Modern English Education, Vol. 17, No. 1, Spring 2016
http://dx.doi.org/10.18095/meeso.2016.17.1.01

A Sequential Analysis of Korean Elementary School English Teachers' Interactional Practices*

Wooyoung Park
Korea Polytechnic University

Park, Wooyoung. (2016). A sequential analysis of Korean elementary school English teachers' interactional practices. *Modern English Education*, *17*(1), 1-26.

The purpose of this study is to examine the major interactional practices of Korean elementary school English teachers (KESETs) under the circumstances of explaining various pedagogical tasks. To this end, eight in-service KESETs with various teaching experiences were recruited by personal contacts with elementary teachers' local communities in Seoul and Gyeonggi. Data collection was conducted from mid May to late October, 2013. The sequential analysis was used as a main method for the analysis after detailed transcription. Major findings of the study are as follows: constantly insisting their initiations about the learning objectives; precisely breaking down the sequence of actions needed for learners to play the games; continuously confirming learners' understanding by eliciting immediate responses from learners; simultaneously organizing learning environment so that learners could concentrate on the ongoing tasks. The findings of the study can be useful in understanding how KESETs perform the various kinds of pedagogical tasks in the course of interacting with their young learners.

**[classroom discourse/conversation analysis/
교실담화/대화분석]**

* This paper is abstracted and revised from the author's doctoral dissertation that was presented in 2015.

www.kci.go.kr

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Purpose of the Study

In their daily teaching activities, Korean elementary school English teachers (KESETs) perform various pedagogical tasks: introducing learning activities, specifying language game steps, confirming to check up, and organizing the learning environment for disciplines, etc. Teaching the target language forms is just one of those duties they are supposed to carry out. In spite of this recognition, few studies have been interested in these daily interactional practices of non-native speaker (NNS) L2 teachers, specifically KESETs. In other words, L2 classroom research primarily concerns itself with the specific language forms that NNS teachers produce and modify in their interaction with NNS students.

In addition, it is hard to find prior studies that investigated detailed bottom-up procedures on how Korean NNS teachers use classroom language to interact with learners in their foreign language (FL) classroom, especially in the elementary school English classrooms. In other words, few studies have concentrated on analyzing the turn-by-turn process or sequence of how a certain event in Korean elementary school English classroom occurs, how a specific utterance of a KESET affects his or her students' understanding, and how a KESET interprets students' imperfect L2 utterances.

It is particularly important to examine the specific interactional practices of KESETs in terms of how they teach English in English. Yet, there is not much research found with regard to how they deal with those students who have not yet fully adapted to English-speaking classroom life. In particular, it is not known how KESETs decide who should talk, how to nominate the next speaker, how to deal with learners' language problems and how to present pedagogical tasks. That is to say, research still remains unexplored in terms of how KESETs use their English while achieving their pedagogical objectives.

Therefore, this study is designed to closely examine and trace the interactional practice of KESETs in classroom settings. Specifically, by examining their spontaneous language use of English as the main medium of instruction, the present study investigates how KESETs organize pedagogical tasks, resolve language issues, and carry out various L2 learning activities in English. The primary goal of the present study is to identify how KESETs' actual everyday interactional activities are conducted for the purpose of accomplishing their pedagogical duties in their regular classroom setting.

2. Research Questions

This study aims to examine how Korean elementary school English teachers conduct

www.kci.go.kr

interactional practices. Specifically, the study investigates how they make their L2 utterances understandable to their students and interpret students' low quality utterances successfully while achieving pedagogical objectives. The present study, thus, consists of the following research questions:

1) What are the common and orderly principles of interactional practices in KESETs' pedagogical task presentation? Is there any difference among the tasks? What are the normative features of their pedagogical task presentation among KESETs?
2) How differently is the basic three-turn mechanism (IRF) manifested according to the various tasks? Alongside, how do KESETs employ code switching in the different contexts of pedagogical tasks?

3. Significance of the Study

Due to the recognition of its importance, L2 classroom interaction research has been widely conducted. System-based approaches employed scientifically designed observation instruments to analyze categorized actions of teacher-student interaction. Discourse analysis (DA) approaches analyzed naturally occurring classroom interaction by putting each move into pre-determined categories on the basis of structure-function relationship. Interactionist Model in SLA approaches views L2 classroom interaction as the process of modified input and interaction. In other words, language learning needs both linguistic knowledge and language use. Instead, most of these approaches took a top-down approach, applying prescribed patterns into naturally occurring classroom data. As a result, it is hard to find such studies, specifically in Korean elementary level, that fully described sequential aspects of how members achieve successful meaning interpretation despite their insufficient L2 proficiency.

Moreover, most research in the Korean elementary classroom setting (H. J. Kim, 2010; J. K. Kim, 2011; S. S. Kim, 2005; H. W. Lee, 2005; S. R. Lee & K. S. Chang, 2011; K. N. Park, 2005) has predominantly concentrated on the frequencies of specific forms and functions rather than how KESETs' daily teaching practices are sequentially organized during their interaction with learners. Especially, in the elementary school level, only few studies have been conducted in order to sequentially identify how to present language games, error-correction, organize in-between tasks and others. Such sequentially identified verbal actions will contribute to broadening the perspective to viewing how Korean elementary school English teaching is being practiced in reality.

In the same vein, Allwright and Bailey (1991) state, "it is not 'the latest method' that we need, but rather a fuller understanding of the language classroom and what goes on there" (xvii). Likewise, Breen (1985) also asserts, "classroom interaction has its own

www.kci.go.kr

communicative potential and its own authentic communicative purpose" (p. 154). That is, knowing better the language classroom interaction can decide the success of L2 learning. Insufficient knowledge about what goes on in the classroom does not make any pedagogical suggestion available (Y. A. Lee, 2001).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Over the several decades, a litany of classroom research has been conducted with different perspectives. Among these, some previous research primarily relevant to the Korean context are reviewed in this study to see how it deals with classroom interaction.

K. N. Park (2005) used a pre-made observation checklist in order to investigate the patterns of the teacher-student interaction in the elementary school English classroom in Korea. He developed his own analysis instrument based on the COLT system (Fröhlich, Spada, & Allen, 1985) to categorize the most widely used teacher-whole student interaction. He analyzed the frequencies and ratios among entire utterances of teacher-students. Based on the results of his analysis, he concludes that it is not easy for children to have opportunities to make spontaneous oral production.

J. K. Kim (2011) analyzed 27 elementary school English sessions taught by four pairs of native speaker (NS) and NNS teachers according to the existing frames such as FLINT and COLT. He categorized all the dynamic utterances of teacher-student via those pre-made external standards, and calculated the frequencies of each category of utterance according to the aforementioned checklists. M. J. Kim and E. J. Lee (2011) also investigated the types and effects of Korean elementary English teachers' repair practice while comparing with NS teachers'. The results of their studies also suggested that there exists the dominance of teacher utterance over student utterance as well as more frequencies of initiation-response-follow up (IRF) under the circumstance of referential questions provided.

S. H. Kim (2008) explored the types and characteristics of classroom exchanges in middle school English classes. She observed for a year a middle school English class (seventh grade) taught by Korean nonnative English teachers. The data were collected and transcribed with "act," the minimal unit of Boulima's (1999) Foreign Language Interactional System (FLIAS) frame, which is a modified version of Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) model. Her findings indicated that there were very few cases of authentic communication in English, which is very similar to those of Sinclair and Coulthard's study.

However, S. H. Kim pursues a prescriptive stance in handling the naturally occurring data by putting each move into predetermined categories on the basis of structure-function

www.kci.go.kr

mechanism. As a result, such a pre-set perspective is less powerful in describing such instances that an utterance can be attached with multiple interpretations in accordance with given contextual variables such as what happens before and after that utterance is made, where and how it happens, etc. Stubbs (1983) points out that it is beyond the capability of prescribed perspectives to identify the dynamic phenomenon that an utterance of a classroom teacher can be interpreted with various meanings depending on at which point of sequence he or she speaks to who and how.

Some researchers in Korea also investigated the aspects between linguistic forms and interactional features occurred in L2 language classrooms (S. S. Kim, 2005; S. B. Lee, 2005; S. R. Lee & K. S. Chang, 2011). S. B. Lee (2005) compared and analyzed the linguistic features as well as the basic interactional works of two veteran Korean English teachers and one native English teacher working in elementary schools. He employed a descriptive interpretative design in investigating the data of his research. His findings revealed that those nonnative English teachers showed lower frequency in the number and the types of sentences used during the teaching sessions than the native teacher.

In terms of the types of NNS teachers' modified interaction, a researcher applied Lyster and Ranta (1997)'s model into Korean elementary school English teachers. H. J. Kim (2010) identified from her Korean pre-service elementary school student teachers' microteaching sessions that teachers use in total seven types of interactional modification strategies such as repetition, completion, recast, confirmation, clarification, comprehension check-up, and error-correction. She added that among these types pre-service teachers used the two types (repetition and comprehension checks) most frequently in their teaching.

S. R. Lee and K. S. Chang (2011) looked into the collaborated teaching sessions of NS English teachers and Korean elementary school English teachers, and compared the differences in terms of syntactic and lexical characteristics. They recorded and transcribed sessions taught by three teams of NS and Korean English teachers. The results of their study reported that nonnative, that is, Korean elementary school English teachers' talk contained more occurrences of display questions and statement-based questions with rising tone or pitch at the end of their speech in comparison to NS English teachers.

In contrast to all the above-mentioned perspectives, an approach called conversation analysis (CA) views interaction as a phenomenon of language in use and emphasizes the participants' own views in the given interaction. Understanding other parties involves tracing the prior or next turn(s) at talk (Y. A. Lee, 2013; Macbeth, 2011; Moerman & Sacks, 1988). This means participants do not access each other on the basis of pre-assigned categories of interactional behaviors. Rather, they try to understand other parties in the course of examining the sequence of turn(s) at talk (Heritage, 1984).

Payne and Hustler (1980) describe how classroom teachers deal with the students as a collective. As they put it, "the concern is to have them all moved along" (p. 84). Therefore,

www.kci.go.kr

classroom teachers methodically make their talk public so that "turning back to the cohort" (Payne & Hustler, p. 84) even while talking individually is constantly observed all through the class. It is because the teacher wants to make sure all students move along just as "a shepherd moving a flock or herd along from one place to another" (p. 64). Payne and Hustler conclude this phenomenon is all because of the institutional goal of classroom instruction that a teacher has to face students in collective.

There are some CA-based studies that were conducted in the FL learning contexts (H. W. Lee, 2002; Mori, 2002). Mori (2002) examined the sequential development of talk-in-interaction observed in a small group activity in a Japanese language classroom in the U.S. She designed a group work in order to have learners get involved in a discussion with Japanese native speakers (NSs) invited to the class. The interaction of the discussion did not run as she intended. It ended up more like a structured interview where ready-made questions and answers come and go.

One study outlined at a macro-level the big picture of Korean elementary English class from an ethno-methodological perspective. Employing a descriptive analysis of the interactional features of talk, H. W. Lee (2002) investigated a data set consisting of twenty sessions of one elementary school English teacher working at a public elementary school in Seoul. Through her ethnographical analysis, she presented four general findings as follows: all lessons were strictly structured, that is, the stage called presentation-practice-production (PPP) was completely followed in all classes. The overall classroom interaction, according to her research, is composed of "listen and repeat drill," that is, a great deal of repetition is required for the mastery of a language form.

Some research revisits the existing notions of classroom discourse by using a CA frame. Waring (2008, 2009) investigates the roles of IRF from a CA perspective, and concludes that IRF sequence within some contexts discourages learners' motivations to explore divergent answers. According to her, utterances like "good, excellent, okay, etc." play a role of explicit positive assessment to the learners. This indicates that learners tend to interpret those tokens as a signal of conversation terminated within a given round of IRF loop. In other words, IRF sequences are only good for teachers to check learners' understanding or homework. This is the result of "CA for SLA," which contributes to expansion of views on taken-for-granted daily actions in our L2 classrooms.

Wong (2000) re-specifies ESL learners' repetition, which is conventionally viewed as an indicator of being less fluent and competent. Applying a CA frame into the data set of ESL learners, she asserts that an alternative function of repetition in the same speaker's utterances seems to empower him or her the interactional resource for self-repair before others do. Also, repetition enables learners to show a signal of holding the floor to their conversation partners. That is to say, the meaning of an utterance is not completely determined. Rather, it is created by the interaction between the participants.

www.kci.go.kr

Although his study is not targeted to elementary school level, M. J. Lee (2008) uses sequential analysis of CA in order to find out two systematic preference organization patterns among Korean high school English learners. His findings include that learners commonly refer to metalinguistic repair with L1 when having difficulty communicating with each other and learners frequently employ self-initiated self-repair strategy in L1. Aside from these findings, his research indicates that Korean high school learners usually prefer L1 self-initiated self-repair for the purpose of both making up for their lack of L2 proficiency and going with the flow.

In CA perspective, classroom talk is not an ordinary conversation. Rather, it is an institutionalized talk in that, unlike the ordinary talk, classroom talks are heavily under the influence of their commitment of the organizational mission (Drew & Heritage, 1992). That is, an institution is established with its own objective. For example, a hospital has its distinctive mission, which is to take care of sick people and their health condition.

III. METHOD

The current section presents more details about how the present study was conducted. That is, the specifications about the context of Korean elementary school English classrooms, the ways the Korean elementary teachers of English generally teach, where and how the classroom data were collected, and how they were transcribed for the analysis are going to be described in detail.

1. Research Context

The data recorded for the present study are collected from regular elementary school English sessions that followed the 2009 Revised National Curriculum. The teachers used textbooks as the main teaching material to teach English. In their classes, they mostly used multimedia contents packed in the DVD or CD-ROMs which are attached in their textbooks. The materials included rich visual and audio contents such as flash animations, karaoke, games that are generally intended for motivating young learners of English as a foreign language.

This study analyzes the talk of Korean elementary school English teachers in-depth as they interact with their students in classrooms. Eight Korean English teachers with various teaching experiences were recruited by establishing contact with the Association of Elementary English Teachers in Gyeonggi and Incheon as well as a local community of elementary school English teachers in Seoul. Such teachers' communities were accessible since I served for about twelve years as a teacher in a public elementary school since 2001.

www.kci.go.kr

TABLE 1

Summary of Participants' Profiles

Participant	Gender	Age	Experience	Diploma
T1	Female	Early 30s	10 years	MA-TESOL
T2	Female	Mid 40s	21 years	Ed. M.
T3	Female	Mid 50s	33 years	Ed. M.
T4	Female	Early 40s	16 years	MA-TESOL
T5	Female	Mid 20s	9 months	B. Ed.
T6	Female	Early 40s	1 year 9 months	M. A.
T7	Male	Early 20s	3 months	B. Ed.
T8	Female	Late 20s	5 years	E. Ed.

For efficient and precise transcribing, two kinds of transcribing tools are employed in the present study. The first one is an application called "F5" that speeds up the process of listening or watching the recorded media repeatedly while transcribing the data. The most difficult thing in the transcribing process is the endless repetition of play, pause, and replay. Along with the software, an additional hardware named "Infinity IN-USB-2 USB Digital Foot Control" is used to accelerate the present study's transcribing process.

2. Data Collection Procedure

Recording teaching sessions started from mid May and ended in late October 2013. Before starting to record, meetings with participants were arranged in order to discuss some details such as exact dates to record the classes, specific lessons to record, and class population, etc. The total amount of the data comes to approximately 1600 minutes long and 120,000 words. The type of documentation that was originally considered for the research was a video recording of all classes taught by the teacher participants, but some participants raised the students' parents' disagreement over the self-portrait issue. For this reason, audio recording was also considered to be used as a method of recording the classes for those who preferred it to video recording.

In order to make the transcription as accurate as possible when only audio recording was available, I used observation notes during the audio recording. The purpose of the observation notes is to strengthen the analysis with visual resources. This is how I conducted observation notes: First, during the audio recording, teachers' moves and facial expressions were jotted down every two or three minutes as quickly as possible. Second, students' moves such as raising hands, motions, on-going activities, etc. were also written down briefly. Lastly, how students and teachers physically interact when they get involved in any exchanges of turns was also written down.

Myriad classroom discourses make the researchers perplexed so much. Audio and video captures almost all interactional sequences that go on. It is not possible to examine all the

www.kci.go.kr

aspects. Therefore, I needed to be selective in choosing which discourse to analyze deeply, and used an application called "F4-Text Analyzer" to have a close look at the collected classroom data while labeling utterances of teachers and students into some categories. This process of coding every utterance in the data does not mean this study is based on such pre-determined frameworks. Rather, the coding process was intended and employed as a means of looking into the collected discourse with a keen eye for seeing what the members are doing at the moment.

3. Data Analysis

The first step taken was to listen and transcribe the whole recorded discourse of teachers and students. In this stage, detailed transcript notations were not used since the purpose was to review the whole discourse of the Korean elementary teachers of English. Then I listened several times to the above-mentioned three categories of various Korean elementary teachers' interactions. Simultaneously, I transcribed in detail in order not to dismiss any tiny verbal actions such as breathe-in/out, mild laughing, rising or falling pitch, varied pauses, etc. At this level of transcription, I tried to make the transcript as accurate as possible so that the present study could make some sort of educated guess whether a certain kind of interpretation is possible in the aspect of sequence, not by any external bias or frames borrowed from other previous research. The last step was to analyze these marked parts of discourse by using the perspective of sequential organization.

The current study followed the convention established by Jefferson (1984) in order to transcribe the collected data of NNS teachers and students (see Appendix 1). The transcription itself is a very important resource for analysis because the specific sound features that transcriptions try to capture can be significant variables which influence the next turn in the given talk-in-interaction (Y. A. Lee, 2001). Accordingly, the present study has a cause to capture those unique sound qualities such as higher/lower pitch, fast/slower pace of talk, pauses, overlaps, latched utterances, etc. All these can be great resources that enable researchers to identify how the members of the conversation understand each other. Besides, Yale system (Martin, 1992) was used to convert Korean utterances into Romanized letters (see Appendix 2).

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The present section explores how KESETs decide to manage their turn taking mechanism for the purpose of achieving various pedagogical tasks: introducing learning objectives of the lesson, explaining game rules or procedures, asking questions with regard

www.kci.go.kr

to the materials, and organizing learning environment for classroom management and disciplines. In addition, this section also investigates how these teachers differentiate their three-turn (initiation-response-evaluation/follow-up) behaviors in accordance with different contexts of pedagogical tasks. Lastly, how KESETs employ code switching in the aforementioned pedagogical tasks will also be discussed in this section.

1. Insisting Initiations Until the Preferred Items Come

Excerpt 1 shows that the presentation of learning objectives is essentially seen in Korean elementary English class. This means teachers consider it a vital step which they cannot skip bluntly. Hence, this section will deal with the common principle or predominant order in which KESETs introduce learning objectives to learners. In addition, the sequential organization of presenting learning objectives is specifically described until the preferred or expected answer appears. Along with this, how KESETs' code switching is conducted for the purpose of achieving their primary work will be also discussed.

Excerpt 1

((Excerpt 1 is taken from the first class of the participant (T7). The teacher is eliciting some key words while presenting the learning objectives to the students. The teacher specifically wants the students to complete the target expressions for oral production. In the meantime, the teacher is, by eliciting, also having the students guess the adequate words to make the target expressions.))

001 T ► Today we are going to study:
002 (0.5)
003 ◦this is it◦
004 ((pointing to the lesson objectives on the board))
005 *ca* (tr.: Here) who: is thi:s
006 Ss Who is thi:s
007 T Is this your blah blah?
008 Ss Is this your blah blah?
009 T *ikesul iyonghayse* (1.0) *pinkhan:ul* >*meywuko* [*mwutko*]
010 *taphay polkentey*<
(tr.: Using this expression, we are going to fill in the blank,
and then ask a question and answer the question.)
011 S1 [( )]
012 T ► Let's guess <what the blank is>
013 Let's guess
014 S2 ► Let's guess?
015 S3 [◦*cilmwun issnuntey*-◦] (tr.: I have a question-)

www.kci.go.kr

016 T ► [*chwuchukhay poca*] (tr.: Let's guess.)
017 (1.0)
018 ► *nwuka sontulkka*? (tr.: Who'll raise a hand?)
019 (0.5)
020 ► *sontule* [*polkkayo*? (tr.: Will anyone raise a hand?)
021 S3 [*akka*- (tr.: Earlier)
022 Ss ((raise hands))

As Excerpt 1 indicates, the primary task for the students is explained in line 001-004. Students are supposed to complete the target expressions by filling in the blank of the sentence on the board. The teacher even demonstrates what to do in line 007. He even code-switched his instruction in line 009. In line 012, the teacher initiates a turn that calls for students' response, but the students do not respond to the initiation. Instead, the student initiates a question. Then the third turn becomes another initiation, where the teacher re-initiates, that is, insisting what he proposed earlier in line 12.

The above occurrence seems quite deviant compared to common classroom cases with regard to questioning practices between the teacher and students. It is more usual that the teacher asks a question and students in a cohort answer the question except when the teacher nominates a certain student. It is usual that the typical three-turn scheme IRF is circulated throughout the session (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). However, as seen from S2's perspective in line 014 the turn exchange is deemed distinctive in that she just reacts in a different way to the teacher's initiation slightly before the cohort responds. S2 asks back as in "Let's guess?" with a rising tone in line 014, which indicates a reaction that the learner does not understand clearly.

Introducing learning objectives is considered a serious work for the Korean elementary teachers of English. This is consistent with general features of L2 classroom (Seedhouse, 2004). Learning objectives themselves are like the compass for the teacher and students in the classroom. In L2 classroom, particularly in Korean context, introducing the learning objectives in L2 seems quite demanding and challenging in that the teachers are supposed to use L2 as the main medium of communication. Besides, L2 utterances used in introducing learning objectives are generally beyond the learnability of beginning learners. The result is manifested in the above extract where the teacher is struggling for the purpose of making his learners understand the learning objectives clearly in spite of their limited L2 learnability. To this end, the teacher interactionally employs code switching and repetition, but the procedure seems quite inefficient when the productivity is considered. In a sense, presenting the learning objectives will be more efficient if it is delivered in L1 rather than L2.

The turn exchange mechanism of the teacher in the stage of checking learning objectives is generally manifested by the centralization of the cohort. Most of the teachers' questions

www.kci.go.kr

travel via the cohort and then to the individual learners, whose responses never fail to be reviewed and examined by the cohort. Hence, the third turn manifestation is occupied by the cohort when it comes to the teacher's display questions in checking learning objectives since the purpose of the teachers' question in the context is to make the cohort aware of the learning objectives. The preference choice is clearly observed by the teacher who responds more interactively to his or her preferred utterances from the individuals or the cohort.

In terms of the predominance of IRF sequences, it turns out that Waring's (2008, 2009) assertion is valid in the case of KESETs' presenting learning objectives of the lesson, which is very effective in checking already-known facts or information by the teacher. However, KESETs also use the variation of IRF to meet the demand of learners' understanding. That is, the third turn (feedback) practice is commonly delayed until the teacher's preferred item is nearly identified. As the title of this section implies, the teacher intends to delay answering back his learners' responses. He rather wants to give some opportunities for other learners to consider the question. This procedure can be also seen as a process of making public the on-going topic which is commonly found in conventional classrooms. Consequently, the teacher's hidden intention lies in the pedagogical consideration for more participation by insisting his identical initiation until the desired item appears.

When it comes to the practice of code switching in the session of presenting learning objectives, KESETs commonly appear to resort to code switching for the purpose of enabling students to respond to the teacher's L2 initiation. Especially when teacher's successive L2 initiations do not have any effect on the students' understanding, the teachers' code switching is more frequently observed. Apparently, students are more responsive to their teachers' L1 initiations. Yet, the data in this section also indicate the teacher frequently uses L1 for the purpose of more effective interaction (M. J. Lee, 2008): encouraging learners to speak up, arranging volunteers, inviting alternative comments, etc. Besides, the data show KESETs also use stand-alone L1 regardless of L2 equivalences in order to achieve their organizing and managerial duties.

2. Breaking Down the Actions in Sequence

Playing language games during the lesson is seen as an almost inevitable ritual in Korean elementary English class. For readers' reference, language games in the current study refer to a kind of activities where some language forms are mainly used while playing a game. For example, as shown in Excerpt 2, the language game below is called "Pass the ball." In this game, learners are asked to speak up the given expressions from the teacher while they begin to pass the ball around as the teacher starts playing music

www.kci.go.kr

Excerpt 2

((Excerpt 2 is from the fourth class of the participant (T7). The teacher is introducing to his students a game called "Pass the Ball." First of all, he makes sure that all the students know the rules of the game by explaining the procedure step by step to the students.))

680 T ▶ Okay ( ) atten:tion↑
681 Ss ▶ Atten:tion
682 T Atten:tion
683 Ss Atten:tion
684 T ▶ One two (.) eyes on me:
685 Ss ▶ One two (.) eyes on you:
686 T Okay do you know this game?
687 Ss Yes
688 S1 I know
689 T Okay I will explain how to play this game.
690 ( ) two things
691 ▶ First, don't throw ((shows the motion)) okay don:'t throw
692 ▶ Secon:d don:'t stand up ((shows the motion)) okay just stand (.) just sit down
693 ▶ and pass the ball (.) okay?
694 Ss [Ah: ah
695 T ▶ [Do you understand?
696 S2 Aha:
697 T Uh okay
698 Uh:: when the music stops
699 ((Sees a boy student not paying attention))
700 *Uysek*
701 (1.0)
702 ▶ <When the music stops, then:>
703 the person who has the ball (.) stand up
704 S3 Huh:
705 T And everyone a:sk "Is this your blah blah?"
706 Okay this kind of ( )
707 An:d stand up and say: "Yes it's mine" or "No: it's <u>not</u> mine"
708 Okay good.

Excerpt 2 clearly shows that the teacher initiates his explanation of the language game rules by getting the cohort's attention first as in line 680 to 685. This undertaking can be regarded as a prelude to the main task of the teacher's work in that the upcoming task needs a high level of attention. Moreover, this prelude seems quite effective in that the

www.kci.go.kr

teacher is successfully setting up the floor to continue his explanation of the relatively complicated task, which is to break down the utterances into smaller actions.

In line 691 to 693, the teacher is dividing the sequence of actions necessary for the language game into two phases. He is not telling just the whole description of the game in a few sentences. Rather, he explicitly and methodically presents step-by-step steps with some motions for his low-proficient learners. Moreover, those steps are quite easy enough for them to understand immediately.

After delivering the two most important actions in lines 691 to 692, the teacher is asking the cohort to see, in line 695, if they follow those two steps before he moves on to the next sequence of the game. It is not sure whether the teacher understands S2's utterance "Aha:" in line 696, but the utterance in the next turn in line 698 "Uh:: when the music stops" shows that the teacher seems to interpret it as a confirming signal to go on his explanation. This incident indicates how KESET tactically backs up in order to compensate the learners' short attention span in course of a long sequence of turns used for explaining the language game rules.

In line 699, the teacher resumes explaining the game rules, but he shortly sees a boy student not paying attention to the game. The result is that he calls the student's name to get his attention back to the on-going task. And then he continues the rest of the game rules. But it needs to note what happens in line 702, where the teacher utters, "<when the music stops, then>." As a matter of fact, this utterance is the same as the teacher's utterance "when the music stops" in line 698, which was previously interrupted by the boy student named *Uysek*. This may be the sequential reason why the teacher recasts the same utterance in slower pace (Schegloff, 1988). That is to say, his slower pace of talk is not just randomly decided but occasioned by the incident of being interrupted in prior turns of the on-going talk.

In addition, explaining the language games among other tasks involves a litany of contingent issues. In the course of interaction, the teacher may find a need to elaborate or explicate various steps or encounter unexpected questions from the students. But it may be impossible for teachers to deal with every response of students. Therefore, the teachers need strategies: if the student's question is considered relevant, the teacher takes it. If not, the teacher passes it up. So are the comments of students in-between the teacher's explications. Otherwise, the teacher would take longer time and effort than expected.

However, the literature has paid little attention to various aspects of language game activities which are being played in Korean elementary English classroom so that only few external information is available such as types of games, preferences of students and teachers, pedagogical effects and so on (K. H. Han, 2012; Y. H. Kim, 1997; S. Lee & Y. Y. Park, 2014; J. Y. Moon, 2012). KESETs' interactional features in language game activities indicate that there exists a stronger degree of contingency between the teachers and

www.kci.go.kr

students. This causes occasional collapses of conventional IRF sequence as well as higher frequency of students' initiations. Thus, it can be also said that teachers have a lesser degree of control over information or knowledge in game activities.

3. Eliciting Responses for Confirmation

While delivering a language learning activity to learners, making sure if they clearly understand what has been explained takes place in Korean elementary school English classes. Particularly when the teacher has to examine if his or her explanation for task presentations is clearly understood by students, confirmation works effectively. As shown in Excerpt 3, it will be shown how a KESET sequentially comes to use confirmation to check up learners' understanding in the middle of a task presentation process. Alongside, how KESETs can be sure if learners understand clearly is going to be described in the course of interacting each other.

Excerpt 3

((Excerpt 3 is from the second class of the participant (T8). The teacher is showing her students some picture cards one by one to let them review the words about family members such as father, mother, uncle, aunt, etc. When the teacher shows a picture card, the student cohort is supposed to say a question "Who's this?" Then, the teacher nominates a student, who has to stand up and match the card with an adequate target expression.))

242	T	Okay. ((shows a picture card))
243		Sunyoung?
244		Okay, everyone!
245	Ss	Who's this?
246	S1	Uh: it's my anga? >*Ani ani* < = (tr.: No no)
247	S2	= Aunt
248	S1	Yes. Aunt!
249	T	Aunt?
250	Ss	Ye
251	T	Okay, very good.
252	▶	*Cal malhaysseyo*? (tr.: Did she say correctly?)
253	Ss	Yes.
254	T	*E: cal malhaysse. Ttalahaypwa*
		(tr.: Yes, it was correct. Repeat after this.)
255		It's my aunt.
256	Ss	It's my aunt.
257	T	It's my aunt.

www.kci.go.kr

258	Ss	It's my aunt.
259	T ▶	Okay. What's the meaning: <of aunt?>
260		((Nominates to S3))
261	S3▶	*Ceypi* (tr.: a swallow)
262	Ss	((laughing))
263	T	*Ceypi* hh
264	S4	( )
265	T ▶	*Ilenase malhay polkkayo*? (tr.: Would you stand up and say?)
266	S4	< *Swukmona imo*> (tr.: an aunt on father or mother side)
267	T	Oh, very good.◦
268	S5	*Swukmo* ( ) (tr.: an aunt)
269	T	*Swukmo: imo: wulika* ↑(.) *yengelo* "aunt" *lako hapnita*.
		(tr.: In English we call it "aunt" to refer to swukmo imo.)

By her remark "*Cal malhaysseyo*? (tr.: Did she say correctly?)" in line 252, the teacher asks the cohort to check if S1's performance is correctly conducted or not. Her question is used to examine how the cohort understands S1's response and her goal is achieved by hearing "Yes" in line 253. But she already confirms the correctness of S1's response in line 251 "Okay, very good." In other words, the teacher re-confirms by hearing the response of the cohort though she has already evaluated S1's response to the given question. This implies that she has to monitor not only an individual learner's but also the collective cohort's understanding.

The question "What's the meaning: <of aunt?>" in line 259 is produced in order to check to see if the cohort understands the definition of "aunt" in Korean. This decision can be related to his first question in line 252, which is mainly used to examine if S1 and the cohort could successfully match the picture and the word. Yet in line 259 the teacher wants to go further to find out whether the student and the cohort are clearly aware of the Korean definition of "aunt." The reason why she asks about its definition is specified in lines beyond 266.

Consequently, the teacher thinks that it would be very imperative to let her students know that there are two possible equivalents of "aunt" in Korean, whereas it could refer to either the sister of one's father or mother in English. Her intention is clearly represented in the summarized remark in line 269-270 "*Swukmo: imo: wulika ↑(.) yengelo "aunt" lako hapnita*" (tr.: In English we call it "aunt" to refer to *swukmo imo*). Namely, the teacher plans to explicitly emphasize the dual meaning of "aunt" in English because she as a Korean knows too well about the difference between "*swukmo* (tr.: a sister of father)" and "*imo* (tr.: a sister of mother)." Accordingly, in Excerpt 3, the teacher utilizes her questions very systematically for the purpose of having her students focus on the form "aunt" per se

www.kci.go.kr

and then those rather complicated meanings of the word "aunt."

Excerpt 3 has shown KESETs' questions are produced with reasons as well as commitment. This means their questions can be occasionally pre-planned for pedagogical issues. Nevertheless, NNS teachers' questions can also be generated contingently to meet the demands of the on-going contextual issues. As the data show in this section, KESETs have to ask to examine if their learners understand the task procedure clearly or correctly. As a result, the teachers come to feel the necessity of verifying the degree of learners' understanding of the on-going task, which results in their frequent elicitations. This action is not the result of their planning. Rather it mostly results from interactional contingency occurring in real time between the teachers themselves and learners. In addition, the above excerpts have also demonstrated the challenges that NNS teachers face in order to overcome those pedagogically planned questions as well as contingently occurring elicitations to interactively deal with real-time occurring issues in the classroom.

It appears that code switching in the practice of eliciting responses does not follow the teachers' L2 initiations. Rather, L1 is more frequently used for new initiations (not for recurring initiations) in the events of eliciting responses than other tasks. That is to say, while eliciting responses the teachers do not employ code-switching as frequently as they do in presenting learning objectives. This may be caused by the purpose of L1 use, which is to promote the interaction between the two parties, not to instruct any language form or content to teach. In this sense, some parts of the results are consistent with M. J. Lee (2008). But, this study confirms that L1 use can also be dependent upon the pedagogical task type to be presented. That is, the teachers' L1 use is caused by the need of interactional drive, and that drive can be specified by the characteristics of the pedagogical task.

4. Organizing Learning Environment Simultaneously

For the purpose of implementing an activity, L2 teachers need to ensure if all the students can follow what they have to do by then. Particularly so is when a language game is being introduced to learners. At this moment, teachers are also required to organize in real time the readiness of learners before an activity begins to play. Excerpt 4 is going to describe how KESETs interactionally conduct the work of making students ready to play a game or activity that is about to begin soon.

Excerpt 4

((Excerpt 4 is from the first class of the participant (T4). The teacher is giving an instruction for her students to work in pairs so that they can practice a short dialog using expressions such as "what do you want to do?" and "I want to do something.”))

www.kci.go.kr

488 T Okay.
489 ▶ Have a partner.
490 ((Waits for Ss to have partners))
491 ▶ Have a partner.
492 (0.5)
493 ▶ *<yeph chinkwu twu myeng, twu myeng, twu myeng>*
(tr.: Make a pair with the partners next to you.)
494 like ↑this
((Demonstrates how to make a pair while approaching Ss around))
495 S1 *aphtwi aphtwi*::
(tr.: Back and forth, back and forth)
496 T ▶ ((Directs Ss to make a pair by pointing her fingers to Ss nearby))
497 ▶ One two, one two, one two, one two an:↑d
498 ((Sees Ss making pairs successfully))
499 ▶ Yes.
499 Ss ( )
500 T Would you- =
501 S2 = Ah↑ a::
502 T ▶ Would you add an answer >what do you want to do?<
503 ▶ an:d I want to do >something somethin'?<
504 ▶ Can you do it?
505 Ss Yes.
506 T Okay. Ready:: go.

In Excerpt 4, the teacher rather directly jumps into the very first step that is to make pairs while actually demonstrating each action step-by-step instead of telling everything in advance to learners. That is, the teacher is giving an instruction to her students while checking to see if her learners follow her instruction for the activity.

The teacher initially directs the cohort to get a partner by saying, "Have a partner" in line 489. Then she observes if the cohort follows her direction. Then she asks the cohort again to find a partner. But this time, she differentiates her repeated utterance by placing word stress on the different as before "Have a partner" in line 491. Looking at the student cohort's behavior, which suggests not all the students are done with making pairs, also contingently occasions this differentiation in spite of the same repeated utterance.

However, despite her repeated instruction, she finds the cohort not following her direction completely. Hence, she decides her code-switching so that all the students can catch up with her instruction, as indicated in line 493, "*<yeph chinkwu twu myeng, twu myeng, twu myeng>* (tr.: Make a pair with the partners next to you.) like ↑this= (Make a

www.kci.go.kr

pair with the partners next to you)." Again, this code-switching from L2 to L1 is not delivered step-by-step wise. Rather it is her decision on the basis of her judgment about learners' insufficient L2 capabilities. As a result, the teacher demonstrates how to make pairs by approaching students around while showing her own motions.

Then she continues to reformulate her utterance as "One two, one two, one two, one two an:↑d" in line 497. This utterance is reformulation of her preceding L1 utterance in line 493. And finally she confirms that all the students have successfully finished making pairs as they were told to do by the teacher. The utterance "Yes" in line 499 indicates that her task-presentation is running well, and it fully reflects that her task-presentation thus far has been conducted by following the contingent actions of her students. In other words, her extended utterances used in the task-presentation are not randomly or pre-planned, but rather contingently decided by judging the actions of the turns before and after her own turn.

One more thing to notice from the above excerpt is the way students respond to the teacher's small stepped task-presentation. Her presentation is not interrupted or intervened by any other student in her class. In contrast, the task-presentation of the teacher in Excerpt 4 had to struggle in order to hold the floor. It is not easy to account for the difference in that kind of phenomenon, but teachers' different ways of presenting tasks could be one of the variables that affect the learners' behaviors.

For KESETs, saying multiple utterances during the organization of a learning environment may be one of the expected difficulties in using English. In fact, building multiple utterances for the purpose of organizing the involved learning requires the speaker to be equipped with an ability of taking care of adequacy and sufficiency with regard to what has been commented on earlier turns or all through his or her turns in the talk (Y. A. Lee, 2012).

With regard to code switching, it turns out that KESETs seem to prefer L1 to L2 when they have to get the students' attention for the purpose of maintaining the learning environment. In such cases, the teachers do not switch their language from L2. When necessary, they just say L1 directions without any hesitation. This might be the reason why the teachers need more powerful and immediate resources to affect students' problematic behaviors on real-time basis. Eventually, the decision for code switching is subject to interactional contingency in real time. In the meantime, Liu, Ahn, Baek and Han (2004) state that there seems to be a principle in the practice of Korean high school English teachers' code switching but it is not conducted under strict consistency. In contrast, the data in this section show that such unclear consistency operates in accordance with interactional contingency given at the moment to moment.

www.kci.go.kr

V. CONCLUSION

The purpose of the present study was to examine the interactional practices of Korean elementary school English teachers from the CA perspective under the tradition of ethnomethodology, particularly on the basis of a sequential analysis of turn construction at classroom talk. The results of the data analysis showed that KESETs implement their English teaching by relying not only on their language proficiency levels or fluency but also on interactional orientations. Specifically, their interactional practices had a tendency to constantly elaborate or revise their talk on the contingent basis of the prior or next turns at classroom talk with their students.

The language use of KESETs was occasioned by the contingency of the sequential organization of the turns at talk. They did not use language in random or pre-planned ways. Rather, they constantly adapted their utterances to fit learners' current learnability and achieve pedagogical purposes. That is, the KESETs kept interpreting how the learners understand what they say, which decisively affects how the teachers alter their utterances in the next turn at talk.

1. Limitations of the Study

This study is based on only eight different data sets from Korean elementary school teachers of English who volunteered to participate in this study. Their classrooms are located in Seoul and Gyeonggi Province, which means they do not represent the whole group of Korean elementary school English teachers. Other English teachers working in different parts of Korea may have shown different ways of interaction with their students. This means that the findings of the study might be differently illustrated in the sense that a wider variety of interactional practices might be observed if a larger recruitment of participants were available.

Apart from the centralization of participants' location, this study does not include the participants' own voices on their classroom practices through the interviews. Thus, if the analysis had been connected with the observation and the interview, the study would have resulted in different aspects of findings.

Furthermore, the participants are entirely from elementary schools. The secondary school or college level NNS teachers of English may display different interactions with their Korean students. The teachers of different subjects may also exhibit different aspects of interactional practices in the classroom. The proficiency level of participants was not considered in recruiting the participants. Although I tried to find out the exact English language proficiency level of the participants, the participants did not agree to disclose their official English test scores such as TOEFL, TOEIC or IELTS.

www.kci.go.kr

In this vein, this study excludes interpersonal variables such as participants' teaching experiences, personality and views on teaching because the premise of the study lies in the belief that a small group of members indicate their social norms by precise description of their common qualities within a target action (ten Have, 2004).

2. Suggestions

The present study suggests that stakeholders of teacher training and education consider and acknowledge the importance of teachers' interactional competence in the classroom. In teacher education, a conventional emphasis is placed upon methodologies for the enhancement of the teaching profession. However, it may not be the methods that teachers need in helping learners be better off; rather it is the teachers' understanding of the realities of how to interact with learners will be more critical to teacher education (Allwright & Bailey, 1991).

Accordingly, procedural knowledge, rather than propositional knowledge, about the interactional requirements for being a professional L2 teacher needs to be introduced to teacher education programs. Closer examination of how teachers' utterances are understood by learners as well as in what ways teachers can support learners to help them understand better should be connected to teacher preparation program. In other words, prospective teacher education or in-service teacher training program alike must reflect what teachers are most likely to say and do in the classroom. Besides, more investigation about teachers' interactional work required in L2 classroom has to be elaborated.

In addition, this study clearly shows how narrow the scope of the Korean elementary classroom talk is between the teachers and students in spite of considering their age factor. All the teachers predominantly initiate task-oriented questions in order to carry out standards of learning achievement established by the Korean government. Their talk hardly goes beyond the threshold of teachers' insisting correct or expected answers from the learners. This kind of the limited boundary of classroom talk may cause severe problems to the prospective Korean teachers of English in that they might develop a false awareness concerning how conversational talk should go by in non-classroom settings.

There exist relatively insufficient opportunities for learners to produce utterances with more freedom. Numerous pedagogical tasks are overwhelmingly explained and presented by the teachers. They pay substantial amount of time and effort to make learners understood. But this process is not free; it takes equivalent tolls. The more tasks the teachers have to explain, the fewer amounts of opportunities the learners come to have. As shown in the present study's data, tasks are always managed and controlled by the teachers. Learners, in turn, are allowed with limited freedom in time and space. It is time to consider the quality of tasks in L2 language class.

www.kci.go.kr

Finally, the interlanguage of NNS teachers should be considered a register and, it needs a systematic investigation particularly in teacher education institutions. This interlanguage includes not only the verbal utterances of prospective NNS teachers but also their interactional strategies that can be developed before and in-service stages respectively. As the data in the current study show, NNS teachers' interactional competence plays a definitely critical role in helping NNS learners with their L2 learning in that interaction itself becomes a great resource for L2 learners to benefit from.

REFERENCES

Allwright, D., & Bailey, C. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom: An introduction to classroom research for language teachers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Boulima, J. (1999). *Negotiated interaction in target language classroom discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Breen, M. P. (1985). The social context for language learning: A neglected situation? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7*(2), 135-158.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). (Eds.). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fröhlich, M., Spada, N., & Allen, P. (1985). Differences in the communicative orientation of L2 classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*(1), 27-57.

Han, Kyung-Hee. (2012). *An analysis of the game sections in the 4th grade elementary school English textbooks*. Unpublished master's thesis, Konkuk University, Seoul, Korea.

Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jefferson, G. (1984). Transcript notation. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. ix-xvi). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kim, Hyun-Jin. (2010). Pre-service English teacher's use of interaction modification in their teacher talk. *Modern English Education, 11*(3), 55-78.

Kim, Jang-Kyu. (2011). *A study of advancing collaborative teaching of native English assistant teachers through the English utterance analysis of elementary school students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Korea National University of Education, Chung-Buk, Korea.

Kim, Min-Jung, & Lee, Eun-Joo. (2011). A study on the types and effects of the teachers' corrective feedback on elementary school students' speech errors. *Modern English Education*, *12*(3), 206-229.

Kim, Seong-Shik. (2005). The teacher talk of a native English speaker teaching English in a primary school. *Primary English Education, 11*(2), 233-263.

www.kci.go.kr

Kim, Sun-Hee. (2008). Types and characteristics of classroom exchanges in Korean middle school TETE classes. *The SNU Journal of Education Research*, *17*, 71-94.

Kim, Young-Hee. (1997). *The effects of songs, chants, and games on elementary English learning*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Sookmyung Women's University, Seoul, Korea.

Lee, Hye-Won. (2002). An overview of interaction features in a Korean elementary English classroom. *Primary English Education, 8*(2), 257-274.

Lee, Hye-Won. (2005). Revisiting the controversial issue of using English as the major medium of instruction: Based on the observed features and practicing teachers' theory. *Primary English Education, 11*(1), 123-156.

Lee, Mong-Ju. (2008). Preference organization in the use of learners' L1 in pair interaction of a Korean EFL classroom. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics, 24*(1), 61-83.

Lee, Sae-Rom, & Chang, Kyung-Suk. (2011). An analysis of the Korean and the native teacher talk in the primary co-teaching English class. *Primary English Education, 17*(1), 299-325.

Lee, Sera, & Park, Young Ye. (2014). An analysis of game activities in three 5th grade English textbooks developed in the 2008 national curriculum. *Primary English Education, 20*(2), 214-267.

Lee, Seung-Bok. (2005). Comparison of teacher talks from three different primary school ESOL teachers. *English Teaching*, *60*(2), 161-183.

Lee, Yo-An. (2001). *Towards a respecification of L2 communicative competence: Interactional fluency and L2 instruction*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus.

Lee, Yo-An. (2012). Building connected discourse in non-native speech: Re-specifying non-native proficiency. *Pragmatics, 22*(4), 591-614.

Lee, Yo-An. (2013). Descriptions of second language interaction: Toward descriptive adequacy. *The Modern Language Journal, 97*(4), 853-868.

Liu, D., Ahn, G., Baek, K., & Han, N. (2004). South Korean high school English teachers' code switching: Questions and challenges in the drive for maximal use of English in teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*(4), 605-638.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*, 37-66.

Macbeth, D. H. (2011). Understanding understanding as an instructional matter. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*, 438-451.

Martin, S. E. (1992). *A reference grammar of Korean: A complete guide to the grammar and history of the Korean language* (1st ed.). Rutland, VT.: Charles E. Tuttle.

Moerman, M., & Sacks, H. (1988). On "understanding" in the analysis of natural

www.kci.go.kr

conversation. In M. Moerman (Ed.), *Talking culture: Ethnography and conversation analysis* (pp. 180-186). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Moon, Ju-Young. (2012). *The learner perceptions of games in elementary English education*. Unpublished master's thesis, Kwandong University, Kangneung, Korea.

Mori, J. (2002). Task design, plan, and development of talk-in-interaction: An analysis of a small group activity in a Japanese language classroom. *Applied Linguistics, 23*(3), 322-347.

Park, Kwang-No. (2005). *An investigation into the patterns of the teacher-student in the elementary English classroom in Korea*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Hanyang University, Seoul, Korea.

Payne, G., & Hustler, D. (1980). Teaching the Class: The practical management of a cohort. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 1*(1), 49-66.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). The organization of language classroom interaction. *Language Learning, 54*(S1), 181-222.

Schegloff, E. A. (1988). Presequences and indirection: Applying speech act theory to ordinary conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 12*(1), 55-62.

Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.

Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of natural language (Language in Society, 4)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

ten Have, P. (2004). *Understanding qualitative research and ethnomethodology*. London: Sage Publication.

Waring, H. Z. (2008). Using explicit positive assessment in the language classroom: IRF, feedback, and learning opportunities. *Modern Language Journal, 92*(4), 577-594.

Waring, H. Z. (2009). Moving out of IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback): A single case analysis. *Language Learning, 59*(4), 796-824.

Wong, J. (2000). Repetition in conversation: A look at "First and second sayings". *Research on Language & Social Interaction, 33*, 407-424.

www.kci.go.kr

APPENDIX 1

Transcript Notation
(cf. Jefferson, 1984)

Italicized	Korean utterance transcribed in Yale system
(.)	Noticeable pause
(0.5), (2.6)	Examples of timed pauses
↑word, word↓	Onset of noticeable pitch rise or fall
A: word [word	Start of overlapping speech
B: [word	
.hh	In-breath (note the preceding full stop)
hh	Out-breath
wo(h)rd	"laughing" (note the parenthesized h)
wor-	Cut-off
wo:rd	Stretched the preceding sound; prolonged sound
(word)	What might have been said if unclear
( )	Unclear talk
(( ))	Actions or context that cannot be transcribed
A: word =	Un-noticeable pause between two speakers' turns.
B: = word	
<u>word</u> , WORD	Louder, capitals louder still
o word o	Quieter voice than neighboring sound or voice
>word word<	Faster speech
<word word>	Slower speech
▶	Signal of a significant line for analysis
tr.	Translation of Korean utterances

www.kci.go.kr

APPENDIX 2

Yale Romanization Convention
(cf. Martin, 1992)

Vowels

ㅏ	ㅐ	ㅑ	ㅒ	ㅓ	ㅔ	ㅕ	ㅖ	ㅗ	ㅘ	ㅙ	ㅚ	ㅛ	ㅜ	ㅝ	ㅞ	ㅟ	ㅠ	ㅡ	ㅢ	ㅣ
a	ay	ya	yay	e	ey	ye	yey	o	wa	way	oy	yo	wu	we	wey	wi	yu	u	uy	i

Consonants

ㄱ	ㄲ	ㄴ	ㄷ	ㄸ	ㄹ	ㅁ	ㅂ	ㅃ	ㅅ	ㅆ	ㅇ	ㅈ	ㅉ	ㅊ	ㅋ	ㅌ	ㅍ	ㅎ
k	kk	n	t	tt	l	m	p	pp	s	ss	ng	c	cc	ch	kh	th	ph	h

Examples in: English
Applicable Language: English
Applicable Level: Elementary

Wooyoung Park
Department of Consilience
Korea Polytechnic University
Rm. 215 Building-G
237 Sankidae-ro Siheung-si
15073 Gyeonggi Province, Korea
Tel: 031-8041-0730
Email: eduranger@kpu.ac.kr

Received 14 December 2015
Revised 26 January 2016
Accepted 12 February 2016

www.kci.go.kr