

Chapter Seven: Repetition in negotiation of understanding

7.0 Introduction

The importance of repetition as a linguistic tool in negotiation sequences is often understated since Other- or Same-speaker repetitions in clarification requests, confirmation or comprehension checks or in respective answers are widely cited but not focussed on as a separate phenomenon (for example, De la Fuente, 2002; Yamaguchi, Iwasaki & Oliver, 1999; Iwashita, 2003; Oliver, 2002 and Williams, Inscoc & Tasker, 1997). Furthermore, repetition research often investigates either native speaker situations (as in Ito, 1993; Horiguchi, 1988; Johnstone, 1994; Kim, 2002; Murata, 1995; Norrick, 1987; Rieschild, 2004; Rost-Roth, 2000; Schegloff, 1997, 2004; Tannen, 1989 and Wong, 2000); or focusses on spoken interaction with learners (Aichiba, 2003; Deen, 1997; Kasper & Ross, 2003; Long, 1996; Lyster, 1998; Mackay, 1999; Mackay & Oliver, 2002; Merritt, 1994; Miyazaki, 1998; Oliver, 1995; Ondarra, 1997a, Swain & Lapkin, 1998 and Takei, 1999). Repetition is usually not examined in both contexts at the same time, and the base language of the learner is not considered. This chapter aims to fill this crucial gap by investigating forms and functions of repetition in negotiation sequences of native and nonnative speakers allowing for a comparison in regard to L1 and L2 language behaviour.

A classic in repetition research is Tannen (1989: 54-55) who identifies a range of possible types such as self- or other repetition, relevant to a spectrum ranging from exact repetitions to paraphrases including different words but similar ideas. She also stipulates that the most usual repetitions are questions repeated in the form of statements (and vice versa) and repetitions including minimal changes such as small repairs. Unlike other earlier researchers she documents the multi-functionality of repetition in conversational discourse:

Getting or keeping the floor, showing listenership, providing back-channel response, stalling, gearing up to answer or speak, humour and play, savouring and showing appreciation of a good joke, persuasion, linking one speaker's idea to another's, ratifying another's contribution, and including in an interaction a person who did not hear a previous utterance. (Tannen, 1989: 51)

This chapter examines forms and functions of repetition in the participants' first language (English and Japanese) and in EL1/EL2 negotiation, allowing identifying potential similarities and variances. Firstly, section 7.1 deals with the English and Japanese native speaker data sets (EL1/EL1 and JL1/JL1). Next, repetition occurring in inter-language situations (in EL1/EL2 dyads) is investigated in section 7.2 and the respective findings are then contrasted in 7.3. Forms of repetition in negotiated interaction are also discussed briefly in the methodology section 3.9.

7.1 Repetition in EL1/EL1 and JL1/JL1 negotiated interaction

In the native speaker data of the present study, utterances often include a form of repetition and in order to understand L1 patterns, it is important to further investigate the precise role of repetition in negotiation. The intention behind the native speaker analysis in this section is to establish norms in EL1/EL1 and JL1/JL1 negotiation in order to appreciate possible variations in the EL1/EL2 data. Sub-section 7.1.1 examines forms of repetition with a focus on who repeats (Same- or Other-speaker repetition). Functions of L1 repetition are investigated in 7.1.2 and 7.1.3 sums up the findings of this section.

7.1.1 Forms of repetition in native speaker negotiation

This sub-section examines who repeats what, how they repeat and where it takes place. In other words: is the speaker who originally made a proposition repeating in his/her subsequent turn (same speaker) or is it the listener (other speaker) who repeats. The 'what' refers to the form of the repetition which is here classed as partial, exact, elaboration or a paraphrase. 'How' refers to the prosody of the repetition which is seldom examined in negotiated interaction, but relevant to its function. Finally 'where' refers to discourse context, that is whether the repetition takes place in the indicator or response (the obligatory turns within a negotiated sequence) or in the reaction to the response or resolution (the possible fourth or fifth turn in negotiation).

In order to reach an initial overview of the number of repetitions within English and Japanese native speaker negotiated interaction, all forms of repetition were totalled according to their category and listed in numbers and percentages in Table 7.1.a. It is important to note that these instances of repetition are taken from both native speaker data sets: the twelve participants in EL1/EL1 dyads and the twelve JL1/JL1 speakers. Table 7.1.b. will examine speakers and forms in detail.

In order to allow for a more reliable comparison of data sets, percentages of repetition refer to the respective total of negotiated AS-units; for example 400 AS-units in EL1/EL1 dyads, 417 AS-units in JL1/JL1 dyads (as indicated in Chapter Four). Table 7.1.a shows that repetition takes place in 20% of all negotiated AS-units in EL1/EL1 interaction, and in 23.7% of Japanese native speaker negotiation.

Negotiation sequences: (*n*) Total AS-units Repetition units Percentage of repetition

EL1/EL1 (12 participants)	400	80	20%
JL1/JL1 (12 participants)	417	99	23.7%

Table 7.1.a. Overall percentages of repetition in NS negotiated interaction

After establishing that repetition occurs in a similar proportion in the native speaker data sets, Table 7.1.b provides a finer grained analysis in regard to speakers and forms of repetition in English and Japanese negotiated sequences. EL1 Other-speaker repetition is presented in column one and EL1 Same-speaker repetition in column two. The Japanese L1 forms of Other- and Same-speaker repetition are listed in column three and four respectively.

	Column One 12 participants (400 AS-units)			Column Two 12 participants (417 AS-units)			Column Three 12 participants (417 AS-units)			Column Four 12 participants (417 AS-units)		
Repetition:	Other-speaker			Same-speaker			Other-speaker			Same-speaker		
forms / speaker	<i>n</i>	EL1	%	<i>n</i>	EL1	%	<i>n</i>	JL1	%	<i>n</i>	JL1	%
Partial repetition	25		6.25%	12		3%	37		8.9%	14		3.5%
Exact repetition	13		3.25%	5		1.25%	11		2.5%	8		1.9%
Elaborated rep.	1		0.25%	11		2.75%	7		1.5%	12		2.9%
Paraphrase	4		1%	9		2.25%	3		1%	7		1.5%
Total	43		10.75%	37		9.25%	58		13.9%	41		9.8%

Table 7.1.b. Overview of forms and speakers in EL1 and JL1 negotiation

Table 7.1.b presents in more detail those forms by speaker type and although the information given in the table is quite dense, the alternative of amalgamating all forms into Other- and Same-speaker data would allow for only minimal insights into the features of negotiation. Hence, forms of repetition are listed to the left of the table and they are either partial or exact repetitions, elaborations or paraphrases. The number (*n*) on the left hand side of each column represents the number of times this form of

repetition occurred within a negotiated sequence. Since one example of each repetition category has already been given in the methodology section 3.9, it is felt that no further illustration of forms is needed. As mentioned above, it is important to keep in mind that all percentages in this chapter are not referring to the total amount of repetition but the total of negotiation of the respective speakers as 100%.

Table 7.1.b also differentiates between repetition by the same or the other speaker. Same-speaker repetition here does not refer to speech processing repetition ('restarts' or 'false starts') within the same turn, but to repetition by the same speaker in a subsequent turn. In the L1 interactions, speech processing repetition within sentences is considered to be only of limited relevance to the negotiation of understanding and is therefore not included or further analysed. Self-initiated self-repair as well as forms of repetition in the same utterance are also excluded by Deen (1997: 39) who postulates that they do not lead to negotiation between the respective speakers.

The percentages in Table 7.1.b reflect the use of the respective forms of repetition per speaker (EL1 or JL1, Other- or Same-speaker). The percentages are calculated in relationship to the total number of AS-units in negotiated interaction per data set as indicated in table 7.1.a (400 negotiated AS-units in EL1/EL1 and 417 in JL1/JL1). Table 7.1.b allows the following comparisons:

- Other-speaker repetition in EL1/EL1: 43 or 10.75% of total negotiated AS-units
- Other-speaker repetition in JL1/JL1: 58 or 13.9% of total negotiated AS-units
- Same-speaker repetition in EL1/EL1: 37 or 9.25% of total negotiated AS-units
- Same-speaker repetition in JL1/JL1: 41 or 9.8% of total negotiated AS-units

Although the overall numbers are not large enough to allow wide-spread generalisation, they do suggest that Other-speaker repetitions prevail in both native speaker data sets. Table 7.1 further illustrates that repetition is an important phenomenon in negotiated sequences. In total, the percentage of AS-units consisting of or including a form of repetition amounts to 20% in EL1/EL1 negotiation (80 out of 400 AS-units) versus close to 24% in JL1/JL1 negotiated sequences (99 out of 417 AS-units). About half of these repetitions by both speakers occur in partial forms (9% out of the 20% in EL1/EL1 and 12.5% out of the 24% in JL1/JL1).

Partial repetition in the present data mainly takes place in Other-speaker repetition. This is also confirmed by Kim (2002: 58) claiming that partial repetition is commonly used in English L1 utterances. Partial repetitions usually recycle the crucial part of the other speaker's turn which is often a noun phrase. Studies analysing Japanese forms also focus on the significance of partial repetition of the utterance of the previous speaker (Horiguchi, 1988: 18).

The present analysis reveals an interesting cross-linguistic distinction between repetition in Japanese and English that is that native speakers of English tend to repeat the final noun phrase of the initial utterance, whereas Japanese speakers sometimes recycle verb phrases. Interlinear gloss is added here to demonstrate this point in Japanese (Same-speaker) partial repetition:

(7.1) [JL1/JL1, D7: 65-68]

1. M 男 の 人 が (1) 箱 下ろそう と してる やつ です か。
Otoko no hito ga (1) hako orosou to shiteru yatsu desu ka
man GEN person SUBJ (1) box put down QUOT doing thing be Q
'is the man (1) the thing about to put down the box'
2. K 違います。
chigai masu *trigger*
'no'
3. M → 下ろそう と してる。
orosou to shiteru *indicator*
put down QUOT doing
'about to put down'
4. K 違います。
chigai masu *response*
'no'

Line three illustrates that the repetition consists of a verb phrase and similar repetitions occur frequently in the JL1/JL1 data. In regard to same turn self-repetition, research by Fox, Hayashi and Jasperson (1996: 207-209) also found that (besides noun phrases) Japanese have a tendency to repeat verb phrases. Their in-depth analysis of English and Japanese utterances concludes that the syntactic structure in English is quite rigid, requiring an overt subject followed by a verb / object, whereas Japanese can leave the

subject, object or even a verb unexpressed. Their sentence elements are less dependent from each other, so it is possible to repeat just the verb.

Example 7.1, line four, also illustrates a typical Same-speaker exact repetition in the final part of a negotiation sequence which in this case consists of a single phrase *chigai imasu* ‘no’. Exact repetition in the data usually takes the form of a word or a short phrase and Kim (2002: 58) also found in his examination of a corpus of spoken English that exact repetitions mainly consist of short utterances. He observes that in a strict sense, there is no exact repetition, considering that there are usually pitch and stress variations between the initial utterance and the repetition. In some studies (Kim, 2002 or Wong, 2000), the term ‘repetant’ or ‘first saying’ is used to refer to the original utterance, and repetition or ‘second saying’ refer to the repeated text. The present study uses the term ‘initial utterance’ for what is subsequently repeated by one of the speakers.

Besides partial and exact repetitions, the findings in Table 7.1.b also show the use of elaboration and paraphrasing. About half of the Same-speaker repetitions in English and in Japanese consist of elaborations and paraphrasing, whereas in Other-speaker repetition these categories play a less prominent role in both languages. This seems to suggest that the L1 participants have a tendency to use partial and exact repetitions in Other-speaker repetition, and elaboration and paraphrasing in Same-speaker repetition.

Furthermore, the data transcript also contains some information about the final pitch (rising, level or falling). In both native speaker data sets, rising intonation mainly occurs in partial repetitions by the other speaker. The same speaker usually repeats with a levelled or downward intonation. Information in regard to final pitch is important in relationship to the function of repetition and is further discussed in sub-section 7.1.2. Finally, with respect to the location of repetition, the data revealed that out of the 80 EL1/EL1 repetitions, 55 (or 69%) are in the indicator or response, and the remaining 25 (31%) are in the reaction to the response and resolution.

In the JL1/JL1 data, repetitions in negotiated sequence occur 99 times with 74% taking place in the indicator or response and 26% in the final part of negotiated sequence, so over two thirds of all repetition in both native speaker interactions occurs in the indicator or response turns of negotiation (the second and third turn). Repetition taking place in

subsequent turns (reaction to response and resolution) in the present study mainly consists of single word or phrase repetitions such as ‘Yes’ or ‘No’, as illustrated in 7.1. Forms of repetition are compared and contrasted with EL1/EL2 findings in 7.3.1. The following sub-section examines prevailing functions of Same-speaker and Other-speaker repetition.

7.1.2 Main functions of repetition in L1 negotiation sequences

Johnstone (1994: 10) states that the function of repetition is determined by how it is understood and responded to by the other speaker, remarking that ‘its functionality is up for grabs in the subsequent discourse’. Norrick’s (1987: 248ff) comprehensive overview refers to semantic, production based, comprehension-based, and interaction based functions of repetition, including to affirm, acknowledge, spotlight (including ‘shadowing’), to accept or think aloud or hold the floor. Unlike Tannen (1989), he distinguishes the functions of Same- and Other-speaker repetition. His taxonomy continues to be a valuable source of information for repetition researchers.

The principal functions in the context of negotiated interaction in the present study were already identified in Chapter Five and Six, and the functional labels given to the overall turn (such as ‘clarification request’ or ‘confirmation check’) can also be applied for repetitions. In order to better understand the importance of repetition as an essential component of negotiation, subsections 7.1.2.1 and 7.1.2.2 explain functions according to speakers, rather than (as in Chapter Five and Six) in relation to the turn in which they occur. Other-repetition is analysed first since it usually follows the initial saying (or trigger) and therewith initiates the negotiated interaction.

7.1.2.1 Functions of Other-speaker repetition in L1 negotiation

One important function of Other-repetition in negotiated interaction is to confirm that the message has been understood correctly through a confirmation check. As stated in the methodology section 3.8, confirmation checks are other-speaker generated and always include a form of repetition.

The present study found that in English and Japanese confirmation checks usually follow the trouble source (or trigger) and occur in the indicator. They generally consist of a partial Other-repetition ending with a rising pitch or the question word *ka* in Japanese.

Here are examples from both languages (7.2 and 7.3) to show an almost parallel phenomenon:

(7.2) [EL1/EL1, D2: 1-4] (English example)

1. H	um (2) {is it the one} is it the one with the dots and the lines/	<i>trigger</i>
2. P →	dots and the lines/	<i>indicator</i>
3. H	yeah	<i>response</i>
4. P	x <no> (quick)	<i>reaction to response</i>

In line two, P seeks confirmation by repeating the last part of the question and H confirms in line three that he is right. The ‘No’ in line four answers P’s question in line one and the confirmation check in line two can therefore be viewed as an interruption or a preface to answering the request for information (in line one) in the negative in line four. Some studies use the term ‘side sequence’ (Jefferson, 1972) for the adjacency pair in line two and three, but since this study uses the terminology of Gass et al (1985) and Pica et al (1989), their terms (*indicator/response*) are adhered to. Kim’s (2002: 70-71) data shows that partial repetitions in English are often expressed in full noun phrases, consisting of the final part of the preceding utterance, which is also the case in the above example, as well as in other partial repetitions in English in this study.

(7.3) [JL1/JL1, D10: 6-9] (Japanese example)

1. T	肩 掛け がた です か。 kata gake gata desu ka shoulder hang type be Q ‘is it the shoulder bag type?’	<i>trigger</i>
2. R →	肩 掛け。 kata kake/ shoulder hang? ‘shoulder bag?’	<i>indicator</i>
3. T	こういう感じですよ。 ko iu kanji desu ‘like that’	<i>response</i>
4. R	うん。 un ‘yes’	<i>reaction to response</i>

In the initial turn in (7.3), the subject (hand bag) is actually left unexpressed and the utterance consists of the predicate (VP) with *kata kake* ('shoulder hang') acting like an adjective within the VP. Just as in the English example (7.2), R seeks confirmation with a partial repetition. In order to better understand which part of the utterance is repeated in line two, interlinear gloss is added. T responds in line three with an elaboration probably accompanied by a gesture. The 'Yes' in line four is the answer to T's question in line one.

As already pointed out in example 7.1, there can be formal variations in Japanese L1 repetition and such differences are further discussed in Fox, Hayashi and Jasperson (1996: 196-200, 207-209). Although their analysis refers only to self-repetition within a speaker's turn, their discussion in regard to variations of repeated elements is also relevant to Other-speaker repetition in Japanese in the present study which can take place in a variety of sentence elements (such as the adjective within the VP in the above example).

Confirmation checks which are consisting of a partial repetition with a rising intonation are also labelled 'echo questions' by Leech and Svartvik (1992: 115). Echo questions play a special role in the process of clarifying meaning since they specifically refer to the element which is not understood, a point also made by Rost-Roth (2000).

Quirk et al (1985: 835) further modifies echo questions by labelling them 'recapitulatory echo questions' postulating that their function can be to recap the initial saying. As discussed in Tannen (1989) and Rieschild (2004), repeats with a rising intonation can also indicate humour or irony. The present study adheres to the term 'confirmation checks' since confirming is the prevailing function of this type of repetition in the data. Checks also play a decisive role in L2 negotiation and are further discussed in subsection 7.3.2.

On the other hand, confirmations in both languages can also consist of partial and exact repetitions with a level or falling pitch. Kim (2002: 73) uses the analogy of a coin with two sides by saying that English repetition with an upward (or rising intonation) is seeking confirmation, whereas a downward intonation contour indicates providing confirmation.

Other characterisations of this type of repetition are ‘participatory listenership’ (Tannen, 1989: 88). Murata (1995) proposes that it emphasises the involvement of the listener and often takes place in Japanese speech after a hesitation while Wong (2000) claims that it acts as a ‘confirming allusion’. The later expression is also used by Schegloff (2004) to refer not only to repetitions but expressions such as ‘right’.

Norrick (1987: 255) suggests that this type of repetition takes place outside adjacency pairs and consist of a ‘back channel’ or ‘think aloud’, and claims its function is to ‘restate without showing affirmation of disagreement’. Kasper and Ross (2003: 90) interpret Other-speaker partial repetition with a falling intonation contour as an acknowledgement which does not convey a particular affective attitude.

Takei’s (1999: 56) research with Japanese language speakers also uses the term ‘acknowledgement repetition’. Takei differentiates between ‘acknowledgement’ and ‘agreement’ repetition, the latter always showing agreement or concurrence with the interlocutor’s opinion. The present study adopts the term of ‘acknowledgement repetition’, for partial repetitions such as in 7.4, line three:

(7.4) [JL1/JL1, D7: 55-57]

1. K 長いハンドルでどっち { あの }。
 | *nagai handoru de docchi {ano}* | (1)
 ‘which one with the long handle {well} (1)
2. M 四角。
 | <x> *shikaku* \ |
 <x> ‘square’\
3. K → 四角。
 | *shikaku*- |
 ‘square’
4. はい。そうです。
 | *hai so desu* |
 ‘yes that’s right (correct)’

K repeats the final element of the utterance in line two (the beginning is incomprehensible on the recording), followed by a ‘Yes’ in line four. Since the final pitch of the repetition in line three is level rather than rising, this type of repetition is most likely to acknowledge the proposition of the other speaker.

Example 7.4 also illustrates that utterances with a level or downward pitch do not necessarily require any intervention by the other speaker, since the same speaker continued with a confirmation in line four. Moreover, when the participants speak in their first language, it can be presumed that the meaning of the words they repeat are jointly understood, an assumption not always possible with learners. This is further discussed in 7.3.2 which compares L1 and L2 functions.

In addition to confirmation checks and acknowledgements, seeking further clarification in form of ‘clarification requests’ is also an important function of Other-speaker repetition. As outlined in Chapter Five, clarification requests can consist of an interrogative such as ‘What?’ or ‘Eh?’. However, clarification requests can also include a repetition of the element of the other speaker’s utterance to be clarified. As opposed to confirmation checks, the partial or exact repetition in clarification requests does not stand by itself but is embedded in a question (as shown in line two):

(7.5) [EL1/EL1, D4: 89-93]

- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. S | on his back | <i>trigger</i> |
| 2. T → | {is it on his} are you asking on his back or- | <i>indicator</i> |
| 3. S | on his back | <i>response</i> |
| 4. T | yes | |
| 5. | it’s the one {that is} that the man is carrying on his back | <i>reaction to response</i> |
| | ((S ticks off correct picture)) | |

T’s clarification request in line two is followed by an exact Same-speaker repetition in line three, clarifying that this is what he (S) meant to say in the first place. In line five, T’s response further clarifies by elaborating the prior utterance. In contrast to Yes/No Questions, clarification requests require the speakers to either repeat or elaborate their original proposition. It is interesting to note that in the above example, elaboration takes place in line five by the speaker requesting clarification in order to assure that S can identify the correct picture. As in earlier examples, this excerpt also shows how speakers collaborate to reach understanding and that overcoming of trouble sources can be seen as a joint accomplishment.

The excerpts in this sub-section also underline how crucial repetition is in terms of confirming and clarifying the other speaker’s proposition in order to assure

understanding. Variations in pitch mark the utterance either as a confirmation check or as an acknowledgement. Clarification requests including a repetition further exemplify how the respective speakers respond to a trouble source in the trigger. Since repetition is used by either speaker, the following section examines repetition by the same speaker.

7.1.2.2 Functions of Same-speaker repetition

Although Same-speaker repetition occurs slightly less in the English L1 data of the present study, it is used consistently in both languages. Same-speaker repetition mainly takes place in the response (or ‘third turn’ of the negotiation sequence) and checks understanding in form of a ‘comprehension check’ or recycles the original saying upon request in a ‘clarifying answer’. In Norrick’s Same-speaker taxonomy (1987: 262), this type of repetition is either categorised as ‘comprehension based’ (insuring precise understanding) or ‘interaction-based’ (repeat with stress).

A comprehension check is not preceded by a clarification request but consists of an utterance by the same speaker in a subsequent turn ensuring that their interlocutor has understood what they meant. Their form is often similar to a ‘confirmation check’ (a partial or exact repetition), however, a different term is necessary because it is not the other, but the same speaker repeating. A comprehension check occurs in a similar fashion in English and in Japanese native speaker interaction and is exemplified in 7.6 in Japanese:

(7.6) [JL1/JL1, D12: 50-53]

1. TA 四画ですか。
 | *yonkaku desu ka* |
 ‘is it square?’
2. T はい。
 | *hai* |
 ‘yes’
3. TA → 四画。
 | *yonkaku-* |
 ‘square’
4. T ええ。
 | *ee* |
 ‘yeah’

Although T does not request any clarification, TA repeats ‘square’ in line three in order to make sure that he is understood correctly. The comprehension check in line three is followed by a repetition of ‘Yes’, however, T paraphrases the *hai* (‘yes’) in line two with *eh* (‘um’) afterwards. Comprehension checks in an L1 context are difficult to interpret since it can be presumed that the speaker’s shared linguistic background allows for an understanding of all lexical items. They appear to ensure that the current speaker’s initial saying is understood correctly. They are used more often by L1 speakers when speaking with a learner and are further discussed in that context in 7.3.2.

Another type of Same-speaker repetition is ‘clarifying answers’. They follow clarification requests and can consist of a ‘repeat with stress’ which is interaction based (as proposed by Norrick, 1987: 262):

(7.7) [JL1/JL1, D8: 1-4], line three:

- | | | |
|--------|-------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. J | 合いましたか。 | |
| | <aimashita> ka (high pitch) | trigger |
| | ‘did they meet/’ | |
| 2. K | えっ。 | |
| | eh/ | indicator |
| | ‘what/’ | |
| 3. J → | 合いましたか。 | |
| | aimashita ka (lower pitch) | response |
| | ‘did they meet/’ | |
| 4. K | うん。 | |
| | un- | |
| | ‘yes’ | reaction to response |

The trouble source here might be traced back to a listening comprehension problem, since J speaks with a rather high pitch in line one. This leads to a request from the other speaker in line two and J providing clarification in his answer in line three. Line three in examples 7.6 and 7.7 illustrated that comprehension checks and clarifying answers are both Same-speaker repetitions and can be similar in form, that is, they can be partial or exact. However, they do differ in that comprehension checks are not requested by the other speaker whereas clarifying answers are.

Repetition in clarification responses can also take other forms, and as mentioned above, about half of all Same-speaker repetitions in both native speaker data sets consist of elaborations or paraphrases. 7.8 and 7.9 exemplify types of paraphrases in English:

(7.8) EL1/EL1 [D3: 25-27]:

- | | | |
|--------|---|------------------|
| 1. V | {is} is yours like a carry bag :: which you carry on the shoulder
:: which is rectangle/ (7) | <i>trigger</i> |
| 2. J | what/ | <i>indicator</i> |
| 3. V → | @ is your bag a rectangle one- | <i>response</i> |

The seven second pause after V's initial turn indicates that J is not able to answer immediately. One has to bear in mind that the eleven to twelve year old participants are not yet fully able to express and understand everything in their own language. V realises that she is asking for too much information at once and in order to make J feel at ease about her clarification request, V starts out with laughter before decomposing (or simplifying) her initial saying in a paraphrase. Her repeat in line three ends with a level intonation. The next excerpt illustrates the same phenomenon:

(7.9) EL1/EL1 [D4: 26-28]

- | | | |
|--------|---|------------------|
| 1. S | {does the} does the man on the right have a beard on it/ | <i>trigger</i> |
| 2. T | he/ (loud voice) | <i>indicator</i> |
| 3. S → | [does the face on the right have a beard on it\ [=overlap | <i>response</i> |

S uses the broad term 'man' in line one resulting in a clarification request in line two. S immediately repairs his utterance in line two by replacing 'man' with the more precise word 'face'. In L2 responses, the speech act of self-repair takes on an additional dimension, since it can lead to the development of the learner's interlanguage, and this is further discussed under 'pushed output' in sub-section 7.2.2.

7.8 and 7.9 also demonstrate that clarifying answers display repetitions with a different intonation contour. The final intonation in the initial utterance is rising, but level or falling in the Same-speaker repeats in line three. There could be a number of reasons for this, such as the rising intonation in the response becomes obsolete since the other speaker knows already that it is a question. Moreover, rather than on form, the focus here is on the speech act of providing clarification, for example, through decomposition and

correction. In addition, since the task requires asking questions, the non-rising intonation in repeats might be marking an utterance as a question in a list of questions. In this case, it allows for gradual elimination of choices in order to be able to tick off the correct answer.

Tannen (1989: 54) states in her description of forms of repetition that the most usual variation is questions repeated in form of statements. Although her study does not make a clear distinction between Same- and Other-speaker repetitions, the above examples confirm her proposition in regard to self-repetition in responses. Native speaker data (in English) are also examined by Kim (2002: 51) and he asserts that third turn repetition takes place after indication of non-understanding in the second turn, but he does not further elaborate on the intonation, nor on comprehension checks which also include repetitions but are not requested by the interlocutor. Other repetition research, such as Norrick (1987: 261), only examines Same-speaker repetition with expansions in the same utterance and not in subsequent talk.

Since clarifying consists of a joint effort, the collaboration between speaker and listener is indispensable. Rather than examining just one aspect or speaker, it is important to take into account how they cooperate with each other in order to negotiate understanding and in the data, there is a consistent pattern of Other-speaker repetition in the indicator and Same-speaker repeats in the response in the same sequence such as shown in 7.10, lines three and four:

(7.10) EL1/EL1 [D4: 46-51]

1. S	does he have a beard and a moustache/	<i>trigger</i>
2. T	ye=s (stretched sound) (0.5)	
3. →	but there's two with a beard and a moustache	<i>indicator</i>
3. S	oh (1)	<i>response</i>
4. →	{is the mous} {eh} is the beard connected to the moustache/	
5. T	yes it is\	<i>reaction to response</i>

Since S did not give sufficient information to allow T to identify the correct picture, T asks S to further refine his question (in line two). The ‘Oh’ in line three is feedback relevant to the content of the proposition in the indicator. The second part of the TCU (line four) consists of a restart, a hesitation particle and an elaboration of S’s original utterance from line one.

Self-repetition within the same speaker's utterance occurring after a restart such as in 7.10 above in line four, or for emphasis in utterances such as: 'the one that has the dot on it are hooking arms (1) *hooking arms*' [EL1/EL1, D4: 109] are not further examined in the native speaker data since this type of repetition is not interaction based or patterned on adjacency pairs. Similarities and variances in same turn self-repetitions in English are especially well demonstrated in Wong (2000) and Fox, Hayashi and Jasper (1996), the latter also including a focus on Japanese texts. Functions of Other- and Same-speaker repetition are further discussed and contrasted with functions of EL1/EL2 repetition in 7.3.2. The following sub-section draws together the findings in regard to L1 forms and functions in EL1/EL1 and JL1/JL1 negotiation.

7.1.3 Summing up native speaker forms and functions

In the present study, repetition is used as a key linguistic resource in English as well as in Japanese negotiation. When speaking in their native language, the Japanese participants repeat somewhat more often than their English counterparts and appear to have a preference for partial forms, whereas exact repetitions occur in similar proportions. Other-speaker repetitions prevail in both native speaker data sets and they include only a limited number of elaborations or paraphrases. The latter two forms are, however, prevalent in Same-speaker repetition, especially with English speakers.

Intonation patterns are included in the transcripts to show that the final pitch of a repetition can differ from the initial utterance. For example, a final rising intonation often changes to level or falling in repetitions acknowledging the other speaker's proposition and in Same-speaker repetition providing clarification in answer to a clarification requests. Furthermore, an additional analysis established where the repetition takes place. The analysis revealed that most repetition takes place in the indicator and response and that repetition in additional turns such as the reaction to the response and resolution are less frequent.

Since the genre of this data is spoken text referring to a Question/Answer game, the number of functions appears more limited than those originally listed by, for example, Norrick (1987) or Tannen (1989). The functions of repetition in negotiated sequences are often identical to the utterance functions which are examined and discussed in detail in

Chapter Five and Six. However, this chapter permits a more detailed understanding of who repeats what, how and where. Special care has been taken to differentiate which speaker repeats allowing for a better insight into patterns of Other- and Same-speaker repetition.

One of the three main categories of Other-speaker repetition are confirmation checks (or ‘echo questions’) which always include a form of repetition and mainly occur in the indicator (as in example 7.2 and 7.3). Checks assure correct hearing or understanding and end with a rising pitch. The present study confirms the proposition of Quirk et al (1985: 835) that ‘echo questions’ often consist of a noun phrase in English and of Fox, Hayashi and Jaspersen (1996: 207-209) underlining that Japanese has a more flexible syntactic structure allowing for a variety of sentence elements to be repeated (such as a verb phrase in example 7.1 and a modifier in 7.3).

Secondly, a repetition by the other speaker with a level or falling pitch can indicate acknowledgement or thought processes such as ‘thinking aloud’. They tend to take place in the final turn of the negotiated interaction as illustrated in 7.4. A myriad of terms have been proposed such as ‘providing confirmation’ (Kim, 2002), ‘participatory listenership’ (Tannen, 1989), ‘solidarity repetition’ (Murata, 1995), ‘confirming allusion’ (Wong, 2000 and Schegloff, 2004) or ‘acknowledgement repetition’ (for example, Takei, 1999 and Kasper & Ross, 2003).

The present study adopted the term ‘acknowledgement repetition’ conceding that other terminology and interpretations are possible. Close-up video recordings of individual facial expressions or gestures are only available to a limited extend and the analysis therefore remains open to other functional interpretations. For example, if the Other-speaker’s eyes are cast down, this could mean that s/he is thinking aloud or trying to win time in order to establish which of the pictures is meant. ‘Thinking aloud’, ‘providing processing time’ or ‘time gain’ is also mentioned as one of the positive functions of repetition in research by Norrick (1987), Merritt (1994: 31) and Rost-Roth (2000). However, even with a video competing explanations are a possibility since it is difficult to judge the exact intention of the participant at that time.

The third function of Other-speaker repetition is requesting clarification (as in example 7.5). Clarification requests differ from confirmation checks in that they are usually not Yes/No questions and the repetition is embedded in an utterance including other sentence elements. Clarification requests not including a repetition (for example, consisting of a question word only) are not relevant to the focus of the present chapter and have been discussed in Chapter Five.

Same-speaker repetition usually takes place in the third turn of a negotiation sequence and has two main functions: checking comprehension or clarifying one's own previous utterance after a clarification request. A comprehension check is not preceded by a question and their form is often similar to a confirmation check, however, speakers differ. Comprehension checks ensure that the same speaker's original utterance is understood correctly and are illustrated in 7.1 and 7.6. This type of repetition is not requested by the other speaker and is often partial or exact.

Same-speaker repetitions following a clarification requests or question word by the other speaker are labelled 'clarifying answers' in this study and they can be a partial or exact repetitions (as in 7.7) or an elaboration or paraphrase (in 7.8 and 7.9). About half of all Same-speaker repetitions take place in the latter two forms. In clarifying answers, the focus appears to shift from the speech act of seeking information to providing clarification and this often entails a different intonation contour of questions (level or falling as opposed to rising final pitch). This confirms Tannen's (1989) proposition that the most usual variation taking place consists of questions repeated in form of statements. Example 7.10 illustrated a typical Other- and Same-speaker repetition in the same sequence, with a clarification request and a clarifying answer forming an adjacency pair.

The above summarises the prevailing forms and functions of repetition in English and Japanese native speaker negotiation in the data. Table 7.1.b allowed for a detailed insight into forms and speakers in both languages. It is of interest to note that there is no significant variation between forms as well as functions in English and in Japanese.

This study does not attempt an exhaustive listing of all possible functions and since it examines only negotiated sequences, the number of main functions might be more limited than in conversational data. The next section applies the framework for forms in the present section to the EL1/EL2 data set.

7.2 Repetition in native and nonnative speaker (EL1/EL2) negotiation sequences

Research mentioned earlier in this chapter investigates repetition in a L1 context. Other studies examine repetition in learner interaction (see in particular Aichiba, 2003; Deen, 1997; Long, 1996; Lyster, 1998; Mackay, 1999; Mackay & Oliver, 2002; Oliver, 1995a,b, 2002 and Ondarra, 1997). Only Oliver (1995a,b and 2002) and Mackay and Oliver (2002) analyse the age group focussed on in the present research and it is therefore of interest to further investigate patterns of repetition in child interaction.

Sub-section 7.2.1 examines forms of repetition in EL1 negotiated interaction firstly, with EL2 beginners and then with intermediate/advanced learners. 7.2.2 looks at Same- and Other-speaker repetition, demonstrating how repetition maintains the flow of the interaction and can help learners to develop their language skills. Sub-section 7.2.3 draws together the findings of EL1/EL2 repetition. A comparison of forms and functions in all three data sets follows in section 7.3.

7.2.1 Forms of repetition in EL1/EL2 negotiated interaction

This sub-section examines who repeats what in native/nonnative negotiation, as well as how and where they repeat utterances. As in previous EL1/EL2 analyses in this study, the data originates from a different set of informants consisting of twelve native English speakers and twelve young Japanese speaking English as their second language. Although the main focus of this study is not on instances and overall percentages of repetition, it is helpful to have an overview of the various forms and speakers in order to better understand the relevance of repetition within negotiation sequences.

Since repetition within the same AS-unit is not included in the present study, the numbers (*n*) represent the number of AS-units consisting of or including one form of repetition. In EL1/EL2 interaction (consisting of twelve dyads or twenty-four participants), negotiation took place in a total of 1032 AS-units. As laid out in Chapter Four, EL1 speakers produced more negotiation in their turns than EL2 speakers and therefore the percentages in Table 7.2.a relate to the total number of AS-units in negotiated sequences per respective speaker: 570 EL1 and 462 EL2 AS-units.

Negotiation sequences: Total AS-units (*n*) Repetition units (*n*) % of repetition

EL1 (NS) in EL1/EL2	570	140	24.56%
EL2 (NNS) in EL1/EL2	462	118	25.54%

Table 7.2.a. Percentages of repetition in NS/NNS (EL1/EL2) negotiation

Although there are less EL2 turns in negotiated interaction, the ratio of repetition in their turns is slightly higher. Rounding off the percentages to the nearest full (or half) mark indicates that the 12 EL1 speakers used repetition in their utterances 24.5% of times, and the twelve EL2 speakers 25.5% of times. These percentages are calculated relative to the overall number of AS-units within negotiation sequences and high-light the importance of repetition as a tool to negotiate understanding.

However, overall percentages allow little discrimination in regard to the level of the learner. Half of the 12 EL1/EL2 dyads consist of a native speaker and a beginner, and it is interesting to note that they use repetition more often than the other 6 dyads formed with EL1/EL2 (intermediate/advanced) participants. Column one and two represent the native speaker (EL1) speaking with a learner at the beginner level (in column one) and intermediate/advanced learners (in column two). Column three and four represent the EL2 and their respective level.

	Column One 12 EL1 (NS) participants	Column Two 6 EL1 (talking to EL2 int./adv.)	Column Three 6 EL2 (NNS) participants	Column Four 6 EL2 int./adv.
Repetition by: Level:	6 EL1 (talking To EL2 beginner)	6 EL1 (talking to EL2 int./adv.)	6 EL2 beginner	6 EL2 int./adv.
AS-units in <i>n</i>	374	196	321	141
% of repetition	25.5%	22.5%	29.5%	17%

Table 7.2.b. EL1 talking to EL2 beginner and intermediate/advanced level versus EL2 beginner and int./advanced in EL1/EL2 dyads

Table 7.2.b indicates that in EL1/EL2 negotiation, there is no major variation with EL1 (NS) speakers in regard to the English level of their interlocutor: with beginners 25.5% of their total negotiation consists of repetitions, and with intermediate/advanced learners the percentage adjusted to their overall negotiated interaction is 22.5%. However, a beginner relies much more heavily on repetition as a tool in negotiated interaction (29.5%) than the intermediate/advanced learner, who uses the least repetition in the data (17%).

Since variations also take place in regard to forms of Other- and Same-speaker repetition, Table 7.2.c divides all data accordingly. Percentages in table 7.2.b and c are calculated in relationship to the total amount of AS-units per speaker as indicated in row one in Table 7.2.b: Out of a total of 1032 negotiated AS-units in EL1/EL2, 695 originate from EL1/EL2 beginners (374 EL1 AS-units and 321 EL2 AS-units respectively) and 337

occur in negotiation between EL1/EL2 intermediate/advanced (196 EL1 AS-units and 141 EL2 AS-units respectively).

Since it is more relevant to present the findings in percentages than in numbers in order to allow comparisons, the following table includes percentages only. The percentages represent the % of the respective repetition in relation to the overall AS-units per speaker (as indicated in row one in Table 7.2.b). The resulting table is complex, however, 7.2.c below allows an in-depth overview of the percentages of all forms and speakers.

Repetition: forms / speaker	Column One		Column Two		Column Three		Column Four	
	12 NS (EL1)		participants		12 NNS (EL2)		participants	
	Other-speaker EL1 (NS) with Beg.	Int/adv.	Same-speaker EL1 (NS) with Beg.	Int/adv.	Other-speaker EL2 (NNS) Beg.	Int/adv.	Same-speaker EL2 (NNS) Beg.	Int/adv.
Partial repetition	2%	3%	3%	1.5%	14.5%	9.5%	2%	1.5%
Exact repetition	1%	3.5%	4%	1%	5.5%	2%	2.5%	0.5%
Elaborated rep.	3.5%	0.5%	5%	5.5%	-	-	3%	3.5%
Paraphrase	1.5%	1%	2.5%	2%	2%	-	-	-
*Same turn rep.	-	-	3%	4.5%	-	-	-	-
Total %	8%	8%	17.5%	14.5%	22%	11.5%	7.5%	5.5%
Overall %	8%		16.5%		18.5%		7%	

* New category: Self repetition of a sentence in the same turn

Table 7.2.c. Overview of forms in EL1/EL2 (beginner and interm./adv.) negotiation

Other- and Same-speaker repetitions by native speakers (EL1) are listed in column one and column two. Six of them interacted with beginners (percentages on the left hand side of column one and two) and the six other EL1 talked with more advanced learners (percentages on the right side of the respective columns). Other- and Same-speaker repetitions of their EL2 interlocutors are listed in column three and column four and again, columns are subdivided according to the level of the EL2 speaker.

All categories in Table 7.2.c are the same as in the native speaker data table 7.1.b except for the last one. ‘Same turn’ repetition has been added in order to account for repetitions taking place by the same speaker after a TRP. They are Same-speaker repetitions after a sentence is completed and the other speaker fails to take a turn after a pause. This phenomenon will be discussed in Chapter Eight. They are not self-repetitions in the same sentence, such as after restarts, which are not further examined in this study.

In regard to Same- and Other-speaker repetition, the Total % row in Table 7.2.c allows the following comparisons or contrasts:

- EL1 Other-speaker repetition takes place 8% of times with either of the learners (see column one)
- EL1 Same-speaker occurs slightly more often with beginners than with intermediate/advanced learners (17.5% vs. 14.5% of times) (see column two)
- EL2 Other-speaker repetition by beginners takes place almost twice as often as with the more advanced learners (22% of times as compared to 11.5%) (column three)
- EL2 Same-speaker repetition is slightly higher with beginners (7.5% versus 5.5%) (column four).

The presentation of the raw data (in percentages) discloses the following patterns: Firstly, there is no variation between EL1 Other-speaker repetition in regard to the level of their L2 interlocutor. Secondly, EL1 Same-speaker repetition takes place slightly more often with beginners. Overall, it is interesting to note that EL1 Same-speaker repetition is used about twice as often than Other-speaker repetition. With learners (EL2) it is just the other way around: they tend to repeat more often the other speaker's utterance rather than their own.

In regard to form, an interesting contrast is that expanded repetition occurs in EL1 Other- and Same-speaker repeats while, on the other hand, paraphrases occur in EL1 Same-speaker (and same turn) repetition. The prevailing EL2 form is Other-speaker partial repetition. Considering that Other-speaker repetition is used by beginners 14.5% of times out of 22% and 9.5% of times out 11.5% by more advanced learners, EL2 partial Other-repetition is a salient feature in EL1/EL2 negotiated interaction.

The final row in Table 7.2.c above averages the overall EL1 and EL2 Other-speaker and Same-speaker repetition (regardless of the learners' English level) and the percentages show that the overall pattern remains the same: the native speakers (EL1) repeat themselves about twice as often than they repeat the other speaker's utterance (16.5% Same-speaker repetition as opposed to 8% Other-speaker repetition). The converse applies with learners (EL2): in negotiated sequences with a native speaker, they tend to repeat the other speaker's proposition more often than their own (18.5% of Other-speaker repetitions versus 7% Same-speaker repetitions).

The overall average percentages in Table 7.2.c for Other-speaker and Same-speaker repetition have been calculated in relationship to the amount of AS-units in negotiated interaction which was higher with beginners than with intermediate/advanced learners. Adding up all repetition results in 24.5% of EL1 and 25.5% of EL2 repetition in negotiation AS-units (as shown in Table 7.a above). The percentages in regard to Other- and Same-speaker repetition and their forms indicate how dependent the learners are on their interlocutor when trying to understand and to get their meaning across. Forms of repetition are further discussed after Table 7.3.b and in sub-section 7.2.2 below.

In sum, the findings in the present chapter highlight that the prevailing repetition categories are EL1 Same-speaker repetition and EL2 Other-speaker repetition and that the young participants employ EL1 Other-speaker repetition and EL2 Same-speaker repetition to a lesser extent. This phenomenon deserves further attention. Repetition focussed on in much of the SLA literature mainly examines NS Other-speaker repetition (in form of NS recasts) and NNS Same-speaker repetition, which can include pushed output. However, this study reveals that these are not the prevailing forms of repetition in negotiation sequences and that learning can also take place in EL1 Same-speaker repetition and EL2 Other-speaker repetition. Sub-section 7.2.2 hence examines Same- and Other-speaker repetition in more detail by illustrating the role of repetition not only in ‘recasts’ and ‘pushed output’, but in NS Same-speaker and NNS Other-speaker repetition as well.

7.2.2. EL1/EL2 Same- and Other-speaker repetition

As already mentioned in the literature review, negotiation is discussed extensively in SLA research. The interaction hypothesis proposed by Long (1983a, 1996) led to a focus on input by the native speaker and Swain’s output hypothesis (Swain 1985, 1995) primarily analysed learner production in form of ‘pushed output’.

A number of input studies (for example, De la Fuente, 2002; Ellis & He, 1999; Iwashita, 2003, Mackey & Oliver, 2002; Mackey & Philp, 1998 and Yamaguchi et al, 1999) seek to establish an explicit relationship between repetition and language learning that occurs when a native speaker reformulates the NNS utterance without changing its meaning. Long, Inagaki and Ortega (1998: 358) define such feedback or ‘recasts’ as: ‘responses

which incidentally reformulate all or part of a learner’s utterance, thus providing relevant morpho-syntactic information that was obligatory but was either missing or wrongly supplied in the learner rendition while retaining its central meaning’. In their study of L2 child and L1 adult dyadic interaction over a task, Mackey and Oliver (2002: 468) exemplify NS feedback (recasts) as follows (→):

(7.11)

<u>Child learner</u>		<u>Adult native speaker</u>
		I have a girl with a hand up like that.
But nothing?	→	But, there’s nothing in her hand?
I have her a bang in her hand.	→	Oh, do you mean like a hammer?
Um yeah.		

Mackey and Oliver’s (2002) study consisted of a control group and an experimental group with children (of an average age of ten) interacting in dyads with adult native speakers. The research examined the impact of feedback on the children’s L2 development in a pre- and post-test design. The twenty-two child ESL participants carried out communicative tasks such as ‘spot the difference’, picture placement and sequencing tasks. The findings show that in comparison to adult learners, the children’s interlanguage in the experimental group was impacted relatively quickly by feedback (in form of recasts) thereby confirming the study’s prediction that interactional feedback does facilitate second language development.

Yamaguchi et al’s (1999) research on NS feedback of NNS utterances found that recasts were provided and used. Mackey and Philp (1998) also establish that interactionally modified input containing recasts are especially beneficial for short term interlanguage development of more advanced learners, even though repetition does not always take place in their immediate response.

Recasts also formed between five and fourteen percent of the NS interactional moves (or ‘strategies’) in a recent study by Iwashita (2003: 21) with NS/NNS speakers of Japanese. Sometimes certain target forms were repeated a number of times in the same negotiation sequence, leading to a more intensive treatment of certain structures. Iwashita also suggests that recasts had a larger impact on short-term L2 grammatical development than other negotiation strategies.

The positive effect of Other-speaker repetition in regard to comprehension of L2 words is also underlined in a statistical analysis by De la Fuente (2002) which examines the impact of negotiation on acquisition of new vocabulary. Moreover, her study stipulates that negotiated interaction incorporating pushed output in form of L2 Same-speaker repetition promotes receptive as well as productive acquisition of words.

Ellis and He's (1999) research focussing on vocabulary also confirms that English second language learners' reception and production improves through pushed output. However, Shehadeh (2001) postulates that in regard to second language grammar there still appears to be relatively little evidence of language development through pushed output.

A recent study by McDonough (2005: 79) states that learning opportunities occur through input and output, and that it is difficult to treat these interactional features separately. Example 7.12 from the present study illustrates both instances, firstly EL2 Same-speaker repetition (or output, line four), followed by EL1 Other-speaker repetition (input/recast, line seven):

(7.12) EL1/EL2 (beginner) [D14:120-128]

1. Y (EL2) | um (2) the person is (1) ee (1) ee\ |
2. D (EL1) | you could ask me like {um} does it have a door knob/ |
3. | is it touching the door knob/ |
4. Y → | {ah} (1) the person is touching the door knob |
5. D | no |
6. Y | {ee}(1) that picture has door knob |
7. D → | it's got a door knob |
8. | yes it does |

The falling intonation of the hesitation particle in line one indicates that Y relinquishes the turn and in line two and three D suggests possible questions. After a feedback token acknowledging D's suggestion, Y repeats (in line four) her original saying from line one adding 'touching the door knob'. The pushed output here consists of partial 'self' and 'other' repetition. As mentioned previously, EL2 speakers often ignore rules for question formation such as inversion, 'do' structures or rising intonation and although Y's proposition in line four displays none of these features, it is accepted by D's negation in line five. Y then asks in line six if the door has a knob. D's recast (or Other-speaker

repetition) in line seven includes the indefinite article ‘a’, which Y left out in the previous turn. Since the speakers move on to the next topic, an EL2 repetition of ‘a door knob’ does not take place and it remains unclear whether the learner has noticed the indefinite article.

The present study agrees with McDonough (2005) that negotiation sequences cannot be examined from one perspective only. Language development opportunities are offered in negotiation sequences through input (NS Other-speaker repetition) and output (NNS Same-speaker repetition). McDonough (2005: 96) also stipulates that NS clarification requests consisting of a question word only are useful to help learners to detect their shortcomings, since they are obliged to modify their output without being provided target-like forms by the NS as shown in 7.13:

(7.13)

Learner: What happen for the boat?

NS: What?

Learner: What’s wrong with the boat?

McDonough (2005: 86)

However, these studies all focus only on two types of repetition: NS Other-speaker repetition and NNS Same-speaker repetition. A major finding of the present study indicates that in NS/NNS negotiation, repetition are predominantly made in form of NS (EL1) Same-speaker and NNS (EL2) Other-speaker repetition and that these types of repetitions can be just as beneficial for language learners. This point is illustrated in the remaining examples in this section.

In EL1 Same-speaker repetition, the young native speaker often makes sure (such as in 7.14, line five) that their EL2 interlocutor understands the message content. The negotiated interaction only takes place from line three to six, however, the turns preceding and following the negotiated interaction have been included for better understanding.

(7.14) EL1/EL2 (intermediate) [D21: 25-33]

1. J (EL1) ‘okay (7) do you know what an arch is?’ (4)

2. N (EL2) ‘ah no’ (1)

3. J | this is an arch | ((drawing)) *trigger*

4. N | eh/ | *indicator*

- | | | | |
|------|---|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 5. J | → | that's an arch | <i>response</i> |
| 6. N | | okay | <i>reaction to response</i> |
| 7. J | | 'does the door have an arch?' | |
| 8. N | | 'no' | |

Although N does not use the word 'arch', he has acquired passive knowledge of the lexical item and is therefore able to answer J's question in line seven. In this particular negotiation sequence, non-verbal communication also plays an important role, since an arch was drawn on the back of one of their task sheets.

EL1 Same-speaker repetition can take place over several turns. H (a girl speaking some Japanese) tries to find out if the window on top of the door has the shape of a semi-circle. This dyad is talking about the same picture as in (7.14) but instead of calling it an arch, H uses the term semi-circle.

(7.15) EL1/EL2 (beginner) [D16: 44-54]

- | | | |
|------------|---|---|
| 1. H (EL1) | | this door {door} |
| 2. K (EL2) | | eh |
| 3. H | → | this door has a semi circle/ |
| 4. K | | mm (1) |
| 5. H | → | door |
| 6. K | | ee |
| 7. H | | <do a no window> <L2 meaning: the door's windows> |
| 8. | | window on top (0.5) {top} |
| 9. K | | mm |
| 10. H | → | semi circle/ |
| 11. K | | um (activity continues) |

H repeats her question over a number of turns, firstly with an expansion (line three) and then through decomposition of her proposition in line three into noun phrases (line five and ten). K's English is very basic and some of her answers are in form of *aizuchis* rather than confirmations.

After another few turns, H realises that K is unable to answer her question and the activity ends with both of them laughing and H probably showing K the picture. However, before doing so, H made a considerable effort to get her question across by relying on repetition as her main tool. The prevalent forms of EL1 Same-speaker

repetition are elaborations or paraphrases, illustrated in this chapter further on in examples (7.20 and 7.24). Not all EL1 Same-speaker repetition can be considered to extend the learner’s interlanguage but it certainly heightens their awareness of target forms.

The other prevailing type of repetition in this study, which is little focussed on in the literature, is EL2 Other-speaker generated, which can take the following form:

(7.16) EL1/EL2 (intermediate) [D19: 96-100]

- | | | |
|------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Y (EL2) | (long pause) | |
| 2. A (EL1) | Say: does yours have all the numbers/ | ((suggests a direct question)) |
| 3. Y → | (1) does yours have all numbers/ | |
| 4. A | um yes | |
| 5. Y | okay | ((ticks off correct picture)) |

This dialogue is preceded by a silent period of several seconds resulting in A’s suggestion of a direct question to the learner. Pre-teaching of a target–form question leads to Y’s Other repetition in line two (after a one minute pause). Y’s repeat is almost target-like, except for the omission of the definite article.

The present study has found that the native speaker participants are often keen to help their nonnative counterparts to construct their utterances. Rather than just being centred on their own task and utterances, they actively participate in other speaker’s meaning construction by suggesting target forms which are then repeated by the learner.

EL2 Other-speaker repetitions can also consist of an effort by learners to pronounce new lexical items or form structures therewith making an effort to expand their language skills (this excerpt has also been partially used in Chapter Two (2.1):

(7.17) EL1/EL2 (beginner) [D14: 66-70]

- | | | |
|------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Y (EL2) | ee (1) they are in (2) | <i>trigger</i> |
| 2. D (EL1) | a bowl (1) a bowl | <i>indicator</i> |
| 3. Y → | a {bo-} bowl | <i>response</i> |
| 4. D | yeah it’s in a bowl | <i>reaction to response</i> |
| 5. Y | um | <i>resolution</i> |

After a two second pause triggering the negotiation, D supplies the word ‘bowl’ in line two. Since Y does not react immediately, he repeats it again in the same turn in a very low voice. Y repeats the suggested vocabulary item at once in line three and after a false start is able to pronounce it correctly. Y includes the definite article which is often omitted in sentences by Japanese speakers. Checking the row of pictures row they are talking about, it is interesting to note, that in order to make it easier for the learner, D actually suggested the picture that consisted of the correct answer.

Sometimes it is the learner who actively requests help. W, an EL2 beginner, is keen to replicate EL1 sentence structures and wants to make sure that starting a question with ‘is there’ is correct. M, the EL1 speaker understands some Japanese and the EL2 takes advantage of this. EL2 Other-speaker repetition occurs in 7.18 line eight:

(7.18) EL1/EL2 (beginner) [D17: 52-60]

- 1. W (EL2) | (1) is there *de ii* | (‘is there’ is correct?)
- 2. M (EL1) | um/ | (in the sense of ‘what?’)
- 3. W | is there *de ii* | (as in line one)
- 4. M | um/ |
- 5. W | is there triangle *toka de ii*/ | (‘is there triangle or whatever correct?’)
- 6. M | *so* | (L2 meaning ‘yes’)
- 7. | is it triangle |
- 8. W → | is it triangle/ |
- 9. M | no |

W repeats his question twice before M modifies it in line seven. Although ‘is there’ is correct, W leaves out the indirect article in line five. M could have suggested in line seven ‘is there a triangle’ but choses to change ‘there’ to ‘it’. His proposition is accepted and repeated by W with a rising intonation in line eight.

Since W is eager to learn, M keeps suggesting vocabulary as well. 7.19 exemplifies both forms of prevailing repetitions in the present study: NS Same-speaker repetition (in line four) as well as NNS Other-speaker repetition (in line five and seven).

(7.19) EL1/EL2 (beginner) [D17: 113-116]

- 1. W ((EL2) | (2) *etto* | (3)
- 2. M (EL1) | that’s a vase (1) vase vase

- | | |
|--------|--|
| 3. W | what/ |
| 4. M → | vase |
| 5. W → | vase/ |
| 6. M | um (in the sense of 'yes') |
| 7. W → | is there a vase/ |
| 8. M | my gosh there are vases on all pictures! |

This sequence is triggered by the particle *etto* (meaning 'Well') and a three second pause. M suggests the word 'vase' and since W is not taking a turn after a one second pause, M repeats 'vase' twice (line two). W still has problems understanding and requests clarification in line three. Only after M's Same-speaker repetition in line four, W attempts to pronounce 'vase' in line five. His rising intonation indicates that he is not quite sure if he got it right and turns his utterance into a confirmation check.

In line seven, he is then able to form his question, including 'is there' (as in 7.18 line one and three) and the indefinite article in his noun phrase. M's proposition in line two ('that's *a* vase') might have caused him to do so. Being able to apply articles appropriately is a big step for Japanese since their own language has neither definite nor indefinite articles and missing articles is a major feature in L2 talk by Japanese (personal communication). Line eight shows that the 'teacher' (NS) does not always get it right since all pictures they were talking about included a vase! The activity continues with further negotiation until W is able to identify the correct picture.

Although long term retention can not be assured since the present study relies on cross-sectional data, examples such as the above one show how learners attempt and succeed to form or finish their TCU with the help of their interlocutor. The examples here and in the data show that the prevailing forms of EL2 Other-speaker repetition are partial or exact.

It is important to note that the above dialogues often do not comprise just one type of repetition and have to be examined as a whole in order to realise how understanding is negotiated and language learning opportunities develop. The danger of focussing only on one type of repetition or speaker is that other forms are discarded or not treated with the same prominence hence allowing only for a partial insight into the role of repetition in the negotiation of understanding.

7.2.3 Summing up repetition in EL1/EL2 negotiation

Section 7.2 establishes that the use of repetition in negotiated interaction is crucial. About one fourth of all negotiated EL1/EL2 AS-units consists of or includes one form of repetition. A finer grained analysis reveals that EL2 beginners repeat more often than the more advanced learners (in 29.5% of all negotiated AS-units, as opposed to 17% of EL2 intermediate/advanced negotiation). EL1 repetition is used in a similar proportion with learners of either level.

Some other studies also postulate that native speakers negotiate more with low proficiency learner dyads (such as Oliver, 2002 and Shortreed, 1993). Oliver (2002) who also examines interaction of children in an age group similar to this research suggests that the higher amount of negotiation with beginners reflects the learners' inability to communicate efficiently and that chances of a breakdown are therefore higher (p. 107).

In Oliver's (2002 and 1995a, b) studies, Same-speaker (that is self-repetition within five speaking turns) and Other-speaker repetition occur in similar proportions in NS/NNS child dyads. For example, Oliver's (1995: 99) research lists 21.7% of Same-speaker and 22.9% of Other-speaker repetition in negotiated interaction. Overall Same- and Other-speaker repetitions in the present study are 23.5% and 26.5% respectively. This is in contrast to Long's (1983b) study with adults in which the percentage of self-repetition is much higher (41%) and Other-speaker repetition in negotiation is lower (15%). Since Oliver's and Long's studies do not further differentiate between speakers nor forms of repetition it remains unclear who repeats what.

Such overall percentages including the native as well as nonnative speakers do not allow discerning variations within the NS/NNS dyadic interaction, for example, is it the native or nonnative speaker who repeats their own or the other speaker's utterance. The present study goes further by analysing who repeats in which form in NS/NNS negotiation, and a comprehensive examination of the EL1/EL2 Same- and Other-speaker repetition data reveals that EL1 (NS) speakers use self-repeats about twice as often as Other-speaker repetitions (16.5% and 8% of times in all negotiated sequences). With learners (EL2/NNS) it is the opposite since they mainly repeat the other speaker's proposition (18.5% of EL2 Other-speaker repetition as compared to 7% of Same-speaker repetition in all negotiation).

These findings point to a gap in interaction studies mainly focussing on NS input (Other-speaker repetition or ‘recasts’) and NNS output (Same-speaker repetition). Sub-section 7.2.2 clearly demonstrates that all types of repetition are a valuable resource to keep an interaction going and that language learning is not only facilitated in recasts and pushed output, but also in EL1 Same-speaker repetition as well as EL2 Other-speaker repetition.

Moreover, another contrast in the present data is that EL1 repetition often takes place in form of elaborations or paraphrases, but most of the EL2 repetition is a partial or exact reformulation of the other speaker (EL1) proposition. Deen’s (1997) study also found that about sixty percent of native speaker repetition consisted of elaboration, complex repetition and paraphrasing and that nonnative speakers used partial repetition about twice as much as native speakers (pp 147-160).

Deen (1997: 108) views repetition as a ‘specific and explicit’ indicator of trouble with understanding, whereas minimal questions are labelled ‘global and implicit’. In her data, both forms occur in similar proportions. Other studies (such as Gass & Varonis, 1985) use terms such as ‘direct’ and ‘indirect’ requests for the same phenomenon and in their study indirect indicators prevailed.

In regard to intonation and turns in the negotiated sequences, a more detailed analysis showed the same pattern with all learners. Only few of the EL2 partial repetitions had a rising final pitch and most repetition took place in the indicator or response. Repetition in the reaction to response or resolution mainly took place by the other speaker. This is further discussed in 7.3.3.

Overall, the EL1/EL2 data and examples illustrate how non- or partial understanding can be overcome through repetition and that there are variations in regard to forms and speakers. It also reveals the dependence of the learner on their native speaker counterpart for lexis and structures of their utterances, as well as for the understanding of the NS utterance. Since this study allows for a comparison with the corresponding L1 data, EL1/EL2 negotiated interaction is further discussed in section 7.3 comparing forms and functions of repetition in all three data sets.

7.3 Repetition in negotiated interaction across data sets

This section compares and contrasts forms of native speaker repetition in negotiated interaction, as well as native and nonnative forms of repetition in EL1/EL2 negotiation (in 7.3.1). Sub-section 7.3.2 further investigates functions of repetition and 7.3.3 concludes this chapter.

7.3.1 Forms of repetition across data sets

As mentioned earlier, the EL1/EL1 and JL1/JL1 data provide a comparison and contrast of EL1/EL2 interaction with patterns in native English and Japanese negotiation sequences. In order to allow for an overview of the percentage of AS-units including or consisting of a repetition, Table 7.3.a below indicates the respective number of AS-units in negotiated interaction, as well as the number and percentage of repetition. Each line represents twelve speakers out of forty-eight participants overall. The information given in the table represents an amalgamation of Table 7.1.a and 7.2.a, outlining the occurrence of repetition in the data.

Negotiation sequences: Total AS-units (*n*) Repetition units (*n*) % of repetition

EL1 in EL1/EL1	400	80	20%
JL1 in JL1/JL1	417	99	23.7%
EL1 in EL1/EL2	570	140	24.5%
EL2 in EL1/EL2	462	118	25.5%

Table 7.3.a. Total number of negotiation AS-units and of repetition (*n* / %)

Table 7.3.a indicates that repetition is used between 20% and 25.5% in utterances of negotiated sequences in all data sets. Overall, the Japanese speakers repeat slightly more in negotiated interactions in their native language than their English speaking counterparts (23.7% of times as compared to 20%). When speaking with or as a learner, percentages vary between 24.5% and 25.5%. However, information on who repeats in which form remains undisclosed. Therefore, above Tables 7.1.b and 7.2.c are combined in Table 7.3.b allowing comparing and contrasting the percentages of repetition in relation to form and speakers across data sets. Tables 7.3.a as well as 7.3.b do not include any new information.

Forms and percentages of Other- and Same-speaker repetition of twelve EL1 speakers in EL1/EL1 dyads are provided on the left and twelve JL1 speakers in JL1/JL1 dyads on the right side of column one and two. Column three and four examines Other- and Same-

speaker repetition in EL1/EL2 dyads by 12 English native speakers and 12 learners on the left and right side respectively. Table 7.3.b uses the terms NS and NNS for the EL1 and EL2 in EL1/EL2 dyads, in order to distinguish more clearly between the L1 data and data from the EL1 interaction with EL2 (NNS), whose base line language is Japanese. Throughout this study, the terms ‘EL1’ and ‘NS’ as well as ‘EL2’ and ‘NNS’ are interchangeable. Since the data of the present research are rather complex, Table 7.3.b. needs to be considered carefully. However, presenting all information in one table has the advantage of obtaining an overview of all data at once. The percentages are calculated relative to the total number of AS-units within negotiation sequences per data set as indicated in Table 7.3.a.

	Column One 24 participants (NS only)		Column Two 24 participants (NS only)		Column Three 24 participants (NS/NNS)		Column Four 24 participants (NS/NNS)	
Repetition: forms / speaker	Other-speaker EL1	JL1	Same-speaker EL1	JL1	Other-speaker NS	NNS	Same-speaker NS	NNS
Partial repetition	6.25%	8.9%	3%	3.5%	2.5%	12.8%	2.5%	2%
Exact repetition	3.25%	2.5%	1.25%	1.9%	1.5%	4.5%	3%	2%
Elaboration	0.25%	1.5%	2.75%	2.9%	2.5%	0.2%	5%	3%
Paraphrase	1%	1%	2.25%	1.5%	1.5%	1%	2.5%	-
*Same turn rep.	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.5%	-
Total	10.75%	13.9%	9.25%	9.8%	8%	18.5%	16.5%	7%

* Only in EL1/EL2 data: Self repetition of a sentence in the same turn.

Table 7.3.b. Comparison of repetition forms and speakers across data sets

An examination of the above percentages allows for the following propositions: firstly, there is no great variation between Other- and Same-speaker repetition in English and Japanese native speaker negotiated interaction; and secondly, in both L1 data sets Other-speaker repetition occurs more often than Same-speaker repetition. However, percentages vary when the native speakers of English (EL1) negotiate with Japanese children speaking English as their second language (EL2). The EL1 speakers repeat their own saying considerably more often with a learner than with an L1 counterpart (16.5% of Same-speaker repeats with EL2 as compared to 9.25% with EL1). When the Japanese participants speak English, the opposite occurs: Same-speaker repetition decreases slightly to from 9.8 in JL1/JL1 to 7% in EL1/EL2 and Other-speaker repetition increases from 13.9 to 18.5%. This is shown in the following comparisons based on the total percentages listed in Table 7.3.b:

- Other-speaker repetition by EL1: in their L1: 10.75% with EL2: 8%
- Other-speaker repetition by JL1: in their L1: 13.9% as EL2: 18.5%
- Same-speaker repetition by EL1: in their L1: 9.25% with EL2: 16.5%
- Same-speaker repetition by JL1: in their L1: 9.8% as EL2: 7%

These findings are important as repetition in negotiated interaction is not usually traced back to the learner's native language. In some studies, a comparison of NS/NNS and NS/NS of English takes place. For example, in Oliver's (1995: 99) research with child dyads, Same-speaker repetition took place in a similar ratio in an L1 and L2 context, however, Other-speaker repetition was lower in native English speaker dyads. In Long's (1983b) study with NS adults both types of repetition were low (around 6%). Neither study included comparisons relating repetition to the native language of the learner, nor a differentiation between who repeats: the native or nonnative speaker.

In regard to forms, Table 7.3.b reveals that all speakers use partial repetition more often than any other form of repetition. In EL1/EL1 9.25% (out of 20% of all repetitions) are in partial form, in JL1/JL1 12.4% (out of a total of 23.7% repetitions) and in EL1/EL2 the learner partially repeats 14.8% of times (out of 25.5%), indicating that more or less half of all repetitions by these speakers are partial. Only the EL1 in EL1/EL2 interaction repeats less in partial form (5% out of a total of 24.5%), with the prevalent forms being elaboration and paraphrases including self-repetition (15% out of 24.5% of total repetitions).

As mentioned earlier, Deen's (1997: 147-160) data also reveal that in NS/NNS negotiation around sixty percent of native speaker repetition consists of elaboration (complex repetition) and paraphrasing and that nonnative speakers use partial repetition about twice as often as native speakers. However, the study does not indicate if they repeat their own or the other speaker's saying.

In the present study, the Japanese participants' use of partial forms is particularly high in EL2 Other-speaker repetition. Moreover, the EL2 participants have a tendency to repeat the Other-speaker's utterance in an exact form. It is interesting to note that there are no instances of EL2 Same-speaker paraphrases in the data and no self-repetition after a TRP such as in EL1 turns. Since the Japanese participants do employ elaboration and paraphrases in their L1 negotiated interaction, the restricted use of these forms could be traced back to their limited English proficiency.

In regard to the final pitch in a negotiation sequence, a separate analysis reveals that the majority of EL2 Other-speaker partial repetitions take place with a level or downward pitch, as opposed to the pitch of L1 Other-speaker partial repetition which is often rising. Deen (1995: 179) also emphasises that the majority of questions in the NS/NNS data of her study occur without question intonation. Forms and pitch are further illustrated and discussed along with functions in the next sub-section.

7.3.2 Comparing functions of Other- and Same-speaker repetition across the data

The main L1 functions of repetition listed and explained in 7.1.2 equally apply to the EL1/EL2 data. Same-speaker repetitions are ‘comprehension checks’ in regard to one’s own initial utterance or ‘clarifying answers’ providing information upon request. The function of Same-speaker repetition in comprehension checks is similar to Other-speaker repetition in confirmation checks: assuring correct understanding or comprehension, however, not of the other speaker’s proposition but of their own. This type of repetition is usually not requested by the other speaker and is often partial or exact. ‘Clarifying answers’ by the same speaker follow a question (or question word) by the other speaker and substantiate their original proposition in order to assure understanding. They can be partial or exact repetitions, an expansion or a paraphrase.

The functional labels of Other-speaker repetition in negotiated interaction are ‘confirmation checks’, ‘acknowledgements’ or ‘clarification requests’. Confirmation checks and acknowledgements both consist of a partial or exact repetition and only differ in regard to their final pitch which is rising in checks and level or falling otherwise. In the L1 data, the difference in function is generally unambiguous and the terms for functions of repetitions have been effectively applied in Chapter Five to all negotiated interaction, native and nonnative. However, although the label of the function is the same, there are variations in EL1/EL2 interaction to be considered.

Firstly, the data reveals that the EL2 (especially beginners) have an overall tendency to form questions without a rising intonation contour making it difficult to differentiate between confirmation checks and acknowledgement at times. Moreover, one cannot be sure if the learner understood the meaning of the lexical item or structure. This results in additional repetitions by some of the native speakers to assure comprehension. And lastly, not only the quantity, but also the quality of utterances can vary. EL2 turns tend to

be shorter or incomplete and their answers sometimes consist of one word only. Rather than saying ‘yes’ the child might acknowledge with a particle (for example, ‘um’). Examples 7.20 through to 7.25 demonstrate several of the points made above:

(7.20) EL1/EL2 (beginner) [D14: 53-65]

1. D (EL1) | um does it have a sharp point at the end/ |
2. Y (EL2) | yes |
3. D | it does/ |
4. Y | um |
5. D | does it have a sharp point at the end |
6. Y | yes |
7. D | or is it blunt |
8. Y → | uh/ blunt/ |
9. D | blunt or sharp |
10. Y → | ee (0.5) sharp |
11. D | sharp | (3)
12. | oh (sighs) (3) okay | ((end of negotiation))

Although Y answers correctly in line two, four and six, D appears to be unsure whether Y understands her question and continues to inquire over a number of turns. Recognition of a word (if clearly pronounced) is unproblematic in L1 negotiation, but often a trouble source for a learner and the native speaker interlocutor in cross-linguistic talk. Moreover, one has to keep in mind that the participants are children; it is difficult to imagine that any adult speaker would use comprehension checks twice in a row as does D in line three and five.

Y’s final pitch in line eight identifies this partial repetition as a confirmation check but it remains unclear if he understands the meaning of ‘blunt’. In the acknowledgement repetition (in line ten) it appears that ‘sharp’ is understood. Line eight and ten also exemplify partial EL2 Other-speaker repetition, the most dominant form of repetition with learners. Furthermore, EL1 acknowledgement repetition is sometimes used together with Yes/No answers to ensure that that they got it right:

(7.21) EL1/EL2 (advanced) [D24: 1-6]

1. M (EL2) | (4) is it a square shape/ |
2. S (EL1) | ah= (2) what do you mean by square |
3. | rectangular or Cartesian/ |

- 4. M | rectangle | (low voice)
- 5. S | yes |
- 6. → | it's rectangle |

This type of EL1 repetition is found more often with learners than in L1 interaction and occurs at the end of the negotiation sequence. Acknowledgement repetition after a Yes/No answer in order to ensure correct understanding is less typical for English, but Rieschild’s (2004) research reveals that in Arabic, answers to Yes/No Questions rely on the partial repetition of the proposition.

7.21 also includes a ‘clarification request’ in form of a question word and a partial repetition (in line two), representing a use of repetition not illustrated in above section 7.1.2 on L1 functions. In many cases, clarification requests are implicit and only consist of a question word, or a question not including a repetition. They mainly occur in the indicator and were discussed in Chapter Five.

It is also interesting to note that L1 confirmation checks can occur at the end of a sequence after a L2 Yes/No answer, followed by an L1 acknowledgment with a falling intonation:

(7.22) EL1/EL2 (beginner) [D17: 62-64]

- 1. W (EL2) | no- |
- 2. M (EL1) | no/ |
- 3. W | no\ |

This pattern of repetition is not present in the respective L1 and it appears as if the native speaker is dubious about the L2 proposition. In Tannen (1989), repetition of ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ are seen as ‘silence-avoiding’ or ‘stalling’, but the function of the repetition here appears to confirm understanding. Confirmation checks and acknowledgements with a learner take on an extra dimension in that the act of repeating also tries to make sure that the message content is understood correctly. This type of repetition is mainly used by the EL1 in EL1/EL2 negotiated interaction.

Besides an EL1 tendency to ensure comprehension with a number of repetitions, there are also qualitative differences in L1 repetitions. For instance, repetitions in L1 English and Japanese can be rather specific and consist of a complex clause such as in the following exact repetition in 7.23, line three, from the Japanese native speaker data set:

1. R 片手を広げて、片手をこういうふうにやっていますか。

2. T えっ。

3.R → 片手を広げて、片手をこういうふうにやっていますか。

4. T うーん、 広げて。

5. いいえ。

The EL2 participants in this study are usually not able to repeat complex clauses which in general are not part of their repertoire. Another interesting feature of this sequence is T's repetition of a verb in line four. As already mentioned earlier, Japanese repetition involves a variety of sentence elements, and research by Fox et al (1996: 207-209) also found that Japanese sometimes repeat verbs instead of nouns.

As opposed to EL1 utterances, EL2 turn construction units (TCUs) can be fragmental because they do not know or remember the necessary vocabulary or structure. This is demonstrated in line one and the partial Same-speaker expanded repetition in line three:

1. M (EL2)→ | does (0.5) he have (0.5) <kore> | <L1 meaning 'this'>

2. D (EL1) | {beard} beard | (1)

3. M → | does he have lots of (3) |

4. D | lots of hair in his beard/ |

5. M | yeah yes |

6. D | compared to the other one/ |

7. M | yes |

190

M's TCU in line one is incomplete (probably followed by a gesture indicating a beard), and D took over the turn, firstly to help out with the correct word (in line two) and then to supply a correctly formed question in line four. In line six, D also takes over M's questioning role thus enabling them to finalise this particular task.

Incomplete utterances can also occur in EL2 Other-speaker repetition as illustrated in Y's questions in 7.25, line two and five:

(7.25) EL1/EL2 (beginner) [D14: 153-159]

1. D (EL1) | is it in different type of writing |
2. Y (EL2)→ | different type of/ |
3. D | is it like four something :: or like a different type of writing | (1)
4. | no/ |
5. Y → | a different a what- | (1) (mumbles)
6. D | okay |
7. | they aren't | ((since they have run out of time, she looks at his sheet))
8. | we finished |

Again, the Other-speaker partial repetitions in line two and five are characteristic for EL2. They consist of confirmation checks, demonstrating that D's proposition is not understood at the semantic level. Another typical feature is that the intonation contour in the second check is not rising and one reason for the lack of a final rising pitch in the present study could also be the learner's L1 conventional use of the marker *ka* (with a level or falling pitch) which is used to indicate questions in Japanese.

The overall negotiated interaction by D14 above is one of the longest in the data, and although D (a girl) ends up looking at Y's sheet at the very end to answer her own question in line seven, she has been very good and very patient with Y whose English is very limited. Through a joint effort they were able to accomplish what has been impossible for most of the other EL2 beginners: to finalise all tasks getting only one wrong. Their dialogue (7.25) is a good illustration of the overall findings of this chapter, that is the EL1 repeat their own utterance generally more often when speaking with EL2 (such as in line three), and the learners use more partial Other-speaker repetition (as lines two and five).

NNS partial repetitions are also a salient feature in research by Ondarra (1997: 440-441) and her study also emphasises that the turns of the native speaker often consist of repetitions linking new utterances to the previous dialogue. Ondarra stresses that the NS usually collaborate with the learners in regard to production problems, such as the supply of lexis. The present study agrees with Ondarra (1997: 454) stipulating that NS repetition either in partial, exact or elaborated forms are a powerful way of meaning clarification.

Overall, a closer analysis of repetition patterns in child interaction produced a number of interesting findings in regard to forms, speakers and functions. Since the L1 data were collected in order to better understand EL1/EL2 negotiated interaction, the final part of this chapter focuses on some of the variations in negotiated interaction with or as a language learner.

7.3.3 Summary

In order to make a meaningful contribution to the existing body of knowledge about NS/NNS repetition, negotiation and language learning, the present study also includes an overview of findings in regard to L1 English speakers, as well as an examination of the baseline data of Japanese speakers. This gives the present study a multi-dimensional aspect which allows additional insights and an appreciation of similarities and variations of the respective speakers' habitual way of negotiating.

Interestingly, in their first language, there is no great variation in the overall repetition patterns in English and in Japanese. Although the limited scale of this study does not allow generalisations, the findings reveal the following trend: Overall percentages of native English and Japanese Same- and Other-speaker repetition are similar with slightly more Other-speaker repetition in both L1 contexts. In both L1 data sets, partial repetition is the dominant form and it mainly occurs in Other-speaker turns. Such repeats in English often consist of noun phrases, whereas Japanese speakers repeatedly use verb phrases. This can be traced back to their more flexible syntax rules allowing the subject or object to remain unexpressed. In both L1 data sets, elaboration and paraphrases tend to occur mostly in Same-speaker repeats. L1 background knowledge is crucial for gaining a deeper understanding of the expectations of the speakers in EL1/EL2 dyads.

Findings from the present study show that there are considerable differences between native speaker patterns and repetition in negotiated interaction with or as a learner. In EL1/EL2 dialogues, there are additional hurdles to overcome owing to the learner's limited knowledge of the target language and this leads to formal differences in Same- and Other-speaker repetition. For example, the EL1 participant in an EL1/EL2 interaction uses fewer partial repeats and more elaborations and paraphrases.

An additional important finding is that there are less EL2 Other-speaker elaborations and no instances of EL2 Same-speaker paraphrases in the data. Since the Japanese participants do employ elaborations as well as paraphrases in their L1 negotiated interaction, the restricted use of these forms might be due to their limited command of English.

The main L1 and L2 functions found of Other-speaker repetition in this study are comprehension checks, acknowledgements or clarification requests. Same-speaker repetition assures comprehension through unsolicited checks or through clarifying answers, providing information after a request. Oliver's (2002) essential functions of child negotiation also include repetition in confirmation and comprehension checks, as well as Self- and Other-repetition, however, the role of the respective speakers and forms of repetition are not further examined.

Although the present study uses the same functional terms, it further distinguishes between forms and Same- and Other-speaker repetition per speaker (NS or NNS). Another interesting finding relates to the fact that in EL1/EL2 dyads, the EL1 speakers repeat their own utterances almost twice as often as with an EL1 counterpart. With the JL1 the opposite occurs: when speaking in English as their second language (as an EL2), Same-speaker repetition decreases slightly and Other-speaker repetition increases.

These are key findings, as NS/NNS repetition is not usually traced back to patterns in the respective speakers' native language. A comparison shows that in EL1/EL2 negotiation, native speakers need to be prepared to repeat their own propositions more often and learners (especially beginners) tend to depend more on other-repetition.

Furthermore, in NS/NNS repetitions there are quantitative and qualitative differences. NS utterances can be complex and include a variety of expressions, whereas learners struggle with their vocabulary and syntax. Their TCU can be fragmental or incomplete. NNS questions are often formed without a rising pitch, and this trend could be traced back to the fact that in Japanese the question marker *ka* has a level or falling pitch. Moreover, it is not always clear if the meaning of what is repeated is understood.

In regard to forms, the NS Other- and Same-speaker repeats are often elaborations or paraphrases, whereas the prevailing NNS form is Other-speaker partial repetition. Although the more advanced learner repeats less often than the beginner, the overall pattern found in EL1/EL2 repetition with intermediate/advanced participants remains the same: the native speakers repeat about twice as often their own saying rather than that of the nonnative speaker and the learners tend to repeat the other speaker's proposition instead of their own.

These results indicate that SLA studies which focus only on NS input (Other-speaker repetition or 'recasts') or NNS output (Same-speaker repetition) are only a partial representation of the negotiation process. The present study demonstrates that learning opportunities can also arise in other types of repeats such as in EL1 Same-speaker and EL2 Other-speaker repetition. The findings reveal that in order to understand the true contribution of repetition in negotiation of understanding, it has to be analysed separately rather than be addressed in clarification requests, confirmation and comprehension checks and a repetition category as suggested in the original framework by Long (1983a).

The role of repetition in negotiation and its relationship to learners' language development continues to be a key issue in many SLA studies and it is hence worthwhile emphasising that repeats often do not occur in isolation, but in a number of forms and functions within the same negotiated sequence. The examples in the present chapter show that repetition is used by all speakers and that it has a positive effect in regard to the flow in the negotiation process. Sub-section 7.2.2 clearly demonstrated that not only recasts and pushed output, but also EL1 Same-speaker and EL2 Other-speaker repetitions act as facilitators in EL1/EL2 interaction.

The use of the target language is often reinforced in NS/NNS collaborative dialogues which are the central theme of Hatch's (1978) seminal research. Donato (1994) as well as Swain and Lapkin (1998) also underline that a focus on just one speaker or one type of repetition does not represent the entire spectrum and that negotiated interaction has to be analysed as a whole. Moreover, the analyses of repetition throughout a sequence reveal a spirit of co-operation between speakers which cannot be captured in formal or functional terms. There is willingness by both speakers to reach understanding and the resolution of trouble sources can be seen as a joint accomplishment.

In some negotiation studies (like Oliver, 1995b or Gass et al 1998) it has been argued that children are egocentric owing to the limited use of comprehension checks in the data. This study would like to argue that measuring co-operation only by looking at one function of repetition (such as comprehension checks) does not reveal the true nature of the preparedness of the speakers to collaborate in negotiated interaction. Despite individual differences, the present study has found that in EL1/EL2 dyads, the native speaker participants are often keen to help their nonnative counterparts with problems in understanding and turn constructions. The learners' partial or non-understanding is not only overcome with comprehension checks, but elaboration and paraphrases in NS Same-speaker repetition. Furthermore, rather than just being centred on their own task and utterances, the NS actively participate in other speaker's meaning construction by suggesting target forms which are often repeated by the learner. Subjectively speaking, the native speakers' patience and ardour in getting meaning across was outstanding especially with some of the learners who had really very little English. It was remarkable that certain EL1/EL2 (beginner) dyads (such as D14) were actually able to finalise the whole task in the time given to them and that repetition did play a major role in this achievement.

In addition, the data reveal that the English speaking child appears to act like a teacher at times, supplying the necessary words or question forms. This can occur in pre-empting moves and does not always lead to negotiated interaction such as in 7.26 where the EL1 tests the EL2 comprehension by explicitly inquiring about a lexical item:

(7.26) EL1/EL2 (intermediate) [D21: 34-37]

- 1. J ‘does the door have (2) do you know what rectangles are?’
- 2. N ‘yeah’
- 3. J ‘does does the door have rectangle windows?’
- 4. N ‘no’

Negotiation does not take place here because N understands but this exchange shows how language mediates task performance. This type of input by the more proficient speaker is also focussed on by Pica (1994) and is being described as ‘pre-modified’ in the sense that the learner does not have to negotiate for meaning or make adjustments.

Native speakers also co-operate at the syntactical level and it is interesting to observe how they are able to adjust and simplify structures if necessary. In this sequence J changes his initial query into a Yes/No Question in order to facilitate N’s answer:

(7.27) EL1/EL2 (intermediate) [D21: 47-50]

- | | |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. J (EL1) | has the hand bag got a long handle/ |
| | or a short one |
| 2. N (EL2) | a: (.5) |
| 3. J → | does the hand bag have a long handle |
| 4. N | a: (.5) no |

The EL1 Same-speaker repetition (as in line three) following N’s clarification request shows that children are able to adjust their language to the level of their interlocutor and therewith overcome comprehension problems. As mentioned above, recasts as well as pushed output are discussed extensively in SLA literature as facilitating and promoting language learning. Repetition in the present study predominantly took place in EL1 Same-speaker repetition and in EL2 Other-speaker repetition and the data reveals that these types of repetition can be just as beneficial for language learners.

The importance of repetition as a universal resource in classroom communication has been underlined by Merritt (1994: 31). Her research proposes that positive functions of repetition are the provision of more processing time and another chance to understand what is meant, as well as focussing and getting attention. Other classroom studies go one step further and Roebuck and Wagner (2004: 74) investigate whether students can be

taught the use of repetition as a strategy in order to make their discourse more cohesive. They assert that repetition is often underused by learners and should be taught more explicitly. The present research confirms that in NS/NNS interaction, the native speaker does use repetition more often (as in AS-units per speaker) and tends to play a crucial role in negotiation with learners. However, if repetition were to be taught to learners, it would also be beneficial to raise the native speakers' awareness of its role.

In sum, beyond forms and functions, the in-depth analysis of the aspects of repetition in negotiated interaction in this chapter stresses its potential as a linguistic resource facilitating language comprehension and production. The data, as well as the excerpts here, illustrate that repetition leads to heightened hearer/speaker attention and involvement. Repeats can also monitor the recipients' understanding and positively support the other speakers' turn. Peer collaboration and a willingness to repeat contribute considerably to language learning opportunities. In addition to salient characteristics of the speech act of repetition, pragmatic features of the negotiation process such as pauses were found to be an area which has received limited consideration and the next chapter hence addresses this short-coming.

Chapter Eight: Management of talk through pauses

8.0 Introduction

This study shows that silent and voiced pauses appear to play a considerable role in negotiated interactions and that they have a particular relevance to culture-specific conversation management norms. The comparison of English and Japanese L1 data revealed that voiced pauses are used more frequently in Japanese and that there are longer silent pauses in English L1/L2 interaction which often impact turn taking. This provides a strong motivation to further examine this phenomenon. The relevance of pauses might not have been recognised by other studies chiefly because L1 baseline data has not been available. This section explains the characteristics of silent and voiced pauses, examines their occurrence in the data, and looks at the relevance of analysing and discussing discourse particles.

In Conversation Analysis, silence in conversation is given different terms depending on its placement. Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974: 714-715) consider intra-turn silence that is not at a transition-relevance place (TRP) to be a 'pause', silence after a possible completion point a 'gap', and an extended silence at a TRP to be a 'lapse'. A 'minimised gap' or 'potential gap' is a silent period occurring at a TRP which is ended by the same speaker who was talking before, therewith transforming the gap into an 'intra-turn pause'. The respective lengths of pauses, gaps and lapses are not further discussed in their study.

The tolerance of silence (or pause length) varies between cultures. For example, in English pausing one second can be considered as a 'standard maximum' silence in conversation (Jefferson, 1989). In regard to Japanese, no precise information appears to be available except that native Japanese speakers seem to tolerate longer silent pauses than English speakers (Futaba, 1996; Harumi, 1999).

Although Sacks et al (1974) propose a useful distinction between intra-turn silence ('pause') and silent periods between turns ('gaps' or 'lapses' according to their length), the present study prefers to divide all silent segments within and between turns according to their lengths, and to label them as silent pauses. Silent pauses will be split up into 'short pauses' (1 second or less), 'pauses' (above 1 second up to 3 seconds), and 'long pauses' (above 3 seconds). Sacks et al (1974) terms 'gaps' and 'lapses' are sometimes

used when differentiating between intra- and inter-turn pauses. If the length is not specified (such as 'short' or 'long'), the term 'silent pause' applies to all unvoiced segments within the negotiated interaction.

However, pauses are not always silent and may co-occur with certain discourse particles and the Bank of English Corpora lists 'ah', 'er', 'mm' and 'um' as the most common vocalisations framed by pauses. An analysis of the 57 million word Cobuild-Direct Corpus of Spoken English shows that they rank in frequency between 'not' and 'or'. According to Stenstrom's (1990: 223) study, drawing on the London-Lund Corpus, between 1% and 23% of English spoken text can consist of 'filled' pauses (including glottal filled pauses).

An analysis of Spanish NS/NNS negotiated interaction by Ondarra (1997: 213-229) reveals that depending on the speaker, between 4% and 19% of all words are 'fillers' (her term for particles in voiced pauses). In the present study, the term 'filler' is avoided since it reflects an assumption that only lexicalised verbalisations have meaning. However, this study employs the term 'voiced' or 'filled' pause in order to differentiate between a pause filled with a voiced sub-lexical particle and a 'silent' pause.

Stenstroem (1990: 227) points out that voiced pauses are often used as turn initiators. According to Kjellmer (2003: 183-184) the major functions of voiced (or filled) pauses are: to signpost the beginning of the speaker's turn, or to hold the turn, signifying that the speakers are thinking about what to say next without intending to yield their turn.

Although the forms and functions of voiced pauses are a salient feature in conversations, the sub-lexical particles used are often not referred to in grammar books which usually only describe the written standard. In spoken interaction, speakers can be unaware that they use them, and might not realise such vocalisations form a part of their utterances. For example, if a speaker, who just said: "Um (.5) does he have a beard?", would be asked to repeat his/her sentence, s/he would most probably drop the initial particle and respond: "Does he have a beard?", repeating the proposition, but not the utterance.

The Japanese television news channel NHK which presents the Japanese news in Australia with L1 subtitles, consistently omits the Japanese equivalents of 'um' and 'er'

in the subtitles although voiced pauses occur frequently in live-interviews on Japanese television. Web-based transcripts of radio or television interviews omit this part of the speech as well. ‘Um’ and ‘er’ were also not listed in a number of dictionaries consulted and not found in the thesaurus on the computer word processing program (Word 2000).

The English native speakers (EL1) in this study made use of the following particles: ‘um’ (or ‘mm’), ‘a:’ and ‘er’. Japanese speakers (JL1) employ a wider range of particles (listed in Figure 8.1) and according to ‘Sanseido’s New Concise Dictionary’ (1987) they can be translated into English as follows (Romanised spelling of the Japanese particles as in the dictionary):

<i>Aa, sa</i>	‘well’, ‘a:’
<i>Anoo</i>	‘well’, (I) say’
<i>Ano ne</i>	‘well’, ‘I say’, ‘I mean’
<i>Ee</i>	‘well’, ‘let me see’
<i>Etto, etto ne</i>	‘let me see’, ‘well’
<i>Jaa</i>	‘well’, (well) then’, ‘if (it is) so’, in that case’
<i>Ne(e)</i>	‘you see’, ‘you know’, ‘I suppose’
<i>Un, mm</i>	‘um’ or ‘mm’ (not listed in the dictionary)

Figure 8.1. Japanese particles and their English translation

The term ‘particle’ here refers only to ‘um’ (‘mm’), ‘a:’ and ‘er’ as well as the Japanese particles listed in Figure 8.1. In earlier research they were regarded as extra-linguistic vocalisations (Quinting 1971: 12-13). Quirk et al (1985: 19.59N) consider ‘er’ to be an exclamation expressing hesitation. Atkinson and Heritage (1984) refers to ‘un’ and ‘hun’ as vocalizations or syntactically dependent items. In some studies (like Kjellmer 2003), they are viewed as ‘hesitation markers’ which describes a form with a functional term.

Excluded from the analysis because of their rare occurrence in the data are particles indicating surprise ‘oh’, as well as question words in form of sub-lexical particles with a rising intonation such as *eh*, *he* (‘huh’) and ‘a:’ when indicating acknowledgement. Moreover, listeners’ responses in form of back-channelling or *aizuchi* are excluded. An outstanding analysis of such responses (or ‘listener tokens’) in English is to be found in Gardner (2001). Other phenomena not further considered here are vocalisations such as throat clearing (sometimes used to break up silence), mumbling (in the form of self-talk or ‘thinking aloud’) or laughter.

The next section (8.1) investigates native speaker silent and voiced pauses in negotiated interaction, followed by EL1/EL2 pauses and co-occurring particles in 8.2. Section 8.3 compares and contrasts silent and voiced pauses of native English speakers in EL1/EL1 and EL1/EL2 negotiation with pauses by Japanese in JL1/JL1 and EL1/EL2 interaction. The respective findings are presented in tables and followed by relevant examples and analyses. 8.4 concludes this chapter with a discussion of the results and implications.

8.1 Silent and voiced pauses in English and Japanese native speaker negotiation

Knowing how the native English and Japanese participants in this study manage their turns by using pauses (with or without particles) allows for a better understanding of the variations occurring in EL1/EL2 discourse. The following subsections firstly examine silent pauses in English and Japanese native speaker negotiated interaction in 8.1.1, and next the use of particles co-occurring with pauses in 8.1.2. As in previous chapters, the findings are based on the native speaker data in EL1/EL1 and JL1/JL1 negotiation sequences (24 participants overall). The main purpose of this analysis is to establish the patterns of silent and voiced pauses in the L1 baseline data, in order to compare them to patterns in EL1/EL2 data. This allows contrasting habitual L1 patterns to pausal behaviour when speaking with or as a learner.

8.1.1 Silent pauses in EL1/EL1 and JL1/JL1

As mentioned above, silent pauses are split into ‘short pauses’ (1 second or less), ‘pauses’ (above 1 second up to 3 seconds), and ‘long pauses’ (above 3 seconds). Micro-pauses (under 0.3 seconds) are not included here since minimal pauses are not the focus of this study.

In order to gain an overview of how often and where these silent pauses occur, Table 8.1 lists the number of silent pauses in the respective native speaker negotiated interaction and presents their frequency and positioning. In regard to their location, a distinction is made between pauses before or after a turn, and intra-turn pauses preceding either a repetition or another sentence element and pauses which precede turn-sharing. This allows for a better overview of where the silent pauses actually occur.

L1 Silent pauses	EL1/EL1 (<i>n</i> 12)	JL1 / JL1 (<i>n</i> 12)
Short pause (turn initial / final)	5	5
(long) pause (turn initial / final)	4	5
Short pause (before a repetition)	7	5
(long) pause (before a repetition)	2	1
Short pauses (intra-turn)	16	13
(long) pauses (intra-turn)	3	3
Pauses preceding turn-sharing	4	3
TOTAL	41	35

Table 8.1. Silent pauses in English and Japanese native speaker negotiation

The most striking feature is that there is little variation in pausing behaviour in the native speaker negotiated sequences. Most silent pauses are short (1 second or less). Owing to the limited number of silent pauses longer than one second, pauses over one second are listed together with long pauses (above 3 seconds). As indicated in Chapter Four, the number of AS-units in native speaker negotiation is similar in English and Japanese (400 versus 417 AS-units) and the number of pauses therefore emerges from about the same amount of talk. The total number of pauses is quite low because micro-pauses are not considered. Silent pauses co-occurring with particles such as ‘um’ and ‘er’ (or Japanese equivalent) are not included here either but form part of Table 8.2 and are further examined under ‘voiced’ pauses in sub-section 8.1.2.

It is interesting to note that in native speaker negotiated interaction, silent and voiced pauses take place about half of the time in the trigger, then mainly in the indicator, and rarely in the response and reaction to the response (or resolution). As a matter of fact, a long silent pause can at times be the catalyst (or trigger) of a negotiation sequence. This is shown in 8.1, where S has finished his turn and is waiting for K to take up hers:

- (8.1) [EL1/EL1, D1: 19-21]
1. S | your turn |
 2. K → (6)
 3. S | go |
 4. K | um (3) {is does} does she have her hair tied up/ | ((negotiation continues))

In line three, S appears to ‘negotiate’ the length of the pause. This research found that six seconds is the longest pause in either native speaker data set and appears to be the limit of silence the native speaker child tolerates or needs to plan an utterance. Line four illustrates a pause after a particle at the beginning of the turn (discussed in sub-section

8.1.2). K's response in line four triggers another negotiation sequence, however, its content is not relevant to this section.

Line four also contains a false start ('is does') and there is no silent pause afterwards. Kjellmer's spoken text analysis (2003: 182) also shows that false starts are seldom followed by a pause, arguing that the false start has provided the speaker with enough time to think about how to formulate the remaining sentence. As opposed to L2 utterances, L1 pauses and false starts at the beginning of a TCU are followed by a well-formed question or answer.

Pause tolerance can, however, be much shorter than in the above example, as in this instance of a 'pause preceding turn-sharing':

(8.2) [EL1/EL1, D1: 7-9]

- 1. K → | is yours fully (1)
- 2. S back to the person's ears/ |
- 3. K (0.5) | yeah |

In line two, S takes the floor after one second, which is considered a 'standard maximum' silence in adult conversations (Jefferson, 1989). Sometimes Yes/No answers are also preceded by short pauses (such as in line three). This might be a sign of that decision making needs to be reflected on briefly.

The most typical silent pauses in native speaker negotiation are in the trigger, intra-turn and short (one second or less) such as in the following example before a repetition:

(8.3) [EL1/EL1, D4: 109-110]

- 1. S → | the one that has the dot on it are hooking arms (1) hooking arms/ | *trigger*
 - 2. T | sorry/ | *indicator*
- ((further negotiation follows))

The pause in line one resulted in a same turn self-repetition emphasising the final noun phrase. T could have taken a turn before the repetition since the one second pause in line one could be considered as a TRP. The repetition took place because he fails to do so and this pattern is also found in talk with learners, with the EL1 repeating or paraphrasing until the other speaker takes a turn. As shown in Chapter Seven, the role of repetition in negotiation is crucial in the process of reaching understanding.

An example of a short silent intra-turn pause from the Japanese data is shown in line two:

(8.4) [JL1/JL1, D9: 7-8]

1. Y

えっと、人は会話をして。

| *etto* (0.5) *hito wa kaiwa o shite* |

‘well (0.5) the people have a conversation’

trigger
2. M

会話分からない。

→ | *kaiwa* (1) *wakaranai* |

‘conversation (1) I don’t know what you mean’

((further negotiation follows))

indicator

Line one includes a short pause after the particle *etto* ‘well’ and is accounted for as a voiced pause (in Table 8.2). The silent intra-turn pause in line two is followed by an expression of non-understanding in the indicator. Responses and final turns of negotiated sequences rarely include silent pauses.

Overall, when speaking in their native language, the participants in this study do not make extensive use of silent pauses. L1 silent pauses can occur inter- and intra-turn and most of them are short. Micro-pauses are not further considered since they do not directly relate to negotiation. Silence before turn-sharing occurred a few times in native speaker interaction with either speaker finishing the TCU in progress.

Silent pauses usually take place in the trigger or indicator and are followed by complete questions or answers. The longest silent pause in native speaker negotiated interaction was six seconds. The next sub-section examines voiced pauses in native speaker interaction.

8.1.2 Particles in voiced pauses in EL1/EL1 and JL1/JL1

This sub-section looks at the particles that co-occur with pauses therewith turning a silent pause into a voiced pause. The present research noticed that voiced pauses are used more frequently in Japanese than in English negotiation and that these variations also appear to influence the EL2 linguistic behaviour of the Japanese participants. In order to provide an overview of how often and where voiced pauses occur in the respective negotiation sequences, Table 8.2 lists the particle, as well as its position in the turn (beginning, middle or end).

Although the particles listed in Table 8.2 are either preceded, followed or framed by a silent pause, no attempt was made to list the length of these pauses separately since the overall amount of data is too limited to make further distinctions. The particles are hence listed without an indication of the length of the respective silent pauses. As mentioned earlier, the silent pauses co-occurring with the particles are not counted in above Table 8.1 and particles indicating surprise, questioning and acknowledgement are not included in this analysis. Moreover, the data of the present study includes a limited number of ‘listener tokens’ and such responses, for example, in form of back-channelling (or *aizuchi*) are also excluded.

In general, the EL1 speakers use ‘er’ and Japanese speakers have a preference for *ee*. The same holds for ‘um’ (frequently used by EL1) and *mm*, which is more often used by Japanese. All Japanese particles included in the data of this study and their English equivalents are also listed in Figure 8.1. Table 8.2 shows which particles are used in voiced pauses and where they are positioned in a turn in English and Japanese native speaker negotiation.

Particles and their position in the turn	EL1/EL1	JL1/JL1
‘Er’ <i>ee</i> (beginning of turn)	4	14
‘Er’ <i>ee</i> (middle, end of turn)	1	16
‘Um’ <i>mm</i> , <i>u:n</i> (beginning)	18	1
‘Um’ <i>mm</i> , <i>u:n</i> (middle, end)	-	2
‘Aa’	5	8
<i>Eetto</i> (beginning) ‘well’, ‘let me see’	-	26
<i>Eetto</i> (middle or end of turn)	-	14
<i>Eetto ne</i> ‘well’, ‘I mean’	-	9
<i>Jaa</i> (beginning) ‘well (then)’, ‘in that case’	-	20
<i>Jaa</i> (middle, end)	-	5
<i>Anoo</i> (beginning) ‘well’, ‘(I) say/suppose’	-	5
<i>Anoo</i> (middle or end of turn)	-	2
<i>Ne(e)</i> , <i>sa</i> ‘well’, ‘you see’, ‘you know’	-	3
TOTAL	28	125

Table 8.2. Particles (co-occurring with pauses) in NS negotiation sequences

The most salient feature in regard to voiced pauses in native speaker negotiated interaction is that Japanese speakers use a greater variety of particles not only at the beginning but also throughout their turn. It is also worth noting that the English words

given as a translation to the Japanese particles in the Sanseido dictionary (for example ‘well’, ‘you know’, ‘I suppose’, ‘let me see’ or ‘in that case’) are not used by any of the 12-year-old participants in EL1 or EL2 negotiation in this study. This indicates a discrepancy between written and spoken language, especially in child interaction, where the L1 level of the speakers is not yet fully completed and utterances such as ‘let me see’ hence appear not to be part of the English speaking participants’ repertoire yet.

Moreover, the English particles ‘um’ and ‘er’ are not found in the English/Japanese part of the dictionary and although ‘um’ and ‘er’ often function as the English equivalent of *etto* or *ano*, the Japanese/English section of the dictionary does not mention these particles. ‘Um’ or *mm* is ignored in both sections. As a Japanese translation for ‘well’ only *sa*, or *ma* were given as ‘indicators of hesitation’, however, *sa* was only used once in that context and *ma* not at all. When vocalising a pause, most Japanese speakers in this study used the particles *etto*, *ee* and *jaa*.

Overall, Table 8.2 shows that native speakers of English use fewer particles than Japanese: 28 as compared to 125. EL1/EL1 speakers mainly use ‘um’ whereas Japanese have a preference for *etto* (used 40 times), *ee* (30 times) and *jaa* (25 times). *Etto* and *jaa* occur more frequently at the beginning of a turn and *ee* is preferred in the middle (or sometimes end) of the turn.

‘Er’ is used less often than its equivalent *ee* by Japanese. The particle ‘a:’ is used in a similar way in both languages with ‘a:’ indicating surprise being excluded. ‘Mm’ with a rising intonation meaning ‘say it again’ is also not included here. *Ano* occurs only 7 times in child negotiation and this may be due to the fact that it is considered to be a marker of more formal discourse (Cohen, 2004).

Importantly, the native English speakers rarely employ particles in the middle of their turn, whereas Japanese children use them mid-turn about one third of the time (about 40 times out of 125). In addition, English speakers typically use only one of these particles in their turn but in Japanese the following combinations are found in the same turn: *eh* (pause) *ano*; *a:* (pause) *etto* or *jaa*; *jaa* (pause) *etto*; *etto* (pause) *ee* or *mm*. For example:

(8.5) [JL1/JL1, D7: 57-60]

1. K じゃあ、La=rge ええ、あの。

→ | *jaa* (0.5) *la=rge ee ano* | (0.5) *trigger*
 ‘well (0.5) large er well’ (0.5)

2. M 一番でかい字ですか。

 | *ichiban dekai ji desu ka* | *indicator*
 ‘is it the largest letter?’

K’s first turn triggers a negotiation sequence since he is not giving sufficient information to allow his partner to understand which picture he is speaking about. The focus here is on the numbers of particles K uses in line one in order to maintain his turn. He begins with *jaa* and after a short pause he says ‘large’ (stretching ‘a’). *Jaa* is predominantly used at the beginning of a turn and usually followed by a short to very short pause (0.5 or less). He then uses *ee* and *ano*, which are examples of particles in a voiced pause in the middle of a turn.

A further example of the variety of particles used by the Japanese speakers is given in the following utterance which took place in the response turn of a negotiation sequence:

(8.6) [JL1/JL1, D8: 9]

J ええ、じゃねえ、女の人指を指していますか。

→ *ee* (0.5) *ja ne* (0.5) *onna no hito yubi o sashite imasu ka*
 ‘Er (0.5) well I see (0.5) is the women pointing with her finger?’

Again, the first and last particle is followed by short silent pauses. In the Japanese discourse it is interesting to note how speakers are able to hold on to their turn by using various particles, a phenomenon not found in the English data of this study.

In regard to pause length, the longest silent pause in either data set is six seconds. However, combining the silent period preceding and following a particle can lead to longer pauses in both native speaker data sets. 8.7 illustrates the longest pause in JL1/JL1 framing a particle:

(8.7) [JL1/JL1, D11: 44-45]

1. A はい。

| *hai* |

‘yes’ ((in this case meaning: your turn))

2. T ええ、 { 一番下は } 一番下の高さは一個ですか。

→ (4) *ee* (6) { *ichiban shita wa* } *ichiban shita no takasa wa ikko desu ka*

trigger

(4) ‘er’ (6) {at the bottom} is the height at the bottom just one?’

The particle *ee* ‘er’ in line two is framed by 10 seconds of silence and followed by a false start and a precise question. Just as in some of the EL1/EL1 negotiated interaction, there are often no pauses after false starts in Japanese L1 either. T’s turn triggers a negotiation sequence but the subsequent turns are not relevant to this discussion. However, not all Japanese participants in this study tolerate such long pauses:

(8.8) [JL1/JL1, D7:24 –31] (two negotiation sequences following each other)

1. M { どっち } どっちにするの。

| { *docchi* } *docchi ni suru no* |

‘which one are you going to make it?’

2. K あー、あの。

→ | *a:* (0.5) { *a* } *ano* (1) |

trigger

‘a: (0.5) { *e* } *er* (1)’

3. M ハンドル。

| <*x*> *handoru* |

indicator

‘<*x*> a handle’

4. K ハンドルがありますか。

| *handoru ga arimasu ka* |

response

‘is there a handle?’

5. M はい、あります。

| *hai arimasu* |

reaction to response

‘yes there is’

((K ticks off correct picture and it is now M’s turn to ask him a question))

6. M 私だね、私行くよ、えっと、うーん。

→ | *watashi da ne* (3) *watashi iku yo* (1) *etto* (3) *mm* (2) |

trigger

‘it’s me, isn’t it (or: my turn) (3) I start now (1) er (3) um (2)’

7. K 早く。
 | *hayaku* | indicator
 ‘quickly’
8. M えっと、えっと、{ 男の人と女の人はこちらとも指を }
 | *etto (1) etto (1) {otoko no hito to onna no hito wa dochiratomo yubi o}*
 ‘{er (1) er (1) the man and the women both (point their) finger}
 この男の人は女の人を、女の方は男の人に指しているのですか。
 | *kono otoko no hito wa onna no hito o :: onna no hito wa otoko no hito ni*
 sashite iru no desu ka | response
 ‘is this man (pointing) to the woman, the woman pointing to the man?’
9. K 違います。
 | *chigaimasu* | reaction to response
 ‘no’ (that is not the case)

Both negotiation sequences are triggered by particles and pauses. A pause of one second (at the end of line two) is followed by a suggestion (turn-sharing) which is picked up by K to form his question in line four. The trigger of the next negotiated interaction is again a combination of pauses and particles (at the end of line six). It is also interesting to note that M uses additional phrases to maintain her turn, such as 'my turn' or 'I start now'. After being told to be quick, M starts out with particles, pauses and a false start (in line eight) before producing a question including subordinated clauses to clarify what she means by 'both'. K uses *a:* and *ano* in the same turn (in line two), the speaker M *etto* and *mm* (in line six).

A possible function of particles can be to indicate non- or partial understanding (such as in line two), or form part of the response and reaction to the response as a device to hold the floor (line three and four):

(8.9) [JL1/JL1, D12: 83-87]

- | | | |
|-------|---------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. TA | 腰に乗せています。 | |
| | <i>koshi ni nosete imasu</i> | <i>trigger</i> |
| | ‘is it on (the person’s) back?’ | |
| 2. TS | えっと。 | |
| | <i>etto @</i> | <i>indicator</i> |
| | ‘well’ (laughter) | |

3. TA ええ、こうです。
 | ee (0.5) kou desu <x> | (unclear speech) *response*
 ‘er (0.5) like that <x>’
4. TS ここ、そうです。
 | koko @@@ a: sou desu | *reaction to response*
 ‘here (laughter) well you’re right’ ((meaning: yes))

The particle *etto* in line two might not have been intended as a turn but since TA takes over the floor to give additional information in line three, TS is able to finalise her turn with a verification and an agreement in line four. Laughter appears to mitigate the fact that TS does not understand right away what the other speaker wants to express. Yamada (1997: 100) suggests in his paper that Japanese often smile or laugh in situations when a topic is not funny in order to show empathy among speakers who rely on each other.

Other findings are that in the L1 data voiced pauses are less likely to precede a repetition and rarely occur at the end of a turn, however, the respective numbers of such pauses were too insignificant to be listed separately.

In sum, silent and voiced pauses form an integral part of English and Japanese L1 negotiation and it is important to note that they occurred in the negotiated interaction of all participants. There are three striking findings in regard to pauses. Firstly, the amount and variety of particles used in voiced pauses by Japanese exceeds English. Secondly, EL1/EL1 voiced pauses are usually at the beginning of the turn, whereas mid-turn EL1/EL1 pauses tend to be silent. And thirdly, JL1/JL1 use about the same amount of silent pauses mid-turn as their English speaking counterparts, but tend to use voiced pauses (including a number of particles) throughout their turn, which is not the case in the English data in this study.

The use of pauses and particles is variously interpretable. Although they often indicate that the speaker needs time to think about what to say next and how, they may at times be treated as expressing uncertainty. Irrespective, they help the speaker to maintain the turn while engaging in a word or idea search. They permit the current speaker to think about,

for example, how best to formulate their questions or answers or how to expand their turn. Clauses after a pause can include additional information, express incomplete understanding or emphasise through repetition. In native speaker negotiation, they are usually followed by fully formed phrases or sentences including complex clauses. Functions of silent and voiced pauses are further discussed in sub-section 8.4.2. This section examined pauses in a native speaker context; the next section investigates their occurrence and role in negotiated interactions with or as a learner.

8.2 Silent and voiced pauses in EL1/EL2 negotiated interaction

As shown in previous analyses in this study, there are differences in the discourse with and of EL2 beginners and intermediate/advanced learners. Since there are twenty-four EL1/EL2 participants overall, the findings here are divided in EL1/EL2 (beginners) and EL1/EL2 (intermediate, advanced) with each group consisting of twelve participants (six native speakers and six learners). Although many of the pauses occur in the EL2 triggers or indicators, the focus of this chapter remains on the negotiation sequence as a whole. As in L1 negotiation, silent or voiced pauses are not an isolated phenomenon but took place in the discourse of all participants.

Sub-sections 8.2.1 and 8.2.2 focus firstly on silent and then on voiced pauses of native and nonnative speakers when talking to each other. Findings are presented in tables and relevant excerpts are analysed and discussed. This is followed by a summary in 8.2.3. The next section (8.3) presents EL1/EL2 pauses alongside with the EL1/EL1 and JL1/JL1 data allowing comparing and contrasting the findings of this chapter.

8.2.1 Silent pauses in EL1/EL2

In interaction with and as a learner, speakers pause for longer and more frequently than in L1 negotiation and in order to illustrate this point, Tables 8.3.a and b list the number of silent pauses in negotiated interaction with beginners and intermediate/advanced learners. However, as opposed to the Native Speaker Tables 8.1 and 8.2 which indicated pauses and particles without differentiating between speakers with in the dyad, the following tables differentiate between speakers (EL1 or EL2). A division between EL1 and EL2 will allow for a comparison to the respective speakers' L1 silent and voiced pauses in negotiated sequences.

As a norm, a pause at the end of an incomplete turn is counted as part of the current speaker's turn, otherwise (if the utterance is completed and requires an answer); the pause is considered to form part of the other speaker's turn. 'Potential gaps' (or 'lapses', Sacks et al, 1974: 715) ensuing into intra-turn pauses are listed as 'intra-turn' pauses according to their length. Pauses preceding turn-sharing are listed under EL1 pauses since the native speaker takes ownership of the pause by finishing off the EL2 sentence. It is realised that one could argue that such pauses belong to the EL2 since they form part of their TCU. For the purpose of this chapter and after discussions with fellow researchers, it was decided to divide silent pauses along the above mentioned lines and since there are only a few instances of silent pauses preceding turn-sharing the numerical difference is not significant.

The data in the following two Tables (8.3.a and b) originate from the same dyadic interaction consisting of a native speaker and a learner. The categories are the same as in L1 interaction and allow for an insight into where silent pauses occur. Table 8.3.a represents the native speaker (EL1, in column one) speaking with EL2 (beginner, column two). Table 8.3.b contains the respective EL1/EL2 (intermediate/advanced) findings.

Another observation is that the EL1 dyadic interaction with beginners and with more advanced learners cannot be compared directly since the overall amount of AS-units in negotiation in EL1/EL2 beginner interaction is about twice as high (695 AS-units as opposed to 337 AS-units with EL1/EL2 intermediate/advanced learners). Tables 8.3.a and b follow each other in order to give a better overview of the emerging patterns:

	Column One	Column Two
Silent pauses: EL1/EL2 (beginner) (12 participants)	EL1 (with EL2 beg.) (6 participants)	EL2 beginner (6 participants)
Short pause (turn initial or final)	22	17
(long) pause (turn initial or final)	11	24
Pauses after a partial start	2	10
Pause preceding turn-sharing	3	-
Short pause (before repetitions)	13	11
(long) pause (before repetitions)	7	3
Short pauses (intra-turn)	38	11
(long) pauses (intra-turn)	9	19
TOTAL	105	95

Table 8.3.a. Silent pauses in EL1/EL2 (beginner) negotiated interaction

	Column One	Column Two
Silent pauses: EL1/EL2 (int./adv.) 12 participants	EL1 with int./adv. (6 participants)	EL2 int./adv. (6 participants)
Short pause (turn initial or final)	7	14
(long) pause (turn initial or final)	8	14
Pauses after a partial start	1	1
Pause preceding turn-sharing	6	-
Short pause (before repeating)	7	6
(long) pause (before repeating)	2	5
Short pauses (intra-turn)	8	10
(long) pauses (intra-turn)	6	1
TOTAL	45	51

Table 8.3.b. Silent pauses in EL1/EL2 (int./adv.) negotiated interaction

The findings show that EL1 and EL2 use about the same number of silent pauses in their respective negotiated interaction: 105 and 95 in EL1/EL2 (beginner) versus 45 and 51 in EL1/EL2 (intermediate/advanced). Considering that the amount of negotiated AS-units with beginners is about twice as high, allows the proposition that silent pauses are used at a similar ratio in EL1/EL2 beginner and intermediate/advanced discourse. Compared to negotiation in their first language, a major difference in EL1/EL2 interaction is a higher ratio of silent pauses by both speakers. In order to allow for a general overview, Table 8.5 (in sub-section 8.3.1) further compares and contrasts findings in regard to silent pauses by all L1 and L2 speakers.

Adding up the silent pauses of all twelve EL1 participants (in column one of Table 8.3.a and b) shows that they use about the same amount of silent pauses as their twelve EL2 interlocutors (in column two of Table 8.3.a and b): 150 versus 146. About 100 (or two thirds) of the 150 EL1 pauses are inter- and intra-turn short pauses (one second or less). EL2 pauses are often longer; only about half of them are short pauses with the remainder being above one second. Tables 8.3.a and b do not further differentiate between pauses up to three seconds and longer than three seconds, but the data and some of the following excerpts show that long silent pauses occur more frequently in EL2 than EL1 negotiated interaction.

This leads to the interesting topic of tolerance of silent periods in talk and the data demonstrates that tolerance varies not only according to the cultural background of the participants but differs according to individual speakers. 8.10 shows that some EL1 children are able to wait for a relatively long time, far beyond the standard maximum of

one second stipulated by Jefferson (1989) or the maximum time of six seconds of silence found in the respective L1 data in this study:

(8.10) [EL1/EL2 (beginner), D13: 75-76]

- 1. Y (EL2) | *etto* (4) have you | (19) @ (laughter)
- 2. S (EL1) | pardon/ |

Y starts out with the Japanese particle *etto* meaning ‘er’ and an attempt to form a question. This is followed by a very long pause during which she is most probably searching for a phrase or structure finishing off the TCU. 19 seconds is one of the longest pauses found in the data and since the interlocutor does not claim the floor and Y cannot find a way to express herself, she produces laughter. S interprets this as a sign that she relinquishes her turn and requests clarification. The negotiated segment that follows is rather long and not relevant to the focus of this chapter. The type of pause illustrated at the end of line one is listed under ‘EL2 pauses after a partial start’. This category was not needed in L1 native speaker negotiation, but has been added to accommodate pauses after a sentence fragment followed by a question or statement not finishing off the TCU in progress.

Sometimes the native speaker’s patience is limited with the EL1 taking over the turn in less than a second:

(8.11) [EL1/EL2 (advanced), D23: 20-23]

- 1. M (EL2) → (1) | {does she= have} (1) does she have <uh> | (0.5) *trigger*
- 2. D (EL1) | where hair is separated like this/ | *indicator*
- 3. | pig-tails/ | (0.5) ((M probably nods in response))
- 4. | yes |

Pauses after a sentence fragment (as at the end of line one) which is completed by the other speaker are included under ‘pauses preceding turn-sharing’. Since M is an advanced learner, she might have the ability to finish off her question and the 0.5 second pause at the end of her turn in line one would then be an ‘intra-turn’ pause. However, D chose to take the floor with a suggestion (in line two and three). The video taken of the overall classroom interaction shows that the participants often use body language to achieve understanding and it can be presumed that M nods in response to D’s questions.

Turn-sharing also takes place in both native speaker data sets, however, in EL1/EL2 interaction, only the native speaker takes over incomplete sentences.

The following complex negotiation sequence further features silent pauses characterising negotiation with learners (line one is not part of the negotiation sequence but has been included for better understanding of the dialogue):

(8.12) [EL1/EL2 (beginner), D14: 74-85]

- | | | |
|------------|---|------------------|
| 1. D (EL1) | are the people holding hands like hand to hand (1) hand to hand | |
| 2. Y (EL2) | yes | <i>trigger</i> |
| 3. D | yes/ they are/ | <i>indicator</i> |
| 4. Y → | {and} (1) and <i>nandakke</i> <L1> (7) | |
| | ‘what’s that’ (Kanto dialect) | |
| 5. D | they are holding hands (1) | |
| 6. | are they holding hands/ | |
| 7. Y → | holding hand and (1) and (8) | |
| 8. | yes | |
| 9. D | they are holding hands/ | |
| 10. Y | yes | |

The negotiated interaction is triggered by Y’s confirmation in line two, which is questioned by D in line three (indicator). In line four Y (a boy) attempts to give further information and since he does not have the vocabulary to do so in English, he ends up using his first language to ‘think aloud’. This is followed by a long pause. After waiting for 7 seconds, D (a girl) responds in line five and pauses expecting Y to take his turn. Since the TRP is not picked up, she paraphrases her question and the short pause, originally intended as a gap, turns into an intra-turn pause or ‘minimised gap’.

In line seven, Y confirms that they are holding hands and the repetition of ‘and’ after a pause indicates that he would like to give additional information. However, he does not find the necessary words and after an eight second pause, Y decides to confirm D’s question with ‘Yes’ (line eight). The intra-turn pause here might be a ‘minimised gap’ considering that D took over the floor in line five after a seven second pause, he might have expected that she intervenes again with a suggestion after a long pause. An examination of their task sheets by the researcher revealed that D ended up ticking off the wrong picture. Y probably wanted to tell her that they are not only holding hands, but

also have their arms crossed. He was not able to express this since his English repertoire is still limited.

It is also worthwhile noting that the EL1 intra-turn pauses in 8.12 line one and five are not in the middle of a TCU but at the end, e.g. before a repetition or reformulation, whereas EL2 intra-turn pauses tend to occur within a TCU such as in line four and seven. Using Sacks et al terms, they could be ‘potential intra-turn pauses’ but are interpreted as ‘gaps’ or ‘lapses’ by the other speaker. Most ‘pauses after a partial start’ can be traced back to EL2 beginners. The pattern of EL1 pauses after a completed TCU and EL2 pauses in the middle of a TCU is found all through the EL1/EL2 data and represents a typical feature in talk with learners.

Pause length often plays an important role, and when given sufficient time, learners are sometimes able to produce a sentence. The next example illustrates how a beginner starts out a question after a long pause and successfully completes it after some self-talk:

(8.13) [EL1/EL2 (beginner), D15: 67 – 72]

- | | | |
|--------------|--|-----------------------------|
| 1. N (EL2) → | (12) {does it have} (3) | |
| 2. | <i>suuji nan to iu</i> <L1> (embedded self-talk) (2) | |
| | (‘how do I say numbers’) | |
| 3. | number/ | <i>trigger</i> |
| 4. Y (EL1) | {wha- which} what kind of/ | <i>indicator</i> |
| 5. N | does it have <x> | <i>response</i> |
| 6. Y | no it doesn’t | <i>reaction to response</i> |

Y finished his task and is waiting for N to ask him a question. After a twelve second pause N starts out his question in line one, then pauses for another three seconds before ‘thinking aloud’ in Japanese in line two (‘how do I say numbers’). After an additional two seconds he answers his own question in line three: ‘number’. Y waits while N is conducting his word search before asking him to be more specific (in line four). N’s answer in line five (not clearly audible on tape) allows Y to finalise the task.

Checking the dialogue preceding the extract (8.13) reveals that Y’s questions repeatedly started with ‘does it have’ and that the learner (N) appears to replicate this structure. The fact that N uses the singular rather than the plural for ‘number’ does not affect Y and

error correction is often not a priority for children. Japanese does not have a plural such as the suffix ‘s’ in English and this type of error is quite common in Japanese EL2 speech.

Overall, the findings show that silent pauses in EL1/EL2 interaction are more frequent and can be considerably longer than in L1 negotiated interaction. It is noticeable that in EL2 talk, pauses during a TCU appear to indicate a trouble source and are sometimes an invitation for EL1 speakers to come to the learner’s assistance. In addition, the TRP after a completed EL1 TCU is not always picked up by the learner and hence turns into an intra-turn pause which is usually followed by an EL1 repetition.

As mentioned above, pauses took place in negotiation sequences of all speakers, however, the number of silent (and voiced) pauses per speaker is too low to make a subdivision meaningful, so rather than concentrating on the individual speakers, this study preferred to focus on the significance of the positioning of pauses. The above examples addressed silent EL1/EL2 intra- or inter-turn pauses without particles. The next subsection examines voiced EL1/EL2 pauses with a focus on the particles used by the respective speakers.

8.2.2 Pauses including particles in EL1/EL2 negotiation

EL1/EL2 also make use of voiced pauses and Table 8.4 illustrates similarities and variances in regard to particles used in EL1/EL2 negotiated sequences. As explained in Figure 8.1, the English translations of the Japanese particles are from the ‘Sanseido’ dictionary, but the English words the Japanese particles translate into (such as ‘well’, ‘I mean’ or ‘suppose’) were not used by any of EL2. Interestingly, the EL1 speakers did not use them either. The Japanese particles are therefore best translated with ‘er’ and ‘um’, which are the predominant English particles found in the EL1 data in the present study. The only other particle in the English data is ‘a:’, which is used in a similar manner in both languages.

The EL1/EL2 results in Table 8.4 are separated along the same criteria as in 8.3.a and b (beginner or intermediate/advanced learners), but this time the findings are listed together in one table. After the list of particles to the left of Table 8.4, column one shows the

findings in regard to the EL1 speaker in EL1/EL2 (beginner) dyads and column two the EL2 (beginner) particles in voiced pauses. This is followed by the EL1 and EL2 (intermediate/advanced) voiced pauses in columns three and four. They are the same twenty-four participants and this time the focus is on the particles used in pauses. These particles are preceded and/or followed by silent short or long pauses, however, since these silent pauses co-occur with a particle turning them into a voiced pause, they have not been included in Tables 8.3.a and b. ‘Er’ and ‘um’ are preferred by English speakers with Japanese mainly using *ee* and *mm/u:n* in the same context.

	EL1/EL2 (beginner) (n 12)		EL1/EL2 (int./adv.) (n 12)	
	Column One	Column Two	Column Three	Column Four
Pauses with particles:	EL1 with beg	EL2 beginner	EL1 with int./adv	EL2 int./adv.
‘Er’ <i>ee</i> (beginning)	2	29	-	4
<i>ee</i> (middle)	-	9	-	-
<i>ee</i> (end, partial turn)	-	7	-	7
‘Um’ <i>mm, u:n</i> (beginning)	5	8	7	3
‘Um’ <i>mm, u:n</i> (middle)	2	6	3	2
‘A:’	4	3	3	3
<i>Etto</i> (beginning) <i>well,</i>	-	17	-	3
<i>Etto</i> (middle) <i>let me see</i>	-	3	-	1
<i>Etto ne*, anoo*, jaa*</i>	-	7	-	-
TOTAL	13	89	13	23

**Etto ne*: ‘well’, ‘I mean’; **Anoo*: ‘well’, ‘(I) say/suppose’; **Jaa*: ‘well’, ‘in that case’

Table 8.4. Particles in voiced pauses in EL1/EL2 negotiation sequences

Table 8.4 allows for several interesting insights. Firstly, the findings in column one and three show that EL1 use voiced pauses considerably less than learners. Next, EL2 beginners use particles at higher ratio than their more advanced counterparts although allowances must be made in regard to the amount of negotiation consisting of twice as many AS-units with beginners than with more advanced learners. Another interesting finding is that beginners often use L1 particles, a phenomenon found less frequently with the intermediate/advanced learners. The following examples allow for a better understanding of the context in which particles are employed by the children in EL1/EL2 dyads.

EL1 voiced pauses in negotiated interaction can take place for a number of reasons. For example, perhaps because they realise that their interlocutor has only a limited grasp of English, the EL1 often appear to take more time to plan their utterance before formulating their questions as illustrated in the following trigger:

(8.14) [EL1/EL2 (beginner), D 15: 52-53]

- | | | | |
|------------|---|---|------------------|
| 1. Y (EL1) | → | (4) um (1) {is the} {is the door} the door has six squares/ | <i>trigger</i> |
| 2. N (EL2) | | six/ | <i>indicator</i> |

It is interesting to observe how after the particle ‘um’ (framed by a long and short pause), Y twice begins a question with a subject-verb inversion, but then forms a declarative question by using rising intonation at the end of a declarative sentence. Analyses and examples in Chapter Five have shown that learners prefer this question form. Although Y (a boy) is not using ‘foreigner talk’, he is calibrating his question to EL2 norms. N responds with a confirmation check in line two and the negotiation continues over another two turns. The excerpt shows that children in the age group of the participants (11-12 year olds) have already a certain linguistic awareness allowing them to adjust their utterances to the English level of their interlocutor without using grammatically wrong structures and one wonders why certain adults address nonnative speakers with incorrect English sentences at times.

EL2 triggers can also contain a number of voiced pauses and some of the EL1 children are able to tolerate long silent pauses in between particles such as in 8.15, line one. This extract also illustrates EL1 patience and efforts to understand and make themselves understood with learners possessing limited English and allows for an appreciation of the role of silent and voiced pauses in a complex negotiated sequence:

(8.15) [EL1/EL2 (beginner), D13: 62-74]

- | | | | |
|------------|---|---|----------------|
| 1. Y (EL2) | → | mm (0.5) eto (6) eto (6) <there’s> two flowa- (low voice) | <i>trigger</i> |
| 2. S (EL1) | | pardon (1) | |
| 3. Y | | two flowers (1) | |
| 4. S | | are you asking me if it has two flowers (1) | |
| 5. | | is that what you are saying (1) | |
| 6. | | are you asking me if I have two flowers (6) | |
| 7. Y | | ee- (0.5) | |
| 8. S | | pardon (2) | |
| 9. Y | | ee- (4) | |
| 10. S | | is that what you’re asking me (1) | |
| 11. | | if I have two flowers (0.5) | |
| 12. Y | | flowers (3) | |
| 13. S | | yes it does have two flowers | |

It is Y's turn to ask S a question and after a number of particles including *etto* ('er') she tries in line one to ask if there are two flowers on the picture. A combination of particles and pauses here play a crucial role in turn-holding, while the learner searches for words. Her voice is rather soft and 'flower' is not pronounced clearly. Indeed, her soft voice might be the trigger of this complex sequence. In line two, S requests clarification and after a short pause Y repeats the noun phrase without interrogative intonation. This leads to further negotiation since S is not quite sure what Y wants to express. He reiterates his question several times (followed by short pauses and a long pause). Only after the long pause (six seconds) in line six does Y react with a particle (*ee*, 'er').

Pauses following the particle *ee* in line seven and nine are taken up by S after 0.5 and four seconds respectively. If S had given Y more time, she might have been able to say more than just *ee*, considering that Y formed a sentence in line one after using particles and six second pauses. Furthermore, it is only after six seconds of silence that she reacts with *ee* in line seven. This might be an indication that six seconds is an acceptable pause length for her.

Since Y is not able to form a question, he ends up answering his own question in order to keep their dialogue going. This excerpt is a further example of word/idea search pauses in EL2 turns cut short by their EL1 interlocutor, and of intra-turn pauses after EL1 sentences that might have been intended as 'gaps'.

Long periods of silence can sometimes stretch the EL1s' patience and upset them. M (EL2, advanced, girl) is one of the few students able to form native speaker like questions (as illustrated in line six), but checking the overall dialogue shows that she often needs very long silent pauses to do so:

(8.16) [EL1/EL2 (advanced), D24: 32-39]

- | | | |
|------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. S (EL1) | you start | |
| → | (28) (a very long pause) | |
| 2. S | quickly (0.5) | |
| 3. M (EL2) | @ <i>ee etto</i> (0.5) | <i>trigger</i> |
| 4. S | number one which one | <i>indicator</i> |
| 5. | God ask something (0.5) | |
| 6. M | does it have a key/ | <i>response</i> |
| 7. S | yes | <i>reaction to response</i> |

Although M speaks English well, it is noteworthy that she consistently used L1 particles in an attempt to hold the floor (as illustrated line three). If she had been given a little more time, she might well have been able to produce her question already in line three. If this had happened, negotiation would not have taken place. There are also a number of cases, where the EL1 takes over the turn to supply a structure or a word:

(8.17) [EL1/EL2, intermediate, D20: 21-25]

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| 1. S (EL2) | (2) <i>ee</i> (1) {is the} (4) {has the} (1) is the (1) < <i>nan da</i> > (1) |
| | ‘what’s that’ <L1> |
| 2. P (EL1) → | clock |
| 3. S | is the clock (1) with roman numerals |
| 4. P | no |

The beginning of line one shows that S is quite successful holding his turn with a particle and ‘thinking aloud’. However, a short pause after an L1 expression triggers P’s intervention. If P would have given him some more time to think, S might have been able to finalise his question. Considering that S knew the expression ‘roman numerals’ (in line three), he probably did not need any help. Excerpts 8.16 and 8.17 showed that the patience of the EL1 is sometimes limited and that the EL2 is hence not able to finish his/her sentence although their English level is already quite high.

There are a number of examples in the non-negotiated interaction (or ‘positive’ evidence; Long & Robinson, 1998: 19) illustrating that it takes EL2 speakers longer to form a sentence and quite often it is the EL1s’ tolerance of long pauses that allow the learner to complete their TCU:

(8.18) [D22, EL1/EL2 advanced, 9-10 and 24-25]

1. H (EL2): (9) *etto* (6) 'Are the cans in a shape of a pyramid?'
2. J (EL1): 'Yes'.
3. H: '*ee nan to ieba ii na etto* (6) *etto* (0.5) is the vase (1) *mm etto* (1) like a bowl?'
- 'Er how could I say this well (6) well (0.5)' 'um er'
4. J: 'Yes'.

D21 resolved most tasks without negotiation since the EL1 speaker was prepared to wait. The overall pausing time of the EL2 in line one is fifteen seconds, and in line three 8.5

seconds. Since J waits, H is able to finish her turn with appropriate questions. Although H is an advanced learner, she does use L1 self-talk and particles. It is remarkable to see that with the help of her mother tongue she is able to hold the floor and to complete her TCU in line three with J not interrupting. It also shows that some of the participating children can be very patient at times.

Overall, the ‘ownership of the pause’ remains a debatable issue, not only owing to cultural backgrounds of the speakers, but their individual character (such as patient or impatient) and habitual linguistic behaviour of the community they live in.

8.2.3 Summary: silent and voiced pauses in EL1/EL2 negotiation

In EL1/EL2 negotiated interaction, silent pauses are utilised more frequently by both speakers than in native speaker dyads and overall, the twelve EL1 participants use about the same amount of silent pauses as their twelve EL2 interlocutors (150 versus 146). However, there is a relationship between the learner’s proficiency level and the amount of pauses occurring since more pauses take place in EL1/EL2 negotiation sequences with beginners. The majority of the EL1 pauses are short, whereas EL2 tend to pause longer, reflecting that they need more planning time for their utterances. These findings are confirmed by Skehan (1998) who claims that L1 speakers successfully draw upon memorized language whereas language learners might need more time to articulate what they want to say. Fayer (1995) suggests that longer pauses in native speaker interaction are the most significant factor in the speech of anxious speakers, whereas in L2 communication pauses occur more frequently with low-proficiency speakers.

A relatively high number of EL1 intra-turn silent pauses (especially with beginners) reflect the native speaker’s effort to repeat or rephrase their proposition. They might originally have been intended as gaps but since the learner does not pick up the TRP, they have become intra-turn pauses (or ‘minimised gaps’). Most native speaker intra-turn pauses are followed by a correct phrase (or sentence) and often take place between TCUs, whereas EL2 pauses (especially with beginners) occur mainly in the middle of the TCU. In some cases, EL2 pauses after a partial start appear to signal turn relinquishing. Further similarities and variations including references to L1 silent and voiced pauses are discussed in 8.3.1 and 8.3.2 respectively.

In regard to EL1/EL2 voiced pauses (silent pauses co-occurring with particles), it is noticeable that EL1 use of particles does not depend on the learner's level of English. However, EL2 beginners utilise particles more frequently than the intermediate/advanced learners. Another interesting feature is the use of L1 particles not only by beginners, but also by the more advanced EL2 speaker. Furthermore, the learners sometimes revert to Japanese phrases when 'thinking aloud'. This allows for an insight into their thought process at that time, which is exemplified by expressions such as *nan da* 'what's that' or *nan to iu* 'how can I say this'.

EL1 participants employ particles mainly at the beginning of the turn and they are sometimes followed by 'false starts'. Although 'foreigner talk' is hardly ever used, they appear to make an effort to present the information in a way that it is readily understood by the learner, for example, by calibrating their sentences to the EL2 level (such as the use of high frequency vocabulary and simpler syntactical structures). The native speaker also intervenes to suggest words or sentence structures. Sometimes, they even answer instead of the learner in order to keep the dialogue flowing. However, EL1 intervention might not be necessary especially with intermediate and advanced learners since some dialogues revealed that when L1 speakers tolerate longer pauses, their L2 counterparts are able to complete their TCU in correct English.

Other observations are that when unsure, EL2 turns can be marked by a soft voice. Some of the EL2 turns are 'minimal', for example, they only contain particles, pauses or laughter. EL2 turns are marked by nonnative like utterances, as well as greater range of floor holding devices. Sometimes they are able to get meaning across by using drawings and gestures (body language). Overall, there appears to be a much greater interdependence in EL1/EL2 interactions and a greater flexibility required with regard to the interpretation of pause length. This is further discussed in the next section contrasting the EL1/EL2 pauses and particles with the respective L1 findings.

8.3 Similarities and variations in L1 and EL1/EL2 pauses and particles

This section combines the findings of 8.1 and 8.2 by comparing silent and voiced pauses in negotiated interaction with native speakers only and with learners. Firstly, in subsection 8.3.1, EL1/EL2 findings in regard to silent pauses are compared and contrasted to EL1/EL1 and JL1/JL1 results. 8.3.2 summarises all L1 and L2 voiced pauses and includes some additional examples to further demonstrate the relevance of

pauses in negotiation with learners. The major reason for investigating pauses was that it was noticed that they were impacting particularly EL1/EL2 turn taking in negotiation sequences and that one way to show this was to account for their number, length and location. In addition, the area of voiced pauses in negotiation has received little attention to date and is of special interest in English interactions with Japanese who often use voiced pauses in L1 talk.

8.3.1 Silent pauses in negotiated interaction across data sets

To allow for an overview of similarities and variations in L1 talk and negotiated interaction with or as a learner, Table 8.5 amalgamates all findings in regard to silent pauses in L1 and L2 negotiation. This table does not represent the data in regard to the learner’s proficiency level, but adds up the silent pauses of all EL1 and EL2 speakers in Tables 8.3.a and b in order to compare and contrast the findings to L1 silent pauses (as shown in Table 8.1). Table 8.5 does not include any new information.

Each column shows the types of silent pauses per data set: firstly, EL1 pauses in a native speaker context and with a learner (in column one and two), and silent pauses in Japanese L1 negotiation and when Japanese speak English as a L2 (in column three and four). Each column presents the data of twelve participants (hence forty-eight overall).

	Column One 12 participants	Column Two 12 participants	Column Three 12 participants	Column Four 12 participants
Silent pauses	EL1 in EL1/EL1	EL1 in EL1/EL2	JL1 / JL1	EL2 in EL1/EL2
Short pause (turn initial/final)	5	29	5	31
(long) pause (turn initial/final)	4	19	5	38
Short pause (before repeating)	7	20	5	17
(long) pause (before repeating)	2	9	1	8
Short pauses (intra-turn)	16	46	13	21
(long) pauses (intra-turn)	3	15	3	20
Pauses after A partial start	-	3	-	11
Pause preceding turn-sharing	4	9	3	-
TOTAL	41	150	35	146
In percentage	10%	26%	8%	32%

Table 8.5. Silent pauses throughout negotiated sequences comparing EL1 speaking to EL1 and EL2, and Japanese speaking in their L1 and L2 (as JL1 and EL2)

There are fewer silent pauses in L1 negotiated interaction than in EL1/EL2 dyads: 41 in EL1/EL1 and 35 in JL1/JL1 (column one and three) as compared to 150 and 146 times when speaking with (or as) a learner (column two and four). However, one has to keep in mind that more negotiated interaction occurs in EL1/EL2 dyads, and therefore percentages at the bottom of the table indicate the overall ratio in relationship to the total amount of negotiated interaction (measured in AS-units) per respective twelve participants: 400 AS-units in EL1/EL1 dyads, 417 AS-units in JL1/JL1 dyads, 570 EL1 AS-units and 462 EL2 AS-units in EL1/EL2 (as discussed in Chapter Four).

Since the total amount of AS-units varies per data set, the percentage at the bottom indicates the proportion of pauses within the total amount of AS-units for each of the twelve participants, that is, 41 pauses in 400 EL1/EL1 AS-units amount to a rate of 10.25% of instances of pausing during negotiation (percentages are rounded off to the nearest full number). The numbers and percentages are only an overall indication since there can be more than one pause in the same AS-unit. They are mainly meant to give a general indication of the pattern of silent pauses per data set and serve as a backdrop to the excerpts and discussion.

The percentages indicate a similar ratio of silent pauses in native speaker negotiated interaction, but a higher proportion of pauses in EL1/EL2 dyads. Especially the EL2 speakers pause four times more often in their L2 than in their native Japanese. Table 8.3.a illustrated that more and longer pauses occurred mainly with EL2 at the beginner level.

In EL1/EL1, silent pauses are mainly short and take place within the sentence or TCU (as in example 8.3, line one). On the other hand, in EL1/EL2 negotiated interaction, native speaker intra-turn pauses often follow a completed sentence with the EL1 making an effort to keep the conversation going by cueing additional possible phrases or sentences. The following dialogue exemplifies how hard some of the native speakers try to help their nonnative counterparts in order to obtain an answer. Although participant Y has been put by the school in the English intermediate class because of her performance in written tests, her listening and speaking skills are still limited. Again, silence plays a crucial role with regard to turn-taking and in this case also triggers the negotiation sequence:

(8.19) [EL1/EL2 intermediate, D19: 18-33]

1. Y (EL2) | um | (2)
2. A (EL1) | does it have a moustache | ((suggests in a soft voice))
3. Y | <x> | (unclear)
4. A | ask: does it have a moustache/ | (1)
5. | does it have a bi-g beard | (5)
6. Y | mm (3) |
7. A | okay so you got to ask me :: big beard or little beard | (5)
8. Y | big beard | (hardly audible)
9. A | pardon |
10. | you got to ask me :: does it have a big beard | (1)
11. | do you want to know if it has a big beard/ | (0.5)
12. Y | yeah |
13. A | it has a bi-g beard (1) a big beard (0.5) big beard
14. Y | big beard\ |
15. A | yeah\ |

Instead of commencing a TCU, Y only produces a particle and after a two second pause at the end of line one, A prompts a question in line two. Y then mumbles and this is followed by A's repetition and additional cues in line four and five. The pause after her suggestion in line four might be a 'minimised' gap. The five second pause at the end of line five, is followed by Y saying 'mm' and after a three second pause A takes up the TRP to make another proposition (in line seven). Y takes up her turn after another five seconds and repeats 'big beard'. Five seconds appear to be the time Y is comfortable with to take her turn.

What follows is the result of A's ingenious idea of obtaining an answer by reversing the roles in line eleven in order to prevent a stalled conversation. The short pause of only 0.5 seconds before Y's confirming answer in line twelve shows that Y monitors the dialogue closely. After a self- and other repetition, A confirms again that the person on the picture has a big beard and the dialogue continues. 8.19 further illustrates that the collaboration of the native speaker is essential in order to overcome silent periods in talk and that the EL1 sometimes takes on the role of a teacher in order to obtain information from the less proficient speaker. The excerpt also demonstrates that it is helpful when a native speaker allows for longer pauses not only after their own propositions but in L2 turns as well.

It is remarkable that before starting out a negotiation sequence, the EL1 participants in EL1/EL2 dyads can sometimes be very patient, considering that speaker Y in excerpt 8.20 waits for fifteen seconds before producing a clarification request. In L1 interaction, the longest silent pauses in the English and Japanese data are six seconds, and it is interesting to see that the EL1/EL2 dyads tolerate much longer pauses when speaking with or as a learner. However, just as in 8.16 and 8.17, where very long pauses were tolerated before the native speaker intervened, the EL1 seems to be less patient after the next EL2 turn, maybe because s/he realises that the learner finds it difficult to complete the sentence. This point is also demonstrated in 8.20, line three, when Y takes over N's TCU after a one second pause:

(8.20) [EL1/EL2 beginner, D15: 90-94]

- | | |
|------------|----------------------------|
| 1. N (EL2) | ee (1) long a: (15) |
| 2. Y (EL1) | er (0.5) what/ |
| 3. N | → which (1) |
| 4. Y | like this like pony tails/ |
| 5. N | yes |

The pause in line three also exemplifies a 'pause preceding turn-sharing' since it is followed by a suggestion of the final sentence part (TCU) by the other speaker. Turn-sharing also takes place in both native speaker data sets, however, in EL1/EL2 interaction, only the native speaker tends to take over incomplete sentences. Using Sacks et al (1974) terms, although the pauses in line one and three are 'potential intra-turn pauses', they can be interpreted as 'lapses' or 'gaps' by the other speaker.

Another observation in regard in EL1/EL2 pauses is that some EL2 intra-turn pauses occur after false starts such as in 8.17 (line one, repeated here):

(8.17) [EL1/EL2, intermediate, D20: 21]

- | | |
|------------|---|
| 1. S (EL2) | (2) ee (1) {is the} (4) {has the} (1) is the (1) <nan da> (1) |
| | 'what's that' <L1> |

In this case, the EL2's TCU is not completed, however, the example shows the reoccurring feature of EL2 pauses after a false start.

False (or new) starts are not the focus of the present study, but it is interesting to note that native speakers (EL1) often manage a new start without pausing such as in 8.14 (line one, repeated here):

(8.14) [EL1/EL2 (beginner), D 15: 52]

1. Y (EL1) → |(4) um (1) {is the} {is the door} the door has six squares/ |

A similar example from the JL1 data would be:

T (4) | ee (6) {ichiban shita wa} ichiban shita no takasa wa ikko desu ka |
‘{at the bottom} is the height at the bottom just one?’

This confirms similar findings by Kjellmer (2003: 182) who argues that false starts give speakers sufficient time to think of how to finish off their TCU. However, the present study shows that this is often not the case with L2 speakers since they tend to need more time to plan their utterance. Overall patterns of silent pauses are further discussed in section 8.4 in conjunction with pauses including particles in negotiated interaction.

8.3.2 Voiced pauses and co-occurring particles across data sets

This sub-section brings to a close the examination of pauses in negotiated interaction by summarising the findings in regard to voiced pauses in native and nonnative talk by all forty-eight participants. The following Table (8.6) amalgamates all information on voiced pauses given in Table 8.2 and 8.4. As in Table 8.5 (overview of silent pauses), there is no new information. The first and third column provides information on voiced pauses (particles) in the respective native speaker negotiation, and columns two and four on particles used in negotiated interactions with or as a learner. The percentages at the bottom refer to the amount of AS-units as specified above and only indicate the general ratio of voiced pauses, since there can be more than one pause per AS-units.

The translation of the Japanese particles is given in Figure 8.1 as well as below Table 8.6. As mentioned before, the dictionary translation of the Japanese articles is of little relevance for this study, since none of the young native English speakers used expressions such as ‘well’ or ‘let me see’. The English equivalent used by children is usually ‘er’ and ‘um’.

	Column One 12 participants	Column Two 12 participants	Column Three 12 participants	Column Four 12 participants
Particles/pauses	EL1/EL1	EL1 in EL1/EL2	JL1/JL1	EL2 in EL1/EL2
'Er'/ee (beginning)	4	2	14	33
'Er'/ee (middle)	1	-	15	9
ee (end, partial turn)	-	-	1	14
'Um'mm, u:n (beg.)	18	12	1	11
'Um'mm, u:n(middle)	-	5	2	8
'A:'	5	7	8	6
<i>Etto</i> * (beginning)	-	-	26	20
<i>Etto</i> (middle)	-	-	14	4
<i>Etto ne</i> *	-	-	9	2
<i>Jaa</i> *	-	-	25	2
<i>Anoo</i> *	-	-	7	3
<i>Ne, sa</i> *	-	-	3	-
TOTAL	28	26	125	112
In percentage	7%	5%	30%	24%

**Etto* (beginning) 'well', 'let me see', **Etto ne* 'well', 'I mean' **Anoo* (beginning) 'well', '(I) say/suppose' **Jaa* (beginning) 'well (then)', 'in that case' **Ne(e), sa* 'well', 'you see', 'you know'

Table 8.6. Voiced pauses and co-occurring particles across data sets

The above findings allow for a number of interesting insights. Firstly, the native speakers of English employ slightly more voiced pauses in EL1/EL1 than in EL1/EL2 negotiated interaction (28 versus 26 – or in relation to the speakers AS-units: 7% versus 5%). The same is true of Japanese speakers, who use particles 125 times in JL1/JL1 as compared to 112 times in EL1/EL2 dyads (or 30% and 24% out of the respective number of AS-units). This is in stark contrast to silent pauses which occur much more frequently in EL1/EL2 negotiation by both speakers. The findings also suggest that the native English speaker can expect a higher number of voiced pauses when speaking with an EL2 of Japanese origin than with their native speaker counterparts.

Moreover, it is interesting to note that the EL2 participants frequently code-switched to use particles in their native Japanese. A closer examination of column three and four above reveals that not all particles used in JL1/JL1 interaction are transferred into English. For example, although *jaa* ('well', 'in that case') is used 25 times in a Japanese native speaker context, it is rarely used with a native English speaker. The particle which Japanese children in this study tend to transfer most (especially at the beginning of their turn) is *etto* 'Well', 'Let me see'. Personal communication revealed that this is a well known phenomenon in English conversations with Japanese.

In addition, Table 8.6 indicates that the Japanese children employ the particles *ee* ('er') and *mm, u:n* ('um') more than twice as often in English as their second language than in their L1 (75 as opposed to 33 times). It could be stipulated that the overuse of *ee* and *mm, u:n* by the learner in EL1/EL2 interaction stems from the fact that *ee* and *mm, u:n* are very similar to 'er' and 'um' and sound closer to English than *jaa* or *anoo* 'well', '(I) say/suppose'. This type of adjustment by the nonnative speaker has received limited attention and would be worth further investigation.

Another characteristic feature in regard to L1 dyads is that EL1 hardly ever employ particles in the middle of their turn, whereas the Japanese children in JL1/JL1 negotiation use them mid-turn about one third of times. It might therefore be possible that the native English speakers interpret the EL2 use of a particle after an incomplete sentence as a TRP. Since a number of EL2 turns in this study end with the particle 'er' / *ee*, this could hence be a signal for the EL1 (who hardly uses voiced pauses mid-turn) that their interlocutor is prepared to hand over the turn.

Moreover, English speakers in the data of this study usually employ only one particle in their turn but Japanese use several at times (in their first and second language). In EL1/EL2 dyads, (especially with beginners), the EL2 tends to revert to their native Japanese for not only for particles but also for thinking aloud and mumbling:

(8.21) [EL1/EL2, beginner, D15: 1-3]

- | | | |
|------------|---|------------------|
| 1. N (EL2) | <i>mm</i> (11) <L1 mumbling> | |
| 2. → | <i>Eto ne</i> (4) <i>mm</i> (4) <L1 mumbling> | <i>trigger</i> |
| 3. Y | <i>what</i> / | <i>indicator</i> |
- (response and resolution of this sequence not relevant to topic here)

Unfilled pausing time in line one and two add up to nineteen seconds and this excerpt again demonstrates that some of the English speakers tolerate quite long silent periods. Other speakers are not prepared to wait that long and interrupt with a question after a short pause:

(8.22) [EL1/EL2, beginner, D14: 44-52]

1. Y (EL2) | mm (0.5) ee- (1)
2. D (EL1) → | is it smaller/ | (1)
3. → | is it small/ | (2)
4. | is it wide/ | ((no pause))
5. Y | wide |
6. D | is it wide/ |
7. Y | yes wide |
8. D | it's wide\ | (1)
- | okay |

Y is supposed to ask a question about the contour of a boat and after two short voiced pauses in line one, D suggests possible shapes. This greatly simplifies the learner's task in that s/he does not have to form a question any longer but only needs to confirm or disconfirm the content of the EL1 proposition. After the suggestions in lines two and three, D pauses to give Y the opportunity to answer. Y appears to be waiting for the adjective best qualifying the boat since in line five he immediately responds to D's question in line four. Again, it is interesting to note the role of repetition and how through repetition the EL1 obtains an answer allowing the dialogue to continue.

Dialogue 8.22 also reflects a pattern found in other negotiation sequences (such as 8.19), where the trigger consists of a voiced pause and the native speaker reacts with prompts or takes over the learner's turn by asking the questions they are supposed to ask with the learner monitoring closely and responding at once when the matching information is given. A final synopsis of important features of silent and voiced pauses in negotiated interaction is given in 8.4 which also includes additional pertinent literature as well as possible functions of pauses.

8.4 Further observations in regard to silent and voiced pauses

This section consists of three subsections with the first one (8.4.1) summing up the findings in regard to pauses across data sets and 8.4.2 examining their functions. 8.4.3 concludes this chapter by looking at some of the implications.

8.4.1 Salient features of silent and voiced pauses

In native speaker negotiated interaction, silent and voiced pauses are usually short and most turn-taking proceeds smoothly without any gaps. Sacks et al (1974: 708) also state that the vast majority of turn transitions in their data take place with either no gaps or slight gaps. In EL1/EL2 negotiated interaction, however, this is not the case. Silent pauses occur at a much higher frequency and the data show that the EL2 often depend on the collaboration of the EL1 to keep the dialogue going. On the other hand, some sequences reveal that patience on the part of the EL1 allows the EL2 to put together their proposition.

Part of conversational competence is knowing how to maintain a turn, and the data illustrate that native speakers are usually able to finish their sentences (except for turn-sharing), but EL2, especially beginners, have repeated difficulty to keep the floor and need much more time to make word and idea searches. They attempt to maintain their turns by using voiced pauses (including L1 particles such as *etto* 'er'), mumbling (L1 self-talk or 'thinking aloud'), or gestures. There are a number of instances in EL1/EL2 negotiated interaction where the EL1 takes over a turn because the EL2 turn only consists of a pause/particle or a partial sentence combined with a voiced pause. EL2 'false' starts are sometimes the only start they are able to make.

There is some research that suggests language specific aspects of pausing. For example, Murata's (1994) study shows that in Japanese L1 conversations, as well as in interactions with Japanese speaking English, there are fewer interruptions after short pauses (within an utterance) than in English L1 talk. Nakane (2005) argues in her analysis of 'silence and speech in the classroom' that Japanese students at tertiary level have difficulties managing the boundaries of discourse and maintaining control of the talk and that their use of 'um' and long silent pauses often resulted in the Australian native speaker taking a turn. The Japanese students in Nakane (2005) report that one cause of their problems in securing a turn is their lack of proficiency, and another is their unfamiliarity with appropriate timing. Evidence supporting this latter explanation is that in Nakane's data overlapping and interruptions frequently occurred with the Australian NS but only rarely with Japanese having English as their second language. This tendency is confirmed in the negotiation sequences in the present study since in EL1/EL2 interaction, only L1

speakers interrupt or finalise the English learners' TCU. In their L1, however, the Japanese do overlap at times and there are a number of interruptions (overlapping turns) occurring in the JL1/JL1 dyadic interactions.

The pause length tolerated by speakers is a much-debated issue. The data demonstrate that the tolerance varies not only according to their language background but differs with individual speakers and within turns. Furthermore, while pausing, the current speaker's intention is sometimes unclear and it is only by examining who speaks after the pause that the terms intra- and inter-turn pauses apply. If the same speaker continues, they are intra-turn, if the interlocutor intervenes, they are inter-turn pauses. L1 patterns are often not applicable and in a number of cases, pauses are 'grey' areas open to intervention by either speaker.

There are other language specific features apparent in the present study. The L1 data reveal that Japanese native speakers use a larger amount and greater variety of particles than the native English speakers. Moreover, it is not unusual to find more than one particle in their voiced pauses which occur not only at the beginning but all through their turn. The EL1/EL1 participants in this study mainly use voiced pauses before they start their sentence and EL1 particles are hardly ever used in the middle of their TCU. Kjellmer's (2003: 183) research based on spoken English text concordances also found that particles such as 'er' are mainly located at the beginning of a sentence (turn) rather than in the middle. The EL1 in EL1/EL2 dyads might therefore think that voiced pauses after a partial EL2 start indicate a TRP and an opportunity to take their turn.

In EL1/EL2 negotiated interaction, the EL1 uses about the same amount of voiced pauses with beginners and intermediate/advanced learners. However, EL2 beginners use more particles than their more advanced counterparts. It is noteworthy that the Japanese L1 particles that occur as code-switches in EL1/EL2 are used differently, that is, *jaa* and *ano* rarely occur in EL2 utterances, whereas *ee* or *u:n* occurs more often in their English turns than in Japanese. Since *ee* resembles the English particle 'er', and *u:n* the particle 'um', the more frequent use of *ee* and *u:n* with a native English speaker might reflect the learners' desire to sound more native like.

In regard to pause length, the longest silent pause in EL1/EL1 and JL1/JL1 negotiation is six seconds, and the longest voiced pause (in JL1/JL1) is ten seconds. In EL1/EL2 dyadic

negotiation, pauses tend to be longer and quite often L1 norms and patterns do not apply for either speaker. Furthermore, pause length in EL1/EL2 varies according to the learner's proficiency level and the longest pauses take place with EL2 beginners. Sometimes, the entire 'turn' consists of silence, such as in 8.23, line one:

(8.23) [EL1/EL2, beginner, D15: 13-15]

1. N (EL2, beg.) | (21) |
2. Y (EL1) | come on | (6)
3. N | what's that | ((sequence continues, not relevant to this chapter))

N is supposed to ask a question but stays silent, probably searching for a word or idea, and Y waits for twenty-one seconds before encouraging N to say something. After a silent pause of six seconds, N finally asks a question. Examples 8.12 and 8.15 also showed that five or six seconds can be an acceptable pause length for EL2 before taking a turn and if given that amount of time, they are often able to produce their utterance. Nakane (2005: 96) also stipulates that the participation of Japanese in an English interaction is likely to improve if the native English speaker waits longer.

Another interesting finding is that silent pauses occur in similar proportions in the native speaker dyads, and are usually short. The amount of silent pauses by the EL1 and EL2 in EL1/EL2 negotiation sequences is also similar; however, they are about four times as frequent as in the native speaker negotiated interactions, and tend to be longer. This suggests that both speakers have to come to terms with more, as well as longer, silent periods when speaking with or as a learner. Overall, the data show that many EL1 appear to be quite tolerant of long pauses when interacting with an EL2 speaker.

The number of voiced pauses is similar for all EL1 speakers, meaning that they are used in a similar proportion in EL1/EL1 and by the EL1 in EL1/EL2. The JL1, as well as the Japanese speaking in English also use about the same amount of voiced pauses in the respective data, the difference being that voiced pauses are used four times more often in their native and nonnative negotiation sequences than in EL1 negotiation. It is therefore to be expected that when a native English speaker negotiates understanding with a Japanese speaking in English, the EL1 will have to cope with a higher number of voiced pauses than they are used to in EL1 interaction.

The EL1 speakers tend to deal with EL2 silent and voiced intra-turn pauses in two ways: either staying silent for a longer time than they are used to doing in L1 interactions, or stepping in with a question, suggestions of words or phrases. EL1 intra-turn pauses (generally silent) in EL1/EL2 negotiation take place more often after a completed phrase or sentence and as illustrated in a number of the above examples, the native speakers often repeat or rephrase their own proposition. These EL1 intra-turn pauses might originally have been intended as gaps but since the learner does not interpret them as TRPs, they become intra-turn pauses (or 'minimised gaps'). The data further reveal that after a pause, the EL1 speakers recurrently calibrate their utterances appropriate to the EL2 level without using 'foreigner talk'.

EL2 intra-turn pauses usually occur within their TCU and can often be traced back to extra planning time needed by the learner to form a sentence. In many instances, the EL2 (especially at the beginner level) appear unsure how to formulate what they intend to say and struggle to formulate their thoughts within the time given. If learners (especially more advanced students) are allowed enough time, they can often express themselves in good English sentences. There are times, however, where EL1 interventions are needed to avoid a stalled conversation.

There is a fine line between knowing when to wait and when to take a turn. Pause 'ownership' and 'appropriate' turn-taking relate to a range of cultural and social preferences, however, the choice of when to be silent and when to talk can also depend on the individual person's immediate interaction goals and at times, it is interesting to notice that within the same negotiation sequence, the interpretation of an acceptable pause length can vary considerably.

Pauses can result from different types of repairs such as false starts, repeats and restructurings and Fayer (1995) infers that as learners advance in their syntactical and lexical understanding their pause time decreases. Temple (1992) also relates pausing to learning stages and observes that learners' pauses are frequently due to limited vocabulary. A relationship between the learners' proficiency level and the amount of pauses occurring is also illustrated in this study since about two thirds of the silent pauses take place in EL1/EL2 negotiation sequences with beginners. Furthermore, the majority of the EL1 pauses in EL1/EL2 dyads are short, whereas EL2 tend to pause longer.

Nakahama et al (2001: 395) also suggest that silence in negotiation is typical for learners and their example is similar to those listed in the present study:

- “1. Rita: What does your floor look like?
2. Sumiko: mm (2)
3. Rita: Mine has lines that go a bunch of different directions.
4. Sumiko: um (2) the lines [incomprehensible]”

Rita allows Sumiko only two seconds in line two to continue with her turn but the present study shows that with learners longer pauses apply. One reason for the tolerance of longer pauses in the data could be the age of the participants (11-12 years old). Most other research on negotiated interaction has been done with older learners and resulting norms might not apply to children.

In addition, it is noticeable that most native speaker pauses in the data of the present study are followed by a correct phrase (or sentence), whereas EL2 attempts can be fragmented or grammatically incomplete. There is also evidence that EL1 structures are monitored and copied by learners, leading to an expansion of their L2 repertoire. Moreover, in a number of the learners' utterances, plurals, articles and rising intonation in questions are missing but if understanding takes place, EL1 often accept EL2 sentences such as, and error correction is limited. The data reveal that it is helpful when a native speaker allows for longer pauses not only after their own propositions but in L2 turns as well.

On the whole, Japanese EL2 learners are confronted with a number of challenges when conversing in English. Although they might have the necessary vocabulary, they sometimes do not have turn-management skills to enable them to hold the turn long enough to express themselves. Since the frequent use of particles all through a turn is an outstanding feature in JL1, their EL2 problems maintaining a turn can at least partially be traced back to lacking floor holding devices which leads to insufficient time to express themselves.

8.4.2 Multi-functionality of pausing

Silent and voiced pauses form an integral part of talk and help to maintain the speaker's turn, however, their functions are not always clear-cut. To assign functions according to the clauses following a pause appears to be restrictive since at the moment of pausing a number of thoughts might cross the mind of the speaker which remain unaccounted for. A number of the examples above illustrate the multi-functionality of pausing and the literature offers a range of explanations of pausing. Fulcher (1996: 216) proposes content or grammatical hesitation pauses, and pauses preceding an addition of examples or marking a word search. Stenstroem (1990: 227) points out that filled pauses often serve as turn initiators.

Kjellmer (2003: 181) rightly observes that particles such as 'er' might be used unconsciously and unintentionally and that therefore it is only by examining what takes place before and after the pause that one can see the strategic purpose of pausing. One consistent function of voiced pauses appears to be to act as a floor holding device, allowing speakers to maintain their turns so they can conduct a word or idea search without being interrupted. Furthermore, Kjellmer (2003) suggests that additional functions of pauses can be turn-yielding, correcting, highlighting or attracting attention.

The present study also shows that pauses and particles occur before giving additional information or when using emphasis (for example, through repetition) or before expressing incomplete understanding, however, separate categories were not considered since functions of silent and voiced pauses might be overlapping. In many instances, the term 'hesitation marker' is justified, but it is avoided as an overall qualifier in the present study as it describes a function rather than a form.

In some studies, like Fulcher (1996), hesitation is considered a sign of non-fluency. This is a debatable point because much of what might be considered hesitation is doing other work in conversation. The present study has shown that particles and pauses play an important role in managing talk and interaction. They mainly occur in the triggers of negotiated interaction, but are also present in indicators and responses, especially in EL2 speech.

A relationship between pauses and better understanding is more difficult to establish. A recent study by Leeser (2004) tests whether L2 comprehension improved by introducing 3-second pauses between sentences. It was hoped that pauses would allow the learner to better process new forms (for example, the Spanish future tense). However, the results of the research show that this was not the case.

Since silent and voiced pauses appear to be an unplanned and unconscious tool for L1 and L2 speakers alike, this study does not suggest using them intentionally in EL1/EL2 spoken interaction, but rather proposes increased tolerance and awareness of their role, especially with learners at the beginner level.

8.4.3 Final observations

The relational importance of silent and voiced pauses is often overlooked by studies examining negotiated interaction and the present investigation hence advances the understanding of their role. Pauses regularly occur in all conversation, either silent or expressed with particles such as ‘um’, ‘er’ and ‘a:’ in English. These particles are often dismissed as meaningless and only some are mentioned in dictionaries. Subtitles or computer programs checked by the researcher do not include them at all.

Interestingly, Japanese speakers use quite a range of particles in their native language and at times, intersperse their turn with several of them. Although they are translated in dictionaries with ‘Well’ or ‘You know’, ‘I suppose’, ‘Let me see’ or ‘In that case’, not a single participant in this study employed any of these English expressions in EL1/EL2 nor in EL1/EL1 negotiation. Although such terms might be used in interactions with older participants, they do not seem to be used by children. For the purpose of this study, it therefore appears appropriate to translate all Japanese particles with ‘er’ and ‘um’, with ‘a:’ being used in a similar fashion in both languages.

Another important finding is that JL1 silent pause length or frequency does not differ significantly from EL1 negotiated interaction. However, in their second language turn management can be problematic. EL2 speakers from the beginner as well as the intermediate/advanced dyads often need several long pauses to produce a sentence.

Although Japanese speakers have a range of options in their own language, they find it difficult to fill pauses when speaking in English. They only make use of English particles (such as 'er' and 'um') in a limited way and frequently employ Japanese voiced pauses in EL2 interaction. However, the English native speaker does not seem to be disturbed by the fact that their Japanese counterparts often use L1 particles or L1 self-talk to maintain a turn.

The higher amount of silent pauses in EL1/EL2 dyads might indicate EL1 planning time in regard to how information can be best presented in order to be understood by the learner and EL2 efforts to make oneself understood. By waiting long enough, a patient EL1 listener sometimes gives the learner an opportunity to produce a sentence, at other times interlocutor interventions are needed to maintain the flow of the dialogue. The EL1 sometimes chose innovative ways (such as in example 8.19 or 8.22) to keep a dialogue going. None of the dyads gave up or skipped a task.

It is not always easy to know when one can take up a turn from another speaker without being interpreted as making a rude interruption and adjustments are particularly important when speaking with learners. Tolerance of longer pauses appears to be a crucial element in successful communication with a nonnative speaker, and applying English L1 norms (using mainly short pauses) might deprive the learners of opportunities to express themselves. On the other hand, the less proficient speakers seem to need EL1 intervention at times. Overall, in EL1/EL2 interactions, there appears to be a greater inter-dependence as well as more flexibility required with regard to the interpretation of pauses.

Since silent and voiced pauses often play a crucial role in turn management, this chapter examined their frequency, length, positioning, their voiced sub-lexical particles and their functions. Further cognitive aspects of pausing are outside the scope of the present study. In line with the topic of this study, only pauses in negotiation of understanding are analysed, although the original transcript contains all pauses taking place in the discourse.

Overall, it is interesting to see that certain patterns and norms have emerged showing that pragmatic and linguistic features such as pauses or repetition play a major role especially in negotiated interaction with learners and that putting negotiation simply into certain functional categories allows only for partial insights. Various phenomena of negotiated interaction are interconnected and from a general approach of ‘what is a negotiated sequence’ in Chapter Four and the following in-depth analysis of these sequences in Chapter Five and Six, certain salient features such as the relevance of repetition and pauses have emerged. Chapter Seven, as well as the present chapter revealed in a finer grained analysis more about the speech act of repeating and the importance of pauses in negotiation of understanding. Chapter Nine will tie together the main findings and further interconnect them with the literature.