "Monitoring and Self-Repair in Speech." *Cognition* 14 (1983): 41-104. Print.
- Markee, N. *Conversation Analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2000. Print.
- Rieger, C. L. "Repetitions as Self-Repair Strategies in English and German Conversations." *Journal of Pragmatics* 35 (2003): 47-68. Print.
- Schegloff, E. A. "Discourse as an Interactional Achievement: Some Uses of 'uh huh' and Other Things that Come between Sentences." *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk*. Ed. D. Tannen. Washington, DC: Georgetown UP, 1982. 71-93. Print.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Conversation Analysis and Socially Shared Cognition." *Socially Shared Cognition*. Ed. L. Resnick, J. Levine, and S. Teasley. Washington, DC: APA, 1991. 150-71. Print.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Repair After Next Turn: The Last Structurally Provided Defense of Intersubjectivity in Conversation." *American Journal of Sociology* 104 (1992): 161-216. Print.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Reflections on Quantification in the Study of Conversation." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 26.1 (1993): 99-128. Print.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Sequence Organization: A Primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. Print.
- Schegloff, E. A., G. Jefferson, and H. Sacks. "The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation." *Language* 53 (1977): 361-82. Print.
- Seedhouse, P. *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004. Print.
- Sinclair, J., and R. M. Coulthard. *Toward an Analysis of Discourse: the English used by Teachers and Pupils*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1975. Print.
- Sparks, R. B. *The Structure Self-Repair in English Conversation*. Diss. U of Colorado Boulder, 1994.
- Tannen, D. "Repetition in Conversation." *Language* 63.3 (1987): 574-605. Print.
- Temple, L. "Disfluencies in Learner Speech." *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 15.2 (1992): 29-44. Print.
- Vygotsky, L. S. *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1978. Print.
- Wong, J. "Delayed Next Turn Repair Initiation in Native/Non-Native Speaker English Conversation." *Applied Linguistics* 21.2 (2000): 244-67. Print.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sidestepping Grammar." *Applying Conversation Analysis*. Ed. K. Richards and P. Seedhouse. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. 159-73. Print.

## Appendix

### CA Transcription conventions

- 'DO' Capitalized letters stand for louder in volume.
- (.) A hearable silence less than two-tenths of a second.
- it- A dash in the English transcript indicates an abruptly cut-off of the prior word or sound.
- . , ? Punctuation marks are not used to indicate grammar, but are instead used to indicate the nuclear tone on a pitch unit.
- . Falling tone indicating the end of a sentence.
- , A slight rise or level tone indicating continuing intonation.
- ? A noticeable rise tone indicating rising intonation.
- :: The prolongation or stretching of the preceding sound. More colons indicate a longer sound.
- (xxx) Something was said but that the transcriber cannot recognize what it was.
- (( )) The non-verbal description of the speakers, e.g.) gesture, facial expressions, etc.
- Specific parts of an extract discussed in the text.

## 국문초록

EFL 예비교사의 수업시연에서 보여진  
수정 시퀀스 연구

이진아 (상명대)

예비영어교사의 언어는 아직까지 SLA분야에서는 많이 다루어지지 않은 주제로서, 본 연구에서는 예비교사의 언어사용, 특히 교실대화에서 흔히 관찰되는 ‘수정 시퀀스(repair sequence)’라는 주제를 Vygotsky의 언어와 인지라는 관점의 연계를 통하여 대화분석을 이용하여 실제로 수업시연에서 어떠한 구조로 발생되며 어떠한 기능을 가지고 있는지가 분석되었다. 데이터로는 세 명의 예비교사의 각각 15분짜리 수업시연을 바탕으로 미시적으로 분석되었다. 수정 시퀀스 분석 결과 (1) IRF를 동반한 문맥에서 교사(타인)가 시작한 학생의 자기 수정(other-initiated self-repair[OSR]); (2) 반복을 동반한 교사(자신)가 시작한 교사의 자기수정(self-initiated self-repair with repetition[SSR]), 그리고 (3) 반복을 동반하지 않은 교사가 시작한 교사의 자기수정(SSR without repetition) 등이 관찰되었다. 이러한 교사의 수정 시퀀스의 인지적 기능으로는 Vygotsky의 자기모니터링(self-monitoring) 그리고 자기통제(self-regulation)의 개념들이 적용될 수 있는데, 이는 수정시퀀스를 인지과정과 연관하여 설명한 Levelt(1983)의 연구와도 유사한 결론을 보인다. 또한 부가적인 연구문제로 교사의 자기수정 경향성과 수업시연 숙달도(proficiency)와의 연관성 역시 관찰되었는데, 실제로 이는 후속연구로 더 많은 데이터를 바탕으로 하는 보편적인 일반화가 요구되는 문제이다.

**주제어 :** 자기수정, 타인수정, 반복, 통제, EFL예비교사, 수업시연



논문접수일: 2018.05.15

심사완료일: 2018.05.31

게재 확정일: 2018.06.17

이름: 이진아

소속: 상명대학교 영어교육과

이메일: jlee@smu.ac.kr

