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ABSTRACT

The negotiated interaction, in which two people interact to attain mutual understanding when communication breakdowns take place, is referred to as "negotiation of meaning." While many studies have been conducted to explore the negotiation of meaning from diverse perspectives, there are few studies that have investigated the naturally occurring negotiation of meaning in the L2 classroom, especially in the field of less commonly taught languages.

This dissertation investigates the negotiation of meaning between the teacher and students in a content-based Korean as a second language (KSL) classroom. Through the analysis of teacher-learner negotiations from the data, this study explores the following questions: (1) How are negotiations carried out between a teacher and students in a content-based KSL classroom?; and (2) How do negotiations in a content-based KSL classroom provide learners with conditions necessary for second language acquisition?

First, the findings regarding the negotiation process revealed that nearly all trouble sources resulted from students' utterances. Trouble sources by students were identified and categorized into two main types, "students' linguistic resource deficits" and "students' inappropriate language use." With regard to signals, the data revealed that signal types are closely related to the trouble source types preceding the signal. The signals were divided into two categories, "teacher-initiated signals" and "student-initiated signals" which indicated students' trouble sources. Regarding the responses, the types of responses are divided into two main
categories, "teacher response followed by student-initiated signal" and "student response followed by teacher-initiated signals."

Secondly, the results showed that the three conditions necessary for SLA were provided in the negotiation of meaning process. Comprehensible input was provided in negotiation when the teacher or students adjusted their utterances to make them more comprehensible to an interlocutor. Production of modified output occurred when students uttered in response to signals of trouble source or feedback from the teacher. Attention to form was also evident in negotiations when students received positive or negative input from the teacher and modified their output.

Lastly, a characteristic of this study is that student elicited negotiation of meaning focused on vocabulary rather than grammar due to the communicative value. The communicative value was an important factor in determining which aspects of language would be acquired through negotiation.

Additionally, many factors related to the negotiation of meaning were observed in the study, such as: (1) learners' L2 proficiency, (2) task type, (3) topic familiarity, (4) learners' L1 background, and (5) cultural background. Although some trends confirmed by previous studies were observed, the students' L2 proficiency did not appear to be a crucial factor affecting the amount of negotiation of meaning. This indicates that other factors had a greater influence than did the learners' proficiency level in affecting the amount of negotiation in the classroom, namely, 'talkativeness.' The results show that the task type was a strong factor in the elicitation of the negotiation of meaning in an L2 classroom. Classroom discussions employed in this study were more effective than other tasks.
Consequently, classroom discussions offered ample opportunities for the negotiation of meaning. The data indicates that the negotiation frequency was related to the topic familiarity. In this study, there was a higher frequency of negotiation during conversations on familiar topics as opposed to conversations that dealt with unfamiliar topics. The results also confirm that a learner's L1 background and cultural background affected the negotiation frequency and style that occurred in the L2 classroom.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

According to the interaction hypothesis, conversational interaction can promote second language learning, "because it connects input, internal learners’ capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways" (Long, 1996: 452). That is, it can provide L2 learners with conditions claimed to be necessary for second language acquisition. "Negotiation of meaning" as a particular type of interaction, has taken an important role in second language acquisition. It is seen as method which provides learners opportunities that prompt learners to understand input as well as elicit the production of output, both of which are thought to be crucial environments in SLA.

The purpose of this dissertation is to investigate the "negotiation of meaning" between the teacher and the college students in a content-based KSL (Korean as a Second Language) classroom. The central issues to be explored in this study are the general characteristics of the negotiation of meaning in the classroom, for example: (1) why and how negotiations of meaning occur, (2) their specific characteristics, and (3) what factors affect these negotiations. In addition, it also explores how the negotiation of meaning supports conditions claimed to facilitate second language learning and acquisition: (1) learners’ comprehension of L2 input, (2) their production of modified output, and (3) their attention to L2 form (Pica, 1994).
This chapter provides an overview of the negotiation of meaning in second language acquisition, and includes related research. Furthermore, this chapter presents the purpose of the study and the research questions.

1.1 Negotiation of Meaning

The negotiated interaction, in which two people interact to attain mutual understanding when communication breakdowns take place, is referred to as the “negotiation of meaning.” Many studies have described the negotiation of meaning from diverse perspectives. Pica (1992) refers to the negotiation of meaning as “an activity that occurs when a listener signals to the speaker that the speaker’s message is not clear and the speaker and the listener work linguistically to resolve this impasse” (p. 200). Later, she argues that “this term has been used to characterize the modification and restructuring of interaction that occurs when learners and their interlocutors anticipate, perceive, or experience difficulties in message comprehensibility” (Pica, 1994: 494). For Gass and Selinker (2001) the negotiation of meaning includes “instances in conversation when participants need to interrupt the flow of the conversation in order for both parties to understand what the conversation is about” (P. 209). Long (1996: 425) defines negotiation for meaning1 as “the process by which, in an effort to communicate, learners and competent speakers provide and interpret signals of their own and their

---

1 Since research on the role of negotiation in SLA have primarily used beginning students when investigating the effect of interaction on their comprehension or grammatical development as a outcome of the negotiation, researchers have used the term “negotiation for meaning” rather than “negotiation of meaning.” As for research with intermediate or advanced-level students, “negotiation of meaning” can be used because the outcome that goes beyond the basic comprehension problems or the beginning grammatical outcome becomes possible.
interlocutor’s perceived comprehension, thus provoking adjustments to linguistic form, conversational structure, message content, or all three, until an acceptable level of understanding is achieved” (p. 418).

Since the early 1980s, SLA research has directed considerable attention towards the role of the negotiation of meaning as a particular type of interaction. A basic concept central to the study of negotiation is interaction and the role of interaction in SLA. Hatch (1978) was the first to emphasize the importance of interaction in language learning. She argues that “language learning evolves out of learning how to carry on conversations, out of learning how to communicate” (Hatch, 1983: 63). That is, second language syntax may evolve from having conversational interaction. Her notion that interaction prompts second language acquisition has sparked and sustained considerably more interest in the field of SLA.

Long is considered to have made the original contribution to research on the negotiation of meaning. In the early 1980s, Long (1980, 1983a) investigated conversations of native speakers (NS) and non-native speakers (NNS), and identified the process that NS and NNS performed to avoid and repair communication breakdowns in their conversations. Long (1983a) argues that conversational interactions in second language learning make input comprehensible for learners, provide opportunities for learners to modify their output, and help focus learners’ attention on language forms through the process of negotiation for meaning. Long (1996) explains that the “negotiation for meaning, especially negotiation work that triggers interactional adjustments by the NS or more
competent interlocutor, facilitates acquisition because it connects input, internal
learners’ capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways”

SLA researchers have supported that the negotiation of meaning is
beneficial in second language acquisition in that negotiation brings about
conditions claimed to be helpful for SLA: (1) learners’ comprehension of L2 input,
(2) their production of modified output, and (3) their attention to L2 form (Pica,
1994). According to Krashen (1985), language is acquired when learners
understand input that is slightly above their current level of development. This
essentially means that input has been modified so that it may be understood. This is
called “comprehensible input.” The input L2 learners receive from native speakers
is interactionally modified through the process of negotiation, and thus becomes
more comprehensible to them. Speech to L2 learners tends to have certain
characteristics that make it more comprehensible, such as propositionally less
complex utterances, greater regularity and redundancy, or elaborated discussions
(Long, 1996).

Long (1996) argues that it is not enough for learners to be exposed to
comprehensible input because some learners do not always successfully
incorporate difficult language features into their interlanguage. In support of this
argument, Swain (1985) maintains that learners have to be given opportunities to
modify their output, which is the related process of conversational interaction,
“comprehensible output.” She argues that comprehensible input does not
necessarily lead to learners’ development of language competence, and thus,
learners' production of modified output is another essential element of L2 acquisition.

Gass and Varonis (1994) argues that the advantage of negotiation work is that it focuses learners' attention on linguistic form. Swain (1985) explains that learners' modification of their output leads them to attend to their interlanguage grammar and manipulate it in creative, complex, and ultimately more target-like ways. In other words, learners can realize gaps between actual forms and their output in the target language. Negotiation provides opportunities to focus on language forms with L2 learners, which is one of the crucial conditions claimed to be necessary for successful second language acquisition.

1.2 The Purpose of the Study

As mentioned so far, SLA researchers have long been interested in the role of the negotiation of meaning in second language acquisition. Previous research on negotiation have been mainly concerned about whether the negotiation of meaning promotes acquisition and what kinds of variables, such as task type and participant dyad (i.e., NS-NNS, NNS-NNS), lead to more negotiation. That is, research has been focused on the causal relationship between negotiation and acquisition and the extent to which variables such as participant structures contribute to the amount of negotiation occurrences.

Many studies on negotiation have been conducted to see which learning variable is more conducive over others regarding the occurrence of negotiation, i.e., task type (Long, 1980; Pica, 1987; Ko, 2001), learners' proficiency level (Gass and
Varonis, 1985a; Rost and Ross, 1991), gender difference (Pica, Holliday, Lewis, Berducci, and Newman, 1991), etc. There are also many studies which concentrate on participant structure (i.e., NS-NNS, NNS-NNS). In addition, some studies have found that NNS-NNS (learner-learner) interactions facilitate learning in the same way that NS-NNS interaction have been shown to do (Bruton and Samuda, 1980; Gass and Varonis, 1985a; Mackey, Oliver and Leeman, 2003).

These studies through quantitative methods have revealed the role of negotiation and if and how it promotes the conditions necessary for second language acquisition. Diverging from this cognitive view of negotiation in SLA, a social perspective on the negotiation of meaning has been recently pursued. For example, Shim (2003) studied teacher-student negotiation in a ESL classroom, and reported that in addition to assisting and mediating students' communication to accomplish successful negotiation, the teacher’s negotiation behaviors were socially- and pedagogically-oriented, and negotiations often unfolded through the collaborative work of the participants.

However, the studies mentioned above have failed to account for the general characteristics of the negotiation of meaning, for example (1) why and how negotiations of meaning occur, (2) their specific characteristics, and (3) what factors affect these negotiations. In this vein, this study examined naturally occurring negotiation of meaning between a teacher and students in a content-based KSL classroom.

This study employs a qualitative research approach to provide the whole picture of the negotiation process through careful examination of how negotiation
occurs in language learning environments and what the negotiation process looks like. Moreover, this study includes a range of negotiation features in Korean, a language typologically different from English and other Indo-European languages, which has rarely been examined in the area of negotiation studies so far. The results of the study enlarge the scope of research on classroom interactions, and demonstrate that the relationship between the negotiation of meaning and L2 development is generalizable to Korean.

1.3 **Negotiation of Meaning vs. Negotiation of Form**

The term “negotiation of meaning” characterizes interaction in which two people interact to attain mutual understanding when communication breakdowns take place. It includes the modification and restructuring that occurs when learners and NS experience difficulties in message comprehensibility (Pica, 1994). Recently, the use of the term “negotiation” has extended to include instances of negotiation over form, although in its original sense it seems to have only been used to refer to the negotiation of meaning. Lyster and Ranta (1997) extended the term, using the phrase “negotiation of form” to denote negotiation more didactic sense focusing less on conversation. The primary differences between “negotiation of meaning” and “negotiation of form” are in their goals. Unlike the negotiation of meaning, negotiation of form is not prompted primarily by problems in communication. In negotiation of form, one interlocutor intentionally draws the other’s attention to specific incorrect form(s) in the previous utterance(s), even though mutual understanding has been achieved. Thus, while the negotiation of meaning is meaning-
oriented, negotiation of form is primarily didactic (Van Lier, 1998). Because of the intentionality behind the interaction, negotiation of form can be initiated strategically by teachers as one of the pedagogical interventions for specific errors.

In this study, "negotiation of meaning" is used as a term extended to include instances of negotiation over form. In other words, this study includes negotiation of form as a portion of the negotiation of meaning in the analysis, which is initiated by the teacher for pedagogical purposes.

1.4 The Model of Negotiation of Meaning

To date, research on the negotiation of meaning has been founded largely on Varonis and Gass' (1985) model of negotiation. The model is represented in Figure 1 below.

Varonis and Gass' model consists of two main parts. The first part of the model consists of trigger, denoted by T. The second part of the model they term the resolution, which is further divided into three stages: indicator (I), response (R), and reaction to the response (RR). Trigger is a speaker's utterance that is not understood by the listener. Indicator refers to utterances on the part of the listener which signals an occurrence of non-understanding. Following the indicator, the
speaker provides a response which normally involves interactionally modified
input strategies. Following the response, the listener may have an optional stage in
which the listener reacts to previous response. The utterance may indicate whether
or not the response clarified the misunderstanding. If the misunderstanding was not
revolved, the listener can give another indicator to continue the negotiation
sequence. An example is given below (Varonis and Gass, 1985: 77).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trigger</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Reaction to Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S: My father is not retire</td>
<td>retire?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>oh yea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to the terms, minor variations were made on the Varonis and
Gass’ model by Pica et al. (1989). They substituted the term “signal” for
“indicator” which is listener utterances in reaction to “trigger” from the speaker.
Varonis and Gass (1985) also referred to “pushdown” and “popup” instead of
“trigger” and “signal” respectively in the process of negotiation. Shim (2003)
proposed the concept of ‘trouble source’ which is compatible with the concept of
“trigger” from Varonis and Gass’ model. She explains that “the concept of trigger
is heavily linguistically driven. A trigger is always embodied in linguistic
specifications, and thus it does not necessarily reveal why the trigger caused
communication breakdowns. In contrast, the idea of “trouble source” refers to the
very cause of what led an utterance or some part of an utterance to be a trigger.
Trouble sources can be traced to non-linguistic as well as linguistic factors.” (Shim,
2003: 77)
Although minor variations were made after Varonis and Gass proposed their model, the essential description of their model has remained as a principal norm to identify the negotiation of meaning routines in numerous studies. This study employs the negotiation routine proposed in Varonis and Gass’ model to describe the negotiation of meaning procedures which take place in a content-based KSL classroom. “Trouble source” and “signal” will be used in place of “trigger” and “indicator” respectively in this study. I revised Varonis and Gass’ model with new terms in the study. The letter T, S, R and RR, placed above each component, denote trouble source, signal, response and reaction to the response, respectively.

\[
\text{Trouble source} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{Resolution} \\
[T] \quad \rightarrow \quad [S \rightarrow R \rightarrow RR]
\]

**Figure 2.** The Revised Model of Negotiation of Meaning

1.5 Research Questions

This study aims to give a description of the negotiation types and procedures which naturally occurred in a content-based KSL classroom. Careful examination will be made to identify characteristics of negotiation routine, for example, (1) what types of “trouble sources” trigger negotiation, (2) what types of “signals” occur in relation to trouble sources, and (3) what types of “responses” occur in relation to signals. Furthermore, this study will also explore how the negotiation of meaning supports conditions claimed to facilitate second language
learning and acquisition: (1) learners' comprehension of L2 input, (2) their production of modified output, and (3) their attention to L2 form. Based on the research purposes of this study, the following research questions will be addressed:

**Research Question 1**: How are negotiations carried out between a teacher and students in a content-based KSL classroom?

1. What types of trouble sources trigger negotiation?
2. What types of signals occur in relation to trouble sources?
3. What types of responses occur in relation to signals?

**Research Question 2**: How do negotiations in a content-based KSL classroom provide learners with conditions necessary for second language acquisition (1) learners' comprehension of L2 input, (2) their production of modified output, and (3) their attention to L2 form?

Research question 1 addresses the nature of negotiation in a content-based KSL classroom. The question focuses on what triggers the negotiation of meaning, what types of indicators signal an occurrence of non-understanding on the part of the listener, and how responses are carried out in order to solve communication problems. Research question 2 focuses on the principle issue of SLA and how the negotiation of meaning promotes the three conditions thought to facilitate SLA.
CHAPTER 2

NEGOTIATION OF MEANING AND SLA

The purpose of this chapter is to review the published literature related to this study. The first section provides a general discussion of the negotiation of meaning in second language acquisition and previous research on causal relations between the negotiation of meaning and SLA. The second section presents previous studies that have examined the negotiation of meaning in an L2 classroom environment.

2.1 Negotiation of Meaning and SLA

The role of the negotiation of meaning has been advocated among many SLA over the last two decades. Research have claimed that the negotiation of meaning is crucial in L2 learning and acquisition in that negotiation brings about conditions thought to prompt second language acquisition in the following areas: (1) learners’ comprehension of L2 input, (2) their production of modified output, and (3) their attention to L2 form (Pica, 1994). I will present the previous literature related to this issue.

2.1.1 Negotiation of Meaning and Comprehensible Input

Input refers to the linguistic data that learners receive by listening or reading. In interaction, this data is provided by the interlocutor. Input is necessary logically for language acquisition. From a logical perspective, linguistic
information must be experienced in some way in order to be learned; in other words, through input. This logical connection established the basis of the original Input Hypothesis (Krashen, 1985). Krashen points out that there is no evidence that any learner can speak language without receiving input.

The input learners receive in interaction is modified through the process of negotiation, and thus becomes more comprehensible to learners (Long, 1996). Long is considered to have made the original contribution to research on negotiation in second language acquisition. Long (1983a) claimed that conversation modification, which was later renamed “negotiation for meaning” (Long, 1996), could lead to L2 acquisition by providing comprehensible input. Long (1983b) claimed that one of the ways to make input comprehensible is achieved by “the interactional structure of conversation through such devices as self- and other-repetition, confirmation and comprehension checks and clarification requests” (p. 211), not by modifying the input itself. Considering the relationship between conversational modification and language acquisition, he proposed that conversational adjustments promote comprehension of input, and comprehensible input promotes acquisition. Consequently, he argued that the conversational adjustments promote language acquisition. These types of modifications are often made when native speakers engage in interaction with non-native speakers. It is through the process of negotiation that the native speaker is able to tune into the appropriate level of speech for the non-native speaker. Thus, the provision of comprehensible input to learners can be related to the negotiation of meaning.
As research on negotiation has gradually progressed, research focus has been changed into the effect of negotiation on comprehension, in other words whether or not negotiation provides learners with comprehensible input. Pica, Young, and Doughty (1987) investigated whether negotiation provided learners with comprehensible input by comparing the listening comprehension of 16 non-native speakers of English, low-intermediate ESL students, in two input treatment groups. In one group, students were exposed to pre-modified input. In the other group, students were given unmodified input but were allowed to negotiate meanings with native speakers (interactionally modified input). Students were asked to place 15 items on a board after listening to directions by a native speaker. As expected, students in the interactional modification group showed significantly higher comprehension than those in the pre-modified input group. From this, Pica et al. argued that interactional modification lead to better comprehension.

Gass and Varonis (1994) studied conversations between native and non-native speakers. The non-native speakers were enrolled in an intensive language class. Different learners were exposed to four different types of input: modified input with interaction, modified input with no interaction, unmodified input with interaction, and unmodified input with no interaction. The modified and unmodified input was gathered in a very interesting way. Prior to the onset of the data collection, two descriptions of pictures including object placement were recorded. One description was provided by a native speaker to another native speaker and the other description by a native speaker to a non-native speaker, in neither case was interaction allowed. None of these native and non-native speakers
participated in the actual study. The descriptions were transcribed and used as scripts for the actual tasks of the study. The first description constituted the unmodified input and the second the modified input. In an actual study, when interaction was allowed, the native speaker could use requests for repetition, clarification, and comprehension checks which could not be used by the non-interaction group. After the non-native speakers were exposed to their assigned input, they were asked to describe the pictures of object placement themselves. Gass and Varonis found that learners were more likely to perform better when interaction had been allowed than when no interaction had been allowed. However, there was no significant difference resulting from the use of modified vs. unmodified input.

Loschky (1994) investigated whether interactional modification would influence comprehension, and further whether comprehension would lead to the acquisition. Loschky divided 41 Japanese learners into three groups: (1) input was not modified, and no interaction; (2) input was pre-modified, and not interaction; and (3) input was not modified, but interaction was allowed. The study involved a pretest and posttest of retention of vocabulary items and the acquisition of two Japanese locative structures, and three information-gap tasks for listening comprehension. The results showed that the negotiated interaction group had significantly better comprehension that the other two non-interaction groups. Although scores in the negotiated interaction group were expected to be better on the posttest, the scores did not show any significant differences among the three
groups. From this, Loschky concluded that there is not direct relationship between comprehension and acquisition.

Unlike Loschky (1994), Ellis, Tanaka, and Yamazaki (1994) found the clear benefits of negotiation for comprehension and acquisition. Ellis et al. investigated the effects of modified interaction on comprehension and vocabulary acquisition among high school students learning English in Japan. Three different conditions were assigned to the participants: (1) control group, (2) pre-modified group, and (3) interactionally modified group. Students took a pretest, two posttests, and one follow-up test. The results showed that the interactionally modified input group performed better than the pre-modified input group in terms of comprehension and acquisition of L2 vocabulary. This study indicated that interactionally modified input facilitates acquisition.

Pica, Lincoln-Porter, Paninos, and Linnell (1996) studied interaction of learners among themselves with respect to their capability to use modified input, feedback, and modified output. Results showed that learners were less able to produce modified input because of their problems with L2 morphosyntax; learners modified their output as little when talking to other learners as to native speakers. However, interaction happened frequently: the learners offered more feedback to one another, although in a limited and simplified form, than they did to native speakers (p. 79). Learners offered more feedback of the segmentation type such as repetition with change and with expansion indicating that their interactions with one another could be a source of morphosyntax learning. With feedback of the segmentation type, interlocutors offered learners different sentential structures
where learners could use the target segment. Interaction again was seen as a positive way of learning a language even when talking to other non-native speakers.

With this review of the literature on negotiated interaction, it is assumed that negotiated interaction provides a learner with opportunities to gain information about the target language. These opportunities would not be possible unless negotiation between learners and native speakers occurred.

2.1.2 Negotiation of Meaning and Production of Modified Output

While the importance of comprehensible input was supported by many researchers, a significant body of research has called into question the assumption that comprehensible input alone is not sufficient for second language acquisition (Swain, 1985, 1995; Ellis et al., 1994; Long, 1996). Long (1996) claimed that learners have to be given opportunities to modify their interlanguage output, which forces them to analyze the correctness of their interlanguage. Swain (1985) introduced the Output Hypothesis, proposing that language acquisition may occur through producing language. Swain’s Output Hypothesis was formulated essentially in reaction to Krashen’s claim about the major role of comprehensible input in SLA and is based on many years of research on Canadian immersion programs. The immersion programs aim at the achievement of both academic and second language learning through an integration of language teaching and content teaching. As such, they provide the students with a rich source of comprehensible input. Decades of research in these immersion classes have found that these programs generally have great success; the learners develop excellent listening
comprehension skills, fluency, functional abilities, and confidence in using their second language. The programs are also successful in that the students are often compared with native speakers in their level of L2 achievement and content learning. Despite the general success of the programs, however, there is a growing awareness that immersion learners still fail to achieve high levels of performance in the target language grammar. One of important reasons why the learners of immersion program do not become very accurate in their grammar has been suggested by Swain (1985), who argues that too little language production by learners prevents them from going beyond a functional level of L2 proficiency. In other words, what is missing for these learners are opportunities for output.

Since the Output Hypothesis was first proposed, Swain has refined her hypothesis and specified the following four functions of output (Swain, 1993, 1995, 1998). First output provides opportunities for developing automaticity in language use. This is an issue of fluency development. Although Swain focused mainly on the issue of accuracy, the issue of gaining better control over existing knowledge constitutes a very important part of language acquisition processes (Dekeyser, 1998). In order to develop speedy access to existing L2 knowledge for fluent productive performance, learners need opportunities to use their knowledge in meaningful contexts, and this naturally requires output.

The second function of output identified by Swain is a hypothesis-testing function. Producing output is one way of testing one’s hypotheses about the target language. Learners can judge the comprehensibility and linguistic forms of their interlanguage utterances against feedback obtained from their interlocutors. This
function of output relates directly to the notion of “comprehensible output” which Swain claimed to be particularly necessary for the students of immersion programs. By producing output, learners can test their hypotheses, and by being “pushed” in the process of negotiation of meaning, the learners can be more accurate in their production via hypothesis confirmation, rejection, or modification.

Third, output has a metalinguistic function. It is claimed that “as learners reflect upon their own target language use, their output serves a metalinguistic function, enabling them to control and internalize linguistic knowledge” (Swain, 1995: 126).

Finally, output serves a noticing function. That is to say,

In production the target language(vocally or subvocally) learners may notice a gap between what they want to say and what they can say, leading them to recognize what they do not know, or know only partially. In other words, under some circumstances, the activity or producing the target language may prompt second language learners to consciously recognize some of their linguistic problems; it may bring to their attention something they need to discover about their L2 (Swain, 1993: 125-126).

This function of output is to facilitate the process of noticing problems in one’s interlanguage and, given the availability of relevant input, noticing the features in the input that have been problematic in the learner’s production. This noticing will then stimulate the processes of language acquisition.

In sum, Swain’s Output Hypothesis claims that output can, under certain conditions, promote language acquisition by allowing learners to recognize problems in their interlanguage capabilities. Recognition of problems may occur
because of either internal or external feedback, and this recognition prompts the
generation of alternatives by searching existing knowledge, assessing alternatives,
and applying existing knowledge to known or new contexts. Alternatively,
recognition of problems through output may prompt learners to seek out relevant
input with more focused attention.

Swain’s Output Hypothesis is now widely accepted as an important
condition for second language acquisition. As such, it has generated empirical
research into the role of output in SLA. First, a series of studies by Pica and her
colleagues have addressed the question of whether the interlocutor’s feedback
would push the learner to modify his/her output in such a way that the output
becomes more accurate. Pica (1988) examined how her nonnative speaker subjects
made their interlanguage utterances comprehensible when their native speaker
interlocutor indicated difficulty in understanding them. The results of her study
indicate that while the NNSs were indeed capable of modifying their interlanguage
in response to the NS’s requests for confirmation or clarification, such NNS
modifications were relatively infrequent and often unnecessary because the NS
often provided target version of NNS interlanguage utterances for them. In a
subsequent study, however, Pica, Holliday, Lewis, and Morgenthaler (1989) found
that their NNS subjects were more likely to produce modified output in response to
clarification requests than to confirmation checks. They examined the role of
negotiation in promoting production of comprehensible output. They investigated
how non-native speakers responded to native speaker’s signals indicating difficulty
in understanding their output. Pica et al. (1989) noted that when learners modify
their output, “they test hypotheses about the second language, experiment with new structures and forms, and expand and exploit their interlanguage resources in creative ways.” (p. 64).

Another issue in learner production of modified output is whether it promotes L2 acquisition. Van den Branden (1997) investigated the effects of various types of negotiation on learners’ output. Sixteen child learners of Dutch participated in the study. They were asked to orally describe a series of pictures to a partner in a communicative context, in other words they were pushed to modify their output. The results showed that the participants who had been pushed in modifying their output produced a significantly greater quantity of output and showed a greater range of vocabulary than participants who were not pushed to modify their output. In addition, the study showed that the interactional modifications participants make during negotiations have delayed effects on their output production in subsequent interactions.

Nobuyoshi and Ellis (1993) investigated whether learners’ production of output contributed to acquisition. The study provides some evidence to suggest that pushing learners to produce more accurate output, by the teacher making requests for clarification, contributes to acquisition. Six Japanese learners of English participated in the study. Three of them were assigned to the experimental group and the other three to the control group. They were required to perform two picture jigsaw communication tasks twice with their regular teacher. In the first session, the experimental group received requests for clarification every time they produced the past tense of verbs incorrectly formed while the control group did not receive
any requests for clarification in the same condition. One week later, the second session was administered and neither group was asked to clarify when they produced the past tense form incorrectly. The results showed that two from the experimental group accurately reformulated their output in a way that corrected their errors of past tense. However, one subject of the group failed to show accurate production of past tense verb forms. None of the subjects in the control group showed an overall gain in accuracy. From these findings, Nobuyoshi and Ellis (1993) showed that “pushing learners to make their output more comprehensible leads to linguistic development in some learners” (p. 208). Similarly, Takashima (1995) found a positive effect for clarification requests provided during communication tasks (referred to as “enhanced output” in her study) on two morphologies (plural and past tense) produced by Japanese learners of English. The students who received clarification requests increased their accuracy at a faster rate than those who received content-based feedback. The increase in accuracy was observed during the 11 week period of the study. However, Krashen (1991), Hopkins and Nettle (1994) raised three objections, arguing that the study had very few learners, the elicitation may not have been communicative and there were few occasions for noticing.

Takashima (1995) found a positive effect for clarification requests provided during communication tasks (referred to as “enhanced output” in her study) on two morphologies (plural and past tense) produced by Japanese learners of English. The students who received clarification requests increased their accuracy at a faster rate
than those who received content-based feedback. The increase in accuracy was observed during the 11 week period of the study.

In addition to this study, LaPierre (1994) examined occasions from L2 learning in peer interaction by looking at 8th grade French immersion students involved in another story reconstruction task. He hypothesized that when L2 learners engaged in a task where they were required to discuss the language they were producing, the metatalk they used may have been a source of L2 learning. Using posttest to examine language-related episodes (i.e. metatalk about L2 problems that the learner experiences) of student pairs discussing L2 problems during a reconstruction task, La Pierre showed that 80% of the 140 language-related episodes that were resolved via collaboration during the joint task were correctly solved one week later on the posttest. Conversely, knowledge that was incorrectly constructed during the collaboration was consistently incorrect for 70% of the same cases on the posttest. LaPierre’s study suggests that L2 knowledge was retained and that the language-related episodes that the students were producing were an opportunity for L2 learning.

Similar to LaPierre’s study, Swain and Lapkin (1998) studied the language related episodes of two 8th grade immersion students learning French. The two students were given a jigsaw task in which they were to write out a story. As they completed the task, the learners encountered problems. To solve the problems, the students were able to use their L1 or L2 to communicate and to help them in the learning process. The authors characterized the language-related episodes of these two learners as evidence for co-construction of knowledge and a tool for L2
learning in which learners generated alternatives, assessed outcomes and applied results to solve a linguistic problem. Lapkin, Swain, and Smith (2002) examined the collaborative dialogues of eight 7th grade French immersion students working in pairs. The students wrote a story that was reformulated by a native speaker. After noticing differences between their original version and the reformulated text, they reflected on their noticing. The authors then examined language-related episodes about French pronominal verbs and determined that episodes during the learner’s collaboration provided evidence that the students progressed in their correct use of pronominal verbs.

Swain and Lapkin (1995) examined whether output leads to conscious recognition of problems and whether this recognition activates cognitive processes that are believed to be conducive to SLA. Think-aloud protocols were used as a technique to elicit information about internal processes taking place in the learners. The subjects in this study wrote an article for a newspaper about environmental problems and were asked to think aloud as they wrote their articles. From the think-aloud protocols, Swain and Lapkin abstracted language-related episodes in which a learner either spoke about a language problem he/she encountered while writing and solved it correctly or incorrectly, or simply solved it correctly or incorrectly without having explicitly identified it as a problem. The results revealed that about 40% of these episodes consisted of the students’ paying attention to the grammatical form, suggesting that these learners recognize problems in their interlanguage during their production. It was also found that recognition of problems often triggered cognitive processes that are implicated in second
language learning: processes that generate linguistic knowledge that is new for the learner, or that consolidate their existing knowledge. Based on these findings, Swain and Lapkin argue that output not only leads to noticing the gaps in the learners’ knowledge but also facilitates language acquisition by triggering various internal processes conducive to SLA.

Iwashita (2003) explored the issue that clarification requests encourage modification of the preceding utterances. Iwashita examined the potential effect of interaction on the acquisition of two grammatical structures: the locative-initial construction and verb morphology for gerund forms, called the “re-form” in Japanese. Fifty-five adult JFL learners participated in the study. Participants in the experimental group engaged in a communication task called “task-based conversation,” in which NNSs were required to describe a set of pictures to NSs. The participants in the control group engaged in free conversation. That task-based conversation was more effective than free conversation, as revealed in the accurate use of two structures during the picture-describing tasks. The analysis of task-based conversation identified three types of utterances that contributed to accurate production: (1) recasts, (2) completion models, and (3) simple models. Iwashita also discovered three “negotiation moves” by NSs that promoted accurate production among NNSs: (1) clarification requests, (2) comprehension checks, and (3) repetitions. These utterances indicated the presence of varying effects on the two grammatical structures, as revealed by the NNSs’ production in the picture-describing tasks. Iwashita categorized the NS feedback described above into two broad categories, positive evidence and implicit negative feedback. Iwashita’s
major relevant findings were the following: (1) Positive evidence occurred 10 times more frequently than negative feedback. (2) Although both positive evidence and negative feedback facilitated accurate use of the two structures, the effectiveness of positive evidence was restricted by the learners' current level of mastery of the respective structures, while this was not the case with the negative feedback. (3) Among the types of negative feedback, recasts were found to be more effective than negotiation moves in promoting accurate production.

2.1.3 Negotiation of Meaning and Attention to Form

So far, I have presented studies that show a positive relationship between production of modified output and second language acquisition. However, as in the case of comprehensible input, researchers argue that production of output is perhaps a necessary but not sufficient condition for second language learning. Long (1996) claims that although L2 learners actively participate in producing and modifying output, they often fail to notice the accurate target forms and consequently modify their output. In this vein, the role of attention to form is also important and may be one of the conditions that need to be considered in SLA.

Attention plays an important role at both ends of the acquisition process in terms of attention to input and attention in production. Schmidt (1990, 1993, 1995) has proposed the “Noticing Hypothesis,” which claims that “intake is that part of the input that the learner notices” (1990:139). Noticing, Schmidt argues, crucially requires focal attention and awareness on the part of the learner, and subliminal learning cannot account for second language acquisition processes, although
learning does occur incidentally. Schmidt also distinguishes noticing from understanding, which requires a higher level of awareness of the underlying rules. The latter is not always necessary for learning, though is perhaps facilitative in many situations. The Noticing Hypothesis further claims that “what must be attended to and noticed is not just the input in a global sense but whatever features of the input that are relevant for the target system.” (1993: 209)

The issue of noticing and the role of awareness in learning have been approached in a different way in the work of Tomlin and Villa (1994), which adds a more fine-grained analysis of the concept of attention. Tomlin and Villa (1994) divide attention into three theoretically and empirically different components: alertness, orientation, and detection. They point out that Schmidt’s term, “noticing,” can be named “detection” within selective attention. For Tomlin and Villa, “Acquisition requires detection, but such detection does not require awareness. Awareness plays a potential supporting role for detection, helping set up the circumstances for detection but it does not directly lead to detection itself.” (1994: 14) They argue that conscious registration is not a necessary component of attentional process in second language learning. According to them, detection is “the process that selects, or engages, a particular and specific bit of information,” and through detection “particular exemplars are registered in memory and therefore could be made accessible to whatever the key processes are for learning, such as hypothesis formation and testing.” (Tomlin and Villa, 1994: 192) Important to their position is that this process of detection does not need to be conscious and does not
require awareness. Nonetheless, Tomlin and Villa (1994) admit that there are indeed problems in separating detection and awareness empirically.

As mentioned in the beginning of the section, while comprehensible input and production of modified output may be important conditions for SLA, the role of attention to form must not be overlooked. What remains to be demonstrated is the link between attention to form and the negotiation of meaning. Gass and Varonis (1994) offer support for the result that negotiation on increased noticing contributes to increased accuracy. In their study, the NSs correctly placed the objects in a picture that was described to them by the NNS. They found that learners showed a significant increase in accuracy in their descriptions if they had been allowed to negotiate with their NS interlocutor on the task compared with those who were not allowed to negotiate on the task. They pointed that the main contribution negotiation made to the increase in accuracy was to increase the learners’ attention to the forms.

Swain (1995) proposed three functions of output in second language learning, including noticing, hypothesis testing, and internalizing linguistic information. Noticing, as one of the three functions, has been considered crucial in that learners need to notice or attend to a form before they can acquire it. The process of negotiation can focus attention on a particular form, allowing learners to notice it when their output differs from the input they receive. That is, the negotiation of meaning leads learners to recognize the gap between a target form and the form in their knowledge. In this way, negotiation can allow learners to
recognize gaps and allow native speakers to provide the correct input to fill the
gaps.

Swain and Lapkin (2001) found that learners engaged in a second language
writing task identified language problems (or gaps in their interlanguage). When
NS forms were supplied through reformulations (targetlike rewriting of the NNS
texts), the students often turned their focus to NS use of linguistic forms to fill
these gaps.

2.2 Negotiation of Meaning in the L2 Classroom

The review of research on classroom negotiation in this section focuses on
the negotiation of meaning between the teacher and student, rather than between
peers, in keeping with the goals of the current study. Although it has been assumed
that there would be little negotiation between teacher and student in the L2
classroom, the interaction of both parties may be meaningful because it provides a
favorable environment for second language acquisition.

Long and Sato (1983) conducted a study to investigate the forms and
functions of teachers’ questions as a part of negotiation. They compared questions
made by six teachers in beginning ESL classrooms and by NSs in 36 NS-NNS
dyads engaging in informal conversations outside the classroom. One of the major
findings of this study was the predominance of display questions (the answers of
which are already known to the questioner), in contrast to referential questions
(which request information unknown to the questioner), in ESL teachers’ speech.
In addition, as may be expected, the authors found that ESL teachers used many
more display questions and many fewer referential questions than NSs did in NS-NNS conversations outside the classrooms. This study also showed that ESL teachers produced a higher frequency of comprehension checks and a lower frequency of confirmation checks than did the NSs outside the classroom.

Pica and Long (1986) subsequently conducted a study to confirm those findings. Ten ESL teachers and their students participated in the study and data were collected from them. This study made use of baseline data from NS-NNS conversations outside the classroom. The result showed that, as in Long and Sato's study, the frequency of display questions is higher in teacher talk than in NS-NNS talk outside the classroom. Furthermore, in their study, Pica and Long confirmed the results that teachers in the classroom produced a greater number of comprehension checks and fewer confirmation checks and clarification requests than NS speech in the NS-NNS conversations outside the classroom. On the basis of the findings from the two studies presented above, Pica and Long concluded that "the amount of negotiation of meaning that occurs in the classroom setting is much smaller than in NS-NNS interaction outside classrooms probably because of the far higher frequency of display questions in the instructional talk, and the lack of two-way information exchange this indicates." (p. 89)

The research on the negotiation of meaning between the teacher and the student has also been conducted in light of data from studies comparing small group classroom interaction. Pica and Doughty (1985) and Doughty and Pica (1986) examined the effect of participation patterns on the negotiation of meaning in conjunction with the effect of task type in ESL classrooms. The findings
revealed that the frequency of negotiation was slightly higher in teacher-student activities than in group activities. Doughty and Pica (1986) conducted a follow-up study using a two-way problem-solving task that required the subjects to exchange information in teacher-fronted, small group, and dyad interactions. Findings showed that the frequency of conversational adjustments, such as comprehension checks, confirmation checks, and clarification requests, was significantly higher in group activities than in the teacher-fronted activities.

Doughty and Pica concluded from the combined research that peer interaction in group settings produces a greater amount and variety of negotiation than does teacher-student interaction in teacher-fronted classrooms. With regard to the small number of conversational modifications during the teacher-fronted tasks in both Pica and Doughty (1985) and Doughty and Pica (1986), Doughty and Pica speculated that “students may have been reluctant to indicate a lack of understanding in front of their teacher and an entire class of students.” (p. 319)

Pica (1987) attempted to account for the empirical findings of previous studies regarding the relative absence of the negotiation of meaning in classroom discourse. She argued that the rarity of teacher-student negotiation in the L2 classroom stemmed from “the unequal participant relationships which shape and are shaped by classroom activities.” (p. 3) In support of her own argument, Pica (1987) reported a study that compared interactions among ESL classroom participants in a teacher-fronted group and in a student-only group as they engaged in two types of task: an information exchange task and a decision-making task. Based on an analysis of the total number of restructuring moves classified as
confirmation checks, comprehension checks, and clarification requests, Pica reported that the teacher-fronted participant pattern generated a fairly low amount of the negotiation of meaning in both the decision making discussion and the information exchange task. Pica argued that this finding resulted from the unequal relationship between teacher and students in classroom settings. With regard to the negotiation of meaning in group participation patterns, it was found that students engaged in little negotiation work during the decision making discussion, while they produced significantly more negotiation of meaning instances during the information exchange task. Pica accounted for this result by suggesting that the nature of the decision making task brought about unequal relationships even among the students as one or two students, taking on the teacher role, would dominate the interaction.

Rulon and McCreary (1986) also examined the difference in negotiational aspects between teacher-fronted and small-group activities in the ESL classroom. Observing that previous research gave little consideration to the relationship between the task and the lesson as a whole, Rulon and McCreary argued for a need to incorporate negotiation of content in investigations of negotiated interaction. In their study, the negotiation of meaning “refers to the process of spoken interaction between NS and NNS or NNS and NNS whereby the meaning of an unclear or misunderstood word or phrase is clarified to the satisfaction of both parties.” (p. 182) On the other hand, negotiation of content is defined as “the process of spoken interaction, whereby the content of a previously encountered passage (aural or written) is clarified to the satisfaction of both parties, either NSs or NNSs.” (p. 32)
In Rulon and McCreary's study, the subjects were NNSs enrolled in an advanced academic listening class. After receiving a pre-listening exercise, students viewed a videotape of a lecture on the American Revolution. Then, they were divided into small groups and teacher-fronted classes, where they were asked to discuss what they had learned from the video. The results of the investigation revealed that the difference in the number of confirmation checks and clarification requests between small groups and teacher-fronted classes was not statistically significant. In contrast, a significant difference was found between the two settings in regard to the frequencies of content confirmation checks and content clarification requests. In other words, when a contextualized two-way task was given, small groups generated more negotiation of content in comparison with teacher-fronted classes. To conclude, Rulon and McCreary argued that the "negotiation of content, like negotiation of meaning, may be essential to the promotion of interaction necessary for successful language acquisition." (p. 195)

For more detailed speculation on the nature of negotiation in the L2 classroom, it appears necessary to review the research which encompasses both cognitive and social variables so that their mutual influence can be better understood. The following portion presents recent studies that have carried out discourse analysis of actual classroom interactions and examined teacher-student negotiation in connection with its social environment.

Unlike previous experimental studies on classroom negotiation, Musumeci (1996), instead of just focusing on the number of negotiation instances, attempted to explain why particular patterns of teacher-student negotiation took place in the
L2 classroom. Three different classes, conducted by three different teachers, were videotaped and transcribed to see what the general nature of the linguistic negotiation that occurs in content-based classrooms is and the extent to which negotiation took place in the classrooms. Research questions involved general characteristics of the language exchange; “Who speaks? How much and when? How is communication difficulty signaled and how are messages modified?” Participants were college students learning Italian as a second language. There were 14, 20, and 14 students attending each class respectively. All three teachers who participated the study were native or near-native instructors of the L2 Italian and competent in Italian regional geography, the subject matter of the classes. They were not informed of the specific goal of the research before the videotaping. The results showed that teacher-initiated utterances occur most of time and they use the majority of negotiations by asking display questions, while students use referential requests. The data revealed that teachers modify their speech in response to students’ signals of non-understanding in whole class, but they rarely request modifications of the students’ speech. That is, the negotiation of meaning in which teachers and students resolve communication breakdown did not occur much in content-based language classrooms. Musumeci (1996) claimed that “in order for teachers to indicate that they have not understood and students to modify, negotiation cannot be interpreted as repair of imperfect or failed communication, rather it must be regarded as an important component of the learning experiences.” (p. 321)
In contrast to Musumeci's study, in which teacher and students were observed to be reluctant to reveal any communication problems, Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain (2003) found that both the teacher and the students initiated repairs and participated in negotiations of meaning in the classroom, but in ways that projected their institutional roles. Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain (2003) investigated how teacher and students used repair in order to negotiate meaning and form in a content-based German as a foreign language classroom. Through qualitative and quantitative approach, they explored whether there were differences between repair types in classroom setting and those in mundane conversation and how repair was used differently by the teacher and the students. The participants of the study were the 12 students who enrolled in an applied linguistics seminar for advanced learners of German at a university in Canada. They were all non-native speakers of German, but they had enough proficiency to take a content-based seminar class. Eleven segments of the class sessions were recorded and analyzed. The data indicated that repair types in a classroom differ from those that occurred outside the classroom. The results also found that repair types and ways were used differently by the teacher and the students. The authors argued that such differences were not simply attributable to insufficient L2 knowledge of the students. Instead, they found that "the initiation of repair in this classroom seems to be governed by a complex set of guidelines that permit both students and the teacher to interact with each other within the boundaries of their respective roles as learners and the instructor." (p. 387)
While the studies by Musumeci (1996) and Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain (2003) described teacher-student negotiation as being somewhat constrained by the institutional context, some researchers, especially those who adopted a Vygotskian perspective, have drawn our attention to the collaborative nature of teacher-student interaction in the L2 classroom. Before reviewing these studies in detail, I present two theoretical constructs, Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) and scaffolding, on which these studies have drawn.

The concepts of ZPD and scaffolding are key features of a Vygotskian view of learning. Vygotsky (1978) defined the ZPD as “the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more able peers.” (p. 86) Vygotsky's concept of ZPD establishes two developmental levels in each learner: the actual developmental level which is determined by what the learner can do alone, and the potential level which is determined by what the learner can do when assisted by a tutor. To Vygotsky, the transformation from the learner’s actual development level to the potential developmental level is initiated and shaped by the dialogic interaction between the tutor and learner during which gradual and contingent assistance (negotiated error correction) is provided.

Vygotsky’s explanation of instruction and development has several significant implications for L2 teaching and learning. Teaching should be more than merely providing learners with optimal environmental conditions (i.e., communicative context, tasks and activities) through the use of conversational
devices such as clarification requests, comprehension checks, confirmation checks, repetition, and so on. Instead, teaching should involve the ongoing co-construction of each learner's ZPD and moment-by-moment evaluations of how to best facilitate the learner. In this sense, a teacher's instruction should not be simply the provision of correct linguistic data to the learners during the negotiation of meaning, but a moment-by-moment, on-line assistance geared toward each learner's cognitive level.

Following Vygotsky's line of thinking, Bruner proposed the concept of scaffolding to illustrate the language of teaching and learning, especially between young children and their mothers. The term "scaffolding" has been popularized by Bruner, who has defined it as tutorial assistance an adult provides to a child for the learning that is little beyond his or her capabilities. According to Bruner (1978), scaffolding "refers to the steps taken to reduce the degrees of freedom in carrying out some tasks so that the child can concentrate on the difficult skill she is in the process of acquiring." (p. 19) In a classroom setting, it is not a caretaker but a teacher (or more capable peer) who provides scaffolding to the learner. While the goal of scaffolding is to mediate students' learning through negotiated interaction, its features vary depending on the context.

Recently, both ZPD and scaffolding have drawn a great amount of attention from SLA researchers and practitioners, primarily because they provide a framework within which classroom participants' interaction can be explained. Accordingly, a growing number of studies have applied these concepts to the investigation of the L2 classroom discourse. Among those, studies that have
focused on the negotiation of meaning between teacher and student in the L2 classroom are of particular interest to this study.

Ko, Schallert, and Walters (2003) suggested a new insight regarding the learner’s role for successful negotiation through analysis of teacher-student negotiation. Twenty one ESL students were asked to tell a personal narrative twice, with the negotiation of meaning session inserted between storytelling sessions. In their analyses of the negotiation of meaning sessions, Ko et al. identified factors that might have contributed to improvements from the first to the second storytelling. They found that the teacher played a crucial role in enhancing the quality of the negotiation of meaning sessions by guiding the discussants to be more productive and constructive. The authors noted, however, that some participants showed little improvement despite the high quality of the negotiation of meaning session. Ko et al. therefore suggested that the teacher’s facilitative role could not alone provide sufficient explanation for the lack of improvement and identified other contributing factors, including the storyteller’s responsiveness to the negotiation and his/her willingness to incorporate changes in the second telling. From those findings, they concluded that the learner’s role was critical for scaffolded interaction to be effective.

Antón (1999) conducted a study through observations of classroom interaction in teacher-centered Italian and learner-centered French classes. The analysis showed that, while the French teacher provided the students with opportunities for negotiation, including negotiation of form, content, and classroom rules, such opportunities were rare in the teacher-centered Italian class. The result
revealed that the teacher provided scaffolded assistance appropriately within the ZPD of the students' capacity for performance and learning. Antón indicated that this distinctive characteristic of learner-centered classroom discourse resulted in plentiful negotiation and possibly further language learning. Gibbons (2003) also emphasized a teacher's appropriate scaffolding was in his study, which examined teacher-student interaction in a content based classroom. The result illustrated how the teacher's clarification requests led to longer and more complete learner discourse.
CHAPTER 3

CONTENT-BASED LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to present a brief discussion on the theoretical background of content-based language instruction (CBI), its three different models, and the outline of its rationale. This study examines the data from a KSL classroom designed according to CBI. Thus, it is necessary to explore the background and rationale behind CBI in order to understand the research setting and process properly. This chapter also looks at the theoretical and empirical benefits as well as the concerns that have been explored regarding CBI.

3.1 Content-based language instruction (CBI)

Content-based language instruction (CBI) emerged in immersion and bilingual programs, where strong needs to combine content and language instruction were raised many years ago. Immersion programs in Canada and bilingual programs in the United States have employed this methodology from kindergarten through high school (K-12) levels but also in college curricula, targeting bilingual students, foreign students, and others who have had the desire to learn an L2 intensively.

A major premise of CBI is that content and language should be taught together for effective language learning. The most fundamental theoretical assumption underlying CBI is that a second language is best learned when it is the medium for learning about content of relevance and interest to the learner (Brinton,
Snow, & Wesche, 1989). Brinton et al. (1989) also claim that CBI provides learners with the necessary conditions for second language learning by exposing them to meaningful language in use. Specifically speaking, they assume that learning a second language in the context of studying a subject matter gives learners access to comprehensible input (Krashen, 1985) which also includes lexical items and grammar structures new to the learner, as well as opportunities to produce and modify output (Swain, 1985).

Within the framework of CBI, it is also assumed that when students learn about content which is interesting and relevant to their needs, their motivation to acquire the language increases. In addition, the concurrent study of language and content is also claimed to enable students to acquire contextualized language use. In particular, it is assumed that by using a second language to learn about a subject matter, students will have access to discourse level features of the language and its sociolinguistic patterns which are important for effective language use. While this integration of language and content in instruction is not a new idea, it gained prominence with the implementation of language education across various language programs.

The strongest argument in support of CBI comes from Krashen's theory. He proposed five hypotheses as fundamentals to understanding the process of learning a second language (Krashen, 1985). Among Krashen's five hypotheses on second

---

2 The integration of content into language teaching is not a new idea. According to Brinton et al. (1989), the approach traces its roots back many centuries. As Mohan (1986) points out: "Even in the traditional Latin class, students often learned about Roman civilization, and learned Latin in the process of doing so."(p.3)

3 These hypotheses are the acquisition-learning hypothesis, the monitor hypothesis, the natural hypothesis, the input hypothesis, and the affective filter hypothesis.
language acquisition, the input hypothesis and the affective filter hypothesis constitute the basic theoretical foundation of CBI.

The input hypothesis is that language is acquired when learners understand input that is slightly above their current level of development. This is called 'comprehensible input'. SLA researchers have identified various types of comprehensible input that are available to learners, such as foreigner talk, teacher talk, etc. As for the affective filter, Krashen defines it in terms of attitudes that are conducive or not conducive to second language acquisition. When the affective filter is lowered, the anxiety is reduced and optimal condition for language acquisition is constituted. In other words, a reduced-anxiety situation is essential to accessing comprehensible input for language acquisition. Krashen claimed that comprehensible input plus low affective filter are the essential causative variables for second language acquisition.

Krashen's argument is that CBI provides learners with comprehensible, meaningful input in relevant context. In addition, CBI provides sufficient opportunity to engage in meaningful use of the language in a reduced-anxiety environment. This hypothesis has been supported by the successful results of some CBI programs such as Canadian immersion programs, U.S. bilingual immersion programs, and the University of Ottawa sheltered programs (Stoller & Grabe, 1997).

Empirical support for CBI has emerged from different research. One of the most carefully studied content-based courses is the sheltered course at the University of Ottawa (Edwards et al., 1984). Edwards' study confirmed that even
in the absence of formal language instruction adult students can gain in the second language proficiency when the second language is used as the medium of instruction and the input is made comprehensible. The study also found that L2 students in content classes gained about as much second language proficiency as comparison subjects who studied the target language directly in traditional language classes. Furthermore, they succeeded in learning the subject at least as well as those students following regular sections of Psychology course.

Additional empirical support for CBI is from the research conducted at the University of California at Los Angeles on the ESL students enrolled in the Freshman Summer Program (Brinton et al., 1989). This study also documented the efficacy of the CBI model course. The majority students reported that they were better writers and could read their content texts more effectively as a result of the program. The students also reported an increase in self-confidence about language learning. However, since these findings are based on students’ self-reports, they have to be interpreted with caution.

Despite significant empirical supports for CBI, some language teachers and SLA researchers have expressed concerns about the effectiveness of CBI and Krashen’s conceptual framework for CBI. Swain (1988) argues that CBI may present some problems because opportunities to produce sustained output in L2 were found to be lacking in the content class. On the basis of the data collected from immersion program, Swain argued that “not all content-based instruction is necessarily good language teaching.” (Swain, 1988; 68) She claimed that more
output demands and error corrections should be included to make CBI an effective language approach especially in terms of speaking proficiency.

Another concern of CBI pointed out by Swain is that the focus in CBI courses is entirely meaning oriented. Swain argues that if students are to actually acquire a second language they will have to focus on the language features in spite of being in the meaning oriented context. And she also posits that, because the main focus is on meaning, teachers frequently provide students with inconsistent and unsystematic information about grammatical features of their target language (Swain, 1988; 68).

A frequently raised concern, which is closely related to the concern pointed out by Swain above, is that the focus on a subject matter in the CBI classrooms may not be sufficient to achieve the level of structural and sociolinguistic accuracy required for the learners’ communicative competence. Lightbown and Spada (1990), in their descriptive study in communicative programs in Canada, found that although learners develop high levels of fluency and communicative ability in their target language, they still have problems with linguistic accuracy and complexity.

It does not seem that Swain and other researchers do not agree with the effectiveness and promising aspects of CBI. They have tried to show that typical content teaching, which lacks enough language support, is not necessarily a good language teaching approach. The typical question and answer sequence found in a content teaching class could be largely substituted with carefully contrived activities, which bring into the classroom authentic language in its full functional range. That is, "the solution is not to force language into content, but to explore
content sufficiently so that language in its full range emerges. That takes time, and will only occur over a range of activities, topics and subjects.” (Swain, 1985; 244)

3.2 Three models of Content-Based Language Instruction (CBI)

This section presents three models of content-based language instruction: the theme-based model, the sheltered model, and the adjunct model. The distinguishing characteristics of the three models are also discussed.

3.2.1 The Theme-Based Model

The theme-based model is a theme or topic-based language course to represent one way to increase the use of subject matter content in language classes. In this model, the class is structured around topics or themes, which are the backbone of the course curriculum. The content materials presented by the language teacher are used as the basis for language learning and practice. A theme-based course might be structured around several unrelated topics. The theme-based model might involve sequencing the curriculum for an entire course around one major topic (e.g., history), which is further subdivided into more specific fields (e.g., ancient history, modern history, etc). Although this type of approach requires a large amount of coordination in terms of material development for language learning, it is beneficial in that learners become acquainted with topic-related vocabulary and concepts. Moreover, students are able to communicate their ideas on these topics fluently as topic-related vocabulary and concepts are recycled through the various materials. Unlike traditional language courses, where the class
topic is determined by a course textbook, materials in theme-based courses are usually selected, adapted, and developed by a teacher from outside sources. In addition, the topic is integrated into the teaching of the all the skills.

The theme-based model is the most widespread at the college level L2 courses. Since the students enrolled in these courses come from varied backgrounds, the theme or topic of the course can be selected based on students’ common interest.

3.2.2 The Sheltered Model

The second CBI model, the sheltered model, consists of content courses taught in a second language by a content area expert, such as a university professor who is a native speaker of the target language. This model has distinguishing characteristics in that the learners of the target language are separated or “sheltered” from native language speaking students. The focus of this approach is on content area rather than the second language. The sheltered model provides L2 learners with the same linguistic situation thereby enabling them to benefit from the accommodation and adjustments made by the native speaking instructor. This approach also provides them with a low-anxiety situation. In this model, attempts are made on certain modification for the second language learners. For example, “texts are carefully selected for their organization and clarity, the instructor might gear lectures more closely to the written text and make certain linguistic adjustments to allow for students’ listening comprehension difficulties” (Brinton et al. 1989: 16). The representative example of the sheltered model is the courses
offered at the University of Ottawa. In the courses, intermediate students of English are enrolled in the sheltered sections of Introduction to Psychology taught in French and French students are enrolled in the sheltered sections of the same course taught in English respectively. They are exposed to the second language by means of the activities which take place in regular content courses including lectures, readings, and discussions.

3.2.3 The Adjunct Model

The adjunct model is a system in which students are concurrently enrolled in two linked courses: a language course and a content course which complement each other in terms of mutually coordinated assignments. Second language learners are sheltered in the language course and integrated in the content course, which both native and nonnative speaking students attend together. Implementing an adjunct program in an existing curriculum is an ambitious undertaking since a large amount of coordination is required to ensure that the curricula of the two interlocking courses complement each other. Generally, modifications to both courses are required to ensure that this happens. Further, the materials used in the language course differ significantly from more traditional L2 courses. An example of an adjunct program is the University of California at Los Angeles Freshman Summer Program where entering freshman students attend an intensive orientation program in which they enroll in one of several linked content and English adjuncts (e.g., Introductory Human Geography and English Composition). The following
table, taken from Brinton et al. (1989, p. 19), summarizes the distinguishing features of the three CBJ models:
Table 1. Distinguishing Features of the Three CBI models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary purpose(s)</th>
<th>Theme-Based Model</th>
<th>Sheltered Model</th>
<th>Adjunct Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help student develop L2 competence within specific topic areas</td>
<td>Help students master content material</td>
<td>Introduce students to L2 academic discourse and develop transferable academic skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Instructional format | ESL course | Content course | Linked content and ESL courses |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional responsibilities</th>
<th>Language instructor responsible for language and content instruction</th>
<th>Content instructor responsible for content instruction</th>
<th>Language instructor responsible for language instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students population</td>
<td>Nonnative speakers</td>
<td>Nonnative speakers</td>
<td>Nonnative speakers separated for language instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of evaluation</td>
<td>Language skills and functions</td>
<td>Content mastery</td>
<td>Language skills and function (in language class)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the methodology of data collection and data analysis, as well as the important components of this research. For this study, data was collected in an advanced level content-based KSL classroom at a university located on the west coast. The main data comes from videotaped interactions between the teacher and students that occurred in the classroom. Supplemental data is obtained through field notes and the researcher’s journal. A qualitative research method was employed in this study.

4.1 Research Setting

The course is designed for students who have defined professional and academic goals, including plans to study abroad in Korea. The goal of the course is to enable advanced learners of Korean to develop their Korean proficiency through the study of subject matter. I was an instructor of this course, which allowed me to simultaneously teach the course and gather data.

For this study, data was collected in an advanced level content-based KSL classroom at a university located on the west coast of the United States. The main data comes from videotaped interactions between the teacher and students that occurred in the classroom. The class was a content-based language class designed to help advanced learners of Korean develop professional and academic language proficiency. The course consisted of a ten-week quarter in which the class met twice a week for 75 minutes. The curriculum content for the quarter was selected
according to the students' needs analysis. The class was team taught by two instructors, one for language and one for content. The language instructor was the lead instructor and was mainly responsible for the course design. Students had two 75 minute classes per week; one was a lecture and the other was a discussion class.

After each lecture, discussion questions were assigned to students for the discussion class. Students answered the questions and posted their answers on the class website before the discussion class. The language teacher, the content specialist, and students all participated in the discussion.

4.2 Participants

There were nine students in the class: seven Korean heritage learners and two non-heritage learners. The students profiles are shown in Table X. Pseudonyms were assigned to the student participants to protect their identity. “S” refers to the student in the class. S followed by a number refers to a particular student in the class (e.g., S1, S2).
They were four males and five females in the class. Their ages ranged from 19 to 35. English is the first language of all the students. The students' Korean oral proficiency level ranged from Intermediate High to Advanced Mid. The oral proficiency level was determined by the ACTFL OPI test administered by a certified tester at the beginning of the academic year. Of nine students, five were at the Advanced Mid, two at the Advanced Low and two at the Intermediate High.

Although students were at a similar oral proficiency level based on the ACTFL OPI test, the students represented a wide range of individual differences in terms of educational and professional backgrounds. A brief description of each

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>ACTFL OPI rating</th>
<th>Heritage/Non-Heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Advanced Mid/High</td>
<td>Heritage Learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Advanced Low</td>
<td>Heritage Learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Advanced Mid</td>
<td>Heritage Learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Advanced Mid</td>
<td>Heritage Learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Advanced Mid/High</td>
<td>Heritage Learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Advanced Low</td>
<td>Heritage Learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Advanced Mid</td>
<td>Heritage Learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Intermediate High</td>
<td>Non-Heritage Learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Intermediate High</td>
<td>Non-Heritage Learner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
student's background is given with regards to their Korean language. This information is useful when analyzing the research findings.

S1 was between the ages of 31 and 35. An elementary school teacher in Los Angeles, she retired temporarily from her job to study advanced Korean for one year. Her overall Korean proficiency seemed higher than all of the other students. She actively engaged in the class activities and was not reluctant to ask questions or make comments when she encountered a communication breakdown. Her participatory behavior reflected her high motivation.

S2 was between the ages of 20 and 23. Before starting the academic year he had been in Korea for about six months as an exchange student studying the Korean language. The primary purpose for taking the class was to improve his professional and academic Korean proficiency because he believed that an advanced Korean skill was crucial to his professional career. Even though he had a strong English accent when he spoke Korean, he had a large vocabulary and good conversation strategies. He was willing to frequently ask questions and negotiate meanings of words with the teacher during the class.

S3 was born and raised in California. She was between 24 and 27 years. Since her purpose in learning Korean was to have opportunities to work in the U.S. with the Korean language, she was actively seeking ways to improve her professional level Korean. Her participation was moderate compared to that of other students in the class. She was very attentive to the class activities, but did not ask questions or make comments frequently.
S4 is a so-called 1.5 generation Korean immigrant. His age was between 23 and 27. Since he had lived in Korea during his early childhood, his Korean proficiency was excellent. He took the KSL course to improve his professional Korean. He was the least talkative student in the class. He rarely asked questions in class when he did not understand. He seemed to prefer asking classmates.

S5 was born in Korea and moved to the U.S. with his parents at the age of 8. He was also a 1.5 generation of Korean immigrant and his general Korean proficiency was excellent. He was highly motivated because he was planning to go to Korea to study abroad. He actively engaged in discussion activities and was the most talkative student once he made a comment. However, he rarely asked questions or negotiated the meaning of words with the teacher because he did not have difficulty in understanding the content of the class and the teacher's words.

S6 was between 24 and 27 and was majoring business at a university on the East Coast. She was actively seeking ways to improve her professional level Korean because she wanted to work for the U.S. Government as a Korean expert. She actively participated in class activities, but was one of the least talkative students in the class. When she encountered communication difficulties she seemed to prefer asking peers and looked up words in the dictionary to eliciting negotiation.

S7 was from the East Coast and her age was between 19 and 22. Although she was one of the second generation Koreans born and raised in the U.S., she had a good command of Korean. She had a good vocabulary and a native-like Korean accent. Her listening ability was also good. However, she did not like the current class because the class did not fulfill her expectations. She wanted to learn more
everyday conversation content rather than academic/professional Korean. Her participatory behavior reflected her low motivation.

S8 was a graduate student majoring in political science, and was between the ages of 25 to 30. He was interested in the nuclear issue of North Korea at the time of taking the class. He audited the class because he needed high-level Korean language skills to conduct in his future research on the North Korean nuclear issue. He had lived with host family in Korea for six months. He did not volunteer comments frequently, but once he made a comment, it tended to be lengthy.

S9 was from the Southern U.S., and was between the ages of 27 and 32. She had learned Korean as a minor at a university and had lived in Korea for two years after graduation. The primary purpose of taking the class was to improve her academic Korean proficiency because she was planning to study abroad in Korea. She actively participated in the class activities, but seemed to be reluctant to ask questions due to her limited Korean.

The content teacher was a Korean native speaker and a Ph.D. student from the History Department. While he did not have formal training in Korean language instruction, he had experience in tutoring to college students in Korean. As a content teacher, he gave lectures and participated in class discussions.

4.3 Data Collection

In order to examine the negotiation of meaning occurring in a content-based KSL classroom, the 'discussion class' was chosen as the focus of this study because it is the primary section of content-based language instruction and it
comprised the bulk of the classroom interactions for actual oral language used by the teacher and students.

4.3.1 Videotaping

Nine discussion classes were videotaped over the 10-week quarter and transcribed, focusing on the negotiations between teacher and students. Videotaping was beneficial for the research purpose, but it could be obtrusive at the same time. I thought that some students might be influenced by the knowledge that they were being videotaped and discouraged in participating in discussion sessions. For that reason, I fixed the video camera in the back of the classroom and aimed it only at the teacher and blackboard. Although not all the students could fit into the camera’s view because of the size of the classroom, this idea was employed to reduce obtrusiveness in the class.

4.3.2 Field Notes

I took field notes while observing the class and shortly after every class. Field notes, coupled with video recordings, served as my primary data source for reconstructing and analyzing negotiations in the classroom. My field notes included descriptions of the setting, the people, and the activities; and comments such as the researcher’s feelings, initial interpretations, etc.
4.3.3 Simulated Recall Interviews

A stimulated recall technique was used to prompt participants to recall what they had thought while performing a task or participating in an event. Gass and Mackey (2000) pointed out that stimulated recall may benefit studies in classroom interaction and negotiation in SLA by illuminating issues remaining unresolved through other data alone. The stimulated recall technique in this study provided useful information about the participants' mental processes while they engaged in the negotiation of meaning, information that might have passed unnoticed by the interlocutors or the researcher because, in many cases, evidence of communication breakdown and its resolution may have been too subtle and instantaneous to be captured simply through real-time observation.

Furthermore, because an L2 speaker's utterances were often incomplete, it was often difficult to infer his or her intended meaning only from what was said. A stimulated recall procedure sheds light on the participants' mental operations and helps determine whether and how the participant perceived communication difficulty and initiated and pursued the negotiation of meaning at a particular moment. The stimulated recall interview in this study included the following procedures: selecting segments as topics for stimulated recall, selecting recall interview participants, and conducting stimulated recall interviews.

4.4 Qualitative Data Analysis

This section presents the philosophy and methods employed in this study for the analysis of the data. This study is qualitative in that it seeks to document,
analyze, and interpret naturally occurring data in the content-based KSL classroom setting. The qualitative research includes identifying factors and patterns in the data and interpreting them. The methods used here are discovery-oriented, interpretive and capable of describing negotiated interaction processes that occurred in the KSL classroom. For this reason, no attempt was made at manipulating variables or predicting performance.

Most research on the negotiation of meaning has been categorical and quantitative studies. Researchers have mainly been concerned with the number of negotiation instances without considering what really happens during the negotiation process. This research trend has not allowed us to explore a fuller understanding of the process of negotiation. Shim (2003) argues that the main characteristic of qualitative research is the use of inductive research strategies. The qualitative researchers derive their new classifications from their interpretation of collected data rather than relying on predetermined categories. That is, they conduct analysis transcribing types in which categories are developed. This interactive method is based on the assumptions that “a qualitative researcher cannot identify multiple realities ahead of time and that mutually shaping influences in a particular setting are performed in unpredictable ways.” (p. 41) In this vein, a qualitative research method employing an inductive strategy is more appropriate than relying on predetermined categories for this sort of study investigating the nature of negotiation of meaning in the classroom.
4.5 Quantitative Data Analysis

This study is qualitative, but the analysis combines quantitative and qualitative approaches. The quantitative analysis was limited to descriptive statistics such as frequency counts and percentages showing trends in the data, rather than focusing on statistical significance. However, the qualitative aspects of the data, such as those concluded by the researcher's interpretive analysis, field notes, and journals, served to provide another basis of information from which to identify and support tendencies in the data. In this way, the qualitative and quantitative results, while not statistically significant, work together to give a detailed picture of the negotiation of meaning in the L2 classroom.

The quantitative approach in this study was to identify teacher-learner negotiations, and then to determine the actual number of negotiations that had occurred in the recorded data. Determining the amount of negotiations between the teacher and students in the classroom is important because it may have implications toward second language acquisition in terms of the availability of comprehensible input, opportunities for modification of output, and opportunities of attention to forms. Thus, this study provides an account of the amount of negotiation that occurred in the classroom as well as provides a discussion on the following factors that may have influenced the amount of negotiation the teacher and students engaged in.
4.6 Reliability

In terms of the reliability of research methods used, the issues similar to the quantitative research concepts of reliability and validity are just as important in qualitative research as they are in quantitative research. Lincoln and Guba (1985: 145) argue that terminology like reliability or validity borrowed from the quantitative research field is not appropriate for qualitative research. They propose instead four alternative terms to deal with the same research issues: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Since these four criteria are such important concepts in qualitative research, I will explore each of these and various strategies adopted to ensure the trustworthiness of the study.

4.6.1 Credibility

Credibility refers to the criteria demonstrating that the research was conducted in a way that ensures the accuracy of identifying and describing the results of study. This is similar to the concept of internal validity in quantitative studies. Credibility can be established by several strategies: prolonged engagement, persistent observation, and triangulation. According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), while the purpose of prolonged engagement is to render the researcher responsive to multiple influences that affect the phenomenon in question, persistent observation aims to identify characteristics in the situation that are most relevant to the issue and to focus on them in detail. In other words, "if prolonged engagement provides scope, persistent observation provides depth." (Lincoln and Guba, 1985: 304)
"Prolonged engagement" usually refers to the researcher staying in the field and in contact with the subjects and data long enough to understand the context of the research. This study included an approximately three-month period of observation and a half year of research. The researcher maintained contact with the participants during the study. In addition, after the transcribing process was completed, the researcher maintained prolonged engagement with the data sets. This process demanded that he spent time on the data not only during the data analysis phase, but also throughout the process of writing the dissertation.

This process also enhanced ‘persistent observations.’ Data analysis and interpretations were repeated many times to identify results that were most relevant to research questions and to describe them in detail. For example, multiple readings of the transcripts enabled the researcher to detect misinterpretations or prejudices that he had at the first reading of the data. According to Lincoln & Guba (1985), persistent observation involves focusing on the items that are important, discounting the irrelevant and paying attention to the atypical events to see if they are important to understanding the events in the data set.

Data triangulation was another strategy adopted to enhance credibility of the findings in this study. Triangulation involves studying the data from different perspectives (Brown, 2001: 225). Triangulation was achieved through the use of multiple data sources. For this study, those sources included: videotaped data, field notes and stimulated recalls interviews. The use of multiple data sources was useful because the information from the different sources was often complementary in explaining the phenomenon being studied. Also, data from different sources
enabled the researcher to verify or invalidate preliminary findings and interpretations. It is also important to recognize that quantitative analyses can be combined with qualitative research in triangulation (Brown, 2001:231). In this study, combining the qualitative results of observations and interpretations with the quantitative analyses of descriptive statistics such as frequency counts and percentages may provide an effective form of triangulation.

4.6.2 Transferability

Transferability refers to the applicability of the findings to other contexts or with other participants. Because the researchers can only make conclusions that are bounded within a specific time and context where they are found, it is difficult to classify transferability in qualitative studies. Thus, in order to enhance transferability in naturalistic studies, the responsibility of a researcher is to provide detailed and precise descriptions of the phenomenon, namely “thick description,” to enable those who are interested in applying the findings to another.

In order to ensure the transferability of this study, I provided a thick description of the research context including a thorough description of each phase of the negotiation of meaning. There are numerous excerpts of negotiation with a careful analysis of each negotiation, and a discussion of the factors which influenced the results. In addition, all transcripts of the data are provided as a part of the study. Taken together, they provide a thick and detailed description of the research which makes transferability judgments possible.
4.6.3 Dependability

This criterion refers to the consistency of the findings. Dependability can be supported by using different data sources and by using overlapping collection methods. In addition, continual examination both of the process and the results can also increase the dependability of the findings. In this study, “overlapping methods” were employed, that is, the use of multiple data-gathering procedures and multiple sources of information to provide cross-validating information (Brown, 2001). It involved recorded data of classes, field notes by the researcher, and stimulated recall interviews with students. These triangulation strategies were carefully planned and provide overlapping and cross-validating information.

Dependability can also be enhanced by quantitative analyses of the consistency of coders in the form of inter-coder agreements (Brown, 2001: 227). The quantitative approach in this study was to identify teacher-learner negotiations and then to determine the actual number of negotiations that had occurred in the recorded data. Two coders participated in the procedure. After identifying instances of negotiation of meaning meeting the criteria by the first coder, namely myself, another coder was asked to identify negotiation in the data in order to check inter-coder reliability. This process can also enhance dependability of the study.

4.6.4 Confirmability

According to Brown (2001), confirmability refers to the full revelation, or at least, the availability of the data upon which all interpretations are based. In other words, readers must be able to confirm the results or interpretations. Thus,
"careful record keeping and retention of data for further scrutiny are essential for this concept." (Brown, 2001: 227) In this study, the recorded data and transcripts have been permanently stored. In addition, the excerpts of each negotiation were included in the dissertation in the appendix. Thus, it would be possible for other researchers to confirm the results and interpretations, which enhances the confirmability of the study.

4.6.5 Critique of Other Qualitative Studies

The purpose of this section is to discuss and critique the research methodologies adopted in recent qualitative studies that analyze how native-nonnative or nonnative-nonnative speakers interact. This process may provide a better insight into understanding qualitative research methodology, as well as establishing reliability in the study.

Alrabah (2002) investigates the potential contribution of interaction in second language acquisition by studying the interactional patterns employed by a group of participants consisting of two ESL learners and four English native speakers in a conversational partners program. Two of the English-speaking conversation partners met in one-on-one interactional sessions with the two Kuwaiti ESL learners. Data in the form of audio-tape recordings, researcher's observational notes, and member checks were collected and analyzed to identify the components of the second language that the participants encountered and utilized during the sessions, the patterns the participants used to communicate and negotiate meaning in the L2, and the interrelationships between the patterns of
linguistic processing and social interaction employed by the participants in the study. As a research methodology, ethnography and discourse analysis were adopted in this study.

In order to ensure the reliability of findings, Alrabah (2002) adopted four measures: member checks, prolonged engagement, triangulation, and field notes. "Member check" is a part of a researcher's strategy to confirm initial observations of what was at work during the conversations. For example, after a conversation has been recorded, the researcher asked the participants what they thought was important for them, and what they remembered most about the interactions. This is similar to the concept of stimulated recalls interviews. The researcher maintained prolonged engagement with participants during and after the study. In addition, the researcher spent hours transcribing the data sets, and after the process was completed, the researcher maintained prolonged engagement with the data sets. During the coding process, the researcher confirmed each category and each group of patterns in the category system by making sure it was a recurring pattern, and by confirming it was a common category throughout most data sets. The process of triangulation of categories was a means to establish credibility and dependability. Field notes were also used as one of the measures. Observations, such as the researcher's observations about the social relations between the participants, were regularly recorded in field notes.

Although credibility and dependability were established by several means in this study, Alrabah (2002) lacked transferability and confirmability. In order to enhance transferability, the responsibility of a researcher is to provide detailed and
precise descriptions on the phenomenon, namely "thick description," to enable those who are interested in applying the findings to another context to make such similarity judgments possible. However, this study did not provide enough descriptions regarding the research results. A very brief explanation of the identified category was presented along with some excerpts. In addition, excerpts did not provide ample information regarding the conversation process because the study did not employ a transcript of the participants' dialogue.

Cervania (2003) conducted a research on the role of group projects in the development of a second language within Vygotsky's zone of proximal development (ZPD). The setting was a second-semester beginning foreign language class of Filipino/Tagalog, which met four days a week for an hour. Participants in the study were children of Filipino immigrant parents and raised in the United States of America. Eight groups were formed (seven pairs and one group of three) and worked collaboratively on a group project. A period of about three weeks was allotted for preparation. Each presentation was 15 minutes and video-taped with students' permission. A discourse analysis was employed to analyze the students' dialogic interactions. The analysis focused on the role of semiotic mediation tools in L2 learning and the role of collective scaffolding on the inter-group ZPD. This study may be categorized in linguistically communicative strategies, or in social interactions of human behavior. Results of the study showed that the group project approach to L2 language learning and the social and dialogic interactions within a social and cultural context facilitated the self-regulation and internalization of L2 vocabulary.
Although Cervania (2003) yielded significant results, some methodological limitations applied to the study. The first limitation lies in the fact that the data was collected prior to the design of the research. As the author mentioned, the original purpose of the data collection was not to conduct a full investigation of group ZPDs but to evaluate the effectiveness of a new teaching approach (Cervania, 2003:37). If the author had designed the study as a research of group ZPD, he or she would have broken the class into fewer groups, making it possible for more members to be in each group. This would have brought out more definitive group dynamics than did the small groups of two or three. In addition, this process would have established stronger credibility of the study.

Next, the group project preparation had been completed out of class before the presentations were performed in the class. If the first-hand data on the interaction during project preparation had been collected, it would have been more reliable data in terms of the research purpose, namely, the study on the development of a second language. If the presentation data had been compared with the data during the preparation stage, it would have provided a better insight into exploring interactions between participants as well as ensuring research reliability.

Foster and Ohta (2005) investigated the negotiations of meaning in peer interactions from both cognitive and sociocultural perspectives. Two separate data sets from adult ESL learners in London, and college students studying Japanese in an American university engaged in information exchange tasks were analyzed for the study. From a cognitive approach, typical measures used to identify negotiation
were adopted for counting negotiation instances and the interactional devices employed in communication breakdowns. The quantitative analysis showed very low incidents of negotiation of meaning in the interactions. The qualitative analysis of the data from a sociocultural approach, however, presented interesting results. During interactions that did not involve meaning negotiation for problems in communication, learners were found to engage in interactional processes that facilitated their communication in the second language. Learners actively assisted each other by co-constructing utterances and providing corrections when possible. The researchers concluded that the negotiation of meaning is just one of the many interactional processes that help learners' SLA process.

In terms of research design, this study is somewhat unusual and unique in that it is a collaborative work between two researchers whose research perspectives are different. The two researchers worked together in order to gain deeper understanding of what the negotiation of meaning did and did not do in a particular classroom data set. Foster and Ohta (2005) also experienced some methodological limitations. The first limitation lies in the fact that only audio-recordings were made for the data collection. To get more complete data of the interactions, sessions should have been videotaped. Videotaping is beneficial for many purposes in qualitative research. Videotaped data can be used to help researchers more deeply explore the negotiation process. The negotiation is generally carried out verbally as well as non-verbally. Since non-verbal expressions such as facial expressions and gestures are crucial parts in understanding the negotiation process, the studies of negotiation should employ videotaping for data collection. In
addition, during stimulated recall interviews the videotapes are used to help participants remember what they said, heard, thought, and felt in class.

The second methodological limitation was that only the first five minutes of each recording were transcribed and coded. Besides the very short time of recording, the first few minutes are generally obtrusive to research participants. The students, especially those who had to reveal their lack of linguistic competence, might be seriously influenced by the knowledge that they were being audio-recorded at the beginning of the session. It would have been better if the whole recording or randomly selected parts of recording had been transcribed.

Foster (1998) investigated students' negotiation of meaning in the classroom, specifically to the extent to which students would produce modified interaction when engaged in group or pair work in a natural classroom setting. The study also explored if the task type (optional or required information exchange) and participant structure (dyad or small group) could affect the amount of negotiation including modified interaction. Twenty-one students from the intermediate level class were observed in the study. Four tasks were chosen for the study: a grammar-based task, picture differences, consensus, and map. The first two tasks were performed by students working in dyads, and the other two tasks were performed by the students working in small groups of four or five. Analyzing only the first five minutes of each interaction, Foster found that relatively little interaction occurred overall. The most negotiation for meaning, defined by the total use of the three 'C's, occurred in pair-work tasks in which each learner controlled specific parts of the necessary information. Foster concluded that the negotiation of
meaning occurred rarely in second language classroom interactions. These findings reveal, however, that there was at least one incidence of negotiation in the first five minutes of every interaction, and that there were several negotiation sequences in the first minutes of many interactions.

One of the methodological limitations in Foster' study (1998) was that many of the recorded tapes (five out of eight) had to be discarded because most of the interaction was inaudible or because students had not properly attempted the task. Moreover, the length of each recording for the analysis was inconsistent. For some, the first five minutes of interaction was transcribed and coded, and for others, the initial ten minutes of interaction was transcribed and coded.

Another limitation lies in the fact that qualitative methods for the study were within a very narrow scope. No detailed information with respect to qualitative approach was presented in the methodology section. The essence of qualitative research studies lies in their live and authentic supporting data. However, the author did not offer enough evidences throughout the study. On the contrary, many tables and numbers were employed to discuss the results. It was likely that the author relied more on quantitative approach in the study.

4.7 Potential Problems

This section presents the potential problems of using the students in my own class as research participants for the data collection and what efforts were made to minimize the harm.
4.7.1 Data Collection Procedure

The data collection was conducted under the agreement that every student in the class volunteered to participate in the study. I informed my class about the study stressing that their participation in the research was voluntary, and their decision of whether or not to participate would in no way affect the grade that they would receive in my class. However, although I ensured students of their voluntary participation, I was concerned that the students may feel compelled to participate in my study in order to appear motivated and to maintain a positive relationship with me. Thus, I used a method to determine whether all students wished to participate in the study without my direct involvement so that I did not know the identity of participants who did not want to participate in the study.

I had the teaching assistant (the content specialist) meet with the students when I was not present in the classroom, and lead a discussion regarding whether they were willing to participate in the study. The teaching assistant then reported back to me whether the students as a group wanted to be a part of the study. The teaching assistant reported the group’s decision, without informing me which individuals did or did not agree to the participation. If the teaching assistant himself was one of the individuals who did not wish to participate in the study, he did not specifically inform me that he did not wish to participate, rather he considered himself to be part of the group’s decision and simply reported to me that some members of the group did not wish to participate. If some of the students were willing to participate in the study, but had questions or concerns that they wished to have addressed before they made their decision, the teaching assistant served as a
liaison between me and the students so that I was unaware of which student(s) raised the concern.

Since the purpose of this study is not to test or evaluate students’ performance or behavior in the class, but to investigate language interactions occurring in a language learning classroom, I thought that there would be no foreseeable potential risks or concerns. However, students might be concerned that their performance or behavior captured on the videotapes might influence the grade that I would give them. In order to prevent and minimize this concern, I did not review the research tapes until after I had finished grading the course because these procedures would help the students in the class feel more confident that their participation in the study would not affect their grades.

Due to the IRB principle, I was unable to use videotapes of classroom interaction as stimuli during the recall interviews. My initial idea was to have an interview with the participants on the day of the videotaping or as soon as possible so while their memories was fresh. However, this idea was abandoned in order to abide the IRB principles. Instead, I conducted recall interviews based on my observations and field notes. In addition to conducting the recall interviews, I also informally asked questions of the participants immediately after a given class about instances of the negotiation of meaning that took place during the class that day.

4.7.2 Confidentiality

I have made efforts to keep the students’ information confidential as research participants. Confidentiality was maintained by means of random
assignment of codes to participants. Furthermore, the data (video tapes and transcriptions) were archived by codes and did not bear the names of any subjects. Only I, the researcher, have the key to the codes and this was destroyed after data analysis was finished.

4.7.3 Subjectivity

The attitudes of the participants in a research toward the study and toward each other can cause subject expectancy, or researcher subjectivity (Brown: 1988, 37). In order to minimize the subject expectancy, the class participants were not informed about the specific aim of the study. They were only informed that their classes would be recorded for research purposes on classroom interaction in a second language learning class, and that no changes would be made in their lessons.

As the researcher and the teacher in the classroom where I conducted my research, I had the unique perspective of being an outsider with an insider’s point of view. This position provided a number of advantages, but since I was a participant in the classroom I studied, this situation calls into question my objectivity as a researcher. However, since the class was designed according to content-based language learning approaches, lecture classes and discussion classes were led by a content instructor. In other words, negotiated interactions occurred between the students and the content instructor. I, as a language instructor, was the lead instructor and mainly responsible for the course design and individualized language feedback after the class. Although I participated in the class because I had
to listen to lectures and discussions in order to provide feedback to each student after class, I tried to be uninvolved in class interactions.

The principle of the IRB also contributed to minimizing subjectivity in this study. As mentioned earlier, the IRB requires that I not review the videotapes that captured students’ performances and behaviors until after I finished grading the course. This procedure prevented a positive impact on the class and on each student’s performance by me as a researcher since I could not immediately apply information I gained from the data collection to improve the course. That is, the classes were not altered by the information I gleaned from the data.
CHAPTER 5
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this chapter is to present research findings identified from the data analysis. The findings are related to the research questions addressed in Chapter 1:

Research Question 1: How are negotiations carried out between a teacher and students in a content-based KSL classroom?

(1) What types of trouble sources trigger negotiation?

(2) What types of signals occur in relation to trouble sources?

(3) What types of responses occur in relation to signals?

Research Question 2: How do negotiations in a content-based KSL classroom provide learners with conditions necessary for second language acquisition (1) learners' comprehension of L2 input, (2) their production of modified output, and (3) their attention to L2 form?

This chapter consists of three sections. The first section addresses findings related to the three separate phases of the research question 1: occurrence of communication difficulty, signal of trouble source, and response to signal. The findings are presented according to the categories established from the data analysis. Careful accounts with excerpts representing each category are rendered in support of the results. The second section discusses how the findings of this study provide evidence that the negotiation of meaning in a content-based classroom promotes the three conditions necessary for SLA: (1) learners' comprehension of L2 input, (2) their production of modified output, and (3) their attention to L2 form.
For each of these conditions, the findings are shown and the effect they have on successful L2 learning is discussed. The last section discusses the characteristics of lexical negotiation, and the important factors affecting negotiation in this study.

SECTION I: Negotiation of Meaning Process

5.1 The Frequency of the Negotiation of Meaning

The purpose of this first section is to discuss the frequency of the negotiation of meaning occurring in the classroom. Before discussing each phase of the whole process of negotiation, the first step is to identify all negotiation that occurs between the teacher and the students, and then present the actual number of negotiations. Instances of the negotiation of meaning were identified by meeting one of two types of the following criteria.

(1) The students explicitly or implicitly indicated that they did not know how to say something, and the teacher responded to it.

(2) The teacher or the student overtly indicated that there was inappropriate use of the target language or less than complete understanding, and the interlocutor responded it.

After identifying instances of the negotiation of meaning meeting the criteria stated above by the first coder, namely myself, another coder was asked to identify negotiation in the data in order to check inter-coder reliability. Final decisions were made based upon both coders’ consent. Table 3 shows the number of times of negotiation of meaning occurred as identified by the two coders designated for this study.
Table 3. The Number of Times the Negotiation of Meaning Occurred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coder</th>
<th>Number of Negotiations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coder 1</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coder 2</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-coder Agreement</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Types of Trouble Sources

The first issue addressed in the data was about the types of trouble sources that trigger negotiation during the interaction between the teacher and the students. As presented in Chapter 1, the idea of trouble source refers to 'the very cause of what led an utterance or some part of an utterance to be a trigger.'

This section discusses what types of trouble sources cause the negotiation of meaning between a teacher and students in a content-based KSL classroom. Through careful examination, trouble sources were identified and categorized into two main types depending on who triggered the negotiation: (1) trouble sources caused by teacher and (2) trouble sources caused by the student. Both types are subcategorized to provide more specific interpretation of the findings from the data. This section will begin with a brief comparison of the percentage of both trouble source types as they occurred in the classroom.
5.2.1 The Frequency and Types of Trouble Sources

First, the result of the analysis is categorized depending on who triggered the negotiation, the student or the teacher. Table 4 lists all the trouble sources grouped according to whose utterance triggered the negotiation.

Table 4. Frequency of Each Type of Trouble Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trouble Source</th>
<th>Frequency of Trouble Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trouble Source By Teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trouble Source By Student</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4 above, there is a great difference between the number of trouble sources created by the teacher and the trouble sources created by the students. While there were only two trouble sources caused by the teacher, approximately 99% of all trouble sources resulted from students' utterances. What is the explanation for such disparity? Some possible reasons include, first, taking initiative. For this research, the class was designed to discuss specific subject matter as part of a content-based KSL class. Within the context of discussing a subject in the classroom, it is assumed that students will actively participate in the debate and initiate discussion. Students are expected to take initiative in introducing topics, developing opinions and ideas, and maintaining discussion for extended periods. Students sometimes alternated leading the discussion with their classmates when they are interrupted as seeking and providing assistance. Through
taking initiative, students break away from the widely observed patterns in language learning of a teacher-centered classroom. Students may have difficulty in producing what they want to say, or they may make errors in their utterances while leading a discussion. Because of this, most of the trouble sources were made by students.

Secondly, teachers tend to adjust or modify their speech according to the learners' level of proficiency by resorting to various kinds of teacher talk. Such teacher behavior contributes to reducing the amount of difficulty students have in understanding what the teacher said, thus reducing the number of trouble sources triggered by the teacher. This was confirmed by student comments during the interview session:

He (the teacher) rarely uses words we don't know and if he does, he explains it to us. For example, if the word is a famous place, piece of writing, or something cultural that I wouldn't really know, then I appreciate the instructor telling me. (S2)

Since only two instances of trouble sources made by teachers is too small of sample for the analysis, they have been excluded from the study. This study includes only trouble sources caused by students. Through careful examination of the trouble sources made by students, the trouble sources were identified and categorized into two main types: (1) students' linguistic resource deficits and (2) students' inappropriate language use. Before uttering statements, students may experience production problem in retrieving what they want to say. They can show production difficulty in direct or indirect ways before they speak because they do
not have sufficient linguistic knowledge of Korean. Students sometimes asked a Korean equivalent to the teacher using English to resolve the communication problem before pronouncing what they intended to say. These types of trouble sources were caused due to the students’ insufficient language resources. Thus, these trouble sources were categorized under “students’ linguistic resource deficits.” On the contrary, students’ inadequate use of the target language, such as inaccurate pronunciation or inappropriate word choice, may result in a communication breakdown. These types of trouble sources are different than those in the category of “students’ linguistic resource deficits” in that they are identified after students make their utterances. They were grouped into the category of and “students’ inappropriate language use.”

This part of the chapter will discuss the frequency and types of trouble sources triggered by students. Table 5 illustrates the number of trouble sources caused by students during the entire sample. The proportions of trouble sources are presented in parentheses (%).

**Table 5. Types and Frequency of Trouble Sources by Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Trouble Sources by Students</th>
<th>Language Resource Deficit</th>
<th>Inappropriate Language Use</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Frequency</td>
<td>145 (63%)</td>
<td>79 (34%)</td>
<td>7 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(231)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Through analysis, what triggered a negotiation was revealed in the process of the negotiation itself, however, there were instances when it was unclear as to what had been the trouble sources of negotiation and these instances were categorized as "Other."

As shown in Table 5, a significant difference can be observed between the two types of trouble sources "students' linguistic resource deficits" and "students' inappropriate language use." The major reasons for communication breakdown stem from the students' limited linguistic resources. By comparing the frequency of trouble sources between "students' linguistic resource deficits" and "students' inappropriate language use" in Table 5, it is clear that the amount of trouble sources triggered by "students' linguistic resource deficits" were almost twice as frequent as "students' inappropriate language use" 145 (63%) and 79 (34%), respectively. These results reveal that students exhibited difficulties in communication more frequently in instances of linguistics resource deficits.

The reason can be posited from the perspective of the class environment. As mentioned in the previous section, the class was designed for discussing specific subject matter as a part of a content-based KSL class. Within the context of discussing a subject in the classroom, students actively participated in the debate and initiate the floor. While students are holding the floor, they may have difficulty in producing what they want to say. Moreover, discussion topics can be difficult, such as Korean modern history or current affairs including North Korean issues. Students may have experienced production problems in retrieving high level words or expressions, or come across situations in which they had to use unexpected
language during the debate. Thus, these features found in the class environment may have led to make more trouble sources due to their insufficient language resources rather than due to their inappropriate language use.

5.2.2 Students’ Linguistic Resource Deficits

As discussed in 5.2.1, the major reasons for communication breakdown stem from the students’ limited linguistic resources. This section details a variety of trouble sources caused by the “students’ linguistic resource deficits.” The following excerpt shows a typical example of trouble source by students due to their linguistic resource deficit. In the classroom when students encountered a word they did not know, their limited linguistic knowledge became the trouble sources of the negotiation. In this case, they often code switched into English after hesitating or even after retrieving the word. It may have been done simply to avoid a communication breakdown and to appeal for help from the teacher. In the following excerpt, S2 is explaining his thoughts to the class about North Koreans.

1. S2: pwukhan salamtyp-un e: seykyey siya? e: mwe-ci(0.4) world view?
North Korea people-TOP world visual field? What-INTERR world view?
*North Korean people mm: ‘seykyey siya (world visual field)’? u: how can I say ‘world view?’*

2. T: seykyey siya ...
world visual field...
‘sseykyey siya (world visual field)’...

world-ACC see-ATTR thing-COMM-POL, world view.
It means to see the world, ‘seykyey siya (world visual field)’
4. T: a: seykyeykwan?  
world view?  
*Ah... 'seykyeykwan (world view)'?

yes world view how see-if world view-NOM not:exist-ATTR thing seem-IE:POL
*Yes, 'seykyeykwan (world view)'. In some ways, it seems like North Koreans don't have a 'seykyeykwan (world view)'.

In the above excerpt, S2 is trying to figure out the vocabulary item to express his intended message in the originally planned form. Not knowing the appropriate word, S2 tries a coined word *seyky ey siya* and signals the difficulty of vocabulary deficit in line 1 by code switching into English to appeal to the teacher for help with the word, “world view.” The teacher tries to guess what the student wants to say in line 2, but he seems to fail to find an appropriate word and shows hesitation by repeating the student’s coined word. In response, the student repeats his utterance to receive a Korean equivalent of “word view.” Finally, in line 4, the teacher is able to provide the student with the word that he is looking for. The student confirms the word, then continues talking, using the word again in the last line.

The next type of trouble source is the “students’ linguistic resource deficit.” This is caused by the learner’s uncertainty of the language item intended to be delivered. When students have to use specific language items in their speech, they sometime do not feel confident with its usage and try to guess what is correct before using it. In fact, a learner’s uncertainty of the language item is the result of
the lack of L2 knowledge. The following negotiation is an excerpt from a conversation in which S6 tries to speak to the class.

1. S6: ku pwukhan salamtul-i cinccalwu: seynoy: pat-ass-nun ke kathass-eyo, seynoy seynoy patasseyo? hasseyo? patasseyo? that North Korea people-NOM really brainwashing receive-PST-ATTR thing seemed-IE:POL brainwashing brainwashing received did received It looked like the North Korean received brainwashing, received brainwashing? Did? Received?

2. T: toyesseyo, toyesseyo, seynoy toyesseyo. became became brainwashing became They were, they were, they were brainwashed.

3. S6: syenoy toy-ess-nun ke kath-ayo. brainwashing become-PST-ATTR thing seem-IE:POL It seemed like they were brainwashed.

In line 1, it is obvious that S6 does not know how to say the passive form, “They were brainwashed” in Korean, so she requests clarification on word choice, although neither examples were correct. In line 2, the teacher provides her with the correct passive form. In response, S6 confirms that this is indeed what she wants to say and repeats the feedback the teacher provided. She then goes on to finish her statement.

What is interesting about the trouble source data in the category of students’ linguistic resource deficit is that there were many instances where students could not produce an accurate language form that they had already learned. This kind of trouble source also stems from the students’ limited language knowledge. An example of this is illustrated below.
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1. S7: sensayngnim-i ce-hantey cwusin article-ul po-myen, keki-ey am(0.4) pikyocek ku kongsan: kwukmin?
teacher(you)-NOM me-to give-ATTR article-ACC see-when there-in mm comparatively communist people
*According to the article that you gave me, in there, um, comparatively the, the communist... people?*

2. T: kongsantang
*The communist party
*The communist party?*

3. S7: cwung, cwungkwuk-ey...
*China China-in
China, in China...*

4. T: cwungkwuk kongsantang?
*Chinese communist party
Chinese communist party?*

5. S7: cwungkwuk-ey...
*China-in
In China...*

6. T: cwungkongkwun!
*Chinese communist army
Chinese communist army!*

7. S7: *Okay! ya: (all laugh.) cwungkongkwun, cwungkongkwun-hako:
in.min.kwun? North Koran army?
okay yeah Chinese communist army Chinese communist army- and North Korean army
Okay! Yeah, Chinese communist army and...North Korean army?*

8. T: [yey, inminkwun. pwukhan.]
*yes North Korean army
Yes, North Korean army.*

*yes the people-NOM comparatively more people-to be:nice-CONN did-DC-QT you:said-IE:POL
Yes, it was written in the article that they had been good to civilians, wasn't it?*
Here, the student and the teacher are talking about the Chinese and North Korean armies that fought against the South Korean and U.S. armies in the Korean War. The student is trying to tell the class that during the war, the Chinese and North Korean armies made an effort to protect civilians. However, she cannot convey the word that she wants to say because she cannot remember it, even though she had previously learned it as *cwungkongkwun* (Chinese communist army). Instead she attempts to request help from the teacher with rising intonations, trying a series of wrong forms known as retrieval. Therefore, in the next line, the teacher tries to guess what she wants to say and then provides a word. However, response to the teacher’s comments, it is obvious that the word is not the potential form that she is searching for. In response, she strategically provides *cwungkwukye* (in China), in hopes that it would clarify the word that she is searching for. From this cue, the teacher infers *cwungkongkwun* (Chinese communist army) and provides her with the word. In the last line, the student confirms and repeats the teacher’s feedback, then goes on to finish the conversation.

5.2.3 Students’ Inappropriate Language Use

Another trouble source by students stem from students’ inadequate use of the target language, such as inaccurate pronunciation or inappropriate word choice. This part begins when the trouble source is triggered due to inaccurate pronunciation of the target language item. Although not all inaccurate pronunciations caused communication breakdowns, mispronunciation in many cases was the trouble sources of communication. Consider the following excerpt
that illustrates negotiation originating from the student’s incorrect pronunciation.

The teacher asks the class to give an example of stereotypes that South Koreans have about North Korea. Student 4 (S4) offers *seynoy* as an example “brainwashing” in English, but pronounces it wrong, triggering a negotiation.

1. T: namhan salamtul-i kac-ko iss-nun pwukhan-ey tayhan imici-nun etten ke-llka-yo? South Korea people-NOM have-CONN exist-ATTR North Korea-to about image-TOP what-ATTR thing-INTERR-POL *What are some impressions the South Koreans have of North Korea?*

2. S4: seyne twayseoyo. brainwashing became. *They are ‘brainwished’ (wrong pronunciation).*


4. S4: seyne. brainwashing ‘brainwished’ (wrong pronunciation).

5. T: seyne? brainwashing ‘brainwished’ (wrong pronunciation).


7. T: a: seynoy, seynoy twayseoyo, brainwashing brainwashing became *Ah... brainwashed, they are brainwashed.*

In the above example, S4’s incorrect pronunciation of the word *seynoy* in line 2 causes communication breakdown for the teacher. This results in the
teacher’s clarification request in line 3. In response, S4 makes an attempt at correctly pronouncing the word, which is the same way it was pronounced in line 2, consequently the teacher still cannot understand the meaning. The teacher attempts to clarify S4’s utterance again by repeating seynoy? Despite S4’s attempts to repair the teacher’s non-understanding by repeating the word, the problem is not resolved until other students in the class speak up and offer the word with the correct pronunciation in line 6. The teacher confirms that other students’ feedback is the correct pronunciation in line 7, ending the negotiation.

This type of negotiation—students use inaccurate pronunciation and thus the teacher does not understand—is typical in a language classroom. As in the aforementioned case, when a student provides only one or two isolated words with incorrect pronunciation, the teacher often cannot understand what is being said because of the lack of linguistic context. As can be seen in the excerpt above, the trouble source prompted by incorrect pronunciation is easily detected and resolved with various strategies, such as clarification requests, paraphrasing, and other repair strategies.

L2 learners sometimes fail to retrieve a certain word or expression at a particular moment and use words that do not exactly fit the context. Their inappropriate word choice may cause the interlocutor’s non-understanding.

1 S8: tongil-eytayhayse salam tul-uy sim-tul-i wena-nun > e:
    reunification-about people-POSS ‘SIM’-PL-NOM want-ATTR
What people’s ‘SIM’ want regarding reunification, uh:
2. T: sim-tul-i mwe-eyyo?
'SIM'-PL-NOM what-IE:POL
What do you mean by 'SIM'?

3. S8: maum-tul.
heart-PL
 Their hearts.

4. T: a: maum-iyo?
heart-IE:POL
Ah, their hearts?

5. S8: yey, maum. yey. hanca kongpwu ttaymwuney. (all laugh) (1.0)
maum-eyse wenha-nun kes-ul chac-aya hay-yo.
yes heart yes Chinese:character study because:of
heart-from want-ATTR thing-ACC find-must-POL
Yes, heart. Yeah. It's because of my Chinese studies. (all laugh)
They need to find what they want with their hearts.
(Reunification needs to occur according to what the Korean people want in their hearts.)

5.3 Types of Signals

This section discusses the frequency and types of signals used to indicate a trouble source during negotiation between the teacher and student. The negotiation process generally begins with either an interlocutor’s signaling a communication breakdown (Varonis & Gass, 1985) or a speakers’ signaling a production problems. Signaling can appear either verbally or non-verbally. While verbal signals appear in a variety of forms such as clarification requests and confirmation checks, non-verbal signals include facial expressions and gestures.

This study divides student trouble source signals into two categories, “teacher-initiated signals” and “student-initiated signals.” Analysis of data shows that signal types are closely related to the types of trouble sources preceding the signal. As
discussed in the previous section, this study focuses only on the trouble sources triggered by the students because approximately 99% of the trouble sources resulted from student utterances. This imbalance revealed that when the trouble sources occurred due to the "students' language resource deficit," signals were initiated by the students because they needed to indicate their problem in production. On the contrary, when the type of trouble sources was caused by the "students' inappropriate language use," the signals were initiated by the teacher because the teacher needed to indicate the students' inaccurate productions to resolve communication breakdown. In order to address the issue of signals, this section is divided into two portions (1) the frequency of signals, and (2) the types of signals.

5.3.1 The Frequency of Signals

An important point in this study with regards to the comparison between teacher-initiated signals and student-initiated signals is the kind of trouble source preceding the signal. As discussed in the previous section, there are two types of trouble sources produced by student "students' language resource deficit" and "students' inappropriate language use." Through carefully examination of the type of trouble sources in the data, the results reveal considerable differences between teacher-initiated signals and student-initiated signals. Table 6 illustrates the number of signals following each type of trouble source during the entire sample.
As shown in Table 6, a noticeable difference can be observed between both signal initiators in the types of trouble source that results in negotiation initiations. As for the teacher-initiated signals, approximately 99% of the signals resulted from the students' incorrect utterances. There were only two instances in which “students' language resource deficit” resulted in teacher-initiated signals. In contrast, the opposite results were identified for student-initiated signals. Of all the signals indicated by the students, 100% resulted from the “students' language resource deficit.” In other words, when trouble occurred due to the “students' language resource deficit” signals were initiated by the students. On the contrary, when the type of trouble sources was caused by the “students' inappropriate language use” the signals were initiated by the teacher. It is important to note that signal types are closely related to the trouble source types.

These results suggest a number of features that may be specific to classroom negotiations. First, they reveal evidence demonstrating differences in the roles played by the teacher and student in the language classroom. In terms of an asymmetrical relationship between the teacher and student, the teacher can be said to play the
dominant role in the language teaching and learning classroom. If the assumption can be made that learners’ inappropriate use of the L2 must be corrected, the teacher must signal to the students what their incorrect utterances are in order to provide feedback. Likewise, students rely on the teacher when they encounter communication difficulties due to their lack of L2 knowledge; and their need to avoid communication breakdown leads them to use a variety of signals directed to the teacher indicating their struggle.

The results presented in this section discuss the frequency of signals initiated by the teacher and students, as well as identify features that characterize teacher-initiated and student-initiated signals. The next question to answer involves how both parties signal when they are confronted with communication problems. This will be examined in the next section by investigating the types of signals given by both teacher and students.

5.3.2 Types of Signals

Signal types in this study are described according to various communication strategies identified in previous second language acquisition studies. Each type of signal used by the students and the teacher, and its relationship to trouble sources need to be examined with particular interest. Each signal was identified in each negotiation and then coded as a specific type of signal. The coded signal types were grouped into several categories. Due to the low frequency of certain types of signals, the types of signals were grouped into four major categories under student-initiated

---

4 This study employed communication strategies and their definitions from Dörnyei and Scott (1997).
signals category, and three major categories listed under a teacher-initiated signals category, respectively.

Table 7 summarizes the number of the specific types of signals produced by the teacher and students in each sample. The number of each of these signal types was then converted into a relative frequency. For each signal type, the relative frequency was calculated by dividing the number of each category of signals by the total number of signals, and then converted into percentages. The results demonstrate the specific kinds of signals used by the teacher and students.

Table 7. Number of Signals by Type

(1) Student-initiated Signals (Total N: 145)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signal Types</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appeal for help with code switching</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own accuracy check</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumlocution</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailing off</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrieval</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-coinage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Teacher-initiated Signals (Total N: 79)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signal Types</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Repair</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification Request</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation Request</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.2.1 Types of Student-initiated Signals

What is notable among the frequently used signals by students was the overt indication of insufficient L2 knowledge. The types of student signals identified in the data were primarily used to appeal for help, and required the teacher to assist students in resolving their production problems. In other words, when students had difficulties in speaking in the L2, they asked the teacher to provide appropriate language prompts in order to facilitate their L2 production. For example, appealing for help with code switching indicates the occurrence of communication difficulty. As a result, the student becomes responsible for the diagnosis and remediation of the communication breakdown.

Appeal for Help with Code Switching

Students used code switching to appeal for help most frequently in the class when they faced communication difficulties due to their limited L2 proficiency. In the following excerpt, S2 is explaining his opinion to class members during a debate on the terrorism of Islamic fundamentalists, and whether it has become a serious problem to the United States. He asks the teacher for the Korean equivalent for a word that he wants to use in the debate.

1. S2: kulentey way thukpyelhi yocum sitay-ey kulkhey simkakha-ta-ko syangkakha-myen um: kuke-nun ku: e:: isullam(.) meci? e: ku: fundamentalism? by:the;way why especially current age-in like:that be:serious-DC-QT think:when that-TOP that Islam what that fundamentalism Particularly, when thinking about why terrorism has recently become a serious problem, the reason is, um... Islam... how can I say, um... fundamentalism?
2. T: kunponcwwuuy? fundamentalism
   Fundamentalism?

3. S2: kunponcwwuuy isullam: fundamentalism islam
   Fundamentalism Islam...

4. T: kunponcwwuuyca? fundamentalist
   Fundamentalist?

5. S2: yey, ku-chyo.
   yes be:so-COMM-POL
   Yes, that's right

In the above excerpt, S2 asks for the vocabulary needed to express his opinion. Not knowing the appropriate word, S2 tries a series of wrong word forms and signals the difficulty of his vocabulary deficit in line 1 by code switching into English to appeal to the teacher for help with the word “fundamentalism.” The teacher tries to guess what the student wants to say, then provides the word in line 2 but, it is not the word the student wants. In response, the student modifies his utterance to reflect the feedback the teacher provided and requests help again from the teacher by elongating a vowel sound. Finally, in line 4, the teacher is able to provide the student with the word that he is negotiating for. The student confirms that it is correct in the last line.

The students’ use of code switching to appeal for help is a designated signal type, and represents 40% of the total signal patterns, indicating that students use this signal considerably more than others when they are experiencing production problems. There are certain classroom situations that affect the use of appealing for
help with code switching. As mentioned in Chapter 3, the classroom discussion was chosen for the data analysis of this study. The class may be a place where students are challenged to use words and grammar that they have not studied before depending on the topic or activity. For example, unfamiliar topics, such as "international relation" which was an actual topic discussed in the KSL class in this study, require students to appeal for help for unknown words and grammatical items.

Another explanation for the frequent use of appeals for help with code switching may have been that students regarded the teacher in the class as the main learning resource in the classroom, to the extent that they often used their teacher as a "dictionary." Appealing for help through code switching seems to be the primary means for students to elicit vocabulary. In an L2 classroom, when the students encounter a word that they do not know or have difficulty producing, they request help by asking the teacher to provide the appropriate word. Moreover, teachers tend to allow students who do not know the word in the L2 to simply replace the word with the English equivalent to elicit the word in the L2. This may be more prevalent in the classroom because of time constraints that prevent teachers from explaining every L2 item that students do not know. In the interview session, a student made the following comment on code switching:
I think code switching’s helpful because when you’re talking and discussing something but get stuck on a word, it’s hard to continue with the pace of the conversation if you don’t know it. For example, if we’re talking about North Korea and I don’t know how to say ‘nuclear proliferation’ then the flow gets disrupted, other people lose concentration, and I end up feeling bad. So, it’s helpful if the teacher tells me the word so I can continue with the content. (S1)

The use of code switching into English seems useful because the target vocabulary item is abstract, and may be too difficult to describe in Korean. Thus, the student asks the teacher for the Korean equivalent to the word because he knows that the teacher and other class members know English well. Basically, students are not allowed to use English during the class for pedagogical purposes in the language learning classroom. The accepted use of English by students in the classroom may deprive students of opportunities to use the L2. However, this type of simple code switching as illustrated in the excerpt above appears to be effective in terms of elicitation of negotiation. Although the students ask the teacher for an exact equivalent, the teacher does not know all of the information to figure out exactly what the students want to say and how the students want to say it. The teacher needs to request clarification and/or confirmation to determine whether or not the item is correct before providing the students with the target item. The teacher must ask questions to find out exactly what the students are seeking and to determine how they want to use the word. This use of code switching promotes negotiation between the teacher and the students.
Another advantage of the simple use of code switching is it reduces time and effort in a classroom. Time constraints in a language class influence interactions between class members and the teacher. The teacher must consider this characteristic of a language classroom in terms of class time management. The use of code switching is first, easy, and second, helps to shorten the amount of time and effort which must be evenly distributed for each class member.

Although the use of the students’ L1 may not be effective in a language learning classroom, the simple use of code switching is beneficial because it provides students with positive L2 inputs as well as opportunities for negotiation. It also reduces student and teacher time and effort thereby facilitating the class time management.

**Own Accuracy Check**

Own accuracy check is the second most frequently used signal pattern performed by the students in this class. This type of confirmation checking is used when learners want to check whether what they said is correct by asking a concrete question or repeating a word with a question intonation. In the classroom, when students are grammatically unsure of the language item they intend to deliver, they attempt to confirm it with the teacher before using it. Own accuracy check is one of the easiest ways for the students to let the teacher know they want to prevent communication breakdown from using incorrect language items. Rather than saying the words that might cause a communication problem, the students want to confirm it with the teacher beforehand. By pinpointing the specific part of the utterance that the
student is unsure about, the own accuracy check serves as an effective signal in helping the teacher identify the student’s communication difficulty before it occurs.

The example of this signal is given below.

1 S6: hayksilhem ha-ki cene-y-nun pwukhan-i wihyep-ilako nukki-ci anhass-eyo. kuntey, hayksilhem ha-n hwuey: e: (0.4) ku kwunpiyengcayng? ani, ke: haykkyengcayng? macayo? nuclear:test do-before-TOP North Korea-NOM threat-DC-QT feel-did:not-IE:POL but unclear:test do-after the armament:race no the nuclear:race is:it:correct

Before North Korea's nuclear test, we didn't feel that North Korea was a threat to us. But, after the test, um... the armament race? no, no, um... nuclear race? Is it correct?

2. T: e:: yey, haykkyengcayng. yes nuclear:race
Um... yes, nuclear race.

So, we are concerned that a nuclear race starts.

In the excerpt above, S6 tries to tell the class that she is concerned that the nuclear test by North Korea can trigger a nuclear race in East Asia. However, she is unsure of the vocabulary that she intends to deliver. Thus, she attempts to confirm it with the teacher by employing “own accuracy check” to signal her difficulty before completing the sentence and the teacher confirms the appropriate item in line 2. In the last line, the student completes the sentence using the confirmed word.

The fact that own accuracy checks occur frequently in the classroom reflects the goals and expectations required in the language learning classroom. Teachers are responsible for their role as language experts, which entitle them to give confirmation
on the accuracy or acceptability of students’ utterances. This confirmation by the teacher is essential to the continuation of the classroom activities. The teacher’s role in language learning classrooms involves not only handling the occurrence of communication problems but also in the prevention of communication breakdowns. Although the prevention of communication breakdown often limits opportunities for students to negotiate the meaning of words, the students believe this is one of the most important roles of teachers. Requesting confirmations to check accuracy and provisions of confirmation by the teacher is a crucial part in classroom interaction. A student’s remarks below confirm this:

I do this a lot. I think I end up asking for confirmation, mainly because I feel insecure about my language ability. I’m not sure if I used the right phrase, the right word, etc., so I look to the teacher for confirmation. Sometimes, it’s only a look or a mumble, but I think it helps me feel like I’m not totally wrong. (S5)

I think it’s really helpful because I’m not too familiar with the topic and I want to make sure I’m not completely off base. It generally makes me feel good when I get a verbal or non-verbal confirmation because that tells me I’m on track. (S1)

On the contrary, as for the student’s role, the use of own accuracy checks indicate that they are actively participating in the classroom. It can be said that they are constantly monitoring and confirming the accuracy of their utterances to avoid communication breakdown.
Circumlocution

Circumlocution is a signal strategy frequently used by students when they experience production problems. It is defined as a roundabout or indirect way of speaking, and is viewed as an important strategy and a major component of strategic competence (Canale & Swain, 1980). Circumlocution involves exemplifying, illustrating or describing the properties of the target object or action with words that a speaker knows until the teacher understands what they are trying to say. Below is the example of the use of circumlocution.

   Although pro-Japanese groups should be punished, they could be important people in establishing the national economy because they are people who have knowledge about how the economy should be established? And... what do I say...like...controlled?

2. T: wunyeng?
   manage
   Managed?

3. S6: wunyeng? hay-yahanun... kulen cisik-ul al-koiss-nun salamtwul-un chinilphatul-ilako sayngkakha-pnita. manage do-must such knowledge-ACC know-CONN exist-ATTR people-TOP pro-Japanese group-DC-QT I:think-IE:POL Managed? Should be managed...like...I think that pro-Japanese groups are groups of people who have knowledge about it.
S6 is explaining her opinion to the class about the pro-Japanese groups during the Japanese colonial era in Korea, but is experiencing lexical difficulty. In order to overcome her lexical gap, she tries to exemplify some words—syewukwu (to establish) and cipay (to control)—that have similar meanings as the target language model, unyeyng (to manage). The teacher guesses and provides the word within the context of her explanation. In response, S6 confirms the word by repeating it and ends the negotiation in the last line.

Students used circumlocution mainly to explain the meanings of vocabulary in their conversations. Since the main task in the class was the discussion of topics, circumlocution was naturally used by students when they encountered a problem in communicating their intended meanings with classmates. The frequency of circumlocution used by the student may be related to the student’s proficiency level. Because S6 is a heritage student who has an advanced oral proficiency level in Korean, she was able to describe the target word using high level words. On the contrary, it is likely that the students who are at a lower level of proficiency would use less demanding signal strategies, such as code switching or trailing off.

**Trailing Off**

There are indirect ways that students can signal for assistance from their classroom teacher. Signaling can be carried out either directly or indirectly. While direct ways to appeal for help appears in the forms of code switching and own accuracy checks, indirect ways usually involve hesitation, vowel elongations, and pauses. When students experience production difficulties, the most frequently used
indirect method of signaling is to "trail off," at the end of sentences by elongating a vowel sound. The excerpt below shows an example of a student who trails off at the end of a sentence, and the teacher subsequently completes the student's sentence by guessing what he wants to say.

1. S5: cwungkwuk-un choytayhan mikwuk-ul concwunghay-ss-kwu, choytayhan mikwuk-kwa machal-ul:: e:(1.0) China-TOP as:much:as:possible US-ACC respect-PST-CONN as:much:as:possible US-with friction-ACC China respected US as much as they can, and in order to...uh...friction with US...uh...

2. T: phiha-kiwihay? avoid-in:order:to In order to avoid?

3. S5: yey, phihakiwihay nolyek-ul manhi hay-ss-ketun-yo/ yes avoid-in:order:to effort-ACC much do-PST-CORREL-POL Yes, in order to avoid friction with the US, they put in a lot of efforts.

S5 talks to the class about how China tried to avoid war with the United States during the Korean War. He tries to continue his explanation, but encounters production difficulty due to limited vocabulary knowledge. Before he says the verb, he elongates the object particle -ul in Korean, indicating he is having difficulty finishing the sentence. This signals the teacher to identify and complete the sentence with the verb that the student is seeking. The teacher provides the verb phrase and requests for confirmation of the word with a rising intonation in line 2. S5 accepts the teacher's feedback and confirms it by repeating the word.

As shown in the excerpt above, S5 uses a trailing off strategy as an indirect signal to prompt the teacher to provide the appropriate word. In this case, the teacher
assists the student in the form of sentence completion so the student can produce the expression he is unable to produce on his own. However, some students seem to employ this strategy simply to allow for more thinking time. A student interview confirms this:

I think I usually trail off because I’m trying to think of the word or phrase I need to complete my thought. Sometimes I do it because I don’t know if I really said what I meant to say, and I end up reviewing or rethinking my words. I usually don’t do it to get help, per se, I think maybe it may be to get confirmation again. I know I do it often but I am pretty sure it’s not to get the right answer or to get help...I think it’s just to buy time to think or to get some sort of approval. (S7)

5.3.2.2 Types of Teacher-initiated Signals

This section discusses the each type of signal initiated by the teacher. The results show that the teacher-initiated signals can be characterized into two main groups: “other repair” (correction and recast) and “clarification request.” The most frequently used strategy for indicating trouble sources was “other repair.” It means that the teacher attempted primarily to correct students’ inappropriate L2 use in the classroom in order to provide them with a target language model. The second most frequently used signal was the “clarification request.” The evidence also suggests that a student’s insufficient L2 speaking ability results in an increase in the number of the teacher signals for clarification. As for the other types of signals, such as confirmation requests, they represented only 8% (6 out of 79) of all teacher-initiated signals.
At this point, let us assume that the type of trouble source preceding the teacher’s signals was caused by the students’ inappropriate use of the L2. When the teacher identifies trouble sources in students’ utterances, he usually modifies part of the students’ preceding statements or substitutes them with the target language model. What is notable is the teacher is able to infer what the students were trying to say. The teacher’s experience in interacting with L2 speakers may enable him to comprehend or infer the meaning of the students’ utterances, and restructure the words.

### Table 8. Number and Types of Teacher-initiated Signals (Total N: 79)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signal Types</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other repair</td>
<td>50 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification request</td>
<td>21 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation request</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Repair**

The data shows that the use of “other repair” as a signal by a teacher represents 63% of the total signal patterns, indicating that the teacher used this signal significantly more often than others. When a teacher identifies a part of a student’s speech that is not grammatically correct, and/or guesses what the student is trying to say, he tends to give direct feedback on the incorrect part or offers a target language model. This category includes cases when the teacher resolves the communication problem with negative feedback rather than following the regular routine of negotiation. In the excerpt below, S4 tries to explain to the class that popular support
is necessary in making war. In line 1, the student tries to express the correct form of the adjective but makes an error by saying *nakkwancek* (to be optimistic) instead of *kwacangtoyn* (to be exaggerated). The teacher understands what he is trying to say and provides S4 with the correct target language in the form of negative feedback. The student responds by modifying his original utterance to incorporate the feedback his teacher has just provided.

war-DC-ATTR thing:NOM people-POSS support-ACC receive-must you:know-IE:POL ruling:class at:their:discretion become-DC-ATTR thing:TOP optimistic thought-DC-CONN see-can-CONN-IE:POL
*I think that a war needs popular support. It is an optimistic thought to say that the ruling class can do whatever they want.*

2. T: nakkwancek-i ani-kwu kuke-nun nemwu (0.4) e:: kwacangtoyn/ optimistic-NOM be:not-CONN that-TOP too exaggerated
*You can’t use ‘optimistic’ here. Um...how do I say... ‘exaggerated’?*

*Yes, it is an ‘exaggerated’ thought to say that and one more thing is...*

One wonders why “other repair” was the most frequently used signal by the teacher rather than other signals, such as clarification requests. There seems to be a few plausible reasons for this. First, the model that the teacher offers for the student to repair is undoubtedly the clearest and most target-like version of what the student was attempting to say. In other words, by triggering negotiation in the conversation, “other repair” provides clear sources of, and opportunities for comprehensible input.
Secondly, when dealing with a communication breakdown, providing repair is perhaps more efficient in terms of time and effort compared to asking the student, whose command of the L2 is still inadequate, to clarify his utterance. Essentially, offering a model of the incorrect item in the target language, and having the student confirm it, is less time consuming than having the student try to clarify their own errors. Students made the following comments on “other repair”:

I personally like it when the instructor fixes my errors. I don’t want to keep saying it wrong and if he tells me right away, especially when I’m using the word or phrase, it probably would help me remember the next time. (S9)

I do feel that an occasional correction is helpful... and for our level of language proficiency, I think it’s appropriate. (S6)

Another reason a teacher may prefer “other repair” is because this strategy may contribute to a smoother class discussion. The teacher rarely implicitly corrected the students’ errors because doing so would take the focus off of the main goal of communication. While “other repair” may be used for the sake of smooth communication, students are less likely to modify their utterances in response to the feedback when “other repair” is used. This may be because the classroom discussion’s main objective is communication: and students tend to use the teacher’s corrective feedback for immediate communicative purposes, and do not attempt to modify or incorporate the feedback into their original, incorrect speech. This is because doing so may disrupt the flow of the conversation. Moreover, if the student is
at a lower proficiency level, or if the teacher's feedback is difficult, they may be unable to modify or incorporate the feedback due to their limited linguistic resources.

**Clarification Request**

The data shows that clarification requests were the second most frequently used signal by the teacher. Clarification requests are strategies used during instances when the listener does not understand the utterance, and seeks to clarify it. As presented in Table 8, there were 21 clarification requests (27%). When students fail to deliver target-like words or expressions, it causes a communication breakdown, and the teacher uses a clarification request to signal to the student that their utterances were not understood. Students respond to this request by clarifying or rephrasing their original utterance to make it more comprehensible.


North Koera position-by:TOP this:time six:party:talk-in actively participate-will-DC-CONN think-CONN-POL first:of:all the energy supply:NOM need-CORREL-POL and humanitarian resource-also negotiation-decide-PST-IE:POL

*North Korea's position is to actively participate in this round of the six party talks. First of all, they need energy and decided to have negotiations regarding humanitarian resource (a wrong form of "aid").*

2. T: intocek cawen-i mweeyyo?

humanitarian resource-NOM be:what

*What is humanitarian resource (a wrong form of "aid")?*

3. S2: e: e: thukpyelhi(.) sikmwul?

mm specially plant

*Um, um, specifically, "plant?"

4. T: (0.5) siklyang?
In the excerpt above, the student is explaining that North Korea has a food shortage and wants to actively participate in the six party talks. However, the teacher does not fully understand a part of what was said—*intocek cawen* (humanitarian resource)—and needs to prompt the student to clarify the word that caused his incomprehension. In response, the student attempts to clarify his utterance in line 3, but fails because he mispronounces the word. Consequently, the teacher provides a target language model inferring the meaning of what S2 wants to say with a rising intonation. The student confirms it in the last line thus completing the negotiation.

In this study, the results reveal that there are not always instances of genuine clarification requests in the classroom when there is a comprehension problem. It is often unclear as to why a teacher requests clarification on student’s utterance. In other words, it is not clear whether a teacher requests clarification because he does not understand the meaning of the student’s utterance, or because the student’s utterance is not appropriate in the context.

1 S2: hankwuk-un 70nyentay-ey kyengcey palcen-ul ha-lswupakkey eps-ess-eyo. ttohan naycen cheycey ha-eyse, Korea-TOP the:70’s-in economy development-ACC do-can:not:help-PST-IE:POL in:additional civil:war system under-in The Republic of Korea could not help the developing national economy in the 70s. In addition, under the Civil War System,

2. T: naycen-iyio, nayngcen-iyio? civil war-IE:POL cold war-IE:POL
Was it cold war or civil war?

3. S2: a, nayngcen. coysonghapnita. ha ha
cold war  I'am: sorry  ha ha ((laugh))
Ah, cold war. I'm sorry. ha ha

it:is:okay
It's okay.

As shown in the example above, the teacher attempts to prompt S2 to reconsider his initial utterance. We see that the teacher has understood the student's original utterance, but wants him to modify it to make it more like the target L2 version. Lyster and Ranta (1997) have called this as the "didactic function" of negotiation "The provision of corrective feedback that encourages self-repair involves accuracy and precision and not merely comprehensibility" (P. 42). This type of clarification request normally occurs in the classroom where teachers integrate negotiation into pedagogical activities, and often pretend to not understand students' speech in order to encourage students to focus on their original utterances and make them more target-like even when there is no evidence of communication breakdown. These types of didactic negotiations are typical in the classroom as emphasized by Lyster and Ranta. For didactic negotiation, teachers use clarification requests to elicit modified output from students. Clarification requests are quite efficient in eliciting modified student output. The use of clarification requests as a signal in negotiation seems to be more closely tied to the participant roles and goals of a language classroom. The goal of a language learning class is to provide students with an environment conducive to second language acquisition, which includes providing
opportunities for interactive negotiation between participants. It is clear, then, that clarification requests play a crucial role in the language learning classroom environment as it prompts students to clarify and modify their inaccurate utterances through negotiation with the teacher.

In summary, the teacher requests clarification in the classroom when he does not understand the meaning of the student utterances, or when the teacher understands the meaning of the student utterances even though they are not appropriate in the context. Either way, it is evident that the teacher provides feedback on the appropriateness of student utterances, and the students clarify and/or modify their utterances in response to their teacher’s feedback.

Through examining the clarification request types produced by the teacher, two patterns were identified: explicit indication clarifications and repetitious clarifications. Explicitly indicated clarification requests include non-statement signals, such as “uh?” and “what?” and explicit statements, such as “What is XX?” These can be explicit and direct indications of trouble sources without specifying the problem area that needs to be solved, which is different from the “other repair” signals mentioned earlier. Another type of clarification request is repetitions. Repetitions can be subdivided into two main categories of intonations; rising and falling. While the repetitions with rising intonations can be easily identified as clarification requests, those with falling intonations have posed a number of analytical problems as they may serve multiple functions including: clarification requests, confirmation requests, acknowledgements, and fillers. For example, speakers can repeat a word or phrase which they only heard in the previous utterance, thus requesting clarification with
repetition and falling intonations. In some cases, speakers may use repetitions to hold their turns, which may or may not represent a communication problem. These detailed functions cannot be easily clarified. Consequently, in this study, repetitions were identified from the perspective of the signal receivers’ response. When repetitions were interpreted by students as an indication of communication trouble, they were counted as a clarification request in the analysis. On the other hand, when they resulted in student acknowledgement or confirmation of their utterances, they were included as a confirmation request. The detailed descriptions of the student responses in reacting to repetitions will be discussed in the section designated for types of responses.

Confirmation Request

The following excerpt shows an example of the teacher’s use of confirmation requests as a signal. The class is engaged in a debate focused on North Korean issues in East Asia. S9 tries to explain that North Korea has become a threat to the regional security in East Asia.

1 S9: ceyil khun wihyep-un / e: ciyek tayhan anpo-lul wihyepieyyo. the:biggest threat-TOP region about security-ACC threat-IE-POL

The biggest threat is, um... the threat to the security of the region (by North Korea).

2. T: ciyek? region

Region?

3. S9: cyek (0.4) ciyek-ey tayhan anpo...

region region-about security
Region. Security of the region...
4. T: a:: tongasia ciyk-eyseuy anpo wihyep?  
   East Asia region-in:POSS security threat  
   Ah: You mean the threat to the security of the East Asian region (by  
   North Korea)?

5. S9: ney.  
    yes  
    Yes.

The excerpt starts with S9 saying that North Korea becomes the biggest threat to the East Asian region in terms of security. However, the word she uses—ciyk (region)—seems to cause some confusion for the teacher because she omitted tongasia (East Asia) before the word ciyk (region). Thus, the teacher repeats ciyk (region) in the next line with a rising intonation, requesting confirmation of it as a signal indicating that a communicative problem has occurred. In line 3, S9 confirms and repeats the word, and then repeats the word with a noun. However, it appears that the problem was not solved and the teacher infers the meaning of what the student wanted to say. The teacher reformulates the student's original utterance and provides the target language model with a rising intonation requesting confirmation of it again in line 4. S9 simply confirms this by saying "yes" ending the negotiation.

5.4 Types of Responses

This section presents the analysis on the types of responses provided in the reaction to the signals. The results provide the answer to the third research question in this study: what types of responses occur in relation to the signals? The responses are carried out after the signal in the negotiation sequence. Responses reflect the way the receiver of the signal interprets the previous speaker's communication problem, and their attempts to resolve that problem.
The data illustrates that the types of responses are related to the preceding signals. The types of responses are divided into two main categories: "teacher response followed by student-initiated signals" and "student response followed by teacher-initiated signals." The first portion of the section will begin with the results of the "teacher responses followed by the student-initiated signals."

### 5.4.1 Teacher Responses Followed by Student-initiated Signals

Table 9 summarizes the frequency of different responses given by a teacher across preceding student-initiated signal types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Student-initiated Signals (N)</th>
<th>Types of Responses</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appeal for help with code switching (58)</td>
<td>Providing an appropriate form</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own accuracy check (36)</td>
<td>Confirmation</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing an appropriate form</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrieval (19)</td>
<td>Providing an appropriate form</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailing off (18)</td>
<td>Providing an appropriate form</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above all, what is most revealing is that most of the responses provided by the teacher were related to the providing an appropriate forms. In reacting to student-initiated signals, the teacher offered adequate language models to the signal slot, which caused student production problems. Furthermore, it can be assumed that such responses are closely related to the way students indicated communication difficulties,
or to the types of signals. As described in the previous section, student-initiated signals tended to indicate communication breakdowns, such as difficulties in producing what students intended to say. As a result, the teacher provided appropriate language items. Students signaled their trouble mostly in direct ways, with code switching and own accuracy checks, and with other ways like retrieval and trailing off.

A more detailed analysis of the providing an appropriate form responses is needed at this point, as these were most frequently observed in the teacher's responses. It is worth noting that although the results reveal the providing an appropriate form responses by the teacher were most frequent, their forms vary, and may have distinct functions depending on the context in negotiation.

First, it is clear that lexical substitution is the most typical response form when students employed code switching to appeal for help. In order to respond to student signals for assistance, the teacher substituted an L2 equivalent as a response to the code switched item in English by students.

1. S2: kulentey way thukpyelhi yocum sitay-ey kulkhey simkakha-ta-ko syangkakha-myen um: kuke-nun ku: e:: isullam(.) meci? e: ku: fundamentalism? by:the;way why especially current age-in like:that be:serious-DC-QT think-when that-TOP that Islam what that fundamentalism Particularly, when I'm thinking about why terrorism has recently become a serious problem, the reason is, um... Islam... how can I say, um... fundamentalism?

2. T: kunponcwuuuy? fundamentalism Fundamentalism?

3. S2: kunponcwuuuy isullam: fundamentalism islam Fundamentalism Islam...
4. T: kunponcwuuyc?  
fundamentalist  
Fundamentalist?

5. S2: yey, ku-chyo.  
yes be:so-COMM-POL  
Yes, that's right

In the above excerpt, S2 tries to figure out the vocabulary item to express his intended message. Not knowing the appropriate word, S2 tries code switching the word into English to appeal to the teacher for help with “fundamentalism.” The teacher tries to guess what the student wants to say then provides the word in line 2, but the word the teacher provided was wrong. Finally, in line 4 the teacher provides the student with the correct word he is trying to say. The student confirms that it is correct in the last line.

When the signals were “retrieval” and “trailing off,” sentence completion types as responses were frequent.

1. S5: cwungkwuk-un choytayhan mikwuk-ul concwunghay-ss-kwu,  
choytayhan mikwuk-kwa machal-ul:: e:(1.0)  
China-TOP as:much:as:possible US-ACC respect-PST-CONN  
as:much:as:possible US-with friction-ACC  
China respected the US as much as they could, and in order to...uh...friction with the US...uh...

2. T: phiha-kiwihay?  
avoid-in:order:to  
In order to avoid?

3. S5: yey, phiakiwihay nolyek-ul manhi hay-ss-ketun-yo/>  
yes avoid-in:order:to effort-ACC much do-PST-CORREL-POL  
Yes, they made a lot of effort in order to avoid friction with the US.
While direct signals take the form of “appeal for help with code switching” and “own accuracy checks,” indirect ways usually involve hesitations, vowel elongations, and pauses. When students experience production difficulties, they frequently used indirect ways to trail off or leave off at the end of sentences, usually by elongating a vowel sound. As in the excerpt above, S5 uses a trailing off strategy as an indirect signal to prompt the teacher to provide an appropriate word as a response. In this case, the teacher responds to the signal in the form of a sentence completion, so the student can produce the expression that he is unable to produce on his own. This evidence may suggest that the signals of communication problems were perceived by the teacher as more related to specific lexical items used in their production difficulties.

This section discusses the types of teacher responses identified in reacting to own accuracy check signals by students. As the figures in Table 9 show, the teacher’s responses can be grouped into two main parts. First, a teacher provides appropriate word forms in place of incorrect items uttered by students in their signal slots. Second, the teacher provides acknowledgement responses, confirming the students’ utterances.

The first type, providing an appropriate form, suggests that own accuracy check signals were perceived by the teacher to be appeals for help. In such cases, own accuracy check signals seemed to have functioned in a way that is similar to the explicit indications for help discussed in the previous section. The teacher assumes
that students experience production difficulty, and request help for what they intend to say. In response, the teacher provides appropriate items if the students’ utterances are not correct.

1. S6: nala-ey oyhwa-ka eps-umyen oywuk-eyse oychwul? oychwul-ul pat­tunka,
country-in foreign:currency-NOM not:exist-if foreign:country-from roan (wrong form of ‘loan’) roan-ACC receive-or
If there is not enough foreign currency in a country, they should apply for foreign currency ‘roan’ (a wrong form of “loan”),

2. T: taychwul
loan
Loan

3. S6: taychwul? pat-tunka animyen,
loan receive-or if:not
Loan? Apply for a loan, or...

This type of response is most frequently observed in the sequence after own accuracy check signals, suggesting that the students’ limited speaking ability leads the teacher to perceive own accuracy checks as appeals for help due to the students’ production difficulty.

In some cases, own accuracy check signals can be perceived by the teacher as confirmation checks when student utterances are correct and acceptable.

1. S1: cey sayngkak-ey-nun hankwuk cengkwen-hako mikwuk-i pankong pankong inyem-ul manhi: phetu phetuli-ntako kule-nayo?
my opinion-in-TOP Korea government-and US-NOM anti-communism
anti-communism ideology-ACC a:lot spread spread-DC:QT say-IE:POL
In my opinion, the Korean government and the US...um... spread, spread anti-communism ideology, can I say “spread?”

2. T: um um
mm mm
   so I:also communists-TOP be:bad-DC:QT think-CONN-IE:POL
   So, I think that communists are bad, too.
   This response implies that student own accuracy checks are relevant, and a
   teacher assumes that no further feedback is necessary.

5.4.2 Student Responses Followed by Teacher-initiated Signals

Table 10 summarizes the frequency of different responses given by the
students across preceding teacher-initiated signal types.

Table 10. Frequency and Types of Student Responses
Followed by Teacher-initiated Signals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Teacher-initiated Signals (N)</th>
<th>Types of Student Responses</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Repair (48)</td>
<td>Repetition of SG*</td>
<td>34 (71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledgements</td>
<td>6 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confirmation Requests</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification Requests (20)</td>
<td>Modification of TS**</td>
<td>9 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modification of SG</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repetition of TS</td>
<td>6 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation Requests (5)</td>
<td>Repetition of TS</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*SG= signal, **TS= trouble source)

Types of Responses to Other Repairs

Table 10 shows certain the characteristics of student responses. First of all,
when the response was followed by an “other repair” which was most frequently used
by the teacher, the repetition of signals dominates student responses. When a teacher
identifies the part of student utterances that is not grammatically correct, he tends to indicate the error directly with feedback, or offer a target language model. This study categorized this signal as “other repair.”

In responding to this signal from the teacher, students tend to repeat what the teacher said. As a response, the “repetition of signals” was used most frequently by students. As for the other types of responses occurring after “other repairs” from a teacher, there were “acknowledgements,” “confirmation request,” or “no response.” Since the “repetition of signals” and “acknowledgements” constituted most of the student responses observed, these are discussed in further detail.

First, as Table 10 shows, 71% of student responses were identified as repetition of signal. The large number of repetition of signal as a response suggests that teacher signals actually served as repair functions. In other words, the teacher initiated negotiation and resolved the communication breakdown, resulting in student reformulation of his or her trouble source by repeating the potential forms that the teacher offered.

1. S2: cey pokiey-nun,
my see:way-TOP
I see it way,

2. T: cey-ka pokieynun
I-NOM see:way-TOP
The way I see it.

3. S2: ceyka pokieynun,
I-NOM see:way-TOP
The way I see it,
Acknowledgement responses were also identified in the category of “other repair” signals, which simply provided acknowledgment utterances such as “yes.”

   *It would be possible to resolve the conflict between urban and rural areas. The conflict between urban area and rural area.*

   *It is the conflict between urban and farm areas.*

   yes
   *Yes.*

The use of this response appears to suggest that students had more difficulty repeating or reformulating the teacher’s feedback as a result of their limited competencies in the L2. In other words, the teacher usually modified the students’ utterances in order to provide a potential target language form. But this feedback was not always helpful as it also had the potential to introduce unfamiliar forms to students. This process seems to elicit a simple acknowledgement because students do not want to indicate another trouble source due to their limited competencies. Another interpretation can be made. Students may focus on the communication of information during the interaction rather than reformulating their own utterances. During the debate class, students may have been much more interested in the flow of communication rather than the correction of their errors. Thus, it can be concluded that students respond to teacher signals by repeating words from the teacher’s
feedback to indicate their acceptance of the reformulated utterances. Or students say “yes,” or its variant, after the teacher offers “other repair” signals.

The fact that repetition of signals and acknowledgements accounted for more than 50% of all student responses to teacher signals supports the results obtained in Pica’s studies (Pica 1993, 1994). The results of her studies revealed that approximately 50% of NNS responses to NS signals were in the form of signal repetitions or acknowledgements.

However, it is not obvious that this type of negotiation procedure is beneficial to second language acquisition. It is the teacher who talks and tries to clarify the meaning of the student utterances. The student, on the other hand, simply acknowledges or repeats the teacher’s signals. Although this type of negotiation does lead to the resolution of the communication problem, it may not provide students with ample opportunities to modify their utterances.

Types of Responses to Clarification Requests and Confirmation Requests

It is worth noting that nearly 20% of student responses appeared in the form of “modification of trouble sources” as shown in Table 10. The following excerpt demonstrates the modification of trouble source responses followed by the teacher’s clarification request signal.

North Korea's position is to actively participate in this round of the six party talks. First of all, they need energy and decided to have negotiations regarding humanitarian resource (a wrong form of “aid”).

2. T: intocek cawen-i mweeyyo?
   humanitarian resource-NOM be:what
   What is humanitarian resource (a wrong form of “aid”)?

3. S2: e: e: thukpyelhi(.) sikmwul?
   mm specially plant
   Um, um, specifically, “plants?”

4. T: (0.5) siklyang?
   food
   Food?

5. S2: nye, siklyang.
   yes food
   Yes, food.

As shown in the example above, in response to teacher’s clarification requests as a signal, students modify or elaborate their initial utterances, although it is not successful. Students may interpret teacher’s clarification requests as an indication of communication difficulty. This type of clarification request demonstrates that the student did not provide sufficient information in their speech, which led to the teacher’s incomprehension. Thus, the teacher requested an elaboration of what the student had previously said. As discussed earlier, although the teacher understood what the student was trying to convey, for pedagogical purposes, the teacher had a tendency to request clarification to elicit a more target-like version of the student’s initial utterance.

1 S8: him cengchayk
   power policy
The results indicate that students provided additional contextual clues by further modifying their own utterances that triggered the signal. This evidence suggests that students did not receive the teacher’s signals as an indication of incomplete understanding. Instead, they assumed that their initial utterances were insufficient and therefore elaborated on them. Moreover, certain types of this signals such as mwelakwuyo? (Pardon me?), may invite students to elaborate more on what they initially said.

As shown in the table 10, besides the modification of signal or trouble sources, “repetition” was also identified as one of a type of response to clarification and confirmation requests. As noted in the signal section, the repetitions of student utterances by the teacher were identified as a signal type. When the repetitions were interpreted by students as an indication of communication trouble, they were included as a clarification request. The analysis of responses revealed that students perceived the teacher’s repetitions as clarification requests, and modified their own utterances. On the other hand, when the teacher’s repetitions resulted in student
acknowledgements or confirmations of the teacher’s utterances, the repetitions were included as confirmation requests in the analysis.

The results show a tendency among students to modify the teacher’s signals when clarification was requested in the form of repetition with rising or falling intonation. Furthermore, all identified signal modification responses were elaborations. The following excerpt presents an example of an elaboration response to the clarification request in the form of repetition. It is revealed that the teacher’s repetition invited the student to elaborate on what he had initially said rather than simply confirming it.

In line 2, the teacher’s repetition signal, *Yeswun*, may be an indication that he could not understand the Korean proper noun (place name). In response, the student repeats the historical term that presumably resulted in the teacher’s repetition. In cases such as this one, the teacher’s repetition signal is perceived by the student as a clarification request.

1 S5: namhan cengpwu-nun ‘Yeswun Saken’-ihwulo te pankong-ul kangcohay-ss-nuntey,
South Korea government-TOP ‘Yeswun Saken’-after more anti:communism-ACC emphasize-PST-and
*The South Korean government emphasized anti-communist policies after the ‘Yeo-Soon incident’;*

2. T: ‘Yeswun’?
   Yeswun
   ‘Yeo-Soon?’

   yes Yeswun:incident Yeswun:revolt-IE:POL
   *Yes, the Yeo-Soon Incident, the Yeo-Soon Revolt.*

4. T: ‘Yeswun Panlan Saken.’
   Yeswun:revolt
5. S5: ye, 'Eyswun Panlan Saken'-ihwulo / kunkka ku(:)
kongsancwuuycatul-i kuttay phoktong kath-un ke ilukhi-kwu kulayss-
unikka, te pankong-ul hanke-cyo.
yes Eyswun:revolt-after that:is the
communists-NOM at:that:time riot like-ATTR thing cause-CONN
did:so-because more anti:communism-ACC did:thing-COMM:POL
Yes, after this Yeo-Soon Revolt, that is... since the communists caused
something like a riot, that's why, they made more anti-communism
policies.

The teacher’s second repetition in line 4 can possibly be interpreted as a
confirmation. However, it triggers the student’s elaborated response in the line 5. In
other words, S5 perceived this repetition as another signal for elaboration, and
provided additional information. In cases such as this, students were more likely to
interpret the teacher’s repetition signals as requesting more information than as a
signal indicating a communication problem. Thus, they attempted to elaborate on
repeated items in their response.

This tendency suggests that this type of repetition signal as a clarification
request invites students to elaborate or provide additional information. In this regard,
it seems worth noting that Ehrman (1996) suggests that the repetition of previous talk,
or “mirroring,” (Ehrman, 1996:34) is an effective elicitation strategy. According to
Ehrman, the use of repetition strategies enables the teacher to provide students with
opportunities to produce output. The result of this current study seems to support this
suggestion, especially with respect to clarification requests in the form of repetitions.
By repeating students’ preceding utterances, the teachers successfully elicited
additional production from students, which is a beneficial effect of the negotiation of
meaning.
Although the results should be interpreted with caution due to the small number of data, a presumption can be made that clarification requests, including repetition of the trouble source, motivates students to modify or elaborate their initial utterances, including inappropriate L2 items. Consequently, students may have opportunities to notice misused forms and thereby produce modified utterances, which are claimed to be crucial conditions necessary for successful second language acquisition. This point will be described in further detail in terms of comprehensible output in Section II.

SECTION II: Negotiation of Meaning and Three Conditions for SLA

The purpose of this section is to discuss how the negotiation of meaning supports conditions claimed to facilitate second language acquisition: (1) learners’ comprehension of L2 input, (2) their production of modified output, and (3) their attention to L2 form (Pica, 1994). The findings of this study provide evidence that the negotiation of meaning promotes the three conditions claimed to be necessary for second language acquisition. The results show that comprehensible input was provided during the negotiation when the teacher or students adjusted their utterances to make them more comprehensible to the speaker. Production of modified output occurs when students speak in response to teacher feedback, and/or signals marking the trouble source. Attention to form is also evident in negotiation when students receive positive or negative input from the teacher, and thus modify their output. For each of these three conditions, the findings from the study are reviewed and illustrated.
5.5.1 Comprehension of L2 Input

The negotiation of meaning helps make input comprehensible. One way in which negotiation makes input comprehensible is that when a communication breakdown occurs because of inappropriate word use or inaccurate language structure, appropriate language forms are provided by the teacher (Long, 1996: 452).

Another way negotiation makes input comprehensible is by adding redundancy through elaboration, which can be done through repetition, paraphrasing, and using appositions and/or by making semantic structures more explicit (Long, 1996: 423). According to Long (1996: 541), “Elaboration is particularly useful in SLA because it not only makes input comprehensible, but it makes complex input comprehensible and both comprehensibility and complexity are necessary for acquisition.” However, in this study, elaboration rarely occurred during the negotiation because class discussions did not provide enough time to elicit ideal negotiations which include long elaborations on specific language items.

Comprehensible Input and Positive Evidence

It is important to note that when comprehensible input occurs, “positive evidence” of L2 forms are provided to students. For this study, the focus of the class dealt with specific subject matter, and as such, class discussions revolved around discussing the content of the subjects. Class discussions involved sharing opinions and relevant anecdotes during which students sought language items and their meanings to express their thoughts, and tried to make their input more comprehensible to other participants. With this focus on modified input for
comprehensibility, students gained access to “positive evidence” of target language items and meaning.

In this classroom, there were three ways in which the students gained access to the various types of positive evidence through comprehensible input. The first way in which the students obtained access to positive evidence was through seeking assistance from the teacher or peers, to which they received modified input. On various levels, students tended to request help in producing language items that they did not know: words, phrases, and sentence structure. As indicated in the previous chapter, in struggling to produce a difficult item, students appealed for help to the teacher by using communication strategies, such as code switching. By giving feedback on these words, the teacher provided target language models that not only defined the word, but also allowed the item to be manipulated in a way that revealed the linguistic relationship it had among the sentence constituents and within the words.

1 S3: nampwuk-uy mwunh-wa ene chai-lul kyolyu-lul thonghayse comte ku: e: (1.0) 'gap'ul ... 'gap'i mwe-cyo? chayw-unta-ko kule-nayo? South:North-POSS culture-and language difference-ACC exchange-through more 'gap'-ACC 'gap'-NOM what-COMM:POL fill-DC-QT say-IE:POL Cultural and language differences between North and South Korea can be reduced through exchange...um...to fill the gap... What is gap (in Korean)? Can I say “to fill the gap?”

3. S3: yeey, kaypul epsay-ko =
    yes gap-ACC remove-CONN
    Yes, remove kayp(gap).

    or culture difference-ACC remove
    Or we can say "remove cultural differences."

5. S3: a yey. mwunhwa chai-lul epsayko,
    ah yes culture difference-ACC remove-CONN
    Ah, yes. "remove cultural differences."

The excerpt above is a good example that positive evidence was given to the students in a way that provided the appropriate word and its structural properties. In this negotiation, S3 requested clarification, and the teacher first clarified by rephrasing her utterance along with an explanation of the word. What is important here is that what is revealed to the student in this negotiation is not only the meaning of the word, but also positive evidence of its structural properties, including how it is used in a sentence. Thus, in terms of positive evidence, S3 is exposed to a variety of vocabulary items and information as to how gap fits into the sentence and what verb form it takes. As Pica (1994) pointed out, these types of negotiation are important sources of comprehensible input in terms of positive evidence because they make the meaning of the lexical items accessible to the student. They also provide opportunities for students to focus on the form, which raises their awareness of the discrepancies between their own interlanguage system and the target language. Attention to appropriate language items was explicitly discussed when the students asked for help due to their lack of proficiency in Korean as shown in the example above.
The second way in which the students gained access to positive evidence was through feedback, which either confirmed their attempts in using the L2 items or provided corrected forms or more appropriate forms of the L2. When they requested assurances that what they had said was correct, and their guesses were confirmed, they obtained positive evidence. They sometimes also requested a linguistic evaluation of their utterances. For example, they asked about the existence of a word they had coined, and about the appropriateness of a particular word or expression. By seeking feedback, students gained access to positive input.

1 S6: hayksilhem ha-ki ceney-nun pwukhan-i wihyep-ilako nukki-ci anhassyeyo. kuntey, hayksilhem ha-n hwuey: e: (0.4) ku kwunpiyengcayng? ani, ke: haykkyengcayng? macayo? nuclear:test do-before-TOP North Korea-NOM threat-DC-QT feel-did:not-IE:POL but unclear:test do-after the armament:race no the nuclear:race is:it;correct

Before North Korea’s nuclear test, we didn’t feel that North Korea was a threat to us. But, after the test, um... the armament race? no, no, um... nuclear race? Is it correct?

2. T: e:: yey, haykkyengcayng. yes nuclear:race

Um...yes, nuclear race.


So, we are concerned that a nuclear race will start.

In the excerpt above, S6 tries to tell the class that she is concerned that the nuclear test by North Korea might trigger a nuclear race in East Asia. However, she is unsure of the vocabulary that she intends to deliver. Thus, she attempts to confirm it
with the teacher before completing the sentence. The teacher confirms the appropriate word. Through this feedback, S6 and other class participants, could access positive evidence.

Lastly, students obtained access to positive evidence through exposure to other class participants’ statements. When students explained and developed their ideas, a lot of input was created. Ideas during class discussions were elaborated and repeated as class participants explained their opinions, responded to each other’s ideas, and made convincing arguments. Some of these discourses served as positive evidence, as many of the students were advanced speakers of Korean as a second language. However, although listening to each other provided some access to positive evidence, not all student input was target-like.

5.5.2 Production of Modified Output

This section discusses the production of modified output--the second condition for SLA mentioned in this study--and how its benefits are related to the negotiation of meaning. The role of output in negotiated interactions has been recognized in the Output Hypothesis by Swain (1985, 1995). The hypothesis states that opportunities for output during interaction may facilitate L2 learning by challenging learners to stretch their linguistic resources. Swain (1985) argued that the role of output is important, and is independent of the comprehensible input that emerges from negotiated interaction. In addition, when learners modify their output, this is evidence that they are paying attention to the gap between their interlanguage and the L2 by directly focusing on L2 forms.
In this study, production of modified output occurs in response to signals of non-understanding, or repairs from the teacher. They are provided in the form of negative feedback. Thus, production of modified output is discussed in conjunction with negative evidence provided in the form of negative feedback from the teacher.

**Modified Output and Negative Evidence**

One requirement for success in language learning is input of the target language (Krashen, 1985). Input could simply be exposure to the target language, or what is called positive evidence. As Long (1991) suggests, positive evidence alone is not enough to adequately learn a language because the learners do not necessarily notice what is correct. Positive evidence is input which provides the learner with correct, native-like examples. Negative evidence, on the other hand, provides learners with input which hopefully would indicate to the learner that his or her utterance was somehow inadequate, provided that the learner notices the negative evidence (Schmidt, 1990). Negative evidence provided in the form of negative feedback is essential for second language acquisition.

Negative feedback is commonly divided into two categories: explicit negative feedback and implicit negative feedback. Explicit negative feedback is given to a student in such a manner as to clearly and explicitly tell the student that his or her utterance was wrong, and is often accompanied with what the correct utterance should be (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Implicit negative feedback is unlike explicit feedback in that the teacher indirectly makes attempts to raise student awareness of their errors without directly saying that what they said was wrong. This form of
feedback has many varieties, which are described by Lyster and Ranta (1997) as recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, and repetition. Normally, negative evidence can be obtained through the instruction of linguistic rules, which indicates what is not allowed in the target language. However, as this course was based on content-based language instruction in which subject matter was the central focus, negative evidence during the discussions generally did not include instruction of rules and exceptions.

In this study, most negative evidence was explicit in nature, provided in response to the students’ inappropriate use of L2 items. Implicit feedback was also available. However, this type of feedback was relatively uncommon in this study. Negative evidence was for the most part, explicitly obtained during class discussions. The following excerpt illustrates teacher explicit negative feedback on student errors.

war-DC-ATTR thing:NOM people-POSS support-ACC receive-must you:know-IE:POL ruling:class at:their:discretion become-DC-ATTR thing:TOP optimistic thought-DC-CONN see-can-CONN-IE:POL I think that a war needs popular support. It is an optimistic thought to say that the ruling class can do whatever they want.

2. T: nakkwanek-i ani-kwu kuke-nun nemwu (0.4) e:: kwacangtoyn/ optimistic-NOM be:not-CONN that-TOP too exaggerated You can’t use “optimistic” here. Um...how do I say... “exaggerated?”

3. S5: ney, kwacangtoyn sayngkak-ila-ko po-l swu iss-kwu, tto hana-nun:
yes exaggerated thought-DC-CONN see-can-CONN-IE and one:thing-TOP Yes, it is an “exaggerated” thought to say that, and one more thing is...
S4 tries to explain to the class that popular support is necessary during times of war. In line 1, the student is trying to express the correct form of the adjective, but makes an error by saying *nakkwancekin* (to be optimistic) instead of *kwacangtoyn* (to be exaggerated). The teacher understands what he is trying to say and provides S4 with the correct target language version in the form of explicit negative feedback. The student responds by modifying his original utterance incorporating the feedback his teacher has just provided. As seen in the example above, it is evident that students have opportunities to modify their production through negative feedback.

In this study, students produce modified output in response to the teacher's feedback. This occurs during a process of negotiation in various ways. The first is when a student responds to the teacher's explicit negative feedback as illustrated above. Next is when a student responds to a teacher's clarification request. In the classroom, clarification requests are used as often as any other strategy. Similar to the findings in the previous studies, students in this study were more likely to modify their output in response to a teacher's clarification request than to other requests, like confirmation requests. The high number of the modification of output in response to clarification requests seems to reflect the goals of the L2 learning classroom. The main goal of a language class is to assist students in recognizing the gap between the target language model and their interlanguage through output modification, which leads them to produce more target-like utterances in the L2.
1 S8: him cengchayk
   power policy
   *Power policy*

2. T: mwe-la-kwu-yo?
   What-DC-QT-IE:POL
   *Pardon me?*

3. S8: e: kanghan cengchayk
   strong policy
   *Strong policy*

4. T: kanglyekhan cengchayk, kangkyengchayk
   strong policy hard:line:policy
   *Strong policy, a hard-line policy*

The example above shows that students provide additional information by further modifying their own utterances after the teacher's clarification request. Lyster and Ranta (1997) point out that corrective feedback and learner uptake in the classroom are incorporated when students incorporate teacher's feedback in their utterances by modifying their output. In this regard, it is evident that clarification requests play an important role in eliciting learners' modification of their output.

Students also have opportunities to modify their original utterances in response to a teacher's feedback which is provided in the form of confirmation checks when the teacher guesses what the student is trying to say and requests confirmation on the feedback.

1. S7: sensayngnim-i ce-hantey cwusin *article-ul po-myen*, keki-ey am(0.4)
   pikyocek ku kongsan: kwukmin?
   teacher(you)-NOM me-to give-ATTR article-ACC see-when there-in
   mm comparatively communist people
   According to the article that you gave me, in there, um, comparatively
   the, the communist... people?
2. T: kongsantang?
The communist party
_The communist party?

3. S7: cwung, cwungkwuk-ey...
China China-in
_China, in China...

4. T: cwungkwuk kongsantang?
Chinese communist party
_Chinese Communist Party?

5. S7: cwungkwuk-ey...
China-in
_In China...

6. T: cwungkongkwun!
Chinese communist army
_Chinese communist army!

7. S7: Okay! ya: (all laugh.) cwungkongkwun, cwungkongkwun-hako:
in.min.kwun? North Koran army?
okay yeah Chinese communist army Chinese communist army-
and North Korean army
Okay! Yeah, Chinese communist army and... North Korean army?

8. T: [yey, inminkwun. pwukhan.]
yes North Korean army
_Yes, North Korean army.

9. S7: ney, ku salamtwul-i pikyocck te salamtwul-hantey calhyacwu-kwu
kulayss-ta-kwu kulaysscanh-ayo?
yes the people-NOM comparatively more people-to be:nice-CONN
did-DC-QT you:said-IE:POL
Yes, it was written in the article that they had been good to civilians,
wasn't it?

In the excerpt above, S7 can not convey the word that she wants to say
because she forgot it, even though she had previously learned it. The teacher tries to
guess what she wants to say and then provides a word. In response to the feedback
from the teacher, the student incorporates the feedback into her utterance and modifies it.

However, a confirmation check does not always trigger modified output by students. In response to this type of feedback, students may simply confirm the teacher’s feedback by saying “yes” rather than modifying their output based on the feedback they were given. The following negotiation gives an example of a student simply confirming the teacher’s interpretation of what she is trying to say, without incorporating the feedback in her output.

1. S9: hankwuk-i honcase kyengeey palcen-ul ha-lyemyenkulikwu... kongcang kath-un kes-ul ci-ulyemyenem:: Korea-NOM on:its:own economy development-ACC do-try:if and factory:like-ATTR thing-ACC build-try:if If Korea independently tries to develop the national economy and..., for example builds a factory, um...

2. T: piyong-i manhi tul-eyo? expenses:NOM a:lot cost-IE:POL It costs a great deal?


In the excerpt above, S9 is talking to the class about how the South Korean economy developed in the 1970’s. However, before she says the verb phrase at the end of her utterance, she elongates the last word indicating that she is having difficulties with finishing the sentence. The teacher infers what she wants to say and offers an appropriate expression for the context. In response, rather than repeating or
reflecting the feedback from the teacher, S9 simply confirms the teacher’s interpretation by saying “yes.”

This is consistent with the findings in Pica’s study (1992) which focused on learner production in negotiation. She found that clarification requests indicating the learners’ unclear utterance had a major effect on whether learners modified their utterances or not. On the contrary, Pica (1992) suggests that feedbacks focusing on confirmations rarely provided students with opportunities to modify their utterances because the teacher already did all the modification that the student needed to do.

Although feedbacks on confirmations may not provide the conditions for SLA in terms of student production of modified output, it can still contribute to SLA in the form of negative evidence. Teachers in language classrooms seem to use this type of feedback as a means to provide students with negative feedback on their unclear utterances by offering a correct target language model, and requesting its confirmation. This helps the focus on what the appropriate model should be.

5.5.3 Attention to L2 form

During the negotiation of meaning during class discussions, students receive negative feedback on their errors, which focused their attention on the correct L2 form. Although explicit feedback overtly draws attention to students’ linguistic deficits and provides target forms, it is also possible that implicit feedback serves to facilitate language acquisition by helping learners notice the mismatches between their limited L2 and the target language models. Long explains that “negative feedback...in the form of implicit correction immediately following an
ungrammatical learner utterance is potentially of special utility because it occurs at a moment in conversation when the NNS is likely to be attending to see if a message got across, and to assess its effect on the interlocutor” (1996: 429).

Student “attention” plays an important role in both sides of the acquisition process in terms of attention to input and attention in production. In other words, attention is relevant to both input processing and output processing. Especially, output modification provides learners with opportunities to attend to forms. If learners are required to modify their output, they are prompted to notice the gap between their interlanguage and the target language. The results of this study, as illustrated in the excerpts so far, offer support regarding the effect of negotiation in increasing student attention to L2 form, and as a result, increasing student L2 output accuracy.

SECTION III: Other Findings

5.6 Lexical Negotiation of Meaning

The results of this study reveal that students are more focused on vocabulary than grammar when they elicit negotiation. This section discusses the lexical negotiation of meaning, and the reasons why it is readily prevalent among negotiations in this study.

There are a number of previous studies that show the negotiation of meaning is more closely related with lexical development than with morphosyntactic development. Some evidence is based on classroom studies, such as those conducted by Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Lyster (1998a, 1998b). As the key to communication, the negotiation of meaning of lexical items is essential in achieving mutual
understanding during interaction. On the other hand, the negotiation of morphosyntactic items may occur less frequently when the primary focus of communication is meaning, because it may be low in “communicative value,” and therefore do not always cause a communication breakdown.

The “communicative value” is an important factor which may be responsible for the higher frequency of the negotiation of lexical items over the negotiation of morphosyntactic items. The high communicative value of lexical items is often discussed with regards to how the negotiation of meaning can effectively promote vocabulary learning. A number of studies have supported the argument that vocabulary acquisition can take place during conversational interaction (Ellis, Tanaka & Yamazaki, 1994; Fuente, 2002). The basic premise underlying this argument is that negotiation of meaning frequently centers on the meaning of vocabulary items, as a lack of lexical knowledge often causes communication breakdowns during conversation. VanPattern (1996) also suggested that the relative communicative values of specific forms play an important role in determining whether the forms will be noticed by learners, particularly in a communicative context. In general, when processing input in an L2 learning environment, learners give priority to meaning over form, and only the most meaning-laden parts will be attended to. Lexical items, vital to comprehension, are more easily noticed by learners. On the other hand, morphosyntactic items may be very low in “communicative value.” The results of this study show that the incorrect uses of morphosyntactic items rarely block the flow of communication. The following example illustrates the negotiation over lexical items.
1. S9: yenghwa salamthul-un skhulinkhwethe-lul ceyke, ceykeha-ko siphcionha-yo. kuliko: c:
   movie makers-TOP screen:quota:system-ACC remove remove-CONN do:not.want-IE:POL and
   Moviemakers (in Korea) don't want to get rid of the "Screen Quota System," and mm...

2. T: celphyeyhako siphcion-ta-kwu…yey: (0.5) kulentey FTA-eyse naon ken skhulinkhwethe chwukso-cyo? celphyey ani-kwu.
   They don’t want to abolish it... yes. By the way, it’s not the abolishment of it, but the reduction of it in the FTA agenda, isn’t it?

3. S9: nye?
   pardon:me
   Pardon me?

4. T: chwukso.
   reduction
   Reduction.

5. S9: chwukso mwe…?
   reduction what
   What is reduction....?

   cut:down-ATTR thing
   It’s to cut something down.

7. S9: a, chwukso.*
   ah reduction
   Ah, reduction.

8. T: celphyey-nun ani-n ke kath-ayo.
   abolishment-TOP be:not-ATTR thing seem-IE:POL I don’t think that it is abolishment.

9. S9: celphyey?
   abolishment
   Abolishment?

    abolishment-TOP do:away:with-ATTR thing
    It’s to do away with something.
11. S9: a, kulayyo?
    ah is:that:so
    Ah, is that so?

12. T: ney.
    yes
    Yes.

The example above illustrates the most common mechanism that promotes vocabulary acquisition during the negotiation between teacher and student in the classroom setting. During the negotiation, learners receive modified input that might contain definitions of the new lexical items, which provide further opportunities for students to produce in their response. Along with the contextualized use of the new vocabulary by the teacher, the provided definitions of new words enable learners to acquire meaning as well as form. The process of negotiation of meaning affords opportunities for students to signal their non-understanding, and to receive input modified according to their ability allowing them to comprehend new items.

In contrast, due to its low communicative value, students’ lack of morphosyntactic knowledge did not trigger the negotiation of meaning as often as did a lack of lexical knowledge. The notion of communicative value is related to the question of whether incomprehension of a particular linguistic item will impair communication. For instance, phonological and lexical items have a high communicative value because they are necessary for comprehension. A student’s inappropriate pronunciation or limited vocabulary knowledge can easily cause a communication breakdown. On the other hand, failure to utter appropriate morphosyntactic items is less likely to result in a communication breakdown due to
incomprehension. The example below is an excerpt illustrating the incorrect use of a morphosyntactic item does not necessarily cause a communication breakdown. There is no miscommunication or signal from the teacher of the incomprehensibility of a message, although the student incorrectly say the order of the grammar structures in Korean---verb stem+ tunci an verb stem+tunci (whether A or not A).

six:party:talk-TOP different country different country-POSS choice be:not-IE:POL
The six party talks is... other countries, not a choice of other countries.

2. T: ney.
yes
Yes.

3. S8: waynyameyn, pwukhan hoytam philyoinci ku...philyotunci anin
anphilyo...tunci / (wrong form of 'philyohatunci an philyohatunci')
because North Korea talk need:whether need:whether need:whether need:or:not
Because, whether North Korea needs or not the six party talks,

4. T: nye.
yes
Yes.

5. S8: kuke-n mwuncey anieyyo. kuken pwukhan-i hayyaha-nun kes-jeeyyo.
that-TOP problem be:not-IE:POL that-TOP North Korea-NOM
do:must-ATTR thing-IE:POL
(Whether it is needed or not) That's not the problem. It's (the six party talks) something that North Korea needs to do.

6. T: kunkka, pwukhan-i yukcahoytam-ey kkok nakayahanta?
so North Korea-NOM six:party:talk in:any:case participate:must
So, what you are saying is that North Korea needs to participate in the six party talks?

7. S8: ney.
yes
Yes.
Assuming that the communicative value is one important factor in determining which aspects of language will be attended to during negotiation, it is possible to surmise that the nature of the tasks used for communication in the classroom influences the different levels of communicative value for different language items. In other words, the level of involvement for linguistic items may vary depending on the nature of the task. The more involved a target item is in a task, the more likely it is to have a communication breakdown. Loschky and Bley-Vroman (1993) have identified three degrees of involvement of a linguistic item in a task: task naturalness, task utility, and task essentialness. Loschky and Bley-Vroman define these terms below:

In task naturalness, a grammatical construction may arise naturally during the performance of a particular task, but the task can often be performed perfectly well, even quite easily, without it. In the case of task utility, it is possible to complete a task without the structure, but with the structure, the task becomes easier. The most extreme demand a task can place on a structure is essentialness: the task cannot be successfully performed unless the structure is used (p. 132).

Ideally, when planning an activity aimed at providing opportunities for students to produce the target L2 linguistic items, task essentialness is a key. However, it is seldom feasible to do so during a “classroom discussion,” because it is not easy for the teacher to control the discussion. According to Loschky and Bley-Vroman, task essentialness can more easily be incorporated into the comprehension part of tasks, while the production part of tasks may only rarely go beyond fostering task naturalness or task utility.

---

5 For this study, a “classroom discussion” is a communicative task.
Upon examination of the classroom discussion in this study which provided students with opportunities to produce grammatical structures, it was found that the lack of task essentialness seemed to be more closely associated with the low communicative value of grammatical structures. Students tended to continue their speech without having the absolute need to use correct grammatical structures. Students made the following comments on this issue:

I know when I get grammar wrong, but when I’m actually talking, I don’t put too much weight on keeping my grammar correct. (S6)

I don’t want to sit there worrying about grammar because then, I’d end up not talking at all. Because I could spend hours picking myself apart. So what I usually end up doing is, just going with the flow of the conversation and making sure that other people understood the bare bones of what I’m trying to say. (S7)

The students were often able to continue their speech without having the absolute need to use correct grammatical structures, which indicates that classroom discussions did not promote task essentialness. The following example illustrates the misuse of a lexical item, as well as morphosyntactic item, which simultaneously occurred.

North Korea needs to maintain domestic support. That is why the plans regarding North Korea's relationship with the US and its relationship with South Korea show a difference.

   plan-NOM be:not policy-NOM difference-ACC show-DC-QT
   Not, plans...that...the policies show a difference?

3. S6: cengchayk?
   policy
   Policies?

   yes policy-NOM difference-ACC show:will-DC-QT
   Yes, the policies will show a difference.

   yes policy-NOM difference-ACC see:will-IE:POL
   Yes, the policies will see a difference (the wrong form of "Yes, the policies will show a difference.")

As seen in the example above, although the teacher provided recast for the inappropriate use of morphosyntactic item, poita (to show) along with feedback for the lexical item cengchyak (policy), the meaning of the utterance intended by the student was clear, and thus it failed to bring the Korean causative verb construction form to the student's attention. In this case, the classroom discussion did not promote task essentialness. The lack of task essentialness may be responsible for the low communicative value of grammar features, and ultimately, for the low occurrence of the negotiation of meaning of these grammar features.

In summary, the results of this study suggest that the communicative value is an important factor in determining which aspects of language will be acquired through negotiation. The results demonstrate that students focused more on vocabulary than grammar when they elicited negotiation.
5.7 Factors Affecting the Negotiation of Meaning

Research on L2 classroom interaction has shown that there is relatively little negotiation between the teacher and students in the classroom context (Pica and Long, 1986; Pica, 1987). Based on their experimental studies, it is argued that the small amount of negotiation between the teacher and students resulted from the learners’ proficiency level and task type. However, these studies (Pica and Long, 1986; Pica, 1987) have drawn the conclusions based upon performances in novice-level classes, from which they obtained their data. Considering this, one can suppose that the classes were traditional language learning classes and the teachers mainly asked display questions, focusing on pattern drills and metalinguistic talk, such as grammar and vocabulary explanations.

Contrary to the findings that a small amount of negotiation of meaning occurred in L2 classes between the teacher and students, the class observed in this study offered ample opportunities for negotiation of meaning. The first reason may be that the main task in this study was classroom discussions consisting of opinion exchange with metalinguistic talk kept to a minimum. Another reason is that the class participants were at advanced levels, and the specific focus of this study was on the improvement of communicative competence.

As such factors mentioned above influenced the amount of negotiation, many other factors related to the negotiation of meaning were observed in this study. This includes factors such as: (1) learners’ L2 proficiency, (2) task type, (3) topic familiarity, (4) learners’ L1 background, and (5) cultural background. This
section discusses these five factors that affected the negotiation of meaning in this particular language learning classroom.

5.7.1 Learners' L2 Proficiency

Table 11 shows the total and average number of negotiations per student. The results reveal that the total number of negotiations for the nine classes, and the average number of negotiations, varied considerably.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Total number of negotiations (Rank)</th>
<th>Average number of negotiations</th>
<th>Oral Proficiency (ACTFL OPI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>21 (6)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Advanced Mid/High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>48 (1)</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Advanced Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>10 (8)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Advanced Mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>8 (9)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>Advanced Mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>17 (7)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Advanced Mid/High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>26 (5)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Advanced Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>28 (4)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Advanced Mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>32 (3)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Intermediate High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>43 (2)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Intermediate High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One of the important factors that affected the amount of negotiations in the classroom was the students' level of proficiency. There is some support for this in the previous negotiation studies. Pica (1987) and Holliday (1988) found that compared to low proficiency learners, advanced learners were more likely to modify their output when they perceived deficits in their production. They argued that this is because advanced learners had the L2 resources to do so. On the contrary, learners at low level were less likely to modify their output due to insufficient L2 resources, and it influenced the frequency of negotiations. While the relationship between a learners' language proficiency and the frequency of the negotiation of meaning is not entirely conclusive, it is argued that the negotiation of meaning between the teacher and low level students is more frequent as compared to negotiations with advanced level students.

For this study, according to ACTFL OPI test, the proficiency level of S1 and S5 was the highest at Advanced Mid/High, and then S3, S4, and S7 scored at the Advanced Mid level. S2 and S6 were at the next lower level, Advanced Low; and S8 and S9 were at the level of Intermediate High. If more negotiation is associated with lower proficiency levels, one would expect this to be observed in the data of this study. However, Table 11 above indicates that the finding of this study does not always support the result of previous research results. What is observable from the data is that S2, whose proficiency level is not the lowest, yielded the most negotiations. Moreover, S1 and S7, whose proficiency level is the highest yielded more negotiations than S3 and S4 whose proficiency level is similar to them. The amount of negotiations elicited by S1 or S7 was more than
twice as frequent as the negotiations of S3 or S4. In this study, although some trends confirmed by previous research were observed, student proficiency of levels did not appear to be a crucial factor affecting the amount of negotiations of meaning. This indicates that other factors must override proficiency levels in affecting the amount of negotiations in the classroom.

There appears to be factors in the classroom that effects the participation of students. For example, S4's data indicates that his level of involvement in the conversation and general talkativeness was lower than the other students'. He was not an active participant in the class discussion and performed with short utterances and the bare minimum in output. On the other hand, S7 whose proficiency was the almost same as S4 is quite talkative and made use of every available resource she had to communicate. Moreover, almost everything she did not understand got negotiated until she understood everything completely. This often resulted in long, detailed negotiations.

If we can consider student motivation as a factor in terms of their willingness to participate in discussions to the extent that they are able to, S2 and S7 would exhibit the greatest motivation, while S3 and S4 would show the lowest. Accordingly, in the data, a low level of talkativeness was one contributing factor to a low amount of negotiation, while a high level of talkativeness contributed to more negotiation occurrences.
5.7.2 Task Type

As previously mentioned in the study, if a task is to elicit many negotiations, it should require participants to exchange information. Including the requiring of information exchange, Pica et al. (1992) proposed four features of a task that can best generate conversational modifications: (1) each participant holds a difference portion of information and supplies and requests information, (2) requesting and supplying information is required, (3) participants have same or convergent goals, and (4) only one acceptable outcome is possible. Applying these criteria, the traditional class and the communicative class were compared with each other to observe the maximum effects of task types. While the communicative class consisted of communicative tasks such as classroom discussions that incorporated all four features, the traditionally designed class, which utilized teacher-centered, one way instruction, did not guarantee any of the features as necessary. In the communicative class, the participants: (1) have their own thoughts and information to share with other participants during the task activity (2) have to express their own thoughts and information to peers and their peers in return must respond (3) have the same goal of finding conclusions about given discussion topics in each class and (4) produce outcomes which are closely related to topics although they do not produce just one possible outcome. However, when students participate in the traditional class, they: (1) do not have information to exchange (2) are not required to give or request information (3) do not have the same goal in communication and (4) may produce acceptable outcomes although they may not be communication-oriented.
However, these four differences do not seem to be sufficient enough to account for the superiority of the communicative tasks such as classroom discussions. One other feature that makes the communicative task a strong impetus for negotiation is that both interlocutors engaging in the task must understand the information given by each interlocutor, as well as accurately convey their own information to the other. Just requiring information to be exchanged is not enough. Without understanding and being understood, the completion of the task is not plausible. In the language classroom, when learners are given opportunities to engage in meaningful communicative activities, they are compelled to initiate the negotiation of meaning to express and clarify their intentions, thoughts, opinions, etc., in a way which permits them to arrive at a mutual understanding. In fact, when a communication breakdown occurs, the interlocutors in the communicative task are forced to engage in negotiation, while those doing other types of tasks may continue along with unresolved communication problems. It seems logical to assume that based upon this distinct contrast, the communicative task is more effective than other tasks in regards to promoting the negotiation of meaning.

As discussed so far, task type turns out to be a strong factor in the elicitation of the negotiation of meaning in an L2 classroom. In negotiation elicitations, the requirement for participants to understand each other’s information or message is suggested as one of the main factors for making a task effective. In this vein, classroom discussion employed in this study is a more effective task than other tasks. Consequently, it offers ample opportunities for the negotiation of meaning.
5.7.3 Topic Familiarity

The analysis of the data indicated that some of the factors that affected the differences in negotiation frequency not only across individuals but also across recorded classes, were related to the topic or to the content of the class discussion.

Topic familiarity and its effect on negotiation frequency have been mentioned as one of the variables of task type in negotiation research. Varonis and Gass (1984) found that when research subjects participated in unfamiliar tasks as compared to familiar tasks, they were most likely to produce more negotiations. This finding is also supported by Pica (1992), who said that when topics are familiar, participants do not need to negotiate as often because they are faced with fewer communication breakdowns. However, results of this study do not support this finding. Table 12 shows the number of negotiation for each of the nine classes and the topics of each class discussion.
Table 12. Topics and the Number of Negotiation for each Class Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>The Number of Negotiations</th>
<th>Discussion Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KH** D1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>The Conflict between the Left and Right in regards to the Political Situation of Korea after Liberation—What sort of country will be established?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH D2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Discussion regarding the Major Participants in the Korean War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH D3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Economic Policies of the 3rd and 4th Republic of Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH D4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>The Origin and Solution for Regional Hostilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH D5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Reunification of the Koreas, and Security Issues for the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH D6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>The Future of Labor Unions and Management—The Point of View of Labor, Management, and Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH D7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>The Korean Peninsula Issue and the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH D8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mock Six-Party Talks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH D9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>The Future of the US-Korea Relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*KH = Korean modern history, **D = discussion)

First, when the frequency of negotiations is observed, there are noticeable differences in the number of negotiations which occurred in each of the 6 classes. D5 had the highest number of negotiations at 30 and D7 had the next highest at 34 negotiations. The least amount of negotiations occurred in D4 with 17, followed by D3 at 19 negotiations. Although each discussion was similarly conducted, each class produced a different number of negotiations. This can be attributed to and explained by student familiarity on the task topic.
According to the previous research results, fewer negotiations occurred between participants when the topic of discussion was familiar. On the other hand, if the topic was unfamiliar, a higher number of negotiations were observed because of the higher number of communication breakdowns. However, in this study, the opposite results were observed. The discussions which had the most amount of negotiations were D5 (Reunification of the Koreas, and Security Issues for the U.S.) and D7 (The Korean Peninsula Issue and the U.S.). The discussions with the fewest amount of negotiations were D3 (Economic Policies of the 3rd and 4th Republic of Korea) and D4 (The Origin and Solution for Regional Hostilities). When the two sets of discussions are compared, it can be concluded that D5/D7 topics were more familiar to the students.

The topics of D5 and D7 were related to U.S. security issues and diplomatic policies which are topics that are accessible to students aside from the academic arena, such as through the media. In contrast, D3 and D4 had topics which were related to modern Korean history that may have required more background knowledge about Korean domestic issues. Although most of the students are Korean-Americans and the majority of these students have a deep understanding regarding Korean society and culture, these topics were most likely unfamiliar to them. In this study, there was a higher frequency of negotiations during conversations that dealt with familiar topics as opposed to conversations that dealt with unfamiliar topics. These results contrast with the results from previous studies conducted on negotiations. These contrasting results can be explained by taking the students' level of interest into account.
The issue of student interest on a topic has rarely been dealt with in previous negotiation research. However, it is likely that such interest serves as an important role in motivating students to talk, as well as to actively participate in the debate despite insufficient L2 knowledge. The rationale behind this is that when students are interested in topics, they tend to be more motivated to make their message understood, produce more speech, and make efforts to understand what the interlocutor says. All of this can lead to increased negotiation. A student made the following comment on this issue:

Well...I definitely think that I felt closer to discussion topics that were related to the US and Korea’s relationship with the US. For one thing, it’s because I’m an American and secondly, I had opportunities to talk about these issues even before I started this program. For example, the issue of North Korean nuclear weapons is constantly on television and my parents even talk about it a lot. (S1)

The student’s comment above provides evidence from her point of view that when she is interested in a specific topic, she is more likely to make efforts to talk about it and listen to it.

5.7.4 L1 Background

There is no doubt that the native language of the L2 learner influences their second language learning at various linguistic levels (i.e., phonological, lexical or syntactic). However, how strong an influence it has still remains controversial. For example, native language influence is most readily detected at the phonological
level. Learners prevent their native language accents from appearing in their L2 output. Learners having the same native language carry the same accents. This sharing of particular accents from their L1 may partly account for occasions where in talking in a second language, learners with the same L1 can more readily understand each than talking with someone whose native language is different from their own. There are also cases that show even inadequate forms of the target language are understandable among learners with the same L1. In this vein, the same L1 background of learners may reduce opportunities to initiate negotiation of meaning. In this study, the participants consisted of English native speakers only. Since they have the same L1 background, when they substituted inappropriate forms of the target language with L1 utterances, they were understood among the rest of the students.

North Korea isn’t making nuclear weapons to exercise hegemony in East Asia, but rather for its own... safety? ...I believe they’re making nuclear weapons for protection.

2. T: ney.
   yes
   Yes.

In the excerpt above, the student pronounces hegemony with an English accent, not using Korean-style pronunciation. Although the student does not use
Korean pronunciation, it is acceptable and conveyable to other class participants without any communication breakdown because they have the same L1. Thus, a common L1 among students can be a factor that may reduce opportunities to initiate the negotiation of meaning among class participants in this study.

Besides the influence of a students' L1, direct use of L1 can also be a factor contributing to the reduction of negotiation opportunities. Although teachers asked students not to speak English for pedagogical purposes in the classroom, it was often used as a strategy, namely, code switching, to resolve communication problems and promote mutual understanding. As discussed in the portion regarding signals, code switching seems to decrease the amount of negotiation that is needed to solve incomplete understanding, which likely would have provided more extensive negotiation if neither party had previous knowledge of English. Moreover, despite the fact that most language teachers agree with previous research results, an avoidance of extensive negotiations by students may be the case in classroom discussion, particularly to make more efficient use of time and perhaps also due to other individual reasons.

In summary, English was the learners' L1 used in the classroom in this study, and its use often made negotiation unnecessary or shorter, thereby reducing the opportunities of extensive negotiation and the use of the L2 (Korean) to its fullest extent. The use of the students' L1 in negotiation has not been specially discussed in previous literature. This is because most negotiation studies were conducted in settings where participants were strongly asked to speak in the target language because the entire point of those studies was to elicit negotiation. In this
study, however, it was important to not control the use of the students’ L1, English, in order to gain a realistic understanding of the situations where students had to engage in negotiation in a content-based KSL classroom.

5.7.5 Cultural Background

The importance of a learner’s cultural background with regard to the negotiation of meaning in an L2 classroom lies in the fact that a culture influences the interaction styles of a class member belonging to that culture. Everyone under the same culture shares social values and those shared values restrict the members’ linguistic behaviors, such as interaction styles. The very interaction styles specific to a culture may have influenced its members’ initiation of negotiation.

Sato (1982) shows how different cultural values of learners affect their styles of interaction with their teacher in the classroom. She divided subjects into Asian and non-Asian groups, and found that Asian students were more reluctant to self-initiate their speech, and more dependent on the teacher’s signals for opportunities to speak in the class. She argues that it is not attributed to their personality of being shy, but to different notions of teacher-student relations across the two groups. That is, Asians saw the teacher as an authority figure and thought it was inappropriate to initiate speech without the teacher’s permission in the classroom. She concluded that different cultures represent different social values, which bring out acceptable attitudes toward the teacher and result in different styles of interaction with the teacher among learners. Since cultural norms regulate student interaction styles, then it seems reasonable to think that the different styles
of interaction due to differences in cultural norms between interlocutors may affect the negotiation of meaning in their interaction, namely, in its amount and type.

This applies to this study. This study is primarily made up of heritage learners. The heritage learners were either born in the United States, or immigrated to the U.S. at a young age. As U.S. citizens, these learners went through the American education process and received their education in English. However, irrespective of where they were born, most of these learners communicate with family members in Korean and have become familiar with the Korean language as well as the Korean way of thinking. In addition, Korean cultural norms affect the students who are learning Korean from a Korean instructor, and also affect the interaction style that occurs in the classroom. A student’s remarks below confirm this:

There definitely is a difference talking to a Korean instructor than to an American instructor. Well, first, it’s the language. In English, you pretty much talk to everyone in the same manner but in Korean, there’s the honorifics issue. If you speak to your elder, say grandparents, parents, or a teacher, you have to use honorifics. So, in a classroom setting, it’s natural to speak to a Korean instructor for a Korean class with more, should I say, caution? Well, because the culture is hierarchical, you have to consider that. In an American class conducted in English, I can ask the professor questions and debate within the classroom setting, permitting that it’s not rude. But, I know that in a Korean class taught by a Korean teacher, there are cultural norms to follow. I wouldn’t ask too directly or contest the instructor outright. Not only that, the professors also talk to you differently. Korean professors can choose not to use honorifics and it kind of brings the teacher and student closer...by setting roles, placing each person in their respectively positions in the hierarchy. So it kind of limits how and what I say to the teachers, restricts certain conversations. (S3)

Of the 9 participants, 7 are heritage learners and 2 are non-heritage learners. However, the 2 non-heritage learners have had experience living in Korea and are familiar with the Korean way of thinking, as well as the language itself.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to describe the negotiation of meaning that takes place between the teacher and the students in a content-based KSL classroom. Despite the widely accepted view that the negotiation of meaning is the most important part of an L2 learning environment, previous research on negotiation has been limited in cognitive approaches which have revealed the role of negotiation and that it promotes language acquisition. However, these studies have failed to account for the general characteristics of the negotiation of meaning, for example (1) why and how negotiations of meaning occur, (2) their specific characteristics, and (3) what factors affect these negotiations. In this vein, this study examined naturally occurring negotiation of meaning between a teacher and students in a content-based KSL classroom.

The central issues to be explored in this study were: (1) what types of “trouble sources” trigger negotiation, (2) what types of “signals” occur in relation to trouble sources, and (3) what types of “responses” occur in relation to signals? It also explored how the negotiation of meaning supports conditions claimed to facilitate second language learning and acquisition: (1) learners’ comprehension of L2 input, (2) their production of modified output, and (3) their attention to L2 form. In addition, the factors that affect the negotiation of meaning in the L2 classroom are investigated.

In this final chapter, the summary of major findings will be presented. Limitations of this study and instructional implication will be presented; and finally, concluding remarks will be given.
6.1 The Summary of Research Findings

Trouble Sources in the negotiation of meaning

The first set of findings was the identification of various trouble sources of communication difficulty between the teacher and the students in the content-based KSL class. Through careful examination, trouble sources were identified and categorized into two main types depending on who triggered the negotiation: (1) trouble sources triggered by teacher and (2) trouble sources triggered by student. The analysis was divided depending on who triggered the negotiation, the student or the teacher. Interestingly, nearly all trouble sources resulted from students’ utterances. One of the reasons for this was that the environment for this study was designed for classroom debate discussing specific subject matter as a portion of content-based language learning. Within the context of discussing a subject in a classroom, it is assumed that students will actively participate in debate. Students may have difficulty in producing what they want to say, or may make errors in their utterances while holding the floor. Secondly, language teachers tend to adjust or modify their speech according to the learners’ level of proficiency by resorting to various kinds of teacher talk. Such teacher behavior contributes to reducing the amount of difficulty students have in understanding what the teacher said, thus reducing the number of trouble source triggered by the teacher.

Trouble sources by students were identified and categorized into two main types: (1) “students’ linguistic resource deficits” and (2) “students’ inappropriate language use.” Before uttering statements, students may experience production problems in retrieving what they want to say. These types of trouble sources occurred
due to students' insufficient language resources. Thus, they were categorized into "students' linguistic resource deficits." On the contrary, students' inadequate use of target language such as inaccurate pronunciation or inappropriate word choice may result in communication breakdown. They were grouped into the category of "students' inappropriate language use."

In comparing the frequency of trouble sources between "students' linguistic resource deficits" and "students' inappropriate language use," the amount of trouble sources in the category of "students' linguistic resource deficits" were almost twice as frequent as those in the category of "students' inappropriate language use." In the classroom discussion setting, students may experience production problems in retrieving the words or expressions at high levels or come across the situation that they must come up with unexpected language items during the debate. Thus, these features of class environment may lead to the result where students had more trouble sources due to their insufficient language resource rather than due to the inappropriate language use.

**Signals in the Negotiation of Meaning**

The negotiation process generally begins with either an interlocutor's signaling a communication breakdown or the speaker signaling when they experience production problems. This study divides signals into two categories, "teacher-initiated signals" and "student-initiated signals" indicating students' trouble sources. The data analysis shows that signal types are closely related to the types of trouble sources preceding the signal. This study focused only on trouble sources triggered by the
students because nearly all trouble sources resulted from students' utterances. The results revealed that when the trouble sources occurred due to "students' linguistic resource deficits," signals were initiated by the students because they needed to indicate their production problem. On the contrary, when the type of trouble sources was "students' inappropriate language use," the signals were initiated by the teacher because the teacher needed to indicate students' inaccurate productions to resolve communication breakdown.

A noticeable difference can be observed between both signal groups. As for the teacher-initiated signals, 100% of all signals resulted from students' incorrect utterances. In contrast, the reverse was identified for student-initiated signals. Of all the signals indicated by the students, 99% resulted from students' language resource deficit. These results suggest specific features of classroom negotiations. First, they reveal the evidence demonstrating differences in the roles played by the teacher and students in the language classroom. As discussed before, in terms of the asymmetrical relationship between the teacher and the student, the teacher can be said to play the dominant role of language teaching in the classroom. The teacher must indicate when a student has made an incorrect utterance in order to provide appropriate feedback. Likewise, students rely on the teacher when they come across communication difficulties due to lack of L2 knowledge, and their need to avoid communication breakdown leads them to use a variety of signals indicating their difficulty to the teacher.

In this study, the types of signals were grouped into four major categories in student-initiated signals and three major categories in teacher-initiated signals.
respectively. First of all, when it came to student-initiated signals, what is notable was the overt indication of insufficient L2 knowledge. Students used the appeal for help with code switching the most frequently in the class when they faced communication difficulties due to their limited L2 proficiency. One reason for this may be due to the discussion format of this class. Students were challenged to use words and grammar that they had not studied depending on the topic or activity in classroom discussions. Another explanation for the frequent use of appeals for help with code switching may have been that the students regarded the teacher as their main source for learning vocabulary. In the classroom, when the students encountered a word that they did not know or had difficulty with in their productions, they requested that the teacher provided the appropriate word. This may be more prevalent in the classroom as time constraints that prevent teacher from explaining every L2 items that students do not know.

The accepted use of English by students in the classroom may deprive students of opportunities to use L2. However, simple code switching appears to be effective in that the teacher must participate in the negotiation of meaning before providing the students with the target item. Another advantage of the simple use of code switching is that it is beneficial in reducing time and effort in the classroom. The simple use of code switching is easy and shortens the amount of time and effort which must be taken for all class members evenly.

Own accuracy check is the second most frequently used signal type by the students in the study. In the classroom, when students are grammatically unsure of the language item that they intend to deliver, they attempt to confirm it from the teacher
before using it. Own accuracy check is one of the easiest ways for the students to let the teacher know that they want to prevent communication breakdown by using incorrect language items. By pinpointing the specific part of the utterance where the student is unsure of its correctness, own accuracy check serves as an effective signal in helping the teacher identify the student’s communication difficulty before it occurs.

The fact that own accuracy check occurs considerably in the classroom reflects the goals and expectations required in the language learning classroom. The teacher’s role in language learning classrooms must be to deal with not only with the occurrence of problem but also the prevention of the occurrences. Although the prevention of problem occurrence often limits the way students participate in negotiation because they deprive students of the opportunities to negotiate, the students believe that it is one of the most important roles of teachers. On the contrary, as for the student’s role, the use of own accuracy check indicates that they are an active participant in the classroom.

Circumlocution and trailing off are also signal strategies frequently used by students when they experience production problems. Circumlocution involves exemplifying, illustrating or describing the properties of the target object or action with words that a speaker knows until the teacher understands what they are trying to say. Trailing off occurs when the student does not finish the end of the sentence and the teacher subsequently completes it by guessing what the student wants to say.

When it comes to the teacher-initiated signals, the results show that they can be characterized by two main kinds of signals: “other repair” and “clarification request.” The most frequently used strategy for indicating trouble source was “other
It means that the teacher attempted primarily to correct students' inappropriate L2 use in the classroom in order to provide them with a target language model. The second most frequently used signal was "clarification request." This evidence also suggests that students' insufficient L2 speaking abilities result in an increase in the number of the teacher's signals for clarification. The important thing is that the type of trouble source preceding the teacher's signals was the students' inappropriate L2 use. When the teacher identifies trouble sources in students' utterances, he most likely modifies part of the students' preceding statements or substitutes them with the target language model.

There were a few reasons the "other repair" was most frequently used by the teacher as a signal rather. First, providing overt correction is perhaps more efficient in terms of time and effort when dealing with a breakdown compared to requesting that the students, whose command of the L2 is still inadequate, clarify their own utterance. Another reason the teacher may prefer "other repair" is that this method lead to the class conversation running more smoothly. The teacher rarely corrected the students' errors implicitly because doing so would take the focus off of the main goal of communication.

Clarification request was the second most frequently used signal by the teacher. The use of clarification request as a signal in the negotiation seems to be more closely tied to participant roles and the goals of a language classroom. The goal of language learning class is to provide students with an environment for second language acquisition, namely the opportunity of interactive negotiation between participants. Therefore, it is obvious that clarification request plays a crucial role as a
signal in that it prompts students to clarify and modify their inaccurate utterances through interaction with the teacher. Moreover, a teacher requests clarification because he does not understand the meaning of the student’s utterance, and because the student’s utterance is not appropriate to the context. Either way, it is evident that the teacher provides feedback on the acceptability of students’ utterance and the students clarify or modify their utterances in response to the teacher’s feedback.

Responses in the Negotiation of Meaning

The responses are carried out after the signal in negotiation sequence and they play a role in reflecting the way the receiver of the signal interprets the previous speaker’s communication problems and in the attempts to resolve those problems. The data illustrates that the types of responses are related to the preceding signals. The types of responses are divided into two main categories based on this point “teacher response followed by student-initiated signal” and “student response followed by teacher-initiated signal.” First of all, what is most revealing is that most of the responses provided by the teacher were related to the providing an appropriate form. Student-initiated signals tended to be indications of communication breakdowns such as difficulties in producing what students intended to say. As a result, the teacher provided appropriate language items as a response. It is notable that the providing an appropriate form responses by the teacher varies and has distinct functions depending on the context in negotiation.

Lexical substitution was the most typical response form when students employed codeswitching to appeal for help. In order to respond to the students’
signals for assistance, the teacher substituted an L2 equivalent as a response for the code switched item in English by students.

When the signals were “retrieval” and “trailing off,” sentence completion types as responses were frequent. The students tend to use these strategies as an indirect signal to prompt the teacher to provide appropriate word as a response. In this case, the teacher responds to the signal in the form of sentence completion.

Teacher responses identified in reacting to own accuracy check signals by students can be grouped into two main types: a teacher’s providing appropriate forms and a teacher’s providing acknowledgement responses. The first type, providing an appropriate form, suggests that own accuracy check signals were perceived by the teacher to be appealing for help. A teacher assumes that students experience production difficulty, and request help for what they intend to say. In response, a teacher provides appropriate items if the students’ utterances are not correct. Secondly, own accuracy check signals can be perceived by the teacher as confirmation checks when students’ utterances are correct and acceptable. This response implies that students’ accuracy checks are relevant and a teacher assumes that no further information would be necessary.

When it came to response types given by the students across preceding teacher-initiated signal, certain characteristics were identified. First of all, when response is followed by “other repair,” the most frequently used by a teacher, “repetition of signal” dominates students’ responses. While various types of responses were identified in the data, repetition of signal was used most frequently by students’ “other repair” signals. Acknowledgement responses were identified in the
category of “other repair” signal, which simply provided acknowledgment utterances such as “yes.” The use of this response appears to suggest that students had more difficulties comprehending teacher’s feedback as a result of their limited competencies.

Next, it is revealed that many student responses were carried out in the form of ‘modification of trouble source’ when a response is followed by a “clarification request” signal. While students may interpret teacher’s clarification request as an indication of communication difficulty, teachers tend to request clarification to look for better information related to the student’s initial utterance. Students provide additional information by further modifying their own utterances that triggered the signal, assuming that their initial utterances were insufficient.

The Negotiation of Meaning and Three Conditions Necessary for SLA

This study explores how the negotiation of meaning supports conditions claimed to facilitate second language learning and acquisition: (1) learners’ comprehension of L2 input, (2) their production of modified output, and (3) their attention to L2 form.

The results show that comprehensible input is provided in negotiation when the teacher or students adjust their utterances to make them more comprehensible to a speaker. Production of modified output occurs when students utter in response to signals of trouble source or feedbacks from the teacher. Attention to form is also evident in negotiation when students receive positive or negative input from the teacher and they modify their output.
First, the negotiation of meaning helps make input comprehensible. One way in which negotiation makes input comprehensible is that when communication breakdown occurs, appropriate language forms are provided. Another way negotiation makes input comprehensible is by adding redundancy through elaboration. However, elaboration rarely occurred in this study because class discussions did not provide enough time.

It is also important to note that when comprehensible input occurs, positive evidence about L2 form is provided to students. In this classroom there were three ways in which the students gained access to the various types of positive evidence through comprehensible input. The first way in which the students obtained access to positive evidence was through seeking assistance for which they received modified input. Students tend to request help in producing language items that they do not know on various levels: word, phrase, and sentence. What is important here is that what is gained in this way is not only the meaning of the word, but also positive evidence of its structure properties including how it is used in a sentence. The second way in which the students gained access to positive evidence was through feedback which either confirmed their guesses or provided corrected forms or more appropriate forms. When they requested assurances that what they had said was correct and their guesses were confirmed, they obtained positive evidence. Lastly, the students obtained access to positive evidence through being exposed to other class participants' statements. When the students explained and developed their ideas, it led to a great deal of input. However, not all student input was target-like, so although
listening to each other provided some access to positive evidence, it was not always the case.

The results reveal that production of modified output occurs when students utter in response to signals of trouble source or feedbacks from the teacher which are provided in the form of negative feedback. Negative feedback is commonly divided into two categories: explicit negative feedback and implicit negative feedback. In this study, most negative evidence was explicit in nature, provided in response to the students' inappropriate use of L2 item. Implicit feedback was also available. However, this type of feedback was relatively uncommon. There were reasons why explicit negative feedback frequently occurred across the classes investigated. First, providing overt correction is efficient in terms of time and effort when dealing with a breakdown. Essentially, offering a model of inappropriate items in the target language and having the student confirm it is more economical than having the student try to clarify their errors. Another reason explicit negative feedback is preferred is because it may lead to communication in the class running smoothly. The teacher rarely implicitly corrected the students' errors because doing so would take the focus off the main goal of communication.

Besides a teacher's negative feedback, students also produce modified output when they respond to a teacher's clarification request. The high number of modification of output in response to clarification request seems to reflect the goals of L2 learning classroom. The main goal of language class is that students are expected to recognize the gap between the target language model and their interlanguage through output modification to make their utterances more accurate and target-like L2.
Students also have opportunities to modify their original utterances in response to a teacher's feedback provided in the form of confirmation checks when the teacher guesses what the student is trying to say and requests confirmation of it. However, confirmation request does not always provide students with opportunities to modify their utterances because the teacher already did all the work. Instead, another aspect of it can be considered in terms of contribution to SLA in the form of negative evidence. Teachers in the class seem to use it as a means to provide the student with negative feedback about their unclear utterances by offering a correct target language model and request confirmation of it. This helps the student draw attention to what the appropriate model should be.

During the negotiation of meaning in class discussions, the students receive negative feedback of their errors which would have focused their attention to the form of L2. Although explicit feedback overtly draws attention to students' linguistic deficits and provides target forms, it is also possible that implicit feedback serves to facilitate SLA by helping learners notice the mismatches between their limited L2 and target language models.

**Lexical Negotiation of Meaning**

The study revealed that students more focused on vocabulary than grammar when they elicit negotiation. In general, when processing input in an L2 learning environment, learners give priority to meaning over form, and only the most meaning-laden parts will be attended to. Lexical items, being the key to comprehension, are more easily noticed by learners. On the other hand, negotiations
over morphosyntactic items may occur less frequently because they may be low in communicative value, and therefore do not always cause a communication breakdown.

Factors Affecting Negotiation of Meaning

Many factors related to the negotiation of meaning were observed in the this study. This includes factors such as: (1) learners’ L2 proficiency, (2) task type, (3) topic familiarity, (4) learners’ L1 background, and (5) cultural background.

An important factor that affected the amount of negotiations in the classroom was the student’s level of proficiency. In this study, although some trends confirmed by previous research were observed, proficiency of students did not appear to be a crucial factor affecting the amount of the negotiation of meaning. This indicates that another factors overrides proficiency level in affecting the amount of negotiations in the classroom, namely “talkativeness.” The data showed that a low level of talkativeness was one contributing factor to a low amount of negotiation while a high level of talkativeness contributed to more negotiation occurrences.

The results showed that task type turned out to be a strong factor in the elicitation of the negotiation of meaning in an L2 classroom. In negotiation elicitations, the requirement for participants to understand each other’s information or message was suggested as one of the main factors for making a task effective. In this vein, classroom discussion employed in this study was a more effective task than other tasks. Consequently, it offered ample opportunities for the negotiation of meaning.
The data also indicated that negotiation frequency was related to the topic familiarity. In this study, there was a higher frequency of negotiations during conversations that dealt with familiar topics as opposed to conversations that dealt with unfamiliar topics. According to the results of previous research, fewer negotiations occurred between participants when the topic of discussion was familiar. On the other hand, if the topic happened to be unfamiliar, a higher number of negotiations were observed because of communication breakdowns. However, in this study, quite the opposite results were observed. These contrasting results can be explained by taking the students’ level of interest into account. The rationale behind this is that when students are interested in topics, they tend to be more motivated to make the message understood, produce more speech, and make efforts to understand what the interlocutor says. All of this can lead to increased negotiation.

The results also confirmed that learners’ L1 background and cultural background affected the negotiation frequency and style that occurred in an L2 classroom. The same L1 background of learners may reduce opportunities to initiate the negotiation of meaning. In this study, the participants consisted of English native speakers. Since they had the same L1 background, when they substituted inappropriate forms of target language with L1 utterances, they were understandable among the rest of the students. Besides the influence of students’ L1, direct use of it also can be a factor contributing to the reduction of negotiation opportunities. The use of English as learners’ L1 in the classroom of this study often makes negotiation unnecessary or shorter, therefore reducing the opportunities of extensive negotiation and use of the L2 (Korean) to the fullest extent.
The importance of a learner's cultural background with regard to the negotiation of meaning in an L2 classroom lies in the fact that a culture influences interaction styles of a class member belonging to that culture. Since the participants in the study are familiar with the Korean way of thinking as well as the language itself, the Korean cultural norms affect the students who are learning Korean from a Korean instructor and also affect the interaction style that occurs in the classroom.

6.2 Limitations of the Study

In addition to the methodological limitations mentioned in Chapter 3, some general limitations apply to this study. First, this study is narrow in scope. It was conducted in one classroom, examining negotiation in one activity (classroom discussion) and at a specific proficiency level (advanced level), and as such the generalizability of the results are limited. Due to the small scope of the study and the fact that the research setting is at specific proficiency level, the results are not widely generalizable. Davis (1992:606) explains that in qualitative studies, the focus is not on generalizability, but on the transferability of the working hypotheses which developed out of the study. In this study, there is a thorough description of each phase of the negotiation of meaning and there are numerous excerpts of negotiation with a careful analysis of each and a discussion of factors which influenced the results. Taken together, they provide a detailed description of the setting which makes transferability judgments possible.

Another limitation is that, because of the detailed description of the negotiation process, the wide-ranging nature of the negotiation of meaning was not
explored in enough depth. Because the purpose of this study was to describe the whole process of negotiation, the priority was placed on detailed analysis rather than comprehensiveness. In particular, the nature of the classroom environment, such as the teacher's scaffolding and the collaborative efforts of the whole class may need to be investigated in more depth. Also, additional analysis of the non-linguistic devices would reflect the various ways the teacher and student access the negotiation of meaning and the different mechanisms they employ to cope with the communication problems.

6.3 Instructional Implications

As shown in the interview data of this study, students' opinions regarding the negotiation of meaning fell into two categories. Some students felt that language learning was effectively accomplished through negotiations while others felt that negotiations only served to complicate the learning process.

Inspired by the research literature that views negotiation as essential to language development, teachers attempt to put the claim into practice in their own classes, but it is not always successful because some students are not as enthusiastic about negotiation. To increase students' access to the negotiation of meaning, there is a need to develop particular meaning-based tasks and activities which promote contributions from the students so that the teacher and student can negotiate with each other for language development. Activities which focuses on form are called for by Lightbown and Spada (1990) and Long (1996). Long (1996:441) explains that "tasks which stimulate negotiation for meaning may turn out to be one among several useful
language-learning activities in or out of classrooms, for they may be one of the easiest ways to facilitate a learner’s focus on form without losing sight of a lesson’s (or conversation’s) predominant focus on meaning.”

Also, the role of the teacher in the negotiation processes emerges as an important issue. It is possible for the teacher to try to encourage students to elicit communication difficulties. Thus, the quality of the negotiation of meaning is more in the hands of the teacher than of the students. During the negotiation of meaning process, teachers need to shift their roles as scaffolders and arbitrators of interaction in order to increase opportunities for students to participate in the negotiation. In particular, the teacher’s role becomes crucial for students who are reluctant to join interaction because of their faces and lack of interaction skills, among other reasons.

Lastly, it is necessary that the value of negotiation should be emphasized to the students. Students’ awareness of how to benefit from negotiation can be more difficult to raise than teachers’ awareness of how to run them. It is suggested that a way to motivate students to negotiate is to provide them with principled reasons for adopting the cognitive and social behaviors required in a classroom for negotiation.

6.4 Concluding Remarks

So far there has been a significant amount of research that demonstrates the effectiveness of negotiations in SLA. However, there has not been much research conducted on negotiations in actual classroom settings with regards to 1) why and how they occur, 2) their specific characteristics, and 3) what factors affect these
negotiations. This study examines these attributes of negotiations in a content-based KSL classroom.

The first distinct characteristic to note in this study is that most of the negotiations focused on vocabulary. Previous literature supports this finding. Next, characteristics of negotiations in this study, which specifically occur in language-classroom environments, can be cited. Data indicated that negotiations occurred for the purpose of acquiring a target language in a classroom.

When the negotiations initiated by students were examined, most negotiations were appeals for help or confirmation in the form of code switching or own accuracy checks. The negotiations of this type are the most basic and effective ways to resolve production difficulties in the classroom. The students seem to be well aware of the role of the teacher in a classroom and utilize the teacher as an effective resource. As mentioned already, there were many student-initiated negotiations for confirmation and/or corrections before their attempts of actual utterances. The reasons for the high frequency of this type of negotiations are closely related to the fact that the research occurred in a classroom situation. First reason is that the classroom model was a discussion-oriented one. Unlike general lecture classes and traditional language classes, discussion-oriented classrooms provide more opportunities for the students to make utterances. Not only that, the communication flow is crucial. As students give their opinions during discussions, they work under a time constraint to solve any linguistic issues while they still have the floor. The time restraints as well as other restraints within a classroom setting cause the students to ask for assistance and/or confirmation before utterances. This, in turn, leads to the negotiation of meaning.
Next to note are the types of negotiations initiated by the teacher. It can be noted that nearly half of teacher-initiated negotiations is in the form of “other repair.” The issue with “other repair,” in terms of the negotiation of meaning, is that many students tend to not modify their errors after the teacher shows them the correct form, rather, they tend to make simple acknowledgements of the teacher’s feedbacks. Not only that, sometimes, the students do not even react to “other repair.” Although it is important for the students to reconsider their errors, it is difficult to garner such effects in this type of classroom situation. However, there also are positive aspects of “other repair.” Through “other repair” students are exposed to target language models and can receive negative evidence to modify their original utterances.

The results of this study revealed that negotiations through clarification requests fulfilled three conditions for successful SLA: input comprehensibility, modified output, and attention to form. This fact has already been proven in previous research. However, the frequency of clarification requests was not very high in comparison with other types of negotiations. Although it is difficult to carry out, negotiation attempts using clarification requests appear to be the best choice for providing an effective language learning environment.

Students’ opinions regarding the negotiation of meaning fell into two categories. Some students felt that language learning was effectively accomplished through negotiations while others felt that negotiations only served to complicate the learning process. They think that for advanced level learners the process of negotiations can be an unnecessary and overly intentional process that contributes only to the wasting of time. However, some students realize on their own that
negotiations can provide opportunities for students to evaluate and correct their errors. Students made comments on the negotiation of meaning in the class the following:

Many times during class when the teacher tried to negotiate, I knew that people felt frustrated because they just wanted the teacher to give them the correct word.

We just want the discussion to be exciting and for it to go smoothly without interruptions... well seeming interruptions caused by negotiation.

I personally liked it when the teacher negotiated because even if I wanted the discussion to go smoothly, I wanted to learn the appropriate words and the correct vocab.

I think negotiating the meaning of an unfamiliar word is more helpful to me than if the teacher just told me the answer. It makes me think. I think that’s important. I mean, if the teacher just told me the meaning of the word right away, I would most likely forget it. But, let’s say the teacher negotiated the meaning with me, then I would remember the process it took for me to reach the correct conclusion, and it would help me remember the word more easily.

As a learner, realizing the usefulness of negotiations can be very encouraging and helpful. This naturally demonstrates the fact that negotiations of meaning, for the purposes of language learning, are highly effective and necessary.
# APPENDIX A: LIST OF COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES AND THEIR DEFINITIONS
(adapted from Dornyei and Scott, 1997)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION &amp; EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other repair</td>
<td>Correcting something in the interlocutor’s speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex) Speaker ... because our tip went wrong ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker: Oh, you mean the tap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker: Tap, tap ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code switching</td>
<td>Including L1/L3 words with L1/L3 pronunciation in L2 speech; this may involve stretches of discourse ranging from single words to whole chunks and even complete turns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex) Using the Latin ferrum for “iron.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal for help</td>
<td>Trying to elicit help from the interlocutor directly or indirectly by expressing lack of a needed L2 item either verbally or nonverbally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex) it’s a kind of old clock so when it strucks er ... I don’t know, one, two, or three ‘clock then a bird is coming out. What’s the name?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own accuracy check</td>
<td>Checking that what you said was correct by asking a concrete question or repeating a word with a question intonation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex) I can see a huge snow... snowman? snowman in the garden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification request</td>
<td>Requesting explanation of an unfamiliar meaning structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex) What do you mean?, You saw what? Also ‘question repeats,’ that is, echoing a word or a structure with a question intonation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation check</td>
<td>Requesting confirmation that one heard or understood something correctly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex) Repeating the trigger in a ‘question repeat’ or asking a full question, such as You said...?, You mean...?, Do you mean...?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumlocution</td>
<td>Exemplifying, illustrating or describing the properties of the target object or action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex) it becomes water instead of “melt”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrieval</td>
<td>In an attempt to retrieve a lexical item saying a series of incomplete or wrong forms or structures before reaching the optimal form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex) It’s brake er ... it’s broken broked broke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-coinage</td>
<td>Creating a non-existing L2 word by applying a supposed L2 rule to an existing L2 word.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: LIST OF TRANSCRIPTS

KH discussion 1

KH-D-1 <1>
1. S1: 전일세력을 압. 지지했다고 그려나요?
   2. T: 네, 일본을 지지했다고
   3. S1: 일본을 지지했다고 생각하지만,

KH-D-1 <3>
1. S6: 우리는 신탁통치하는 것을 반대합니다. 왜냐하면 신탁통치 하는
   사람들은 제국노라구=
   2. T: =제국노 제국노
   3. S6: 제국노, 신탁통치 지지하는 사람들은 제국노라구
   생각합니다.

KH-D-1 <4>
1. S6: 그리구, 공산주의는 현실적인: 아: 개념이 아니구*/ 이상... 이상형?
   2. T: 이상주의,
   3. S6: 이상주의... 이상적이라고 생각합니다.

KH-D-1 <5>
1. S6: 사람들이 조금씩 평등하게 농사짓고 할 수 있겠지만/ 단기. 어:
   장기적으로는, 단기 장기
   2. T: 장기적으로는
   3. S6: 장기적으로 보면은 어: 정체도 참패되구,

KH-D-1 <6>
1. S2: 'southern africa'에서도 그런 일이 있었잖아요,
   2. T: 네? 어디요?
   3. S2: 아, 사망...아: 남아프리카
   4. T: 아 예 남아프리카
KH-D-1 <7>
1. S7: 적대국인 일본과 협력까지 해가면서 자식들 발 백이구 그랬는데 (모두 웃음) 그런 거 가지구...어...음...처벌?
2. T: 음
3. S7: 처벌한다는 거는 좀 잔인한 것 같아요.

KH-D-1 <8>
1. S7: 다 먹고 살자구 하는 거구, 다 못살구 있었었구. 때문에 그런 상태에서는 전자, 모든 사람들이 적일 수가 있어요. 왜냐하면, 내가 살아야하기 때문에(•) 어 진자: 사람의 본능? instinct?
2. T: (고개 끄덕인다.)
3. S7: 오케이,
4. T: 네, 본능 맞아요.
5. S7: 어: 그것을 따르자면 진자(•) 살아남아야 되 iParam이야?

KH-D-1 <9/10>
1. S2: 일반적으로는 다들 처벌할 수는 없잖아요. 왜냐하면, 뭐: 독일...그 저..전워
2. T: 전후에.
4. T: 평민.
5. S2: 예, 평민. 다 처벌할 수가 없잖아요.

KH-D-1 <11>
1. S2: 다 처벌할 수가 없지요. 왜냐하면 처벌하면은 뭐 누가 누가 나찌당에서 뭐 lea, leader?
2. T: 지도자
3. S2: 예, 지도자(•) 지도자들은 처벌해야하는 뭐, 뭐...

KH-D-1 <12>
1. S2: 결국에는 거 뭐지... reconciliation?
2. T: 화해.
3. S2: 예, 할 수가 없지요(화해할 수가 없지요.)
KH-D-1 <13>
1. S2: 그런데 어떤 경우엔 좀 해봐야가요?
   2. T: 애매
   3. S2: 애매할 수가 있어요. 예를 들면, 위 경찰들은

KH-D-1 <14>
1. S2: 그 사람들은 일본 사람들 말하는 대로 했어야 했잖아요. 물론... 그게 좀 헷갈려도 (.) 뭐, 뭐 헷갈려한 (.) 뭐 아이... (.)
   2. T: 과잉진압?
   3. S2: 과잉한 사람도 있겠지만... 뭐(,) 보통으로는 판단 잘 서고,

KH-D-1 <15>
1. S1: 그런데 뭐 생각에는 노력이 했어도 당신들이 때문에 실패했잖아요. 그건 그건 뭐 도라고 그리지고, passed(inaudible))
   2. T: 그냥 넘기는?
   3. S1: 아니... 그건... 이 뭐, 특별 사법제도 같은게 실패한 이유는, 우파들이 반대하고 이승만이 협조적이지 않아서 그런 것 같아요.

KH-D-1 <16>
1. S6: 당분간은 이해...(목표는 한국 사람들에 대해서는), 그: mean?
   2. T: 수단,
   3. S6: 수단을...(그렇게라도 해야하는 거라고 생각해서,

KH-D-1 <17>
1. S9: 경쟁 없으면 산업을 확대하고, 어: 항(,) improve?
   2. T: 발전, 항상, 네.

KH-D-1 <18>
1. S9: 그 마지막으로, 어: 사회주의적 개념에 따라 토지의 국유화는, 역사적으로 나온 생각이에요. 어: 1951년에 티베트의 농지를 국유화했는데
   2. T: 국유화.
   4. T: 국유화?
5. S9: 국유화? 그:: commonize?

6. T: 공유화... 사실은 가장 정확한 말은 집산화라고 라고요. 집산화. 집단의 재산으로 만드는 거. 집산화란 말이 가장 적합한 말이에요.

7. S9: 아, 예. 집산화했는데,

KH-D-1 <19>
1. S9: 토지 개혁은 (0.4) 일반 인구((국민))의... 성장 경제적 성장을 줄 수 있어요. 마오쩌둥

2. T: 모택동,


KH-D-1 <20>
1. S9: 토지를 집산화했는데 결국은 대..경우의(대부분의 경우에) 기 기

2. T: 기근,


KH discussion 2

KH-D-2 <4>
1. S1: 그래서 그때 있던 땅들 일어버리지 않았나요? 왔다가보다가...난민들, (포르는 표정)

2. T: 난민들, 다 피난갔다고,


KH-D-2 <8>

2. T: 남침


4. T: 남침

5. S2: 네 go down. 남침

7. S2: 남진?
8. T: 남침.
9. S2: 침, 침이요? 예 남침. 네, 오케이. 그리고:

KH-D-2 <10>
1. S6: 저는 한국전쟁에서 핵심적인 역할을 하라고 생각해요. 미국의 가입=
2. T: \=개입

KH-D-2 <11>
1. S6: 북한은 원래 이제, 서울만 점령한 하구 서울 점령하구 총을 한번만이라도 쏘면, 이승만이 항항 항복?
2. T: 네.
3. S6: 항복하리라고 생각을 했습니다. 그래서,

KH-D-2 <15>
1. S9: 국가를 통일하고 싶어도... 우리는 공산주의 확산을\= 예복?
2. T: 먹 먹기위해?
3. S9: ((no response)).
4. T: 예방하기 위해?
5. S2: 네, 예방해야 돼요.

KH-D-2 <21>
1. S5: 한국전쟁 당시에 중국이 중국내전이 풀난지... 끝나고, 아직 사회주의 체제가 완전히 겹혀있지 않은 상태에서,
2. T: 자기 겹히지 않은 상태에서.
3. S5: 예, 자기 겹히지 않고 혼란스러운 상태에서,

KH-D-2 <25>
1. S9: 그렇지만 우리는 그...3차세계대전을 시작하고 싶지 않아서, 그 폭탄을: 
아\= 어떻게 표현해야요?
2. T: 흉한 흉하.

4. T: 원자폭탄?

5. S2: 네.

KH-D-2 <26>
1. S8: 우리한테, 원자력 쓰는 것이 논의가 있어요.

2. T: 일리가 있어요.

3. S8: ra, ra, rational?

4. T: 네, 일리가 있다구...

5. S8: 네, 일리가 있어요.

KH discussion 3

KH-D-3 <6>
1 S7: 한국이 앞으로 어떻게 이끌어나가는지보는 게 중요하지, 그 전제, 다시 권위주의를 한다는 것은 정말이: anachronistic?(1.0) 에, 안 맞아요.

2. T: 시대에 안맞아요. 시대착오적인.

3. S7: 시대?


5. S7: 예, 시대착오에요.

KH-D-3 <8>
1 S2: 물론 보통 국민들은 그런 교육을 받지 못했는데, 이제 한국에서 뭐(?) 뭐조, 그 읽는 줄...

2. T: 문맹율?


4. T: 아, 그런 식자율이에요. 문맹율은 illiteracy 에요.

5. S2: 아 그 식자율은 높고.

KH-D-3 <11>
1 S2: 정부의 주변 문제도 있었잖아요. 머나먼, 이런 대기업들은 마음대로 하면은( ) 그리면 그럼... 법보다 더 높은(1.0) 원저 알죠? (웃음)
2. T: 불법적인 일을 할 수 있었어요.

3. S2: 예, 많이 하구 있고, 그리고,

**KH-D-3 <18>**
1 S3: 의자에 너무 의존하게 되면 인플레이션이 일어나게 되구, 물가의 상(.) 상
2. T: 찹?
3. S3: 상승? 예상승이 일어나서,

**KH-D-3 <19>**
1 S3: 산업화를 하면 농업 부문이 희생되니까, 농민들이 타...어도시로:
2. T: 이농.
3. S3: 이농? 이농하는 현상이 생기면서,

**KH discussion 4**

**KH-D-4 <2>**
1. S8: 그 당시 야당인 한나라당이, 취.창 후보는
2. T: [이화창 이화창후보]
3. S8: (웃음)이화창 후보는 충정 충정 어 미안해요 충정도 출신이였습니다

**KH-D-4 <3>**
1. S7: 사실 정치인들이(.) How can I say ((incomprehensible word))? (0.4)
   ((incomprehensible word))? 이, 하기 때문에요,
2. T: 그래 뭐예요? 한국말로,
3. Ss: 악아빠早早.
4. S7: 오케이 (모두 웃음) 악아빠져가지구, 그, 언제 어디서 어떻게 사람들에게 영향을 미쳐야 되는지 다 알려드려요.

**KH-D-4 <4/5>**
1 S1: 전부다 의도적이라고 할 수 없지만... 자신의 권력을, 유지하려고 하는 행동에서(.) 중요한 요직들은 다 자기들이 다(0.4) 그렇게...그런
2. T: 정경유착?
3. S1: 네. 그런 그런 것 때문에 더 자신의 출산지역을
4. T: 출?
5. S1: 출산지역은?

6. T: 생?

8. S1: 아, 출생지역을 (옷을) 출생지역을 선호하는 그런 것 때문에 지역감정은 더 강해지는 거 같아요.

KH-D-4 <7>
1 S3: 자료를 보면 경상도 대통령을 뽑지 않으면 우리 영남인들은 '개방의 도토리' 신세가 된다. 뒤 그식으로 지역 감정을 부추기는 예가 많은 거 같아서,

2. T: 개방의 도토리 알아요? (1.0) 무슨 뜻이에요?

3. S3: 아뇨, 자세히 모르겠는데(...) 나쁜 뜻인 거 같아요. (모두 웃음)

4. T: 아시는 분 있어요? 개방의 도토리라는 속담이 있잖아요, 우리, 도토리 알죠, 도토리. (설명 이어짐)

KH-D-4 <8>
1 S6: 지역감정은 어느 지역 국가에도 있을 거라고 생각하지만, 이:: catalyst?

2. T: 촉매, 

3. S6: 촉매?

4. T: 예, 촉매

5. S6: 촉매가 있어야 된다는 생각에서,

KH-D-4 <9>
1 S4: 저두 표면적으로 볼 때는 정치인들이 이런 지역감정에 대해, 어...을 뭐지, 정치인들의: 조. 조.

2. T: 조강?


KH-D-4 <10>
1 S5: 김대중이 박정희로부터 전압 받으면서, 의도적으로 하지는 않았겠지만 이 지역감정에 영향을 받았다고 생각합니다

2. T: 근데 진압 받는 게 뭐에요?

1. S7: 선생님,

2. T: 네.

3. S7: 근데 ‘남행열차’는 뭐에요?


5. S7: (웃음) 근데 그래 뭐에요?

6. T: 남 남이라고 하면 보통 호남지역을 이야기해요. 남도, 호남, 같은 말이거든요. (설명 계속)

KH-D-4 <12>
1. S7: 한국 사람들이 좀 그런 게 있는 거 같아요. 논리적이진 않지만, 좀 한국 사람들이 감정적인 거 같아요. 좀 무슨 일이 있으면, 왜 그랬어요? 그래 나가서 배포하자. 막 그런 논리적으로 생각하지 않구 좀 다혈질인

2. T: 다혈질적인

3. S7: 예 좀 다혈질적인 면이 있는 거 같아요.

KH-D-4 <13>
1. S9: 그때 호남지역 사람들은 농민들이니까 다 과실당했어요. 그 경제:

2. T: 과산?

3. S9: 과산?

4. T: 망했다구요?

5. S9: bankruptcy.


KH-D-4 <15>
1. S7: 요즘 대학생들은 (지역감정을) 직접적으로 경험했던 것이 아니기 때문에 잘 교육을 시켜가지구 서로의 이해를 성립?

2. T: 예 성립.


KH-D-4 <17>
1. S6: 교류도 중요하지만 선거제도를 만드는 것도 중요하다고 생각해요. 전 선거제도 잘 모르지만, 그 소.소. (0.4)
2. T: 소선거 소선거제?


KH discussion 5

KH-D-5 <1>
1. S7: 그 할머니 할아버지들이 다 죽으면... 진짜
2. T: 그죠. 그 전쟁을 경험한 사람들이 없어지니깐
3. S7: 그 역사의 고통하고 아픔을(0.4) 어, 회복?
4. T: 예.
5. S7: 회복시켜야 할 것 아니에요?

KH-D-5 <2>
1 S5: 제가 생각에는 한국의 그 국내 시장이(,) 근가 위낙 그 over:.
2. T: 너무... 속 차서요?
3. S5: 시장이 너무 속 차있으니까 더 이상 (0.5) 시장을 열 때가 없거든요.

KH-D-5 <6>
1 S6: 베트남과 미국의 관계를 보면, 그 hope hope 가 있고... 회망?
2. T: 네 회망.
3. S6: 회망이 있고,

KH-D-5 <7>
1 S6: 논리적으로 보면 경제를 개발하는 사람들의: standard in general(,)
      삶의 질?
2. T: 네 그죠.

KH-D-5 <9>
1 S7: 북한에서는 자기 체제를 위협하는 것을 용납 못하고 대단히::
      한정된, 통제된, 통제된
2. T: 통제된
3. S7: 어, 이... 그것이 되기 때문에 교류가 얼마나 될는지는 잘 모르죠.
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KH-D-5 <10>
1. S2: 저는 연방제 같은 그런... 어: 점차적으로 (.) 계단적인
2. T: [단계적인]
3. S2: 그런 방향이=
4. T: =단계적인
5. S2: 아, 예 단계적인 그런 방향이 바람직하다고 생각합니다.

KH-D-5 <11>
1. S2: 그래서 그 아 중앙정부 어느정도... 어 (0.5) 시험실 실험,  2. T: 예, 실험
3. S2: 예. (0.4)어 how do you say 'natural power'?
4. T: 실제 실험
5. S2: 네 실제적인 영향이 있는지 없는지 그것은 보다는,

KH-D-5 <14>
1. S8: Not surprisingly 하나의 논의를 해요. (0.5) 아...이론적으로, 
사실적으로 empirically?
2. T: 현실적으로,

KH-D-5 <15>
1. S8: 이론적으로 그: 어떻게 경제.. 자본주의화하고, 정치 구조의 변화...관계 어떻게...관계: 아 (1.0)
2. T: 있나구요?
3. S8: 예. 있나구..있나구요, 잘 우리는 잘 모르겠다요.

KH-D-5 <17>
1. S8: 중국은 자본주의화하면서 대만 중국 관계가 더 나빠졌어요. 대만 중국 
통일 오히려 far: 
2. T: 멀어졌어요, 어 더 멀어졌어요 오히려, 어
3. S8: 네 멀어졌어요.
KH-D-5 <19>
1. S6: 적두 홍수통일이 바람직하겠지만, 적두 연합정부를 수립하다가 단계적으로 일케...합 창하는, 합해서


3. S6: 연합해서 한 정부를 수립하는데,

KH-D-5 <20>
1. S6: 신뢰성이 일케 쌍이구(0.4) 쌍이구?

2. T: 예, 쌍이구

3. S6: 인쇄 쌍이면서 해결이 시작된다고 보는테요,

KH-D-5 <21>
1. S1: 김정일 정권이(.) 어::

2. T: 무너지면?

3. S1: 아뇨.

4. T: 위협?

5. S1: 위협 받으면,

KH-D-5 <26>
1. S6: 북한사람들이 남한에 대해서 알게되여도, 판단하는 것을 받아줄 수가 있잘아요 교육보다는... widen::

2. T: 확대할 수 있어요? 인식을 확대?

3. S6: 네, 그래서 북한사람들이 남한체제에 대해서 알게 되며는,

KH-D-5 <29>
1 S7: 중국은 모든 것이 경제에 있으니까(.) Controlled? 통::체?

2. T: 통제된

3. S7: 통제되어 있으니까, 통제되어 있으니까

KH-D-5 <30>
1 S7: 중국은 북한의 제일 친한: (0.5) Ally?

2. T: 동맹

3. S7: 동맹이니까
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KH-D-6 <3>
1. S4: 강력한 구속력을 강제할 수 있어요.
2. T: 무엇을 강제할 수 있다구요?
3. S4: 다들 이런 혐의 내용이 이행될 수 있도록 =
5. S4: 강력한 구속력, 구속력?
6. T: 구속력? (0.5) 구속력?
7. S4: 네 구속력.
8. T: 예. 강력한 구속력. 강제로 될 수 있는.

KH-D-6 <4>
1. S4: 당시에 300여 건의 노사간의 문제가 있었는데요,
2. T: 분규가.
3. S4: 분규가?
5. S4: 노사 분규가 있었는데요,

KH-D-6 <6>
1. S8: 아시다시피 한국사람은 감정 사람이지요?
2. T: 감정적인.
3. S8: 감정적인(.) 사람이지요?

KH-D-6 <7>
1. S8: 그래서 덜모 동안... 좀 사이코 사이코인 것 같아요.
2. T: 사이코?
3. S8: 사이코
4. T: 예. 아주 미친 사람이지요.
5. S8: 네 미친 사람 같아요.
KH-D-6 <9>
1. S8: 그런 테모 많으면, 우리... 투자인: 우리
2. T: 아니, 투자하는 사람이 우리, 투자하는 사람들이 우리하게 되서.
3. S8: 예, 그래서 투자 많이 못할 거예요.

KH-D-6 <11>
1. S7: 선생님이 전에 수업시간에 해주신 건데,
2. T: 네.
4. T: (1.0) 상호지갑보증,
5. S7: 오 야, 그러요.

KH-D-6 <13/14>
1. S9: 노조가... 너무 강하면, 사장님이: appropriate order?
2. T: 적절하게 명령을 내리는 거, management 같은 거
3. S9: 네, 네 반대로 나올 거에요. 그래서 그 그렇다면, 그 노조가 너무 아... 강하게 되면, 음::(1.0) 그러면... 지배 없을 것 같아요. order 없을 것 같아요. 그날 그 노동자 마음대로
5. S9: 아 감사합니다. (웃음) 이상입니다. (또한 웃음)

KH-D-6 <17>
1. S8: 우리 입장에서는 회사가 점원에게 안부를 제공하면,
2. T: 안부? 안부가 뭐에요?
3. S8: 실패했어요, (웃음) 어: respect?
4. T: 존중.
5. S8: 존중해주면 그렇게 될겨요.
KH-D-6 <18>
1. S4: 노동자들은 생 생 생계를?

2. T: 음

3. S4: 이끌어야 돼는데,

KH-D-6 <19>
1. S6: 자본주의 체제라서 정부가 너무 간섭하면 그: 인제(,) 자본주의가 아니라(1.0)

2. T: 사회주의?

3. S6: 예, 사회주의 같은 체제가 되니가,

KH-D-6 <20>
1. S6: 회사와 노조가 좀... 아: timely?하게 협상할 수 있도록,

2. T: 적절하게.


KH-D-6 <23>
1. S9: 해고한 사람들을 다시 재고용할 때, 엄...

2. T: 비용이 많이 들어요.


KH-D-6 <24>
1. S7: 마지막이라서: (웃음) 다들 한 얘기 repeat 하게 될 것 같는데,

2. T: 반복

3. S7: 반복하게 될 것 같는데,

KH discussion 7
KH-D-7 <2>
1. S2: 천천히 미국군대는 조금씩 철수하고, 그런 어: 안보, security force 가 안보,

2. T: security force?

3. S2: ya...아 (0.5) 예, 그냥 security force 만 남기면 되요

4. T 어:: 평화유지군 평화유지군
5. S2: 예, 예
6. T: 구성력? (0.5) 구속력?

KH-D-7 <6/7>
1. S9: 난민들과 합력 합함으로써,
2. T: 협력함으로써
4. T: 아.
5. S9: 그럼로서 (1.0)
6. T: 그 뒷부분 좀 더 설명이 필요할 것 같은데, 그건 그 난민들을 도
  와함으로써 미국 면에 서게 한다구요?
7. S9: 미국에 (0.4) 면에, 서요.
8. T: ((no repsonse))
9. S9: stand against the U.S.

KH-D-7 <13>
1. S7: 위 부시가 책을 직접 읽지는 않았지만 사람들이 정책에...하여도
  주변에 있는 사람들이:
2. T: 정책을 만드는 사람들?
3. S7: 예, 정책을 만드는 사람들이 옛날에 읽었거나 지금 읽고 있거나
  뭐 (웃음)

KH-D-7 <15>
1. S5: 어떤 사람들은 중국 간첩이라 하지 않느냐, 근데 아무리 그래도 지
  금 미국과 중국과의 관계가 너무...어 일 일 어떻게 말해요, 없?
2. T: 엇허져 있다구
3. S5: 엇허었기 때문에,
KH-D-7 <19>
1. S2: 태러집단이 핵무기를 사용하고 싶으면 가장 중요한 것이...핵무기의 소형화?
2. T: ((non verbal confirmation))
3. S2: 핵을...그 핵무기의 소형화 Miniaturization 필요하다.
5. S2: 예 예

KH-D-7 <20>
1. S2: 아니면...뭐: 생화학, 대량...살상무기로
2. T: 생화학 무기?
3. S2: 예, 그것은 더 쉽지 않아요? 태러집단들에게?
5. S2: 아 그 생화학적인...암 그거 맞죠?
6. T: 예, 생화학 무기 문제 이슈는 이런 거예요.(설명 계속)

KH-D-7 <22>
1. S3: 어려워서 자세히 모르겠다는데, 미중양정보국? 미연방…
2. T: 수사국,
3. S2: 그런 기구를 통해서 철지한 교육 훈련을 통해서 태러집단을 찾아내서,

KH-D-7 <26>
1. S2: 지금 태러집단들은 돈 없으면 운영할 수 없잖아요. 그래서 제 보기에는 국제적으로 금융...그 뭐지? source, source 가 뭐라고 그래요?
2. T: 자원.
4. T: 동결시켜요.
5. S2: 둘 동결. 그런데,
KH-D-7 <30>
1. S7: 국가가 주된 행위자이기 때문에, 사실은 개인이 어... 개인이당사자?
2. T: 행위자?
3. S7: 어 개인이.
4. T: 행위자?

KH-D-7 <33>
1. S7: 절박한 위험은 대리라고 생각합니다. 왜냐하면 알카에다도, 어: 미국의(...) 가장...어: umbilical cord? 그거 어떻게 말해요?
2. T: ((no response))
4. Ss: 테 solidity!
5. S9: 테 solidity. 석유라고 생각해서 그것을 이용해서 미국을 약화시킬 수 있다는 말이 있었고,

KH discussion 8

KH-D-8 <4>
1. S2: 미국이 말로... 어: How do you say 'threaten'?
2. T: 위협?
3. S2: 예. 위협

KH-D-8 <6>
1. S8: 북한이 우라늄, 우라늄 발견했어요.
2. T: 우라늄을 개발했어요.
3. S8: 네, 개발했어요.
KH-D-8 <8>
1. S2: 그 미국. 어 머지, congress,

2. T: 의회?

3. S2: 의회 때문에 사실은 이행하지 못했답니다. 근데,

KH-D-8 <13>
1. S8: 국제 원자력기구...문? 서류? 책? Document?

2. T: 예...서류?

3. S8: 서류?...서류에서 군사: 군사 곳에서,

4. T: 군사시설에서.

5. S8: 특별한 사활 어디든지 할 수 있어요.

KH discussion 9

KH-D-9 <4> <1>
1. S2: 근데, 그 저 intellectual property를 떠라고 해요?

2. T: 지적재산권


4. T: 재산권.

5. S2: 재산권. 예.

KH-D-9 <2>
1. S2: 그건 실패 개발을 위해 R&D 많이 하니까,

2. T: 연구개발비라고 해요, 한국말로.

3. S2: 예. 연구...그래서 한국에서도 그냥 R&D 라고= 

4. T =예 그렇게도 써요 한국에서.

5. S2: 예, 연구개발로 많이 하고 있으니까,
KH-D-9 <5>

1. S9: 미국 의약품이 갑자기 한국 시장에 제시하면 (0.5) 그 ... 의약품 그게가? 가 가
2. T: 가격.
3. S9: 가격?
5. S9: 가격. 가격이 갑자기 올라가면 이 사람들이 약을 살 수 없을 것 같아요.

KH-D-9 <6>

1. S9: 그래서 변하는데, 우리는 negotiate 할 수 있는데... 그: 어: 잠지? gradually? 잠지,
2. T: 점차, 점진적으로.

KH-D-9 <12/13>

1. S9: 우리는 관세를 내려시키면,
2. T: 관세를 인하하먼.
3. S9: 예, 어... 미국 미국 의약품들이 우리 시장들, 쇼 쇼;
4. T: 쇼도?
5. S9: 예, 쇼도할 거에요.

KH-D-9 <14>

1. S6: 특히 한국은 지금 한국에서... 노령화 (1.0)
2. T: 노령화 사회,

KH-D-9 <18>

1. S2: 예를 들면, 종 종... 아: 중유 회사도
2. T: 중유회사요?
3. S2: 예, oil company.
4. T  예석유회사?
5. S2: 예석유회사들도 사실은 거의 90% 다시 연구개발로 투입하려고요.

KH-D-9 <20>
1. S3: 한국 국내에 있는 대학들이 경쟁을 해서, 경쟁력이 올라가면 그런 인증은 대학들이: 퇴출?
2. T: 예 퇴출된다고
3. S3: 예, 퇴출될 수 있어서 그런 기회가 있어서 좋다고 생각하구,

KH-D-9 <22>
1. S1: 그런데 제 생각에는 한국에 빌려 경쟁이 심하다구 생각하구요, 또 교육, 뭐: 학교간 경쟁도 아 (0.5) 심하구, 심하 심하: (1.0)
2. T: 싶혀져 있다,
3. S1: 예, 싶혀져 있구요,
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1. S5: 그리고, 마지막으로 하나는, 모르겠어요, 저는 현실주의자라서 그러는지 모르겠지만은, “양”육강식을 믿게들어요, “양”육강식을, 만약에
2. T: 뭐 뭐를 믿어요?
4. T 아 악육강식,
5. S5: 이 세계화 시대에서는 국제적인 뭐 그런 시스템이 더 뭐 more influence 라고 그러나요?
6. T: 더 영향력이 있다=
3. S5: = 한국교육 미국교육 그런 거 보다 좋은 교육을 추구하게 되잖아요. 그렇기 때문에,
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1. S2: 한국에서 스크린契트 없어도 아니 뭐 축소해도 한국에서 뭐 그 표. 사는. 울? 그게 뭐지, ticket sale 뭐라고 하...
2. T: 판매. 티켓 판매?
3. S2: 예, 티켓 판매하는 거 보면은 한국은 별세 60% 이상 차지하고 있으니까,
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