SECOND LANGUAGE INTERACTION IN A UNIVERSITY LANGUAGE LOUNGE: A FOCUS ON HOW REPAIR BECOMES NOTICEABLE AND REPAIR SEQUENCES AS POTENTIAL SITES OF LEARNING AND TEACHING

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Jeffrie Leigh Butterfield

September, 2016

Kanagawa University

Graduate School of Foreign Languages

ABSTRACT

Second Language Interaction in a University Language Lounge:

A Focus on How Repair Becomes Noticeable and Repair Sequences as Potential Sites of Learning and Teaching

Jeffrie Leigh Butterfield

Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate School of Foreign Languages, Kanagawa University

Advisor: Dr. Yuri Hosoda

In recent years, many Japanese universities have created language lounges, places where students can go to practice and learn various languages, such as English and Chinese, with native speakers. However, despite the increasing number of university language lounges, there are still few studies which examine the various interactional phenomena which occur in them. The data used in this study come from approximately 16 hours of audio-video recorded interaction in an English university language lounge.

Building on previous research on repair, the present study adopts a conversation analytic perspective in order to analyze language lounge interaction between teachers and students and aims to accomplish the following: (a) elucidate how repair becomes noticeable to the speaker of the trouble source and therefore does not go overlooked (b) reveal how conversation analysis can be used a tool to uncover how and where learning may occur in second language interaction, (c) exhibit how repair sequences can possibly be sites of learning when repair sequences are initiated either by a teacher or student, (d) show how repair sequences can also potentially be sites of teaching when teachers orient to students' problem in producing an appropriate word, expression, and so on at the time of interaction, and (e) demonstrate how a whiteboard is used by teachers to perform repair and by students

when producing repaired utterances.

An analysis of the data revealed that repair can become noticeable to the trouble source speaker (a) when a teacher joins a conversation between two students to perform repair, (b) when a teacher uses words such as "you mean," "you could say," "we say," and "say it," (c) when a student self-initiates repair, (d) when a teacher uses a combination of various resources, including the production of "you said" and emphasis to perform repair after next turns, (e) when repair is pre- and post-framed, (f) when the word repaired is produced in isolation and repeated, and (g) when a teacher uses gestures.

This study builds on previous conversation analytic studies on learning which attempt to show how CA may be used as a tool to illustrate how learning may occur in short-term interaction and reveals how repair sequences may potentially be sites of learning. This dissertation identified an interactional pattern, which, when viewed aggregately, suggests that learning may have occurred. Lastly, this study found that repair sequences can also be potential sites of teaching when teachers treat students' inappropriate usage of vocabulary or grammar or the inability to produce an appropriate response as a lack of linguistic knowledge that needs to be filled through teaching.

This study focuses on interaction in a language lounge, more specifically, repair in a language lounge, but the findings may be of interest to teachers in other educational contexts as well. Understanding the resources identified in this study that cause repair to become noticeable would be beneficial to teachers because utilizing them would help to ensure that students notice that their utterances have been repaired, which may lead to learning.

要旨

Second Language Interaction in a University Language Lounge: A Focus on How Repair Becomes Noticeable and Repair Sequences as Potential Sites of Learning and Teaching

大学のランゲージラウンジにおける第二言語相互行為

—修復への気づきと学習と教育の機会としての修復連鎖に注目して—

近年、多くの日本の大学はランゲージラウンジという学生が英語・中国語などの言語を母語話者と練習・学習できる場所を学内に設置している。ランゲージラウンジの数が増加しているが、そこで行われる相互行為を検証する研究はまだ少ない。本研究は大学のランゲージラウンジで行われる相互行為を16時間録音録画し、それをデータとして用い、修復という相互行為内で発生する発話の問題、聞き取りの問題、理解上の問題に対しての対処に焦点をあてている。

本研究は会話分析の手法を用い、教員と学生のランゲージラウンジにおける相互行為を分析する。本論の主な目的は、どういった相互行為の環境や資源を駆使して修復を行うとトラブル源の話者は他者修復がされたことに気付くのか、を明らかにし、第二言語の相互行為内のどこでどのように学習の機会が生じるのか、を解明するために会話分析は分析手法として有意義な手法であることを示す。また、修復連鎖は学習が行われ得る場であることを提示し、学生が相互行為時に適切な言葉、表現などを用いることができなかった際に教員はそれを知識不足の問題として捉えて修復する場合には、その修復連鎖によっては教育の機会が生じることも示す。さらに教員は学生の発話を修復する際、いかにしてホワイトボードを利用するのか、また、学生は修復された発話を産出するのに、どのようにホワイトボードを活用するのか、を明確にする。

第4章は修復を行う教師はどのようにしてその修復をトラブル源の話者である学生に認識させられるのか、ということを検討する。具体的にはどういった相互行為の環境や資源によってトラブル源の話者は修復に気づくのかを考察している。その結果、以下の相互行為内の環境や資源にてトラブル源の話者は修復に気づくことが明らかにされた：(a) 教員が修復をするために学生同士の会話に突然参与した際、(b) 教員が修復に「you mean」「you could say」「we say」と「say

it」という言葉を付け加えた際、(c) 学生が修復を自己開始した際、(d)トラブル源の次の順番以降に教員が「you said」や強調といった資源を同時に用いた際、(e) 修復に前方枠付けや後方枠付けがされた際、(f) 修復する部分のみが繰り返し発された際、及び (g) 修復と共にジェスチャーが用いられた際である。

第5章では相互行為中のどこでどのように学習が行われたのか、を探求している。ある慣行を突き止め、その慣行におけるそれぞれの要素を総合的に見れば、学習が行われたのではないか、ということが示唆されている。その慣行とはまず、学生は理解上の問題や相互行為時に適切な言葉を発することができないことを公に示し、次に知識変化のトークンを産出し、最後に修復された言葉を自らが後の相互行為にて用いるということである。この慣行の検証により、修復連鎖は学習が実施され得る場の一つであるということが判明した。

第6章では学生が言語的な間違いをした際、または適切な答えを言えなかった際、教員はそれを知識不足の問題として捉え、教育でその知識のギャップを埋めようとすることが明確にされている。また、ホワイトボードは教員・学生によって、教育・学習のための道具としてどのように利用されたのか、を検討している。教員がホワイトボードに修復する言語アイテムを記入すると、学生は書き留められた修復に注目をすることがわかった。学生は修復された言語アイテムを目に見ることにより修復を見逃さずに言語アイテムを産出できるようになったのである。ホワイトボードを資源として利用することにより、学生は修復された文が比較的長い場合でもその文が発話できたことが示された。

本研究はランゲージラウンジにおける第二言語相互行為、特に修復に焦点をあてた。教員は、いかなる相互行為の環境や資源を利用して修復することにより、学生が他者修復がされたことに気付くのか、を理解することによって、正規の教室など他の教育現場でも学生に修復を認識させて学習へ導く可能性が高くなるであろう。

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to the following people for their invaluable guidance and support throughout the process of writing this dissertation.

First and foremost, I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Yuri Hosoda. I am sincerely grateful to have her as an advisor as her guidance, feedback, and expertise in the field of conversation analysis have enabled me to grow as a researcher and write a dissertation that I am proud of. Her passion for research is infectious and has been extremely motivational.

Next, I would like to thank Dr. David Aline for dedicating his time and effort to meticulously review several drafts of my dissertation. His feedback and comments have helped me to understand what it takes to be a good researcher and writer and have allowed me to improve my dissertation immensely.

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Tim Greer for introducing CA to me and for giving me guidance throughout my master's and doctoral programs. I sincerely appreciate his continuous encouragement and advice.

I am tremendously grateful to the teachers and students who allowed me film them in the language lounge. I would also like to extend my thanks to my fellow graduate students for reading various sections of my dissertation and providing invaluable feedback.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family. This dissertation would not have been possible without their love, support, and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

In recent years, many Japanese universities have created language lounges, places where students can go to practice and learn various languages, such as English and Chinese, with native speakers. However, despite the increasing number of university language lounges, there are still few studies which examine the various interactional phenomenon which occur in them. In many respects, the university language lounge, which is the focus of this study, closely resembles a communication-based language classroom in the sense that it is often task- and activity-based, and involves both interaction among students and interaction between teachers and students. The tasks and activities range from finding out what their partners' three dreams are to games such as passing a ball around the table to each of the participants while one of them tries to answer a question before the ball gets to them. Although some of the extracts contain more than one student, the majority of the interaction which is the focus of this study involves one teacher and one student.

In the field of conversation analysis (CA), the analyst does not decide what phenomenon to focus on a priori; they let the phenomenon emerge from the data. The original purpose of this study, which was to analyze language lounge interaction to understand how interaction is accomplished, was intentionally general as I did not know what kind of phenomenon an analysis of the data would reveal.

Repair, the methods for addressing problems of hearing, speaking, and understanding talk (Schegloff, 1997a), is the underlying theme of this dissertation. Since the language lounge is a place where students of various linguistic competencies interested in practicing and learning English go, repair was extremely prevalent and it was performed both by students and teachers. Some researchers make a distinction between the use of the words

"repair" and "correction," whereas others do not. The present study uses the word "repair" to include correction as correction can be a type of repair. Repair can "fix" a problem of speaking, whether it is a grammatical or lexical mistake, or a slip of the tongue. Although the debate regarding the use of the words "repair" and "correction" is briefly discussed in the Repair Literature Review section, an in depth discussion is beyond the scope of the present study.

In order to attempt to better comprehend the topic of learning, some researchers interested in second language acquisition have investigated educational contexts where learning may occur (Gardner, 2008). Although my original objective was not to examine language lounge interaction in order to explore the topic of learning, after repeatedly analyzing the data, some remarkable instances began to emerge which suggested that learning opportunities may have been created. The sites where the learning may have occurred were repair sequences. One of the goals of the language lounge is language learning, so after discovering that repair sequences may be one site in which learning may occur, I began focusing on other cases of repair to see what else may be revealed. Another phenomenon that continually drew my attention was how teachers could be seen doing teaching through repair. If repair sequences can be both sites where learning and teaching occur, making the repair recognizable would most likely increase the likelihood that learning may occur. The more instances of repair that I analyzed, the more that I began to see cases in which repair became noticed and acknowledged by the trouble source speaker.

Since Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks' (1977) seminal paper on repair, there has been an extensive amount of research examining several facets of repair and how it is performed in a variety of interactional settings. Building on this previous research on repair, the present study adopts a conversation analytic perspective in order to analyze language lounge interaction between teachers and students and aims to accomplish the following: (a) elucidate

how repair becomes noticeable to the speaker of the trouble and therefore does not go overlooked, (b) reveal how conversation analysis can be used a tool to uncover how and where learning may occur in second language interaction, (c) exhibit how repair sequences can possibly be sites of learning when repair sequences are initiated either by a teacher or student, and (d) show how repair sequences can also potentially be sites of teaching when teachers orient to students' inability to produce an appropriate word, phrase, expression, and so on at the time of interaction.

1.2 Findings and Contributions of the Study

All of the chapters in this study are concerned with one main phenomenon, that is, repair performed in interaction between teachers and students. One focus of this study concerns the various interactional environments and resources which are conducive to making repair noticeable to the trouble source speaker. They are as follows: (a) when a teacher joins a conversation between two students to perform repair, (b) when a teacher uses expressions such as "you mean," "you could say," "we say," and "say it," (c) when a student self-initiates repair, (d) when a teacher uses a combination of various resources, including the production of "you said" and emphasis to perform repair after next turns, (e) when repair is pre- and post-framed, (f) when the word repaired is produced in isolation and repeated, and (g) when a teacher uses gestures.

When a teacher suddenly joins a conversation between two students engaged in an activity to do repair, it draws attention to the repair, therefore making it noticeable. I discovered that another way that repair becomes noticeable is when the teacher uses certain expressions, such as "you mean," "you could say," "we say," and "say it." These expressions mark the previous utterance as a trouble source and the utterance that follows as repair of the trouble source. When a student self-initiates repair, it makes a repair relevant, but that does

not guarantee that if a repair is produced, it will not go overlooked. In this dissertation, I demonstrate how a resource such as a piece of paper can be used to do repair, thereby helping to make it apparent to the trouble source speaker that their utterance is being repaired.

I also investigate how repair after next turns can become noticeable when a teacher uses a combination of various resources, including the production of "you said" and emphasis. When repair is produced at a distance from the trouble source, it may be difficult for the producer of the trouble source to notice that their utterance has been repaired (Schegloff, 1992a). I found that one way that repair can become noticeable to the trouble source speaker is when the participant performing repair uses expressions, such as "you said," which help call attention to the problematic utterance. Another method used to locate the problematic part of a word can be the use of emphasis. In the example presented in this study, the participant says the word, "mathematic," which is repaired by the teacher, who locates the trouble source by placing emphasis on the "c," saying "mathematic." He then produces "s," the letter missing from the word. It is a combination of these elements that helps to make the trouble source speaker notice that that the word he produced is being repaired.

Repair can also become noticeable by pre- and post-framing the repair, a practice that frequently occurs in mundane conversation. This provides a context for the trouble source speaker and allows them to see what part of their utterance is being repaired. Producing the repaired word in isolation and repeating it were also found to help ensure that repair does not go overlooked. Finally, this study established that repair can become clear when a teacher uses gestures, more specifically, when the teacher raises his fingers in order to prompt the student to produce the repaired sentence..

This dissertation examines one potential site where learning may occur, namely repair sequences. It builds on previous conversation analytic studies on learning (e.g., Hellermann, 2011) which attempt to show how CA may be used a tool to illustrate how learning may

occur in short-term interaction. This study identified an interactional pattern, which, when viewed aggregately, suggests that learning may have occurred. It is as follows:

1. Student shows problem of understanding or speaking as displayed through a question or inability to produce an appropriate word
2. Student or teacher initiates repair
3. Teacher performs repair (teaches)
4. Student produces a change of state token, such as "ah" or "oh" (Heritage, 1984)
5. Student demonstrates their understanding of the newly-learned word by explaining the meaning to another participant or applying it

All of the examples presented in Chapter 5, Repair Sequences as Potential Sites of Learning, share these common features. First, the student shows a problem of understanding or speaking that is followed by a repair initiation either by the student, the trouble source speaker, or by the teacher. Next, the teacher produces the repair proper, which the student receipts with a change of state token, such as "ah" or "oh." Lastly, the student shows their understanding of the linguistic item that was taught by explaining what it means or by applying it in the subsequent interaction.

This study also found that repair sequences can also be potential sites of teaching when teachers orient to students' inappropriate usage of linguistic items or inability to provide a suitable answer as a deficiency in linguistic knowledge. This dissertation contributes to the topic of repair by demonstrating how repair is performed in interaction between native and non-native speakers, the teachers and the students. More specifically, it identifies interactional environments and resources which cause repair to become noticeable and explicates the interactional circumstances in which learning and teaching may occur. In addition, this study contributes to the understanding of how interaction is accomplished in a university language lounge, which is still an underresearched area. Students attend the

language lounge in order to learn English and improve their English communication skills. This study examines how learning may occur, which may be of interest not only to university administrators at universities with a language lounge or universities interested in creating a language lounge, but to language teachers in general.

By revealing various environments and resources in which repair does not go unnoticed in interaction between native and non-native speakers, this study contributes to the fields of second language learning and pedagogy. As Schmidt (1990) argues, noticing is an essential criterion for language learning to occur, so identifying the resources which help students to notice repair could be extremely useful to teachers. Even though this study focuses on interaction between language teachers and their students, the findings may be beneficial not only to language teachers, but to teachers in general.

This study also contributes to the understanding of learning and to the field of conversation analysis by demonstrating that learning, which is often thought to be a cognitive action that occurs in the mind, can actually become visible and that CA can be effective in identifying a traceable learning object and addressing the topic of learning. The findings of this study may be of interest to teachers because they show that repair sequences are one potential site in which learning may occur and they suggest that it may be beneficial to students that teachers do not let mistakes pass (Firth, 1996).

This study contributes to the fields of conversation analysis and second language pedagogy by showing how teaching is performed through repair, how repair initiations can act as catalysts for teaching episodes, and how students and teachers, through various methods, achieve intersubjectivity.

1.3 Organization of the Chapters

Chapter 2, Literature Review, provides a summary of some of the literature that is

pertinent to the present study. It begins with an explication of the field of conversation analysis (CA), and then introduces previous studies on mundane and institutional interaction and describes the differences between the two. This is followed by an explanation of what is meant by the term "repair" in the field of the CA and a description of the main locations of repair as discussed in CA literature, which are: (a) same turn repair, (b) transition space repair, (c) second position repair, (d) third turn repair, (e) third position repair, and (f) fourth position repair. Next, this chapter outlines the four types of repair which were identified by previous CA research through empirical analyses of natural interaction. They are (a) self-initiated self-repair, (b) self-initiated other-repair, (c) other-initiated self-repair, and (d) other-initiated other-repair. The subsequent section provides a summary of previous research on repair in various interactional circumstances, such as repair in native speaker classrooms, repair in foreign/second language classrooms, and repair in native and non-native speaker interaction in non-educational settings. The last section of Chapter 2 provides an overview of various conversation analytic studies on learning, which include studies that focus on opportunities for learning, sites of learning, longitudinal learning, and learning in short-term interaction.

Chapter 3, Method, describes the data used in this study as well as the participants and procedures used to analyze the data. It outlines the ethical considerations of this study, such as consent forms, matters that were considered when recording the data, and data transcription and storage. This chapter discusses the relevance of reliability, validity, objectivity, and quantification to the present study.

Chapter 4, How Repair Becomes Noticeable, is concerned with demonstrating how repair becomes noticeable to the producer of the trouble source. It investigates various interactional environments and resources which contribute to making repair noticeable, thereby ensuring that it does not go overlooked.

Chapter 5, Repair Sequences as Potential Sites of Learning, presents three examples

that illustrate how participants display a problem in understanding or speaking, a change of state, as shown by their use of change of state tokens, and that they may have learned something as revealed by their application or explanation of a linguistic item.

Chapter 6, Repair Sequences as Potential Sites of Teaching, focuses on how the inappropriate usage of vocabulary or grammar or the inability to produce an appropriate response by students is treated by teachers as a lack of knowledge that needs to be filled through teaching. It illustrates how some of the responses by students are treated as problematic by teachers and how these problematized utterances can serve as catalysts for teaching episodes. Finally, I show how a whiteboard is used as a resource by teachers to carry out repair and by students when producing the repaired linguistic item.

Chapter 7, Conclusion, summarizes the main findings of this study and discusses the implications of the findings and some directions for future research.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter reviews some of the literature relevant to the present study. The first section explains the basic principles of CA as well as some of the fundamental aspects of conversation. The second section introduces institutional interaction and the relation of identity to institutional interaction, and discusses some of the defining features of classroom interaction. The third section reviews previous studies on repair and how it is performed in various interactional settings. The last section reviews CA studies which focus on the topic of learning.

2.1 Conversation Analysis

Conversation Analysis (CA) is a methodology informed by a variety of disciplines for analyzing and understanding how humans interact. It is the explication of social action and how interlocutors maintain an interactional social order. The founders of CA, Harvey Sacks and Emmanuel Schegloff, were interested in exploring new means of doing sociological research. While working as a fellow at the Center for the Scientific Study of Suicides, Sacks discovered some records of phone calls which were made to the center. Sacks's analyses of those phone calls are what led to the approach now known as CA (ten Have, 2007). The field of CA is greatly influenced by Harold Garfinkel, who created the methodology called "ethnomethodology" (1967) to describe the social methods by which people make sense of the world around them.

CA is concerned with how interaction is organized and how interlocutors perform various actions in interaction. According to Schegloff (1986), interaction is the "primordial site of sociality" (p. 112), and it is the means through which humans are socialized and cultures are transmitted (Clayman & Gill, 2004).

In CA, talk is viewed as an interactional accomplishment by participants who collaborate in order to achieve orderly communication (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008). CA is concerned with how interlocutors communicate and maintain intersubjectivity, that is to say, mutual understanding. Schegloff (1991b) refers to this as "socially shared cognition" (p. 160).

Mainstream sociology and CA are similar because they are both concerned with human behavior. They are different, however, because conversation analysts do not formulate a priori hypotheses to be tested. CA's focus is on the sequential environment in which interaction occurs and how the previous turn affects the next, whereas mainstream sociology focuses on how various factors such as culture and social environment affect people's cognitive and behavioral practices. The approach adopted by conversation analysts is referred to as "unmotivated looking," which means that analysts do not predetermine a particular phenomenon that they want to analyze before examining at the data. They allow the phenomenon to emerge from the data, which is revealed through detailed analyses. Analyses must be empirically grounded in the data and analysts refrain from including factors that may affect interlocutors' actions unless they are observable in the data. According to Dimulescu (2009), conversation analysts "are not concerned with the underlying social, cultural, and psychological messages that are rendered through talk, but with describing the ways in which speakers coordinate their talk to produce meaningful actions" (p. 184). That is to say, analysts are concerned with how interlocutors maintain an interactional social order.

In CA, turns are viewed in pairs or sequences and analysts examine sequences of actions, which is referred to as sequence organization (Schegloff, 2007). Researchers in the field of CA are concerned with answering the question, "why that now?" (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, p. 301) and analysts only describe elements of the interaction which the interactants orient to through their actions and talk (Schegloff, 1991a, 1992b; Drew & Heritage, 1992). In CA, two types of context are often discussed: social context and sequential context. Social

context refers to factors that may influence how participants speak, such as culture and background, that are not visible to the analyst unless the participants orient to the context through talk. Sequential context is the environment of sequential utterances produced by participants. In CA, context is said to be context-shaped and context-renewing. Context-shaped refers to interlocutors' actions being responses to preceding actions and context-renewing means that the present action is the context for the next action, and that present action constantly renews the context (Heritage, 1984). Through their actions, interlocutors display which aspects of context are relevant at any particular moment, and that context should be connected to the talk or action being performed (Schegloff, 1987). Schegloff (1992c) explains that sequential context is "proximate," "discourse," and "intra-interactional," and social context is "external" and "distal" (p. 195).

In the field of CA, when social context is claimed to be relevant to the unfolding interaction, there must be empirical evidence in the data to support the claim (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). Therefore, Schegloff (1997) maintains that in CA, analyses should be conducted based on interlocutors' orientations and responses to relevant elements of interaction. Schegloff (1991a) points out that when conducting analyses there is a "paradox of proximateness" (p. 64), which means that analysts are required to demonstrate how factors of the external environment are relevant to interlocutors and how interlocutors show through their actions that they are relevant. Potter (1998) comments that Schegloff's idea of context "starts to dissolve the traditional micro-macro distinction" (p. 31).

Conversation analysts approach data from the perspective of the participants, which is known as an emic perspective (Goodwin, 1984). This involves examining interaction in the participants own terms, which means analyzing the sequential environment in which utterances occur. Analyzing the data from the perspective of the researcher often involves the invocation of elements of social context which are not necessarily visible to the researcher.

In the following sections, I introduce some fundamental aspects of conversation, placing a focus on turn-taking, sequence organization, and repair. I will first begin by explaining turn-taking.

2.1.1 Turn-Taking

In interaction, when a speaker performs an action, often in the form of a verbal utterance, it is referred to as a turn. The basic building block of turns is called a turn constructional unit (TCU). Schegloff (2007) summarizes the general features of TCUs as follows.

1. They are lexical items, phrases, clauses, or sentences
2. They are shaped by their phonetic or intonational properties
3. They can be recognizable as performing specific actions

One of the most influential studies on turn taking was that of Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974). In their study, they sketched a basic set of rules which govern turn-taking. At the initial transition-relevance place of an initial turn-constructional unit the current speaker can select a next speaker (rule 1a), but if the current speaker does not select a next speaker, someone else can self-select and begin their turn (rule 1b). If neither rule 1a nor 1b occur, then the current speaker can, but is not obligated to, continue speaking (rule 1c). Rule 2 states that if rules 1a and 1b are not applied, and the current speaker continues to speak as stipulated in rule 1c, "then the rule set a-c re-applies at the next transition relevance place, and recursively at each next transition relevance place, until transfer is effected" (Sacks et al., 1974, p. 704).

The following extract exemplifies some of the basic features of TCUs as explained by Schegloff (2007) as well as some of the turn-taking rules described by Sacks et al. (1974). In this extract, Vivian (Viv) and her boyfriend, Shane (Sha), have invited their friends, Nancy

(Nan) and Michael (Mic), over for dinner. Sha is joking with Viv by complaining about the food that she prepared.

```
Extract 1: in Schegloff, 2007, p. 5
01       (1.1)
02 Sha:  Ah can't- Ah can't [get this thing ↓mashed.
03 Viv:                     [Aa-ow.
04       (1.2)
05 Nan:  You [do that too:? tih yer pota]toes
06 Sha:      [This one's hard ezza rock.]
07 Sha:  ↑Ye[ah.
08 Viv:     [It i:[s?
09 Sha:           [B't this thing- is ↑ha:rd.
10       (0.3)
11 Viv:  It's not do:ne th' potato?
12 Sha:  Ah don't think so,
13       (2.2)
14 Nan:→Seems done t'me how 'bout you Mi[chael,]
15 Sha:                                  [Alri'  ]who
16      cooked this mea:l
17 Mic: ·hh Little ↓bit've e-it e-ih-ih of it isn'done.
18 Sha:  Th'ts ri:ght.
19       (1.2)
```

In line 02, Sha jokingly says, "Ah can't- Ah can't get this thing ↓mashed.", to which Viv responds, "Aa-ow." Following a 1.2-second gap, Nan self-selects and asks, "You do that too:? tih yer potatoes", which, based on the content of the prior utterance, is selecting Sha as the next speaker. Lerner (2003) describes two forms of addressing used when selecting a next speaker in multiparty conversations: explicit addressing and tacit addressing. Explicit addressing is directing one's gaze at another participant and addressing them by name or other address terms. Tacit addressing refers to the selection of a next speaker based on the content of the utterance or specific circumstances. Nan's selection of Sha as the next speaker

is tacit. Sha's utterance in line 06, "This one's hard ezza rock.", is produced in overlap with Nan's turn in line 05, so is Sha answer's Nan's question, "You do that too:? tih yer potatoes", with "↑Ye[ah." in the subsequent line. In line 08, Viv self-selects and asks, "It i:s?, thereby selecting Sha as the next speaker. Sha answers in the following turn with "B't this thing- is ↑ha:rd." After Sha's turn, it is a transition relevance place, which refers to a point in a speaker's talk that may possibly be complete. This does not mean that a transition to another speaker will definitely occur, rather, it is appropriate for a speaker change to occur. At this point, Sha can continue speaking or another participant can self-select and take a turn. Sha does not continue speaking so Viv self-selects and provides a follow-up question, asking, "It's not do:ne th' potato?" Sha's reply, "Ah don't think so," is followed by a 2.2-second gap. In line 14, Nan inquires, "Seems done t'me how 'bout you Michael,". This turn consists of two TCUs, which both perform specific actions. The first TCU, "Seems done t'me" is answering Viv's question in line 11, "It's not do:ne th' potato?". The end of this TCU is not turn-final intonation and therefore projects that another TCU may come. The second TCU, "how 'bout you Michael," selects Mic as the next speaker and therefore make an answer from him relevant. Mic responds in line 17 with "·hh Little ↓bit've e-it e-ih-ih of it isn'done." This extract illustrates the various ways that participants self-select and select other participants to speak.

2.1.2 Sequence Organization

When people are engaged in conversation, they for the most part respond to the immediately preceding turn, which exhibits their understanding of that turn. For example, if a speaker provides an answer, it shows that they understood the previous turn as a question. Thus, in every turn speakers display how they understood, or in some cases, misunderstood, the preceding turn. When misunderstandings occur, speakers can use a resource referred to as

repair in order to achieve mutual understanding (Schegloff, 1992a).

TCUs are units of action that help participants to project whether or not a transition relevance place is coming, that is, the turn is coming to a potential zone of completion. TCUs that select a next speaker make a particular action relevant by that speaker. This is what is referred to as "conditional relevance" and it forms the foundation of what is called an "adjacency pair" (Schegloff, 2007). The most basic form of an adjacency pair is as follows:

A: First pair part (FPP)

B: Second pair part (FPP)

Schegloff and Sacks (1973) explain that adjacency pairs have the following five general characteristics:

1. Consists of two utterances
2. The utterances are adjacent to each other
3. The two utterances are produced by different speakers
4. The first pair part (FPP) comes before the second pair part (SPP)
5. A particular type of FPP requires a relevant type of SPP (e.g., question-answer, greeting-greeting, summons-answer, etcetera)

The following extract shows how an adjacency pair works in an actual conversation. Extract 2 is an adjacency pair in its simplest form: a question immediately followed by an answer.

```
Extract 2: in Liddicoat, 2007, p. 107
01   John:  What time's it?
02  Betty:  Three uh clock.
```

In this extract, John produces the FPP in line 01, "What time's it?, which is followed by the SPP, Betty's answer, "Three uh clock."

2.1.3 Repair

In the field of CA, repair refers to the methods that interactants use to deal with problems of speaking, hearing, or understanding. Repair is not limited to fixing errors or mistakes, rather, it is also a resource that is used by interlocutors when there is a problem of intersubjectivity, which is how interlocutors demonstrate their understanding of each other's actions (Schegloff, 1992a). Repair consists of two basic components: a repair initiation and a repair proper, which can be thought of as the solution to the problem.

In their pioneering study on repair, Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) outlined four types of repair. They are (a) self-initiated self-repair, (b) self-initiated other repair, (c) other-initiated self-repair, and (d) other-initiated other-repair. "Self" refers to the person who produced the trouble source and "other" denotes the recipient of the action or talk. Repair can occur in the same turn as the trouble source, in the transition space, in the second position, in the third turn, in the third position, and in the fourth position. The locations of repair refer to the places in which repair occurs relative to the trouble source. Repair will be discussed in detail in the next section, a review of research on repair pertinent to this dissertation.

2.1.4 Summary

Conversation analysis is concerned with uncovering how interaction is organized as well as the resources that interlocutors use in order to achieve intersubjectivity. Contrary to other disciplines which analyze language and interaction as cognitive processes or actions that are a priori determined to be influenced by non-observable factors such as culture, CA analyzes interaction from an emic perspective, the perspective of the participants, and focuses on the observable features of interaction and how interlocutors orient to each other's verbal and non-verbal actions at the time that they occur. Some of the fundamental aspects of conversation discussed in this section were turn-taking, sequence organization, and repair.

2.2 Institutional Interaction

In the field of CA, a distinction is often made between mundane interaction and institutional interaction. Mundane interaction, or everyday conversation, "has come to denote forms of interaction that are not confined to specialized settings or to the execution of particular tasks" (Heritage, 2004, p. 104). Institutional interaction refers to interaction in specialized settings, such as classrooms, hospitals, and meetings in which there are specific goals to accomplish (Takagi, Hosoda, & Morita, 2016). Previous CA research has investigated the interactional intricacies of various institutional contexts, such as news interviews (e.g., Heritage & Clayman, 2002), medical interaction (e.g., Heritage & Lindström, 1998; Heritage & Maynard, 2006), and classroom interaction (e.g., Pekarek-Doehler & Fasel-Lauzon, 2015). According to Heritage (1997), there are:

> at least two kinds of conversation analytic research going on today, and, though they overlap in various ways, they are distinct in focus. The first examines the institution of interaction as an entity in its own right; the second studies the management of social institutions in interaction. (p. 162)

In other words, CA research is concerned with how social interaction is organized in a variety of everyday non-institutional situations (institutions of interaction) as well as how interaction is organized in institutional environments in which talk may be restricted or regulated by certain circumstantial conditions (institutional interaction).

Heritage (2004) outlines the following characteristics of institutional interaction:

1. Institutional interaction normally involves the participants in specific goal orientations which are tied to their institution-relevant identities: doctor and patient, teacher and pupil, etc.
2. Institutional interaction involves special constraints on what will be treated as allowable contributions to the business at hand.

3. Institutional talk is associated with inferential frameworks and procedures that are particular to specific interactional contexts. (pp. 224-225)

In classroom interaction, for example, there are often pedagogical goals which dictate the content of the interaction as well as how the interaction will proceed. It is often the teacher who talks or who decides who speaks when and about what and students are often selected to answer known-answer questions about the content being discussed or to perform particular tasks. Different institutional contexts are comprised of elements that are specific to that context, such as institutional identities, which often impact how the interaction proceeds. The following extract exhibits the three characteristics described by Heritage (2004). The extract comes from interaction in a Norwegian elementary school. The teacher is listed as T and the language learners are listed as LL.

```
Extract 3: in Seedhouse, 2004, p. 102
01 T: now I want everybody (.) to listen to me. (1.8) and when I say you are
02    going to say after me, (.) you are going to say what I say. (.)°we can try.°
03 T: I've got a lamp. a lamp. <say after me> I've got a lamp.
04 LL:I've got a lamp.
05 T: (.) I've got a glass, a glass, <say after me> I've got a glass
06 LL:I've got a glass
07 T: I've got a vase, a vase <say after me> I've got a vase
08 LL: I've got a vase
```

In this activity, the teacher's proclaimed goal is to have the students produce the expression, "I've got ...." In lines 01 and 02, T gives instructions to the students, explaining, "now I want everybody to listen to me. and when I say you are going to say after me, (.) you are going to say what I say. (.) °we can try.°" T selects what they are going to do and when they are going to do it, as well as who is going to speak and when. In line 03, T provides the students with a prompt, "I've got a lamp. a lamp. <say after me> I've got a lamp.", thereby selecting them to

produce the next turn. The teacher's prompt, "I've got a lamp.", as well as their instruction to "<say after me>" limit the type of response in the next turn. Following T's turn, the students repeat, "I've got a lamp." The interactional pattern shown in this extract is just one type of pattern specific to classroom interaction, but it reveals how participants orient to their institutional identities of teacher and student, the constraints regarding what type of contributions are appropriate, and how interaction is accomplished in a classroom framework.

In institutional interaction, institutional roles and identities constructed and oriented to during the interaction are of extreme importance. They affect the fundamental organization of the interaction as well as other elements of the interaction, such as turn-taking and turn design. This is discussed further in the following section.

2.2.1 Identity and its Relation to Institutional Interaction

In institutional interaction, participant identities, which are made relevant through the interaction, often affect who speaks when and who is able to select the next speaker. Schegloff (1999a) points out that in the field of CA, all of the interlocutors are treated as equal, as evinced by the use of the word "participant" in analyses. He comments, however, that although participants are viewed as equal, category terms for institutional roles and discourse identities, such as caller and answerer, are used when they are related to the interaction. Antaki and Widdicombe (1998) summarize the tenets of identity as follows:

1. For a person to 'have an identity'—whether he or she is the person speaking, being spoken to, or being spoken about—is to be cast into a category with associated characteristics or features.
2. Such casting is indexical and occasioned.
3. It makes relevant the identity to the interactional business going on.
4. The force of 'having an identity' is in its consequentiality in the interaction; and

5. All this is visible in people's exploitation of the structures of conversation. (p. 3)

Some of the activities associated with the membership category, "teacher," for example, are lecturing in a classroom, deciding who speaks when and about what, holding epistemic primacy regarding the subject being taught, and demonstrating this epistemic primacy by asking known-answer questions to students and then assessing the answers. Participant identities are visible through their actions, or sometimes inactions, and these identities are oriented to by participants and affect various elements of the interaction, such as turn-taking. Regarding membership categorization, Antaki and Widdicombe (1998) assert that:

> The ethnomethodological spirit is to take it that the identity category, the characteristics it affords, and what consequences follow, are all knowable to the analyst only through the understandings displayed by the interactants themselves. Membership of a category is ascribed (and rejected), avowed (and disavowed), displayed (and ignored) in local places and at certain times, and it does these things as part of the interactional work that constitutes people's lives. (p. 2)

This implies that the characteristics of a certain category are known to the analyst often because they are a member of the society in which that is common knowledge. In the field of CA, it is common practice to label interlocutors based on their membership categories (Liddicoat, 2007). In this study as well, participants are labeled based on their emergent membership categories.

2.2.2 Classroom Interaction

Institutional interaction differs from that of mundane interaction because in institutional interaction there is often a pre-established turn-taking system and a pre-determined topic to be discussed (Heritage & Clayman, 2010). Also, the interactional rights of the participants in classroom interaction are different from that of mundane

conversation (Drew & Heritage, 1992). Depending on the particular type of institution and the identities of the participants, there may be restrictions on who may talk and when. Heritage (2004) points out that in institutional interaction there are often differences in the level of participation among participants, the way that turns are organized and designed, and the way interaction is structured. CA research on interaction in educational institutions deals with how interaction is organized as well as how interactants accomplish "goal-oriented actions" (Heritage, 2004, p. 14).

In teacher-fronted classroom interaction, it is often the teacher who speaks the majority of the time and who selects who speaks next. Teachers hold a higher epistemic status, the "K+" (Heritage, 2012, p. 4) position, as demonstrated, for example, by the way that they judge if a student's answer is accurate or not. In classroom interaction, teachers often ask questions, students produce responses, and teachers provide feedback often in the form of words such as "great" or "good job." This three-part sequence, which was first discussed by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), is known as the Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) sequence. It has also been referred to as Question-Answer-Comment (QAC) (Mchoul, 1978), Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) (Mehan, 1979), and triadic dialogue (Lemke, 1990), and is frequently discussed in studies on classroom discourse (e.g., Macbeth, 2000). Walsh (2011) points out that the IRF sequence is "the most commonly occurring discourse structure to be found in classrooms all over the world" (p. 23).

The F turn of the IRF sequence is where feedback is provided by the teacher. However, teachers do not always give feedback. Seedhouse (2004) asserts that even when teachers do not give explicit positive feedback, it is implied. The following is an example of an IRF sequence in a language classroom.

```
Extract 4: in Waring, 2008, p. 582
01    T:  °Good.° Number six, Yuka?
02        (0.8)
```

```
03 Yuka: ((reading)) >oh< come o::::n. You really play the saxophone
04       (0.5)
05       How lo:ng (.) have you been playing the sa- the saxophone.=
06    T: =The ↓saxophone.↓Very good. °very good.° Number seven? Miyuki?
```

In this extract, T, the teacher, initiates the sequence (I) in line 01, and Yuka provides a response (R), which in this activity involves reading a passage, and then producing a question about that passage. This is followed by the teacher's feedback (F), "Very good. °very good.°"

Classroom interaction is different from mundane and other institutional interaction in a variety of ways. For example, the types of questions as well as how questions and turns are designed are markedly different. In classroom interaction teachers often ask known-answer questions (Heritage, 2005; Hosoda, 2014, 2015; Lerner, 1995; Schegloff, 2007) and produce designedly incomplete utterances (Koshik, 2002) with the expectation that students complete them, and with the assumption that this completion displays their knowledge.

The expression, "classroom interaction," is often used to mean traditional teacher-fronted classroom interaction. In classroom interaction, as observed by Erickson (2004), it is often the teacher who decides the topic to be discussed, who speaks when, as well as the amount of attention given to each student. In classroom interaction since it is the teacher who holds the interactional rights to decide who speaks when and about what, there is frequently a disproportionate number of turns taken by the teacher as well as a significant difference in talk time between teachers and students. Consequently, in order to give students time to participate in interaction, many language classrooms consist of activities in which students practice dialogues together.

The data used in this dissertation come from a university language lounge, which highly resembles a language classroom in regards to the fundamental aspects of conversation, namely turn-taking, repair, and overall organization. Therefore, in the following sections I will discuss some of the general features of turn-taking, repair, and the organization of

language classroom interaction.

2.2.2.1 Turn-Taking in Language Classrooms

In language classroom interaction, teachers often control the topic of discussion as well as who takes turns when (Walsh, 2006). Seedhouse (2004) describes various contexts (e.g., procedural, meaning and fluency, form and accuracy, and task-oriented) which affect how turns are taken. Seedhouse asserts that the pedagogical focus affects how turns as well as the overall interaction are organized. In order to demonstrate how the pedagogical focus affects the organization of turn-taking, I will present extracts from form and accuracy contexts and procedural contexts.

2.2.2.1.1 Form and Accuracy Contexts

In language classrooms, teachers often teach a linguistic item such as a grammar structure or expression as well as how to alter them using other lexical items. Prior to the following extract, the teacher, T, taught the students the expression, "I've got...," as well as how to answer the question, "Have you got...?" using "Yes, I have."

```
Extract 5: in Seedhouse, 1996, p. 473
01    T:   I have. fine. I've got a trumpet. >have you got a Trumpet Anna?<
02 L15:    eh er erm °yes I have°
03    T:   I've got a radio. have you got a radio e:r (.) e:r Alvin?
04 L16:    yes I have
```

In this extract, T produces a prompt which is then followed by a student response using the expression that T taught. In line 01, T states, "have you got a trumpet Anna?" to which L15, the student, replies, "yes I have."

Typically, in classroom interaction it is the teacher who speaks for extended periods of

time. However, many language classrooms are often task-based, and the teacher does not always produce extended turns as seen, for example, in an economics course. Hellermann (2008) argues that when most people think of classroom interaction, they think of teacher-student interaction and rarely consider the interaction among students working on peer learning activities. In language classrooms, after teaching a particular linguistic item, teachers sometimes instruct students to practice in pairs or groups the grammar structure or expression that was just taught. In the following extract, the students, L21 and L22, are practicing expressions that were taught earlier in the interaction by the teacher.

```
Extract 6: in Seedhouse, 1996, p. 473
01 L21:   I've got a radio. have you got a radio?
02 L22:   yes.
03 L21:   what?
04 L22:   yes I have. I've got a book. have you got a book?
05 L21:   yes I have.
```

In this task, students L21 and L22 are using the expressions "I've got...," "Have you got...?" and "yes I have." This extract illustrates two things. First, it shows how the type of activity can constrain who speaks when as well as the type of sequences produced. Second, it shows that language classroom interaction does not always consist of a teacher speaking for an extended period of time while students just listen.

Markee (2000) points out that in language classrooms interaction sometimes resembles ordinary conversation during group work among students. He presents the following extract in order to show how students in language classrooms orient to having equal rights to take turns during activities with their peers.

```
Extract 7: in Markee, 2000, p. 91-92
74  L10:  *shall we write it?
```

```
75          (++)
76   L10:    that on //the line//
77    L9:             //do you  // have uh the information to write
78   L10:    <hhh>
79    L9:     ok
80            (2)
81    L9:    *(I don't write you go right ahead)
82    L?:     ((cough))
83            (+)
84   L11:    *uh:m you- how about you read
85    L?:     uh
86   L11:     these two
87            (+)
88    L9:     yeah
89   L11:     *you- you read //these two//
90   L10:                    //these two//
91    L9:     ((cough))
92   L11:     pa//ragraph//
93    L9:       //paragraph//
94   L10:     ok
95   L11:     *and (+) I read (+) these (+) uh- I read (++) you've already finished?=
96   L10:     =yeah yeah
97    L9:     yeah
              (NM: Class 1, group 3)
```

In this extract, the students orient to their equal statuses as demonstrated by the fact that they are freely taking turns and selecting next speakers. Markee (2000) further comments that although the students self-select to initiate turns as in mundane conversation, in this interaction the teacher has decided the content to be discussed as well as the length of the interaction.

2.2.2.1.2 Procedural Contexts

Another type of context that occurs in language classrooms, which is similar to

non-language classrooms in the sense that teacher turns can sometimes be extended, is called procedural context. This refers to information given to students by the teacher that is needed in order to perform classroom activities. In procedural contexts teacher turns are often extended monologues (Seedhouse, 2004). The following extract is an example of one such monologue.

Extract 8: in Seedhouse, 1996, p. 373

```
01 T: I'd like you to discuss the following statements. and then you read them,>I
02    don't read them, those for you. if there are words you're not sure of (1.0) in
03    these statements you can ask me. but the ((coughs)) statement and you can
04    pick out the statements you want to erm start with. you don't have to do it
05    in in the (.) way in the (.) way ((coughs)) I have written them. so if you
06    find out that one of them erm you'd like to discuss more thoroughly you just pick
07    out the the statement that you think is the most (.) or is easier to discuss. (1.0)
08    maybe there will be so much (.) disagreement that you will only be able to
09    discuss two or three of them, that's what I hope. (.) so if you just start now
10    forming the groups, (1.0) should I help you to do that? ((T divides learners into
11    groups))
```

This extract exhibits how teacher turns can be extended when giving students directions required for performing activities. Extended turns such as these are rarely deployed by students in teacher-fronted classroom interaction as students usually only provide minimal responses to teacher questions. Student turns may occasionally be lengthy if they are doing a role play or doing group work with other students.

2.2.2.2 Repair in Language Classrooms

Repair in language classrooms can differ from that of repair in mundane conversation in a variety of ways. Because the teacher in language classrooms is often the expert in regard to the language being taught, they hold a higher epistemic status than that of the students. In

addition, they hold different statuses with regards to their turn-taking rights and this can affect how and where repair can occur. This leads to the possibility for the higher occurrence of other-initiated other-repair in language classrooms compared with that of mundane conversation. In language classrooms it is most often the teacher who repairs student utterances and rarely does the opposite occur. In conversation, there is a preference for self-repair and when others do initiate repair, it is often mitigated. The following extract demonstrates how T, the teacher, performs other-initiated other-repair on a student's utterance, initiating the repair using an unmitigated "no."

```
Extract 9: in Jung, 1999, p. 164
01   T:   Another grain product?
02  LL:   Ummmmm..um..
03  L3:   Beans.=
04  L4:   =Sugar.
05   T:   E:r=
06  L6:   =Sugar?=
07   T:   =Sugar, we don't think of sugar as a grain.
08  L3:   Beans?
09  LL:   ((unint))
10   T:   No, actually I'll bring you some examples tomorrow.
11  L5:   Spaghetti?
12   T:   O::ats, barle::y. ((turning her back and starting to write
13         "oats, barley" on the board at the same time))
14   T:   Err, you've got several, I think, in your Oxford Picture
15        Dictionary, you got some pictures of them. But, I'll bring
16        some, er, in the class tomorrow. Milk products? More milk
17        products?
```

In this extract, the teacher is asking the students to name some grain products. A few students attempt to provide answers, but they are treated as inappropriate. Following L3's turn in line 08 in which the student suggests, "Beans?", and LL's unintelligible turn in line 09, T performs repair with an unmitigated "no", which is extremely rare not only in classrooms, but in

mundane conversation and other institutional settings as well. After the students do not produce a correct answer, T gives some examples of grain products in line 12, stating, "oats, barley." T performs unmitigated repair using "no."

2.2.2.3 The Organization of Interaction in Language Classrooms

Seedhouse (2004) argues that the organization of classroom interaction is shaped by the pedagogical goals and that language classroom interaction has three features which stem from these goals. They are as follows:

1. Language is both the vehicle and object of instruction.
2. There is a reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction, and interactants constantly display their analyses of the evolving relationship between pedagogy and interaction.
3. The linguistic forms and patterns of interaction which the learners produce in the L2 are potentially subject to evaluation by the teacher in some way. (p. 183-184)

The following extract shows the three features discussed by Seedhouse (2004) as well as how the pedagogical goal can affect the organization of interaction. In this extract, T says, "I've got ...," and then selects a student to say what he possesses using the same expression.

```
Extract 10: in Seedhouse, 1996, p. 472
01  T:  now again(1.0) listen to me (1.0) <I've got a lamp>
02 LL:  [I've got] a lamp
03  T:  [wha-]
04  T:  don't repeat now, don't say after me now. alright I say it and you and you
05      just listen. I've got a lamp. what have you got? (1.0) raise your hands.
06      what have you got Eirik?
07 L1:  e:r I've=
08  T:  =can you say=
09 L1:  =I've got a book.=
10  T:  =alright, fine. I've got a telephone. what have you got? (2.5) Trygve.
```

```
11 L2: I've got a hammer.
```

In this interaction, the language being taught is English and it is also the language of instruction. In line 01, T produces the target structure, "I've got a lamp," which is repeated by students in the subsequent turn. T again repeats the same sentence, but this time it is followed by the question, "what have you got?" in line 05. After asking the students to raise their hands, T selects a student, L1, to answer the question in line 06. L1 produces the sentence, "I've got a book" in line 09, and it is turns such as these that are subject to evaluation by teachers. T provides his evaluation of L1's utterance in the subsequent turn with "alright, fine."

In classroom interaction, there are a variety of activities and pedagogical goals, and depending on which one is the focus of the interaction, the organization of the interaction is greatly affected. This extract is just one example which demonstrates how the pedagogical focus can affect the structure of how and when turns are taken as well as what type of turns are produced. The goal of this activity is to get students to produce sentences using the lexical stem, "I've got..." The teacher presents the target structure and then asks a question which allows students to use that structure. Once the student produces a sentence using the target structure, the teacher provides feedback, which closes that sequence.

2.2.3 Summary

Institutional interaction denotes interaction in settings such as workplaces, courtrooms, and classrooms. Institutional interaction differs from mundane interaction in that participants are oriented to a specific goal and their institutional identities are relevant to the interaction at hand. In addition to participants' identities, constraints specific to various settings affect the fundamental elements of interaction, such as turn-taking and turn design.

2.3 Repair

One fundamental aspect of interaction is that, as Sacks (1984) formulates it, "there is order at all points" (p. 22). By this he means that interaction is not as chaotic as it may seem on the surface. In reality, it is quite the contrary; it is extremely organized. When order fails or problems arise, participants will employ repair to deal with those problems. In the field of conversation analysis, repair refers to "practices for dealing with problems or troubles in speaking, hearing and understanding the talk in conversation" (Schegloff, 1997a, p. 503). The word "correction" is generally understood as meaning replacing an error or mistake with the correct word, but repair is a more general term that also involves fixing utterances that are not necessarily "mistakes" or "errors" (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 363).

The CA term "repair" can be used to describe the action that occurs when a speaker is unable to produce a word or name at the time of speaking, and it can also be used to describe a problem in hearing because of surrounding noise, or the performance of a confirmation check (Schegloff, 2000). Repair can also refer to actions such as requests for clarification (Drew, 1997), confirmation or understanding checks (Wong, 2000a), and word searches (Schegloff, 1979). Even though repair sequences often emerge in order to attain intersubjectivity in social interaction, for many years it received little attention in the field of applied linguistics. However, when it did receive attention, the focus was on error correction and not on other facets of repair (Schegloff et al., 1977). As seen in the extract below, repair sometimes occurs even when an error or mistake is not present.

```
Extract 11: GTS:1:2:11, in Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 363
01   Ken:→ Sure enough ten minutes later the bell r-
02       → the doorbell rang
```

In line 01, Ken treats the word "bell" as problematic and performs repair in line 02, replacing "bell" with "doorbell", a clarification of the type of bell.

Schegloff (1992a) remarks that intersubjectivity is achieved locally and that socialization cannot provide a solution for individuals to obtain intersubjectivity in all contexts. He adds that the defense of intersubjectivity is "procedural," "party administered," "locally managed," "locally adapted," and "recipient designed" (p. 1338), and that the organization of repair "involves a self-righting mechanism built in as an integral part of the organization of talk-in-interaction" (p. 1299). The organization of repair is highly effective in handling problems that arise in interaction (Schegloff, 2000). The action of repair can take precedent over the next item (e.g., the next TCU or turn) which would have come if something problematic had not occurred. Because repair sometimes occurs within sentences, it can rearrange the order of words, thus altering their structure (Schegloff, 1979). The problematic part of an utterance that is repaired is referred to as the trouble source or repairable, and Schegloff et al. (1977) remark that nothing is "excludable from the class 'repairable'" (p. 363).

Repair consists of two segments, a repair initiation and a repair proper (Schegloff et al., 1977; Schegloff, 2000), and is concerned with who performs the repair initiation and who performs the repair proper. The repair initiation, which refers to the start of the repair, marks a "possible disjunction with the immediately preceding talk" (Schegloff, 2000, p. 207). Repair proper refers to the production of the repair itself, which can be thought of as "solving or completing" (Schegloff, 1987, p. 210) the problem.

There are four types of repair: self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, other-initiated self-repair, and other-initiated other-repair. Here, the word "self" refers to the speaker of the trouble source and "other" refers to an interlocutor other than the speaker of the trouble source. Each of the types of repair will be explained in detail later in this chapter.

Repair is restricted by the opportunity space in which it can occur. The space surrounding the trouble source is where the repair initiation often occurs and the repair proper

is often performed in proximity to the repair initiation (Schegloff, 2009).

2.3.1 Types of Repair Initiation

This section describes two types of repair initiation as well as various resources used to initiate repair. Repair can be initiated both by the speaker of the trouble source (self-initiated repair) and by a participant other than the speaker of the trouble source (other-initiated repair). Schegloff et al. (1977) state that the positions of the opportunities for self- and other-initiated repair are "organizationally designed" and that the ordering "is the product of an organization that relates the positions to each other" (p. 373). Opportunities for self-initiated repair and other-initiated repair occur in succession, meaning that the opportunity for self-initiated repair precedes the opportunity for other-initiated repair (Schegloff et al., 1977). I will first discuss self-initiated repair.

2.3.1.1 Self-Initiated Repair

Most self-initiated repair occurs in the same turn as the trouble source and most other-initiated repair occurs in the turn just subsequent to the trouble source. Trouble source speakers sometimes temporarily halt the turn-in-progress in order to initiate repair. There is a preference for self-initiated repair over other-initiated repair, which is due to the fact that the opportunities for self-initiation precede the opportunities for other-initiation. Self-initiations of repair often contain speech perturbations, such as cut-offs, sound stretches, and uhs, which indicate that a repair may follow. Self-initiated repair generally occurs in three main locations: (a) the turn which contains the trouble source, (b) the transition space, and (c) the third turn from the trouble source turn. Most self-initiated repairs are performed in the same turn as the trouble source turn and in most cases the repair is successfully carried out in the same turn. Self-initiated repairs that occur in the transition space or in the third turn also

generally solve whatever is problematic (Schegloff et al., 1977). The following extract is an example of a repair initiation that occurs in the same turn as the trouble source.

```
Extract 12: Post-party:11, in Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 366
01   Deb:   Kin you wait til we get home? We'll be home in five minutes
02  Anne:   Ev//en less th'n that.
03 Naomi:→ But c'd we- c'd we stay u:p?
04          (0.2)
05 Naomi:   once we get // home,
06 Marty:   For a few minutes,
07   Deb:   Once you get yer nightgown o:n
```

In this extract, the trouble source turn is line 03, in which Naomi restates, "c'd we," thereby performing repair in the same turn.

In the following extract, the self-initiation of repair occurs in the transition space, or transition relevance place, which refers to the space just after "the possible completion of a first TCU in a turn [where the] transition to a next speaker can become relevant (Schegloff, 2007, p.4).

```
Extract 13: MO, Family Dinner:1:9, in Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 366, Simplified
01   J:   He's stage manager
02        (2.0)
03   J:→  He's actually first assistant but- he's calling the show.
04   J:→  They take turns=
05   J:→  =he and the production manager take turns calling the show
```

In line 03, J states, "he's calling the show.", which is a complete TCU. At the transition relevance space in lines 04 and 05, he repairs his original turn, saying, "They take turns" and "he and the production manager take turns calling the show".

The next extract illustrates how self-initiation of repair can occur in the third turn in

relation to the turn which contains the trouble source.

```
Extract 14: SBL:1:1:12:11, in Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 366
01 Hannah:   And he's going to make his own paintings.
02    Bea:   Mm hm,
03 Hannah:→ And- or I mean his own frames
04    Bea:   Yeah
```

This extract begins with Hannah saying, "And he's going to make his own paintings". Following Bea's minimal response in line 02, which does not problematize the prior turn, Hannah self-initiates repair in the third turn, line 03, with "And- or I mean his own frames".

One type of self-initiated repair is called a word search, which can occur when a speaker is unable to come up with a linguistic item at the time of speaking (Schegloff et al., 1977). The problem in producing a linguistic item is often displayed through the use of phrases such as, "what's it called," "whatchamacallit," "what's her name again," as well as fillers, such as "uh:::", "hm:::", and so on. In CA, word searches are not viewed as a cognitive process, rather as an interactional practice (Brouwer, 2003) that is visible both to the participants in the interaction and the analyst. Word searches are a form of self-initiated repair and because there is a preference for self-repair, word searches which appear to be questions, often do not receive answers (Brouwer, 2003). Word searches are sometimes accompanied by gestures which help other participants in projecting the word that is being searched for (Hayashi, 2003). Goodwin and Goodwin (1986) examined interaction among native speakers of English and discovered that the participant doing the word search will look away from the recipient of the talk and display a "thinking face," but that when they wish to solicit help from a participant they will gaze at that person.

Lerner and Kitzinger (2015) analyzed self-initiated repairs in American and British English prefaced with "or," and found that trouble sources followed by or-prefaced

alternatives are not treated as completely irrelevant. Rather, the repair coming after the "or" can be viewed as the preferred alternative. The analysis revealed that the "or" serves to connect the trouble source and repair and signals that an alternative will follow. The alternative is sometimes similar to the trouble source and its production draws attention to the trouble source. They do note, however, that "or" is not always used to preface repair.

Laakso and Sorjonen (2010) studied how cut-offs and the particles, "*siis* (since)," "*tai* (or)," and "*ei ku* (negation word + conjunction)," are used in self-initiated repair in Finnish interaction. They discovered that cut-offs were the most prevalent type of repair initiations in their data. Out of the three particles, "*tai*" was most frequently used when replacements proffered as alternatives were involved; "*eiku*" was most often used when speakers abandoned the previous utterance or the construction in progress, and that although "*siis*" was used when speakers replaced a lexical item and abandoned a previous utterance, its use was not as common as that of "*tai*" and "*siis*."

2.3.1.2 Other-Initiated Repair

Repair initiations initiated by a participant other than the speaker of the trouble source, which is referred to as other-initiated repair (Schegloff, 1997a), generally occur in the turn just after the trouble source, but, as I discuss in the next section, they sometimes occur in the fourth position in relation to the trouble source (Schegloff, 1992a). Repair initiations which occur in the turn just subsequent to the trouble source were originally referred to as next turn repair initiations, or NTRI, by Schegloff et al. (1977). Other-initiated repair may be initiated through a variety of interactional resources. One type of such resource is called "open class repair initiators" (Drew, 1997). These repair initiators consist of words such as "huh," "what" (Schegloff, et al., 1977), "pardon," "sorry" (Robinson, 2006), "what do you mean," "are you serious" (Schegloff, 2000), "*bitte*" ("pardon" in German) (Egbert, 2004), and so on. In various

languages, interjections such as "huh?" have similar phonetic patterns (Dingemanse, Torreira, & Enfield, 2013) and in their study of eleven languages, Dingemanse, Blythe, and Dirksmeyer (2014) revealed resemblances in the ways in which repair is initiated across languages.

Words such as "when," "where," and "who," also known as "class-specific question words" (Sidnell, 2010, p. 124), or "category-specific question words" (Schegloff, 1997a, p. 504), can also be used to initiate repair. These repair initiators are stronger than open-class repair initiators in their ability to locate the trouble source. Previous research has shown that repair can be initiated by using other strong repair initiation resources, such as repeating part of the trouble source turn (e.g., Wu, 2009), repeating part of the trouble source turn followed by a question word (e.g., Sidnell, 2011), "you mean" followed by a candidate understanding of the previous turn (Schegloff et al., 1977), interrogative clauses (e.g., Koshik, 2005b), and candidate understandings (e.g., Antaki, 2012). Other-initiated repair can be performed to reject, show disalignment, question, disagree, and so on (Schegloff, 1997a). Repair can also be initiated in the form of a question, such as "what did you say?" (Enfield, Stivers, & Levinson, 2010, p. 2615). The following is an example of an other-initiation of repair using the open-class repair initiator, "huh."

```
Extract 15: CD:SP, in Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 367
01   D:   Wul did'e ever get married 'r anything?
02   C:→  Hu:h?
03   D:   Did jee ever get married?
04   C:   I have // no idea.
```

In line 01, D states, "Wul did'e ever get married 'r anything?", which is followed by C's other-initiated repair, "Hu:h?" Schegloff (1997a) remarks that "huh" is the weakest of the repair initiators because of its minimal ability to help the producer of the previous turn locate

the trouble source.

The extract below demonstrates how a class-specific repair initiator can be used to initiate repair. In line 03, F initiates repair with the class-specific repair initiator, "who."

Extract 16: KC-4:3-4, in Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 367-368

```
01   F:   This is nice, did you make this?
02   K:   No, Samu made that.
03   F:→  Who?
04   K:   Samu.
```

The interaction begins with F stating, "This is nice, did you make this?", which is followed by K's response, "No, Samu made that." In the subsequent turn F initiates repair with "Who?" The class-specific repair initiator "Who" used in this extract is stronger than the "Hu:h" employed in Extract 15 with regard to its ability to locate the trouble source. "Hu:h" does not identify the problematic part of the previous turn, whereas "Who" points to the name of the person as being the trouble source.

In the following extract, Bob, the recipient of the talk, initiates repair by repeating part of the trouble source turn followed by the question word, "what."

Extract 17: BH:1A:14, in Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 368

```
01   Sue:   Yeah we used to live, on the highway, too. And when we first moved
02          up there, it was terrible sleeping because all these semis were going
03          by at night.
04          ((short silence))
05   Bob:→  All the what?
06   Sue:   Semis
07   Bob:   Oh
```

The trouble source in this interaction is the word, "semis", which Sue produced in line 02. After Sue finishes her turn in the following line, there is a short silence, after which Bob initiates repair by repeating the "All" from Sue's turn plus the word, "the", followed by the

question word, "what?" "All the" creates a context for Sue and helps to identify the word that follows as problematic. Sue repeats "Semis" in the subsequent turn and Bob accepts it with "Oh" in line 07.

The next extract illustrates how a partial repeat of the trouble source turn can be used to initiate repair.

```
Extract 18: TG:15-16, in Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 368
01   A:   Well Monday, lemme think. Monday, Wednesday, an' Fridays I'm
02        home by one ten
03   B:→  One ten?
04   A:   Two o'clock. My class ends one ten.
```

The interaction begins with A saying, "Well Monday, lemme think. Monday, Wednesday, an' Fridays I'm home by one ten". B initiates repair on A's turn by repeating part of it, asking, "One ten?" Partial repetitions such as these can help to pinpoint the trouble source. In the next turn, A repairs his utterance, answering that he is home by "Two o'clock", and clarifying, "My class ends one ten."

As shown in Extract 19, "y' mean" or "you mean" plus a candidate understanding can be used by a participant other than the speaker of the trouble source to initiate repair.

```
Extract 19: JS:II:97, in Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 378
01  Lori:   But y'know single beds'r awfully thin tuh sleep on
02   Sam:   What?
03  Lori:   Single beds. // They're-
04   Sam:→  Y'mean narrow?
05  Lori:   They're awfully narrow // yeah
```

This extract begins with Lori commenting, "But y'know single beds'r awfully thin tuh sleep on". Sam initiates repair with "What" in the subsequent turn, which does not clearly locate

the trouble source. Lori answers, "Single beds. They're-", which is followed by another repair initiation, "Y'mean" plus the candidate understanding "narrow". This helps Lori to identify the word "thin" as being problematic. Lori accepts the candidate understanding in line 05 with "They're awfully narrow yeah". Benjamin (2012) examined how the phrase "you mean" is used to perform an understanding check, a type of repair initiation, as well as how it aids in identifying the trouble source when the repair initiation is not produced immediately following the TCU that contains the trouble source. Repair is frequently initiated in the next turn, but in cases when it is not, the participant initiating repair may need to use resources to locate the source of trouble. Benjamin (2012) comments that one such resource is the phrase "you mean." He explains that "you mean" is sometimes used when performing an understanding check as it helps to locate the trouble source when there is a distance between the trouble source and repair initiation. He found that when "you mean" is used with understanding checks that require confirmation from the speaker of the trouble source, it is other-initiated self-repair. He notes, however, that "you mean" can also be used in other-corrections, as described by Schegloff et al. (1977).

As the following extract demonstrates, participants other than the speaker of the trouble source sometimes withhold repair initiations (Jefferson, 1972) until a problematic turn in progress is completed.

```
Extract 20: in Jefferson, 1972, p. 295
01 Steven: One, two, three, ((pause)) four, five, six, eleven, ((pause)) eleven, eight
02         nine ten.
03  Susan: "Eleven"?-eight, nine, ten?
04 Steven: Eleven, eight, nine, ten.
05  Susan: "Eleven"?
06 Steven: Seven, eight, nine, ten.
07  Susan: That's better
```

Although Susan could have interrupted Steven's turn in progress to initiate repair, she waits, or withholds, until he is finished. She does not interrupt his turn, which Jefferson (1984) describes as "starting up 'in the midst of' another's turn at talk, not letting the other finish" (p. 16). Several other studies (e.g., Radford, 2010a, 2010b) have shown that withholding correction and providing prompts to students can create additional opportunities for them to perform self-repair and produce an answer.

As evinced in numerous CA studies (e.g., Schegloff et al., 1977), there is a preference for self-repair, so in most cases it is the producer of the trouble source who is chosen to perform the repair. However, examining multiparty interaction, Bolden (2011) shows how a participant who is not the producer of the trouble source is sometimes selected to perform repair. She refers to this as "other-selection" (p. 239) and asserts that this occurs in situations when the participants treat the speaker selected to do repair as having the knowledge needed to perform the repair and when the participants are trying to avoid disturbing the progressivity of the interaction. An example of other-selection can be seen in the following extract.

```
Extract 21: in Bolden, 2011, p. 254
01 VIV:   ((to Shane)) [Meanwhile yih doing a scene with Jimmy,
02         a rehearsed one, (0.4) [en you hav'n ev'n: nex' ↑week=
                                  [((Mic looks towards Shane))
03  VIV:   =en you hav'n even,
04  SHA:   ( [ ]
05  MIC:→    [Nex  [week yer doing it?  ((to Shane))
06 VIV:             [(spoken to um)
07 SHA:  Yup,
08 MIC:  Should be real (gud).
09       (0.4)  ((Michael looks down at his plate))
10 NAN:  h[nh hnh hnh  ]
11 VIV:    [An' it's reh[ea:rsed it's su]ppose]a' be rehea:r[se'.
           [((Shane looks to Michael))
```

```
12 SHA:                  [h u h ha ha ha ]   h u]              [
13 MIC:                                                       [It sh'd
14        be ril good.bec'z he's good.
```

In lines 01, 02, and 03, Vivian (VIV) begins to complain that Jimmy, one of their classmates, did not rehearse a scene that he will be performing with Shane (SHA). Shane has epistemic rights over the information because it is about his experience with Jimmy. Although it is VIV's turn in lines 01 to 03 that is treated as problematic, because Shane holds the primary epistemic rights, Michael (MIC) initiates repair by gazing at SHA and asking, "Nex' week yer doin it?" in line 05, before VIV is able to complete her turn. SHA confirms that he will be performing the scene next week, saying, "Yup," in line 07.

There has been a plethora of studies investigating how various types of other-initiated repairs are performed in order to deal with interactional problems (e.g., Selting, 1988, 1996; Sidnell, 2007, 2008, 2009; Robinson & Kevoe-Feldman, 2010; Kendrick, 2015; Hayashi & Kim, 2015). Robinson and Kevoe-Feldman (2010), for example, investigated how recipients of talk initiate repair on questions directed to them. They discovered that questions that were fully repeated with rising intonation on the end marked the action of asking a question as problematic. One salient characteristic of the trouble source questions that they present is that they are sequentially inappropriate or are markedly disconnected from the previous talk. An example of the phenomenon that they described is as follows.

```
Extract 22: in Robinson & Kevoe-Feldman, 2010, pp. 239-240
01  VIC:   W'=that- >what thuh hell< (did) that girl do with her
02         life. di' she graduate?
03         (0.2)
04  IDA:   Y:es. She uhm (0.3) she's w(h)aiting <to get> (.) her
05         c(h)ertification.=I don't know if she's passed thuh exam (.)
06         yet
07         (0.3)
```

```
08 IDA:   But she's substitute teaching,
09        (0.4)
10 VIC:   m=Oh. Okay,
11 IDA:   A:n:d (.) yeah
12        (0.4)
13 VIC:→'S=she pretty?
14        (.)
15 IDA:→Is she pretty?
16        (.)
17 VIC:   She=ever get good looking, er no.
18 IDA:   I think she looks thuh sa:me? >I don' know< its a very (.)
19        [(                                          )]
20        [I always thought she was in=an awkward stage]she'd grow out
21        of but maybe not heh heh heh
```

In this extract, the participants are discussing a girl that both of them know. IDA recently saw the girl, but VIC has not met her in many years. The extract begins with VIC asking, "W'=that- >what thuh hell< (did) that girl do with her life. di' she graduate?" IDA answers, "Y:es. She uhm she's w(h)aiting <to get> (.) her c(h)ertification.=I don't know if she's passed thuh exam yet", and adds, "But she's substitute teaching,". VIC receipts that with "m=Oh. Okay," in line 10, after which IDA produces, "A:n:d (.) yeah". Following a 0.4-second silence, VIC asks, "'S=she pretty?", in line 13, which IDA treats as problematic, as shown by her repair initiation in which she repeats the whole question with rising intonation in line 15. VIC's question, "'S=she pretty?", is not coherent with his question in lines 01 and 02, "W'=that- >what thuh hell< (did) that girl do with her life. di' she graduate?", which could possibly explain why IDA orients to VIC's utterance as problematic.

Kendrick (2015) examined various forms of other-initiated repair and how they can occasionally perform other actions simultaneously. He also investigated turns that look like other-initiated repair, but that actually function as other actions and are not treated as other-initiations of repair by participants. He refers to the latter as "pseudo OIRs" (p. 181).

He demonstrates how "pseudo OIRs" are sometimes used to tease, do jokes, and demonstrate surprise and other times they precede dispreferred responses.

Hayashi and Kim (2015) analyzed Japanese and Korean conversations and focused on other-initiations of repair using the English equivalent of "what," which is "*nani*" in Japanese, and "*mwe*" in Korean, as well as their use with the postpositional particles "*ga*" for Japanese and "*ka*" for Korean, and the various trouble sources they target. They determined that when Korean speakers change the prosody on "*mwe,*" to target a different trouble source. In other words, when "*mwe*" is produced with rising intonation, the entire prior turn is treated as the trouble source, whereas "falling, flat, or flat-slightly rising intonation is used to target a particular referential element in the prior turn" (p. 215). For Japanese, however, they discovered that when "*nani*" was not produced with "ga," it functioned as an open-class repair initiator regardless of intonation. They also report that in Japanese when "*nani*" was produced with "*ga,*" it functioned to repair a particular reference, whereas in Korean they were unable to determine the distinction between "*mwe*" produced with and without the particle "*ka*" when used for reference repair.

There has also been research which has identified various ways in which speakers receipt repair. For example, Heritage (1984) discovered that "oh" is often used to receipt a repair by the speaker of a trouble source after another speaker has initiated repair. This is highlighted in the following extract.

```
Extract 23: in Heritage, 1984, p. 316
01   A:   Well who-r you working for.
02   B:  ·hhh Well I'm working through the Amfat
06         Corporation
07   A:   The who?
08   B:   Amfah Corpora[tion. T's a holding company.
09   A →               [Oh
10   A:   Yeah
```

In this extract, A displays a problem with B's utterance by initiating repair on it in line 04 with the question, "The who?" B produces the repair in line 05, which A receipts in the subsequent turn with "oh", therefore manifesting that there was a change of state and that B's utterance is no longer a problem.

2.3.1.2.1 Multiple Other-Initiations of Repair

In most cases when repair is initiated by a speaker other than the producer of the trouble source, one repair initiator is sufficient for locating the trouble source, which is most often repaired by the speaker of the trouble source. However, in some cases the repair initiation fails to induce a repair that solves the trouble source. When this happens, a second, often stronger, repair initiator is used by a participant other than the speaker of the trouble source (Schegloff et al., 1977; Schegloff, 2000). This can be referred to as "multiple other-initiations of repair" (Schegloff, 2000). Repair initiators have varying strengths, which refers to their ability to identify a trouble source, with stronger repair initiators preferred over weaker ones (Schegloff et al., 1977). The following example illustrates how multiple repair initiators are used.

```
Extract 24: HS:FN, in Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 369
01   A:   I have a: - cousin teaches there.
02   D:   Where.
03   A:   Uh:. Columbia.
04   D:→  Columbia?
05   A:   Uh huh.
06   D:→  You mean Manhattan?
07   A:   No. Uh big university. Isn't that in Columbia?
08   D:   Oh in Columbia.
09   A:   Yeah
```

As shown in this extract, weaker repair initiators are often used before stronger ones. The

first repair initiation occurs in line 02 when D asks, "Where"? When initial repair initiations fail to produce a successful repair proper, participants other than the speaker of the trouble source will resort to using stronger repair initiators (Schegloff et al., 1977). In line 06, D again initiates repair, this time by using "You mean" plus the candidate understanding "Manhattan".

Egbert (1997) describes how repair is initiated on the same trouble source by different participants in German interaction. This occurred when one participant initiated repair on a trouble source and before the repair was performed, another participant initiated repair on the same trouble source.

2.3.2 Locations of Repair

Repair initiation and repair proper can occur in various locations in relation to the trouble source. The sequential placement of repair varies based on who performs it. The following are the main locations of repair.

1. Same turn repair
2. Transition space repair
3. Next turn repair
4. Third turn repair
5. Third position repair
6. Fourth position repair

In the field of CA, there is a difference between the terms "turn" and "position." Turns change when a speaker changes and each speaker change is counted as one turn. However, position is not thought of in terms of how many times a speaker changes. Position is established based on when a speaker exhibits their understanding of a particular utterance or based on the location of a response to that utterance. For example, an utterance is not

necessarily in the second position even if it is produced in the in the second turn from the trouble source turn. In addition, it is possible for an utterance to be in the second position even if it is produced later than the second turn from the trouble source turn (Takagi, Hosoda, & Morita, 2016).

Same turn repair and transition space repair are always performed by the speaker of the trouble source, whereas second position repair, also known as next turn repair initiation (NTRI), is always performed by an interlocutor other than the speaker of the of the trouble source. Transition space repair occurs in the transition space following the TCU that includes the trouble source. Third turn repair always occurs in the turn immediately subsequent to the turn which contains mere acknowledgement that does not problematize the prior turn. Third position repair is initiated by the speaker of the trouble source in the third position following a turn by a recipient who exhibits their misunderstanding of the first turn. Fourth position repair is carried out by a participant other than the speaker of the trouble source. This can be seen as this participant's second opportunity to initiate repair. In short, opportunities for self-initiation always precede those for other-initiation. Each position can be thought of as a repair space and the trouble source can be thought of as passing through multiple "repair-initiation opportunity spaces" (Schegloff, 1977, p. 375). Below I will briefly describe the various locations in which repair occurs as well as provide examples of repair which occur in each location.

2.3.2.1 Same Turn Repair

Repair which occurs in the same turn as the trouble source is referred to as same turn repair. The following extract illustrates how same turn repair can occur.

```
Extract 25: NJ:4, in Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 364
01   N:   She was givin me a:ll the people that
```

```
02      → were go:ne this yea:r I mean this
03      → quarter y' // know
04   J:   Yeah
```

In this extract, the trouble source is the phrase, "this yea:r". The speaker of the trouble source, N, initiates and performs repair in lines 02 and 03, by replacing "year" with "quarter" in his utterance, "I mean this quarter".

2.3.2.2 Transition Space Repair

Self-repair that occurs in the transition space following a complete TCU that contains the trouble source is known as transition space repair. This can be seen in the extract that follows.

```
Extract 26: in Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 370
01   B: -then more people will show up. Cuz
02       they won't feel obligated to sell.
03     →tuh buy
```

In lines 01 and 02, B explains, "then more people will show up. Cuz they won't feel obligated to sell." Following the word "sell", the TCU is complete. Then at the transition space B performs repair on the word "sell" by replacing it with the word "buy".

2.3.2.3 Next Turn Repair

Second position repair refers to repair which occurs in the turn immediately subsequent to the turn which contains the trouble source. The extract below is an example of second position repair.

Extract 27: GTS:3:42, in Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 370

04 A: Hey the first time they stopped me from sellin cigarettes was this
05 morning.
06 (1.0)
07 B: From selling cigarettes?
08 A: From buying cigarettes. They // said uh
09 C: Uh huh

In lines 01 and 02, A states, "Hey the first time they stopped me from sellin cigarettes was this morning". Following a 1.0-second gap, B initiates repair in the second position, line 04, asking, "From selling cigarettes?", placing rising intonation on the word "selling", thereby requesting confirmation from A. A performs repair in the subsequent turn by stating, "From buying cigarettes", replacing the word "selling" with "buying."

2.3.2.4 Third Turn Repair

In third turn repair a speaker performs a turn, which the recipient does not treat as problematic in the subsequent turn. In the third turn, the speaker of the trouble source performs repair on their own utterance in the first turn. The following demonstrates how third turn repair can occur.

Extract 28: TG, 286-289 , in Schegloff, 1997b, p. 33

01 Bee: Y'have any cla- y'have a class with Billy this term?
02 Ava: Yeah, he's in my Abnormal class
03 Bee: Oh yeah [how
04 Ava:→ [Abnormal Psych.

In this extract, Bee asks Ava if she has "a class with Billy this term?" Ava answers, "Yeah, he's in my Abnormal class.", to which Bee responds, "Oh yeah how". Even though Bee did not show any problem understanding, Ava performs repair in line 04, stating, "Abnormal

Psych."

Third turn repairs occur when trouble sources that are produced in terminal position and the turn produced by the other speaker is often very short. Because self-initiations of repair often occur in the transition space shortly after a turn is completed, third turn repair and transition space repair can be viewed as performing the same action. Third turn repair demonstrates how speakers of trouble sources orient to correcting something in the trouble source turn even though it might only be of minimal significance to the interaction at hand (Schegloff, 1997b).

2.3.2.5 Third Position Repair

Self-initiated repair occurs in the third position from the trouble source turn in cases in which a speaker produces an utterance in the first turn, another speaker responds to that utterance in the second turn, and that response demonstrates to the speaker of the first utterance that their turn was misunderstood (Schegloff, 1992a). The speaker of the first turn then initiates and carries out repair in the third position to make sure that the other participant understands correctly (Schegloff, 1997b). This "repair after next turn" (Schegloff, 1992a, p. 1304) is produced in order to address the trouble source and help the other speaker to understand their turn correctly. The general components of third position repair are a turn-initial particle, such as "no," an agreement or acceptance of a response when a trouble source is treated as a complaint, a rejection of the previous speaker's understanding of the trouble source, and the repair itself, in which the speaker of the trouble source will reformulate their turn or explain what they mean. The reformulation or explanation could take the form of "I don't mean X" or "I'm not Xing." However, every example of third position repair does not necessarily contain all four elements (Schegloff, 1992a).

According to Schegloff (1992a), third position repair can be seen as the "last

systematically provided opportunity to catch (among other troubles) such divergent understandings that embody breakdowns in intersubjectivity" (p. 1301). In third position repair, speaker A produces an utterance, and speaker B responds in the second position. B's response in the second position demonstrates to A that their utterance was misunderstood, which is why they perform third position repair in the third position. An example of third position repair can be seen in the following extract.

```
Extract 29: GTS, I, 37 in Schegloff, 1992a, p. 1303
01    Dan:   Well that's a little different from last week.
02 Louise:   heh heh heh Yeah. We were in hysterics last week.
03    Dan:→  No, I mean Al.
04 Louise:   Oh. He…
```

In this extract, Dan does third position repair after Louise produces her response to his utterance in line 02. Her utterance demonstrates to Dan that she misunderstands who he is talking about. Dan's repair contains the repair marker, "I mean," which is designed to correct the recipient's understanding (Schegloff, 1992a).

2.3.2.6 Fourth Position Repair

Fourth position repair occurs when a trouble source is produced in a first turn (T1) by speaker A, another participant, speaker B, responds to that turn in the subsequent turn, which is followed by a contingent or follow-up question by speaker A (T3). The turn in T3 exhibits to speaker B that their understanding of the turn in T1 was incorrect, and therefore their answer in T2 was inappropriate. In T4, speaker B performs repair to address the problem of understanding (Schegloff, 1992a). An example of fourth position repair is as follows.

```
Extract 30: EAS, FN, in Schegloff, 1992a, p. 1321
01   Marty:   Loes, do you have a calendar.
```

```
02    Loes:   Yeah ((reaches for her desk calendar))
03   Marty:   Do you have one that hangs on the wall?
04    Loes:→  Oh, you want one.
05   Marty:   Yeah
```

This extract begins with Marty asking Loes for a calendar. Marty's turn in line 01 can be seen as a request for a calendar or a request to borrow a calendar. Loes treats Marty's turn as a request to borrow the calendar and she reaches for her calendar in line 02. In line 03, Marty then asks Loes, "Do you have one that hangs on the wall?", which demonstrates to Loes that her understanding of Marty's turn in line 01 was incorrect. Loes then performs repair in the subsequent turn, the fourth position, with "Oh, you want one.", which shows that she now understands that Marty's turn in line 01 was a request for a calendar and not a request to borrow one.

The following diagram summarizes the most common locations of repair as well as who usually performs the repair in that location.

In Schegloff, 1992, p. 1327

T1	A:	Q1			
T2	B:	A1	NTRI (T1)		
T3	A:	Q2	NTRI (T2)	Repair 3d (T1)	
T4	B:	A2	NTRI (T3)	Repair 3d (T2)	Repair 4th (T1)
T5	A:	Q3	NTRI (T4)	Repair 3d (T3)	Repair 4th (T2)
T6	B:	A3	NTRI (T5)	Repair 3d (T4)	Repair 4th (T3, 1)

T represents the turn number and Q and A stand for question and answer. Supposing A's turn in T1 contains a trouble source.

2.3.3 Types of Repair Patterns

As mentioned above, there are four types of repair: self-initiated self-repair,

self-initiated other-repair, other-initiated self-repair, and other-initiated other-repair. In this section I describe each of the types of repair patterns in detail and present examples of each type.

2.3.3.1 Self-Initiated Self-Repair

Self-initiated self-repair refers to repair in which the speaker of the trouble source initiates and performs repair on their own utterance. There is a preference for self-initiated repair, which is a result of the opportunities for self-initiated repair preceding those of other-initiated repair. The following is an example of self-initiated self-repair in the same turn.

```
Extract 31: GTS:5:33, in Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 370
01  Roger:   We're just workin on a different
02         → thing, the same thing
```

In this extract, the trouble source, "different", is repaired by Roger, the speaker of the trouble source, in line 02. He states, "same", which is post-framed with "thing", thereby making the repair visible.

2.3.3.2 Self-Initiated Other-Repair

Self-initiated other-repair occurs when the speaker of the trouble source initiates repair on their own utterance, and another participant performs the repair proper. Most instances of self-initiated other-repair are word searches. An example of self-initiated other-repair can be seen in the following extract.

```
Extract 32: BC:Green:88, in Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 364
01   B:→ He had dis uh Mistuh W- whatever k- I can't
```

02 think of his first name, Watts on, the one thet wrote // that piece,
03 A:→ Dan Watts

In this extract, whose participants are native English speakers, B initiates repair on his own utterance in line 01, stating, "Mistuh W- whatever k- I can't think of his first name, Watts on, the one thet wrote // that piece," and when he is unable to come up with the man's full name, A provides it in line 03, stating, "Dan Watts". Hosoda (2006) analyzed conversations both between native speakers of Japanese and conversations between native and non-native speakers of Japanese. Her analysis revealed that although other-repair did not occur often in the conversations among native speakers, when it did occur, it was a result of a word search performed by the speaker of the trouble source. Hosoda (2000) examined self-initiated other-repair in conversations between native and non-native speakers of Japanese and found that other-repair by native speakers often followed both verbal and non-verbal actions by non-native speakers that seemed to function as self-initiation of repair. The verbal actions included "sound stretches, fillers, cut-offs, rising intonation, the question marker *ka*, and explicit expressions of ignorance" (p. 45), whereas the non-verbal actions consisted of "eye gaze, posture, raised eyebrows, laughter, nods, pointing to oneself, and head tilts" (p. 48).

2.3.3.3 Other-Initiated Self-Repair

Other-initiated self-repair refers to repair in which a speaker other than the speaker of the trouble source initiates repair and the speaker of the trouble source performs the repair proper. In most cases when other-initiated repair is performed, it results in self-repair (Schegloff, 1997a), which is a consequence of the preference for self-repair. The extract below demonstrates how other-initiated self-repair can occur.

Extract 33: Debbie and Shelley, in Sidnell, 2010, p. 120
35 Debbie: [.hhh

```
36 Shelley: [you were at the halloween thing
37  Debbie:  huh?
38 Shelley: the halloween p[arty
39  Debbie:                [ri:ght.
```

In this extract, the trouble source is in line 36 in which Shelley says, "you were at the halloween thing". Debbie initiates repair with the open-class repair initiator, "huh?", after which Shelly performs self-repair, replacing the word "thing" with "party" to produce the utterance "the halloween party". Debbie accepts the repair with "right" and the sequence closes.

Schegloff et al. (1977) provide evidence that shows that most other-initiated repairs result in self-repairs. However, as will be demonstrated in Chapters 4, 5, and 6, in interaction between native and non-native speakers of English in a university language lounge, other-initiated repair often results in other-repair.

2.3.3.4 Other-Initiated Other-Repair

The least occurring repair pattern, other-initiated other-repair, refers to repair in which a speaker other than the speaker of the trouble source both initiates and performs repair on the trouble source. The following extract exemplifies such an occurrence.

```
Extract 34: GTS:5:3, in Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 365
01   B:   Where didju play ba:sk//etbaw
02   A:   (The) gy:m
03   B:   In the gy:m?
04   A:   Yea:h Like grou(h)p therapy. Yuh know=
05   B:   =[Oh::.
06   A:   =[half the group thet we had la:s' term wz there en we was jus' playing
07        arou:nd.
08   B:→  Uh- fooling around.
09   A:  Eh- yeah…
```

In this extract, the trouble source, the word "playing" in the phrase "jus playing arou:nd" in lines 06 and 07, is repaired by B in line 08 by replacing the word "playing" with "fooling." Schegloff et al. (1977) point out that there may be more instances of other-correction in interaction with participants who are "not-yet-competent" (p. 381).

2.3.4 Correction and Repair

Previous research has discussed the ways that repair and correction are different (e.g., Schegloff et al., 1977; Macbeth, 2004; Hall, 2007; Rosenthal, 2008; Haakana & Kurhila, 2009) as well as the ambiguity between the two (e.g., McHoul, 1990). McHoul (1990) mentions that Schegloff et al. (1977) appear to use the term "correction" to mean the replacement of errors and the term "repair" to refer to both interactional troubles and errors. Distinguishing between the two can often create confusion, which is why some studies treat them as one and the same (e.g., Jung, 1999; Seedhouse, 2004; Kääntä, 2010). Hall (2007) asserts that repair is the practice of how interlocutors cope with interactional problems, and although correction is a kind of repair, it involves substituting the mistake with the correct word, etcetera. Errors can be seen as problems of speaking, which is repair, and correcting the error by replacing the word, etcetera, which the recipient treats as problematic can also be repair.

Embedded correction refers to correction performed by the recipient of talk that does not interrupt the interaction nor become the focus of the interaction. In this type of correction the producer of the problematic turn uses the corrected word, expression, and so on in the subsequent interaction (Jefferson, 1987). Embedded correction is an action separate from repair because the next turn is not delayed due to the correction and it does not stop the progressivity of the interaction in the way that repair does. In repair sequences the repair becomes the interactional business, and as Couper-Kuhlen (1992) observed, when repair

occurs, participants try to get back to the main interaction as quickly as possible.

2.3.5 Repair in Various Interactional Circumstances

In recent years there has been a growing number of studies on repair which cover a wide range of topics including syntax (e.g., Hayashi, 1994; Fox, Hayashi, & Jasperson, 1996), turn-taking (Kendrick, 2015), learning (Butterfield, 2016), and so on. In the previous section, I discussed the basic tenets of repair. In the following sections, I will summarize literature on repair in various interactional circumstances which is directly related the focus of this dissertation and serves as the foundation on which this study is built.

2.3.5.1 Repair in Classrooms

CA can be used as a tool to develop a deeper understanding of the intricacies of pedagogical interaction (Gibson, 2009). Repair in classroom interaction is markedly different from that of repair in mundane conversation. This is due to a variety of factors, including epistemic status (Heritage, 2012) and identity. In the next two sections, I give an overview of previous research on repair in native speaker classrooms and foreign/second language classrooms.

2.3.5.1.1 Repair in First Language Classrooms

Regarding interaction in first language high school geography classrooms, McHoul (1990) established that other-correction occurs more frequently than in mundane conversation. In addition, he reveals that the number of other-initiated self-corrections exceeded those of other-initiated other-corrections. When teachers and students did perform self-initiated self-corrections, the trouble source was usually something other than an "error in the strictest sense" (p. 353). Most other-initiations, which occurred in the second turn, contained a

linguistic item that replaced an informational error such as a geographic location in the prior turn. He explains that other-initiations were performed immediately after a turn which contains the trouble source or immediately after the trouble source is produced. Lastly, he found that other-corrections occur in specific environments. One such environment is after the teacher restates a question or gives hints to students, which fail to induce self-correction by the students.

In McHoul's classroom data, the minimal amount of self-initiated self-corrections on the part of the students could possibly be attributed to the fact that the number of turns taken by students are minimal compared to that of the teacher. When students do speak, they are producing answers that they think are correct. If students produced an informational error, in order to perform self-initiated self-repair their knowledge would have to change after they produce the answer. However, they may have to refer to their textbook or some other resource in order for their knowledge state to change, but by the time that happens, someone else would likely take a turn.

Radford, Blatchford, and Webster (2011) investigated elementary and junior high school mathematics classroom which contained students with special educational needs and placed a focus on how teachers and teaching assistants allocated turns, performed repair, and generated topics. They explain that when students' utterances contained mistakes or when they were unable to produce an adequate answer, the teaching assistants immediately provided correction or the appropriate answer. Because the teaching assistants did not withhold correction or provide prompts or clues, they argue, it limited students' opportunities to repair their own utterances and provide answers by themselves.

2.3.5.1.2 Repair in Foreign/Second Language Classrooms

Previous studies have discussed how repair is performed in foreign/second language

classrooms and in settings in which the goal is language learning and improvement (e.g., Kasper, 1985; Seedhouse, 1999, Jung, 1999; 2004; Buckwalter, 2001; Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2003; Seo & Koshik, 2010; Okada, 2010; Cho & Larke, 2010; Otsu, 2011; Fotovatnia & Dorri, 2013; Otsu, 2011; Hellermann, 2011; Hoshino, 2013; Kääntä, 2014; Park, I., 2015; Butterfield, 2015; Butterfield & Bhatta, 2015; Butterfield, 2016).

Because of limitations in linguistic knowledge, it can be assumed that repair occurs more frequently in interaction between native and non-native speakers and between non-native speakers than in interaction among native speakers (Kasper, 1985). Liebscher and Daily-O'Cain (2003) analyzed second language classroom interaction and argue that repair initiated in the language classroom differs from that of mundane conversation in that students use specific repair initiations such as "what does it mean?", which highlights their identities as learners.

Although, repair, especially other-repair, may occur more frequently in conversations with non-native speakers, Gaskill (1980), who analyzed conversations between native and non-native speakers, found that there is still a preference for self-repair. Schwartz (1980) examined conversations between second language learners and also indicated that self-repair is preferred over other-repair.

Kasper (1985) examined high school English as a foreign language classes and demonstrated that depending on whether the classroom activity was language-centered or content-centered, the preferred pattern of repair varied. She showed that in addition to other-correction performed by teachers, learners also correct their own utterances. She adds that teachers also restate their own utterances in order to help students understand and that these modifications also deserve attention because of their implications for teaching and learning. Her analysis revealed that in language-centered activities, which are activities that focus on the learning the language, learners rarely self-initiate repair and other-initiated repair

is preferred. She points out that this may be because students' "self-repair is suspended due to the asymmetrical distribution of knowledge" (p. 204). Regarding content-centered activities in which learners use the language they are learning to discuss content, she found that self-initiated self-repairs and other-initiated other-repairs were most prevalent. The self-initiated self-repairs consisted of problems related to grammar, vocabulary, and content. In her study, other-initiated other-repair occurred more frequently than other-initiated self-repair in the language-centered phase. In most cases, it was the teacher who initiated the repair, but the teacher would occasionally have another student perform the repair proper.

Jung (1999) examined the organization of repair in ESL classroom interaction and determined that the patterns of repair differed based on the type of activity. The types of activities that she focused on were role-playing activities and teacher-fronted activities. In the role-playing activities a variety of repair patterns (e.g., self-initiated-self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, and other-initiated other-repair) were observed. Students were witnessed collaboratively performing repair sequences through actions such as giving clues and providing candidate answers following word searches. However, in the teacher-fronted activities, the most commonly occurring repair pattern was other-initiated other-repair.

Seo and Koshik (2010) identified gestures that function as repair initiations in interaction between an ESL conversation tutor and tutee. There are several conversation analytic studies which investigated how gestures are used in interaction (e.g., Goodwin, 1979, 1986, 2000, 2003; Hayashi, 2003, 2005). However, whereas most conversation analytic studies on gestures investigate how gestures are performed in concert with verbal utterances, their study examines how gestures can be used to initiate repair even without an accompanying verbal utterance. They state that head turns, tilts, and pokes are used to initiate-repair by the recipient of the talk and their analysis reveals that tutees only used head pokes to initiate repair, whereas tutors used head tilts/turns, and pokes and sometimes a

combination of them to initiate repair. In the majority of the examples of repair initiation in their data, the tutor initiated repair on the tutees' turn because of a linguistic production problem, whereas when the tutee initiated repair on the tutor's utterance, it was because of a problem of understanding on the part of the tutee. They argue that these gestures function as repair initiators by the recipient of the talk and that it is possible for repair to be initiated solely by the use of gestures. Lastly, they claim that gestures which function as repair initiators resemble open-class repair initiators (Drew, 1997) such as "huh?", as they do not clearly identify the trouble source.

Cho and Larke (2010) investigated how elementary school students in English as a Second Language (ESL) classes do repair and uncovered nine repair strategies that were employed. Their study identified two types of novel repair strategies used by language learners in addition to those already discovered by Schegloff et al. (1977), Egbert (1988), and Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2003). Schegloff et al. (1977) discovered types of repair initiation techniques in native conversations, which are non-lexical speech perturbations, the use huh, what, who, where, or when, partial repeats of the trouble-source turn plus a question word, partial repeats of the trouble-source turn, and y' mean plus a possible understanding of the word. Analyzing oral proficiency interviews between native and non-native speakers of German, Egbert (1998) discovered that participants initiated repair by requesting repetition, which was the second most common repair initiator following partial repeats. Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2003) observed that an additional way in which learners in a German EFL classroom initiated repair was by requesting an explanation, definition, or translation. In their study, Cho and Larke (2010) found that students initiate repair through non-verbal resources, such as head patting and squinting, and by doing correction. They report that in their data the most commonly used repair initiation was understanding checks.

Unlike most classroom interaction which focuses on interaction between a teacher and

students, Hellermann (2011) focused on the longitudinal repair practices in student interaction in a language classroom. He explains that over time the participants oriented to different types of trouble sources and the ways in which they initiated and performed repair appeared to have increased. He argues that this is evidence which demonstrates that the participants' interactional competence improved during the time that they were observed.

Kääntä (2014) analyzed eighth grade content and language integrated learning (CLIL) English classes in Finland and demonstrated how the function of embodied noticings, for example, shifts in gaze and facial expressions, precede the initiation of correction by students. The correction initiations are performed in regards to what the teacher has written on an exercise sheet which is able to be seen by all of the students as it is projected onto a screen. Her focus is on how students display their epistemic status when initiating corrections on what the teacher has written on the exercise sheet and how these epistemic statues are negotiated throughout the interaction. She observes that after students initiated correction, they left a slot for teachers to self-correct, and remarks that although embodied noticings precede correction initiations, it is the latter and not the former that are oriented to by other participants.

Analyzing native and non-native speaker interaction in a university language lounge, Butterfield (2015) demonstrated how other-initiated other-repair occurs in second language interaction and notes that it occurs quite frequently in interaction between native and non-native speakers.

Butterfield and Bhatta (2015) investigated Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) sequences in team-teaching EFL classrooms and revealed that in instances when one teacher initiated the sequence which was followed by a student response and repair by the other teacher, the other teacher would provide feedback because their acceptance or rejection of the repair was relevant as they are the one who treated the student's utterance as problematic.

Some studies suggest that the power and importance of repair may extend beyond its ability to temporarily halt the interaction underway in order to address interactional issues. Butterfield (2016), for example, examining interaction in a university language lounge, revealed that repair sequences are one possible site in which learning may potentially occur. In a similar vein, Morgenstern, Leroy-Collombel, and Caët (2013) assert that "repairs may not be sufficient, but they represent ideal interactional sequences for the acquisition of language to take place" (p. 153).

2.3.5.2 Repair in Native and Non-Native Speaker Interaction in Non-Educational Settings

In recent years, there has been an increasing amount of research which has examined repair in interaction between native and non-native speakers in non-educational settings (e.g., Kurhila, 2001; Wong, 2000a, 2000b; Hosoda, 2000, 2006; Park, J.-E. 2007; Park, I., 2007; Bae & Oh, 2013; Yasui, 2010). Many SLA studies view the identities of participants, such as native speaker and non-native speaker, as something that is invariable throughout interaction (Hosoda, 2001). However, in conversation analytic research, analysts aim to demonstrate how specific identities are visible in the interaction and oriented to by participants (Schegloff, 1992b). There have been numerous CA studies which analyze second language conversations (e.g., Gardner & Wagner, 2004) and which demonstrate how repair or correction is done in second language interaction (e.g., Firth, 1996; Firth & Wagner, 1997; Carroll, 2000, 2004; Park, J.-E., 2007; Wong 2000a, 2000b, Hosoda 2000, 2001, 2006; Brouwer, 2003; Egbert, 2004; Kasper, 2004; Park, J.-E., 2007; Yasui, 2010; Bae & Oh, 2013; Lilja, 2014; Tsuchiya & Handford, 2014; O'Neal, 2015; Quan & Weisser, 2015; Greer, 2015).

Firth (1996) demonstrated that there is a preference for self-repair in non-native speaker interaction, which supports the findings of Schegloff et al. (1977), who pointed out that there is preference for self-repair in interaction among native speakers.

Firth and Wagner (1997) argue that many SLA studies tend to ascribe categories to non-native speakers and native speakers a priori, and attribute their linguistic competence, or lack thereof, to the fact that they are members of those categories. Some CA studies (e.g., Carroll, 2000, 2004) demonstrate that non-native speakers' identities as non-native speakers are not always relevant and that on many levels their interactional practices (e.g., restarts) resemble those of native speakers. Other studies, on the other hand, have revealed that participant's identities do sometimes become relevant at different points in the interaction. Park, J.-E. (2007), for example, found that participant identities became relevant in interaction between native and non-native speakers during word searches and when linguistic performance was evaluated.

Wong (2000a) discovered that in native and non-native conversations, the non-native speaker initiated repair on another speaker's utterance on a turn other than the turn just subsequent to the trouble source. She therefore concludes that repair in non-native speaker conversations does not always necessarily occur in the earliest position possible.

Hosoda (2000) examined the circumstances in which other-repair occurs in interaction between native and non-native speakers of Japanese as well as interaction among native speakers of Japanese. She reports that other-repair occurs more frequently in native and non-native interaction compared to that of interaction among native speakers. She mentions that because non-native speakers lack the linguistic proficiency that native speakers possess, it may be assumed that the native speaker would give unsolicited correction, but this did not occur in the data that she analyzed. She also found that similar to conversations between native speakers, participants do not often correct the co-participant's obvious errors. Hosoda (2001) observed that the native and non-native speaker identities of participants were visible in other-repair sequences (a) when there was a problem of understanding, (b) when a non-native speaker invited the native speaker to do repair, and (c) when one of the

participants repaired the co-participant's *katakana* English. She discovered that the participants demonstrated their status as non-native speakers when they requested help from the native speaker and the native speaker's status as expert was made visible when they provided help to the non-native speaker. Hosoda (2006) noticed similar patterns in conversations that she analyzed between native and non-native speakers of Japanese, and reveals that in her data the difference in linguistic expertise became relevant when one participant invited the co-participant to do repair and when a problem of understanding occurred. Her analysis also showed that language expertise can be made visibly relevant in other-repair.

Brouwer (2003) explored word searches performed by non-native speakers in interaction between native and non-native speakers of Danish and revealed that they provide possible opportunities for learning. This implies that the producer of the trouble source turn may not know the word, and by having another participant produce the word that they are looking for, an opportunity for learning may occur. Some studies assume that word searches represent a gap in a language learner's knowledge (Kasper & Kellerman, 1997), and while it may be true sometimes, it is not always the case. Native speakers also perform word searches when they cannot produce a word at the time of interaction. It does not necessarily mean that the speaker does not know the word, rather that they are unable to produce it at the time they are speaking.

Egbert (2004) examined how membership categorization becomes visible in repair initiated by a participant other than the speaker of the trouble source in German conversations. Participants' linguistic and regional categories emerged as a result of the other-initiated repair, which occurred because of a problem in understanding or hearing. In other words, the participants' membership in a particular category was relevant to the occurrence of a problem that arose in the interaction. She presents examples that demonstrate how participants' repair

initiations show the ways they assign memberships to other members or themselves by orienting to the trouble source speaker's utterance as lack of cultural or linguistic knowledge or a word that belongs to a particular dialect or region.

Kasper (2004) scrutinized interaction between a native and non-native speaker of German. She uncovered that the native speaker would provide corrections following repair initiations performed by the non-native speaker. In her data, if the non-native speaker did not invite other-repair or correction, the native speaker did not provide it.

Bae and Oh (2013) examined the correlation between repair and the identities of the participants in native and non-native interaction and found that the identities of native speaker and non-native speaker were not always relevant to repair. Participant identities became relevant when one of the participants initiated repair to address a problem that occurred as a result of the lack of linguistic competence on the part of the non-native speaker. They reported that participant identities became relevant when non-native speakers invited native speakers to assist a repair. In a similar vein, Kurhila (2004) reports that linguistic expertise was made relevant when the non-native speaker encountered linguistic issues.

Park, I. (2007) focused on word searches in native and non-native interaction from tutoring sessions and casual social gatherings and asserts that word searches are social actions which are visible to other participants. She shows how interactants use and orient to a variety of interactional resources such as cut-offs and shifts in gaze to jointly perform word searches. Yasui (2010) investigated repair in native and non-native interaction and examined whether there were differences in repair patterns between advanced and beginning speakers of Japanese learners. She reports that there was a preference for self-repair among advanced speakers, but that beginners preferred other-repair.

Seo and Koshik (2010) remark that in their data on interaction between a native speaker and non-native speakers participating in ESL conversational tutoring sessions, the

linguistic abilities of the participants were not relevant, for example, in cases when a participant initiates repair on a referent that is unknown to them.

Analyzing data between native and non-native speakers of Finnish, Lilja (2014) focused on how partial repetitions of the previous utterance can function as repair initiations. She demonstrates that partial repetitions can indicate problems of understanding on the part of the non-native speaker and that as participants' asymmetric linguistic knowledge becomes relevant, opportunities for learning may be created for the non-native speakers.

Several studies have investigated repair in lingua franca conversations. In Firth's (1996) study, in which he examined English as a lingua franca conversations, he described the idea that even when participants do not understand what the previous speaker has said, they will occasionally "let it pass" (p. 243). In contrast to this, Tsuchiya and Handford (2014), who also analyzed English as a lingua franca conversations at meetings to discuss a bridge building project, focused on what happens when participants do "not let it pass" (p. 122). They explain that this entails other-repair, which was often other-initiated and occurred between participants from different institutions and who had different nationalities. They add that most of the other-repairs were often reformulations by the Chair of the meeting. O'Neal (2015) investigated how interlocutors participating in lingua franca conversations perform segmental repair, which is the reparation of phonemes resulting from a problem of pronunciation (Matsumoto, 2011), in order to maintain intersubjectivity. He demonstrates how the omission of consonants in words affects recipient understanding as well as how the insertion of consonants helps them to restore intersubjectivity. In the examples that he presents, with the exception of one example in which a dual syllable word was repaired, repair is most often performed on monosyllabic words. He indicates that the omission of a consonant can harm intersubjectivity, but that it can be restored by performing segmental repair, which in his examples, involved the insertion of consonant.

Analyzing interaction between both native and non-native speakers of English as well as between native speakers of English, Quan and Weisser (2015) analyzed the self-repair techniques of non-native and native speakers of English and focused on comparing the syntactic class of words and types of syntactic and lexical items used when speakers recycle and replace a trouble source. They conclude that in non-native talk verbs are frequently recycled and used as the replacement item and that both native and non-native speakers often recycle individual words and not groups of words.

Greer (2015) examined how a non-native English speaker participating in conversations with native speakers of English employs a type of repair known as "brokering," which involves using the help of a third person, a broker, to solve a problem of understanding (Bolden, 2012). All of the brokering that occurs in Greer's study involves a non-native speaker tacitly selecting a speaker other than the speaker of the problematic utterance in order to provide clarification. When a recipient appeals to a broker for assistance, they make public their assumption that that person is familiar with the content and context of the talk and possesses the ability to make problematic utterances easier to understand. In a similar vein, Bolden (2011) showed how interactants select a speaker other than the speaker of the trouble source to do repair. By doing this, they are orienting to the trouble source speaker's lack of proficiency and to the fact that they are possibly incapable of performing repair.

2.3.5.3 Repair in Bilingual Interaction

In addition to research on interaction among native speakers and interaction between native and non-native speakers, there has been a growing body of research on bilingual interaction. Gafaranga (2011) , for example, investigated Kinyarwanda/French bilingual participants' use of code-switching, demonstrating that they sometimes oriented to it as repair. He pointed out that one possible reason that code-switching occurred in his data could be that

interlocutors are orienting to the language preferences of the other interlocutors, which is consistent with the findings of other research (e.g., Auer, 1984, 1995; Gafaranga, 2001; Torras & Gafaranga, 2002; Greer, 2013).

Gafaranga (2012) examined repair in bilingual interaction and considered whether the language itself was being repaired or if something else in the talk was being repaired in cases of language alteration. His analysis revealed that in some cases language change is the trouble source, sometimes it is repairing something else, and sometimes it signals a repair failure. In addition, he found that language alternation can be viewed as a resource that participants draw on to do repair which helps them to solve interactional problems.

Greer (2013) focused on how interlocutors' embodied actions and code-switching practices were used when accomplishing word searches in interaction between bilingual teenagers in Japan. He observed that when performing words searches, interlocutors would invite help from other interlocutors or design their turn for particular interlocutors by changing their gaze and switching their language. In his data the participants would switch languages when doing word searches and after the word search was complete, the speaker would return to the language that they were speaking prior to the word search.

2.3.6 Summary

Repair is a fundamental aspect of conversation that helps interactants maintain order and intersubjectivity. Repair can be initiated and performed in a variety of ways using a variety of verbal and gestural resources. Ever since Schegloff et al.'s (1977) pioneering study on repair, there has been an increased interest in the significance of repair in human interaction and a wide array of studies on repair covering an expansive range of topics has begun to appear.

2.4 Conversation Analysis and Learning

In recent years there have been a growing number of studies focusing on what conversation analysis can contribute to second language acquisition and second language research in general. The studies have covered a wide range of topics including learning opportunities (e.g., He, 2004, Waring, 2008, 2011), interactional competence (e.g., Young & Miller, 2004; Hellermann, 2011), and repair (e.g., Hosoda, 2000, 2006). However, studies which directly address the topic of learning are still quite scarce. Markee (2000) remarks that conversation analysis for second language acquisition (CA for SLA) studies should be able to demonstrate temporary learning behaviors. As most studies on learning have revealed, this is easier said than done. Some studies, such as He (2004), have taken to the debate as to whether CA is capable of addressing the topic of learning. Several studies have attempted to use conversation analysis to show how learning occurs, but because many studies lack a traceable learning object, skepticism surrounding the ability of conversation analysis to address issues of learning remains.

Lee and Hellermann (2014) point out that because conversation analysis focuses on the description of interaction, some researchers do not think that it is ideal for second language acquisition research. Some researchers argue that because CA's focus is only on the observable aspects of participants' behavior, it is ill-equipped to deal with the subject of learning, which is a change in a cognitive state that occurs in the mind, and is therefore not observable to the analyst. However, what is observable to the analyst is how participants, through their actions, or sometimes inactions, may go from a state of not understanding or knowing to a state of understanding or knowing. This problem of understanding or lack of knowledge could be displayed in the form of a question such as "what is ...?" or the participant's inability to produce the correct word. Heritage (1984) demonstrates that CA is capable of showing changes in knowledge states which can be seen through the use of change

of state tokens such as "oh."

CA for SLA is often censured for its lack of a concrete theory of learning (Markee, 2008). Several conversation analytic studies concerned with learning draw from exogenous theories of what learning is or may be, such as sociocultural theory (e.g., Gardner, 2007) or situated learning theory (e.g., Young & Miller, 2004; Brouwer & Wagner, 2004; Hellermann, 2008), in order to demonstrate that learning is or may be occurring.

In the field of conversation analysis several researchers interested in second language acquisition have focused on environments such as educational settings where learning may take place in order to better understand how learning occurs (Gardner, 2008). Through an in depth analysis and explication of second language interaction, conversation analysts hope to demonstrate the processes through which languages are learned. While the traditional focus of learning a language has been on form and linguistic structures, some researchers (e.g., Hellermann, 2009; Firth, 2009) have shown that learning does not just involve mastering a certain linguistic form, it can also involve improving overall communicative competence . The following sections provide an overview of previous conversation analytic research on learning. The four main areas of focus regarding learning are opportunities for learning, learning sites, longitudinal learning, and learning in short-term interaction.

2.4.1 Opportunities for Learning

Most second language (L2) conversation analytic research to date has focused on how second languages are used but not on how they are acquired. The reason for this lies in the fundamental nature of conversation analysis. It is concerned with the observable aspects of interaction, and the word "acquire" is generally thought to mean something that occurs in the mind. Using the methodological framework of conversation analysis, it is difficult to demonstrate that learning has occurred, which is why most conversation analytic research to

date regarding learning has been concerned with identifying opportunities for learning and not with identifying the processes through which languages are acquired. In order to argue that learning or some developmental change has occurred, there has to be a traceable object. If the teacher teaches something, it is difficult to argue that learning is occurring unless an observable learning object can be identified. Just because the teacher is teaching does not necessarily mean that students are learning. Finding a traceable object is difficult in short-term interaction and extremely challenging to identify in a longitudinal study. As Lee and Hellermann (2014) point out, conversation analysts are hesitant about addressing learning because of "CA's programmatic principle, which does not speculate on the cognitive states of the participants; this is in direct contrast to the reviewed view of SLA, which treats learning primarily as a psychological construct" (p. 3).

Mori (2004) reveals how participants orient to various learning opportunities in classroom interaction, such as the accuracy of vocabulary and pronunciation as well as producing counter arguments. She points out that when students' different orientations became problematic the students' orientations had to be negotiated. Waring (2011) discusses three types of learner initiatives and how they create learning opportunities. The initiatives are: (a) initiating sequence, (b) volunteering response, and (c) exploiting assigned turn. She states that initiating sequences allows participants to show knowledge and pursue understandings, but does not claim that learning has occurred, rather that it may promote learning. She argues that volunteering responses provide opportunities for learning by "its production of symmetry, participation, and language play" (p. 212). Lastly, she maintains that by exploiting the assigned turn the participants construct opportunities for learning by increasing participation through the provision of more information than what is requested.

Kasper (2004) analyzed a conversation for learning between a non-native and a native speaker of German. She discusses how this context has the potential for learning, but admits

that it does not demonstrate learning. She comments that looking at cross sectional or longitudinal interaction is needed in order to obtain evidence for learning. Nakayama, Tyler, and van Lier (2001) examine how participants negotiate meaning in information gap activities and conversations and argue that conversations do provide opportunities for learning.

Li (2013) discusses potential missed learning and pedagogical opportunities in a Chinese as a foreign language class in which a teacher does not address the questions asked by students which would have allowed her to explain the pragmatic difference between two sentences. During a translation exercise the teacher tells the students a sentence to say in Chinese, but the students want to know the situation and who they are saying it to so they can decide the appropriate expression to produce. However, because the teacher proceeds without addressing the students' questions, the students are left unsure of the type of situation in which they can use the expression in.

Lilja (2014) analyzed conversations between native and non-native speakers of Finnish and highlights how the fact that participants' orientations to the difference in linguistic knowledge, that is, when the non-native speaker repeats part of the native speaker's previous utterance, can create learning opportunities for the non-native speaker. She demonstrates how these partial repetitions are treated as the non-native speaker's lack of understanding of a previously produced linguistic item, as well as how participants address the lack of understanding, which sometimes causes the linguistic item to become a learning object. She notes that the asymmetry in linguistic knowledge becomes visible in repair, but that even after the problem of understanding is resolved, interlocutors occasionally continue discussing the repairable.

2.4.2 Sites of Learning

Some research has been concerned with identifying sites in which learning occurs. Gardner (2007) states that bricolage turns may be a place where learning becomes visible claiming that they "can be seen as potential loci for learning" (p. 71). For one example, Gardner refers to Vygotsky's (1978) notion of zone of proximal development to suggest that learning might be occurring because a word may be between a participant's current linguistic level and the zone of proximal development, and scaffolding is occurring to help her learn the word. Gardner (2008) suggests four potential sites of learning. They are sites where:

1. teachers start a sentence and allow students to finish it
2. teachers provide a slot for students to repeat new words
3. these slots are framed at the beginning and end of a sequence
4. code-switching occurs to confirm understanding of a learning object

Brouwer and Wagner (2004) present an example in which repair led to learning, which suggests that repair sequences may be one potential site in which learning may occur. This study presents three examples which support their findings. Their example will be discussed in detail in the next section. He (2004) points out that still little is known about what type of interaction promotes second language acquisition. She argues that conversation analysis may help us to understand what type of classroom interaction encourages language learning, but points out that conversation analysis does not address, nor is it designed to address, the process of learning and long term changes in behavior. In her study she demonstrates how conversation analysis can be used to illustrate how teaching and language learning opportunities are created in a Chinese heritage classroom. She postulates that if the acquisition of a language is viewed as an active and not passive process then teaching activities, such as having students answer questions and producing "designedly incomplete utterances" (Koshik, 2002) for students to co-complete, can also be viewed as learning

activities as students are attempting to produce correct answers and co-completing teacher sentences.

2.4.3 Longitudinal Learning

Some conversation analytic research has examined learning longitudinally (e.g., Brouwer & Wagner, 2004; Young & Miller, 2004; Hellermann, 2006, 2008, 2011; Firth & Wagner, 2007; Markee, 2008; Kim, 2009; Pekarek-Doehler, 2010; Lee & Hellermann, 2014). Brouwer and Wagner (2004) argue that language learning does not merely involve learning linguistic forms, rather it entails learning interactional skills and resources as well. They maintain that learning should be viewed as a social process which occurs in communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). They demonstrate how participants use knowledge gained from previous interaction in the future, which helps the interaction proceed more smoothly with fewer problems. In the following example taken from their study, which I show here in simplified form, J wants to speak with Visti Petersen, but says "Vee Tee Petersen" in line 10.

Extract 35: in Brouwer & Wagner (2004), p. 38, Simplified

```
5   J:   ·h Øh kan jeg snake med herr ↑peter↓sen.
         Eh can I talk with mister (second name)
         Can I talk to Mr. Petersen
6        (0.5)
7   P:   wa-° hvem vil du tale med siger du?
         whom wish you talk with say you
         Whom do you want to talk to did you say
8   J:   ·hh Herr ↑peter↓sen.
         Mister (family name)
9        (0.6)
10  J:   Herr vet te (.) ↑peter↓sen.
         Mister (initials) (family name)
         Mister Vee Tee Petersen
11       (1.0)
```

```
12   P:    Vi:sti peter↓sen.=
           (first name) (family name)
13   J:    =ja [ja]=
           Yes
```

In line 12 P repairs J's utterance by saying, "Vi:sti peter↓sen." Brouwer and Wagner point out that this repair can also be viewed as an opportunity for learning. As shown in the following extract, the next time that J calls the school and requests to speak to Visti Petersen, he uses the correct name that was repaired by P in the previous interaction.

Extract 36: in Brouwer & Wagner (2004), p. 39, Simplified

```
1          ((telephone rings))
2    K:    Navigationsskolen Karen ↓han↑sen
           Nautical school (first name) (family name)
3    J:    Ja øh goddag det e:r jaap koluff igen.
           Yes goodday this is (first name (family name) again
           Yes hello, this is Jaap Kolf again
4          hh Øh kan jeg snake met visti: peter↓sen:eh
           can I talk with (first name) (second name)
           can I talk to Visti Petersen
```

In line 4 we are able to see that J produces the correct name which was previously repaired by J, hence suggesting that what was taught to him was learned, which is visible through his application of the correct reference term.

Young and Miller (2004) cite situated learning theory, which was proposed by Lave and Wenger (1991), and view learning not just as something that occurs in people's minds, but also as a social process. One of the main tenets of situated learning theory is a process called legitimate peripheral participation which views learning as the increase in participation in sociocultural practices from peripheral to full. Contrary to second language acquisition theories that view learning as a cognitive action that occurs in the mind, they argue that

second language acquisition is a process that is situated and jointly constructed by interlocutors. Their focus is not on the acquisition of the student's linguistic competence, but on the level of the student's participation and how it changes over time. In their longitudinal study, which focuses on interaction between a student and teacher in ESL writing conferences, Young and Miller (2004) argue that the student's participation increased, therefore transforming from peripheral, that it to say minimal participation, to fuller participation.

Hellermann (2011) examines how the interactional competence of two language learners changes over an extended period of time by focusing on how other-initiated repair is performed. He points out that participants orient to various trouble sources that need to be repaired at different time periods and they use a variety of methods to initiate and perform repair. One example he cited to demonstrate the improvement of an interlocutor's interactional competence was her provision of an account for her repair which was initiated with "no." However, Hellermann comments that the changes that occurred could be attributed to the fact that the context changed.

Markee (2008) considers how certain learning objects may be tracked over time in order to demonstrate when an object of learning occurs and how interlocutors partake in language learning behaviors. He calls this longitudinal approach "learning behavior tracking" (p. 404). In his example which focuses on a lexical item, the word "prerequisite," the teacher repairs the student's utterance "precourses" with "prerequisites." The student repeats the word "prerequisites" and says "previous courses," which Markee argues, suggests the student has undergone a change of state. He remarks that "the case for the viability of this methodology would be even stronger if other instances of how the student, He Hua, independently deploying this word in other, more distant, speech events could be found" (p. 420).

2.4.4 Learning in Short-Term Interaction

Firth (2009) investigates workplace interaction between L2 speakers of English and argues that in one section of the interaction learning-in-interaction is occurring as demonstrated through the interactants' ability to co-construct well-timed turns which are "coherent, orderly, and intelligible and, for these interactants, expedient interaction" (p. 140). He maintains that the ways in which interactants synchronize their actions and calibrate their talk would not be possible if learning were not occurring.

Ishida (2009) analyzed the use of modal expressions in decision-making talk between a native and a non-native speaker of Japanese. The focus of her study is interaction which lasts ten minutes and she remarks that the non-native speaker comes to use modals in a manner that bears resemblance to the way that the native speaker used them, thus demonstrating a change in how she participated in the interaction. She argues that the non-native speaker became more interactionally competent because of her ability to project the consequences of an utterance.

2.4.5 Summary

The ability of CA to deal with the issue of learning has been widely debated in recent years. Some researchers argue that because learning occurs in the mind and CA is only concerned with the visible aspects of interaction, it is not able to effectively show how learning occurs. Many studies have attempted to reveal that CA can be used as a tool to demonstrate how learning may occur. These studies have covered a plethora of topics, such as opportunities for learning and sites of learning. However, because most of these studies lack a traceable learning object, many researchers still doubt the ability of CA to address the topic of learning.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

This chapter describes the data, procedure, and ethical considerations of the present study and discusses reliability, validity, objectivity, and quantification as they relate to this study.

3.1 Data

The data analyzed in this study come from interaction in a language lounge at a private university in Japan. A language lounge is a place where university students can go to practice speaking English with native speakers of English and other students. In recent years, many Japanese universities have created language lounges with the goal of improving students' communicative abilities. Language lounge interaction is still an under-researched area and this study is an attempt to detail how interaction is accomplished in a language lounge.

Language lounge sessions closely resemble English conversation classes in the way that they are structured. The native speaker of English, the teacher, prepares activities, games, and topics for the students. In the language lounge, teachers frequently choose who speaks when and students rarely self-select. When students are selected by the teacher, their responses are often minimal and they usually only address the question asked without giving any additional information or returning questions. In recent years, there has been a shift from teacher-centered instruction to student-centered instruction, in which students actively engage in activities and discussions and collaborate with other students in pair and group work. In the language lounge, many of the activities involve pair or group work among students and teachers frequently facilitate the flow of the conversations, games, or activities, change the topic when they see fit, and often repair students' utterances. In this data, the actions of the

native English speaker were virtually indistinguishable from teachers in traditional classrooms, and both they and the students orient to their "discourse-internal" (Kasper, 2004, p. 563) identities of students and teachers. It is for these reasons that I will be referring to the participants as teachers and students throughout this paper. That is to say, I am not ascribing identities to the participants a priori, rather, these identities are made visible through the actions and inactions of the participants as they are seen doing being students and teachers. Antaki and Widdicombe (1998) comment that a person's identity is a display of membership to a certain identity category and that the characteristics associated with that identity category are able to be understood by the analyst through the actions of the participants. In his discussion on membership categorization, Sacks (1972) coined the expression "category-bound activities", and explained that "many activities are taken up by members to be done by some particular or several particular categories of members where the categories are categories from membership categorization devices" (p. 335). For example, in classroom settings, teachers lecture from the front of the room while students listen and take notes. Lecturing is a category-bound activity done by teachers and listening to a lecture and taking notes are category-bound activities engaged in by students.

What is important is whether a category is relevant at the time of interaction. In CA, identities are what the participants orient to and make relevant during the interaction (Sacks, 1972). CA studies argue that analysts should not have preconceived notions about the identities of participants as native or non-native and that these categories should only be invoked when they are relevant to the interaction (e.g., Mori, 2007). Throughout the interaction recorded for this study, the identities of the participants are manifested as teachers and students and for the majority of the interaction the participants orient to each other as such.

The data consists of approximately 16 hours of audio-video recorded conversations

which were collected by me or my colleague, and one of us was always present at the time of recording. Twenty-four language lounge sessions were recorded in total and each session was approximately 40 minutes. Each session was recorded with two video cameras, one on each side of the area where the participants sat, and two small remote microphones were set on the tables in between the participants to ensure maximum sound quality.

3.2 Participants

In general, one teacher managed each session, but there was one session in this data set in which two teachers managed the language lounge together. The number of students in each session that was recorded ranged from one to nine and in the 24 sessions recorded there were 11 unique teachers and 50 unique students in total. Some students participated in language lounge sessions many times. A summary of each session ca be found in Table 1.

Table 1

Summary of Each Session

Session number	Number of teachers	Number of students	Time in minutes
1	1	4	40
2	1	5	40
3	1	1	40
4	1	5	40
5	1	4	40
6	1	7	40
7	1	7	40
8	1	3	40
9	1	3	40
10	1	9	40
11	1	2	40
12	1	3	40
13	1	5	40
14	1	9	40
15	2	8	40
16	1	7	40
17	1	3	40
18	1	3	40
19	1	2	40
20	1	2	40
21	1	3	40
22	1	2	40
23	1	1	40
24	1	1	40

3.3 Procedure

At minimum, conversation analytic research often involves the following steps: (a) recording natural interaction, (b) transcribing all or part of the recording, (c) analyzing specific phenomena, (d) conducting data sessions and consulting CA experts, (e) writing up the analysis, and (f) disseminating research findings. A summary of each is as follows:

1. Recording natural interaction: Conversation analysis is concerned with analyzing interaction in natural settings and not experimental settings created by the researcher. The first steps in conversation analytic research involve deciding what type of interaction you want to record, getting permission to record, and then actually recording. Conversation analysts do their best not to disturb the natural setting of the situation. They pay special attention to camera and microphone placement in order to ensure that they capture the details of the interaction as well to minimalize their intrusiveness, which may make the participants conscious that they are being recorded and hence change their behavior,
2. Transcribing the recording: The analyst does not look for something in advance, rather, they let the patterns or phenomena reveal themselves through the recordings, which are transcribed in detail and carefully examined repeatedly by the analyst. Once they have discovered the pattern or phenomenon of their interest, they transcribe the surrounding interaction in detail if they have not done so already. Conversation analysis requires that transcripts be quite detailed and transcribing the minute details of the interaction can be exceptionally time-consuming (Markee, 2000).
3. Analyzing specific phenomena: After the analyst has decided the phenomenon that they want to focus on, they begin making collections, conducting detailed analyses, and, when relevant, performing deviant case analyses.
4. Conducting data sessions and consulting CA experts: Once the analyst has performed a detailed analysis of the phenomenon of their interest, they conduct data sessions with

other CA experts and discuss the findings with these experts in order to confirm their accuracy.

5. Writing up the analysis: Next, the analyst writes up their analysis of the data. Before presenting or publishing the written analysis, the analyst will often have it peer reviewed by a CA expert.
6. Disseminating research findings: After the analysis is finished, the findings of the research are often shared with other researchers at academic meetings or published in academic journals.

As mentioned above, natural interaction in a university language lounge was recorded for this study and all possible steps were taken to avoid disturbing the natural setting of the interaction. All of the recordings were transcribed while viewing the original videos. As a phenomenon of interest emerged from the interaction, I described it in detail and then began a collection of the instances of the phenomenon. After I decided the phenomena that I wanted to focus on I presented the data used in this study at several data sessions with other CA experts in order to confirm or revise my findings and to strengthen the reliability and validity of them.

3.4 Ethical Considerations

When conducting research, there are ethical issues that need to be considered by researchers. This section deals with the various ethical issues considered by the researcher for this study.

3.4.1 Consent Forms

When collecting data it is important to consider matters of consent (ten Have, 1999). The Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT)

(2002) states that researchers should obtain informed consent from participants prior to their participation. All of the participants who were recorded for this study signed consent forms, which were available in English and Japanese (see Appendices B and C for consent forms). Students were given Japanese consent forms and teachers were given English consent forms to ensure that participants understood the purpose of the research and that their privacy would be protected.

Sometimes it is difficult for researchers concerned with informed consent to explain the research to participants in terms that they can understand (Oliver, 2010). The best effort was made to explain to the participants in simple, non-specialist terms the goal of this study, which as the consent forms state, is to examine language use in interaction. Researchers are obligated to protect the rights of the participants in their studies. One right of particular importance is the participant's right to confidentiality. Some participants may not want their identities revealed so it is important that they understand that their privacy will be protected and that any identifying details such as their names and faces will be changed or hidden. It was clearly explained in the consent forms that participants' real names will not be used; they will appear as pseudonyms.

Data is often used in presentations and academic publications in the form of audio, video, and screen shots. When data is used it is crucial that the researcher take all precautions to protect the confidentiality of the participants. The consent form used in this study states that the audio, video, and screen shots taken from the recording will be used for research purposes and only viewed by professional researchers, and whenever video or screen shots are used in a presentation or publication they will be blurred to conceal the identities of the participants. Consent forms were filled out before the sessions began and did not interrupt the session in any way.

3.4.2 Recording

Labov (1972) describes an "observer's paradox," which is the notion that in order to study how people talk in natural settings, people's conversations in natural settings must be observed, but if people know that their conversations are being observed, they may change the way that they speak, therefore making their speech unnatural. In the present study, all conceivable precautions were taken to avoid affecting the natural environment of the language lounge. During the sessions, the data collectors were not visible to the participants and only returned to the tables where the students sat after each session in order to explain the purpose of the research and the consent form to the participants of the following session. The cameras were placed on each side of the area in which the participants were seated at a distance from that area so as not be intrusive. The cameras were set up in between sessions so as not to affect the session in any way. The remote microphones were set in the middle of the tables away from the participants in order to avoid impeding their ability to write or take notes.

3.4.3 Transcripts

All of the conversations were transcribed according to the transcription conventions established by Gail Jefferson (See Atkinson & Heritage, 1984). Only the extracts which are exemplary of the phenomena under discussion are shown in this dissertation.

3.4.4 Data Storage

Providing secure storage to ensure the confidentiality of data is one issue faced by researchers (Long & Johnson, 2007). MEXT (2002) states that researchers should appropriately manage and protect the personal information of participants. After the recordings were taken, the data were transferred to an external hard drive, where it is

currently stored, and then deleted from the video camera. In order to maintain the privacy of the participants, the external hard drive is kept in a secure cabinet accessible only by the principle researcher.

3.5 Reliability, Validity, Objectivity, and Quantification

CA research is quantitative in the sense that it involves systematically analyzing large sets of data and it is qualitative in that it also analyzes single cases of phenomenon (Hosoda, 2002). Concepts such as reliability, validity, objectivity were originally used in quantitative research, but because of their proven ability to critique the quality of research, they are often used to assess qualitative studies (Peräkylä, 2004). The nature of these constructs and the questions being asked in order to determine the soundness of a study differs depending on the type of research. In the following sections, I discuss each of them as they relate to the present study.

3.5.1 Reliability

According to Nunan (1992), "Reliability refers to the consistency of the results obtained from a piece of research" (p. 14). Reliability consists of two basic elements: internal reliability and external reliability. The internal reliability of a study describes the extent to which other researchers agree upon what was observed, whereas external reliability refers to the ability of another researcher to produce comparable findings using the same or similar type of data (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982).

I have taken steps to establish the reliability of the results of the present study. In order to confirm my findings of the data used in this study, the data and analyses were presented at several data sessions with experts in the field of CA and the findings were discussed with and reviewed by the aforementioned experts.

CA studies include transcripts which can be scrutinized by readers and this helps to ensure that the same conclusions can be reached regardless of who analyzes them or when they are analyzed (Waring, 2016). Transcripts allow readers to test the reliability of a study by analyzing the same data and using the same methods as the author (Seedhouse, 2005). The external reliability of this study can be confirmed and reproduced through the use of the data and transcripts, which are available to other researchers. This is similar to what was described by Lincoln and Guba (1985) as "inquiry audits" (p. 317), which refers to having another researcher use the same data, or in some cases, transcripts, and methods of analysis to verify the results.

3.5.2 Validity

Validity refers to the extent to which the results are accurately interpreted (Kirk & Miller, 1985) and is concerned with whether the interpretations made by the researcher are grounded in the data, which is possible to support through empirical analyses. In CA research, analysts do not construct a hypothesis a priori to prove or disprove. Through the repeated viewing and listening of the recorded data, various phenomena begin to emerge, and it is from these phenomena that the researcher chooses what to focus on. The researcher's analyses are detailed descriptions of the observable aspects of the interaction; researchers refrain from discussing non-observable elements of interaction. This is one feature of CA studies that helps solidify the validity of the findings. In CA research, the analyst is not imposing their ideas of what they think is happening, rather, they are explicating what is occurring in the interaction and their observations can be validated by observing how the producer of the current turn treats the previous turn.

Sacks et al. (1974) describe what is called a "proof criterion" (p. 729), which means that each interactant's turn demonstrates how they interpret the previous speaker's turn. They

point out that it is the interactants' interpretations and understandings of the previous turn that are used in analyses. Therefore, the "display of those understandings in the talk of subsequent turns affords both a resource for the analysis of prior turns and a proof procedure for professional analyses of prior turns – resources intrinsic to the data themselves" (p. 729). In short, by looking at how the participants treat the next turn, we are able to see if the analyst's interpretation of the previous turn is correct (Peräkylä. 2004).

CA research is concerned with identifying patterns of interaction or interactional devices. Although many CA studies present several examples in order to demonstrate a particular pattern, many studies may only analyze a single case of a particular phenomenon. This raises the question, how many examples are needed in order to generalize the results? Even if a single case of a particular phenomenon is identified, it may be a deviant case, but it does demonstrate that that phenomenon does exist and that it is possible that it could occur again. By presenting a single case analysis or deviant case analysis, it creates a platform from which other researchers can build on and compare the research results of their own and others. In their study on repair, Schegloff et al. (1977) mention that their goal is to identify the interactional patterns or devices of a particular interactional environment, which will then make apparent some common features of the same pattern or device in a different interactional environment. The goal of their study is representative of the goal of CA studies in general. The ultimate goal of CA research is to develop accounts of interactional patterns or devices, and through the accumulation of multiple single case analyses, generalizations about the pattern or device being focused become possible.

3.5.3 Objectivity

According to Kirk and Miller (1986), objectivity is the greatest degree of co-occurring reliability and validity. They state that, "Reliability is the degree to which the finding is

independent of accidental circumstances of the research, and validity is the degree to which the finding is interpreted in a correct way" (p. 20). This implies that when the results of a study can be replicated by another researcher using the same or similar data and methodology, and the interpretations of the researcher are accurate and therefore confirmed, the study can be labeled as being objective.

In CA research, the data are available to readers in the form of transcripts. Readers, therefore, have access to the data and can assess the accuracy of the findings based on the transcripts. When readers scrutinize the analyses while referencing the transcripts, this is a form of replicating the results. Transcripts and analyses allow readers to determine the accuracy of the results as well as if the results can be replicated using the same data and methods. It is a combination of these elements that help define the degree of objectivity of a study.

3.5.4 Quantification

Guba and Lincoln (1981) argue that for qualitative analysis the incidence with which something occurs is not always relevant in order make an argument regarding the thing being analyzed. This suggests that just because something does not frequently occur or because it may only occur once, it does not mean that consideration is not warranted, nor does it take away from its analytical importance.

Seedhouse (2004) points out that for CA researchers, quantification is not of primary interest, but that what is of concern, is conducting detailed analyses of the data from an emic perspective. Schegloff (1993) mentions that in CA research, a form of quantification can be seen through the use of terms such as ordinarily, commonly, and regularly. He explains that in the field of CA, researchers analyze large data sets and examine collections of single instances, so quantitative analysis is therefore "not an alternative to single case analysis, but

rather is built on its back" (p. 102).

3.6 Summary

This chapter provided an overview the data and procedure used in the present study and outlined the ethical factors considered when conducting this research.
It also explained how reliability, validity, objectivity, and quantification relate to conversation analytic studies such as this one.

CHAPTER 4

HOW REPAIR BECOMES NOTICEABLE

This chapter investigates various types of repair and interactional environments which cause repair to become "recognizable as repair" (Lerner & Kitzinger, 2015, p. 62) to the recipient of the repair who is also the producer of the trouble source. The analysis presented here builds on previous conversation analytic studies on how repair is performed, and examines several interactional environments and resources which help to make repair noticeable in those environments.

All of the interactional repair considered in this chapter concerns problems of speaking by students. Repair is initiated by a student, the speaker of the trouble source, or by a teacher. Other-initiations of repair have varying strengths in regards to their ability to locate a trouble source and stronger repair initiators are preferred (Schegloff et al., 1977). Sometimes other-initiated repair and other-repair do not clearly locate the trouble source, and go overlooked by the speaker of the trouble source. This chapter explores the possible reasons repair does not go overlooked and also examines the ways that speakers of trouble sources demonstrate their understanding that their utterance has been repaired. Some of these ways include repeating the repaired utterance, which was most common, and the use of change of state tokens, such as "oh", "ah", and the like. Koshik (2005a) explains that one way that language teachers get students to notice and self-repair their problematic utterances is by repeating students' utterances in the previous turn with rising intonation. This chapter also discusses other methods that teachers use to draw student attention to the fact that their utterance is being repaired. Schmidt (1990) asserts that noticing is an essential condition for second language learning to occur. In the next chapter, I illustrate how repair sequences can be potential sites of learning. As noted there, however, it is likely that learning occurs from the repair if the participant who is having a problem of speaking realizes that repair is

occurring. In other words, even when another participant treats the speaker's utterance as problematic and carries out repair, if the speaker of the trouble source does not realize that their utterance is problematic and is being repaired, it is less likely that learning will occur.

4.1 Analysis

In this section, I examine various interactional contexts in which repair is made noticeable to the speaker of the trouble source as well as some interactional resources deployed by teachers to demonstrate to students that their utterances are being repaired. I also analyze how the lack of relevant next interactional elements, such as continuers (e.g., uh huh, yeah, etcetera) (Schegloff, 1982) and receipt tokens can help to call attention to the turn which contains the repair and make it visible to the producer of the trouble source that their utterance is under repair. Lastly, I explicate how a self-initiation of repair performed by a student can set the stage for a relevant repair either by the speaker of the trouble source or another participant and how students display to teachers their understanding that their utterance has been repaired. The interactional environments and resources that I explore in this section are as follows: (a) when a teacher joins a conversation between two students to perform repair, (b) when a teacher uses words such as "you mean," "you could say," "we say," and "say it," (c) when a student self-initiates repair, (d) when a teacher uses a combination of various resources, including the production of "you said" and emphasis to perform repair after next turns, (e) when repair is pre- and post-framed, (f) when the word repaired is produced in isolation and repeated, and (g) when a teacher uses gestures.

4.1.1 Teacher Joins a Conversation Between Two Students to Do Repair

One way that repair becomes noticeable is when a third party, who is not a recipient of the talk at that moment (Goodwin, 1981) joins a conversation to do repair. In this section I

examine how a teacher's sudden participation in a conversation between two students engaged in an activity to do repair draws attention to the repair, therefore making it noticeable. In both of the examples in this section, the speaker of the trouble source receipts the repair by repeating it.

In the following extract, the students, TK and RS, are doing an activity in which one student describes a job and the other student is supposed to guess what that job is. The interaction begins with TK asking RS "do you have >many money<?"

```
Extract 1: 2-1-26:13
01   TK:   do you have >many money<?
02   RS:   ah ((nods))
03         (1.4)
04   TK:   do you have ma-=
05   RS:   =many money
06   TK:   many hu- money
07   T2:   °much money°
08   TK:   ah mu- much money do you have much money? [much money
09   RS:                                             [°much money°
10   TK:   much money ha ha ha sorry ha ha ha sorry
11   RS:   hn:: yes
12   TK:   yes
13   RS:   yes
14   TK:   yes yes
15   RS:   yes
16   TK:   oh
17         (2.6)
```

RS responds to TK's question with "ah" and a nod in line 02. TK treats RS's response as insufficient as shown by his pursuit of an answer in line 04, when he recycles the same question from line 01. But before TK is able to fully produce the word "many", RS responds with "many money". This is followed by TK saying, "many hu- money", which T2, the

teacher, acting here as overhearer (Goffman, 1981), repairs with "°much money°" produced in a quiet voice. Schegloff (2000) reports that other-initiations of repair occasionally do not occur in the turn just subsequent to the trouble source when the participant who is not a recipient of the talk initiates repair. In this extract, T2 is not a recipient of the talk and it is possible that he is withholding repair until he sees if the recipient of the talk will initiate repair or not. After seeing that TK does not initiate repair, T2 joins the conversation and deploys other-initiated other-repair. In line 08, TK states, "ah mu- much money do you have much money? much money". RS also produces the phrase "much money" in the following line in overlap with TK's final "much money". In line 10, TK again repeats "much money" and apologizes for his perceived mistake with "ha ha ha sorry ha ha ha sorry." In the following turn, RS answers TK's reworded question with "hn:: yes.", which also works as a repetition and clarification of his positive response in line 02. In this interaction, two students are engaged in an activity and T2's participation in the activity is not required. Nonetheless, his sudden intervention in the interaction to do repair has become the focus of RS and TK's attention. T2 orients to "many money" as being problematic as indicated by the fact that he joins the conversation to do repair.

Both RS and TK display their understanding that the word "many" was repaired by repeating "much money". TK does this in line 08 when he reproduces his question, replacing the words "many money" with "much money" and RS demonstrates his understanding in the following line by repeating "much money".

Similarly, in the next extract, two students are having a conversation and even though the teacher is not a recipient of the talk, he suddenly joins the interaction to perform repair.

```
Extract 2: 11-2-15:51
01   HN:   where have you been (.) to?
02   TY:   uh England Australia Austria Canada eh:: Czecho
03         (1.4)
```

```
04   T2:   Czech [Republic
05   TY:         [Czech Czech Republic Germany and Switzerland
06   T2:   oh
```

The interaction begins with HN asking TY, "where have you been (.) to?" In line 02, TY responds with "uh England Australia Austria Canada eh:: Czecho", and this is followed by a 1.4-second gap. Schegloff et al. (1977) explain that occasionally other-initiations are performed slightly after the completion of a trouble source turn and that this sometimes results in the next turn being somewhat delayed. They also state that when a gap follows a trouble source turn, it creates an additional opportunity for the speaker of the trouble source to initiate repair. This extract is an example of one such case. Following the problematic turn, there is a 1.4-second gap, in which TY could self-initiate repair. In this extract, however, the speaker of the trouble source does not use the opportunity to do self-repair. Following the gap, T2 performs other-initiated other-repair, stating, "Czech Republic", and after he says "Czech", TY repeats "Czech", but because it was produced in overlap with T2's "Republic", he recycles "Czech" again, which is followed by "Republic". T2's participation in the conversation, the location of the other-repair, the turn subsequent to the trouble source, as well as the isolation of the repaired utterance help to make it clear that the previous utterance is being repaired. Additionally, because the repaired utterance does not contain rising intonation, which could be seen as a confirmation of the previous utterance, and the fact that it is slightly similar to but different from the previous utterance, locates the trouble source and makes the repair stand out. TY displays his recognition that his utterance was repaired by repeating the repair proper.

In a corpus-assisted discourse analytic study, Tsuchiya and Handford (2014) analyzed English as a lingua franca meetings for a bridge building project and they present an example somewhat similar to the two extracts above. In the meetings that they analyzed, a chairperson

is present and they occasionally perform repair, or what they refer to as a reformulation, thus treating the previous utterance as problematic, even when it is not grammatically incorrect. They argue that the reformulations are performed to elucidate the meaning for the other participants. Their example is similar to the above examples in that the Chair is not a direct recipient of the talk and his sudden participation in the interaction draws attention to his turn, thereby making his reformulation noticeable. In their example as well, the speaker of the trouble source accepts the reformulation by repeating it. Bolden (2011), in a conversation analytic study, demonstrates how a participant who is not the producer of the trouble source is sometimes selected to perform repair. She explains that the speaker who initiates repair "interjects the repair initiation into the ongoing course of action in such a way as to not break its contiguity" (p. 245). In the two examples from my data presented above, the teacher is not a recipient of the talk, but interjects to perform repair. These examples differ from Bolden's findings, however, in that the progressivity of the interaction is temporarily halted when the teacher joins the conversation to perform repair. In the language lounge, it is the teacher who controls the interaction and therefore has the right to alter the course of the interaction.

4.1.2 Teacher's Use of "You mean," "You could say," "We say," and "Say it"

In this section I explore various expressions that teachers use to indicate to a student that their utterance is being repaired. Repair initiations differ in their abilities to locate trouble sources (Schegloff et al., 1977). Expressions such as, "you mean," "you could say," "we say," and "say it" serve to mark the words that precede or follow as a repair proper. The use of "you mean," "you could say," and "we say" demonstrate to the speaker of the trouble source not only that their previous utterance is problematic, but also that what precedes or follows is possibly the more appropriate word or expression. Schegloff et al. (1977) provide evidence that other-correction can be downgraded through the use of uncertainty markers such as "I

think" and "you mean" and by various types of questions. In addition to "I think" and "you mean," "you could say" also downgrades the repair and modifies the speaker of the trouble source's utterance. On the other hand, "we say" and "say it" do not. "We say" does not downgrade the repair, but it directly suggests that the participant performing the repair is not providing an alternative to the producer of the trouble source's expression. "Say it" demonstrates to the speaker of the trouble source that the repaired utterance just produced is in fact a correction and commands the speaker of the trouble source to repeat the corrected utterance. Out of all of the expressions used in this section that make repair noticeable, "say it" is the strongest and its use intensifies the repair. The extracts in this section are arranged by the strength of the expressions used by the teachers in this data. It is ordered weakest to strongest: "I think you mean," "you mean," "you could say," "we say," and "say it."

The following extract exhibits how the expression "I think you mean," can be used to mark repair, thereby making it apparent to the producer of the trouble source. In this extract, the students are discussing the last movie that they watched.

Extract 3: 4-1-37:55

01	AI:	I watched *Kamisama no Karute*
02	YK:	ah *Karute* of God ha
03	AH:	Ja- Japanese movie
04	T4:	uh huh
05	YK:	Japanese movie
06	T4:	what- what kind of movie is it? is it a drama, horror movie
07	YK:	doc- doctor
08	AM:	drama
09	AI:	um::
10	YK:	drama and di- diary?
11	AH:	ha ha ha
12	T4:	diary? ((points to RI)) do you- have you seen this?
13	RI:	((shakes head))
14	AM:	non- non fiction
15	YK:	non fiction

16 T4: non-fiction oh↑(.) I think you mean documentary
17 YK: documentary
18 T4: documentary
19 AM: ah
20 T4: that' like a record yeah
21 YK: yeah
22 T4: you are documenting real life

This extract begins with AI stating, "I watched *Kamisama no Karute*", which YK translates part of in line 02, saying, "*Karute* of God". AH and YK point out that it is a "Japanese movie" in lines 03 and 05. In the next turn, T4 asks, "what- what kind of movie is it? is it a drama, horror movie". YK and AM answer that it is a "doctor" "drama" in lines 07 and 08 and YK elaborates that it is a "drama and di- diary" in line 10. T4 initiates repair in line 12, asking, "diary?", which is a question-intoned repetition of YK's turn. Schegloff (1997a) has shown that a repetition of part of or all of a trouble source is a strong repair initiator, meaning that it helps to make it easier for the speaker of the trouble source turn to locate the repairable. AM and YK state that the movie is "non-fiction" in lines 14 and 15, which T4 receipts through repetition, followed by the change of state token "oh ↑ ". Since T4 has established that the movie is non-fiction, the description of it as a drama is probably not so precise, perhaps prompting him to perform repair by stating, "I think you mean documentary". Benjamin and Mazeland (2013) note that "I think" can be used to mitigate claims to a higher level of knowledge, which is what is happening in this example. The teacher, who is a native speaker of English, does have superior knowledge regarding English, but because he is not familiar with the movie, he uses the phrase "I think," which is a "display of doubt" (Lerner & Kitzinger, 2015, p. 70) and serves to mitigate his repair. The use of the expression, "I think you mean," displays to the students that the word or sentence that follows is a repair of the words "drama" and "diary" in lines 08 and 10, respectively. YK, one of the producers of the trouble source, accepts the repair by repeating it in line 17. The teacher acknowledges her

receipt of the repair by repeating the word, "documentary," in the subsequent turn, thus closing the repair sequence.

This extract exemplifies how marking the trouble source can indicate to the producer of it that their utterance is being repaired. The response, in this case, is the repetition of the appropriate word, "documentary," and not "drama" or "diary." Hosoda (2006) reports that in the native/non-native conversations that she analyzed, the non-native speaker often accepted the repair by repeating it, but that rarely occurred in the conversations among native speakers that she analyzed.

The next two extracts highlight how the expression, "you mean," can make the repair noticeable. "I think you mean" differs from "you mean" because the use of "I think you mean" downgrades the repair and demonstrates a lack of certainty. The difference between the extract above and the two extracts below is that in the extract above the teacher is not familiar with the movie and is therefore unable to say with complete certainty whether the movie is a drama, diary, or documentary. In contrast, in the following two extracts, the teacher appears to be more confident because the problem has to do with English grammar, which is demonstrably in his epistemic domain. Prior to the interaction examined in this extract, T1 instructed the students to ask each other what they did on the weekend, which they finished doing. After that, the teacher selected students one by one to explain what their partner did on the weekend. The extract begins with YK reporting about her partner TK, "on Sunday he went to Yokohama?", while looking at TK as if to confirm that what she is saying is correct.

```
Extract 4: 1-1-23:15
01   YK:   on Sunday he went to ((looks at TK)) Yokohama?
02   TK:   yes
03   YK:   for hn with your with his friends
04   TK:   yes
```

05 YK: hn: uh he went to- uh they went to karaoke and Doutor ((looks at TK))
06 TK: yeah
07 YK: and hh ha ha ha
08 TK: hanging in- hang in- hang in
09 YK: ah hang in
10 TK: ha ha ha ha Doutor in Doutor. I hang there with my friend
11 T1: hung- hung out? [you mean
12 TK: [hang out [hang out hang out
13 T1: [hung out okay

TK confirms that YK's sentence is correct in line 02, stating, "yes", after which YK continues explaining that TK went "with his friends" and "they went to karaoke and Doutor" in lines 03 and 05. TK again confirms that her statements are true in lines 04 and 06 with "yes" and "yeah". YK attempts to continue her turn in line 07 with "and," but begins laughing and in the next line TK states, "hanging in- hang in- hang in", which is followed by YK repeating "hang in". In line 10, after briefly laughing, TK continues his turn with "Doutor in Doutor. I hang there with my friend". T1 then performs other-initiated other-repair on TK's utterance with "hung- hung out? you mean". Schegloff et al. (1977) comment that one way to initiate repair is through the use of "you mean." They found that other-correction consisting of "you mean" and modifications marked by uncertainty "is not asserted, but it is proffered for acceptance or rejection" (p. 379). They refer to this as a "correction invitation format." Benjamin (2012) investigated the use of "you mean" to initiate repair and focused on how it is used to perform understanding checks in cases where the repair initiation is not produced immediately after the turn containing the repairable. The examples that he presents differ from this extract in that the repair initiation occurs immediately after the turn that contains the trouble source. They are similar because the use of "you mean" serves to locate the trouble source for its speaker. The isolation of the trouble source, the rising intonation on the word "out" as well as the phrase "you mean" help to illustrate to TK that his utterance is problematic.

Since "hung out" is produced with rising intonation, it requires a response from TK, which he provides in line 12, stating, "hang out hang out hang out", showing that he was unable to hear that T1 is saying "hung out" and not "hang out". Schegloff (1997a) states that "some turns are hearably or analyzably produced as 'repeats,' even if in one or more respects they actually fail to reproduce (either in whole or in part) their apparent, nonetheless, retrievable target" (p. 525). Although TK's "hang out" is not an exact repeat of T1's "hung out", it is a repeat attempt and therefore can be treated as a receipt through repetition. Because the first "hang out" is produced in overlap with T1's utterance, "you mean", he has to produce it in the clear to make sure that it is heard. TK's second production of "hang out" overlaps with T1's "hung out" in line 13 and the third time he produces it, "hang" is said in overlap with T1's "okay". This "okay" seems to be an acknowledgement of TK's attempt to correctly repeat the repaired utterance. Although TK is unable to produce the words "hung out", T1 decides to let the mistake pass (Firth, 1996).

Regarding modulated other-repairs, more specifically, the use of uncertainty markers when performing other-repair, Schegloff et al. (1977) remark, "if it were confidently held, it ought not to be done" (p. 380). However, in this example, the problematic utterance, "hang in", should be in the epistemic domain of T1, a native English speaker. Even though he is probably sure that "hang out" is the appropriate expression, he uses the uncertainty marker, "you mean".

The following extract also highlights how the use of the phrase "you mean" can signal to the speaker of the trouble source that their utterance is being repaired. Before the extract below begins, T1 wrote "Your Dreams" on the whiteboard.

```
Extract 5: 1-1-24:25
01   T1:   what do you think your dream is
02         (1.4)
03   T1:   are you ready to talk about your dreams?
```

```
04          (2.0)
05    TK:   real
06    T1:   hn?
07    TK:   real my dream
08    T1:   real- realize you mean.
09    TK:   realize realize
10    T1:   wh- so there could be at least two meanings of this word right?
```

The extract begins with T1 asking the students, "what do you think your dream is". After a 1.4-second gap, T1 asks the students, "are you ready to talk about your dreams?" In line 04, there is a 2.0-second gap, which is followed by TK self-selecting and saying, "real". In the next turn, T1 initiates repair with the open class repair initiator (Drew, 1997) "hn?", to which TK responds, "real my dream". In line 08, T initiates and performs repair with "real- realize you mean." The phrase, "you mean," marks that TK's utterance is being repaired and that "realize" is the word that he should use. Using phrases such as, "you mean," can serve as a signal to the trouble source speaker that their utterance is being repaired. TK displays that he understands that the word he produced has been repaired by repeating the word "realize" twice in line 09.

The following extract demonstrates how the phrase, "you could say," can mark the repair proper, thereby making it noticeable. "You could say" indicates to the producer of the trouble source that "this is repair" (Lerner & Kitzinger, 2015, p. 77). Before the interaction shown in the extract began, the students were instructed to write down three dreams, discuss them in groups, and ask their partners questions about their dreams. In order to get the students thinking about the types of questions that they could ask each other, T1 told them that his future dreams are to ride his bike around the world, learn to play guitar, and to have twelve children, and then instructed them to ask him questions about his dreams. The extract begins with SI asking T1 about one of his dreams.

Extract 6: 1-1-33:44

01 SI: where did you go around (.) wo- around the world by bike your bike
02 T1: yeah but I didn't go yet so you could say where (.) will you go
03 SI: ah::↑
04 T1: yeah but where is a great question ((writes "where will" on
05 whiteboard))
06 SI: where are you going?
07 T1: or where are you going yeah where will you go where will you go (1.7)
08 I want to ride- I've ridden many countries but (.) Europe and some
09 Asia and some more in South America

In line 01, SI says "where did you go around wo- around the world by bike your bike". T1 initiates other repair and performs the repair proper in line 02 by stating, "yeah but I didn't go yet so you could say where will you go", with emphasis added on "will". In line 06, SI suggests an alternative expression, "where are you going", which T1 receipts through repetition, "or where are you going" in line 07. In lines 08 and 09, T1 answers the correct version of SI's question in line 01, which is "where will you go" by stating, "I want to ride- I've ridden many countries but Europe and some Asia and some more in South America". In addition to making the repair noticeable by using the phrase, "you could say," T1 writes "where will" on the whiteboard." The word "will" replaces the trouble source "did". This also helps to make the repair manifest to the speaker of the trouble source. SI acknowledges that his utterance was repaired by producing the change of state token, "ah::: ↑ ", which is elongated and produced with rising intonation.

The following extract shows how the phrase, "we say," can indicate to the speaker of the trouble source that their utterance is being repaired and that the appropriate utterance follows. "You could say" and "we say" differ in the fact that "you could say" is a more mitigated form of repair. The word "could" might suggest to the trouble source speaker that what they said is not wrong and that the word, phrase, sentence, etcetera that follows is an alternative. The phrase "we say" does not suggest that what follows is an alternative to what

was said. It conveys to the speaker of the trouble source that what they said is different from how native speakers, the group referred to with "we" in this case, would say it and that what follows is the more appropriate word, phrase, sentence, etcetera.

```
Extract 7: 19-1-20:38
01   T3:   can you ice skate?
02         (0.5)
03   HY:   hn::: (1.9) hn: no actually I not that often °often° (1.3) I uh::
04         played ice skating before but I was not good at it
05   T3:   I've done
06   HY:   I've done it before
07   T3:   yeah so you've played a sport, so I've played ice hockey
08         (0.6)
09   HY:   ice hockey no
10   T3:   but I've been ice skating
11   HY:   ice skating yeah
12   T3:   so because it's a verb to skate we say I (.) have (.) been ice
13         skating
14   HY:   °I have been ice skating°
15   T3:   but if you play a sport I have played (.) ice hockey
16   HY:   hn:
17   T3:   because it's a sport
```

The interaction begins with T3 asking HY, "can you ice skate?" Following a 0.5-second gap, HY responds, "hn::: hn: no actually I not that often °often° I uh:: played ice skating before but I was not good at it". This is followed by T3's other-initiated other-repair in which he states, "I've done". This is a repair on "I uh:: played ice skating before". HY accepts the repaired utterance by repeating it and producing "it before" after it. Although HY repeats the repaired utterance, T3 begins to explain that the word, "play," is used for sports, stating, "yeah so you've played a sport, so I've played ice hockey". In lines 10, 12, and 13, he continues his explanation, saying, "but I have been ice skating", "so because it's a verb to skate we say I

have been ice skating". Possibly because in line 07 T3 uses the examples, "you've played a sport" and "so I've played ice hockey" to show HY that the word "play" is used with sports, HY does not seem to realize that T3 is explaining something and not just summarizing HY's turn. HY takes T3's utterances in lines 07 and 10 as confirmation checks, as shown by his utterances, "ice hockey no", and "ice skating yeah" in lines 09 and 11. However, in lines 12 and 13, when T3 says, "so because it's a verb to skate we say I have been ice skating", HY acknowledges his receipt of the repair by repeating it. When T3 uses the words, "so you've" and "so I've", HY does not treat them as explanations, rather as a confirmation check of what he said. T3's use of "we say" and pauses, his production of "I have" instead of "I've", as well as his stress marking on the "ing" in "skating" in line 12 make it apparent to HY that T3 is repairing his utterance. HY exhibits that he understands that his utterance was repaired by repeating the repaired utterance in the subsequent turn, stating, "I have been ice skating". In line 15, T3 continues to clarify, saying, "but if you play a sport I have played ice hockey", which HY receipts with "hn:" in the subsequent turn.

In many of the extracts explicated in this chapter, the teacher initiates and/or carries out repair, the student receipts the repair by using a receipt token or by repeating the repaired utterance, and the teacher acknowledges the student's receipt or production of the repaired utterance. In the above example, however, the teacher, T3, does not acknowledge HY's correct production of the repaired utterance. This is because he is not finished with his explanation, as shown in his turns in lines 15 and 17 when he states, "but if you play a sport I have played ice hockey" and "because it's a sport".

The extract which follows illustrates how the expression, "say it," can be used to indicate to the speaker of the trouble source that their utterance has been repaired and that producing a repaired form of their previous utterance is necessary to show the teacher that they understand it. "We say" is different from "say it" because "we say" merely indicates that

what follows is repair, whereas "say it" is an imperative that tells the speaker of the trouble source that their utterance has been repaired and that producing the repaired utterance is imperative in order to show the participant who performed the repair that the recipient recognized the repair. In this extract T3 and HZ are participating in an activity in which they pull a piece of paper out of a hat and on that paper there is a topic or question. T3 and HZ are to discuss that topic or question until they have exhausted it.

Extract 8: 3-1-30:20

01	T3:	((reads)) which country has the most handsome men?
02	HZ:	ha [ha
03	T3:	[and beautiful women
04	HZ:	w(h)h(h)a(h)t?=
05	T3:	=hh
06	HZ:	that's really interesting
05		(1.0)
06	HZ:	since I've never- I mean I've been- (3.9) I- how should I say
07		like I have <u>few</u> countries
08	T3:	hn I have <u>been</u> to a few.
09	HZ:	yeah I have been to a few, not a few like few- few
10	T3:	few countries
11	HZ:	yeah not so many.
12	T3:	I haven't been to many
13	HZ:	yeah yeah that- hn so not
14	T3:	say it
15	HZ:	like
16	T3:	I haven't been to many
17	HZ:	I haven't been to many countries
18	T3:	good.

In line 01, T3 reads a slip of paper which asks, "which country has the most handsome men?" This is followed by HZ's laughter and T3's continuation of his turn in line 03 in which he says, "and beautiful women." HZ responds, "that's really interesting", and after a 1.0-second gap, she says, "since I've never- I mean I've been- I- how should I say like I have <u>few</u> countries".

Following HZ's repair initiation, T3 performs repair with "I have been to a few." HZ then receipts the repair by saying, "yeah I have been to a few", but then states, "not a few like few-few", which is a rejection of part of the repair. In line 10, T3 finishes the last part of HZ's sentence by stating, "few countries", which HZ accepts in the following turn with "yeah".

In line 12, T3 repairs HZ's utterance from line 11 ("not so many") by saying, "I haven't been to many", which HZ receipts in the following turn by stating, "yeah yeah that-". This also displays to T3 that HZ recognizes that her utterance was repaired. HZ continues her turn with "hn so not" and it appears as if she is going to say, "so not so many", but T3 demonstrates to HZ that he wants her to produce the complete repaired utterance in the following line by saying, "say it". T3 says, "say it", because HZ does not immediately produce the repaired utterance. The words, "say it", mark T3's previous utterance as a repair proper that needs to be completed. Thus, it exhibits how T3 orients to the production of the repaired utterance as relevant and necessary before the interaction can proceed. HZ's actions reveal that she recognizes that her utterance has been repaired, but the words "say it" serve to emphasize to her that she has not produced an adequate response to T3's repair. HZ repeats the utterance in line 17 and adds the word "countries," completing the turn constructional unit. T3 provides feedback in the subsequent turn, stating, "good".

4.1.3 Student Self-Initiates Repair

In this section I explore how the self-initiation of repair by a student can set the stage for a relevant repair either by the speaker of the trouble source or another participant. It is the self-initiation of repair which helps make the repair noticeable.

The following extract shows how a self-initiation of repair by a student can make a repair in the subsequent turn relevant and noticeable. It also showcases how a resource, in this case, a piece of paper, can be utilized by a teacher to perform repair. The repair is

produced in the turn immediately following the trouble source and the use of the paper helps to make the repair the focus of the interaction, thus ensuring that the repair will not go overlooked. In this interaction, the topic is someone you find funny. Prior to the following extract, HZ said that her friend from Osaka is funny and then she begins describing people from places in Western Japan, such as Osaka.

Extract 9: 3-1-21:34

01 HZ: um I'm not sure but you know like um I heard that like when they (1.7)
02 walk across the street- no wa:lk <on the street>
03 T3: un hn
04 HZ: is that like um wa- anyway like walk the street- like when they
05 ((simulates passing with her hands (1.8))) wait how should I say
06 (.) cross
07 T3: paths
08 HZ: pass through
09 T3: okay I would say when they walk down the street
10 HZ: uh huh
11 T3: so if you have the street ((writes on a piece of paper))
12 HZ: ((looks at piece of paper)) yeah
13 T3: ((continues writing)) like this I would say walk down the street
14 HZ: ((continues looking at paper)) un hn
15 (1.7)
16 HZ: ((continues looking at paper)) walk down
17 T3: ((simulates walking on piece of paper)) you are walking on the street
18 HZ: ((continues looking at paper)) un hn
19 T3: ((simulates walking on piece of paper)) but walk down as in going down
20 it ((continues writing)) then you pass someone ((continues writing
21 (1.8)))
22 HZ: ((continues looking at paper)) yeah
23 T3: ((continues writing (1.7)))
24 T3: [((stops writing)) when you walk past someone=
25 HZ: [((looks up))
26 HZ: =un un un un yeah walk pas°t°
27 (2.1)
28 T3: past

29 HZ: past past
30 T3: when you walk past
31 HZ: oh↑ when you walk past wa:lk >past<
32 T3: yeah
33 HZ: like and then like one of the (1.7) person (2.0) *e:to* imitates like
34 shooting a gun like psh and then like
35 T3: pretends
36 HZ: pretends okay thank you pretends to like shoot the gun like the other
37 person will like oh oh

In lines 01 and 02, HZ says, "um I'm not sure but you know like um I heard that like when they walk across the street- no wa:lk <on the street>". HZ initiates repair on her own utterance, replacing "across" with "on". T3 responds in line 03 with a continuer, "un hn". He does not assist HZ with the repair possibly because at this point he does not seem to have enough information to decide if "walk across the street" or "walk on the street" is appropriate. Because HZ is unsure which expression to use, she starts to ask for confirmation from T3 in line 04 with "is that like um wa-", but abandons that and says, "anyway like walk the street- like when they" and then begins to use gestures to enlist T'3's help in finding the appropriate expression. In line 05, she simulates people passing with her hands, and says "wait how should I say cross", again explicitly soliciting help. In line 07, T3 suggests a word to complete the idiomatic verb phrase, to which HZ responds, "pass through", in line 08, demonstrating her lack of understanding or the rejection of the expression, "cross paths", that T3 offered. HZ produces the word "cross", which could explain why T3 says "paths" in line 07. In response to HZ's utterance, "pass through", in line 08, T3 initiates repair in line 09 by remarking, "okay I would say when they walk down the street", and HZ responds in line 10 with, "uh huh". In line 11, T3 says, "so if you have the street", and writes on a piece of paper.

Based on his physical movements as captured by the camera, it appears that T3 is drawing a picture on the paper and not writing sentences. In line 12, HZ looks at the paper and says, "yeah", and T3 continues to explain in line 13 with, "like this I would say walk

down the street", placing emphasis on "down," because it is the preposition that HZ is apparently struggling with. As shown in lines 02 and 04, HZ seems unsure if "walk across the street", "walk on the street", or "walk the street" are appropriate to describe the situation. In line 14, HZ says "un hn", while looking at the paper, and in line 15 there is a 1.7-second silence. In line 16, HZ repeats "walk down" from line 13. In line 17, T3 states, "you are walking on the street" while simulating walking with his fingers on the paper, and HZ says "un hn", while continuing to look at the paper.

T3 tries to show HZ the difference between "walking on the street" and "walking down the street" in lines 17, 19, and 20 by using his fingers to simulate a person walking down the street on the paper. In line 22, HZ responds with "yeah", and T3 continues writing in the following line. Next, T3 stops writing at the same time that HZ looks up and T3 states, "when you walk past someone", In line 26, HZ says, "un un un un yeah walk pas°t°", but produces "t" in "past" very quietly. After a 2.1-second gap in line 27, T3 initiates and performs repair with "past," to which HZ responds, "past past", emphasizing the "t" in the first "past." In line 30, T3 says, "when you walk past", and HZ produces the change of state token, "oh↑", in the following turn, with rising pitch. She then says, "when you walk past wa:lk >past<", showing that she understands how to use the expression as well as how to pronounce the words in it. In line 32, T3 gives confirmation by stating, "yeah", closing the repair sequence. In the following turn, HZ continues her story about people from Western Japan that she started in line 01.

This extract highlights how self-initiation of repair, which, in this case is a word search and request for help by HZ when she says, "how should I say", while using gestures to help T3 interpret what she is trying to communicate verbally, makes an other-repair relevant and noticeable in the next turn. It also reveals how a drawing on a piece of paper can be used to perform repair and facilitate student understanding. HZ's use of gestures helps T3 interpret

what she is trying to communicate verbally.

The extract below also showcases how a self-initiated repair followed by an other-repair can help to make it clear to the producer of the trouble source that their utterance is being repaired. In this example, the turn in which the repair is produced does not contain continuers or receipt tokens, thus serving to isolate the repair. Prior to the interaction below, T3 and HZ were discussing things that they have in their kitchens. Here, T3 shifts the subject slightly, asking HZ, "do you like to cook?"

Extract 10: 3-1-29:02

01	T3:	hm do you like to cook?
02	HZ:	un hn
03	T3:	hn what do you like to make, your favorite
04		(1.9)
05	HZ:	hm:: it depends on my feeling but I like to cook what we call
06		nikujaga it- like potatoes and meat and
07	T3:	hn
08	HZ:	it's very Japanese I think
09	T3:	okay is it like a soup, stew
10	HZ:	hn: [it's not
11	T3:	[or is it dry
12		(2.2)
13	HZ:	it depends on the people who would- who makes- who cooks or who
14	T3:	cook it
15	HZ:	who cook it
16	T3:	it depends [on the person cooking it
17	HZ:	[on
18	HZ:	ha ha ha [okay thank you
19	T3:	[(there you go)
20	T3:	it depends on the person cooking it
21	HZ:	yeah but I like dry one

In line 01, T3 asks HZ, "do you like to cook?", to which HZ replies "un hn". T3 then deploys a follow-up question, asking, "what do you like to make, your favorite"? Following a

1.9-second gap, HZ replies, "hm:: it depends on my feeling but I like to cook what we call nikujaga it- like potatoes and meat and it's very Japanese I think" in lines 05, 06, and 08. This is followed by T3's questions in lines 09 and 11, "okay is it like a soup, stew" and "is it dry"? Waring (2009) describes the teacher's use of "okay" in classroom interaction and indicates that it functions to mark the "boundary after which a new item may begin" (p. 805). Beach (1993) found that "okay" can signal an activity shift in classroom interaction. The "okay" in line 09, as well as in several other extracts in this chapter, however, functions as a receipt of the previous utterance and often precedes a follow-up question. HZ responds to his questions with, "hn: it's not" and "it depends on the people who would- who makes- who cooks or who" in lines 10 and 13. HZ's self-initiation of repair in the form of a word search prepares the ground for a relevant repair and is followed by T3's repair in which he states, "cook it". HZ repeats the repair in the subsequent turn with the frame, "who", which she said before the trouble source, to produce the expression, "who cook it".

In line 16, T3 again performs repair on HZ's line 13 utterance, this time repairing the first part of the turn, "it depends on the people who", to produce the sentence, "it depends on the person cooking it", while placing emphasis on the word "cooking". HZ receipts the repair in line 19 with "okay thank you", which is said in overlap with T3's unclear utterance. T3 again says the repaired sentence in line 20, and it is followed by another receipt by HZ, "yeah".

This extract exhibits how a repair initiation by a trouble source speaker followed by an other-repair in the turn just subsequent to the trouble source and repair initiation can make the repair relevant and therefore noticeable to the producer of the trouble source. Also, the utterance produced is not a continuer, receipt token, or repetition of the previous utterance with falling intonation, which are all elements that would signify to the speaker of the trouble source that they are facing some problems. Completely ignoring the repair would not allow

the interaction to proceed because some type of response, such as a receipt token, is necessary and relevant. This particular extract contains two repairs of the same utterance. HZ receipts the first repair by repeating it and receipts the second repair by saying, "okay thank you". Both of these responses indicate that HZ acknowledges that her utterance was repaired.

The extract examined next also comes from the session above and the topic written on the paper that T3 pulls out of the hat is "have you ridden any animals?" T3 and HZ briefly discuss an animal that HZ has ridden and the following interaction begins.

Extract 11: 3-1-33:14

01 T3: would you like to ride any other animals?
02 (1.2)
03 HZ: ride (8.1) oh yeah↑ camel.
04 T3: oh:: why would you like to ride a camel?
05 HZ: because (2.0) like there's like um it depends on the camel but there's
06 like how should I say like the ((does a gesture to show the shape of
07 of a camel hump))
08 T3: hump
09 HZ: hump
10 T3: ((writes on a piece of paper (2.5)))
11 HZ: ((looks at T3's paper)) yeah yeah yeah
12 T3: I draw lovely
13 HZ: ha ha ha ha
14 T3: hump
15 HZ: hump
16 (1.4)
17 HZ: yeah there like you know on there's hump something like valley ha ha
18 ha ha this one here ((points to T3's paper))
19 T3: hh yes um a gap
20 HZ: okay
21 T3: a gap between the humps
22 HZ: uh huh
23 T3: I don't know if it has a name
24 HZ: ha ha ha ha
25 T3: it doesn't come up much in English

```
26   HZ:   ha ha ha ha ha ha
27         (1.2)
28   HZ:   um yeah (.) I would like to: sit on the gap in humps
29   T3:   the gap between the humps
30   HZ:   the gap yeah hn
```

In line 01, T3 asks HZ, "would you like to ride any other animals?" and after a 1.2-second gap, HZ responds, "ride oh yeah↑ camel", in line 03. In line 04, T3 asks a follow-up question, "why would you like to ride a camel?" HZ replies, "because there's like um it depends on the camel but there's like how should I say like the" and in lines 06 and 07 she initiates repair by doing a word search and using her hands to show the shape of a camel hump. This extract is similar to the previous extract in that a verbal repair initiation ("how should I say") as well as a gesture are used in combination to request help from T3. In line 08, T3 states, "hump" and HZ repeats "hump" in the following turn. In line 10, T3 draws on a piece of paper, assumingly a picture of a camel hump, because in line 11 HZ looks at the piece of paper and says, "yeah yeah yeah". In line 14, T3 again says "hump" and T3 repeats it in line 15.

In line 17 HZ comments, "yeah like you know on there's hump something like valley ha ha", which is followed by her initiation of repair in which she states, "ha ha this one here" as she points to T3's paper. In line 19, T3 performs repair, stating that it's called "a gap". HZ receipts this with "yeah" in line 20 with "okay" and in line 21 T3 combines both of the words that he taught HZ saying, "a gap between the humps". In line 28, HZ attempts to apply the words "gap" and "hump," stating, "I would like to: sit on the gap in humps". T3 initiates and performs repair in line 29 with "the gap between the humps" and HZ receipts that with "the gap yeah hn" in line 30, but does not repair the preposition.

In this extract, HZ uses words as well as gestures to initiate repair and T3 uses a drawing on a piece of paper in order to perform and communicate the repair. The gestures performed by HZ appear to be sufficient to communicate to T3 the words that she is looking

for. T3's drawing on the piece of paper allows HZ to confirm that that is in fact what she is referring to. This extract, similar to the previous extract, demonstrates how a request for help during a word search by a student can prepare the grounds for a relevant repair, which, in this case, was performed by T3. The location of the repair, as well as the fact that it follows an initiation of repair are what help make the repair noticeable to the speaker of the trouble source.

The following interaction also exemplifies how a self-initiation of repair by the student sets the stage for a relevant repair, which is performed by the teacher. It begins with T3 asking HZ, "what do you normally do on the beach?"

```
Extract 12: 3-1-38:23
01   T3:   okay what do you normally do on the beach?
02          (1.3)
03   HZ:   like the be- like beach volleyball?
04   T3:   un hn
05   HZ:   or like we can't swim on the beach but like yeah on like (.) we
06          can be in the shadow- we can be=
07   T3:   =shade
08   HZ:   yeah shade uh huh
```

Subsequent to a 1.3-second gap, HZ responds to the question with "like the be- like beach volleyball?" In line 03, T3 produces the continuer, "un hn", after which HZ self-selects and states, "or like we can't swim on the beach but like yeah on like (.) we can be in the shadow- we can be=". HZ initiates repair in line 06 by cutting off her utterance in progress, "we can be in the shadow-", and restarting, "we can be". This is followed by T3's repair, "shade". HZ receipts this repair in the subsequent turn by saying, "yeah", and repeating "shade".

Following HZ's repair initiation in line 06, a repair is relevant either by HZ, the producer of the trouble source, or T3. Before HZ is able to do self-repair in line 06, T3

performs repair. HZ's production of the word, "shadow", instead of the word "shade", as well as the restart of her sentence signal to T3 that HZ may not be able to come up with the appropriate word, "shade". As seen in the extracts above, following such a repair, some type of response is needed before the interaction proceeds. This is produced in line 08 by HZ, and contains both the receipt token, "yeah", and a repetition of the repaired word.

Similar to the example above, Extract 13 below demonstrates how self-initiated repair can make an other-repair relevant, and therefore noticeable.

```
Extract 13: 3-1-47:37
01   HZ:   there's a fence though and then like- like the I heard like you
02         know like sometimes I heard the not sh- how should I say that like-
03         ((looks down (1.9) )) ((looks up)) like you know the- the like it
04         sounds like the bear's [like
05   T3:                          [growl
06   HZ:   yeah growling
07   T3:   the bear growling
08   HZ:   uh huh and then like so I thought- I still think there's bears
09   T3:   un
```

HZ is describing a dream that she had in lines 01 and 02, relating her description with, "there's a fence though and then like- like the I heard like you know like sometimes I heard the not sh-", which is followed by her self-initiation of repair in the form of a word search, "how should I say that like like you know the- the like it sounds like the bear's like". In the subsequent turn, T3 provides a solution to the word search with the word, "growl". After HZ produces the phrase "sounds like the bear's", it appears to be enough information for T3 to project what she is trying to say. HZ's self-initiated repair makes a repair by either her or T3 relevant, and when she is unable to produce the appropriate word, T3 offers the word "growl". T3's repair is produced in isolation, which helps make it clear to HZ that T3 provided a solution to her word search.

A relevant next turn following a repair is an uptake of the repair, which HZ gives in line 06 by stating, "yeah", and repeating the repaired word, "growl", plus "ing". In line 07, T3 again performs repair on the same utterance as before, but this time on a different part. He repairs the word "bear's" by stating, "bear growling". In this extract, the T3 first performs repair on the later part of the HZ's problematic utterance and after the she receipts that, T3 goes back and repairs an earlier part of the utterance. After T3 performs repair for the second time, HZ receipts it with the receipt token, "uh huh". T3 then acknowledges HK's receipt of the repair with "un" in line 09.

The next extract also contains a self-initiation of repair followed directly by other-repair. Before the interaction began, HN and T3 were talking about cow tongue being a popular food in the Japanese city of Sendai.

```
Extract 14: 11-2-03:32
01   HN:   I think most of all beef tongue is uh imported by- in? by America
02   T2:   oh it's imported from America?
03   HN:   from yes
04   T2:   oh okay
05   HN:   ha ha ha [ha ha
06   T2:             [wow
07   T2:   so it's American (.) beef tongue?
08   HN:   yeah
```

HN's turn in line 01, "I think most of all beef tongue is uh imported by- in? America", contains self-initiated self-repair. However, in the next turn T2 performs other-repair, stating, "oh it's imported from America?" The appropriate word, "from", is emphasized and is repeated by HN in line 03. T2 then acknowledges HN's repetition of the word with "oh okay". HN's self-initiation of repair makes repair by HN or T2 relevant. HN struggles to produce the appropriate preposition as exhibited in her attempt to self-initiate self-repair in line 01, stating

"in? by America", but because the words "in" and "by" are inappropriate, T2 provides correction in the following turn. T2 demonstrates the appropriate word to HN by placing emphasis on "from" and framing it with the word "America".

In this example, the trouble source is not isolated in T2's repair, as seen in some of the examples above. However, because the location of the repair is in the turn just subsequent to the trouble source, which contains HN's repair initiation and repair attempt, and because T2 places emphasis on the appropriate word "from" and frames it with "America", HN is able to understand that T2 is initiating repair on her utterance. She accepts T3's repair by repeating "from" and saying "yes".

This extract differs from most of the extracts shown above in that the student not only initiates repair on her own utterance but also attempts to repair it, albeit unsuccessfully. T2's repair initiation is in the turn immediately following the trouble source, and he emphasizes the word, "from", which is followed by "America". T2's emphasis on "from" and his production of the repair in the exact same order that HN produced it, helps to exhibit to HN that "from" is the appropriate word and not "by" or "in".

The following extract also reveals how other-repair can become noticeable when it follows a self-initiation of repair. Earlier in the interaction TY mentioned that he has been to Australia and Canada. The interaction begins with HN asking TY, "when did you °go there°?"

Extract 15: 11-2-17:22

```
01   HN:   when did you °go there°?
02   TY:   hn:: Australia when I was- when I was (.) fifteen (.) so uh:: third
03         grade in high school
04   HN:   hn::
05   TY:   then Canada when I was seventeen fo:r >two weeks<
06   T2:   hn: okay
07   TY:   it's ((looks up (0.4) )) house- (0.5) house stay? or ((tilts his head))
08         (1.3)
09   T2:   homestay?
```

10 TY: yes. homestay
11 T2: oh okay.

In line 01, HN asks TY, "when did you °go there°? TY replies "hn:: Australia when I was- when I was (.) fifteen (.) so uh:: third grade in high school", which HN accepts with "hn::". TY then states, "then Canada when I was seventeen fo:r >two weeks<", which T receipts with "hn okay". TY continues his turn, saying "it's house- house stay? or", self-initiating repair by looking up to do a word search after saying "it's" and then producing "stay" with rising intonation. Rising intonation on the candidate solution which follows a word search was also reported by Seo and Koshik (2010), Koshik and Seo (2012), Hosoda (2006), and Kurhila (2001) in their studies on native and non-native interaction. Following a 1.3-second gap, T2 initiates repair, stating, "homestay?", the apparently sought-for word (Sacks, 1992a, 1992b), which TY accepts in line 10 by stating, "yes", and repeating "homestay". T2 acknowledges TY's uptake of the repair in the next line with "oh okay".

This extract is similar to the extracts presented earlier in this chapter in that the teacher joins the conversation between two students. However, in those extracts the teacher joins the conversation to do repair, whereas in this extract, the teacher joins the conversation in line 06 to produce a receipt of TY's turn in line 05 and then in line 09 he corrects TY's utterance from line 07. TY's attempt to self-initiate repair in line 07, the production of "house stay" with rising intonation as well as the tilting of his head make the performance of self-repair or other-repair relevant. There is a 1.8-second gap in line 08, in which TY could have self-repaired, but seeing that TY does not further self-repair the word, T2 performs other repair by providing the word "homestay", with rising intonation. The fact that repair is relevant at that time coupled with the fact that T2 produces a candidate word in isolation helps to make it apparent to TY that T2 is initiating repair. TY indicates that he understands that his utterance has been repaired by saying "yes", followed by a repetition of the repaired

word, "homestay".

The following example is similar to the extract above in that a student performs self-initiated repair. However, also seen in the extract above, the teacher treats the repaired utterance as problematic in the subsequent turn as evinced by T3's repair initiation. Here, TY is describing his brother to the other participants.

Extract 16: 11-2-28:42

```
01   TY:   he: major in law
02   T2:   oh okay.
03   TY:   so he has many (1.0) uh laws- uh many laws? books
04   T2:   hn many law books?
05   TY:   law books
06   T2:   oh okay
```

The extract begins with TY stating, "he major in law", which the teacher receipts with "oh okay." Schegloff (2007) explains that participants sometimes use "oh" to receipt information and "okay" to accept the information. As demonstrated in extracts 14, 15, and 16, "oh" and "okay" are sometimes used together to receipt the previous turn. In those extracts, the teacher initiates repair, and the student repeats the repaired word with another word, which the teacher then receipts with "oh okay." TY continues to explain that his brother "has many uh laws- uh many laws? books". The trouble source, the word "laws," is produced twice. The first time, it was preceded by a 1.0-second silence and the filler, "uh", signaling that he is in a word search and the word that follows may be problematic. Following the cut off after "laws", TY utters, "uh many laws? books", marking the word "laws" with rising intonation. T2 then provides a candidate solution to the search in line 04, stating, "hn many law books?" TY accepts the candidate word by repeating it, followed by the word "books". T2 accepts the repair by stating, "oh okay".

The second time that "laws" is produced it has rising intonation, thereby making it a

repair initiation. It could be seen as a request for confirmation or a request to provide the appropriate word. Although the repaired word, "law" is not produced in isolation, T2 indicates to TY that the appropriate word is "law" by placing emphasis on it. The repair initiation by TY, which can be seen as a request for confirmation or help, the placement of the repair initiation by T2 in the turn directly after the trouble source turn, the emphasis placed on "law," as well as the frame "many" and "books" exhibit to TY, the speaker of the trouble source, what is being repaired. TY expresses his understanding of the appropriate word by repeating it.

The following extract is also an example of a self-initiated repair followed by other-repair. It contains two repairs which are performed by a participant other than the speaker of the trouble source. Both of the repairs isolate the trouble source and are produced immediately after it. In this extract, TY is talking about his parents.

```
Extract 17: 20-1-05:38
01   TY:   they are ve:ry annoying (.) to me=
02   T9:   yeah=
03   RI:   =ha ha=
04   TY:   =it's very uh- my father complain- usually complain about my
05         behavior in- at home uh: wear the clothes hh don't be naked
06         (0.4)
07   T9:   hh [ha ha ha ha ha ha ha ha ha ha
08   TY:      [like that
09   RI:   ha ha ha ha ha
10   TY:   I- uh al[ways sta::y only (.) pants?
11   T9:           [.hh
12   T9:   underwear
13   TY:   [underwear
14   RI:   [ha ha oh:
15   T9:   yeah yeah
16         (1.3)
17   TY:   [I- I
18   T9:   [me too at home
```

19 TY: ha ha
20 T9: but it's only my wife and I so
21 TY: a::nd my mother make many foods I- I can't eat it all- all things
22 T9: hn
23 TY: it's too big to finish it
24 T9: too much food
25 TY: too much food yes

In line 01, TY states, "they are ve:ry annoying to me", which T9 receipts with "yeah". TY then explains that his "father complain- usually complain about my behavior in- at home uh: wear the clothes hh don't be naked". After a 0.4-second gap, T9 responds with laughter. In line 10, TY continues his explanation, stating, "I- uh always sta::y only pants?" Repair is initiated on the word "pants" with rising intonation and it makes confirmation or correction of the word relevant in the next turn by one of the participants. In response, T9 performs repair, stating, "underwear". The word, "pants", is the Japanese loan word for underwear, which is why T9 treats it as inappropriate. Because the repair is produced immediately following the self-initiation of repair in which TY can be seen orienting to the problem of producing a word and soliciting assistance from T9 (See similar examples in Hosoda, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2006), and because it is isolated, it helps to TY to see that his utterance is being repaired. TY accepts the repair by repeating the repaired word, "underwear," in the subsequent turn. In line 15, T9 acknowledges TY's correct production of the repaired word by stating, "yeah yeah".

4.1.4 Teacher's Use of Various Resources to Perform Repair After Next Turns

When repair is delayed, even slightly, it may be difficult for the speaker of the trouble source to realize that their utterance is being repaired. Schegloff (1992a) remarks that even though "most turns respond to the immediately preceding talk, speakers can construct turns to address themselves to much earlier talk, even to talk occurring days or weeks previously" (p. 1319). He also comments that the farther a repairable goes into the repair space, the less

likely it is that it will be noticed (Schegloff, 1992a). The extracts presented in this section illustrate how repair that is initiated later than the next turn can be made noticeable. The teacher locates the trouble source by placing emphasis on the problematic part of the word and produces the repair in isolation, thereby making it clear to the producer of the trouble source that their utterance is being repaired. Also, similar to some of the examples presented earlier in this chapter in which the teacher uses "you mean," which calls attention to the repair, the teacher uses the expression, "you said," which marks the utterance that follows as a repair of the previous utterance.

I present Extract 18 below because it contains the utterance which T9 repairs in Extract 19 and it enables readers to see how the trouble source was produced. The participants are playing a game in which they roll a die, and each player moves their token the number of spaces indicated by the die. It is similar to a board game, but instead of using a board, the participants are using a piece of paper with squares on it. In each square there is a question that the players have to answer or a topic they have to discuss. TY rolls the die and his token lands on the square that says "say six school subjects." In the previous turn another participant's token landed on the same square so the teacher, T9, directs the students to "just think of three", as seen in line 01.

```
Extract 18: 20-1-10:12
01   T9:   just think of three
02   TY:   three?
03   T9:   yeah
04   TY:   okay. hh (matte)
05         (2.5)
06   TY:   hh
07         (1.9)
08   T9:   maybe something very Japanese
09         (0.3)
10   TY:   mathematic ((writes on list with other school subjects))
```

```
11          (0.4)
12   T9:    ((looks at RI)) oh how did we skip that?
```

Following T9's instructions, TY initiates repair by stating, "three?", which is a partial repetition of T9's turn. Partially repeating the previous utterance to initiate repair was also reported in several studies (e.g., Schegloff, et al., 1977; Wu, 2009; Robinson, 2013; Benjamin & Walker, 2013), but repetition can be used to initiate repair on different types of trouble (Drew, 1997). Curl (2005) analyzes the phonetic difference of words that are repeated to initiate repair and finds that the phonetic patterns of repeated words differ based on their location and type of trouble being addressed. TY initiates repair because he wants to confirm that it is okay to produce three and not six school subjects as stated on the square. T9 responds, "yeah", which TY receipts with "okay". TY has difficulty producing an answer immediately as shown by his turns in lines 04 and 06, in which he produces outbreaths, but no answer, as well as the silences in lines 05, 07, and 09. In line 10, TY produces the subject, "mathematic", which T9 repairs in the continuation of this interaction, as presented in Extract 19. Approximately two minutes after TY says, "mathematic", the follow interaction begins.

Extract 19: 20-1-12:25

```
01   T9:    ((looks at list of subjects)) history and culture
02          and religion all kind of go together too don't they
03   TY:    hn
04   T9:    you said mathemati(.)c
05   TY:    c
06   T9:    s
07   TY:    s
08   T9:    mathematics
09   TY:    ah forgot s
10          (0.7)
11   T9:    it's okay in America we shorten it
12   TY:    hn
13   T9:    what do we say
```

14 TY: math
15 T9: math

After TY finishes saying the subjects and writing them on a piece of paper, he passes the paper to T9. T9 begins to read the subjects written on the paper in line 01, explaining, "history and culture and religion all kind of go together too don't they", to which TY replies, "hn". In line 04, T9 initiates repair by saying, "you said mathematic", placing emphasis on the final "c," which T9 treats as the problematic part of the word by repeating it. TY repeats the emphasized part of the word, "c", and this is followed by T9's repair, "s". In the subsequent turn, TY repeats "s", but the repetition of "c" and "s" does not make it evident that TY understands that his turn has been repaired. T9 produces the word, "mathematics", in line 08, which contains the "s" in the full word, indicating to TY what the appropriate word is.

Schegloff (2000) asserts that sometimes when a large action such as a story or list is in progress, other-initiations do not appear to occur in the turn subsequent to the trouble source. He explains that it may "reflect an ambiguity for recipients on the proper way to assess the turn organization and turn-taking organization in effect at the moment in locating what will properly count as 'next turn' position when alternative structures are simultaneously in progress" (p. 216). In Extract 18, the participant is making a list of school subjects, which may account for T9's delayed repair.

When other-initiated repair does not occur in the next turn position, the participant initiating the repair uses various resources which help the speaker of the trouble source locate the trouble source. Some of these resources include repeating the trouble source and framing it with words from the trouble source turn (Schegloff, 2000). In this extract, T9 repeats the trouble source, "mathematic", after saying, "you said", which calls attention to the trouble source. If T9 just produced the correct word, "mathematics", while looking at the paper, it would be more difficult for TY to understand that the word "mathematic" is problematic. TY

displays his recognition of the repair with his comment, "ah forgot s". The repair initiation and repair proper are produced approximately two minutes after the trouble source was produced, which may sometimes be problematic because it may be difficult for the producer of the trouble to realize that the utterance they produced a few minutes before is being repaired. T9's use of the phrase, "you said", as well as the fact that he made the repair the focus of the interaction helped to make the repair noticeable and to make TY realize that his utterance was being repaired.

4.1.5 Pre- and Post-Framing

In this section, I explore how pre- and post-framing can help to make repair noticeable to the speaker of the trouble source. In the following extract, which is an example of pre-framing, T1 is trying to elicit questions from students that they can ask each other when doing the assigned activity.

```
Extract 20: 1-1-34:20
01   T1:   can you think of any more questions?
02   TK:   how much do you buy a bicycle?
03   T1:   ((writes "how much" on whiteboard)) yeah how much- yeah how
04         much maybe will you spend?
05   TK:   will (.) you (.) spend?
06   T1:   yeah how much will you spend
07   TK:   ah↑:
08   T1:   for a bicycle
09   TK:   for a bicycle
10   T1:   un ah not too much maybe one (.) ten man
11   TK:   ha ha ha
```

In line 01, T1 asks the students, "can you think of any more questions?", to which TK responds, "how much do you buy a bicycle". In line 03, T1 writes "how much" on the whiteboard and performs other-initiated other-repair, saying, "yeah how much- yeah how

much maybe will you spend?" This "how much" is a repetition of TK's correctly produced phrase and functions as a pre-frame and "will you spend" "for a bicycle" is a repair of TK's expression, "do you buy a bicycle". The pre-frame is a repetition of TK's utterance, and both acts as a receipt of TK's utterance and sets the context for the repair. The word, "maybe", comes before the repaired utterance, "will you spend?", and serves to downgrade the correction. It also marks the utterance that follows as something that requires attention. The rising intonation on "spend" calls attention to that utterance and assists in making the repair noticeable.TK repeats "will you spend" with rising intonation, which could possibly be because he does not understand the meaning of the question or because he is asking for confirmation. In line 06, T1 repeats the whole correct utterance and in line 07, TK produces the change of state token, "ah", with rising pitch. T1 produces the last part of the question, "for a bicycle", in line 08 and TK repeats this in line 09. T1 answers the correct version of TK's question, "how much will you spend on a bicycle", with the conjecture, "ah not too much maybe one (.) ten man" in line 10.

The next extract under consideration is also an example of pre-framing and shows how the use of a pre-framing followed by a word other than the word produced in the previous turn by speaker of the trouble source can help to make repair noticeable. In this extract, AN is reading a speech for one of her classes to T6 and one other student.

```
Extract 21: 22-2-11:01
01   AN:   ((reading a speech)) spring and autumn are really dry and windy.
02         (1.2) summers are hot and uh humid (1.0) an::d (1.3) a July means
03         temperature of twenty fifth
04         (2.7)
05   T6:   twenty five=
06   AN:   =twen- twenty five?
07   T6:   uh huh
08   AN:   oh twenty five but it is also thirty (1.6) six when the hottest
09   T6:   hn okay
```

In lines 01 to 03 AN says, "spring and autumn are really dry and windy. summers are hot and uh humid an::d a July means temperature of twenty fifth", which is followed by a 2.7-second gap. Sometimes recipients of talk will withhold repair after a trouble source turn is complete, creating an additional opportunity for the speaker of the trouble source to initiate self-repair (Schegloff et al., 1977). However, in this extract AN does not self-initiate repair. T6 repairs her utterance, "twenty fifth", in line 05, stating, "twenty five". T6's use of the pre-framing, "twenty", followed by a word which is different from the word produced by AN calls attention to the repair, thereby making it noticeable. If T6 had only produced the word "five" without the pre-frame, it may have been more difficult for AN to comprehend. Dingemanse, Blythe, and Dirksmeyer (2014) remark that, "In trouble-framing repeats, repetition helps to 'frame' or locate the trouble-source item" (p. 22). The gap before T6's repair could be because he does not treat AN's turn as complete or because he is giving her an opportunity to do self-repair. When AN does not continue or do self-repair, T6 performs other-initiated other-repair. Schegloff et al. (1977) present data that shows that there is a preference for self-repair based on the fact that the position of the repair opportunity space for self-repair precedes that of other-repair. AN repeats the repaired utterance, "twenty five", in the following turn, but because "five" is produced with rising intonation, this can be heard as a request for confirmation, which T6 gives in line 07, stating, "uh huh". AN accepts the repair in the following line by saying, "oh twenty five", which is followed by T6's acknowledgement of AN's production of the repaired utterance. AN displays her recognition of T6's repair by repeating it. If she treated T6's turn as a receipt of her previous utterance, there would be little reason for her to repeat it, but because T6's utterance is slightly different from AN's, she notices it, as shown by her repetition of the repaired utterance.

The extract which follows shows how the use of a post-framing can help repair to become noticeable. Before the extract begins, T9 instructs the students to ask three "have you

ever" questions.

```
Extract 22: 20-1-32:11
01   TY:   have you ever- ((looks down and to his left side (4.9) )) have you
02         e:::ver:::: hospitalized?
03   T9:   been hospitalized
04   TY:   been hospitalized?
05   T9:   right
06         (0.5)
07   RI:   no
08   TY:   no
09   T9:   yes (.)when I was younger I had an operation on my ears
10   TY:   eh::
```

In lines 01 and 02, TY inquires of T9, "have you ever- have you e:::ver:::: hospitalized?" T9 performs other-initiated other-repair in the next line, stating, "been hospitalized" The word, "been", is missing in TY's question, but if T9 only produced the word, "been", when repairing TY's utterance, it would be difficult to understand where in TY's question the word, "been", should go. However, because T9 also produces it with the post-framing, "hospitalized", it indicates to TY where in the question "been" should appear. TY repeats the phrase, "been hospitalized", with rising intonation, thus signaling to T9 that he is asking for confirmation, which T9 gives in line 05, with "right".

T9's production of the repair with the post-framing, "hospitalized", makes it stand out and marks it as something which requires attention.

4.1.6 The Word Repaired is Produced in Isolation and Repeated

This section examines how the isolation of a problematic word as well as the repetition of the repaired word by the recipient producing the repair proper can cause repair to become noticeable. In the extract below, participants are playing a game in which the teacher gives

each student a directive. The teacher begins passing a ball around and each student sitting around the table has to pass it to the student next to them. The purpose of the game is to answer the question before the ball is passed back to the teacher. The extract begins with T4 directing RI "name three things that you did yesterday".

```
Extract 23: 8-2-11:06
01   T4:   name three (.) things you did yesterday
02         (1.4)
03   RI:   uh watching- watch TV uh take- take the shower took the shower
04   T4:   you took a shower
05   RI:   uh eat uh: dinner
06   T4:   yeah. ate ate.
07   RI:   ate a dinner
08   T4:   yeah so you ate dinner alright. what did you have for dinner?
09   RI:   u::m (.) fish.
```

Following a 1.4-second silence, RI says, "uh watching- watch TV uh take- take the shower took the shower", which T4 performs embedded correction on in the subsequent turn by stating, "you took a shower". The expression, "you took a shower" sounds very similar to "took the shower", and may appear to be a receipt of the previous turn rather than a repair, which may account for the lack of uptake of the repair by RI. If T4 only produced the repaired part of the utterance, "a", in isolation, RI could have possibly produced some sort of uptake of the repair as seen in some of the extracts above. In line 05, RI says the third thing that he did the day before, which was "eat uh: dinner". T4 acknowledges this with "yeah", and performs other-initiated other-repair, stating, "ate ate". This time the problematic part of the expression, "eat uh: dinner", is isolated, therefore making the trouble source clear to RI. Regarding the correction of non-native speaker's by a native speaker, Kurhila (2001) observed a somewhat similar phenomenon and noted that because "the substitution is not camouflaged by any other activity, the NNS orients to it as repair" (p. 1100). Also, the word,

"ate", is repeated by T4, thereby calling further attention to it. RI displays an orientation to T4's repair by repeating the repaired word, "ate," followed by the noun phrase "a dinner". T4 acknowledges RI's uptake of his repair by saying, "yeah so you ate dinner alright".

This extract demonstrates how performing repair shortly after the trouble source is produced does not necessarily guarantee that it is going to be recognized as repair by the trouble source speaker. When the repaired part of the utterance is produced with words other than words that serve to pre- or post-frame it, it may be harder to recognize. In this example, RI does not respond to T4's repair in line 04 when the repaired part of the utterance is produced with other words and he corrects an article but does not emphasize it. However, RI does show that he recognizes the repair when T4 repairs another utterance in line 06 because the repaired part of the utterance, the verb "ate", is produced in isolation, therefore making the repaired part of the utterance clear.

Following T4's repair in line 06, a response to or recognition of the repair by RI is normatively appropriate in order for the interaction to proceed. The pattern seen in this extract is similar to those we observed in some of the extracts above: the student produces a problematic word, the teacher performs repair, the student produces some uptake of or accepts the repair, and the teacher acknowledges the uptake or produces some token of acceptance.

4.1.7 Teacher's Use of Gestures

This section analyzes how the teacher's use of gestures can help repair to become noticeable. In the following extract, T3 and RK are doing an activity in which they pull a piece of paper out of a hat, and on that paper is a topic that they discuss. Prior to the following extract, RK pulls a piece of paper out of the hat upon which is written, "your dream holiday." RK reads what is written on the piece of paper and then shows it to T3 as if to

request help.

```
Extract 24: 24-1-07:33
01   T3:   so (0.5) i- this is saying where- where do you like to go on holiday
02   RK:   do you like holiday (.) holiday ha suki desu ka? yes.
                                          Top like COP:POL Q
                                          Do you like holidays?
03   T3:   do you like going on holiday, where? to the beach
04         [to the mountains?
05   RK:   [ah:::::::::↑
06         (4.4)
07   RK:   not go I like house
08   T3:   ah::::↑ you lik- you lik- you like staying at home?
09         (0.8)
10   RK:   yes
11   T3:   come ((pulls hands towards himself))
12   RK:   eh? I like stay home?
13   T3:   okay. what do you do at home
14         (1.4)
15   T3:   °do you read?° ((does a book opening motion)) what do you do? what
16         things
17   RK:   ah↑ watch TV
18   T3:   okay I ((sticks out hand as if to start counting))
19   RK:   I watch TV ((T3 raises a finger for each word while RK says
20         "I watch TV"))
21   T3:   un hn
```

In line 01, T3 explains that "this is saying where- where do you like to go on holiday," which is followed by RK's turn in which she states, "do you like holiday (.) holiday *ha suki desu ka*? yes." Because "yes" is an inappropriate answer to T3's question, T3 pursues an appropriate answer by asking, "do you like going on holiday, where? to the beach to the mountains?" This is followed by RK's production of the change of state token, "ah::::::::↑", indicating that RK understands what T3 is now asking. Following a 4.4-second gap in line 06, RK states, "not go

I like house". T3 initiates repair on RK's utterance in the next line with "you lik- you lik- you like staying at home?", to which RK replies, "yes", in line 10.

Perhaps because T3's repair initiation does not make it clear exactly what part of RK's utterance is problematic and/or because T3's repair is drastically different from RK's problematic utterance, RK does not repeat any part of the repaired utterance. In line 11, T3 says, "come," while pulling his hands towards himself as if to signal to RK that he wants her to produce the repaired utterance. Up to this point, RK has not displayed that she understands that her utterance has been repaired, but T3's gestures as well as his production of the word, "come", call attention to T3's previous utterance. It is these two actions that assist to make the repair as well as the pursuit of uptake noticeable.

In the next turn, RK says, "eh?", exhibiting that she is unsure about what T3 wants her to do. In the same line, she says, "I like stay home?", while placing rising intonation on the word, "home", thereby requesting confirmation from T3. The confirmation could mean, "Is this the correct sentence?", or "Do you want me to produce the same sentence as you?" Although the sentence is not grammatically correct, T3 acknowledges her production of the repaired utterance with "okay", followed by the question, "what do you do at home". Following a 1.4-second gap, T3 again pursues an answer, asking, "°do you read?° what do you do? what things". RK then produces the change of state token, "ah↑", with rising intonation followed by the words, "watch TV". In the subsequent turn, T3 initiates repair by saying, "okay I", and then sticks out his hand and raises his finger as if he is counting. He provides a slot for RK to do the repair, which she does in line 19, stating, "I watch TV", as T3 gives her prompts by raising a finger for each word. T3's repair initiation, the word, "I", as well as the use of his hands are effective in demonstrating to RK that her utterance contains some problem and that he wants her to repair it using the word, "I". T3 again acknowledges RK's production of the correct sentence by stating, "un hn" in line 21.

4.2 Discussion

This chapter investigated several interactional environments and resources which help to make repair noticeable. All of the examples presented in this chapter concerned problems of speaking by students and repair was either initiated either by a student or by a teacher. When repair was self-initiated by a student, it set the stage for a repair proper either by the student or by a teacher. However, just because a repair proper is relevant does not necessarily mean that it will not go overlooked if it is performed by another participant. The examples highlighted various environments and methods which are conducive to making repair noticeable.

This chapter explored various resources used by teachers which serve to make repair noticeable. Teachers' use of "you mean," "you could say, "we say," and "say it" help to make it apparent to the speaker of the trouble source that their utterance has been repaired by marking the previous or following utterance as repair. "You mean" and "you could say" downgraded and modified the speaker of the trouble source's utterance, whereas "we say" and "say it" did not. Out of the four expressions used to mark the repair, "say it" was the strongest and served to demonstrate to the speaker of the trouble source that their recognition of the repair in the form of repetition was necessary before the interaction could proceed. As Schegloff et al. (1977) and Benajamin (2012) pointed out, "you mean" does occur in mundane conversation. "You could say" and "we say" are frequently seen in everyday conversation, and as shown in this chapter, in institutional talk. To my knowledge, there have not been any studies which have documented the use of "say it" in ordinary conversation. While this expression may be used in ordinary conversation, for example, when demanding an apology, it may be specific to teacher/student interaction or interaction where the focus is learning through language use.

In the example in which repair was delayed, the teacher called attention to the

problematic utterance by saying, "you said". He then located the trouble source, the end of the word "mathematic", by placing emphasis on the "c". Another way that repair can be made noticeable is by pre- and post-framing the repair. This provides a context for the speaker of the trouble source and allows them to see which part of their utterance is being repaired.

Another resource used by teachers to make repair noticeable was the isolation of the repair and repetition of the repaired word. This helped to mark the problematic part of the previous speaker's utterance and make the repair stand out. Lastly, this chapter demonstrated how the teacher's use of gestures can serve to make repair noticeable. In the example presented above, the teacher used his fingers as prompts to get the student to produce the correct sentence.

In most of the examples in this chapter, students displayed their understanding that their utterance had been repaired by repeating the repaired utterance. These findings support those of Hosoda (2000), who reports that in her data most of the cases of other-repair were followed by repetition. In the instances where repetition was absent, students used change of state tokens, and in the delayed repair example, the student repeated the "s", which was missing from the word "mathematics" and then produced the meta comment, "ah forgot s". When the producer of the trouble source did not accept the other repair either through repetition or acknowledgement tokens, it may suggest that the repair was recognized but not fully understood.

Schegloff, Koshik, Jacoby, and Olsher (2002) suggest that the findings of CA research can be used to inform second language pedagogy. This chapter was an attempt to use CA to understand how repair can be made noticeable to second language learners, which is extremely important because, as I illustrate in the next chapter, repair sequences can be potential sites of learning. However, learning may only occur if the students notice that their utterance has been repaired. This chapter presented various interactional devices used by

teachers to make repair noticeable. These devices, if used by teachers, can help students to notice their mistakes, which may be one step in the learning process.

CHAPTER 5

REPAIR SEQUENCES AS POTENTIAL SITES OF LEARNING

This chapter focuses on how learning can be made visible in interaction and examines one potential site where learning may occur, namely repair sequences. There have been an increasing number of studies which discuss whether or not CA can contribute to the field of SLA and address issues of learning as well as how CA may do so (e.g., Larsen-Freeman, 2004). This study builds on previous conversation analytic studies on learning (e.g., Hellermann, 2011) which attempt to reveal how conversation analysis can be used as a tool to illustrate how learning may potentially occur by tracing a particular learning object in short-term interaction. In the current study, the expression traceable learning object is used to refer to what was taught by the teacher to a student in the repair sequence and tracing the learning object will help to identify where learning may have occurred. Because many of the conversation analytic studies to date lack a traceable learning object, there is still doubt regarding CA's ability to address issues of learning.

Some studies argue that CA can be used as a tool to help us gain more insight into the issue of learning (e.g., Lee, 2010; Sahlström, 2011). This study follows that line of research and attempts to show how participants display a problem in understanding or speaking, a change of state, and that they may have learned something as illustrated by their explanation or application of the learning object. In this study learning is used to mean going from an observable state of not understanding or knowing to a state of understanding or knowing as exhibited through the participants' behaviors, and then explaining or applying the word or expression in the subsequent interaction. If the learning object is immediately merely repeated in the turn subsequent to the turn in which it was taught, it would be difficult to argue in conversation analytic terms that learning may have occurred. Some may argue that the listener is merely repeating what the speaker said to show they are listening and merely

repeating an utterance does not necessarily mean that learning has occurred. I suggest that it could be argued that temporary learning occurred if the understanding of the learning object is demonstrable as shown through its explanation or application in any turn subsequent to the turn in which the student displays a change of state. In the examples presented in this chapter the explanation or application of the word or expression occurs at a distance from where it was taught by the teacher. All of the examples presented in this study have the following general features:

1. Student shows problem of understanding or speaking as displayed through a question or inability to produce an appropriate word
2. Student or teacher initiates repair
3. Teacher performs repair (teaches)
4. Student produces a change of state token, such as "ah" or "oh" (Heritage, 1984)
5. Student demonstrates their understanding of the newly-learned word by explaining the meaning to another participant or applying it

I acknowledge that in cases when the explanation or application of a learning object does not occur, it does not necessarily mean that learning did not occur. Learning may occur, for example, through comprehensible input (Krashen, 1982). However, conversation analysis does not speculate on what is occurring in an individual's mind. It is concerned with the visible actions of the participants. Therefore, the display of understanding of a learning object as shown through its explanation or application in subsequent interaction could suggest that learning may potentially be occurring

Gardner (2008) remarks that analyzing interaction in settings where learning may potentially occur may help to identify possible learning sites. In a similar vein, Brouwer (2003) comments that interaction which involves a non-native speaker is worth analyzing as it may help us to learn more about second language learning. The present study analyzes

language lounge interaction, a place where students who are non-native English speakers go to learn and practice English with native speakers of English. This chapter attempts to contribute to the growing research on possible sites of learning by revealing how and where learning may occur in second language interaction.

Brouwer (2003) states that, "As a prerequisite for locating learning at a precise point in interaction, it needs to be shown that these sequences actually have the potential to advance language learning (p. 535). In the present study the location where the potential learning occurs is in repair sequences, which are initiated both by students and teachers. In two of the three examples shown here, the repair is other-initiated by students because of a problem in understanding, and in one of the examples the repair is initiated by the teacher because the student does not produce the appropriate word. This chapter argues that repair sequences are one possible site in which learning may occur and that conversation analysis can be analytically effective as an instrument to illustrate how learners can potentially go from a state of not understanding or knowing to a state of understanding or knowing, and then become capable of explaining or applying the learning object.

5.1 Analysis

In this section I present three examples which lend support to Brouwer and Wagner's (2004) findings that repair sequences could be one site where learning may occur. The three examples come from three different language lounge sessions, lasting approximately forty minutes each. Similar to Markee's (2004) study, the focus of all of the examples presented in this chapter are lexical items and the potential learning occurs as a result of a repair initiation followed by a repair proper, which is essentially the teacher teaching a student something. This section consists of three examples in total, all of which are divided into more than one extract in order to make it easier for the reader to process.

The first example is divided into Extracts 1 and 2. Extract 1 begins with TY describing his brother after being asked by T2 if he has any brothers or sisters.

Extract 1: 11-2-28:15

01	TY:	he::'s uh very clumsy
02		(0.8)
03	T2:	clumsy?
04	TY:	yes with cleaning
05		(0.5)
06	TY:	about cleaning
07	T2:	oh okay so he doesn't
08	TY:	yeah
09	T2:	clean after himself
10	TY:	yes. his room is scattered with things such as comic books comic books
11		comic books
12	T2:	ha ha ha o(h)ka(h)y
13	TY:	an:d books. he: major in law
14	T2:	oh okay
15	TY:	so he has many (1.0) uh laws- uh many laws? books
16	T2:	hn many law books?
17	TY:	law books
18	T2:	oh okay so (.) ho- how old he?
19	TY:	he's twenty one now
20	T2:	oh twenty one?
21	TY:	twenty one? un twenty one.
22	T2:	okay and he- does he still live at home?
23	TY:	yes
24	T2:	oh okay
25	TY:	but he is very (.) genius I think
26		(0.5)
27	T2:	oh he's very smart?
28	TY:	yeah but his characteristic is worst ha ha [ha
29	T2:	[oh:
30	HN:	eh::
31		(0.7)
32	T2:	well we say there's uh in English we say there's two kinds of people
33		there is left brain people and right brain people

```
34  TY:   what does it mean?
35  T2:   so (( (2.9) stands up and walks towards whiteboard and begins to draw
36        a picture of a brain))
37  TY:   left brain ah: sou  iu  koto  ka
                         that say thing Q
                         "that's what it means"
38        (1.9)
39  T2:   this is your brain
40  TY:   hn
41  S1:   hn
42        (2.0)
43  T2:   kin- kind of like your brain (1.6) so left brain people (1.8) they
44        tend to be uh: more (1.8) I think (2.0) maybe- maybe I'm not- maybe
45        I'm getting this wrong °hh but I think left brain
46        people tend to be more organized
47  TY:   organized
48  T2:   they're- they tend to- or maybe it's right brain I'm not sure maybe
49        I'm [getting them mixed up
50  HN:       [ha ha ha ha
51  T2:   but left brain people are usually organized and uh very structured
52  TY:   un
53  T2:   and have uh you know their (.) uh home is usually very clean
54  TY:   ah::↑
55  HN:   hn:
```

TY says that his brother is "very clumsy about cleaning" and T2 initiates repair on TY's utterance in the form of a confirmation check, stating, "so he doesn't clean after himself" in lines 07 and 09. In line 10, TY elaborates why his brother is messy by saying, "his room is scattered with things such as comic books comic books comic books". TY's explanation of his brother not being very clean will be shown to be relevant to his understanding of a new expression that the teacher presents.

In lines 10 and 11, TY states that his brother's room "is scattered with things such as comic books comic books comic books". TY says "comic books" three times to emphasize

that his brother has a lot of comic books. TY and T2 discuss TY's brother's major, other types of books that he has, his age, and whether he lives at home or not. After this, TY states that his brother is "very genius" in line 25, which T2 initiates repair on with "oh he's very smart?" TY's description of his brother as being smart will also lend evidence to his correct understanding of the learning object that will be taught by the teacher in the ensuing interaction. TY confirms this is what he meant and states that his brother's "characteristic is worst" to which T2 responds with "oh:", which is produced in overlap with TY's laughter. In lines 32 and 33, T2 states, "well we say there's uh in English we say there's two kinds of people there is left brain people and right brain people". This is followed by TY's initiation of repair in which he asks, "what does it mean?", showing a lack of understanding of the terms "left brain people" and "right brain people". The subsequent interaction illustrates that his repair initiation creates not only a possibility for learning, but also results, the application of the expression "right brain", suggesting that learning might have occurred.

TY initiates repair, asking, "what does it mean?", which opens the repair sequence. Lilja (2014) comments that it is possible to view questions such questions as being engaged in learning because they attempt to reestablish understanding and that repair sequences can create learning opportunities. Following TY's question, T2 walks to the whiteboard and begins to draw a picture of a brain, and then in line 37, TY says, "ah: sou iu koto ka" in Japanese, which can mean "ah that's what it means" or "ah I see." Through this utterance, TY displays that he has made a connection between the picture of a brain that the teacher drew on the whiteboard and the phrases right brain and left brain. In line 43, T2 begins his explanation of the expressions left brain and right brain. As will be discussed in detail below, TY's responses to T2's description of right and left brain people, specifically his change of state tokens, are important because his understanding not only of what his brother is, but what his brother is not, is important when he applies the learning object, and it is also significant for

the argument that something was potentially learned. In lines 44 and 45, T2 provides a disclaimer by saying that he may be getting the terms right brain and left brain mixed up. Whether he gets them wrong is irrelevant because what is important for this study is to show how the teacher teaches something and how TY is able to display his understanding of it through its application. In lines 45 and 46, T2 explains that left brain people "tend to be more organized" and TY repeats the final word, "organized", in line 47.

In lines 51 and 53, T2 describes left brain people as "organized and uh very structured" and their homes as "usually very clean", to which TY responds in line 54 with the change of state token "ah", which is elongated and has rising pitch. This change of state token publicly displays that he may have gone from a state of not knowing to a state of knowing.

T2 expands his explanation of left brain people as the interaction proceeds, the continuation of which is shown in the following extract.

Extract 2: 11-2-30:15

56	T2:	and they're very uh: uh: analytical
57		(1.5)
58	TY:	analytical
59	T2:	((writes "analytical" on whiteboard)) analytical
60	TY:	ah↑ analytical
61	T2:	so they analyze things. (.) so um why- why is this like this
62	TY:	ah
63	T2:	or they're always thinking
64	TY:	hn
65	T2:	about something
66		(1.0)
67	T2:	and then right brain people they tend to be more creative
68	TY:	hn:
69	T2:	or disorganized. uh: tend to daydream
70	HN:	hn ha ha
71	T2:	like just ugh↑
72	HN:	ha ha ha ha

73 T2: thinking about nothing
74 TY: ha ha ha it's ( )?
75 HN: °ha ha ha°
76 T2: the right brain people tend to be messier
77 (0.8)
78 TY: messier?
79 T2: yeah messy
80 TY: messy
81 T2: ((begins to write "messy" on whiteboard))
82 TY: ah↑ messy.
83 T2: so they don't clean their rooms much or they you know have comic books
84 everywhere or but they're very creative or smart
85 TY: hn: ah↑
86 T2: they spend their time thinking about the world or thinking about
87 dreams they don't think so much like a left brain person
88 TY: ah↑ I see. so my brother is the right brain [person
89 T2: [right brain maybe

After T2 states that left brain people are "analytical" in line 56, there is a 1.5-second gap after which TY repeats "analytical" in a similar way that he repeated "organized" above. The way that he repeats the words makes it difficult to discern whether he understands them or not. In line 59, T2 writes "analytical" on the whiteboard, following which, in line 60, TY states "ah↑ analytical" with rising pitch on the "ah". Again, this "ah↑", a change of state token, suggests that TY did not understand the word when the teacher said it or when he repeated it, but that there may have been a change in his knowledge state when he sees it in written form.

In line 61, T2 explains that left brain people "analyze things" to which TY responds with "ah". Based on its lack of pitch, it functions as a continuer. In line 63, T2 says that left brain people are "always thinking" and TY again replies with the continuer "hn". T2 finishes his TCU in line 65 with "about something", which is also where the explanation of left brain people ends. There is a 1.0-second gap and then T2 begins to describe right brain people. In line 67, he remarks that they "tend to be more creative", and in line 69, he continues by

saying that they are "disorganized" and "tend to daydream". In lines 68 and 70, TY responds to T2's utterances with the continuer, "hn". T2 moves ahead by saying that right brain people are "just like ugh" in line 71 and "thinking about nothing" in line 73, eliciting laughter by HN and TY.

In line 76, T2 states that "right brain people tend to be messier" and after a 0.8-second gap, TY initiates repair with "messier?" in line 78, with rising intonation. T2 responds with "yeah messy" and TY repeats "messy". T2 begins to write "messy" on the board and TY says "ah↑ messy" in line 82 with rising pitch on the "ah", indicating his possible recognition of the word. In lines 83 and 84, T2 says that right brain people "don't clean their rooms much or they you know have comic books everywhere or but they're very creative or smart", to which TY responds, "hn: ah↑", with rising pitch on the "ah", again displaying a change of state. In line 86 and 87, T2 then mentions that right brain people "spend their time thinking about the world or thinking about dreams they don't think so much like a left brain person" and to this TY replies in the subsequent turn with "ah↑ I see. so my brother is the right brain person". Based on TY's description of his brother as not being clean and being very smart, T2 seems to agree in part that TY's brother is a right brain person as evinced by his utterance in line 89, "right brain maybe".

This extract exhibits how TY went from a public displayed state of not understanding the expression "right brain" to some understanding of it, and by implication, the meaning of "left brain" as demonstrated by his application of "right brain" in line 88. His previous lack of understanding is evinced in his turn in line 34 where he states, "what does it mean?", an initiation of repair on the teacher's turn in lines 32 and 33 in which he says, "well we say there's uh in English we say there's two kinds of people there is left brain people and right brain people". TY displays his change of state following T2's explanation of left brain and right brain people through his use of change of state tokens throughout the interaction. For

example, in lines 54 and 60, in response to T2's explanation of left brain people as "clean" and "analytical", TY says, "ah::↑" and "ah↑", both of which are produced with rising pitch, suggesting that he went from a state of not knowing to a state of knowing. Also, in lines 82 and 85, in response to T2's description of right brain people as being messy, creative, or smart, TY responds with "ah↑" with rising pitch. In lines 86 and 87, T2 says that right brain people "think about the world or dreams, but do not think like left brain people" and TY says, "ah↑ I see", indicating that he understands. He then goes on to further indicate his understanding by saying, "so my brother is the right brain person". It is the application of the expression "right brain person" that suggests that learning may have occurred.

In lines 01, 04, 06, 10, and 11, TY describes his brother as not being clean and having books scattered around his room and in line 25 he describes his brother as "very genius", which the teacher repairs with "very smart". Later, the teacher says that left brain people are "organized" and "structured" (line 51) and "clean" (line 53). He describes right brain people as "creative" (line 67), "disorganized" (line 69), "messier" (line 76)," smart" (line 84) and points out that they "tend to daydream" (line 69), "don't clean their rooms" and "have comic books everywhere" (lines 83-84). It seems that through TY's application of the expression, "right brain person", he was able to understand that because his brother is smart and messy like right brain people and not clean and organized like left brain people, he must therefore be a right brain person. Based on the information provided by TY regarding his brother, T2 seems to agree that TY's brother is a right brain person. Not only S2's application of the expression right brain, but his correct application of it based on the explanation provided by T2 suggests that some learning may have occurred.

The next example is divided into Extracts 3, 4, and 5. In Extract 3 below, the participants are playing a game where T9 explains a type of job and the other participants have to guess what that job is. Previously in the interaction T9 says "to build houses with

wood what job is that?" ER says "architecture", to which T9 replies, "that is to design houses but to build houses". Although "architect" and not "architecture" is correct, T9 does not repair ER's utterance at that time. ER then says "carpenters", which is corrected in embedded form by the teacher with "carpenter that's right". This sequence is made relevant later in the interaction when the teacher does a nudging motion to ER, hinting to her that the correct answer is the word she produced earlier. After that interaction, the game continues with T9 explaining another job and the students trying to guess the correct answer, and then the following extract begins.

Extract 3: 21-2-40:05

01	T9:	two more u:::m (3.0) I design houses
02	ER:	un hn
03		(4.0)
04	T9:	I work with blueprints
05		(1.1)
06	ER:	°blue°
07		(1.9)
08	T9:	((makes a nudging motion to ER))
09		(1.0)
10	T9:	°say it say it° ((says this as he does a nudging motion to ER))
11	ER:	architecture
12	T9:	architect
13	MR:	ha ha ha
14	ER:	architect
15	T9:	architect is the person
16	MR:	ah
17	T9:	architecture is the thing
18	ER:	ah:::↑
19	MR:	ah:

The interaction commences with T9 saying, "I design houses" in line 01. ER responds with "un hn" and then there is a 4.0-second gap. When no one provides an answer, T9 gives

another hint in line 04 adding, "I work with blueprints" and ER repeats "°blue°" in a quiet voice. A 1.9-second gap follows and then T9 makes a nudging motion to ER, but ER does not appear to understand why as indicated by a lack of an appropriate response. T9 continues to try to pursue an answer by uttering, "°say it say it°", in line 10 in a quiet voice while doing a nudging motion to ER again. ER now seems to understand why T9 is doing the nudging motion as shown by her production of the word "architecture" in line 11, to which T9 initiates and performs repair on by stating, "architect". I argue that this repair initiation not only creates a learning opportunity, but, as mentioned above, the resulting interaction suggests that learning may have occurred. I will discuss this in more detail below.

In response to T9 saying, "architect", MR laughs, most likely because she now realizes why the teacher was doing the nudging motion to ER. ER repeats "architect" in line 14 and T9 explains the difference between architect and architecture. He explains that "architect is the person" and "architecture is the thing" and places stress on the "tect" in "architect." To this, ER responds with an elongated ,"ah:::↑", with rising pitch. This change of state token suggests that some change has occurred in the state of her knowledge, at least as publicly displayed through the deployment of the token.

The following extract begins approximately one minute and thirty eight seconds after the interaction above ends. The teacher is now bringing the session to a close, as exhibited by his asking, "did we come up with anything really new today".

```
Extract 4: 21-2-42:07
01   T9:    did we come up with anything really new today
02          (1.7)
03   T9:    not really.
04          (1.9)
05   T9:    maybe architect
06          (0.7)
07   ER:    architect
```

08 T9: yeah architect is the person=
09 ER: =architect=
10 T9: =and architecture is the (.) the thing
11 ER: >thing< [architecture is thing okay architect is the person
12 MR: [oh:
13 T9: for example uh: when I (.) went to Europe (1.0) I took pictures of
14 beautiful architecture
15 (1.5)
16 T9: beautiful buildings
17 ER: yeah
18 FK: hn hn hn
19 ER: oh okay beautiful architecture=
20 T9: =yeah=
21 ER: =is that right?
22 T9: yeah sure
23 ER: architect is a person who design a building
24 T9: yeah can you think of one of the most famous architects in the world?
25 (2.0)
26 ER: °ha ha° [ha ha ha ha ha ha I do(h)n't kn(h)ow
27 MR: [yeah I don't know about that
28 T9: I'm thinking Spain
29 ER: °Spain°
30 T9: the really unusual buildings
31 FK: Sagrada Familia
32 T9: hn? one more time I can't hear (.) °I'm sorry°

The words "architect" and "architecture" become topics of discussion and T9 once again explains the meanings of both words as seen in lines 08 and 10 when he says, "architect is the person" and "architecture is the thing". In lines 07 and 09, ER repeats "architect" and in line 11 she repeats "architecture is thing okay architect is the person". In lines 13 and 14, T9 gives an example using the word "architecture" and relates, "when I went to Europe I took pictures of beautiful architecture". In line 19, ER repeats "beautiful architecture" and T9 responds with "yeah," giving her feedback telling her that that expression is correct. Possibly because "yeah" was produced immediately after ER's response and was not heard by ER, ER asks T9

"is that right" in line 21 and T9 responds, "yeah sure". In line 23, ER provides a summary of what the teacher taught by stating, "architect is a person who design a building" and in line 24 the teacher asks "can you think of one of the most famous architects in the world?" There is a 2.0-second gap after which ER and MR state, "I do(h)n't kn(h)ow" and "I don't know about that", so T9 says, "I'm thinking Spain", "the really unusual buildings", in lines 28 and 30. FK says, "Sagrada Familia" in line 31 and in line 32 T9 initiates repair with "hn? one more time I can't hear sorry", opening a new sequence in which students try to explain that Gaudi is the architect of Sagrada Familia.

Approximately one minute and twenty five seconds passes between the end of the extract above and the beginning of the extract below; during that time the words "architect" and "architecture" were not used by any of the participants.

```
Extract 5: 21-2-44:29
01   ER:    but now right yeah the building name is Sagrada Familia
02          (0.5)
03   T9:    [ah::
04   ER:    [and then the- the architect is Gaudi
05          (1.0)
06   T9:    okay
```

In line 01, ER tells T9 that "the building name is Sagrada Familia", to which T9 responds with the elongated change of state token "ah::" in line 03. In line 04, ER continues to explain that "the architect is Gaudi". It is S2's application of the word "architect" that suggests that learning may have occurred. I maintain that although it may only be temporary learning, the fact that the word "architect" was not used for a short period of time, and then it was applied correctly later in the interaction, demonstrates that the word "architect" is, at least for the moment, in her repertoire. Not only does she use the word, but she uses it correctly with the name of the architect of Sagrada Familia, Gaudi. This potential learning was made possible

by the initiation of repair by the teacher, as shown in Extract 3. ER's use of the change of state token "ah" in Extract 3 as well as her application of the word "architect" in Extract 5 suggest that through the repair sequence, the student's state of knowledge may have changed and learning may have possibly occurred.

The last example consists of Extracts 6, 7, and 8. In the following extract the topic for discussion in the session is moral dilemmas. The interaction begins with T1 handing the students a piece of paper with a question written on it that they are expected to discuss.

```
Extract 6: 5-2-34:52
01   T1:    ((hands S3 and S4 a piece of paper with a topic))
02   T1:    how about this one
03          (0.5)
04   HT:    okay
05          (2.1)
06   HT:    hn:
07          (1.0)
08   HT:    ((reading))the person you engaged to marry- (1.0) if the person (.)
09          you are engaged to marry (2.9) had accident and become a para-
10          paraplegic (.) would you go through the marriage or back out hn? °if
11          the person you engaged to marry° (       ) para- paraplegic? ((gazes
12          at teacher))
13   T1:    hn it means no- no arms no legs
14   HT:    ah↑::↓: ((continues reading)) would you go through with the marriage
15          or back- back out? ((gazes at T1))
16   T1:    would you ((pulls arms towards himself)) say no no [(    )
17   HT:                                                      [no no
18          marriage
19   T1:    no marriage
20   HT:    oh okay hn: ah::↑
21          (2.0)
22   HT:    °(    )°
23          (7.5)
```

In line 08, HT begins reading out loud what is written on the paper. After he reads the paper one time, he says, "hn?", in line 10 with rising intonation, suggesting that he may be encountering some problem of understanding. He reads the paper again and seems to have a hard time producing the word "paraplegic", as evinced in his utterance "para- paraplegic?" The production of the word "paraplegic" with rising intonation coupled with HT's gazing at T1 (Koshik & Seo, 2012), is an initiation of repair on T1's action of handing them the paper on which he wrote the question, "If the person you are engaged to marry has an accident and becomes paraplegic, would you go through with the marriage or back out of it?" Most conversation analytic research focuses on the repair of verbal utterances, but written forms and actions can be repairable as well. Hayashi, Raymond, and Sidnell (2013) point out that "any aspect of conduct can be a source of trouble" (p. 10). In this example, the source of trouble is the question that the teacher wrote on the paper, which is essentially the teacher's utterance in written form. Kääntä (2014) discusses how students initiated correction on what a teacher wrote on an exercise sheet, which was visually available to all of the students because it was projected onto a screen. She describes the trouble source as a "visual repairable," which is how the trouble source in this example can be characterized. It is HT's repair initiation that not only creates the opportunity for learning, but begins the repair sequence, which, as will be shown, is the site where learning may be occurring.

After HT initiates repair in lines 11 and 12, T1 says "it means no- no arms no legs" to which HT responds with the elongated change of state token, " ah↑::↓:". This "ah" has rising pitch at the beginning and falling pitch at the end. However, as mentioned above, only producing a change of state token is insufficient to posit that learning has occurred. HT continues reading in line 14. In line 15, he encounters another phrase that he has trouble with, "back out", again initiating repair by saying "back- back out?" with rising intonation, after which he looks at T1 in line 15 as if to elicit help. In response to this, T1 pulls his arms

towards himself as if to signify taking something back, while saying, "would you say no no", as well as something else that is inaudible because it is produced in overlap with HT's repetition of "no no". The word "marriage" is produced by HT in the clear and T1 confirms that HT's verbalization of the meaning of "back out" is correct by repeating "no marriage" in line 19. HT receipts that with "oh okay" and then again produces another change of state token, "ah::↑", which is elongated and has rising pitch. HT's use of change of state tokens is a public display indicating some change of state in his knowledge regarding the meaning of "back out."

Now that the problems with the word "paraplegic" and the phrase "back out" appear to be solved, HT continues with the activity by reading the question to RI in line 24 of the following extract.

```
Extract 7: 5-2-35:46
24   HT:   ((reading)) uh: if the person you are engaged to marry had a accident
25         and become a para- paraplegic would you=
26   RI:   =paraplegic?
27   HT:   uh not arm not (.) leg not arm not arm
28   RI:   (no arm?)
29   HT:   not- not arm
30   RI:   okay okay
31   HT:   okay uh ((continues reading)) would you go through with the marriage
32         or back out of it
33         (1.4)
34   RI:   cancel?
35   HT:   ah yeah yeah back out is not not marriage
36   RI:   cancel
37   HT:   y- cancel
38         (1.4)
39   HT:   yeah
40         (0.9)
41   RI:   oh of course
42   HT:   oh
```

RI initiates repair in line 26 by stating, "paraplegic?" with rising intonation. HT responds, "not arm not leg not arm not arm", which grammatically is incorrect, but still exhibits that he understands the meaning of paraplegic and suggests that he learned and understood the meaning that the teacher taught him. RI again initiates repair in line 28 with something that is inaudible, to which HT responds in the subsequent turn, "not- not arm". RI receipts this with "okay okay" in line 30 and HT continues with the rest of the question in lines 31 and 32 by reading, "would you go through with the marriage or back out of it". After he finishes reading the question, there is a 1.4-second gap that is followed by RI's initiation of repair in the form of a confirmation check, "cancel?" In the next turn, HT explains that "back out" means "not marriage" and RI again seeks confirmation that "back out" means "cancel" in line 36. HT confirms this in lines 37 and 39 with "cancel" and "yeah" and RI displays his understanding by replying, "oh of course", in line 41.

In the following extract, which occurs approximately one minute and forty seconds later in the interaction, HT provides his answer to the question regarding what he would do if the person he was engaged to marry became paraplegic and he applies the words "paraplegic" and "back out".

```
Extract 8: 5-2-37:57
01   HT:    the same same but if I- so if I (.) back out of this mar- marry so
02          this this- this  person so (4.0) so not- not good hn (1.0) like uh
03          character so this person this- this woman so not- not good feelings
04          so I think I would an paraplegic person's man ah s- woman
05          (1.0)
06   T1:    okay
```

Although his use of the expressions is grammatically incorrect, his application of them lends evidence to the argument that learning may have occurred. He states that "if I back out of this mar- marry" (line 01) "this woman so not- not good feelings" (line 03) "so I think I would an

paraplegic person's" (line 04), which appears to mean, "if I back out of the marriage the woman would not feel good so I think I would marry the paraplegic woman."

HT's repair initiations in lines 11 and 12 in which he states, "paraplegic?" with rising intonation followed by his gazing at the teacher, and in line 15, in which he produces "back out?" with rising intonation followed by his gazing at the teacher, suggest that HT had some problems with those words, which is why he elicited help from the teacher. His actions suggest he was in a state of not knowing the meanings of those words and this state seems to have changed, as evinced through his use of change of state tokens "ah" in line 14, and "oh" and "ah" in line 20 of Extract 6. These change of state tokens are not enough to suggest that learning has occurred, but in Extract 7 HT's explanations of "paraplegic" as "not leg not arm" in line 27 and "back out" as "not marriage" in line 35 to RI demonstrate that he does understand what they mean and therefore suggests that he learned what the teacher taught him in lines 13, that "paraplegic" means "no arms no legs," and in lines 16 and 18 of Extract 6, that "back out" means "no marriage". HI also confirms to RI that "back out" means "cancel" in lines 37 and 39 of Extract 7.

5.2 Discussion

In all of the examples presented in this chapter the participants exhibit a problem of understanding or lack of knowledge as shown through their actions. In Extract 1, TY displayed a problem of understanding in the form of a question, "what does it mean?" In Extract 3, ER's lack of knowledge was made apparent through her inability to produce the correct word "architect". In Extract 6, HT showed his problem with the words "paraplegic" and "back out" by producing them with rising intonation coupled with gaze to elicit help from T1. In all of the examples this problem of understanding or lack of knowledge appeared to change after the explanation by the teacher as evinced through their use of change of state

tokens such as "ah", "oh", and "I see". As mentioned above, through the use of change of state tokens the participants display that their perceived state of knowledge has changed. However, the use of change of state tokens does not necessarily indicate that a change of state actually occurred, which is why just based on their usage of the change of state tokens it is difficult to argue that learning occurred.

Learning is often thought to be a cognitive action that occurs in the mind and is therefore not visible, but the examples presented in this study suggest that learning can be visible and conversation analysis can be used to uncover how and where it may potentially occur. This study used a conversation analytic approach to explicate how the participants may go from a state of not knowing to a state of knowing, as illustrated by the participants' visible problem of understanding or lack of knowledge, their use of change of state tokens, and through their actions of explaining or applying the newly learned word or phrase. This publicly visible change of state and the explanation or application of a learning object are what lend evidence to suggest that learning may have occurred. In line 88 of Extract 2, TY states, "so my brother is the right brain person", which is the application of an expression that he did not previously know, as shown by his question "what does it mean?" in line 34 of Extract 1 after T2 says the words" right brain" and "left brain". In line 04 of Extract 5, ER says, "the architect is Gaudi", which is the application of the learning object, "architect". In line 27 of Extract 7, HT indicates that he understands the learning object when he explains to RI that "paraplegic" means "not arm not leg" and "back out" means "not marriage" and confirms that it means "cancel" in lines 37 and 39. He applies the learning objects, although ungrammatically, in lines 01 and 04 of Extract 8. All of these actions as a whole suggest that learning may have occurred in the examples presented in this study. The type of learning discussed in this study is all short-term and although the examples do not show long-term sustained learning, they do suggest that repairing student utterances and not letting mistakes

pass (Firth, 1996) may lead to at least temporary learning, which is the first step to achieving long-term learning. The principle of "let it pass" was discussed by Garfinkel (1967, p. 3) as meaning not requesting clarity, but in the present study, "letting it pass" does not refer to problems of clarity or understanding, rather letting problems in speaking and understanding pass. Previous studies on second language acquisition (e.g., Doughty & Varela, 1998) have shown that providing corrective feedback to students can lead to learning. The data presented in this study suggests that contrary to criticism that CA is not able to show that learning is occurring, CA can help uncover evidence to suggest that learning may potentially be occurring, albeit in the short-term.

Gardner (2008) comments that one "problem of course is how one can be sure that any learning that takes place is the result of what has been captured in the classroom recordings" (p. 237). This is a very important issue that researchers attempting to demonstrate learning have to face. As shown in the examples presented in this study, although it is impossible to say definitively that learning is occurring, through an analysis of the actions of the participants it is possible to say that learning may possibly be occurring when a participant goes from displaying a lack of knowledge or inability to produce an appropriate word, a change of state, and then to applying a newly learned word or phrase.

The potential learning was made possible as a result of a repair initiation made either by the teacher or one of the students. The data suggests that repair sequences may be potential sites for learning and that it may be beneficial for teachers to repair students' utterances and not always let mistakes pass. The focus of this study was not on repair or how repair is performed, rather it was to show that learning can possibly occur as the result of learning opportunities created by a repair initiation. The findings in this study support those of Brouwer and Wagner (2004), who showed how learning occurred as a result of repair.

Brouwer (2003) examined word searches in native and non-native interaction and

investigated the possibility of opportunities for learning. In the examples in which she argues that learning occurred, she points out that participants oriented to their language expertise; one participant is a novice and the other is an expert. In all of the examples presented in this chapter, the participants orient to their language expertise. The non-native speakers ask the native speakers the meanings of words, or the native speakers correct non-native speakers' problematic utterances. Hosoda (2006) analyzed conversations between native and non-native speakers and had somewhat similar findings. She revealed that interlocutors oriented to language expertise when there was a problem of understanding or speaking and when one interlocutor invited repair from the other interlocutor.

Gardner (2008) remarks that examining interaction in which learning is the primary focus may reveal sites where learning occurs and that describing this interaction may identify "sequences and practices which would be worth further exploring as potential sites of learning, and take CA beyond 'mere description' of second language use" (p. 230). It is my hope that the examples presented in this paper illustrate that CA is capable of more than merely describing how second language is used, rather it is capable of identifying possible sites of learning. Mori (2004) points out that:

> there has been a lingering question as to how one can adhere to CA's rigorous methodological focus on unmotivated, yet meticulous, observation of recognizable, technical procedures for developing talk-in-interaction, on one hand, and on the other hand, work out the practical implications that correspond to the concerns of SLA researchers and language teaching professionals. (p. 547)

This chapter attempted to show how CA can be applied to second language studies to demonstrate how and where learning, an issue of interest both to researchers and language teachers, may occur. Further research on classroom interaction that addresses how second languages are acquired and maintained is needed (He, 2004). As this study revealed, showing

how and where short-term learning occurs and identifying learning objects for comparison may be possible using CA.

CHAPTER 6

REPAIR SEQUENCES AS POTENTIAL SITES OF TEACHING

This chapter focuses on how students' utterances, which are treated as a lack of linguistic competence and therefore problematic by teachers, can create opportunities for teaching for teachers. According to the Merriam-Webster's Learner's Dictionary, the word "teach" means "to cause to know something." In this chapter, I use the term "teach" to describe the action of teachers repairing students' problematic utterances. CA is concerned with analyzing the observable aspects of interaction; it does not try to look into the minds of participants to examine whether they have the linguistic capabilities to produce a correct utterance. Gardner (2008) remarks that when speaking in a second language, speakers seem to "draw on the lexical and grammatical resources they have, together with all the other interactional resources at their disposal" (p. 231). Therefore, what the teachers treat as the incorrect usage of vocabulary or grammar or inability to produce an appropriate response suggests that they may not have adequate linguistic competence they can draw on, at least in the moment of the interaction. In CA, whether the researcher analyzing the interaction thinks that students have the linguistic competence to produce correct utterances or not is actually not relevant. What is relevant is whether teachers treat certain utterances by the students as problematic and attribute the problems to the students' lack of linguistic knowledge. Teachers sometimes orient to incorrect or inappropriate production of an utterance as a lack of linguistic competence that needs to be filled through teaching. This study aims to contribute to previous research by showing how repair is initiated and performed as well as by illustrating how the teachers in the interaction do teaching through repair, and in some cases, continue doing teaching even after the repair sequence has closed.

Schegloff (1997a) explains that certain practices perform certain actions. In the examples in this chapter, teachers perform repair using language and other resources that are

specific to language teachers, such as writing repaired utterances on the whiteboard, teaching alternative expressions, and pointing to the words on the whiteboard as prompts to get students to produce various sentences. The action being done through repair is teaching, which occurs in repair sequences following an utterance that is treated as problematic by teachers, and in some cases, teachers initiate expansion sequences to continue teaching or give students practice even after the repair sequence has closed.

Repair can be initiated both by students and teachers, but in all of the data that I examine in this chapter, the repair is performed by teachers, who use the whiteboard in order to assist the repair, which is a unique feature of classroom interaction. In addition to being used by teachers to do repair, the whiteboard is also used by students as a resource when they produce repaired utterances. In this chapter, I examine not only how opportunities for teaching are created, but also how the classroom whiteboard is utilized by teachers to assist repair and by students to produce repaired utterances.

One thing of particular interest regarding the use of a whiteboard is that in every example in which the teacher used the whiteboard to carry out repair, the students repeated the repaired utterance, and such repetition occurs less often when repair is only done verbally. All of the examples in this chapter have the following general features:

1. Student produces an utterance that is subsequently treated as problematic by the teacher
2. Student or teacher initiates repair
3. Teacher repairs the utterance verbally and by writing the repaired utterance on the whiteboard or vice versa (verbal and written repair can be performed separately and sometimes they are performed almost simultaneously)
4. Student repeats the repaired utterance

Building on previous research on repair in classroom interaction, this chapter contributes to a better understanding of the manner in which repair is performed in a

classroom setting, and how teaching opportunities are created.

6.1 Analysis

In this section, I present various extracts which reveal how opportunities for teaching arise, how repair sequences can become potential sites of teaching, and how various resources, such as a whiteboard, can be used to do repair. Some examples are divided into multiple extracts in order to make them easier to process for the reader. Although some extracts do not contain content which is directly related to the focus of this chapter, they are included in order to demonstrate how the interaction unfolds. The repair that I focus on in this section concerns problems of speaking, and not problems of hearing and understanding. Some of the extracts, however, do contain several repair sequences which include problems of hearing and understanding. These are mentioned when they are relevant to the analytical focus. For each example, I concentrate on one utterance, which often becomes the focus of the interaction and creates the opportunity for teaching. An analysis of the data revealed two general repair patterns, which I present in subsections in the analysis section. They are: (a) repair in which written and verbal repair are done separately and (b) repair in which written and verbal repair are performed almost simultaneously. Each example will be explained in its respective section.

6.1.1 Verbal and Written Repair are Performed Separately

In this section, I will analyze an example in which verbal and written repair are performed separately. By separately, I mean that the verbal and written repair do not occur exactly at the same time; first, verbal repair is performed and then written repair is performed. Both the verbal and written repair can be seen as two distinct, but related opportunities for students to be exposed to the repair. The written repair allows students to see the repaired

utterance and verbal repair allows students to hear the repaired utterance. Occasionally, when only verbal repair occurs, students may not realize that their utterance has been repaired. Writing the repaired utterance on the whiteboard increases the chances that students will realize that their utterance has been repaired. This is why I argue that the use of the whiteboard to perform repair has a significant role.

In the following extract, TY is talking about the type of job that he wants. Before this extract began, T2 and TY were discussing the characteristics of what they call right brain and left brain people and T2 mentioned that left brain people are analytical and he wrote "analytical" on the whiteboard.

```
Extract 1: 11-2-35:28
01   TY:   I want to be a English teacher or something ana- Engli- something
02         relate to English
03   T2:   okay something English related
04   TY:   hn
05         (1.5)
06   TY:   so maybe I'm a member of the analytical person
07   T2:   hn okay you're analytical minded
08   TY:   ah yes.
09         (0.9)
10   T2:   you can say minded ((writes "minded" on whiteboard next to the word
11         "analytical," which he wrote earlier in the interaction (2.2) ))
12   TY:   ((looks at whiteboard)) analytical minded
```

In line 01, TY says, "I want to be a English teacher or something ana- Engli- something relate to English" and in line 02, T2 initiates and performs repair on his utterance with "okay something English related". Hosoda (2006) analyzed mundane interaction between native and non-native speakers of Japanese and found that as seen in conversations among native speakers, participants do not usually repair the other speakers' errors. In contrast, in this example, as well as in most of the examples in this chapter, the native speakers often repair

students' errors and by doing so they are doing being teachers. TY receipts T2's repair with "hn" in line 04, followed by a 1.5-second gap. TY then states, "so maybe I'm a member of the analytical person" in line 06, which T2 again initiates and performs repairs on with "okay you're analytical minded." TY again receipts T2's repair in line 08 with "ah yes.", thus closing the repair sequence. Brouwer (2003) discovered that corrections of non-native speaker utterances are often acknowledged with a "yes," which is what is occurring here. This is followed by a 0.9-second gap in line 09, and T2 then expands on his previous repair with "you can say minded" and then writes "minded" on the whiteboard next to the word "analytical", which he wrote earlier in the interaction. In line 12, TY repeats T2's expression, "analytical minded", while looking at the whiteboard.

In lines 01, 02, and 06, although TY's expressions are grammatically incorrect, we are able to see, based on T2's repairs, that he does not have a problem understanding what TY is trying to say. Therefore, T2 does not need to repair TY's utterances in order to achieve intersubjectivity, but he orients to his role as a teacher as shown by his other-initiated other-repairs of linguistic form in lines 03 and 07. TY's utterances in lines 01, 02, and 06 create a teaching opportunity for T2. The difference between T2's repair of the problematic utterance in lines 01 and 02, and the one in line 06 is that in addition to doing verbal repair in line 07, T2 also writes "minded" on the whiteboard in lines 10 and 11 next to the word "analytical". Having the expression written on the whiteboard allows TY to be exposed to the expression one more time in a different modality. Moreover, because it is written on the whiteboard TY can reference it when needed during the interaction. TY does this in line 12 when he looks at the whiteboard and says, "analytical minded". Often in repair sequences, repair can be ignored or receipted by repeating a part of the repaired utterance or with minimal response tokens, such as "hn" or "okay." However, writing the repaired expression or utterance on the whiteboard makes it easier for students to produce the repaired item and

increases the likelihood that the repair will not go overlooked.

6.1.2 Verbal and Written Repair are Performed Almost Simultaneously

In this section, I analyze examples in which the teacher performs the verbal and written repair almost simultaneously. In the following example, T2 and RK are doing an activity in which RK throws a ball at the whiteboard on which T2 drew four sections. Each section contains one of the following topics: food, travel, strange, and hobbies. For each topic, there are cards on the table with questions written on them by the teacher and there are three levels of difficulty for each topic: easy, medium, and difficult. In this extract, RK closes her eyes and throws the ball at the whiteboard and after the ball hits a topic, RK chooses a level of difficulty for that topic, takes a card, and reads the question on that card.

Because of the length of the transcript of this activity, I have divided it into three parts. Before the activity shown in the following extract began, RK threw the ball and it hit the "food" section on the whiteboard.

```
Extract 2: 23-1-10:12
01   T2:   do you want to try medium?
02   RK:   a::h  [hn::::::::::::::::::
03   T2:         [try medium if it's too difficult we- we can do easy
04   RK:   not- not different
05   T2:   not difficult okay
06   RK:   ((takes and reads card)) what food do you ever want to eat? why? huh?
07   T2:   okay let me see.
08   RK:   please ((gives T2 the card))
09         ((T2 looks at card (2.2) ))
10   T2:   ((reads card)) so what food do you never
11   RK:   never
12   T2:   want to eat
13   RK:   want to eat
14         (2.0)
15   T2:   so never
```

16 (0.5)
17 RK: never
18 T2: means not (.) never
19 RK: never
20 (1.9)
21 T2: so if I say u::m ((walks to whiteboard and begins to draw a picture
22 of a bowl of *natto* (2.1)))
23 RK: broken (.) ah soup?
24 T2: you have u::m ((continues drawing (6.0))) *natto*
"fermented soybeans"
25 ((points to whiteboard and writes "*natto*" (7.1)))
26 T2: *natto*
27 RK: *natto*
28 T2: so me I don't like (.) *natto*
29 RK: hn
30 T2: so I never want to eat (.) *natto*
31 (1.0)
32 T2: never
33 RK: hn
34 (4.6)

In line 01, T2 asks RK, "do you want to try medium?", to which S1 replies, "a::h" and then "hn::::::::::::::::::" in line 02, which is produced in overlap with T2's utterance in the next line, "try medium if it's too difficult we- we can do easy". RK then says, "not- not different", which T2 corrects with "okay not difficult" in line 05. RK takes a card from the pile and begins to read it in line 06, saying, "what food do you ever want to eat? why?" and then self-initiating repair with "huh?" RK then gives the card to T2, and T2 looks at it for 2.2 seconds and then begins to read it in line 10. He performs other-initiated other-repair in line 10, asking, "what food do you never", placing emphasis on "never", which is the word that replaces the trouble source, "ever", in line 06.

In line 11, RK repeats "never", and in line 12 T2 completes the question with "want to eat", which RK also repeats in the next turn. After T2 finishes the question in line 12, an

answer from RK becomes relevant in the subsequent turn (Sacks, 1987), but because she fails to produce one, T2 self-selects in line 15 and says, "so never". After a 0.5-second gap, RK says, "never", but again does not produce an answer. After a 1.9-second gap in line 20, T2 states, "so if I say u::m", and then walks to the whiteboard and begins to draw a bowl of *natto*, Japanese fermented soybeans. In line 24, he says, "you have u::m *natto*", while continuing to draw. After producing the word "*natto*", he points to the whiteboard and writes "*natto*", which he then says in line 26. RK repeats "*natto*" in line 27, and in lines 28 and 30, T2 gives his own example, stating, "so me I don't like *natto* so I never want to eat *natto*". Okada (2010) noticed a similar phenomenon and mentions that "teachers' orientation to addressing the students' difficulty with the question is observable through their strategy of proffering candidate responses" (p. 69). By prefacing the sentence, "I never want to eat *natto*" with "so me I don't like *natto*", it may help S1 to understand that if you do not like something, you never want to eat it. After a 1.0-second gap, T2 repeats the word "never", and RK produces a minimal response token, "hn". The interaction continues in the extract below with S1 asking, "why?" instead of producing a sentence using the word "never".

Extract 3: 23-1-11:18

35 RK: why?
36 (0.5)
37 T2: u:h be- because↑ u:h I don't like *natto's* smell
38 (1.2)
39 RK: hn:::
40 T2: smell is ugh (.) I don't like it
41 (1.6)
42 T2: okay how about you? what food do you never want to try
43 (3.6)
44 RK: I don't like *tofu*
45 (1.4)
46 T2: you don't like?
47 (0.6)

48 RK: *tofu*
49 T2: *tofu*?
50 RK: yes
51 T2: really
52 RK: yes
53 T2: why?
54 RK: e::h↑ (1.2) u::::m (4.1) I'm little look at is um rice and *tofu*
55 is ((does mixing motion))
56 T2: mixed?
57 RK: mixed very very very no- no- not
58 T2: oh okay
59 RK: uh not dish- de- de- *nan dakke*
what COP:Q
"What was that word?"
60 T2: delicious
61 RK: not delicious
62 T2: oh okay so you don't like rice and *tofu*
63 RK: yes
64 T2: together
65 RK: yes
66 T2: oh a(h)l(h)r(h)i(h)g(h)h(h)t [ha ha ha ha
67 RK: [hn::

T2 answers in line 37 with "because ↑ u:h I don't like *natto's* smell", to which RK responds, "hn:::", in line 39. T2 then elaborates, stating, "smell is ugh I don't like it" and after a 1.6-second gap, he asks RK, "okay how about you? what food do you never want to try", again placing emphasis on "never". Based on T2's repeated use and emphasis of the word "never" in this extract as well as the previous extract, it appears that T2 wants RK to produce a sentence using the word "never", but instead, in line 44 RK says, "I don't like *tofu*", which is a sentence similar to T2's sentence in line 28 in the previous extract. After a 1.4-second gap in line 45, T2 responds with, "you don't like?" After a 0.6-second gap, RK replies with "*tofu*" in line 48, which T2 requests confirmation for by repeating in the next turn. RK confirms that she does not like *tofu* in line 50 and 52, and then T2 asks "why?" RK exhibits uncertainty in

her ability to answer in line 54 through her use of the fillers "e::h ↑ " and "u::::m" as well as the pauses prior to answering. The sound stretches in RK's turn project that a trouble may possibly follow (Schegloff et al., 1977). She states, "I'm little look at is um rice and *tofu* is" and then initiates repair by gesturally doing a mixing motion in line 55. This action is referred to as "embodied completion" (Olsher, 2004; Mori & Hayashi, 2006). Olsher (2004) explains that it "involves launching a turn at talk, and then at a point where some trajectory of the turn is projectable, ceasing to talk and completing the action that had been initiated by the partial turn through gesture or embodied display" (p. 221). It is interesting to note how RK uses gestures in order to help her communicate a word that she is unable to produce. The use of gestures makes other-repair possible as it helps the other participant project what the speaker is trying to say. In line 56, T2 says, "mixed?", with rising intonation and RK responds with, "mixed very very very no- no- not", and T2 receipts that with "oh okay" in line 58. RK attempts to continue her turn, but struggles to produce the word "delicious", as shown in her turn in line 59 in which she states, "uh not dish- de- de- *nan dakke* (what was that word?)". Schegloff (1987) mentions that self-initiated repairs which occur in the same turn as the trouble source often involve cut offs, as seen in line 59, after which the speaker of the trouble source attempts to address the trouble. RK's self-initiation of repair in line 59 is followed by T2's repair in the next turn, "delicious," and RK receipts the repair through repetition in line 61, framing it with the word "not," which she previously produced. T2 summarizes the fact that RK does not like rice and *tofu* together in lines 62 and 64 and RK confirms this in lines 63 and 65. Subsequently, T2 says, "alright", which is produced with laughter and is followed by laughter, overlapping with RK's confirmation in line 67, "hn::".

In the extract above, T2 established that RK does not like rice and *tofu* together, but RK still has not produced an utterance using the word "never", which would answer the question that is the focus of the activity, "what food do you never want to eat?" Kasper (1985)

mentions that "the trouble-sources in teacher-initiated repairs of learners' utterances relate to aspects in the learners' production which the teacher defines as wrong or otherwise undesirable" (p. 206). In the following extract, T2 continues to pursue a desired response, which would be a sentence with the word "never", by building on the information that he acquired in the extracts above.

Extract 4: 23-1-12:27

68 T2: so you don't like u:h you don't like (.) uh *mabo dofu*
"spicy *tofu* dish"
69 (2.3)
70 RK: [yes
71 T2: [Chinese food
72 RK: yes I don't know (.) *mabo dofu*
73 T2: oh okay you don't?
74 (1.0)
75 T2: so anything *tofu* and rice you don't like
76 RK: yes
77 (1.5)
78 T2: okay good so you don't like (.) even *tofu* only?
79 (0.5)
80 RK: um↑ (1.4) no *mou* no
already
"no way"
81 T2: n(h)o [n(h)o ha ha
82 RK: [no
83 RK: *mou* no no no no [*tofu* is no
already
"no way"
84 T2: [tofu is
85 T2: okay ne- so you would say- you would say ((writes "I never" on
86 whiteboard)) I never
87 RK: I never
88 T2: ((writes "want")) want
89 RK: want
90 T2: ((writes "to")) to

91 RK: to
92 T2: ((writes "eat")) eat
93 RK: eat
94 T2: ((writes "*tofu*")) *tofu*
95 RK: >*tofu*<
96 (1.7)
97 T2: so never means zero ((underlines "never" on whiteboard and writes a
98 "0" above "never"))
99 RK: ah yes
100 T2: percent
101 (2.8)
102 T2: so I never want to eat- so me I never want to eat *natto*
103 RK: yeah
104 T2: so you I never want to eat
105 RK: I never want to eat *tofu*
106 T2: okay
107 (0.8)
108 T2: very good

In line 68, T2 performs a confirmation check, stating, "so you don't like u:h you don't like uh *mabo dofu*", which is a dish that contains both *tofu* and rice. RK confirms this in line 70 with "yes", which is preceded by a 2.3-second gap. In line 71, T2 mentions that *mabo dofu* is "Chinese food" and RK responds, "yes I don't know (.) *mabo dofu*", in line 72. In response to T2's confirmation check regarding whether RK likes *mabo dofu* in line 68, RK says "yes" in line 70. RK says that she does not know *mabo dofu* in line 72, but based on her previous response in line 70, it is possible that she intended to say "I don't like *mabo dofu*" and not "I don't know *mabo dofu*."

T2 asks, "so you don't like even *tofu* only?" in line 78, to which S1 replies, "um↑ no *mou* no" in line 80, and RK continues to emphasize her dislike for *tofu* in lines in 82 and 83, stating, "no" and "*mou* no no no no *tofu* is no". In line 84, T2 produces the words "*tofu* is" at the same time as RK does in line 83. T2's treats RK's utterance in line 83 as having some

need for adjustment when he initiates repair with "okay ne- so you would say-" and then he writes "I never" on the whiteboard and says, "I never", which RK repeats in line 87. T2 writes "want" and then says "want" in line 88, and RK repeats it. T2 writes and says "to" in line 90, and RK repeats it. T2 writes and says "eat" in line 92, and RK repeats it. T2 writes and says "*tofu* in line 94, and RK repeats it quickly. By line 95, RK has produced a teacher-assisted answer to the question written on the card, which RK read in line 06 of Extract 2, "what food do you never want to eat?" T2's repairs display his identity as a teacher as well as the fact that there is an asymmetry of knowledge (Drew, 1991). That is to say, T2, the native speaker of English, demonstrates his knowledgeable position by repairing RK's turn.

Here, it would be appropriate for T2 to provide some sort of feedback, which would close the repair sequence. However, possibly because RK produces the sentence in fragments, or because her repetition of T2's words does not necessarily mean that she understands the meaning of the word "never," T2 continues to explain in line 96 that "never means zero". T2 then underlines the word "never" on the whiteboard and writes the number "0" above the word "never." RK acknowledgesT2's explanation in line 99 with "ah yes", after which T2 completes his turn with the word "percent". Following a 2.8- second gap, T2 says, "so I never want to eat- so me I never want to eat *natto*", again including the word "me", showing that it is his example, but this time, contrary to Extract 4, he shows RK that it is her turn to produce her own sentence by saying, "so you I never want to eat" in line 104. RK seems to realize that it is her turn to produce a sentence using the word "never" in line 105 and she produces the sentence, "I never want to eat *tofu*" while looking at the whiteboard. The repair sequence closes in line 106 with T2 receipting RK's sentence with "okay". Regarding participants' use of "okay," Schegloff (2007) remarks that "it may mark or claim acceptance of a second pair part." In this extract, the first pair part is T2's prompt in line 104, "so you I never want to eat", is followed by the second pair part, RK's production of the sentence, "I never want to eat

tofu". T2 accepts that with "okay" in the subsequent turn.

Extracts 2, 3, and 4 highlight how a problematic utterance can create teaching opportunities. The first trouble source in this interaction was the question, "what food do you never want to eat?" The second trouble source, "*mou* no no no no *tofu* is no", was a response to T2's question, "so you don't like even *tofu* only?"

In line 85 of Extract 4, T2 uses the whiteboard as a resource to repair RK's utterance and help her produce the answer to the question that is the main focus of the current activity, "what food do you never want to eat?" T2 writes "I never want to eat *tofu*" on the whiteboard, which allows RK to see the repaired utterance and assists T2 in getting RK to produce the sentence. When T2 performs repair only verbally, RK does not produce a sentence using the word "never", even after T2 provides an example sentence. The whiteboard seems to help RK visualize how she can answer the question written on the card, and also appears to act as a prompt for RK to produce the repaired utterance.

In the following extracts, written and verbal repair are also done almost simultaneously and they showcase how a whiteboard can be used to assist repair. Prior to the following extract, RK picks a card that says, "What is your favorite spicy food?" RK reads the question and T2 answers that his favorite spicy food is *kimchi*, a Korean food made from fermented cabbage. T2 mentions that he eats *kimchi* once a month, but because RK appears to have difficulty understanding, he attempts to explain it a few different ways. T2 abandons trying to explain the expression, "once a month", and the interaction below begins.

```
Extract 5: 23-1-16:19
01   T2:   how about you?
02         (1.0)
03   RK:   eh::: (0.7) hn: I like curry¿
04         ((T2 erases whiteboard (0.8) ))
05   T2:   curry=
06   RK:   =un (.) yes
```

```
07  T2:  okay uh:: (.) what's your favorite curry restaurant?
08  RK:  huh?
09  T2:  ((writes "restaurant" on whiteboard (4.3) ))
10  RK:  hn::: I like (.) my mother cooking curry
11  T2:  oh okay
12  RK:  yes
13  T2:  so you would say (.)I like ((writes "I like" on whiteboard (0.5) ))
14  RK:  I like
15  T2:  my (.) mother's ((writes "my mother's"))
16  RK:  mother's
17  T2:  ((writes curry (2.2) )) curry
18       (0.8)
19  RK:  curry
20       (1.2)
21  RK:  I like my mother is curry
22  T2:  mother's
23  RK:  mother's
24  T2:  yeah
25  RK:  mother's
26  T2:  or you can say I like ((writes "I like" (2.8) )) the curry ((writes
27       "the curry" (2.5) )) my mother ((writes "my mother" (2.7) )) makes
28       ((writes "makes" (2.4) ))
29       (0.8)
30  RK:  I like the curry my mother makes
31  T2:  yeah
32  RK:  un
33       (1.8)
34  T2:  or you can say cooks ((writes "cooks" on whiteboard (4.4) ))
35  RK:  I like the curry my mother cooks
36  T2:  yeah both are okay
37       (2.5)
```

In line 01, T2 asks RK, "how about you?", which, based on the previous interaction means, what is your favorite spicy food? After a 1.0-second gap in line 02, RK responds with, "eh::: hn: I like curry", and after a 0.8-second gap during which T2 erases the whiteboard, T2 receipts that with "curry" in line 05. RK provides a minimal response in line 06, saying, "un

yes", which T2 receipts with "okay" followed by the question, "what's your favorite curry restaurant?" in line 07. RK initiates repair with the open class repair initiator (Drew, 1997), "huh?" Then T2 performs repair in line 09 by writing "restaurant" on the whiteboard. In line 10, RK responds with "hn::: I like my mother cooking curry". T2 does not immediately initiate repair on this response by RK. According to Schegloff (2000), occasionally other-initiations of repair do not immediately follow a trouble source. This occurs when a recipient responds to a trouble source turn and then initiates repair on it as seen in the example. In line 11, T2 says, "oh okay", and RK responds with "yes" in the following turn. Waring (2008) points out that "assessment does not automatically engender sequence closing" (p. 581). T2's assessment in line 11, "oh okay", does not close the sequence in this case. Rather, it is followed by his initiation of repair in line 13. In line 13, T2 initiates delayed repair with "so you would say I like" and then writes "I like" on the whiteboard. RK repeats "I like" in line 14 and T2 continues the repair by saying "my mother's" after which he writes "my mother's". RK repeats "mother's" in line 16 and T2 then completes the repair with "curry", which he also writes and RK repeats it in line 19 after a 0.8-second gap. After a 1.2-second gap in line 20, RK attempts to read the whole sentence, stating, "I like my mother is curry" in line 21. Because she says "mother is" instead of "mother's", T2 again initiates and performs repair in line 22 with "mother's", which RK repeats correctly in line 23. T2 confirms that her utterance is correct with "yeah", and RK again repeats the correct utterance in line 25.

In line 26, T2 provides RK with an alternative way to answer his question, saying, "or you can say I like the curry my mother makes", while writing each of the words on the whiteboard. Contrary to the previous sentence in which RK does not wait until T2 is finished writing the words on the whiteboard to repeat the words, RK waits to repeat it until T2 has said and written the sentence on the whiteboard. T2 affirms that her reading of the sentence is

correct in line 31 by remarking "yeah", and RK receipts that with "un" in line 32. After a 1.8-second gap, T2 states "or you can say cooks" and then writes "cooks" on the whiteboard under the word "makes" in line 34. RK again repeats the sentence in line 35, stating, "I like the curry my mother cooks" and T2 confirms that her production of that sentence is correct by saying, "yeah both are okay".

RK's utterance, "I like my mother cooking curry", is treated by the teacher as inappropriate and creates a teaching opportunity for T2, which he uses to teach RK the expression, "I like my mother's curry". After RK says all of the words in the repaired utterance correctly, the repair sequence is closed in line 31 when T2 says "yeah". T2 orients to his role as teacher by expanding the sequence and saying, "or you can say I like the curry my mother makes" as he writes it on the whiteboard. RK repeats the sentence while looking at the whiteboard and T2 gives feedback by stating, "yeah". T2 continues to give one more alternative, stating, "or you can say cooks" and then writes "cooks" on the whiteboard.

In the extract above, T2 establishes that RK likes the curry that her mother makes. However, RK still has not answered T2's question, in line 07 of Extract 5, "what's your favorite curry restaurant?" The interaction continues in the following two extracts. In Extract 6 below, the whiteboard is not used to do repair, but it connects Extracts 5 and 7 and demonstrates how the interaction unfolds. The interaction begins with T2 asking RK follow-up questions about her mother's curry.

Extract 6: 23-1-17:39

38 T2: so is your mother's curry very spicy?
39 RK: ((tilts head))
40 T2: or only a little spicy
41 RK: little spicy
42 T2: a little spicy okay
43 (1.9)
44 T2: uh:: when- when does your mother (.) make curry?

45 (1.6)
46 RK: dashumaza?
47 T2: when?
48 RK: when? (.) when?=
49 T2: =so does she make curry once a week?
50 RK: hn:::: *toki dok-* what's *toki doki*?
"sometimes" "sometimes"
51 T2: sometimes
52 RK: sometime
53 T2: okay so you can say she makes curry
54 (1.3)
55 RK: she makes curry is sometime
56 T2: she makes curry sometimes
57 RK: she makes curry sometimes
58 T2: yes. (1.3) okay very good
59 (1.6)

In line 38, T2 asks, "so is your mother's curry very spicy?", placing emphasis on the word "very". RK initiates repair by tilting her head in line 39 as if she does not understand the question or know how to answer it. Seo and Koshik (2010) point out that gestures like a head tilt/turn, or poke are used to initiate repair and often indicate to the recipient they do not understand the prior talk. They report, however, that head poke were only used by tutees, whereas both head pokes and tilts were used by tutors. In this example, it is the student who initiates repair by tilting her head. Hosoda (2000) also found that participants' self-initiated repair through a variety of ways, including head tilts. T2 performs repair in line 30 with "or only a little spicy", this time emphasizing the word "little", which is the contrastive adjective of "very". RK replies, "little spicy" in line 41 and T2 receipts that with "a little spicy okay", which closes the repair sequence. The repetition of the repaired utterance was also observed in native/non-native mundane conversation by Hosoda (2001) and classroom interaction by Ohta (2001).

T2 asks another follow-up question about RK's mother's curry in line 44 by stating,

"when does your mother make curry?" After a 1.6-second gap, RK again initiates repair by saying, "does your mother", pronounced "dashumaza", with rising intonation in line 46. In this turn RK attempts to repeat part of T2's utterance, "does your mother", but she does not seem to recognize that "does", "your", and "mother", are separate words, which is why she produces all three words as one word with rising intonation, displaying her problem in hearing. T2 performs repair in line 47 with "when", repeating only the most important word of the question. RK again initiates repair with "when? when?", indicating her inability to understand what T2 is trying to ask. Because only repeating "when" is insufficient for RK to understand, T2 rephrases his question in line 49 and places emphasis on the words related to time, asking, "so does she make curry once a week?" RK responds in the next turn with "hn:::: *toki dok-* what's *toki doki*?" to which T2 replies, "sometimes" in line 51. RK says "sometime" in line 52 and in line 53, T2 accepts her answer with "okay", which closes the repair sequence.

However, instead of letting the repair sequence close and moving on, T2 opens another sequence and begins to teach. T2's opportunity to teach is made possible and relevant by RK's repair initiation in line 46, in which she shows her lack of understanding of T2's question, "when does your mother make curry?" Although RK's response in line 52, "sometime", is missing an "s", the utterance does not cause a problem of understanding for the teacher, as revealed in the teacher's subsequent acceptance, "okay". However, T2 orients to his role as teacher and teaches RK how to answer his question in a complete sentence.

In line 53, T2 says, "okay so you can say she makes curry", to which RK responds, "she makes curry is sometime" in line 55 after a 1.3-second gap. T2 initiates and performs repair in line 56 with "she makes curry sometimes", placing emphasis on the problematic word, "sometimes". Other-repair is often followed by both verbal and non-verbal acceptance before interactants return to the interaction that was occurring prior to the repair. The other

repair can be seen as initiating a new sequence that requires a relevant response to the repair in the next turn (Hosoda, 2000). RK accepts the repair by repeating, "she makes curry sometimes" and the repair sequence closes in line 58 with T2's utterance, "yes. okay very good". Butterfield and Bhatta (2015) analyzed team teaching EFL classrooms and found that when one teacher was managing an activity and the other teacher stepped in to repair a student's utterance, their acceptance of the repair was needed before the interaction could proceed. In this example as well, T2, the teacher, initiates repair on RK's utterance and his acceptance of the repair is relevant before the interaction can move forward.

RK has yet to answer T2's question, "what is your favorite curry restaurant?" in line 07 of Extract 5. Extract 7 below begins with T2 pursuing an answer to that question by asking RK if she likes a well-known curry restaurant named Momo's.

Extract 7: 23-1-18:24

60 T2: do you like Momo's curry?
61 (1.0)
62 RK: hn I don't- I don't go:::: Momo's
63 T2: okay you don't go to Momo's
64 (3.0)
65 T2: yeah so me I've never ((writes "I've never" on whiteboard (5.1)))
66 been ((writes "been" (1.4))) to ((writes "to" (0.8))) Momo's ((writes
67 "Momo's" (2.4)))
68 RK: I've never been to Momo's
69 T2: yeah so uh before I said I never want to eat *natto* (.) so never
70 RK: never
71 T2: so ((writes "0%" on whiteboard)) zero percent
72 (1.9)
73 T2: so I've never been to Momo's
74 RK: I've never been to Momo's
75 (2.7)

In line 60, T2 connects back to his question about RK's favorite curry restaurant in Extract 5,

asking, "do you like Momo's curry?" After a 1.0-second gap, RK responds with "hn I don't- I don't go:::: Momo's". She attempts to do repair, but her repair is the same as the original sentence. This restart what Schegloff (1979) refers to as "marking time" (p. 279), meaning that the interlocutor attempts to repair a part of an utterance, but produces the same word, etcetera, to buy time. This is followed by T2's embedded correction in which he states, "okay you don't go to Momo's" in line 63. A similar occurrence was reported by Kurhila (2001) who observed that when non-native speakers exhibited uncertainty in turns containing grammatical mistakes, a native speaker would often correct them. T2's receipt of RK's utterance in line 63 demonstrates that he understands what RK wants to say, and therefore, nothing more is needed after T2's embedded correction. However, T2 orients to his role as teacher and in line 65 T2 initiates a delayed repair initiation in order to teach RK how to answer. RK's utterance, "I don't go:::: Momo's", creates a teaching opportunity for T2. T2 interprets that RK is unable to produce an appropriate response as shown by his verbal and written repair in lines 65 to 67, in which he states, "yeah so me I've never been to Momo's", while writing the sentence on the whiteboard, placing emphasis on the words "me" and "never". After T2 finishes writing the sentence, RK repeats it in line 68 saying, "I've never been to Momo's". T2 receipts RK's utterance in line 69 with "yeah" and begins to refer to the sentence that he taught RK earlier in the interaction, saying, "so uh before I said I never want to eat *natto* so never".

RK repeats "never" and T2 writes "0%" on the whiteboard and explains that never means "zero percent". After a 1.9-second gap, T2 again states, "so I've never been to Momo's" and RK again repeats it. T2 confirmed that RK's first production of the sentence is correct in line 69 with "yeah", but he does not provide feedback after RK's second production of the sentence.

T2 expands on his teaching in the extract below by asking a question that requires RK

to answer using the present perfect tense, which T2 taught in Extract 7. At this point, the sentence, "I've never been to Momo's" as well as "0%," "food," "travel," "strange," "hobbies" are written on the whiteboard.

Extract 8: 23-1-19:09

76 T2: have you- have you been to America?
77 RK: ((looks at whiteboard)) I've never been ((looks away from whiteboard))
78 to:: go:: to:: America?
79 T2: oh you can say ((points to whiteboard)) I've never been [to America
80 RK: [to America
81 T2: yeah that's okay
82 (0.4)
83 T2: how about England? have you been to England?
84 RK: I've never ah↑-
85 T2: yes
86 RK: ah↑- I go to Am- ((looks at whiteboard)) I:: I've ever: been to::
87 >America↑<
88 T2: oh you have been to America [okay
89 RK: [((nods))
90 T2: [((writes "I" on whiteboard))
91 RK: [I don't remem- I don't remem- remember
92 T2: you don't remember [okay
93 RK: [ha ha
94 T2: ((writes "have" on whiteboard)) so you can say I have ((writes "been"))
95 been
96 RK: I have been
97 T2: to ((writes "to"))
98 RK: to
99 T2: America=
100 RK: =America
101 T2: ((writes "America" (4.0)))
102 T2: so never you would say ((points to whiteboard)) I have never been
103 to America
104 RK: I've never been to America
105 T2: but ((points to whiteboard then to RK))
106 RK: I have been to America

107 T2: okay

In line 76, T2 asks, "have you- have you been to America?" and RK responds, "I've never been to:: go:: to:: America?" RK produces, "I've never been", while looking at the whiteboard on which "I've never been to Momo's" is written. She then looks away from the whiteboard and says, "to:: go:: to:: America?" RK's incorrect production of the sentence could be attributed to her looking away halfway through the sentence. T2 utilizes this teaching opportunity by his initiating and performing repair in line 79 with "oh you can say I've never been to America". After producing "oh you can say", T2 points to the whiteboard in order to show RK the model sentence that she needs to follow. In RK's turn in lines 77 and 78, "I've never been" is produced correctly, but the problematic part of RK's utterance is "to:: go:: to:: America", which is possibly why she just produces the correct version of the problematic part of her utterance, "to America", in line 80, which is produced in overlap with T2's repair. T2 confirms that RK's production of the repaired utterance conforms to his publicly manifested expectations in line 81 with "yeah that's okay".

In line 83, T2 provides another opportunity for RK to practice the present perfect tense by asking, "how about England? have you been to England?" In line 84, RK begins to answer by stating, "I've never" and then produces "ah ↑ -", as if she just remembered something. T2 then says "yes" in line 85, giving RK the go ahead to speak and she states, "ah↑- I go to Am- I::." RK then looks at the whiteboard and says, "I've ever: been to:: >America↑<" in lines 86 and 87. Up to this point in the interaction T2 has taught RK how to say, "I have never been to…," but T2 has not taught RK how to say "I have been to…," which may account for her misuse of the word "ever". In line 88, T2 performs embedded correction, stating, "oh you have been to America okay" and RK responds with a nod in line 89. In line 90, T2 initiates repair by writing the first word of the repaired utterance, "I", on the whiteboard, but he does not utter anything as RK is saying, "I don't remem- I don't remem- I don't remember" in line

91, which seems to mean "I don't remember anything about when I went to America". In line 92, T2 responds with "oh you don't remember okay," which is followed by RK laughing. In line 94, T2 writes "have" on the whiteboard and states, "so you can say I have". He then writes and says, "been", and RK repeats "I have been". T2 then says and writes "to" in line 97 and RK repeats "to". In line 99, T2 says, "America", RK repeats it in the subsequent turn, and then T2 writes it on the whiteboard.

In lines 102 and 103, T2 tells RK, "so never you would say", after which he points to the whiteboard and states, "I have never been to America". RK repeats "I have never been to America" in line 104 and T2 says, "but", after which he points to the whiteboard and then to RK. RK interprets T2's pointing gesture as T2 indicating that he wants RK to produce the sentence that he just wrote on the whiteboard because she says it in her next turn. In line 106, RK produces the correct sentence, "I have been to America", which T2 accepts with "okay", thereby closing the repair sequence in line 107.

The second utterance that T2 treats as inappropriate in this extract, "I've ever: been to:: >America↑<", creates another teaching opportunity for T2. Up to that point in the interaction, T2 had taught RK how to say, "I have never been to...," but not "I have been to...," which possibly accounts for her inaccurate utterance. T2 does verbal repair while writing the repaired utterance on the whiteboard and after RK produces the repaired utterance, T2 gives RK an opportunity to produce both of the sentences that he taught her. RK repeats T2's sentence, "I've never been to America", in line 104 and then T2 points to the whiteboard in line 105, signaling to RK that he wants her to produce the sentence, "I have been to America", which she does in line 106.

The following example is also divided into three extracts because of its length. In the first extract below, RK and T2 are talking about RK's part-time job. Prior to the start of the extract, T2 established that RK works at a barbeque restaurant and T2 begins to ask her

questions about her job.

```
Extract 9: 23-1-28:02
01   T2:   are you a- you are a waitress?
02         (1.0)
03   T2:   waitress?
04   RK:   ah yes
05   T2:   oh okay.
06   T2:   ((erases whiteboard (2.1) ))
07   RK:   but today is a $holiday↑$
08   T2:   oh today is a holiday
09   RK:   yes
10   T2:   oh okay. so: you- you can say- you can say I ((writes "I" on
11         whiteboard))
12   RK:   I
13   T2:   am ((writes "am"))
14   RK:   am
15   T2:   off ((writes "off"))
16   RK:   off
17   T2:   work ((writes "work"))
18   RK:   work
19   T2:   today ((writes "today" (2.8) ))
20   T2:   off work
21         (1.7)
22   RK:   I'm (.) off work today
23   T2:   yeah [so you have no work
24   RK:        [so
25   RK:   yes hn go- go: English Lounge
26   T2:   oh: okay so you came to English Lounge
27   RK:   yes
28   T2:   okay good. okay so if you have no work you can say off- I am off
29         work (.) today
30   RK:   yes. I'm off today
```

In line 01, T2 asks RK, "are you a waitress?" After a 1.0-second gap, T2 pursues the answer by repeating, "waitress?" RK responds with, "ah yes" in line 04, and T2 receipts that with "oh

okay". In line 07, RK says, "but today is a $holiday↑$", and T2 receipts that by responding, "oh today is a holiday". RK confirms that in the next turn with "yes". Although this sequence is closed here, in line 10, T2 returns to attend to RK's utterance in line 07. T2 performs a delayed repair initiation (Jefferson, 1972) stating, "oh okay. so: you- you can say- you can say I", and then writes "I" on the whiteboard, which RK repeats in line 12. In line 13, T2 says, "am", then writes it, and RK repeats "am". This same patterns continues in lines 15 to 18 with T2 producing "off" then "work", writing each of them on the whiteboard and RK repeating them. In line 19, T2 says and writes "today", but the pattern seen up until now in which T2 says a word, writes it, and RK repeats it, is broken when RK does not repeat "today" after T2 writes it on the whiteboard. T2 self-selects and says, "off work", in line 20, which is followed by a 1.7-second gap.

In line 22, RK produces the complete sentence that is written on the whiteboard, but she says the contraction "I'm" instead of "I am," saying "I'm off work today". In line 23, T2 explains that "off work" means "you have no work". In line 24, RK says, "so", but because it is produced in overlap with T2's utterance, she waits until T2's turn is finished to continue. RK states, "yes hn go- go: English Lounge" in line 25, which T2 receipts in line 26 with embedded correction, stating, "oh: okay so you came to English Lounge". RK responds with "yes", and in lines 28 and 29 T2 summarizes what he has taught RK, saying, "okay good. okay so if you have no work you can say off- I am off work today". RK receipts it with "yes", and produces "I'm off today" in line 30, but leaves out the word "work".

T2 states "okay." in the next turn, which can be seen in the extract below. This "okay." closes the repair sequence, but the interaction continues in Extract 10 with T2 asking RK another question, which requires RK to produce the words, "I am off ..." from the sentence that he just taught her.

Extract 10: 23-1-28:50

T2: okay. how about tomorrow?
(1.0)
T2: tomorrow. are you off work tomorrow?
RK: no
T2: no you have to work tomorrow
RK: today works is tomorrow ((moves arms as if putting something next to her))
(1.5)
T2: oh it moved?
RK: move ((moves arms as if putting something next to her))
T2: to [tomorrow
RK: [tomorrow ((again moves arms as if putting something next to her))
T2: ah: I see.
(1.6)
T2: so how many days- (.) how many days do you work?
(1.0)
RK: I- (1.3) Tues- Tuesday:
T2: Tuesday
RK: and Sunday: ah↑ Tuesday Sunday and °Sunday Monday Tu-° Monday Tuesday
T2: okay so ((faces the whiteboard and writes "m" 2.0)) what's this (.)
(0.9)
T2: so Monday
RK: Mond- [ah no no no no no no Tuesday.
T2: [((T2 writes the weekdays on the whiteboard]))
(1.2)
RK: ah Sunday↑ hn? Monday Tuesday Wednesday Thursday Friday
T2: yeah so Monday
RK: ah off work
T2: okay off. Tuesday
RK: yes
T2: okay so you would say I have to ((writes "I have to" (1.6))) work ((writes "work" 2.6)))on ((writes "on" (0.6))) Tuesday ((writes "Tuesday" and turns around (3.2)))

In line 31, T2 asks, "okay. how about tomorrow?" However, as RK does not respond, after a

1.0-second gap, T2 pursues an answer in line 33 by rephrasing the question from a wh-question to a polar question, asking, "tomorrow. are you off work tomorrow?" Several previous studies have reported that teachers rephrase questions in order to pursue responses from students (e.g., Gardner, 2004; Kasper, 2006; Kasper & Ross, 2007; Okada, 2010; Hosoda, 2014). For example, Gardner (2004) analyzed interaction between native and non-native speakers of English and found that rephrasing the question was one way in which the native speaker pursued a response. Similarly, Kasper (2006) and Kasper and Ross (2007) examined language proficiency interviews and observed that participants would rephrase the question in order to pursue an answer. RK responds with "no" and T2 performs a confirmation check with, "no you have to work tomorrow". In line 36, RK explains that "today works is tomorrow", while moving her arms as if she is putting something next to her. After a 1.5-second gap, T2 asks, "oh it moved?" RK confirms that her workday moved by stating, "move", while again moving her arms as if putting something next to her. In line 41, T states "to tomorrow", which is a continuation of his previous turn and after T2 states "to", RK produces the word "tomorrow" in overlap with T2. In line 44, T2 says, "ah: I see." and after a 1.6-second gap, he follows up in line 45 with "so how many days- how many days do you work?" After a 1.0-second gap, RK responds with "I- Tues- Tuesday:", which T2 receipts by repeating "Tuesday". In line 50, RK attempts to produce the other days that she works and begins to perform a word search while looking up and saying the days of the week quietly to herself. Goodwin and Goodwin (1986) comment that it might not be appropriate for a participant to interrupt a speaker who is doing a word search that is manifested with a "thinking face" (p. 57), which refers to the face participants make when they gaze up in the air and look as if they are thinking about something. Here, T2 does not interrupt her word search and after RK's word search is finished, she again produces the word "Tuesday".

In line 51, T2 says, "okay so", and then faces the whiteboard, writes "m", and asks RK,

"what's this?" After RK fails to respond, T2 says, "so Monday", in line 53, and RK begins to repeat "Monday", but stops after "Mond-" and then says, "ah no no no no no no Tuesday". In line 55, T writes all of the weekdays on the whiteboard, and after a 1.2-second gap, RK begins to read the days out loud. T2 gives RK a prompt in line 58, saying, "yeah so Monday". RK displays her recognition of what T2 is doing with the prompts by responding, "ah off work" in line 59. T2 receipts that in line 60 with "okay off" and then T2 gives RK another prompt, saying, "Tuesday". RK responds with "yes" in the following turn. Up until now T2 has only taught RK how to say "I am off work" for the days that RK does not have to work, but T2 has not taught RK what to say for the days that she has to work. In lines 62 to 64, T2 says, "okay so you would say I have to work on Tuesday", while writing that on the whiteboard.

After writing "Tuesday" on the whiteboard, T2 turns around and looks at RK. The following extract begins with RK, after being selected by T2, reading the sentence that T2 just wrote on the whiteboard.

Extract 11: 23-1-30:01

```
65  RK:  I have to work on (.) Tuesday:: ((T2 points to "Thurs")) Tue-
66  T2:  Thursday
67  RK:  Thursday and S:- Sunday
68  T2:  and Sunday okay
69  T2:   ((writes "Sat" and "Sun" on the whiteboard (5.4) ))
70  T2:  okay so ((points to whiteboard)) Tuesday Thurs[day [Sunday
71  RK:                                                 [day [Sunday
72       ((T2 circles "Tues" "Thurs" and "Sun" on whiteboard (3.3) ))
73  T2:  so Wednesday ((points to "Wed" on the whiteboard))
74       ((points to the "I am off work today" sentence on the whiteboard
75       (2.7) ))
76  RK:  I am off work ((T2 points to the "on" in the "I have to work on Tuesday"
77       sentence on the whiteboard)) to Wednesday
78  T2:  ((again points to the "on" in the "I have to work on Tuesday" sentence
```

```
79          on the whiteboard)) I am off work on
80    RK:   on
81    T2:   ((points to "Wed" on the whiteboard)) Wednesday
82    RK:   Wednesday
83    T2:   okay ((points to "Fri" on the whiteboard)) Friday
84    RK:   I am off work on Friday ((RK says each word as T2 points them on the
85          whiteboard))
86    T2:   okay ((points to "Sat" on whiteboard)) Saturday
87    RK:   I am off work on Saturday ((RK says each word as T2 points to them
88          on the whiteboard))
89    T2:   okay good
```

In line 65, RK produces the sentence, "I have to work on Tuesday", after which T2 points to "Thurs" on the whiteboard. RK then says, "Tue-", which T2 treats as problematic, as shown by his other-initiated other-repair in which he states, "Thursday". In line 67, RK accepts T2's repair by repeating "Thursday", after which she produces "S:- Sunday". In line 68, T2 receipts "Sunday", by saying "and Sunday okay". T2 then writes "Sat" and "Sun" on the whiteboard because up until now T2 has only written the weekdays on the whiteboard. In line 70, T2 states, "okay so", and while pointing to the whiteboard, he says, "Tuesday Thursday Sunday". RK says "day Sunday" at the same that T2 does.

T2 then circles "Tues," "Thurs," and "Sun" on the whiteboard in line 72 as those are the days that RK reported that she works in the interaction so far. In line 73, T2 says, "so Wednesday", while pointing to "Wed" on the whiteboard. T2 then points to the sentence, "I am off work today", after which RK states, "I am off work". After RK says, "I am off work", T2 points to the "on" in the "I have to work on Tuesday" sentence on the whiteboard, but RK says, "to Wednesday" in line 77, instead of "on Wednesday". In lines 78 and 79, T2 again points to the "on" in the "I have to work on Tuesday" sentence and says, "I am off work on", after which RK repeats "on" in line 80. T2 then points to the "Wed" on the whiteboard and says, "Wednesday", which is repeated by RK in line 82. T2 continues to give RK prompts so

that she can practice the expressions that he is teaching. In line 83, T2 says, "okay", points to "Fri" on the whiteboard and says, "Friday". In line 84, RK says the words that T2 points to on the whiteboard to produce the sentence, "I am off work on Friday". T2 again says, "okay", points to "Sat," and states, "Saturday". In line 87, RK says, "I am off work on Saturday", again saying each word as T2 points to them on the whiteboard. T2 provides feedback in line 89 with "okay good", which closes the teaching sequence. In this extract, the whiteboard is used as a resource by T2 to teach the words and sentences written on the whiteboard which he uses as prompts to help RK practice the sentences that he taught her. RK uses the whiteboard as a resource to produce the sentences that T2 taught her.

As the interaction opens in the following extract, T2 and RK are talking about summer vacation. The interaction begins with T2 asking RK where she likes to go for summer vacation.

```
Extract 12: 23-1-34:59
01  T2:  where do you like to go for summer vacation
02       (1.0)
03  RK:  I like (.) sea
04       (1.2)
05  T2:  okay
06  RK:  °like swimming°
07  T2:  you like to swim in the sea?
08  RK:  yes
09  T2:  okay
10       (0.9)
11  T2:  so u::m (1.9) so what city?
12       (1.5)
13  RK:  °city° ((stretches neck forward to show she does not understand))
14  T2:  ((writes "city" on the whiteboard 0.4) )) city
15  RK:  hn::=
16  T2:  =or place so Okinawa or
17       (2.1)
18  RK:  $I don't know$ ano I don't know with- with fa- family and
```

19 *makasekiri* *makasekiri* *tte nan darou*
leave it up to leave it up to QT what COP
"I leave it up to my family. How do you say I leave it up to my family?"
20 (0.7)
21 T2: hn::=
22 RK: =um=
23 T2: =I don't know
24 RK: u::m (2.0) choose where- choose where is my friend my family
25 T2: ah:↑ okay
26 RK: I don't know::
27 T2: so you go- you could say ((goes to whiteboard and writes "I
28 will go" (8.0))) I will (.) go ((writes "wherever they go" (8.9)))
29 you can say ((points to "I will go")) I will go
30 RK: I will go
31 T2: ((points to "wherever")) wherever
32 RK: wherever
33 T2: ((points to "they go")) they go
34 RK: they go
35 T2: okay so if your friends go to *Enoshima*
36 RK: ((nods)) uh
37 T2: then okay I'll go
38 RK: ((nods)) hn .hh
39 T2: your- your parents or your family goes to Hawaii okay I'll go
40 RK: ((nods)) hn
41 T2: okay. I see
42 (0.9)

In line 01, T2 asks RK, "where do you like to go for summer vacation?" After a 1.0 second gap, RK replies, "I like sea". After a 1.2 second gap, T2 responds with "okay", after which RK says, "like swimming", in a quiet voice. In line 07, T2 gives a candidate understanding, asking, "you like to swim in the sea?" RK replies with "yes" in line 08, which T2 receipts in line 09 with "okay". As seen in most of the interaction in this chapter, after a sequence is finished, because of the nature of classroom interaction, it is usually T2 who self-selects and makes the interaction move forward. Following a 0.9-second gap in line 10, T2 asks a

question, "so u::m so what city?" in line 11, which could be seen as a follow-up question or a simpler, easier to understand reformulation of his question "where do you like to go for summer vacation?", which could also been seen as a pursuit of a more appropriate answer. T2's original question, "where do you like to go for summer vacation?" is ambiguous in the sense that it could possibly mean what city or country or what type of place as shown by his question, "so what city?" Okada (2010) mentions that occasionally teachers' questions are ambiguous and when they are, teachers may orient to their own talk as problematic and repair it. Following a 1.5 second gap, RK responds in line 13, saying, "city", in a quiet voice while stretching her neck forward as if she does not understand. In line 14, T2 writes "city" on the whiteboard and says, "city". In line 15, RK says, "hn::", and because she has not produced a sufficient answer, T2 continues to pursue an answer in line 16, stating, "or place so Okinawa or". Regarding how participants pursue responses in native speaker conversations, Pomerantz (1984) points out that if a speaker expects agreement from the recipient, but does not receive it, the speaker of the original utterance will perform a "remedy pursuit" (p. 161), which is a type of repair. She describes three types of remedies. The first type is a clarification, which is performed in order to clarify the problematic term or reference to the recipient of the talk by providing an alternative reference term. The second type occurs when the speaker of the original utterance provides additional information about the thing being referenced in order to establish what the source of the breakdown of communication is. The final type occurs when a speaker alters their original assertion. Because it is not yet clear whether RK does not understand the word "city", if she is not able to decide where she likes to go, or if she is having some other problem answering the question, T2 produces an alternative reference term for city, "place", as well as a place name, "Okinawa", which may possibly help RK understand the meaning of the word "city".

After a 2.1-second gap, RK says, "$I don't know$ *ano* I don't know with- with fa-

family and *makasekiri makasekiri tte nan darou*". T2 does not understand the Japanese as he responds with "hn::" and "I don't know" in lines 21 and 23. In line 24, RK attempts to explain what she meant by the Japanese expression, "*makasekiri*", by explaining, "u::m choose where- choose where is my friend my family". This ungrammatical utterance creates a teaching opportunity for T2. In line 25, T2 produces the change of state token, "ah:↑", followed by "okay". T2 initiates and performs repair in lines 27 and 28 by explaining, "you could say I will go" and writing "I will go wherever they go". He continues the repair, saying "you can say I will go" and he points to "I will go" after saying "you can say". RK repeats "I will go" in line 30, after which T2 points to "wherever" on the whiteboard and says, "wherever", which RK repeats in line 32. Next, T2 points to and says, "they go", and RK repeats this in line 34. T2's verbal and written production of the repaired utterance allow RK to hear and see the repaired utterance. Seeing the repaired utterance on the whiteboard also serves as a resource for RK that she can use when she wants to produce it.

In lines 35 and 37, T2 provides an example which summarizes what RK stated, saying, "okay so if your friends go to Enoshima then okay I'll go". He also gives one more example in line 39, saying "your- your parents or your family goes to Hawaii okay I'll go". RK shows agreement with T's summaries in lines 36, 38, and 40, by nodding and producing, "uh", "hn .hh," and "hn". T2 states, "okay. I see", in line 41, which shows his understanding of what RK wanted to say in line 24.

While no apparent problems in understanding remain, T2 continues teaching, as shown in the following excerpt. Although the repair sequence is closed, and no further explanation or repair is needed for the progressivity of the interaction, T2 explains the meaning of "wherever". Even though RK was able to produce the sentence that T2 taught her accurately, that does not necessarily mean that RK understands the meaning of every word in the sentence. T2 orients to this possibility by opening a new sequence and expanding on his

previous teaching.

Extract 13: 23-1-36:28

```
43  T2:  so wherever
44  T2:  ((circles "wherever" on whiteboard (o.8) ))
45  RK:  wherever
46       (0.8)
47  T2:  this means
48       ((T2 extends arms and then RK extends arms (3.3) ))
49  T2:  yeah .hh
50  RK:  hn
51  T2:  anywhere ↑
52  RK:  anywhere
53  T2:  anywhere is okay.
54       (2.0)
55  T2:  okay so I will go wherever they go
56  RK:  I will go wherever they go
57  T2:  okay
```

In line 43, T2 says, "so wherever", and then circles "wherever" on the whiteboard. RK also says, "wherever", in line 45 and following a 0.8-second gap, T2 states, "this means", and extends his arms, which RK copies. In line 51, T2 explains that wherever means "anywhere", which RK repeats in line 52. In line 53, T2 elaborates that "anywhere is okay" and after a 2.0 second gap, he again repeats the sentence written on the board, "I will go wherever they go". RK repeats it in line 56 and the interaction concludes with T2 receipting RK's correct production of the sentence with "okay".

6.1.3 Written Repair is Followed by Significantly Delayed Verbal Repair

In this section, I will analyze two extracts which highlight how written repair can be followed by a significantly delayed verbal repair as well as how a repaired utterance written

on a whiteboard can be used by students as a resource. The first extract in this section is different from the extract presented in the section entitled "Verbal and Written Repair are Done Separately," in which the verbal repair immediately precedes written repair because written repair is carried out first and verbal repair occurs approximately one minute later. Before the start of the extract, the teacher instructed the students to write down three dreams and talk about them in groups.

Extract 14: 1-1-29:12

```
01  RN:  I want to- to marry to
02  SI:  I- [I write- I wrote this ((shows other students his paper))
03  RN:      [different country's man ha ha ha
04  T1:  ((looks in the direction of RN and YK)) yeah it's a little strange
05  YK:  ((reads SI's paper)) (°I want to foreign°)
06  RN:  which country's woman do you want to ha ha ha ma(h)rr(h)y
07  SI:  mah: I want to European or American
08  RN:  [ha ha ha ha ha ha
09  TK:  [ha ha ha ha ha ha
10  RN:  $why?$
11  T1:  wait we will do that after [we'll get into that good question good
12       question
13  RN:                              [ha ha ha
14       ((students write about their dreams (11.5) ))
15  T1:  ((writes "marry someone from a different country" on whiteboard
16       (13.0) ))
((lines 17-49 in which T1 and SI discuss a topic from the previous week omitted))
50  T1:  okay finish up your writing so we can talk as much as possible ((points
51       to phrase on whiteboard)) this is probably what I would say for you
52       two. ((points to SI and YK)) marry someone from a different country
53  SI:  a[h↑
54  YK:    [ah↑::
55  SI:  country
56  T1:  I think would be the- you could say marry a foreign person it's
57       possible but
58  YK:  [((writes in notebook while looking up at whiteboard))
59  SI:  [((writes in notebook while looking up at whiteboard))
```

In line 01, RN begins to tell YK about her dreams by saying, "I want to- to marry to", but before she finishes her turn, SI starts to speak. He states, "I- I write- I wrote this" in line 02 as he shows the other students his paper. RN's utterance in line 03, "different country's man", a continuation of her turn in line 01, is produced in overlap with SI's utterance in line 02. In line 04, T1 looks in the direction of RN and YK and remarks, "yeah it's a little strange", but he does not initiate repair yet. In line 05, YK reads SI's paper and says something that sounds like "I want to foreign," but it is not completely audible to the transcriber. In line 06, RN asks SI "which country's woman do you want to marry ha ha ha ma(h)rr(h)y" and SI replies in line 07, "I want to European or American." RN and TK both laugh and their laughter is produced in overlap in lines 08 and 09. In line 10, RN then asks SI "why?", but before SI responds, T1 says, "wait we will do that after we'll get into that good question good question" in lines 11 and 12.

After RN's laughter in line 13 and an 11.5-second gap in line 14, during which the students write about their dreams, T1 prepares to initiate repair in line 15 on YK's turn in line 05, in which she read SI's sentence and RN's utterance in lines 01 and 03, by writing "marry someone from a different country" on the whiteboard. Although T1 writes the repaired sentence on the whiteboard for everyone to see, no one looks at it or responds. T1 refrains from interrupting the students' activity-in-progress in order to call attention to the sentence on the whiteboard at the time that he writes it. After T1 writes the sentence, he stands up and begins to walk around the room to look at what the students have written. In lines 50 to 52, which occur approximately one minute after T1 finishes writing the repaired utterance on the whiteboard, T1calls the students' attention to the sentence on the whiteboard by stating, "this is probably what I would say for you two. marry someone from a different country". After saying "this is probably what I would say for you two", he points to SI and YK, but not to RN. When T1 wrote the repaired utterance on the whiteboard, it appeared that it was originally for

YK's reading of SI's sentence and RN's utterance. However, while T1 is walking around and looking at what the students have written, he appears to have noticed an incorrect sentence written on YK's paper. This means that T1's sentence on the whiteboard is repairing YK's written sentence as well as SI's written sentence. As revealed in the next extract, both SI and YK have the same dream, to marry someone from a different country.

In response to T1's repair in lines 50 to 52, SI and YK both produce the change of state token, "ah," with rising pitch in lines 53 and 54. Next, SI says, "country", a repetition of the last word in T1's turn in line 52. This repetition could be seen as a receipt of T1's other-repair. There are many ways in which interlocutors receipt a previous utterance (Schegloff, 1982). Receipting the prior talk through repetition has been reported in several studies (e.g., Keenan, 1977; Tannen, 1989; Kim, 2002; Brown, 1998; Schegloff, 1997; Svennevig, 2004; Greer, Andrade, Butterfield, & Mischinger, 2009). Greer, Andrade, Butterfield, and Mischinger (2009) explain that the recipient's repetition of part of the previous speaker's utterance demonstrates to the previous speaker that the recipient understands and that the previous speaker can now proceed. Receipting the prior talk by repeating all or part of it is one of the many actions that repetitions can perform. SI's repetition of the word "country" seems to be showing T1 that he can proceed with the next action. In line 56, T1 expands the sequence with, "I think would be the- you could say marry a foreign person it is possible but". After this, YK and SI begin writing in their notebooks while looking up at the whiteboard. They continue looking up at the whiteboard and then back down to write, so they are likely to be copying the corrected expression, which is written on the whiteboard, "marry someone from a different country."

The students' inaccurate sentences in Extract 14 create a teaching opportunity for T1, and the repair sequence is where the teaching occurs. However, even after the repair sequence is closed, T1 orients to his role as teacher and initiates an expansion sequence to teach the

students an alternative expression. Sometimes repaired utterances are not repeated and one reason for this is that the speaker of the trouble source may not realize that their utterance has been repaired. The use of the whiteboard, however, allows the students to see the repaired utterance.

In Extract 15 below, which occurs shortly after the interaction above ends, we can see how T1's use of the whiteboard allows RN and YK to apply the repaired utterance.

```
Extract 15: 1-1-37:06
01   RN:   please tell me your (.) >dreams<
02         (0.9)
03   YK:   ((reads paper)) my dream is u::m I want to be rich
04   RN:   rich?
05   YK:   hn
06   RN:   .hh
07   YK:   ((reads paper)) and I want to live France
08   RN:   yes
09   YK:   ((reads paper)) I want to marry someone from a different country
10   RN:   hn↑:: (.) so: hn::: why do you wan- why will you want to: (.) marry?
11         ((turns around and looks at whiteboard)) someone ((points to
12         whiteboard)) from different country?
```

The extract begins with RN saying to YK, "please tell me your >dreams<" in line 01. After a 0.9-second silence in line 02, YK begins to read to RN the three dreams that she wrote down. In line 03, she reads, "I want to be rich", in line 07 she says, "I want to live France", and in line 09 she continues reading, "I want to marry someone from a different country". What is interesting about her utterance in line 09 is that it is the expression that T1 wrote on the whiteboard. After T1 pointed out to YK and SI that that is the correct expression in Extract 14, they produce the change of state token, "ah", with rising pitch. After they produced the change of state tokens, they both began writing something in their notebooks while looking up at the whiteboard on which the expression "marry someone from a different country" is

written and then back down to write. Based on this, it is highly likely that both students wrote "marry someone from a different country", which allowed YK to produce the appropriate expression after the interaction. In lines 10, 11, and 12, RN asks YK, "why do you wan- why will you want to: marry? someone from different country?" After she says, "marry", with rising intonation, she turns around and briefly looks at the whiteboard and then states "someone", after which she points to the whiteboard. She then completes her question in line 12 by stating, "from different country?"

In Extracts 14 and 15, it is interesting how the teacher uses the whiteboard as a resource to repair inaccurate sentences and how the students use it as a resource to produce the repaired utterance in the subsequent interaction. YK seems to write the accurate sentence in her notebook in line 58 of Extract 14 and RN reads the expression off the whiteboard in lines 11 to 12 of Extract 15 during the activity. Although the teacher wrote "marry someone from a different country" on the whiteboard, in line 15 of Extract 14, RN says, "from different country", leaving out the "a." This could be because the whiteboard was behind her and she briefly looked at it before returning her gaze to her partner, YK, and completing her turn. In YK's case, she was able to produce the correct expression while reading from her notebook. Based on the fact that she began writing something in her notebook in line 58 while looking up at the whiteboard after T1 called attention to the repaired sentence on the whiteboard, it is assumed that she is reading the sentence that she wrote.

6.2 Discussion

The examples presented in this chapter illustrate how repair sequences can be sites of teaching opportunities. The opportunity for teaching was created as a result of the production of students' utterances, which teachers treated as problematic and oriented to as a lack of linguistic knowledge that needed to be filled through teaching. The teaching was done both

verbally by telling the students the correct word, expression, etcetera and orthographically by writing on the whiteboard. Verbal repair is something that is also seen in first language conversations. Using a whiteboard to perform written repair, however, is something very specific to classroom interaction. As seen in the extracts presented in this chapter, sometimes they occurred separately, and sometimes they occurred almost simultaneously.

What is interesting about the examples in this chapter is that they reveal how utterances are treated as problematic and addressed by teachers. Often in classrooms, it is always thought that teachers are teaching, but as mentioned above, the word teaching implies teaching something to someone that they do not know. However, just because a teacher is "teaching," does not necessarily mean that students are learning. An analysis of the examples in this chapter suggests that one way to decide what to "teach" is by identifying what students do not know. One way to identify what students do not know may be examining their speech carefully to see what kind of problems the students are facing. In all of the examples in this chapter, teachers seem to treat verbal repair as insufficient for students to notice those specific repairs, which is possibly why the whiteboard is also used to carry out repair.

When students are taught a new expression for the first time, especially low-level language learners, it may be difficult for them to hear or repeat something longer than a couple of words, which may explain the receipt of repair with minimal response tokens or the repetition of the last word or few words in the repaired utterance. Also, some language learners may not realize that their utterance has been repaired, which may account for the occasional lack of a response following other-initiated other-repair. However, the use of the whiteboard to perform repair allows students to see the repaired utterance and helps them to notice that their utterance is being repaired. Seeing the repaired utterance on the whiteboard also gives the students a chance to write it down in order to study or refer to it later. For example, as seen in Extract 14, YK and SI, wrote something in their notebooks while looking

at the repaired utterance on the whiteboard. Later in the interaction, YK produced the repaired utterance while reading from her notebook. Without the teacher's use of the whiteboard to carry out repair, it may have been difficult for YK to correctly produce a repaired sentence with several words. In all of the examples in this chapter, students were able to produce repaired utterances consisting of multiple word units.

Hosoda (2000) points out that in mundane native/non-native conversations, because non-native speakers are not as proficient as the native speaker they are interacting with, one might expect that the native speaker would provide unsolicited correction as is the case in classroom interaction, but this was not the case in her data. In the extracts in this chapter, however, the native speaker occasionally provides unsolicited correction even when there does not appear to be a problem of understanding. This lends evidence to how the native speakers, the teachers in the language lounge, orient to their roles as teachers. Hosoda (2006) found that in her data of interaction between native and non-native speakers, linguistic expertise became relevant when one of the participants invited another participant to do repair and when there was a problem of understanding. Examining institutional interaction between native and non-native speakers of Finnish, Kurhila (2004) reports that language expertise was made relevant when the non-native speaker manifested linguistic difficulties. In most of the examples in this chapter, linguistic expertise was made relevant even when the speaker of the trouble source did not invite repair and when there was no apparent problem of understanding. The native speakers, the teachers, made their linguistic expertise relevant by selectively correcting student utterances, teaching alternative expressions, and having the students produce repaired utterances. However, in some of the examples, other-repair was invited by the speaker of the trouble source.

As seen in Chapter 4, other-repair is often not followed by the repetition of more than a few words. The use of the whiteboard seems to not only engage students, but also makes the

production of the repaired utterance relevant. Other-initiated other-repair can often go unnoticed, but by using the whiteboard to do repair, the teacher makes the repair the momentary focus of the lesson. This increases the probability that the repair will not go unnoticed. Schegloff et al. (1977) point out that in conversations between native speakers, grammatical errors are not always repaired by another participant. On the other hand, in the extracts in this chapter, the native speaker often repairs the grammatical mistakes made by the nonnative speakers. They also note that other-correction may occur more frequently in interaction with "not-yet-competent" (p. 381) speakers, which could explain the repeated occurrence of other-repair seen in the language lounge data.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

This chapter summarizes the main findings of Chapters 4, 5, and 6 and discusses their implications. The last section proposes some possible directions for future research.

7.1 Main Findings

Chapter 4 explored various interactional environments and resources that help repair to become noticed by the recipient of the repair who is also the trouble source speaker. The interactional environments and resources that I identified are (a) when a teacher joins a conversation between two students to perform repair, (b) when a teacher adds words such as "you mean," "you could say," "we say," and "say it" to the repair proper (c) when a student self-initiates repair, (d) when a teacher uses a combination of various resources, including the production of "you said" and emphasis to perform repair after next turns, (e) when repair is pre- and post-framed, (f) when the word repaired is produced in isolation and repeated, and (g) when a teacher uses gestures.

When the teacher suddenly joined a conversation between two students to do repair, it caused the repair to stand out and therefore became noticeable to the trouble source speaker. The teachers were not recipients of the talk and they did not have a higher epistemic status regarding the topic being discussed, so their participation in the conversation was unnecessary. Some resources identified in Chapter 4 that were used by teachers and caused repair to become noticeable were the use of expressions such as "you mean," "you could say," "we say," and "say it." Each of these expressions marked the just prior utterance or utterance that followed as repair. "You mean" and "you could say" modified and downgraded the repairable, whereas "we say" and "say it" did not. Out of the four expressions identified in Chapter 4 which helped to make repair noticeable, "say it" was the strongest and the teacher's

use of it invariably necessitated the trouble source speaker's repetition of the repair utterance.

One environment which was conducive to making repair noticeable was when students self-initiated repair, which set the stage for a repair proper by either a student or teacher. The repair initiations took the form of questions, such as "how should I say?" and gestures as in Extract 11 of Chapter 4 when the student was unable to produce the word "hump."

When repair is delayed it can be difficult for the trouble source speaker to notice that their utterance has been repaired. In Extract 19 of Chapter 4, the teacher located the trouble source by saying "you said mathemati(.)c", placing emphasis on the "c", therefore displaying to the student that the end of the word was problematic. The teacher then produced "s", the consonant missing from the word "mathematic", which is followed by the student's repetition of "s". In addition to this repetition, the student displayed his recognition that his utterance was repaired by stating, "ah forgot s".

Chapter 4 revealed that as in mundane conversation, teachers' repair can also become noticeable when it is pre- and post-framed because it creates a context for the trouble source speaker to see which part of their utterance is being repaired. For example, in Extract 22, the student asked, "have you e:::ver:::: hospitalized?" The teacher repaired this by post-framing the word "been" with "hospitalized". In some contexts, repeating a repaired word in isolation was also found to help make the repair recognizable. Lastly, Chapter 4 demonstrated how gestures can be used to perform repair and make repair noticeable. For example, in Extract 24, the teacher pulled his hands towards himself, signaling to student that he wanted her to produce the repaired utterance. The teacher also used his fingers as prompts to exhibit to the student that he wanted her to produce the repaired utterance. He raised one finger for each word in the sentence. In all of the examples presented in Chapter 4, the recipient of the repair, who is also the trouble source speaker, displayed that they noticed that their utterance was repaired by repeating the repaired utterance or part of the repair. It is the trouble source

speakers' production of the repair that shows their receipt of it.

Chapter 5 was concerned with the topic of learning and demonstrated that CA can be used a tool to reveal how and where in interaction learning may potentially occur. Some critics of CA argue that because CA focuses on the observable elements of interaction, it is not capable of addressing the subject of learning, which is a cognitive action that occurs solely in the mind, and is therefore not observable to the analyst. This study showed that CA is capable of showing how and where learning may occur by identifying a pattern, which, when viewed as a whole, suggests that learning may have occurred. Is it as follows:

1. Student shows problem of understanding or speaking as displayed through a question or inability to produce an appropriate word
2. Student or teacher initiates repair
3. Teacher performs repair (teaches)
4. Student produces a change of state token, such as "ah" or "oh" (Heritage, 1984)
5. Student demonstrates their understanding of the newly-learned word by explaining the meaning to another participant or applying it

In all of the examples presented in Chapter 5, the student displayed a problem of understanding or speaking as shown by a question to the teacher or the inability produce the appropriate word at the time of interaction. This was followed by a repair initiation either by the student or teacher, and a repair proper performed by the teacher. The student then produced a change of state token, such as "ah" or "oh," exhibited that a change of state occurred. The student then publicly revealed their understanding of the newly-learned word by using it or explaining it in the subsequent interaction. It is this sequence of actions that when viewed aggregately suggests that learning may have occurred and the sites in which these actions occurred were repair sequences.

Contrary to Chapter 5 in which I showed how repair sequences may be potential sites

of learning, Chapter 6 investigated repair sequences from a different angle. Chapter 6 revealed that in addition to being potential sites of learning, repair sequences may also be sites in which teaching can occur. That chapter focused on students' utterances which were treated as a lack of linguistic competence by teachers. In the extracts presented in that chapter, repair was initiated both by students or teachers and it was the repair initiation that served as the catalyst for teaching episodes. All of the extracts had the following features in common:

1. Student produces an utterance that is subsequently treated as problematic by the teacher
2. Student or teacher initiates repair
3. Teacher repairs the utterance verbally and by writing the repaired utterance on the whiteboard or vice versa (verbal and written repair can be performed separately and sometimes they are performed almost simultaneously)
4. Student repeats the repaired utterance

Chapter 6 examined various ways in which opportunities for teaching arise and how resources, such as a whiteboard, can be used to perform repair. An analysis of the data revealed that teaching episodes can occur as a result of the lack of an appropriate response or an utterance which is treated as inappropriate by the teacher. The teaching occurred within repair sequences, which were initiated either by a student or a teacher and were followed by a repair proper performed by the teacher. Sometimes even after the repair sequence was closed, the teacher continued teaching things such as alternative expressions. I demonstrated how verbal and written repair can be done separately and almost simultaneously and how using the whiteboard to do repair can help students to repeat extended sentences, which would be extremely difficult to repeat if only verbal repair was performed. Lastly, I showed that the use of the whiteboard helps students to notice that their utterance has been repaired and that it can be used as a reference throughout the interaction.

7.2 Implications

The findings from this study have some important implications for language teachers. In Chapter 4, I demonstrated various environments and resources which help to make repair noticeable and therefore not go overlooked by the trouble source speaker. Previous research (e.g., Schmidt, 1990) has argued that noticing is an essential criterion for language learning to occur. When other-initiated repair or other-repair are performed, they are sometimes not noticed by the trouble source speaker. Using the various linguistic resources identified in Chapter 4 can help language learners to notice that their utterances are inappropriate or incorrect and this could possibly become the first step toward learning.

Chapter 5 demonstrated how repair sequences may be potential sites of learning. However, learning may only occur if the trouble source speaker notices that their utterance has been repaired. When viewed collectively, the findings from Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 suggest that not letting mistakes pass could be beneficial to students and that making repair noticeable to the trouble source speaker is extremely important as it may possibly lead to learning. Using some of the resources identified in Chapter 4 which cause repair to become noticed, such as a piece of paper, gestures, or linguistic resources, such as "you said," or emphasizing the problematic part of the word will increase the likelihood that repair will not go overlooked.

Chapter 6 revealed how teachers orient to the need to teach when students are unable to produce an appropriate response. It also showed how the whiteboard can be used as a resource to do repair by teachers and how it can also be used a resource by students to produce the repaired utterance. Because the whiteboard was used to do repair, students were able to produce extended sentences which would otherwise be extremely difficult if only verbal repair was performed. Chapter 5 revealed that repair sequences may be potential sites of learning, and Chapter 6 showed that repair sequences can also be sites in which teaching

can occur. The findings from Chapters 5 and 6 suggest that if repair sequences are sites in which learning may occur, identifying and repairing a problematic utterance is one way in which teaching can occur. And one way that teachers can increase the probability that repair does not go overlooked is by writing the repaired utterance on the whiteboard.

7.3 Directions for Future Research

This study focused on interaction in a university language lounge between native and non-native speakers of English and was a preliminary attempt to show how repair becomes noticeable, and how repair sequences can be both potential sites of learning and teaching. Some directions for possible research are as follows:

Identifying other resources that cause repair to become noticeable would be beneficial to language teachers because using them would help to ensure that students notice that their utterances have been repaired, which may lead to learning. This study focused on environments and resources that cause repair to become noticeable and showed how trouble source speakers display their receipt of the repair, but it did not examine instances in which repair is not receipted or acknowledged. Conducting a comparative analysis of environments and resources which are conducive to making repair noticeable and those which are not would provide an interesting insight into the topic of repair.

This study demonstrated that repair sequences may be one site in which learning may occur in short-term interaction. It identified an interactional pattern that when viewed as a whole suggest that learning may have occurred. It would be interesting to try to find other interactional patterns in classroom interaction that may also reveal how and where in interaction learning may occur.

This line of inquiry could be expanded upon by recording students over an extended period of time, and if a newly-learned word or expression is identified, conducting a

longitudinal analysis may reveal that students were able to remember the word or expression at a significantly later date in time from when it was learned. This would suggest that repair sequences are not only sites in which short-term learning occurs, but long-term sustained learning as well. In addition, examining data in other educational contexts may reveal other potential sites in which learning may occur as well as other sequences of actions which demonstrate learning.

Lastly, this dissertation demonstrated how repair sequences can also be potential sites of teaching. It showed how verbal and written repair can be done separately and almost simultaneously, and how a whiteboard can be used as a resource to perform repair by teachers and as a resource to reference during interaction by students. These findings could be further explored by analyzing data in other educational settings, which may reveal other catalysts that cause teaching episodes to occur and other resources that can be used to perform repair and make repair noticeable.

REFERENCES

Antaki, C. (2012). Affiliative and disaffiliative candidate understandings. *Discourse Studies*, *14*(5), 531-547.

Antaki, C. & Widdicombe, S. (1998). Identity as an achievement and as a tool. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in talk* (pp. 1-14). London, England: Sage Publications.

Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Auer, P. (1984). *Bilingual conversation.* Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Auer, P. (1995). The pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages* (pp. 115-135). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Beach, W. (1993). Transitional regularities for 'casual' "Okay" usages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *19*(1), 325-352.

Benjamin, T. (2012). When problems pass us by: Using "you mean" to help locate the source of trouble. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *45*(1), 82-109.

Benjamin, T., & Mazeland, H. (2013). Conversation analysis and other-initiated repair. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 1068-1075). Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Benjamin, T., & Walker, T. (2013). Managing problems of acceptability through high rise-fall repetitions. *Discourse Processes*, *50*(2), 107-138.

Bolden, G. (2011). On the organization of repair in multiperson conversation: The case of "other"-selection in other-initiated repair sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*. *44*(3), 237-262.

Bolden, G. (2012). Across languages and cultures: Brokering problems of understanding in

conversational repair. *Language in Society*, *41*(1), 97-121.

Buckwalter, P. (2001). Repair sequences in Spanish L2 dyadic discourse: A descriptive study. *The Modern Language Journal*, *85*(3), 380-397.

Butterfield, J. (2015). Other-initiated other-repair in second language conversations. In G. Brooks, M. Grogan, & M. Porter (Eds.), *The 2014 PanSIG conference proceedings* (pp. 16-22). Miyazaki, Japan: JALT.

Butterfield, J. (2016). Repair sequences as potential sites of learning. In G. Brooks, M. Porter, D. Fujimoto, & D. Tatsuki (Eds.), *The 2015 PanSIG Journal* (pp. 31-37). Tokyo, Japan: JALT.

Butterfield. J., & Bhatta, B. (2015). IRF sequences in team-teaching EFL classrooms. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *2*(3), 176-185.

Brouwer, C. E. (2003). Word searches in NNS-NS interaction: Opportunities for language learning? *The Modern Language Journal*, *87*(4), 534-545.

Brouwer, C. E., & Wagner, J. (2004). Developmental issues in second language acquisition. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *1*(1), 29-47.

Brown, P. (1998). Conversational structure and language acquisition: The role of repetition in Tzeltal adult and child speech. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, *8*(2), 197-221.

Carroll, D. (2000). Restarts in novice-to-novice L2 conversations. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, *11*(1), 67-110.

Carroll, D. (2004). Restarts in novice turn beginnings: Disfluencies or interactional achievements? In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 201-220). London, England: Continuum.

Cho, E. H. &, Larke, P. J. (2010). Repair strategies usage of primary elementary ESL students: Implications for ESL teachers. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, *14*(3), 1-18.

Clayman, S. E., & Gill, V. T. (2004). Conversation analysis. In A. Bryman & M. Hardy (Eds.), *Handbook of data analysis* (pp. 589-606). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Couper-Kuhlen, E. (1992). Contextualizing discourse: The prosody of interactive repair. In P. Auer & A. Di Luzio (Eds.), *The contextualization of language* (pp. 337-364). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Curl, T. S. (2005). Practices in other-initiated repair resolution: The phonetic differentiation of 'repetitions.' *Discourse Processes*, *39*(1), 1-43.

Dimulescu, C. (2009). A *CA* versus *CDA* approach to cross-gender talk-in-interaction. *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brasov*, *2*(51), 183-188.

Dingemanse, M., Torreira, F., & Enfield, N. J. (2013). Is 'huh?' a universal word? Conversational infrastructure and the convergent evolution of linguistic items. *PLOS ONE*, *8*(11).

Dingemanse, M., Blythe, J., & Dirksmeyer, T. (2014). Formats for other-initiation of repair across languages. *Studies in Language*, *38*(1), 5-43.

Doughty, C., & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form. In Doughty, C. & Williams, J. (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp.114-138). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Drew, P. (1991). Asymmetries of knowledge in conversational interactions. In I. Markova & K. Foppa (Eds.), *Asymmetries in dialogue* (pp. 29-48). Hemel Hempstead, England: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Drew, P. (1997). 'Open' class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of trouble in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *28*(1), 69-101.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). Analyzing talk at work: An introduction. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work* (pp. 3-65). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Egbert, M. (1997). Some interactional achievements of other-initiated repair in multiperson conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *27*(5), 611-634.

Egbert, M. (1998). Miscommunication in language proficiency interviews of first-year German students: A comparison with natural conversation. In R. Young & A. W. He (Eds.), *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency* (pp. 147-172). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Egbert, M. (2004). Other-initiated repair and membership categorization-some conversational events that trigger linguistic and regional membership categorization. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *36*(8), 1467-1498.

Enfield, N. J., Stivers, T., & Levinson, S. C. (2010). Question-response sequences in conversation across ten languages: An introduction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *42*(10), 2615-2619.

Erickson, F. (2004). *Talk and social theory*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *26*(2), 237-259.

Firth, A. & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA. *The Modern Language Journal*, *81*(3), 285-300.

Firth, A. (2009). Doing not being a foreign language learner: English as a lingua franca in the workplace and (some) implications for SLA. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *47*, 127-156.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (2007). Second/foreign language learning as a social accomplishment: Elaborations on a "reconceptualized" SLA. *The Modern Language Journal*, *91*(5), 800-819.

Fotovatnia, Z. & Dorri, A. (2013). Repair strategies in EFL classroom talk. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *3*(6), 950-956.

Fox, B. A., Hayashi, M., & Jasperson, R. (1996). Resources and repair: A cross-linguistic study of syntax and repair. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 185-237). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Gafaranga, J. (2001). Linguistic identities in talk-in-interaction: Order in bilingual conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33*(12), 1901-1925.

Gafaranga, J. (2011). Transition space medium repair: Language shift talked into being. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(1), 118-135.

Gafaranga, J. (2012). Language alternation and conversational repair in bilingual conversation. *Journal of Blingualism, 16*(4), 501-527.

Gardner, R. (2004). On delaying the answer: Question sequences extended after the question. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (246-266). London, England: Continuum.

Gardner, R. (2007). 'Broken' starts: Bricolage turn beginnings in turn starts in second language talk. In Z. Hua, L. Wei, & V. Cook (Eds.), *Language learning and teaching as social inter-action* (pp. 58-71). London, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gardner, R. (2008). Conversation analysis and orientation to learning. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, 5*(3), 229-244.

Gardner, R. & Wagner, J. (2004). *Second language conversations*. London, England: Continuum.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Gaskill, W. H. (1980). Correction in native speaker-nonnative speaker conversation. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.), *Discourse analysis in second language research* (pp. 125-137). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Gibson, W. (2009). Negotiating textual talk: Conversation analysis, pedagogy and the

organization of online asynchronous discourse. *British Educational Research Journal, 35*(5), 705-721.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk.* Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Goodwin, C. (1979). The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 97-121). New York, NY: Irvington.

Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational organization: Interaction between speakers and hearers.* New York, NY: Irvington.

Goodwin, C. (1984). Notes on story structure and the organization of participation. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 225-246). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, C. (1986). Gesture as a resource for the organization of mutual orientation. *Semiotica, 62*(1/2), 29-49.

Goodwin, C. (2000). Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics, 32*, 1489-1522.

Goodwin, C. (2003). Pointing as situated practice. In S. Kita (Ed.), *Pointing: Where language, culture, and cognition meet* (pp. 217-241). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Goodwin, C., & Goodwin, M. H. (1986). Gesture and coparticipation in the activity of searching for a word. *Semiotica, 62*(1/2), 51-75.

Greer, T. (2013). Word search sequences in bilingual interaction: Codeswitching and embodied orientation toward shifting participant constellations. *Journal of Pragmatics, 57*, 100-117.

Greer, T. (2015). Appealing to a broker: Initiating third-person repair in mundane second language interaction. *Novitas-Royal, 9*(1), 1-14.

Greer, T., Bussinguer, V., Butterfield, J., & Mischinger, A. (2009). Receipt through repetition. *JALT Journal, 31*(1), 5-34.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). *Effective evaluation: Improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Haakana, M., & Kuhila, S. (2009). Other-correction in everyday interaction: Some comparative aspects. In M. Haakana, M. Laakso, & Jan Lindström (Eds.), *Talk in interaction: Comparative dimensions* (pp. 152-179). Helsinki, Finland: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Hall, J. K. (2007). Redressing the roles of correction and repair in research on second and foreign language learning. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*(4), 511-526.

Hayashi, M. (1994). A comparative study of self-repair in English and Japanese conversation. In N. Akatsuka (Ed.), *Japanese/Korean linguistics* (pp. 77-93). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Hayashi, M. (2003). Language and the body as resources for collaborative action: A study of word searches in Japanese conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 36*(2), 109-141.

Hayashi, M. (2005). Joint turn construction through language and the body: Notes on embodiment in coordinated participation in situated activities. *Semiotica, 156*(1/4), 21-54.

Hayashi, M., Raymond, G., & Sidnell, J. (2013). Conversational repair and human understanding: An introduction. In M. Hayashi, G. Raymond, & J. Sidnell (Eds.), *Conversational repair and human understanding* (pp. 1-40). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Hayashi, M., & Kim, S. H. (2015). Turn formats for other-initiated repair and their relation to

trouble sources: Some observations from Japanese and Korean conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *87*, 198-217.

He, A. W. (2004). CA for SLA: Arguments from the Chinese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, *88*(4), 568-582.

Hellermann, J. (2006). Classroom practices for developing L2 literacy: A Microethnographic study. *Applied Linguistics*, *27*(3), 377-404.

Hellermann, J. (2008). *Social actions for classroom language learning*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Hellermann, J. (2011). Members' methods, members' competencies: Looking for evidence of language learning in longitudinal investigations of other-initiated repair. In J. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek-Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 147-172). Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299-345). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. (1997). Conversation analysis and institutional talk: Analyzing data. In D. Silverman (Ed.), Qualitative research: Theory, method, and practice (pp. 161-182). London, England: Sage.

Heritage, J. (2004). Conversation analysis and institutional talk. In R. Sanders & K. Fitch (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social interaction* (103-146). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Heritage, J. (2005). Cognition in discourse. In H. te Molder & J. Potter (Eds.), *Conversation and cognition* (pp. 184-202). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. (2012). Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Interaction*, *45*(1), 1-29.

Heritage, J., & Clayman, S. (2002). Questioning presidents: Journalistic deference and adversarialness in the press conferences of Eisenhower and Reagan. *Journal of Communication, 52*(4), 749-775.

Heritage, J., & Clayman, S. (2010). *Talk in action: Interaction, identities, and institutions.* Chichester, England: Wiley-Blackwell.

Heritage, J., & Lindström, A. (1998). Motherhood, medicine, and morality: Scenes from a medical encounter. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 31*, 397-438.

Heritage, J., & Maynard, D. (2006). *Communication in medical care: Interactions between primary care physicians and patients.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Hosoda, Y. (2000). Other-repair in Japanese conversations between nonnative and native speakers. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 11*(1), 39-63.

Hosoda, Y. (2001). Conditions for other-repair in NS/NNS Conversation. *The Language Teacher, 25*(11), 29-31.

Hosoda, Y. (2002). *Analyzing Japanese native-nonnative speaker conversation: Categories, other-repair, and production delay* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Temple University, Tokyo, Japan.

Hosoda, Y. (2006). Repair and relevance of differential language expertise in second language conversations. *Applied Linguistics, 27*(1), 25-50.

Hosoda, Y. (2014). Missing response after teacher question in primary school English as a foreign language classes. *Linguistics and Education, 28*, 1-16.

Hosoda, Y. (2015). Teacher deployment of "oh" in known-answer question sequences. *Classroom Discourse, 7*(1), 58-84.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Ishida, M. (2009). Interactional competence and the use of modal expressions in

decision-making activities: CA for understanding microgenesis of pragmatic competence. In K. Bordovi-Harlig, C. Felix-Brasdefer, & A. S. Omar (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (Vol. 11) (pp. 55-79). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii at Manoa, National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (2002). Retrieved from http://www.lifescience.mext.go.jp/files/pdf/n796_01.pdf

Jefferson, G. (1972). Side sequences. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in social interaction* (pp. 294-338). New York, NY: Free Press.

Jefferson, G. (1983). Notes on some orderliness of overlap onset. In V. D' Urso & P. Leonardi (Eds.), *Discourse analysis and natural rhetorics* (pp. 11-38). Padova, Italy: Cleup Editore.

Jung, E. H. S. (1999). The organization of second language classroom repair. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, *10*(2), 153-171.

Kääntä, L. (2010). Teacher turn-allocation and repair practices in classroom interaction: A multisemiotic approach. *Jyväskylä Studies in Humanities*, *137*.

Kääntä, L. (2014). From noticing to initiating correction: Students' epistemic displays in instructional interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *66*, 86-105.

Kasper, G. (1985). Repair in foreign language teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *7*, 200-215.

Kasper, G. (2004). Participant orientations in German conversation-for-learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, *88*(4), 551-567.

Kasper, G. (2006). When once is not enough: Politeness of multiple requests in oral proficiency interviews. *Multilingua*, *25*, 323-350.

Kasper, G. & Kellerman, E. (1997). Introduction: Approaches to communication strategies. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (Eds.), *Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic and*

sociolinguistic perspectives (pp. 1-13). New York, NY: Longman.

Kasper, G. & Ross, S. (2007). Multiple questions in language proficiency interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics, 39*, 2045-2070.

Keenan, E. O. (1977). Making it last: Repetition in children's discourse. In S. Ervin-Tripp & C. Mitchell-Kernan (Eds.), *Child discourse* (pp. 125-138). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Kendrick, K. H. (2015). The intersection of turn-taking and repair: The timing of other-initiations or repair in conversation. *Frontiers in Psychology, 6*(250), 1-16.

Kendrick, K. H. (2015). Other-initiated repair in English. *Open Linguistics, 1*, 164-190.

Kim, H. (2002). The form and function of next-turn repetition in English conversation. *Language Research, 38*(1), 51-81.

Kim, Y. (2009). Korean discourse markers –nuntey and –kuntey in native-nonnative conversation: An acquisitional perspective. In H. T. Nguyen & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Talk-in-interaction: Multilingual perspectives* (pp. 317-350). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii at Manoa, National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Kirk, J. M., & Miller, M. L. (1986). *Reliability and validity in qualitative research.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Koshik, I. (2002). Designedly incomplete utterances: A pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 35*(3), 277-309.

Koshik, I. (2005a). *Beyond rhetorical questions: Assertive questions in everyday interaction.* Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Koshik, I. (2005b). Alternative questions used in conversational repair. *Discourse Studies, 7*(2), 193-211.

Koshik, I. & Seo, M-S. (2012). Word (and other) search sequences initiated by language

learners. *Text Talk, 32*(2), 167-189.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* Oxford, England: Pergamon.

Kurhila, S. (2001). Correction in talk between native and non-native speaker. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33*, 1083-1110.

Kurhila, S. (2004). Clients or language learners - being a second language speaker in institutional interaction. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 58-74). London, England: Continuum.

Laakso, M., & Sorjonen, M-L. (2010). Cut-off or particle -Devices for initiating self-repair in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 42*, 1151-1172.

Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2004). CA for SLA? It all depends. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(4), 603-607.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, Y.A. (2010). Learning in the contingency of talk-in-interaction. *Text Talk, 30*(4), 403-422.

Lee, Y., & Hellermann, J. (2014). Tracing developmental changes through conversation analysis: Cross-sectional and longitudinal analysis. *TESOL Quarterly, 48*(4), 763-788.

Lemke, J. L. (1990). *Talking science: Language, learning, and values.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Lerner, G. (1995). Turn design and the organization of participation in instructional activities. *Discourse Processes, 19*, 111-131.

Lerner, G. (2003). Selecting next speaker: The context-sensitive operation of a content free organization. *Language in Society, 32*(2), 177-201.

Lerner, G. H., & Kitzinger, C. (2015). Or-prefacing in the organization of self-initiated repair.

Research on Language and Social Interaction, *48*(1), 58-78.

LeCompte, M. D., & Goetz, J. P. (1982). Problems of reliability and validity in ethnographic research. *Review of Educational Research*, *52*(1), 31-60.

Li, H. (2013). Student initiatives and missed learning opportunities in an IRF sequence: A single case analysis. *L2 Journal*, *5*(2), 68-92.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2007). *An introduction to conversation analysis*. London, England: Continuum.

Liebscher, G., & Daily-O'Cain, J. (2003). Conversational repair as a role-defining mechanism in classroom interaction. *The Modern Language Journal*, *87*(3), 375-390.

Lilja, N. (2014). Partial repetitions as other-initiations of repair in second language talk

Long, T., & Johnson, M. (2007). *Research ethics in the real world: Issues and solutions for health and social care*. London, England: Churchill Livingstone.

Macbeth, D. (2000). Classrooms as installations. In S. Hester & D. Francis (Eds.), *The local education order* (pp. 21-72). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Macbeth, D. (2004). The relevance of repair for classroom correction. *Language in Society*, *33*(5), 703-736.

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

Markee, N. (2008). Toward a learning behavior tracking methodology for CA-for-SLA. *Applied Linguistics*, *29*(3), 404-427.

Matsumoto, Y. (2011). Successful ELF communications and implications for ELT: Sequential analysis of ELF pronunciation negotiation strategies. *The Modern Language Journal*, *95*(1), 97-114.

McHoul, A. W. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in Society*, *7*, 183-213.

McHoul, A. W. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in Society, 19*, 349-377.

Mehan, H. (1979). Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Merriam-Webster's Learner's Dictionary. http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/teach

Mori, J. (2004). Negotiating sequential boundaries and learning opportunities: A case from a Japanese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(4), 536-550.

Mori, J. (2007). Border crossings? Exploring the intersection of second language acquisition, conversation analysis, and foreign language pedagogy. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*(s1), 849-862.

Mori, J., & Hayashi, M. (2006). The achievement of intersubjectivity through embodied completions: A study of interactions between first and second language speakers. *Applied Linguistics, 27*(2), 195-219.

Morgenstern, A., Leroy-Collombel, M., & Caët, S. (2013). Self- and other-repairs in child-adult interaction of pragmatic abilities and language acquisition. *Journal of Pragmatics, 56*, 151-167.

Nakayama, Y., Tyler, A., & van Lier, L. (2001). Negotiation of meaning in conversational and information gap activities: A comparative discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*, 377-405.

Nunan, D. (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

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

Okada, Y. (2010). Repairing "failed" questions in foreign language classrooms. *JALT Journal, 32*(1), 55-74.

Oliver, P. (2010). *The student's guide to research ethics*. New York, NY: Open University Press.

Olsher, D. (2004). Talk and gesture: The embodied completion of sequential actions in spoken interaction. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 221-245). London, England: Continuum.

O'Neal, G. (2015). Segmental repair and interactional intelligibility: The relationship between consonant deletion, consonant insertion, and pronunciation intelligibility in English as a lingua franca in Japan. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *85*, 122-134.

Park, J.-E. (2007). Co-construction of nonnative speaker identity in cross-cultural interaction. *Applied Linguistics*, *28*(3), 339-360.

Park, I. (2007). Co-construction of word search activities in native and non-native speaker interaction. *Teachers College, Columbia University, Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, *7*(2), 1-23.

Park, I. (2015). Or-prefaced third turn self-repairs in student questions. *Linguistics and Education*, *31*, 101-113.

Pekarek-Doehler, S. (2010). Conceptual changes and methodological challenges: On language and learning from a conversation analytic perspective on SLA. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh, & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising learning in applied linguisitics* (pp. 105-126). London, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pekarek-Doehler, S., & Fasel-Lauzon, V. (2015). Documenting change across time: Longitudinal and cross-sectional CA studies of classroom interaction. In N. Markee (Ed.), *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp. 409-424). Chichester, England: Wiley-Blackwell.

Peräkylä, A. (2004). Reliability and validity in research based on naturally occurring social interaction. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method, and practice*

(pp. 283-304). London, England: Sage.

Pomerantz, A. (1984). Pursuing a response. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 152-163). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Quan, J., & Weisser, M. (2015). A study of 'self repair' operations in conversation by Chinese English learners. *System, 49*, 39-49.

Radford, J. (2010a). Practices of other-initiated repair in the classrooms of children with specific speech and language difficulties. *Applied Linguistics, 31*(1), 25-44.

Radford, J. (2010b). Adult participation in children's word searches: On the use of prompting, hinting, and supplying a model. *Clinical Linguistics and Phonetics, 24*(2), 83-100.

Radford, J., Blatchford, P., & Webster, R. (2011). Opening up and closing down: How teachers and TAs manage turn-taking, topic, and repair in mathematics lessons. *Learning and Instruction, 21*, 625-635.

Robinson, J. D. (2006). Managing trouble responsibility and relationships during conversational repair. *Communication Monographs, 73*(2), 137-161.

Robinson, J. D. (2013). Epistemics, action formation, and other-initiation of repair: The case of partial questioning repeats. In M. Hayashi, G. Raymond, & J. Sidnell (Eds.), *Conversational repair and human understanding: Studies in interactional sociolinguistics* (261-292). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, J. D., & Kevoe-Feldman, H. (2010). Using full-repeats to initiate repair on other's questions. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 43*(3), 232-259.

Sacks, H. (1972). On the analyzability of stories by children. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 325-345). Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.

Sacks, H. (1984). Notes on methodology. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures*

of social action: Studies in conversation analysis (pp. 21-27). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press

Sacks, H. (1987). On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button & J. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organization* (pp. 54-69). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Sacks, H. (1992a). *Lectures on conversation I.* G. Jefferson (Ed.). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Sacks, H. (1992b). *Lectures on conversation II.* G. Jefferson (Ed.). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, *50*(1), 696-735.

Sahlström, F. (2011). Learning as social action. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek-Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 45-65). Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Schegloff, E. A. (1979). The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation. In T. Givon (Ed.), *Syntax and semantics, volume 12: Discourse and syntax* (pp. 261-286). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of 'uh huh' and other things that come between. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk* (71-93). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1986). The routine as achievement. *Human Studies*, *9*, 111-151.

Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Between macro and mico: Contexts and other connections. In J. C. Alexander, B. Giesen, R. Munch, & N. J. Smelser (Eds.), *The macro-micro link* (pp. 207-234). Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1991a). Reflections on talk and social structure. In D. Boden & D. H.

Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk and social structure* (pp. 44-70). Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1991b). Conversation analysis and socially shared cognition. In L. B. Resnick, J. M. Levine, & S. D. Teasley (Eds.), *Perspectives on socially shared cognition* (pp. 150-171). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992a). Repair after the next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology, 97*(5), 1295-1345.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992b). On talk and its institutional occasions. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work* (pp. 101-134). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E.A. (1992c). In another context. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon* (pp. 191-227). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1993). Reflections on quantification in the study of conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 26*(1), 99-128.

Schegloff, E. A. (1997a). Practices and actions: Boundary cases of other-initiated repair. *Discourse Processes, 23*(3), 499-545.

Schegloff, E. A. (1997b). Third turn repair. In G. R. Guy, C. Feagin, D. Schiffrin, & J. Baugh (Eds.), *Towards a social science of language Volume 2: Social interaction and discourse structures* (pp. 31-40). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Schegloff, E. A. (2000). When 'others' initiate repair. *Applied Linguistics, 21*(2), 205-243.

Schegloff, E. A. (2002). Conversation analysis and applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 22*, 3-31.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis* (Vol. 1). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E.A, & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica, 8*(1), 289-327.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, *53*(2), 361-382.

Schegloff, E. A., Koshik, I., Jacoby, S., & Olsher, D. (2002). Conversation analysis and applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *22*, 3-31.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *11*, 129-158.

Schwartz, J. (1980). The negotiation of meaning: Repair in conversations between second language learners of English. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.), *Discourse analysis in second language research* (pp. 138-153). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Seedhouse, P. (1996). *Learning talk: A study of the interactional organisation of the L2 classroom from a CA institutional discourse perspective* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of York, York, England.

Seedhouse, P. (1999). The relationship between context and the organization of repair in the L2 classroom. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *37*(1), 59-80.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Seedhouse, P. (2005). Conversation analysis as research methodology. In K. Richards & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *Applying conversation analysis* (pp. 251-266). London, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

Selting, M. (1988). The role of intonation in the organization of repair and problem handling sequences in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *12*(3), 293-322.

Selting, M. (1996). Prosody as an activity-type distinctive cue in conversation: The case of so-called "astonished" questions in repair initiation. In E. Couper-Kuhlen & M. Selting (Eds.), *Prosody in conversation: Interactional studies* (pp. 231-270). Cambridge,

England: Cambridge University Press.

Seo, M., & Koshik, I. (2010). A conversation analytic study of gestures that engender repair in ESL conversational tutoring. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *42*(8), 2219-2239.

Sidnell, J. (2007). Repairing person reference in a small Caribbean community. In N. J. Enfield & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Person reference in interaction: Linguistic, cultural and social perspectives* (pp. 281-308). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Sidnell, J. (2008). Alternate and complementary perspectives on language and social life: The organization of repair in two Caribbean communities. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *12*(4), 477-503.

Sidnell, J. (2009). Language-specific resources in repair and assessments. In J. Sidnell (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Comparative perspectives* (pp. 304-325). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Sidnell, J. (2011). *Conversation analysis: An introduction.* Chichester, England. Wiley-Blackwell.

Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Svennevig, J. (2004). Other-repetition as display of hearing, understanding and emotional stance. *Discourse Studies*, *6*(4), 489-518.

Tannen, D. (1989). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Takagi, T., Hosoda, Y., & Morita, E. (2016). *Basics of conversation analysis*. Tokyo, Japan: Hitsuji Shobo.

ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis*. London, England: Sage.

Torras, M., & Gafaranga, J. (2002). Social identities and language alternation in non-formal institutional bilingual talk: Trilingual service encounters in Barcelona. *Language in*

Society, *31*(4), 527-548.

Tsuchiya, K., & Handford, M. (2014). A corpus-driven analysis or repair in a professional ELF meeting: Not 'letting it pass.' *Journal of Pragmatics*, *64*, 117-131.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action.* New York, NY: Routledge.

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

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

Waring, H. Z. (2011). Learning initiatives and learning opportunities in the language classroom. *Classroom Discourse*, *2*(2), 201-218.

Waring, H. Z. (2016). *Theorizing pedagogical interaction: Insights from conversation analysis*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Wong, J. (2000a). Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/non-native speaker English conversation. *Applied Linguistics*, *21*, 244-267.

Wong, J. (2000b). The token "yeah" in nonnative speaker English conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *33*, 29-67.

Wong, J. & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Wu, R-J. R. (2009). Repetition in the initiation of repair. In J. Sidnell (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Comparative perspectives* (pp. 31-59). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Yasui, E. (2010). Repair and language proficiency: Differences of advanced and beginning language learners in an English-Japanese conversation group. *Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education*, *14*(1), 41-57.

Young, R. F., & Miller, E. R. (2004). Learning as changing participation: Discourse roles in ESL writing conferences. *The Modern Language Journal*, *88*(4), 519-535.

APPENDIX A

Consent Form

The research for which this video and audio data are collected is to examine language use in interaction. There is no pre-established focus as the research topic arises from analysis of the data. The research is not to examine language errors, but to look at achievement of communication in social interaction.

Your name will remain anonymous as a pseudonym will be used in research reports. The video, audio, and pictures from the video will only be used for research purposes and only viewed by professional researchers. At all times in presentations at conferences or in publications in scholarly journals the video and pictures will be blurred so that you will not be identifiable (see the pictures on this page). Your privacy is absolutely protected.

I, _____, consent to the use of the video and audio data of myself for research purposes only as described and outlined above.

Date _____

Jeffrie Butterfield
Kanagawa University, Graduate School of Foreign Languages
Email address: jeffriebutterfield@gmail.com

APPENDIX B

研究承諾書

本調査は、映像及び音声資料を収集し、相互行為における言語使用を考察するためのものです。研究課題は資料分析から生ずるもので、あらかじめ設定されたものではありません。また本調査は言語の誤りを考察するものではなく、社会的相互行為の達成に注目するものです。

被験者の名前は、その論文及び報告書においては匿名が用いられます。映像、音声、及び映像から得られた写真は本研究の目的にのみ使用され、専門の研究者によってのみ利用されます。研究発表や学術論文の出版物においても映像や写真は不鮮明に処理され、被験者が明かされるようなことはありません（例として下の写真をご覧ください）。被験者のプラバシーは固く保護されます。

私、 _____ は、上記内容の調査目的における映像、及び音声資料の使用を:

☐ 承諾します。 ☐ 承諾しません。

日付 _____

バターフィールド・ジェフリー
神奈川大学 外国語学研究科
メールアドレス: jeffriebutterfield@gmail.com

APPENDIX C

Transcription Conventions

( )	inaudible talk
(data)	parentheses with words inside indicate that the transcriber is unsure if this is what is uttered by the participant or not
?	rising intonation
:	prolongation of sound or syllable (more colons indicate more prolongation)
(( ))	transcriber's comment
(.)	micropause
.	fall in intonation
,	continuing intonation
(3.0)	silence (in tenths of a second)
-	cut-off or self-interruption
=	latched utterances
.hh	inbreath
hh	outbreath
da(h)ta	laughter inside a word
[	indicates where overlapping talk begins
]	indicates where overlapping talk ends
<u>data</u>	stress or emphasis
↑	higher pitch
↓	lower pitch
< >	an utterance that is slower than the surrounding talk
> <	an utterance that is faster than the surrounding talk
°data°	degree signs indicate that the utterance is quieter than the surrounding talk
$data$	smiley voice

APPENDIX D

Abbreviations for Interlinear Gloss

COP	Copulative verb
POL	Politeness marker
Q	Question marker
QT	Quotation marker