The Teacher's Strategies in Targeting the Trouble Source for Inviting Self-repair in Classroom Talk.

A Conversation Analysis Case Study in the EFL Classroom.

Dr Asma Ismael Ebshiana

Department of Modern Languages and Linguistics, faculty of languages & Translation- University of Zawia

a.ebshiana@zu.edu.ly

Abstract

The concept of repair is crucial to classroom talk and is often essential to the way the sequences expand or continue. In classroom talk, the teacher's third turn is the richest turn since it affects how the sequence expands frequently. It is repaired that often expands the sequence in order to direct students to go back and correct their own utterance. Understanding these communication breakdowns will help teachers create new thoughts and ideas to promote student participation and also the development of students' proficiency. Therefore, the present paper aims to focus on how repair is sequentially structured in the teachers' third turn. Moreover, to examine the repair strategies that the teacher employs in the classroom and demonstrate how the teacher pinpoints or targets the trouble source, as well as how the students orient to the teacher's initiation. The participants were 30 adult EFL learners undertaking an academic English course at higher education. Conversation Analysis method (CA) was used as sequential approach. A deep analysis is conducted to analyses how various interactional patterns of initiation repair are used by the teacher to create or inhibit opportunities for students' participation. Results demonstrate that, other repair initiations are regularly found in the teacher s' third turn of the three-part sequence. The analysis shows that each strategy has different consequences for a student's responses. It was found that in specific repair initiation, the teacher locates precisely the trouble

source in the student's response and the student initiates self-repair in the next turn recurrently with a non- elaborate response, whereas, in non-specified repair initiators, the student is invited to initiate repair with a more elaborate response. Such strategies encourage the learner to self-repair, participate, or self-select. All these aspects of interaction are seen to be essential patterns in encouraging students' participation.

Keywords: Repair-strategies, Trouble-sources, Conversation analysis, classroom talk.

استراتيجيات المعلم في تحديد الاصلاح الكلامي وتحفيز الطالب للإصلاح الذاتي
دراسة حالة لتحليل المحادثة في فصل اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية

أسماء اسماعيل بشينة
قسم اللغة الإنجليزية كلية اللغات والترجمة
الجامعة الزاوية
a.ebshiana@zu.edu.ly

الملخص

تُعد فكرة الإصلاح اللفظي أمرًا أساسيًا في الحديث داخل الفصل الدراسي وغالبًا ما تكون ضرورية للطريقة التي يتم بها إصلاح المشكلة في الحديث بين المعلم والطالب.

في هذه الورقة تم إستخدام نهج تحليل الحديث الذي يعتمد على التحليل العميق للتفاعل الكلامي المتضمن ترتيب الكلام وتتابعه وأدوار المشاركين في الحديث، حيث كان عدد المشاركين 30 مشارك من البالغين متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية الذين يتلقون دورة اللغة الإنجليزية الأكاديمية في التعليم العالي كلغة أجنبية. تم استخدام طريقة تحليل المحادثة (CA) كنهج متسلسل. أظهرت هذه الدراسة أن هناك تقنيات مختلفة يستخدمها المعلمون لإستهداف مصدر المشكلة واستنباط مجموعة متنوعة من حلول الإصلاح الناتجة عن

استجاب الطلاب ولقد وُجد أن المعلمين في هذا السياق المحدد استخدموا مبادرات إصلاح محددة وغير محددة لاستهداف مصدر المشكلة ولتشجيع الطالب على الإصلاح الذاتي. حيث أنه في عملية إصلاح معينه يحدد المعلم مصدر المشكلة بدقة بناء على إستجابة الطالب ويبدأ الطالب في الإصلاح الذاتي في المرحلة التالية من الحديث التسلسلي من خلال إعطاء استجابة غير مفصلة بشكل متكرر، بينما في بادئات الإصلاح غير المحددة، تتم دعوة الطالب لبدء الإصلاح باستجابة أكثر تفصيلاً، وذلك لأن الإصلاح غير المحدد لا يحدد كلمة أو عبار معينة لإصلاحها، ولكنه يدعو إلى إعادة صياغة الإجابة بأكملها وكل هذه الجوانب من التفاعلات يُنظر إليها على أنها فعالة في تشجيع مشاركة الطلاب في الإصلاح الكلامي الذاتي .

الكلمات المفتاحية: استراتيجيات الإصلاح، مصادر المشاكل، تحليل الحديث، المحادثة الصفية.

1. Introduction

This article examines and focuses mainly on the way teachers sequentially practice repair as a social action on the students' utterances and how it contributes to the teaching process. This study will not focus on the students' language development within the learning process. The main purpose of this study is to examine the repair strategies that the teacher uses in the classroom and show how the teacher targets the trouble source and additionally how the students orient to the teacher's initiation. Repair is described as a conversational strategy used by participants for dealing with inherent problems, in order to achieve a common understanding through communication, and to communicate effectively among participants. (Kendrick, 2015; Kitzinger, 2013). These problems can be in speaking, listening, and understanding messages (Wong & Waring, 2010).The structure of repair contains two major steps. The first one is named "initiation" which refers to the process in which the recognized mistake or errors are signified as a "trouble source".

A "trouble source" can be a word, a phrase, or a statement that is treated as a problem, which needs to be repaired; so, it is anything that blocks or obstructs the participants' communication. Studying repair assists scholars in understanding the ways in which communication is successfully achieved (Terzi, 2010). EFL/L2 classrooms are contexts that have great potential for communication breakdowns between the teacher and the learners. A communication breakdown occurs when any of the speakers deliver or utter a message that is not carried accurately among the participants and thus, the conversation is obstructed. These communication breakdowns may be overwhelmed with several repair activities undertaking by either speakers or listeners. Therefore, it is significant to study repair in this particular (PSP) classroom because it is the place where students' dialogues potentially breakdown and where learners keep negotiating meanings and continue to participate in the learning activities. There has been some interesting work on classroom repair which has revealed some of the similarities and the differences in normal conversation, however, much remains to be revealed in particular classrooms, such as an EFL context (Gardner, 2013). This article examines the allocation of repair initiations, where the repairs took place. Also, how the teacher constructs and accomplishes the initiation of repair, by targeting the trouble source among different strategies in terms of prompting, such as wh-questions, interrogative questions and using designedly incomplete utterances (DIU), (Koshik, 2002b), whether in groups or with individuals. Before proceeding to examine the data in this classroom, it is necessary to support the paper with some of the related literature, showing the specificity of the current study.

2. Literature Review

McHoul (1990) was the first to describe and fully analyse the activities and practice of classroom repair. In his investigation of teacher-initiated repair in English monolingual high-school geography classes, he concluded that the prevalence of other-initiated self-repairs was more frequent in a classroom context, due

to the asymmetric relationship between the teacher and the student. This occurred specifically when the pedagogy emphasised linguistic accuracy, unlike in everyday conversation, through a method called "cluing" (Sidnell&Stivers, 2012, p. 603).In addition, McHoul (1990), shows that the preferred repair type in everyday talk, self-initiated self-repair, is less frequently used by the teacher than other-initiated repair. However, he also found a preference for self-repairs similar to the ones observed in everyday conversation in which the teacher initiates repair, often positioned immediately in the third turn of the IRF/E pattern, and followed by a turn where the student self-corrects him/herself (Dippold, 2014).

Seedhouse (2004b) argues that the situation in the classroom is complex, as it is related to pedagogical interaction. Seedhouse maintains that the organization of repair practice is seen from two angles; the first angle is "form" and "accuracy" while, the second is "meaning" and "fluency" (Gardner, 2013; Seedhouse, 2004b, 2004c). He argues that a teacher evaluates any word spoken by a learner. Therefore, it is probable that repair mechanisms will be carried out, if the learner utters anything that does not match with the teachers' pedagogical focus (Seedhouse, 2004b).

Another study by Kasper (1985). He argues that "studies of repair in the EFL classroom should include all repair activities rather than focus on one specific repair type, namely the teacher's correction of learners' errors" (Kasper, 1985, p. 200). Therefore, it is an important investigation in the current study to examine all types of repair showing how the teacher and students' orients through the repair mechanisms while taking turns of actions. However, I mainly focus on other-initiated self-repair (OISR) which is recurrent in my data.

Another perspective from Wong (2000) examines the positions of other-initiated repairs in either native or non-native speaker interaction. She discovered that other-initiated repair commonly occurs after the trouble source. On the other hand, Schegloff (2000), argues that there are instances which appear to be delayed in the next turn in special occurrences. This is due to a constraint, which

has been enforced by the turn-taking system when aiming to initiate repair on the multi units turns

Yet, little research has been conducted on EFL/L2 adult learner classrooms that involves a description of the teacher targeting the problem through identifying and examining the impact of different repair strategies on students' responses. Whereas previous research has focused more on students, this study focuses on how teachers employ a variety of types of repair strategies in different conversation breakdowns in this context. It focuses on how the teacher targets the trouble source with the student utterance through a wide range of techniques.

The fruitfulness of this study for both researchers and teachers situated in the process of reinforcing insights and broadening an understanding of what is really occurring in teacher-student talk. Examining how turns are sequentially constructed with a focus on repair, will offer us a unique and extended picture into how these patterns of repair play out through the turn organisation. I mainly focus on the other-initiated self-repair type of repair, which is the most common in the data. With this in mind, this article aims to answer the following questions:

1- How is repair sequentially organised in the PSP context?
2- What are the main trajectories of repair in the PSP context?
3- Are the mechanisms of repair in the PSP context similar to everyday conversation?
4- What are the repair strategies in this classroom and how does the teacher target the trouble source in student responses?

3. Data and Method.

The participants in the current study were 30 adult EFL learners undertaking an academic English course who were recorded and observed in a specific classroom (PSP).From a totalof 22 hours of recordings of interactions 5 hours were selected and transcribed.CA framework was used to analyze and investigate repair mechanisms operating in the (PSP) classroom as well as the nature of preferred initiation repair models in this context. Specifically, focused on

how the teacher targets trouble source or specifies the students' response, by employing some strategies that encourage students to participate and initiate self-repair and foster student independence.CA is mainly interested in talk as actions and how the production of utterances "is seen not in terms of the structure of language, but first and foremost as a practical social accomplishment" (Hutchby& Wooffitt, 2008, p. 12).

 CA has its own principles and features. Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998, p. 23) list the following as four fundamental principles of CA: Talk-in-interaction is systematically organised and deeply ordered. The production of talk-in-interaction is methodic. CA should be based on naturally occurring data • One should not assume that a piece of data is not worth analysing before attempting to analyse it. The aforementioned principles are essential to my study in examining how teacher initiates repair and pinpoints the trouble source in the sequence.

In CA, only naturally occurring interactions are acceptable as data; every minute through a linguistic detailing for example of speakers" pauses, sound, stress pitch, and also non-linguistic elements, such as strengthening the word or in-breaths, and overlaps is considered relevant in uncovering participants" orientation towards the interaction. I include pauses, I timed them to the nearest tenth of a second, overlaps, prosody and falling and rising tone in order to get a fine-grained analysis through teacher and student interaction. Intonation is interactional resource used by the teacher in initiation questions, providing evaluation and initiating repair in the sequence. However, I only will use them as an additional data the analysis is not measuring them acoustically. In order to enhance confidentiality, I refer to the teacher by T, and students as S1, S2, and S3 and when a group of students are participating this is referred to as SS. However, their identities such as nationalities or genders

are not revealed. The extract is referred to as [1][AE: TST] All of the interactions in the data extracts were performed in English. I transcribed the various interactions in the chosen (PSP) classroom from the audio recorder (Zoom MH2N) and ended up with a comprehensive written record of the talk.

4. Findings and Discussion
The analysis demonstrates that Other-Initiated Self-Repair (OISR) was a recurrent pattern in the data. This type looks more specifically at the teacher strategies in targeting the trouble source for inviting self-repair, which consequently leads to more participation and successful collaboration. In terms of identifying and targeting the trouble source, I grouped the patterns extracted from the data into two categories. The first category is when the teacher specifies the problem as a specific trouble source in the second turn as a response to the prior turn. The second category is when the teacher does not specify the trouble source in the student's utterance. I show how the teacher uses a variety of repair patterns and strategies in order to facilitate and prompt the student for self-initiated repair. Also, the analysis will show how the teacher targets the problem, how the student orientates to the teacher's initiation, and how both the teacher and the student treat these communication breakdowns in order to reach a mutual understanding. By doing so, the teacher will gain insight into ways of developing teaching in order to contribute to the students' progression of their language proficiency.

4.1 Specific Repair Initiation
4.1.1.err:: sorry (.) I didn't quite hear.
The following extract is from a grammar practice session involving filling the gaps of missing adjectives and adverbs for describing graphs and charts from the book material.
Extract 1 [AE: TST:]

---

[1]The AE stands for the researcher's initials, TST stands for Teacher Student Talk.

```
1 T: umm (0.7)Err ::(.) ahh (1) Amani then
(.) number two□
2 S: Two (the times table↓)
3 T: err:: sorry (.) I didn't quite hear↑
4 S5: T::o> (reminds table<↓)
5 (0.2)
6 SS: ↑to remain stabl[e
7 T: ↑[yes fine↓
8 T: remain stable (.) yes yes fine
```

The teacher starts the turn by selecting the student in line 1. S5 produces a trouble source in line 2 *"(the times table□)"*. The teacher initiates repair in line 3 *"err :: sorry (.) I didn't quite hear□"*. The teacher indicates trouble with an "open class" (Drew, 1977) "sorry". Then she specifies the nature of the problem as one of having difficulties. The next turn is taken by S5 to initiate a repair as an opportunity to repeat her answer. The trouble source is an issue elated to the teacher's hearing, and hence is overheard as a request for a repeat. However, the teacher treats the whole prior utterance as problematic and specifies it at the TRP with rising intonation *"(.) I didn't quite hear"*. This kind of repair initiator identifies the trouble source explicitly and passes the work of repair itself to the following turn. Then the repair is passed back to the first speaker in the first FPP who produced the trouble source. This indicates that other-initiated repair is frequently aimed to achieve self-repair (Liddicoat, 2011).

4.1.2 "Wh-questions"

Extract 2 [AE:TST]
```
1 T:→ [you just erm (2)err >what about< the
spelling there=↑
2 S2: =re::ah main remain
3 T: >remain<
```

International Science and Technology Journal
المجلة الدولية للعلوم والتقنية

العددVolume32
المجلد Part 2
يوليو July 2023

المجلة الذولية للعلوم والتقنية
International Science and Technology Journal
ISTJ

تم استلام الورقة بتاريخ: 2/ 7 /2023م   وتم نشرها على الموقع بتاريخ: 31 / 7 /2023م

```
4 S2: with I::
5 T:→ with (.) so: yes >you have a missing
letter there<
6 S2: okay (.) missing letter and then
7 (0.5)
8 T: → ↓which (.) letter is missing↓
9 S3: ˚uhm˚ (0.3) e::rm A↑.
10 T: that's right yes=
```

In this example, the teacher initiates repair in the form of wh-questions + partial repeat. In this extract, there are two repair initiations in lines 1 and 8. The teacher uses a wh-question in line 1 with a rising tone; the student responds in line 2 with stretching the word *"(re::_main)"*. Following that, the teacher in line 3 repeats the student's answer so as to target the problem. In the next turn S2 provides a response in line 4 and the teacher suggests his response is inadequate. Subsequently, in line 5, the teacher initiates repair using a declarative question "*you have a missing letter there<*" After a 0.5 second pause, the teacher initiates another wh-question and this time he specifies precisely as in line 8 *"□which (.) letter is missing□"*.The teacher targets a specific series of linguistic forms which involves a missing letter in the spelling of a word. Eventually, the student provides the correct response after 0.3 seconds of pauses and hesitation; *"e::rm A"* with rising intonation. In the third turn the teacher confirms the student's answer by affirming *"that's right yes="* as an acceptance. From the analysis one can say that this finding echoes McHoul's (1990), consequences for first language speakers; often the teacher initiates repair various times before the target trouble is achieved.

4.1.3 "what do you mean?"
In the following extract the teacher initiates repair by repeating the student's whole contribution. The teacher is performing a speaking practice and asking the whole class how to give a good presentation.

Extract 3- [AE:TST]

```
1 T: YEAH (.) a- also the> speed when you
think
2 about the voice<(.) how quickly they are
speaking↑
3 too fast =↑ too slow okay↓
4 S4: ↑WHAT about the(.) delivery of
information↓(0.2)
5 T: what do you mean delivery of the
information↓
6 S3: [> ?Sense sense< ]
7 S2: [it is : easy to understand]
8 T: ↑OKEY↓
9 S4: ( ) simple for the audience to
understand
10 T: okeyokey ↑good.
```

In this extract, the teacher here not only specifies the problem for repair initiation, but also seeks clarification, for eliciting a repetition or reformulation from the student with regard to the form of the student's ill-shaped utterance. In line 5, the teacher initiates repair by targeting the trouble source through repeating the whole statement in the prior turn *"↑what do you mean delivery of the information↓"*. The stress in both items *"mean"* and *"delivery"*, helps to indicate that both items carry the trouble source of the exchange. Often this type of repair seeks clarification of the meaning. As defined by Long and Sato (1983) a request for clarification or seeking confirmation refers to "any expressions by a speaker designed to establish whether that speaker's preceding utterance has been understood by the interlocutor" (p.275). In the subsequent turn, both S2 and S3 self-select and provide a response in overlapping turns. In this type of repair initiation, the teacher targets the problem more precisely, in other words, it becomes clearer and more specific which part of the prior turn needs to be repaired. Furthermore, this type of repair seeks clarification. In the

above extract, the student's response is ill-shaped in some way that the teacher is unsure what does the student mean. Therefore, seeking clarification is essential to maintain the flow and the continuation of speech (Walsh, 2011). So, it is interesting that a teacher can prompt student self-repair by repeating the student's response in the prior turn, thus addressing the students' mistakes.

4.1.4 Partial Repeat of Trouble Source + Wh-questions
Another type of repair initiation which is prevalent in the data, is where the teacher targets the trouble source by using partial repetition with a wh-Interrogative (Wong & Waring, 2010).

Extract 4 [AE:TST]
```
1 T: .hh ↓excellent (.) ↓eight (1.0)
2 S5: op[ened]
3 S2: [open]ed
4 S1: opened=
5 S4: =[past]
6 S2: [op ]ened
7 S5: past
8 S2: past
9 T: → past ↓what
10 S5: simp[le
11 S4: [past simple]
12 T: ↓good
```
In this extract, the teacher is working through the answers to some questions about the forms of verbs in a collection of sentences, which the students have read. The teacher in line 9 initiates repair by repeating the student's contribution accompanied by wh-question word *"↓what"* (Drew, 1997; Schegloff, 1997). This type of technique is used by the teacher where he repeats some part of the trouble, making the utterance more specific than an unspecified repair initiation. S5 in line 10 gives a response "*simp[le"* overlapped with S4's response in line 11. Following that, the teacher, produces his positive evaluation *"↓good"* in line 12 closing the sequence with an affirmative assessment. It is clear from the example, that using

these specific repair initiations allows the student to solve the problem and initiates self-repair to highlight the trouble source. Both students initiate a response and give the correct answer. Both students produce one or more words surroundings the wh-question as S5 gives *"simp[le"* and S4 utters *"[past simple]"*.

4.1.5 Designedly Incomplete Utterance (DIU)

The DIU refers to grammatically incomplete utterances that invite self-correction by discontinuing just before a potential trouble source. They are used to prompt correction in several sequential positions, pointing to the position of the mistake or targeting the actual trouble source. DIUs are recurrent in my data and the teacher uses them simply to target the trouble source and prompt the students to complete the turn through partial repetition of the student's responses in the prior turn as in the following example. The setting is a reading practice where the teacher is asking students to answer questions in their textbooks.

Extract-5 [AE:TST]

```
1 T: yes (.) ↑so: how exactly does it (.5)
disadvantage
2 ↑China
3 (2.5)
4 S4: mo::re (1) err:: compatting=
5 S: =com↑batting=
6 T: =(each)
7 S4: more compatiness:: a::nd=
8 T: → ↑more
9 (2)
10 S4: err compat-titon
11 T: com↑petition
12 S4: → ↓yeah compe[titions]
```

In the above extract, the teacher specifies the trouble source by using the DIU as a repair initiation in line 8. Here, the teacher partially repeats the student's answer *"more"* with rising intonation and also

| International Science and Technology Journal المجلة الدولية للعلوم والتقنية | العدد Volume32 المجلد Part 2 يوليو July 2023 | ISTJ |

تم استلام الورقة بتاريخ: 2 /7 / 2023م   وتم نشرها على الموقع بتاريخ: 31 / 7 / 2023م

by stressing the word which gives an indication to the student that a repair is required. Although, the student does initiate repair in line 4 by searching for the correct word, he fails to pronounce it correctly, even in line 7. Moreover, what the S4 turns show us is that his production of turns, with the along of stretching and struggling pronunciation, aims to achieve throughout "try makers" (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979). This action is recognised by the teacher who instantly delivers repair. In the meantime, the responses which are provided by S4 in lines 4 and 7 are not the expected answers. The teacher withholds the repair by giving a chance for the student to do so in line 9 where there is a 0.2 second pause. Meanwhile, S4 gives the correct answer in line 10 although there are some cut offs and some marks of disfluency but the teacher considers his response as accepted where the teacher repeats the student answer for acknowledging that it is the desirable response as in line 11, followed by the student's confirmation line 12 *"yeah compe[titions]"* showing emphasis and agreement.

4.1.6 Alternative Questions

A strategy used by the teacher, which was also prevalent in my data, is "alternative questions", as stated by Wong and Waring (2010, p. 259).The teacher formulates his/her initiation by applying an alternative question. The first alternative marks the trouble source and the second offers a candidate correction.

Extract 6 [AE:TST]

```
1 S1: if err i if I ↑had gone to scho[ol
2 S2: [had gone to school
3 T:→ ↑if I↑ had or hadn't↓ =
4 S1: = if I [had
5 S2: = if I [hadn't
6 T:→ if(.)I hadn't okay ↓
7 S1: yeah (0.1) can I
```

As shown in the extract, the teacher uses a repair initiator through an alternative question. Here, the teacher uses an *"if"* conditional

clause to target the trouble source and the solution to the problem at the same turn, making it much easier to pick the correct response. The student in line 5 accepts the correction by repeating the negative form "*if I [hadn't*". We can see the turns run smoothly with no gaps or silences, which gives an indication that using such a practice does facilitate responses.

4.2 Non-specific Repair Initiation

This technique is used where the teacher may not specify the trouble in detail or, locate the item to be repaired. This is due to the message not being clear and the teacher having some sort of difficulties, either through hearing or understanding the student responses. Therefore, the teacher hypothetically targets any part of the students' previous utterance. I also show how such techniques have an impact on the students' responses in the following sequence.

4.2.1 Asking for Repetition

The following example shows how the teacher initiates repair through asking the student to repeat his/her utterance.

Extract 7 [AE:TST]
```
1 S9: I say the immigration to the city and
decreasing food supply
2 T: → say that again
3 S9: immigration to the city
4 T: ↑yep
5 S9: and decreasing food supply
6 T: ↓good (.) (Kevin [ ] )
```

In the above extract, the teacher initiates repair by targeting the trouble without identifying which part of the student talk needs to be repaired. In line 2 the teacher produces *"say that again"* indicating that s/he is having difficulty in understanding the student's response. Here the student must initiate repair to the previous utterance and in line 3, the student repeats his response by reformulating and re-framing his answer more clearly. Although the teacher has not specified the trouble source, the student gives a

response in line 3, followed by a positive acknowledgement token from the teacher *"↑yep"* showing agreement.

4.2.2 Open Class Repair

"Open class repair" (Drew, 1997) initiators are often considered the weakest category of initiators. Such techniques do not specify the nature of the problem (hearing, understanding or both) for instance, "Huh?", "sorry?", "pardon"? (Drew, 1997). In the following example, the teacher uses *"pardon"* as a repair initiator. In this part of the lesson, the teacher and the student work in pairs, rewriting sentences using synonyms and their own words. This practice is a writing activity.

Extract 8 [AE:TST]
```
1 S2: he can see now (0.4) er: he he can
er::
2 1.5) can we say nowadays=
3 T:→ =↑pardon
4 S2:→ can we say nowadays er: the woman
(1.3)
5 S2 er: (0.8) balanced (.) the man fo-
different works=
6 T: =good don't forget your little words in
between
7 so: the woman is ↓balanced=
8 S2: =yep is balanced
```

From the above extract, the teacher identifies trouble with an open class initiator *"↑pardon"* in line 3, and this is taken up by the student offering a chance to reformulate her/his grammar. 'Pardon' may possibly mean that the trouble-source involves an issue (without necessarily specifically indicating what or where it is) and can thus be heard as an invitation to repeat some part, or whole elements, of an utterance. Here, S2 repeats and reformulates his response thus making it more comprehensible. He repeats some components of his opinion and also restates his original word order and verb form.

Although the teacher initiates another repair in line 6 *"don't forget your little words in between"*, the teacher accepts the students' answer by providing a positive assessment *"good"*. In the following turn, the teacher gives the correct version (in line 7), and the student repeats the teacher's contribution. A justification for the reformulation may be that "open class repairs" are used to consider that the entire of the preceding turn in somehow is problematic (Drew, 1997). The student, as a result, orients to teacher's targeting of the trouble with potentially any component or part of her turn in lines 1 & 2. Previous studies have demonstrated that open-class repair initiators are often heard as indicating an issue in hearing (Drew, 1997), presumably they are following the norms of ordinary conversation.

4.2.3 Immediate Repair

Another strategy that the teacher is using when initiating repair is directly repairing the problem in the student response. Seedhouse (1997) suggested that this direct approach to "error correction" is preferred by teachers because it is less time consuming. Moreover, this strategy is known also as "corrective recasts" (Hauser, 2005) or corrective feedback (Lee ,2013) which replaces the learner's error with the accurate linguistic form (McHoul, 1990). Within the CA agenda, the concepts of "corrective feedback" or "corrective recasts" constitute the notion of repair (Wong & Waring, 2010). The following example shows how the teacher directly initiates repair of the students' response in the third turn. In other words, the teacher supplies a correct form in place of the erroneous form:

Extract 9 [AE: TST]
```
1 T: Think about good ↑presentation skills↓
2 S2: ↑ice contact=
3 T: =↑eye contact↓=
4 S2: ↑=eye contact↓
```

It is obvious from the extract the teacher in line 3 quickly initiates repair through recasting the student's contribution with high

intonation and stress indicating emphasis. In this extract, the student rapidly initiates a repair in the following sequence by repeating the teacher's feedback. Moreover, the student does the repair without being asked by the teacher to do so. It can be noticed that the sequence of talk is allowed with no interruption or overlapping by the teacher. This technique perhaps the simplest and quickest repair procedure, however, it does not give the student the chance to self-repair. The teacher quickly inserts the correction without interfering with the flow of the student's talk, instead of stimulating or waiting for the student to initiate self-repair (Wong Waring, 2010). The teacher should be aware of initiating repair directly since this may lead to minimising the student's involvement in speaking. Meanwhile, the teacher needs to maintain the flow of the conversation (Walsh, 2006).

4.2.4 Embedded Correction

Unlike the previous extract, where the teacher initiates repair directly in the next turn correction, teachers may instead initiate repair indirectly. The following type of initiation repair technique used by the teacher is called "embedded correction" (Jefferson, 1987; Seedhouse, 2004c). "Embedded correction" (Jefferson, 1987), means when a speaker slips in a correction, and the recipient corrects the trouble in passing, without disrupting the progression of talk. The embedded repair refers to initiating a repair in a latent manner. This is done by the recipient in the second turn without discontinuing the ongoing talk (Wong & Waring, 2010).

Extract 17 [AE:TST]
```
1 T: (1) unemployment for British people=
2 S6: [yes] unemployment ratio would be
↓decre- err an
3 increase=
4 S6: [yes]
5 T =yes alright (.) because a lot >of the
people<
6 who come to work here=
```

تم استلام الورقة بتاريخ: 2/ 7 /2023م   وتم نشرها على الموقع بتاريخ: 31 / 7 / 2023م

```
7 S6: =competition on their ( )=
8 T: =they are happy to work for ↓what (.5)
9 [((muffled background talking))
10 S6: [lesser salaries]
11 T: [↓right (.) lower wages (.)] yes okay
(2)-
12 CAN that have an ↑effect on British
↑people's
13 ↑wages also=
14 S6: =yeah=
15 T: =yeah=
```

In the above extract. It is noticeable that the teacher in line 11 gives "*[right*" as confirmation he acknowledges and understands the student's response yet he still initiates repair on the linguistic items embedded in his response. The teacher produces the repair by giving alternative corrections, for *"lesser"* which he replaces with "*lower*" and *"salaries"* with *"wages"*. After a micro pause, the teacher produces an evaluation through an affirmative response *"yes"* and an acknowledgement token *"Okay"* indicating closing and moving on to another question. All this work embeds the repair within the natural flow of talk (Nakamura, 2008)."Embedded correction" (Jefferson, 1987), are similar to reformulation and recasting, however, it has been identified as a confusing and unclear correction technique in the (SLA) Literature (Wong & Waring, 2010). This is despite the fact that, in some cases, it enables the student to participate without halting him/her speaking.

Nevertheless, the student may not realize that he has made a mistake, and the student may have no clue that the remedy has occurred, which may have a critical effect on his learning. Furthermore, in the above extract, the teacher initiates repair blatantly, seemingly it does not inhibit or obstruct the continuation of the student's response. For illustration, the teacher overlapped with the student's response and even though he produced an affirmative token and the acknowledgement token *"yes okay (2)"*,

following the (2.0) seconds pause, there is no self-selection from the student, leaving the turn to the teacher, and thus, the teacher needs to self-select as a next speaker, through initiating another interrogative question. What is interesting is that the teacher accepts his answer by acknowledgement token *"right"* evaluation, although the student's response carries a linguistic error. It seems that the teacher passes the inadequate response when it focuses on meaning or vocabulary, since it sounds understandable, however, when the practice is focused on form or grammar, the teacher uses a wide range of strategies in elicitation and hinting to the student to achieve the target answer. These finding supports (Seedhouse, 2004c) opinions.

5. Discussion

The analysis has shown different techniques used by the teachers to target the trouble source and elicit a variety of repair solutions resulting from the students' responses. The study found that teachers in this specific context (PSP) used specific and non-specific repair initiations for targeting the trouble source and for encouraging the student to self-repair. It was found that in specific repair initiation the teacher precisely locates the trouble source in the student's response and the student initiates self-repair in the next turn, by giving recurrently a non-elaborate response. Whereas, in non-specified repair initiators, the student is invited to initiate repair with a more elaborate response. This is because non-specified repair does not pinpoint a particular word or phrase to be repaired but invites reformulation of the entire answer. With regards to sequential structure, the teacher used these strategies in the third turn of the sequence.

The results demonstrates that the teacher uses specific repair initiators through: a) wh- interrogatives b) partial repetition c) designedly incomplete utterances d) alternative questions.The findings revealed that the teachers use other strategies in initiation repair such as immediate repair, embedded correction and teachers inviting other students to initiate repair.

Such strategies are significant in facilitating student involvement and keeping the channels open.Furthermore, it was found that with regards to their sequential position, other initiations of repair are regularly found in the third turn of the three-part sequence. This means that their occurrence shows, there is a concurrent relation between repair and the three-part sequence (Ebshiania,2019). The analysis provides fresh insight into the recurrent activities that occur in the third turn, which regularly include repair initiation. These initiations are manifested through several resources, for instance, cluing and prompting in the form of checking confirmation or seeking information. This finding supports Macbeth's (2004) views, on repair and its relevance throughout the sequence.An interesting finding was the use of intonation accompanied with some of these repair strategies. These repair initiators function as a resource in pinpointing where the trouble source is located in the student's response and intonation seemed to play a key part in enhancing this function. For example, the teacher initiates repair through raising her tone, inviting student self-repair as in extract5line 8 *"↑more"* and as in the DIU strategy. In line with Koshik (2002,p 289), "DIU are merely one in a series of practices that combine to assist the student in making the correction". Combined with the teacher's rise and fall in tone, DIUs are utilized to elicit and to prompt the student to self-repair and give the exact desirable response.

The results also show that the teacher's initiation of repair can be delayed (Wong, 2000) or the teacher withholds his correction. In other words, the teacher pauses before initiating repair as a signal to give the student a chance for correcting or self-repairing, this is done through silences or pauses, which are produced after a possible completion of a TCU in the next turn as in extract2 line 7 (0.5 seconds).It is clear from the analysis that the organization of repair in this specific classroom have shown some similarities from conversational repair in its basic or original organisation, particularly with respect to the types of repair initiators. For instance, the teacher may use "open class repair" (Drew, 1997), such initiators were found in the data, for instance, *"say that again"* or

International Science and Technology Journal
المجلة الدولية للعلوم والتقنية

Volume32 العدد
المجلد Part 2
يوليو July 2023

ISTJ المجلة الدولية للعلوم والتقنية
International Science and Technology Journal

تم استلام الورقة بتاريخ: 2/ 7 /2023م   وتم نشرها على الموقع بتاريخ: 31 / 7 /2023م

"pardon" or *"sorry I didn't quite hear"*. These repair strategies are appropriate for clarification requests or asking for repetition. Such strategies function as elicitations and call for the repetition or reformulation of any or all elements of the student's prior utterance. In non-specific repair initiation such as when the teacher has asked the student for repetition as in extracts 7, the student is encouraged to self-repair using a more elaborate response. In this case, the student has to repeat and reformulate the whole trouble source. As a result, this leads to sequence expansion and encourages students' participation in the following turn. Teachers' repair initiation is important to the learning process, because it is the place where the teachers direct the students to self-repair and thus, to participate. In other words, it is in this environment where the teacher and the students' meaning is being negotiated. This finding support existing views (Wong, 2010; Walsh, 2011) which suggest that negotiation of meaning provide learners with intelligible input which create an opportunity for language learning. These repair techniques are important resources for both the teacher and the students.In line with the previous studies that demonstrate that open-class repair initiators are often understood as indicating a hearing problem (Drew 1997), I can presume they are agreeing with the norms of ordinary conversation.However, the conclusion, to be drawn from the teachers' repair practices in the present data is that teachers more clearly initiate repair on the students' talk than in everyday conversation. The analysis shows that OISR is prevalent, which is accomplished after the teachers pinpoint the trouble on the student's responses. This happens through a wide range of techniques with some specifying the trouble source and others not.

6. Conclusion
In conclusion, the current paper has shown different techniques used by the teachers to target the trouble source and elicit a variety of repair solutions resulting from the student's responses. It was found that teachers in this specific context used specific and non-specific repair initiations for targeting the trouble source and for encouraging

the student to self-repair. It was found that in specific repair initiation the teacher precisely locates the trouble source in the student's response and the student initiates self-repair in the next turn, by giving recurrently a non-elaborate response. Whereas, in non-specified repair initiators, the student is invited to initiate repair with a more elaborate response. This is because non-specified repair does not pinpoint a particular word or phrase to be repaired, but invites reformulation of the entire answer. With regards to sequential structure, the teacher used these strategies in the third turn of the sequence. This study offers a contribution to the area of repair organization in instructional talk by examining the machinery of repair in adult EFL learners. Also, the analysis of these repair initiations can provide language teachers with a better understanding of how teachers target the trouble source through specific repair initiation and non-specific repair initiation in order to encourage the student to self-repair. The analysis provides fresh insight into the recurrent activities that occur in the third turn, which regularly includes repair initiation.

7. References

  American journal of sociology, 97(5), 1295- 1345.

Dippold, D. (2014). "That's Wrong": Repair and Rapport in Culturally Diverse Higher Education Classrooms. *The Modern Language Journal, 98*(1), 402-416.

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

Drew, P. (2005). Conversation analysis. In In K.L.Fitch& R. Saunders (Eds) (Ed.), *Handbook of language and social interaction* (pp. 71-102). Mahwah,NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ebshaina, A. (2019). Investigating Three-part Sequence in Classroom interaction: A Case study of Pre-Sessional Program (PSP) as English for Academic Purposes (EAP) University

---

Classroom. PhD dissertation. University of Huddersfield, Huddersfield.

Gardner, R. (2013). Conversation analysis in the classroom. In J. -S. a. T. Stivers (Ed.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 593-611): Wiley-Blackwell.

Hutchby, I., &Wooffitt, R. (1998). Conversation Analysis: Principles, practice and applications. *Cambridge, England: Polity*.

Hutchby, I., &Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis* (2nd ed.) ed.). Cambridge:Polity.

Kasper, G. (1985). Repair in foreign language teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7*(02), 200-215.

Kendrick, K. H. (2015). Other-initiated repair in English. *Open Linguistics, 1*(1), 164- doi:10.2478/opli-2014-0009 190

Kitzinger, C. (2013). Repair. In I. J. S. T. Stivers (Ed.), *the handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 229–256.). Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Ko, S. (2013). *Understanding the dynamics of classroom communication: 1. publ*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.

Koshik, I. (2002b). Designedly Incomplete Utterances: A Pedagogical Practice for Eliciting Knowledge Displays in Error Correction Sequences. *Research on Language & Social Interaction, 35*(3), 277-309. doi:10.1207/S15327973RLSI3503_2.

learning. *Language teaching, 38*(4), 165-187.

Linguistics, 21(2),244-267.

McHoul, A. W. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in Society, 19*(03), 349-377.

Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. A. (1979). Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. *by UtaQuasthoff*.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation.

International Science and
Technology Journal
المجلة الدولية للعلوم والتقنية

Volume32 العدد
المجلد **Part 2**
July 2023 يوليو

المجلة الدولية للعلوم والتقنية
International Science and Technology Journal
ISTJ

تم استلام الورقة بتاريخ: 2/ 7 /2023م   وتم نشرها على الموقع بتاريخ: 31 / 7 / 2023م

Schegloff. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction* (Vol. 1).
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seedhouse, P. (2004a). Conversation analysis methodology.
Language Learning, 54(S1), 1-54. doi:10.1111/j.1467-
9922.2004.00268.x.

Seedhouse, P. (2004b). *The Interactional Architecture of the
Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective*
(Vol. 54). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Seedhouse, P. (2004c). The organization of repair in language
classrooms. *Language Learning, 54*(S1), 141-180.

Seedhouse, P. (2005a). Conversation analysis and language

Sidnell, J., &Stivers, T. (2012). *The handbook of conversation
analysis* (Vol. 121). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Sidnell, J., &Stivers, T. (2013). *The handbook of conversation
analysis* (Vol. 1). Oxford:

Terzi, C. (2010). Preferred initiation-repair mechanisms in EFL
classrooms. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 9*,
776- 782. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.12.233.

Walsh, S. (2011a). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in
action*: Taylor & Francis.

Walsh, S. (2011b). *Exploring classroom discourse: language in
action*. London: Routledge.

Wong, J. (2000). Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/non-
native speaker English conversation. *Applied*

Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation analysis and
second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers*:
Routledge.