English Language & Literature Teaching, Vol. 13, No. 2 Summer 2007

ESL Teachers' Corrective Sequences and Second Language Socialization

Guiboke Seong
(Inha University)

Seong, Guiboke. (2007). ESL teachers' corrective sequences and second language socialization. *English Language and Literature Teaching, 13*(2), 177-200.

The language socialization approach states that novices are socialized into cultural norms through participating in routine, repeated interactional acts and sequences (e.g., Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984; Ochs, 1988; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a; 1986b; Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1986). One of the cultural norms or dominant epistemological orientations in American culture is the tendency to avoid the overt display of power asymmetry in novice-expert relationship (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984). This study examines how this cultural preference is reflected and encoded in ESL teachers' use of routine discourse patterns in corrective sequences. Eight hours of ESL classes taught by three Caucasian teachers born and educated in the U.S. were analyzed for the study. The analysis showed that the cultural tendency in question is keyed and indexed in the teacher's routine corrective discourse patterns in the form of various questioning, elicitation, and mitigation practices. Findings support that teachers' routine classroom discourse practices represent their cultural ideologies and transfer these cultural predispositions to second language learners and that they possibly socialize the learners into the target language-oriented beliefs.

[Corrective sequences/ESL classroom discourse analysis]

I. INTRODUCTION

This study examines second language (L2) teachers' use of certain routine discourse patterns and how these patterns reflect a particular cultural value of the target language. According to the language socialization approach, novices are socialized into the language and ideologies of their community through being

involved in routine discourse and interactional acts and sequences (e.g., Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984; Ochs, 1988; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a; 1986b; Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1986). In the classroom setting this approach means that the interactional sequences between the teacher and the students are motivated and pervaded by underlying cultural ideologies. In the second language classroom, therefore, the teacher as representative of the target culture and language is considered to deliver the target language values and cultural ideologies to the second language students through interactional routines and discourse patterns.

The American cultural value or ideology in question is what Ochs and Schieffelin (1984, p. 287) call "a discomfort with the competence differential between adult and child." They report that it is a tendency where American caregivers or experts have to accommodate or assist children or novices in white middle class American society. In other words it is a tendency for experts like teachers to suppress the overt display of power or knowledge differences in their interactions with novices like students in the classroom. This study is designed to investigate how characteristics of this tendency and predisposition in American expert-novice interaction are encoded in ESL teachers' one type of routine classroom discourse practices, that is, corrective sequences.

Corrective sequences in the L2 classroom, as in any other classrooms, inherently involve face-threatening elements to students. Seen from the language socialization perspective, teachers' direct negative feedback or explicit correction of an error made by a student is an overt display of power and of knowledge differentials between the teacher and the student as an expert and a novice. Therefore, negative evaluative sequences and the teacher's corrective feedback practices have been chosen as a powerful context for socialization in L2 academic discourse.

This study aims to investigate what specific aspects of the teacher's routine discourse patterns in corrective practices constitute and display the tendency of avoiding power asymmetry as one of the dominant epistemological orientations in American academic culture or American culture in general. Little on the topic has been documented in the second language socialization literature yet. We will first briefly introduce characteristics and contributions of language socialization approaches, and review major studies on second language socialization as theoretical and methodological foundations for the present study.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Language socialization refers to the processes where new members of a discourse community develop their competence and membership through participating in routine linguistic and interactional practices (Ochs, 1990; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986b). Studies on language socialization have developed based on a variety of anthropological and sociolinguistic research (e.g., Ervin-Tripp & Mitchell-Kernan, 1977; Gumperz, 1982; Heath, 1983; Hymes, 1972; Saville-Troike, 1989; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a). From the perspective of second language studies, language socialization is one of the social practices approaches along with conversation analysis (Markee, 2000; Seong, 2006; Jung, 2005), sociohistorical/cultural or sociocognitive theory (Ohta, 2001), community of practice (Norton & Toohey, 2001), and the identity theory (Norton, 2000). It has a relatively short history and second language socialization approach have been published mostly during the last decade (e.g., Atkinson & Ramanathan, 1995; Duff, 1995; Harklau, 1994; He, 1997; Losey, 1995; Pallotti, 1996; Poole, 1992; Schecter & Bayley, 1997; Siegal, 1996; Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1994; Willet, 1995).

Language socialization approach adds a new view of learning, language, and cognition. It sees language as an integrated social behavior. Language creates context and structure, and language is also the result of such context and structure. Thus according to language socialization approach language acquisition is something constructed through interaction in specific historical, political and sociocultural context (Watson-Gegeo & Nielsen, 2003).

Language socialization also contributes to expanding the available research methods in the field of second language acquisition. It emphasizes contexts and ethnography. Social and cultural anthropology, linguistics, sociology, and education are taken into consideration in conducting language socialization research. Ethnography of communication uses both etic and emic, macro- and micro-level analyses of communication and discourse, looking into patterns and functions of communication (Saville-Troike, 1989). Its integrative method or framework for conducting qualitative, interpretive research in a variety of settings is a fruitful addition to existing second language research methodologies.

As mentioned earlier, not many empirical studies have been done on second language socialization. Let us discuss major findings of the existing studies. The basic premise of language socialization is that linguistic and cultural knowledge are constructed through each other. Therefore how sociocultural interactions influence

second language learning and how language forms and delivers social and cultural identities in the target language culture in and outside the second language classroom have also been major issues in second language socialization studies.

As one of the pioneering studies in second language socialization, Poole (1992) analyzed two hours of ESL classes with eight beginning level ESL students taught by two female teachers in an American university, looking at their interactional sequences in the light of several preferred American middle class caretakers' accommodation styles for their children identified by Ochs and Schieffelin (1984). These styles include simplifying speech and richly interpreting what the young child is expressing, expert's accommodation of novice' performance, giving whole credits for assisted performance, and the caregivers' or experts' tendency to suppress the display of power difference. Poole's findings included coconstructed propositions represented by test questions, incomplete sentence frames, expansions, and using first person plural markers (*we*). The teachers also asked students to perform beyond their current competence, helped them perform, and gave the whole credit to the student as if he/she has accomplished the task alone.

While Poole's study adopted discourse analytic methods in investigating second language socialization, Duff (2002) used the typical ethnography of communication methodology to examine Canadian high school social studies class with students of multiple ethnicities. She found that the teacher made efforts to involve the non-native English speaking students in class activities. Through such processes the teacher and the students cooperated to develop respect for the cultural differences and eventually to construct their identity in the mainstream class.

Morita (2000) was interested in native and nonnative English speaking graduate students' discourse socialization. For eight months Morita videotaped two courses in a TESL (teaching English as a second language) program at a university in the U.S. Using interview data and questionnaire data along with the classroom data, Morita investigated how the students acquired the oral academic discourse. The students were involved in class activities such as verbal negotiations with instructors and other classmates, observing and commenting on other students' presentations, performing and reviewing their own presentations. Morita concluded that through participating in these processes of the oral academic presentations, both the native and nonnative students were gradually socialized into oral academic discourse.

Willett (1995), on the other hand, examined children's second language socialization processes. For one year she observed four first grade children learning English as a second language. She found that the three girls strategically worked

together to understand and survive the classroom where they use English only. The girls went through daily social interactional routines together with their teachers and peers. They enacted those cultural routines, developed communicative competence, and were eventually able to coconstruct their identity in the classroom and achieve academic proficiency in ESL. Among the four children the only boy could not achieve it.

Mohan and Smith (1992) observed eight Chinese students in a Canadian graduate adult education course. They had poor English proficiency (low TOEFL scores). However, the teacher knew the cultural differences between China and Canada, and increased the students' background cultural and contextual knowledge before their academic tasks. The students' performance for the course was successful. Mohan and Smith concluded that it was possible because the teacher and the students cooperatively constructed interactional context through which the students increased competence and confidence in the classroom performance.

Broadening the results of Mohan and Smith's (1992) study, Ballard (1996) brought up in her book chapter the issue of cultural influences on second language learning and foreign students' academic achievements in American universities. Ballard argues that values of a particular society or a culture are reflected in participants' classroom behaviors. If a society values the teacher's authority, the class atmosphere and the teacher's and the students' behaviors will reflect it. But in a society that respects independence and individuality the interactional aspects of the classroom will be very different. Therefore in order for overseas students such as Asian students, for instance, to be successful in an academic program in American universities, they will have to first learn the cultural differences and adjust themselves to American academic discourse styles and social values.

Based on the above review of literature on theoretical positions and methodological perspectives in second language socialization, the present study intends to contribute to gaining more knowledge about how an L2 cultural value, "avoiding display of asymmetry in power," is mirrored in second language teachers' routine corrective sequences in the ESL classroom.

III. METHODS

The data analyzed for the study are eight hours of ESL classes collected from two intensive English institutes in the U.S. Two hours of mid level grammar class

(indicated as IG in transcript excerpts below) was from videotaped data at the larger institute where normally 17 to 21 international students are placed in each class. The other six hours of data came from a high level listening course (HL), a low level listening course (LL), and a high level reading and vocabulary course (HRV) offered at the smaller institute with fewer than 10 students per class. Two hours of each of these three classes have been included for analysis for the study.

The grammar class was taught by a male teacher in his 30s (indicated as T1 in transcript excerpts below). The two listening classes were taught by a male teacher in his late 40s (T2) and the reading and vocabulary class was taught by a female teacher in her late 40s (T3). The choice of these four different classes was motivated by their diversity. For the purpose of the study mixed teaching contexts (e.g., size of the institutes, student proficiency levels, subject matters in ESL) in the data pool are more beneficial as they would increase the credibility of the findings. For the same reason, different genders and the age levels of the teachers were also taken into consideration in the selection of the data.

All three participating teachers were Caucasian and spoke English as their native language. They were born in the U.S., had been educated there and all had a Master's degree in TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) from a large U.S. university. Naturally it was expected that their discourse styles have encoded typical American cultural norms, ideologies and values in which and by which they grew up and have been educated. The two older teachers had over 10 years of ESL teaching experiences and the younger one around 7 years then. Most classes had ethically mixed adult students.

The video-taped and audio-taped data were closely transcribed following the Jefferson transcription convention (1974, see the Appendix). The data have been analyzed from a qualitative perspective following Ochs, Schieffelin and Poole. Microanalysis of the transcripts identified several different aspects of the teachers' corrective routines that manifest the American cultural norm of avoiding the display of asymmetry of power and knowledge.

IV. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of the analysis can be divided into three categories: the questioning features, accommodation routines, and mitigation practices in the corrective sequences. The questioning features include two sub-characteristics. In the

accommodation routines three kinds of related practices have been observed. Also three types of specific verbal and nonverbal practices have been identified for mitigation in corrective sequences.

1. Questioning in Corrective Sequences

In the teachers' corrective sequences two kinds of characteristics regarding their questioning behaviors have been identified and recognized as conveying the target American cultural norm. They are a) repeated solicitations of student responses and b) preference for questions to other elicitation devices.

One of the most frequently observed discourse routines in the observed teachers' corrective sequences was their multiple attempts to elicit answers from students. When a student's answer was initially incorrect, the teachers almost always made efforts to draw better or correct answers through multiple turns of elicitations instead of giving away the answer himself or herself right away. Also it was observed that the question (interrogative) format was preferred as a corrective elicitation device to some others such as imperatives or statements. See excerpt (i) below. In the following transcript of a class session from the high level listening class, the students and the teacher are reviewing vocabulary on the crossword puzzle. The words on the puzzle are from the CSI episode that they watched for listening comprehension practice earlier in the class.

(i) HL
1 T2: fugitive.
2 (1.5)
3 T2: did you see the movie the fugitive?
4 K4: yeah.
5 T2: what wou-
6 K4: want to,
7 K2: ( ), richard gere, and-
8 K4: [(ha- harrison fo-),
9 K2: [ah, Wesley-
10 T2: harrison ford.
11 (1.5)
12 -> T2: >why was he a fugitive.<
13 (3.0)
14 K4: maybe he don't have the crimer, uh he- he's not crimer, but-
15 (1.0)

16 K2: K3 is coming.
17 ((K3 walks in))
18 -> T2: what does fugitive mean?
19 (2.0)
20 K3: fugi- fugitive? ((running gestures))
21 -> T2: to run around, a track star.
22 K3: yeah.
23 -> T2: a track star is a fugitive?
24 K3: a track star?
25 T2: a track star like a::
26 K2: like ben johnson,
27 T2: ben johnson or um:: carl lewis,
28 K2: carl lewis, yeah.
29 T2: i don't even know whose-
30 K3: [you mean, one of the athletes can be a fugitive, you mean?
31 ->T2: [is that a fugitive?
32 ->T2: i don't know. >i'm asking You.<
33 K3: uh:
34 K2: cuz you said ((running gestures)). haha
35 ->T2: you said ((running gestures)), yeah. so is that running?
36 (5.0)
37 T2: let's look at the crossword puzzle and find out what fugitive is.
38 (8.0)
39 ((19 lines of discussion on another word 'tunnel'))
40 T2: okay. so we will do the tunnel a little bit more.
41 (1.0)
42 ->T2: but i need to know what a fugitive is.
43 (3.0)
44 K3: you want the second or the third meaning?
45 ->T2: how about the first meaning.
46 K3: first meaning?
47 ->T2: it's not a track star.
48 K2: hehehehe
49 K3: it's kind of a uh: running away from other people.
50 T2: running away from other people. okay. i'll take that.
51 K3: or the- from enemies.

52 T2: okay.
53 K1: the meaning of fugitive?
54 T2: yeah.
55 (2.0)
56 K1: it's the escapee from jail?
57 T2: Yes, yes, yeah. it means you are running away from someone.
58 that makes you a fugitive.
59 K1: ah
60 T2: you are trying to escape, trying to get away.

The purpose of this lengthy sequence is drawing the meaning of the word "fugitive" from the students. The teacher (T2) is asking his first intended question in line 12 (>*why was he a fugitive.*<), hoping to get students' understanding of the word. K4's answer in line 14 was interrupted by another student's late appearance, so T2 is asking again in line 18 (*what does fugitive mean?*). In 21 T2 is expressing his understanding of line 20 and eliciting again in line 23, using a display question (*a track star is a fugitive?*). In lines 31, 32, 35, 42, 45, and 47 T2 is constantly trying to elicit the exact meaning of the word from the students, when he could have just told them what it was at any point of the corrective sequence. His efforts were successful in the end and he gives them the definition in lines 57, 58, and 60. As seen in the script, the teacher is using a number of questions (e.g., lines 12, 18, 23, 31, 35, and 45) as elicitation devices in the corrective sequence. Similar aspects, longer or shorter, have been observed in other teachers data as well. For example, the teachers used a number of "can you..?" format of questions (e.g., *Can you use it in a sentence?*) for requests instead of the corresponding imperatives (e.g., *Use it in a sentence, Make a sentence using it*) or statements (e.g., *You should use it in a sentence, You should make a sentence using it*).

How do these characteristics of ESL teachers' discourse patterns relate to the American cultural tendency in question? In their efforts to maximize eliciting student responses or to at least try hard to give more opportunities for students to explore or revise answers, the teachers are giving the students chances to contribute to finding the answer. The teachers, in fact, could simply give out the answers when the first couple of elicitations have failed. Or they could criticize the students for their wrong or incomplete answers. In many cases it even looks like the American teachers instinctively avoid giving the answers themselves shortly after the initiation turn. Such a tendency shows students that the teachers believe in their students' abilities, value

their opinions and expect them to collaborate with the teachers in finding the best answers. Teachers' giving away answers and not trying to solicit student responses would reflect the traditional views of teacher's role as unilateral information deliverer and an authority of the setting, thus can maximize the power differentials between the teacher and the students.

Using the question forms (yes/no or wh-questions) more frequently than other elicitation devices such as imperatives or statements devices can also be interpreted as motivated by similar cultural orientations. As Poole (1992) and Ochs, Schieffelin and Platt (1979) mentioned, language socialization approach interprets display questions as having cultural predispositions in expert-novice relationships. That is, through asking and answering display questions "novice and expert contribute to the overt coconstruction of the same proposition (Poole, 1992, p. 600)." Soliciting student answers using frequent display questions instead of imperatives and statements in their evaluative sequences, therefore, demonstrates the participating teachers' tendency of displaying such American cultural norm.

2. Accommodation in Corrective Sequences

Another frequently observed characteristic of corrective routines in the present data is related to the ESL teachers' motivations to accommodate the students. A well-known example of accommodation of expert to novice in the classroom setting is structural simplification of teacher talk. Discourse accommodations observed in the present data were marked by three characteristics. They are a) offering options to choose from using or-choice questions, b) switching from wh-questions to yes/no questions, and c) suggesting better alternatives for students' imperfect answers. Excerpts (ii), (iii) and (iv) illustrate these tendencies, respectively.

(ii) HRV
1 T3: if you are practicing or trying out for the baseball team,
2 K1: uhu
3 T3: you have: uh: ((to K2)) do you have tryouts for the baseball tem?
4 K2: uhu
5 ->T3: what- what happens first.
6 (1.0)
7 ->T3: do you all play or:
8 (3.0)

9 -> T3: do they- do they have something they do and then certain people get
10 cut out
11 K1: Aha::

In this sequence from the reading and vocabulary class the teacher first reads a line off one of their reading materials (line 1). Her agenda for this line of questioning and elicitation is to make sure the students know what "trying out for the baseball team" means. When nobody responded to her wh-question in line 5, she decides to change her questions into what's called an "or-choice" question (Hatch, 1978) across two turns (lines 7 and 9-10). In this kind of question structure, the students are given two options to choose from. Or-choice questions are designedly bound to include the correct answer, which is, interestingly enough, often observed to be placed after the "*or*" just like the case above. This way the teacher accommodates the students by helping out with their difficulties in answering the questions because all that the student has to do is choose either one of the two options given. It can be interpreted as these American teachers providing scaffolding for their nonnative students. When the silence of the students' turn (e.g., line 6) gets longer, the students' not being able to answer the question becomes recognizable. The knowledge differentials become recognizable, too. Giving students an easy way out of the situations through asking or-choice questions can be looked at as experts' interactional efforts to mitigate the overt display of such differentials.

The discourse pattern of moving from wh-questions to yes/no questions illustrated in excerpt (iii) below represents exactly the same cultural motivation. The teacher asks a wh-question in line 1 but fails to elicit an answer as evidenced by the students' silence in line 2. In the following turns, however, the teacher switches to yes/no questions (lines 3, 6) to successfully elicit student responses (lines 5, 7). The teachers used yes/no questions as a discourse accommodation routine when their wh-questions fail to elicit an answer from students. It is definitely easier for students to answer yes/no questions than to answer wh-questions. Thus the teachers were accommodating the students as novices in the setting through this practice.

(iii) LL
1 ->T2: the guy who was already there? what did He say.
2 (2.0)
3 ->T2: did you hear the word Busy?
4 (0.5)

5 K1: uhu, uhum, busy.
6 ->T2: you hear the word busy? ((writing))
7 J2, K2: hmm
8 ->T2: and the guy who's already in the cell says busy something?
9 (2.0)
10 K1: mm

(iv) IG
1 ST: to take the exa:m.
2 T1: they were challenged to take-
3 now that's allright↑
4 they were challenged to take the exam.
5 ((turns to the student at the right most side,
6 which leaves the most of the students on his back
7 -> side)) but I think it would be even better
8 -> challenge, (0.2) to say they were challenged to
9 -> Pass the exam, or challenged to get a very
10-> high score (0.2) on the exam. because that's a- a
11-> goal º( ) to fight (.) fo:r.º ((turns
12 back)) um:: (.) anything else. ((looks around))

Excerpt (iv) is from the mid level grammar class. In his corrective sequences the male teacher was sometimes observed to accommodate students with their answer by offering better alternatives. When student ST in line 1 offers an answer, "*to take the exa:m.*" for a blank in a sentence, the teacher starts reading the whole sentence with the blank filled with the student's answer in line 2. As he reads, the teacher interrupts himself after uttering "*take* (*take-*)." Later lines in the sequence (lines 7 through 11) show that the teacher did not think this student's answer, "*take the exam*" was the best one in the given context. He thinks "*to pass the exam*" or "*to get a very high score on the exam*" would be better answers. Thus the teacher is suggesting or offering these alternative answers instead of giving overt or direct negative evaluations for the initial answer that the student provided.

What is important here is how these suggestions were made. If the teacher had just given those other answers, they would have been considered by the student as simple corrections because the teacher is giving his intended answers with the student's initial answer negated in the same way regular corrections (replacement of an error with a

correct answer) are made. However, in this sequence the teacher first acknowledged SP's answer in a positive way (line 3) and then used this phrase "*I think it would be even better challenge*" before offering his alternative answers. That is, the teacher is not using the overt and direct "not A but B" format of correction but the format of "A is good and B would be even better." This discourse structure gives the student the impression that his/her answer is not wrong but just needs a little bit of adjustment. This certainly is a way of conducting correction in a more indirect and less overt manner as it, although partially, acknowledges the novice participant's (i.e., the student's) contribution toward the perfect answer.

3. Mitigation in Corrective Sequences

The analysis of the data showed three kinds of mitigation practices employed by the teachers that represent the American cultural preference in question. They are a) hedges, uncertainty expressions and modals, b) requesting student assistance, and c) vertical headshakes.

Highly pervasive was their use of uncertainty expressions, hedges and modal auxiliary verbs. Modal auxiliaries are verbs like *would, could, may*, and so on. Uncertainty expressions and hedges include words and phrases such as *maybe, perhaps, almost, a little bit*, and *you know*. Hedges are used to "qualify, soften, or make claims more polite" and "serve a ritual function and act like disfluencies in smoothing over a disagreement with a conversational partner" (Hatch, 1992, p. 127). Let us take a look at some excerpts presenting these from the present class transcripts.

(v) HRV
1 K1: eighteen? hehehe, i think dog is ubiquitous. we can see dogs
2 everywhere.
3 (2.0)
4 T3: dogs are ubiquitous species?
5 K1: uhu.
6 (0.5)
7 T3: Yeah.
8 (3.5)
9 T3: i never thought of that but dogs Are ubiquitous. (.) Okay.
10 (3.0)
11 ->T3: i Don't think you can actually say a ubiquitous species, but dogs are

12 ubiquitous.
13 K1: uhm.
14 ->T3: would be the way, yeah.

In lines 11 and 14 in excerpt (v), the female teacher is inserting "*i Don t think*" as a hedge or an uncertainty expression and the modal auxiliary "*would*" in order to mitigate her evaluative or corrective comments. She could have simply said, for example, *"'A dog is ubiquitous' is incorrect. You should say 'a dog in a ubiquitous animal.'"* By making use of these devices, the teacher is displaying her reluctance to give direct or overt negative evaluation to the responding student. This contributes to mitigate the face-threatening impact of the teacher's corrective remarks thus helps the teacher, as the expert of the subject matter and authority of the setting, avoid explicit display of power differentials.

(vi) IG
1 ->T1: No, Kick them both out. well maybe we will allow
2 -> (.) you (.) to be president. um, the- the
3 -> meaning, the meaning is a little bit strange. It
4 -> is a little bit strange. it's not bad, but it's a
5 -> little, little questionable. ((placing a question
6 mark on the board next to the sentence))

In excerpt (vi), the male teacher's corrective turn is full of hedges and uncertainty adverbs. There are *maybe* in line 1, filler expressions like "*well*" and "*um*" in lines 1 and 2. The rest of the turn includes a number of *a little*'s and *a little bit*'s (lines 3, 4, 5). These are used in the teacher's attempts to mitigate the negative evaluative nuance of his utterance and to even try to create a presumable context where the student's not-so-perfect answer might make sense (lines 1 and 2), which fails anyway. These discoursal efforts and patterns can also be considered representations of the cultural predispositions and constraints to avoid direct and overt display of power differences in the classroom, embedded in him.

The same cultural preference was observed to be reflected in the ESL teachers' elicitation of student reformulation of answers in the form of requesting their assistance. It is very interesting because it is actually the students who have the responsibility of revising their answers. Yet the teacher is eliciting correction by asking for their help as if the students and the teacher are working together for the

completion of a task and the teacher needs the students' help in improving the answer in their collaborative efforts. Excerpt (vii) illustrates this.

(vii) IG
1 SP: [how about (.) to go to home.
2 T1: well it's- it's graMMatically, it's okay,
3 I want to (.) think of what is the situation.
4 ((turns to the student))
5 (2.0)
6 SP: uh::::,=
7 ->T1: =can you- [can you help me] with the situation?

In excerpt (vii), student SP is offering her answer "to go to home" in line 1 by asking "*[how about (.) to go to home.*" One can tell that a negative evaluation is in order just by seeing that the teacher's first utterance in his evaluation turn is "*well,*" a filler word often used as a hedge or an uncertainty device before a negative evaluation. Then the teacher says that SP's answer is grammatically okay but he needs more explanations about the situation where the offered answer makes better sense. When the student SP hesitates in line 6, the teacher realizes that his correction initiation in the previous turn was probably not clear to SP thus he redoes his turn by asking the student to help him come up with the appropriate situation (line 7).

This is a case of direct representation of cultural ideologies as the teacher is mitigating the power and knowledge differentials between himself and the student by explicitly asking for the novices' help, treating them as equal or, for a moment, even more powerful beings that can help out the expert. By asking to help him with the situation the teacher is framing the classroom discourse in a way that the teacher and the student are equally participating to make contributions to complete the task of creating or finding the right answer. Through this type of initiating and making corrections, the teacher is delivering to the student his cultural message that they prefer to appear equal in interactions with less powerful participants in the given setting.

Analysis of the present data also showed that the gesture of vertical headshakes is frequently used as part of the corrective moves in the teachers' classroom practices. This is, again, interpreted as an aspect of display of avoiding power asymmetry in American expert-novice interaction. During the corrective sequences, the female teacher in excerpt (viii) and the male teacher in (ix) below are using vertical

headshakes as part of their corrective routines that certainly have interactional functions.

In (viii) the two students K1 and K2 are arguing about the structure of a sentence in the text they read. A lengthy discussion turn prior to this sequence was omitted due to the space limit. K2 in lines 2 to 4 is contending that the phrases “mother to be” and “son to be” are functioning as adjectives. The teacher in line 5 through 7 is giving a corrective remark as she nods throughout the turn. Her vertical headshakes here are working as a mitigation device to soften the correction by creating a positive climate in her feedback turn responding to K2's strong contention. In line 8, K2 acknowledges the teacher's correction and the teacher moves on to add more comments to her prior remark in lines 10 and 11, nodding as well.

(viii) HRV
1 K1: actually he was not so, very, impressed, so=
2 K2: =no, no, what- what i’m saying is that, what- this expression, you said
3 mother to be, son to be, it’s like, Yeah, sounds like a adj- adjective itself.
4 this is a sentence=
5 ->T3: =by itself without the hyphens it would be a sentence ((vertical headshakes)).
6 putting the hyphens in makes an adjective. ((coughing)) pardon me. yeah
7 you can do that.
8 K2: Okay.
9 (1.0)
10 ->T3: in fact, i’d say we do that (0.5) Fairly routinely. ((vertical headshakes))
11 something like that. taken expression out of=
12 K2: =when i Speak, like this, it’s possible, but wow::. when i read
13 [like this-
14 ->T3: [makes it hard to, ((vertical headshakes, smiling))
15 K2, T3: ((murmur and smile))

(ix) IG
1 T1: well it’s a- (0.2)
2 -> ((vertical headshakes)) it’s strange. it’s not wrong. but it seems
3 -> strange.=because (.) a CHallenge really is (.)
4 a little bit about com- uh- like a Contest.
5 ((boxing gestures))
6 almost like a competition

7 like you have to work (.) or fight (0.2)
8 to reach (0.2) your goal. so:::, (2.2) to::
9 be challenged to go home seems, a seems like a,
10 -> (.) an int-, a strange challenge. that's a
11 -> strange challenge. ((strong vertical headshakes))

In (ix) the male teacher begins his evaluation turn by "well" as he often does in other cases we have seen in the previous excerpts. A negative evaluation is to follow. A false start involving a self-interruption is observed in line 1 continued to line 2 (*it's a- (0.2) it's strange,*). It is a stress signal. What is interesting here is the fact that while he is producing these fillers, uncertainty markers and stress signals, he is moving his head up and down as if he were acknowledging the student's answer in an affirmative manner.

From the video analysis, his headshakes at the beginning of the turn accompanied his utterance, "*it's strange. it's not wrong. but it seems strange.=because*" (lines 2 and 3) and those toward the end of the turn was made as the teacher was producing lines 10 and 11, "*an int-, a strange challenge. that's a strange challenge.*". The rest of the turn in lines 3 through 9 is the teacher's explanations about the definition of the word, *challenge*. His actual corrective evaluation of the student's answer in the prior turn is provided in the word "strange" and its accompanying mitigating expressions in lines 2 and 3, and 10 and 11 where the teacher used the headshakes alongside. This means that the teacher was using this approving gesture (vertical headshakes) with his negative evaluative remarks.

The examples of using vertical headshakes along with negative evaluative comments sound like an oxymoron, but it makes sense from the perspective of American cultural tendency in question. The teachers' vertical head shakes can be explain as their nonverbal routine devices designed to mitigate the negative evaluative comments that they make. As we have seen in the previous analysis of other cases, giving direct and overt criticisms explicitly and overtly display the differences in power and knowledge among the class participants (the teacher and the students). Affirmative gestures such as vertical headshakes can help neutralize the differences and suppress the display of them.

V. IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION

This study examined how "avoidance of overt display of power differentials," one of the characteristics of American white middle class expert-novice interaction styles found in Ochs and Schieffelin's (1984) study, is mirrored, conveyed, keyed and indexed through routine corrective practices employed by three ESL teachers in the classroom. The cultural tendency was observed from characteristics of questioning, accommodation routines, and mitigation practices. As questioning routines, repeated solicitations of student responses and preference for questions to other elicitation devices were pervasive. For accommodation routines, using or-choice questions, moving to ask yes/no questions from wh-questions, and suggesting better alternatives for students' imperfect answers stood out. Mitigation techniques in the corrective sequences have been observed to be encoded in the form of verbal and nonverbal discourse practices. Uncertainty expressions such as hedges and modals were highly pervasive. The teachers were also observed to request student assistance in improving answers and to make strategic vertical headshakes during the negative evaluative remarks.

This study contributed to adding more knowledge to the classroom second language socialization literature. It expanded Poole's (1992) research scope in terms of the number of teachers involved, the number of subject matters and the levels of student proficiency, and the quantity of analyzed data. In addition, while Poole looked mainly at the opening sequences, this study focused on the corrective sequences and the questioning and elicitation practices in them. This study thus also provided further and richer base line data for second language socialization studies.

The results of the study confirm the popular belief that language cannot be separated from culture. Teacher talk and teachers' discourse routines function as vehicles to represent and transfer cultural norms and values of the target language and thus socialize the students into the language-oriented beliefs and preferences. Due to such bearings of cultural motivations and constraints teachers' choice of language use and routine classroom discourse practices should be carefully examined and taken into account.

Findings of the present study also indicate that second language socialization does not necessarily involve conflicting, pressure, and tension-creating relationships as Ballard (1996) and Allwright (1996) said. Some of the observed American cultural messages such as accommodation routines and mitigation routines may actually be pedagogically beneficial for the acquisition of the target language because of their

contributions to added comprehensibility and affective advantages of reducing students' anxiety in the classroom.

Methodologically the study used fine-grained observations, videotaping, audiotaping, microanalysis of the discourse patterns and interactions from the close transcripts. Interview sessions and surveys can be a good methodological addition to help solidify the results of the transcript analysis.

Future studies on second language socialization should be designed to clearly demonstrate how the social context and forms develop knowledge and cognition in L2 language learning. If second language students' beliefs, expectations, or responses are expected to change after being exposed to native American teachers' culture-specific routine discourse patterns for a certain period of time and if this socialization process influences learners' second language acquisition, we should investigate more specifically how that happens and find ways to make use of the findings for facilitative purposes.

Learning a second language most inevitably involves learning the target culture and the associated cultural values. Students gradually develop certain attitudes toward the target culture as they learn the language. Teachers of second language should be fully aware of this and be more sensitive and knowledgeable about the influence and function of culture in language pedagogy. Teacher training programs should also make more efforts to enhance pre-service teachers' awareness and understanding of the relations between culture and language.

REFERENCES

Allwright, D. (1996). Social and pedagogic pressures in the language classroom: The role of socialization. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Society and the language classroom* (pp. 209-228). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Atkinson, D., & Ramanathan, V. (1995). Cultures of writing: An ethnographic comparison of L1 and L2 university writing/language programs. *TESOL Quarterly*, *29*(3), 539-568.

Ballard, B. (1996). Through language to learning: Preparing overseas students for study in Western universities. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Society and the language classroom* (pp. 148-168). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Duff, P. A. (1995). An ethnography of communication in immersion classrooms in Hungary. *TESOL Quarterly*, *29*(3), 505-538.

Duff, P. A. (2002). The discursive co-construction of knowledge, identity, and difference: An ethnography of communication in the high school mainstream. *Applied Linguistics, 23*(3), 289-322.

Ervin-Tripp, S., & Mitchell-Kernan, C. (1977). *Child discourse.* New York: Academic Press.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harklau, L. (1994). ESL versus mainstream classes: Contrasting L2 learning environments. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(2), 241-272.

Hatch, E. (1978). Discourse analysis, speech acts and second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie (Ed.), *Second language acquisition research* (pp. 137-155). New York: Academic Press.

Hatch, E. (1992). *Discourse and language education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

He, A.W. (1997). Learning and being: Identity construction in the classroom. In L. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning 8* (pp. 201-222). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Press.

Heath, S. B (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). Harmonsworth: Penguin.

Jung, E. H. (2005). Second language classroom discourse: The roles of teacher and learners. *English Language and Literature Teaching, 11*(4), 121-137.

Losey, K. M. (1995). Gender and ethnicity as factors in the development of verbal skills in bilingual Mexican American women. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*(4), 635-661.

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Mohan, B., & Smith, S. M. (1992). Context and cooperation in academic tasks. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Collaborative language learning and teaching* (pp. 81-99). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morita, N. (2000). Discourse socialization through oral classroom activities in a TESL graduate program. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*(2), 279-310.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning.* Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education.

Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2001). Changing perspectives on good language learners. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(2), 307-322.

Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E. (1990). Indexicality and socialization. In J. W. Stigler, R. A. Shweder & G. Herdt (Eds.), *Cultural psychology* (pp. 287-308). Cambridge: CUP.

Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories and their implications. In R. A. Shweder & R. A. LeVine (Eds.), *Cultural theory: Essays on mind, self and emotion* (pp. 276-320). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E., Schieffelin, B. B., & Platt, M. (1979). Propositions across utterances and speakers. In E. Ochs & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Developmental pragmatics* (pp. 251-268). New York: Academic Press.

Ohta, A. (2001). *Second language acquisition processes in the classroom: Learning Japanese.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pallotti, G. (1996). Towards an ecology of second language acquisition: SLA as a socialization Process. In E. Kellerman, B. Weltens & T. Bongaerts (Eds.), *EuroSLA 6: A Selection of Papers* (pp. 121-143). Amsterdam: VU Uitgeverij.

Poole, D. (1992). Language socialization in the second language classroom. *Language Learning, 42*(4), 593-616.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50*, 696-735.

Saville-Troike, M. (1989). *The ethnography of communication: An introduction* (2nd Ed). New York: Basil Blackwell.

Schecter, S.R., & Bayley, R. (1997). Language socialization practices and cultural identity: Case studies of Mexican-descent families in California and Texas. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(3), 513-541.

Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (1986a). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 15*, 163-191.

Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (1986b). *Language socialization across cultures.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Seong, G. (2006). Pedagogical functions of teachers' conversational repair strategies in the ESL classroom. *English Language and Literature Teaching, 12*(1), 77-101.

Siegal, M. (1996). The role of learner subjectivity in second language sociolinguistic competency: Western women learning Japanese. *Applied Linguistics, 17(3),* 356-382.

Watson-Gegeo, K., & Gegeo, D. (1986). The social world of Kwara'ae children: Acquisition of language and values. In J. Cook-Gumperz, W. Corsaro & J. Streeck (Eds.), *Children's worlds and children's language* (pp. 109-127). New York. Mounton de Gruyer.

Watson-Gegeo, K.A., & Gegeo, D.W. (1994). Keeping culture out of the classroom in rural Solomon Islands schools: A critical analysis. *Educational Foundations, 8,* 27-55.

Watson-Gegeo, K., & Nielsen, S. (2003). Language socialization in SLA. In M. Long & C. Doughty (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 155-177). Oxford: Blackwell.

Willett, J. (1995). Becoming first graders in an L2: An ethnographic study of L2 socialization. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*(3), 473-503.

APPENDIX

Transcription Notations

A fuller glossaries can be found in Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974).

( ) Empty parentheses indicate talk too obscure to transcribe. Letters inside such parentheses indicate the transcriber's best estimate of what is being said.

(0.7) Numbers in parentheses indicate periods of silence, in tenths of a second.

(.) A discernible pause which is too short to be timed mechanically is shown as a micro pause.

[ ] Square brackets indicate overlaps between utterances. The point of overlap is marked with a single left-hand bracket. Right side brackets indicate where overlapping talk ends, or marks alignments within a continuing stream of overlapping talk.

= = Equal signs (ordinarily at the end of one line and the start of an ensuing one) indicates a "latched" relationship where there is no discernable interval or silence between turns.

. A period indicates a falling intonation

, A comma indicates a continuing intonation

? A question mark indicates a rising intonation (not necessarily a question)

::: Colons indicate a lengthening of the sound just preceding them, proportional to the number of colons.

.h Inhalation is shown by a stop, followed by 'h', the length of the inhalation being indicated by the number of h's.

h. Outbreath is shown by 'h' followed by a stop, the length being indicated by the number of h's.

Hhh the letter "h" is used to indicate hearable aspiration, its length roughly proportional to the number of "h"s. If preceded by a dot, the aspiration is inbreath. Aspiration internal to a word is enclosed in parentheses. Otherwise "h"s may indicate anything from ordinary breathing to sighing to laughing, etc.

Hi Underlining indicates stress or emphasis.

OH Particularly emphatic speech, usually with raised pitch, is shown by capital letters (other than as conventionally at the beginning of turns)

.Tch Other audible sounds are represented as closely as possible in standard orthography

-> Arrows in the margin point to the lines of transcript relevant to the point being made in the text.

((points)) Words in double parentheses indicate transcriber's comments, not transcriptions.

becau- A hyphen indicates an abrupt cut or self interruption of the sound in progress indicated by the preceding letter(s) (the example here represents a self interrupted "because")

Dr↑ink A "hat" (^) or upward arrow indicates a marked pitch rise. A downward arrow indicates a pitch fall.

°why A small circle on the upper right corner of a word indicates that it is spoken distinctively softly

< > When talk is markedly slowed, it is indicated by these brackets around them

> < These brackets mean that the talk between them is rushed

Examples in: English

Applicable Language: English

Applicable Levels: Tertiary/Adult

Guiboke Seong
Dept. of English Language Education
Inha University
Yonghyun-Dong 253 Nam-Ku
Incheon, 402-751, Korea (ROK)
Tel: (032) 860-7855
Fax: (032) 865-3857
Email: gseong@inha.ac.kr

Received in April, 2007
Reviewed in May, 2007
Revised version received in June, 2007