Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics (*IJAL*)

Vol. 20, No. 1, March 2017, 151-184

Organizational Patterns of English Language Teachers' Repair Practices

Fatemeh Mozaffari, *Yazd University, Yazd, Iran*
Hamid Allami*, *Yazd University, Yazd, Iran*

Abstract

Despite the abundance of research on teachers' repair practices in language classroom interaction, there are not enough conversation analytic studies on repair organization with the focus on the details of interaction in the context of EFL. Drawing on sociocultural and situated learning theories, this study explores the contingent nature of English language teachers' organizational patterns of repair practices (repair focus, repair completion, repair trajectory and convergence) by adopting the context-dependency of repair as a point of departure. More specifically, we analyzed two classroom interactional contexts: form-oriented and meaning-oriented contexts as well as their realization in student participation. Data were collected through video- and audio-tape recordings of 14 lessons from eight EFL teachers at four private language institutes in Iran and they were analyzed based on the framework of conversation analysis methodology. The analysis of lesson transcripts indicated that the teachers varied in their repair practices; however, an organizational repair pattern emerged from the data. The analysis of qualitative data revealed that the teachers largely repaired divergently in form-oriented contexts but convergently in meaning-oriented contexts, and deployed other-repair more than self-repair. The pedagogical implications of the study are for language teachers' awareness of the role of repair organization in facilitating learning opportunities and for teachers' professional development.

Keywords: Conversation analysis; Organizational pattern of repair practices; Other-repair; Self-repair; Form-oriented and meaning-oriented contexts; Context convergence and divergence

Article Information:

Received: 21 July 2016 Revised: 28 January 2017 Accepted: 9 February 2017

Corresponding author: Department of English Language and Literature, Yazd University, Yazd, Iran Email address: hallami@yazd.ac.ir

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

1. Introduction

Within the frameworks of sociocultural (Donato, 2000; Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1985) and situated learning theories (Lave & Wenger, 1991), learning is conceptualized as participation rather than acquisition and is co-constructed in interaction. Teacher-student interaction, thus, may impact students' engagement and active participation as there is a relationship between teachers' interactional practices and learning opportunities (Walsh, 2006). One aspect of these practices in English language classrooms, apart from turn-taking and sequencing practices, is repair practices which refer to the various ways of addressing problems in speaking, hearing, or understanding of the talk (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977) and even correcting errors.

Second language acquisition (SLA) research seems to have addressed corrective feedback more than repair (see recent reviews and meta-analyses, e.g., Li, 2010; Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2012; Nassaji, 2015). According to Hall (2007, p. 511), 'correction is a particular type of repair in which errors are replaced with what is correct'. SLA studies on classroom repair/correction have basically suggested repair taxonomies or supported the efficacy of some repair types over the others (Loewen, 2011; Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Several repair types extensively investigated include explicit and implicit recast, prompt, clueing, clarification request, direct repair, scaffolding repair, collaborative repair, code switching repair, peer repair, and exposed and embedded repair. Repair, however, is a highly complicated phenomenon. Recently, conversation analytic (CA) studies of pedagogic repair have appeared in the SLA research, offering more powerful tools for the analysis of organizational patterns of repair practices in second language (L2) pedagogy and SLA research.

Conversational repair and classroom correction/repair are two different, but cooperating organizations (Macbeth, 2004). Repair and correction are

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

resources for dealing with trouble sources, whether the participant's orientation is toward a common understanding or toward correction. Given this, pedagogical repair refers to 'repair practices that address problems of comprehension and production in learning contexts' and it is other-initiated by the teacher or peers in order to facilitate the learning task (Wong & Waring, 2010, p. 252). Thus, in second language classrooms, repair as the umbrella term is done to clear up both form-related and linguistic problems (pronunciation, lexicon, syntax, or discourse errors) and meaning-related problems (problems of fact, content, or conversational problems).

Some valuable findings from CA studies on pedagogical repair practices include 'designedly incomplete utterance' which refers to an incomplete utterance that prompts the student to complete (Koshik, 2002, p. 277) and the use of 'alternative-question repair, where the question exhibits a preference for one alternative over the other' (Koshik, 2005, p. 203). The main contribution of CA-informed studies to pedagogical repair is the analysis of organizational patterns of repair practices. Schegloff et al. (1977, p. 361) analyzed the organization of repair in terms of (a) its position in relation to an initial trouble source or repairable; (b) who initiates repair, the current speaker (self) or the interlocutor (other)—and who completes it (self or other); and (c) whether a repair effort is successful or unsuccessful.

Therefore, the three essential components for repair organization comprise trouble, initiation and completion (Schegloff et al., 1977) resulting in four repair trajectories: self-initiated self-repair (SISR), self-initiated other-repair (SIOR), other-initiated self-repair (OISR), and other-initiated other-repair (OIOR). Studies of repair show that the preferred type in ordinary conversation is self-repair (Markee, 2000; Schegloff et al., 1977), whereas in classroom interaction, other-repair is more common (Macbeth, 2004; McHoul, 1990).

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

Preferences and dispreferences for specific repair organizations depend on the configuration of different factors among which the pedagogical purpose of the interactional context has turned out to be the decisive factor (Seedhouse, 2004). Classroom interactional contexts refer to different activity types in oral classroom interaction. Each context consists of a specific pedagogic goals and specific interactive practices. Seedhouse (2004) characterized four contexts: form and accuracy, meaning and fluency, task-oriented, and procedural contexts. He contextualized specific repair practices according to the pedagogical focus in which it occurs in terms of: (a) participants in the repair, (b) repair trajectories, (c) types of repair, and (d) focus of repair (p. 142). Seedhouse (1997) focused on repair organization in accuracy contexts and found that teachers shy away from performing direct and overt negative evaluation of learners' linguistic errors.

Walsh (2006) identified four contexts calling them modes: managerial, materials, skills and systems, and classroom context modes. According to him, a teacher's use of language including repair practices may be context convergent (where pedagogic goals and language use coincide) facilitating learning opportunities, or context divergent (where pedagogic goals and language use do not coincide) hindering learning opportunities. Unlike an evaluative approach to repair in which feedback in the third move of Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) exchange takes an evaluative role (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975), in a context-based approach, repair is organized differently within each interactional context (Jung, 1999; Kasper, 1985; McHoul, 1990; Seedhouse, 2004; Van Lier, 1988).

CA can show how teachers' repair practices can facilitate or inhibit the opportunities for student participation and learning in each context by analyzing the contingent engagement of the participants, as situated in the minute details of interaction (Hellerman, 2009; Nakamura, 2008; Schegloff

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

et al., 1977; Seedhouse, 2004; Walsh, 2006). There is a growing body of research in SLA field that has cumulatively built contributed to a more comprehensive understanding of how repair work is accomplished in L2 classroom interaction. However, there are not enough CA studies on repair organization in the context of EFL to take into account the details of interaction in Iranian contexts.

The purpose of the present study was to explore the nature of Iranian EFL teachers' repair practices and students' learning opportunities and to identify any organizational patterns for the wide range of practices teachers are engaged in to contingently treat problematic learner contributions. To this, we took the context-dependency of repair as a point of departure for further deliberating the pedagogical values of different repair practices by teachers. The two essential classroom contexts explored were form-oriented context where the lesson focuses on formal correctness and meaning-oriented contexts which give learners opportunities for expressing their ideas fluently. Repair was taken in this paper in its generic sense including the correction of errors, though in L2 classroom, the focus is generally on error correction because this phenomenon occurs more frequently.

We drew on sociocultural theory and situated learning theory to examine the significant role of teacher as the more knowledgeable person in a community of practice and to analyze language learning opportunities as the change in participation from peripheral participation to fuller participation. Pedagogical activities or contexts that provide access and encourage engagement across repair sequences, especially opportunities for self-repair, are considered beneficial to learning. In this study, participation is thus dealt with as situated practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) based on which the participants' orientation to the contingent features of discourse might be considered as the evidence of learning opportunities. The study set out to answer the following questions:

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

1. In what way are language teachers' repair practices and organizations, in oral classroom interaction, context convergent and divergent (i.e., the repair practices fit with the context)?
2. What is the nature of language teachers' repair practices and their manifestations on learning opportunities across form-oriented and meaning-oriented contexts?

2. Method

2.1 Setting

As part of a larger research project on the nature of repair practices in an EFL context, this study was conducted at four intact private language institutes in two cities in Iran. The context of the study was English classrooms and teacher-student oral interactions at these institutes. Most of the classroom interaction was being situated in traditional whole class contexts. The teaching contexts in these EFL programs involved learners in a wide variety of activities including communicative activities such as summarizing texts and stories, discussing reading and listening materials, performing information gap activities as well as classroom activities with a greater linguistic focus, allowing learners to practice targeted linguistic forms in slightly more structured contexts such as grammar or vocabulary exercises.

2.2 Participants and sampling

Participants of the study were 8 teachers (female=2 and male=6) with an age range of 25 to 40 and 60 students (female=28 & male=32) with an age range of 17 to 30. They were all Persian-L1 speakers. The teachers (indicated by the pseudonyms T1, T2, T3, T4, T5, T6, T7, and T8) varied in their teaching

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

experience (from 8 to 20 years). At the time of the research, four teachers held BA degrees in Teaching English, three MA degrees in the same major, and still another one was working on his MA degree. Apart from their institute teaching experience, two teachers had experienced college teaching and two held elementary and middle school teaching certificates. The student groups were relatively small with class sizes ranging from five to ten students. The types of classes observed varied from pre-intermediate to upper-intermediate levels as evidenced by the institute.

The study stemmed from both purposeful and convenience sampling. The first four teacher participants were chosen purposefully based on their years of teaching experience and their background working with video-recorded teaching. However, like other qualitative studies, our study involved an emergent design continuing to select new cases or teachers as the research unfolded based on the derived patterns from the data. As Glaser and Strauss (1967) highlighted, qualitative sampling should be flexible, ongoing and evolving processes of selecting participants and contexts to test and refine emergent ideas and concepts. Therefore, we added additional participants to finalize the repair patterns found. The remaining teachers, thus, were selected based on convenience sampling which was practical, but not purposive and at the expense of credibility (Miles & Huberman, 1994). We chose the other four willing teachers based on ease of access, time, and video recording circumstances.

2.3 Data collection and analysis

This study was grounded within CA methodology which has the potential to show naturally occurring practices in teacher-student interactions. Data were collected qualitatively through video and audio-tape recording. They were then transcribed and analyzed descriptively and qualitatively. The data

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

consisted of 23 hours of audio- and video-taped EFL classroom interactions from 14 lessons. The equipment was arranged in a way to record all student-teacher interaction; however, it did not capture any student-student interaction.

All 14 recorded lessons were transcribed after being recorded in their entirety according to CA conventions (see the Appendix). The participants were orally asked for permission to videotape and analyze the discourse in their classes. It is to be noted that two students who had not consented were not filmed.

The transcripts along with the recordings were examined within the CA framework (Sidnell & Stivers, 2013; Ten Have, 2007). We focused not only on the sequential organization of repair talk, but also on various nonverbal resources enacted by the participants including gaze, gestures, and body movements. The analysis began with repeated listening and viewing to make initial observations. Then, the cases of repair made in different form-oriented and meaning-oriented contexts were identified and coded as RS1, RS2, etc. (RS: repair sequence). The boundaries of repair sequences were marked by attention to the repairable, repair initiation, and repair completion. Next, a line-by-line CA analysis was conducted for each case.

When a repair sequence was selected for analysis to uncover the participants' own orientations to the repair practices, we characterized the actions in the sequence; examined the action sequence in terms of the organization of turn taking, sequence organization, and repair organization, examined the linguistic forms, and uncovered roles, identities, and relationships (Pomerantz & Fehr, 1997). The empirical tool used for identifying participants' orientations was the 'next-turn proof procedure' (Hutchby & Wooffit, 1998, p. 15; Sacks et al., 1974, p. 728). It refers to the reflexive way in which utterances are combined to form sequences of

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

actions, and how within these sequences, a turn-of-action is contingently built to respond to the previous turns and produces a next action.

The data analysis was unmotivated as the discourse patterns and themes emerged from the data. Finally, following case-by-case consideration, the analysis was extended to multiple extracts in the transcripts which involved comparison of extracts and verification of emergent designs (Silverman, 2005). The contexts analysis of the repair organizations was analyzed based on Schegloff et al. (1977), Seedhouse (2004), and Walsh's (2006) frameworks. The repair sequences were analyzed in terms of these categories for research questions: (a) the repair focus or the repairable; (b) typical repair trajectory (OIOR-ORSR-ORSR-SISR); (c) typical participants in the repair (teacher, current student, or peer); (d) types of repair completion (overt/direct/exposed repair or covert/indirect/embedded repair-delegated repair-didactic repair or conversational repair- form-focused repair or content-focused repair); and (e) context convergence or divergence.

We used these categories based on preferential organization of repair along with participants' own orientations to repair practices based on the pedagogical focus of the interactional context (form- and meaning-orientedness) in which the repair was occurring. The CA notion of preference refers to the 'sequence-and-turn-organizational features of conversation' (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 362). The object of learning for analysis, in this study, was not linguistic competence, but the sequential organization of repair and participation opportunities.

Our claims about learning opportunities, based on the notion of situatedness and participation, were grounded in the actual data through analyzing the moment-by-moment contingent talk within CA framework (Lee, 2010). Contingency refers to 'A quality of interaction in which the design of each turn is thoroughly dependent upon and responsive to its prior

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

turn.' (Wong & Waring, 2010, p. 290). We, in particular, drew on several sources of evidence, used by CA analysts, from the surrounding talk for developing our analysis which included (a) the subsequent talk in the next turn, (b) co-occurring talk within the same turn, (c) identifying alternate practices, (d) using comparison, (e) basing the evidence on nonverbal conduct, and (f) looking at the position and composition of the repair practice (Sidnell & Stivers, 2013, p. 82).

As is common for qualitative studies on classroom interaction, it was not possible, or desirable, to control for variables since the observations were naturalistic. However, in order to strengthen the credibility or validation of data collection and analysis, two lessons of almost each teacher were observed to make up natural data without informing the participant teachers regarding the specific focus of the study. Moreover, rich, thick, qualitative descriptions including information on the sample, the selection process, contextual descriptions, methods of data collection, detailed notes, recordings, videotapes, and other descriptive material were provided in the study report to explicate how repair issue worked in particular instances which warrants the validity of the analysis and allows transferability (Creswell, 2007). Furthermore, in regard to the dependability of the results, good-quality recording and transcription were obtained. Moreover, coding was done without setting any presupposed patterns and intrarater coding interrater agreement was applied which is a code–recode strategy (Silverman, 2005).

3. Results and Discussion

We approach the results and discussion in two stages, beginning with general organizational patterns of repair practices and then presenting the analysis of several lesson extracts. In the following section, several themes

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

or patterns emerged from the data and the analysis are set out for presentation in terms of three categories.

3.1. General organizational patterns of repair practices

3.1.1. Repair focus

In form-oriented contexts, nearly all teachers reacted to all types of linguistic errors including errors of syntax, lexis, phonology, and discourse. However, the most frequent type of repair focus or repairable in these 14 lessons was grammatical errors. Pronunciation errors were the second category. The least frequent ones were vocabulary or lexical errors and discourse errors. Several teachers, like T1 for example, repaired grammar or structural errors a lot, even the learner utterances which were entirely correct in linguistic terms, whereas others like T4 was more attentive to lexical errors. As an illustration, take the following transcript in which T1's pedagogical focus is to get the learners to produce a specific string of linguistic forms. Even though the answer which L6 produces is linguistically correct, the teacher initiates repair in the next line which involves repeating the words which the learner used immediately prior to the error, *people's accent.*

1 L6: what I generally notice (.) is their accent.
2 T1: what I generally notice is people's? (.) accent.

In meaning-oriented contexts, reacting to content problems was more frequent. Linguistic errors were repaired extensively; however, they were largely ignored as well to create grounds for more meaningful and genuine conversations.

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

3.1.2. Repair completion type

The range of divergent and convergent repair completion types are shown in Table 1. The table shows that when the pedagogical focus was on accuracy, other-repair types with reduced wait-time were generally more predominate than self-repair ones while students need opportunities for self-repair or 'fuller participation' (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 29). Furthermore, there was a rather strong tendency toward avoiding negative feedback or correction and using vague implicit repair. Take the following extract from T8's lesson to illustrate these points.

1	T:	what other jobs do you think that hm we will not
2		be doing in 50 years?
3		(5.0)
4	L3:→	hm (.) hm people working in hm factory hm don't work.
5	T:	because of?
6	T:	they will not be working in factories. why?
7	L3:→	of use-of use (.) of use-will have used robots.
8	T:	ah. you mean that because they will use robots, =

Here the aim is eliciting the production of different future tenses. However, this teacher performs a great deal of interactional work to avoid direct and overt negative evaluation of learner linguistic errors by using implicit repairs in lines 6 and 8. A similar result had been reported by Seedhouse (1997). Teachers may be influenced by what would constitute an appropriate course of action outside the classroom where overt correction might be considered less acceptable (Walsh, 2006) or teachers may seem to believe overt and explicit correction is 'face-threatening' (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 67).

Despite these practices, some convergent repair practices including encouraging peer, collaborative, explanation, clueing, prompting and

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

steering repair were found effective. In meaning-oriented contexts, in contrast, other-repair on form and content troubles, especially in the form of direct repair was the basic type used. Direct repair involves a short, quick correction, and is a useful interactional strategy since it has minimal impact on the exchange structure (Walsh, 2002, 2006).

Another repair completion type applied convergently was clarification request repair which is a wh-question initiating and prompting message or content without implying that an error has occurred like what is found in ordinary conversation (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). We have found clarification request repair more effective for meaning-oriented contexts, whereas Ding (2012) found it effective for form-oriented contexts. The reason for this discrepancy is that Ding defined clarification request in reference to the well-formedness of the linguistic form while we defined it in reference to the content.

Table 1

The range of teacher practices for repair completion

Form-oriented Context	**Convergent practices** • Explicit recast more than implicit recast • collaborative, clueing, prompting, peer and gestured-repair
	Divergent practices • Other-repair types more than self-repair types • Avoiding negative and direct feedback • Vague repair • Reduced wait time for self-repair
Meaning-oriented context	**Convergent practices** • Other repair more than self-repair • Embedded repair more than exposed repair • Direct repair
	Divergent practices • Negative feedback on linguistic trouble • Exposed repair

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

3.1.3. Repair trajectory

In form-oriented contexts, in relation to linguistic errors, OIOR occurred more than OISR in all teachers' lessons. Waring (2015) considered other-initiated self-repair as a learning activity that promotes 'self-discovery' and as one which may be inhibited or retarded by other-repair. Unlike Waring's data, in our data, only T2 and T3 deployed a lot of OISR which is convergent to form-oriented contexts. Several factors may explain the frequency of other-repair in this study context. One is the lack of time to elicit self-repair by the learner as shown in Extract 2. Another factor could be the teacher's teaching experience leading to the use or non-use of 'delayed correction' (Rolin-Ianziti, 2010). For example, T2 in this study had the most experience of all and he was among those teachers that elicited self-repair or peer-repair, probably to facilitate learning opportunities.

In meaning-oriented contexts, teachers used OIOR more than OISR. The latter type was basically done on content rather than form which is convergent to this context. Teachers used other-initiations of repair by supplying hints and prompts possibly to foster student independence and encourage pupils to think for themselves and to involve learners in participation (Vygotsky, 1978).

3.2 Data analysis of extracts

In what follows, we offer an analytical account of how such concerns discussed above were managed in the details of classroom interaction.

3.2. 1 Form-oriented context

Extract 1 illustrates a writing review session in which T2 and the learners are identifying form-related problem areas in one student's writing. This is

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

an illustrative exemplar of repair as a co-constructed activity replete with OISR and negotiation (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994; Nassaji, 2015; Walsh, 2006) and thus interactional opportunities which all appear to be context convergent. That is, this teacher's repair practices do coincide with the activity that is going on.

Extract 1

1	T:	ok next paper? ((to L5))
2		((L5 gives a copy of his writing to the T))
3		((T reads)) In the name of God. The thirty-nine steps.
4	L5:	((starts reading)) Richard Hamilton have tired from a boring life
5		in big flat in the London. Then decided came back to Africa.
6		((incorrect pronunciation of "Africa"))
7	T:	problems?
8	L7:→	then decided.=
9	L2:→	=then he decided.
10	L7:→	from a boring life or the boring life? ((to T))
11	L6:	a boring. ((to T))
12	T:	the boring life.
13	LL:	the boring.
14	T:	((to class)) ok. another problem?
15	L7:→	((gaze to L5)) in a big flat.
16	L2:→	Landon. London. ((to T))
17	L6:→	decided to come? ((to T))
18	T:→	it's not *the* London. London. L-O-N-D-O-N.
19	L6:→	then decided to come back.
20	T:→	then decided to come back yes. or to go back because
21		the tense is past, We'd better say go back.
22	L5:	we can use retun?
23	T:	huh?
24		((raises his eyebrows, and opens his eyes wider maintaining his
25		eye gaze))
26	L5:	retun.
27	L6:→	return.
28	T:→	return to Africa. Ok. another problem?
29		Richard Hamilton have tired? What do you mean by that?
30	L7:	*khaste shodeh bood.* ((to T)) (she was tired)
31	L6:	*khaste bood.* ((to T)) (she was tired)
32	L7:→	have been tired.
33	T:	was tired.

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

L7 locates an error in L5' prior turn (line 8), and another learner, L2, in a latched turn, corrects the problematic utterance. L2's orientation displays an emerging understanding of the need for a subject pronoun and its use in the context. Without any pause, L7 initiates repair in the subsequent line again, in the format of 'an alternative question', *from a boring life or the boring life?* (Koshik, 2005, p. 203) and looks at the teacher for confirmation. A peer (L6 in line 11) provides an option which receives T2's other-repair in the form of scaffolding repair, *the boring life.*

The teacher's request for identification of more errors receives three answers. First, L7's treatment of L5's *in a big flat*, as a trouble source in line 15, does not get a response either by the teacher or by the others. The reason may be that L7's repair initiation is not correct. Second, L2 in line 16 notices a spelling error (*Landon*) and L6 in line 17 another grammatical error (*decided to come?*) by offering completion and checking for confirmation in which both repairs receive T's confirmation plus more explanation and extra repair respectively. Here, the teacher tries to 'manage the competing voices' by reacting to the repair initiations in order (Waring, 2013).

In line 22, L5 asks, *can we use retun?* Teacher's *huh?* in response is accompanied by two gestures. The gestures not only ask for repetition to provide a chance for self-correction. After a two-second silence, L5 repeats the verb softly which may show his doubt about the correctness of the verb (line 27); however, his repetition of the word is still problematic. L6 and T2 replace the incorrect word with *return*. The teacher's *huh?* is one of the 'open class repair initiators' (Drew, 1997; Schegloff, 1997) which here signals a problem with hearing or understanding. L6's response to the teacher's 'huh' shows which action it establishes. L6' s 'return' may establish the teacher's 'huh' as a rejection of L5's offer as incomplete and L6's 'return' offer the correct version of the word. Teacher's repetition in

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

line 29 acknowledges L6's contribution as correct, and the search for errors continues.

In the last repair sequence (lines 28-34), we see the teacher's clarification request on form, *what do you mean by that?* which leads to two code switching repairs and a repair completion option. Throughout this piece, learners self-select, do self-repair, ask the teacher for confirmation, and do repair collaboratively. These are all features which are common to form-oriented contexts and are preferred repair practices (Young & Miller, 2004). Collaborative repair found in this lesson may echo observations made by Iles (1996).

By contrast, Extract 2 below showcases another teacher (T1) whose repair practices and the pedagogic aim do not coincide. The class is working on practicing cleft sentences. Here we can see how the teacher abstains from encouraging self-repair which is convergent with form-oriented contexts for the purpose of facilitating participation.

Extract 2

1	T:	So these sentence are called cleft sentences. Now you have got
2		eight sentences, to change into cleft sentence structure.
3		ok number one you? ((to L7))
4		((reads from book)) I generally listen to their accent. =
5	L7:→	=what I generally
6	(0.4)	
7	T:	=what I generally notice? (0.2) About people?
8		Different structures you learnt. Shahrooz, you? ((to L6))
9	(0.2)	
10	L6:→	what I generally notice is their accent.
11	T:	what I generally notice is people's? (.) [accent.]
12	LL:	[accent.]
13	T:	and number three, Vesal? = ((to L2))
14	L2:→	=what I look at first is=

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

15	T:	=what I? =
16	L2:	=look. =
17	T:	=look first is their [eyes.]
18	LL:	[eyes]
19	T:	number four?
20	L1:	look, 'look' don't need proposition?
21	T:	yeah you can add 'at' both.
22		And Sara you? ((to L3))
23	L3:→	>what I ask about (0.3) their (0.4) ask there- is about habits
24		and hobbies<
25	T:	so what I ask first is about their hobbies and interests.
26		Five, Vesal? ((to L2))
27	L2:→	what pay atten::tion what↑ I first=
28	T:	=((reads)) so I pay attention to their manners. =
29	L2:→	=yes, what I pay attention to their manners=
30	T:	=yes, what I pay attention to is their manners.

L7's silence in line 6 is a trouble source here. In response, the teacher asks for repair, but not from the same learner. Instead of helping L7 with an opportunity for self-repair, T1 shifts his gaze from L7 and directs his question to L6. In line 11, in response to L6's answer, the teacher readily accepts and confirms the response by repeating the correct answer. Then, he asks another student (L2). He elicits self- repair, *what I?* in orientation to L2's response (line 15). It seems that the student's short answer, *look*, is not successful in line 16 because the teacher completes the repair in the form of recast in the subsequent turn, *look first is their eyes* (line 17). The teacher does not clarify the part which contains the trouble; this leads to another learner's request for explanation and scaffolding repair, '*look' don't need proposition? In later turns* (line 20).

T1 nominates L3 for the next item (line 22). She struggles to provide the correct sentence, but makes the same error not using the word *'first'* in the new structure (lines 23 and 24). T1's recast in the next repair completes this

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

trouble and also fills the missing verb 'is' (line 25). What makes this repair sequence (22-25) different from others in the extract is that T1's other-repair is accurately and convergently done here because the pauses and a cut-off in line 24 show that the learner finds trouble producing this new structure.

Although the pedagogical focus of the extract seems to be eliciting accurate forms through self-repair, other-repair is evidenced in almost every teacher turn, filling the missing items and even interrupting the learners' turns (lines 14 and 28), indicated by absence of a period and a latched turn (Author et al., 2012). The turn-taking organization in Extract 2 seems to follow a IRF/E-structure (Mehan, 1979) which is very much determined by the nature of a teacher-led recitation kind of sequence. There is also pressure on the learners to keep intra-turn pauses and hesitations to a minimum as there is no wait-time for them.

The next two extracts do less focus on formal correctness. Instead, they come from phases in the lessons where the focus is on fluency and expression of personal ideas.

3.2.2 Meaning-oriented context

The following extract illustrates how repair is situated within the contingent context it occasions. In this context, there is clear evidence that the teacher's goal of promoting oral fluency is consistent with his repair practices maximizing space for learners and learning. The extract is taken from T8's class. The teacher and her students are discussing the topic of education.

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

Extract 3

1	T:	So let's talk about education. what do you think that will
2		happen in the future?
3		(2.0)
4	L1:→	maybe there will no hmhhm (2.0) the t-the students (3.0) won't
5		go to the school. =
6	T:	=uhu. so it means that students won't attend the school.
7	L1:→	uhu won't attend at school. =
8	T:	uhu. you mean is it hm virtual learning?
9	L1:	[hmhm]
10	T:	[on[line learning] [or virtual learning.]
11	L1:→	[online]. [on their] homes with the computer.
12	T:	((nods)) uhu <u>at</u> homes. yes. yes. at their [PC].
13	L1:	[their voice].
14	T:	ok and maybe they have booklets ha? the booklets. ha? they have
15		the for example books on the I don't know tablet on the? so they
16		don't have any hardcopy like this.
17	L1:	yes.
18	T:	the books are not in hard copy. they are on the, I mean, tablet, pc
19		or laptop. ok? =
20	L1:→	=maybe they won't read a book sometimes.
21	T:	=they don't read a book?!! so how can they learn?
22	L1:→	hmhm from the computer, the computer.
23		((pronounces 'computer' incorrectly))
24	T:	from the?
25	L1:→	from the computer.
26		((pronounces the word "computer" incorrectly again))
27	T:	computer? ((corrects the pronunciation))
28	L1:	hm I mean they won't need a <u>paper.</u> they won't need, =
29		((grammatical error: paper is uncountable))
30	T:	aha. ok. so they need it online? in your tablet or something.

Repair here is either lacking or is done in a very constructive way. For example, the other-initiated, other-repair for pronunciation error in line 27,

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

computer? seems more like a request for clarification than a direct error correction. As another illustration, in line 6, the teacher uses the format of 'it means plus an element of prior turn' as a repair initiator to challenge the learner's grammatical use of the verb *'attend'* rather than in the form of bold or direct repair, in an unmodulated way without any regressive actions. This strategy for other-initiation of repair is to propose a 'possible understanding of prior turn' (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 368).

Line 24 is also peculiar since it contains a repair practice called 'Designedly Incomplete Utterance (DIU)'. The teacher uses this to initiate repair on the pronunciation of the word *'computer'* and to prompt self-repair. DIU is defined by Koshik (2002, p. 283) as a grammatically incomplete utterance that invites self-correction by stopping just before a potential trouble-source with prosodic features such as slowing, lengthening, or continuing intonation at the end of the utterance. The learner's response, *from the computer* is still problematic (mispronunciation). In reaction, the teacher provides a 'partial repetition of the trouble source' (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 368) in the form of confirmation check which appears to be a frequently used technique in language classrooms to address learner errors. (Fotovatnia & Dorri, 2013). Another interesting repair completion type occurring in this episode is the embedded correction (Jefferson, 1987) in which the teacher first confirms the learner utterance by the use of *uhu* and then very briefly embeds the correct form within his sentence (lines 6 and 12).

The main observations in this extract are as follows. First, each next move is designed to offer contingent assistance that leads the students a step closer to the topic under the discussion. Second, the repair work resembles more closely repair in ordinary conversation resulting in a more dialogic turn-taking organization. Several specific repair practices associated with this extract include: an absence of repair (lines 7, 20, and 28); completing

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

repairs in passing (line 12); and focus on content rather than linguistic correctness (lines 8 and 21). The teacher chooses to ignore them because these errors do not impede communication and fulfil the teacher's pedagogic goals here (elicitation and sharing of opinions). Wong (2005, p.170) called this 'sidestepping' the linguistic problem with a priority on meaning over form.

The next extract, by contrast, shows how teacher's repair practices in meaning-oriented contexts can also diverge with the purpose. In Extract 4, the learners, in T6's class, are required to share their personal ideas about a tip of advice written in their textbook. T6 only intervenes when necessary, giving language support, correcting errors or adding a personal comment, but the main the main analytical observation comes when repeated errors are untreated.

Extract 4

1	T:	the tip of advice that my friend gave me, ((reads))
2		"If you're worried about losing your passport, don't carry it
3		around with you, just keep it in your hotel room".
4		ok what's your advice?
5	…	
6	T:	=maybe you, maybe for example you are in a situation you need
7		your driver's License. =
8	L2:→	=of course yeah, driver's license is our need, our needed↑
9		((gaze to the T))
10	…	
11	T:	aha and (to L1) Hesam, what's your idea? =
12	L1:→	= I said my idea, I have same idea.
13	T:	so what if in a situation your passport is needed? =
14	L1:→	= in the place my passport if needed, I will carry with my own=
15	T:	=ok you don't know for example you put it in a hotel=

Two kinds of trouble sources occur here. On the one hand, message problems occur in lines 5 and 12 to which T6 orients through 'prompting or

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

clueing repair' (Ferreira, More & Mellish, 2007; Lyster, 2004) (lines 6 and 13) likely to push the respondent learner to clarify his ideas. The teacher's prompts in the initiation slots here seem to scaffold opportunities for guided practice in the context of communicative interaction resulting in context convergence as it encouraged collaboration. This demonstrates sociocultural theory's emphasis that learning is a collaborative achievement (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994; Donato, 2000; Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1985) which can be encouraged through 'dialogic interaction' regardless of the correctness of the learner's second turn response (Hall & Walsh, 2002, p. 190).

The second kind of trouble source focused here is linguistic errors which occur in lines 8 and 17. The main repair comes in line 8 in which L2 struggles to produce a correct structure of the verb 'need', *of course yeah, driver's license is our need, our needed*↑ with a rising intonation and a gaze to the teacher indicating that there is a problem with the clause (structural error) and the student somehow asks for scaffolding repair. As Hosoda (2006) demonstrates, such verbal and non-verbal repair-initiation techniques can invite other-repair. The teacher, in reaction, avoids treating the trouble. Later, in line 13, we see T6 uses the correct form of 'need' by embedding it vaguely in her utterance. However, L1 in the subsequent line, repeats the same error, *in the place my passport if needed, I will carry with my own* which is untreated again. This problem would have been prevented if T6 had repaired it earlier more explicitly in his interaction with L2.

What is significant in this short extract is the kind of relevant next action(s) T6's repair practices create across the sequence. The teacher's repair of meaning troubles are managed convergently in relation to the pedagogical focus which is meaning-oriented context, whilst his orientation to the repeated linguistic error appears to be divergent.

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

4. Conclusion

The study set out to investigate the nature of EFL teachers' repair practices and organizations. The study, in line with several other studies, has found that there is a reflexive relationship between the pedagogical aim and the repair organization (Kasper,1985; Jung, 1999; McHoul, 1990; Schegloff, et al., 1977; Seedhouse, 2004; Van Lier, 1988; Walsh, 2006).

The first research question sought to identify how language teachers' repair practices were context convergent and divergent. The case by case analysis revealed that the participant teachers varied in terms of their repair practices in both form-oriented and meaning-oriented contexts. Despite this variation, a general pattern emerged by comparing and contrasting different teachers' repair organizations.

The second research question aimed to explore the nature of language teachers' repair practices and their realization in learning opportunities across the two analyzed contexts. The interaction transcripts above demonstrate that teachers need to consider a number of factors, including the nature of the error, the student, and the teaching objectives for providing a specific repair trajectory and type at a particular time. The data reinforce the claim that learner participation is a contingency which is a context specific consideration (Seedhouse, 2004; Walsh, 2006). We showed that a highly controlled practice activity generally requires more error correction than one where the focus is oral fluency. By contrast, things were more complex in meaning-oriented contexts as there were many selections for repair by the teachers (Nassaji, 2015; Pawlak, 2014).

To sum up the specific findings, based on the information found in the data, linguistic problems were the focus of repair in form-oriented contexts while content ones in meaning-oriented contexts. Moreover, among linguistic error types, vocabulary and discourse errors received less repair

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

than grammar and pronunciation errors, suggesting that enough attention should be paid to such errors in L2 classrooms. This might be in line with Webb (2005) and Schmitt's (2008) call for focusing on multiple aspects of L2 lexical knowledge. Another main finding was that participants do not always treat linguistic errors as problem sources in classroom interaction. As Hosoda (2006) and Walsh (2002) showed, linguistic errors are not corrected when they do not cause any problems in the discourse flow or they are corrected through direct repair to minimize interruptions. In other words, in meaning-oriented contexts, repair techniques involve some form of 'negotiation' such as prompts or elicitation (Ammar & Spada, 2006; Lyster, 2004) in order to promote 'self-discovery' (Waring, 2015) or they involve interactional feedback (Nassaji, 2015). The current inquiry, therefore, contributes to this literature by reconsidering such efficacy and dimension.

As with repair trajectory, the data analysis illustrates that other-initiated self-repair on linguistic problems is largely convergent in form-oriented contexts while basically divergent in meaning-oriented contexts where other-initiated and other-completed repairs are more acceptable instead (Kasper, 1985). Moreover, repair completion types such as direct repair, clarification request, and extended wait time may facilitate student participation and communication according to sociocultural and situated learning theories (Donato, 2000; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1985). Finally, non-verbal gestures, especially in the environment of other-initiated repair can be deployed to provide students with an opportunity to self-correct (Muramoto, 1999; Olsher, 2004; Seo & Koshik, 2010; Taleghani-Nikazm, 2008). As Nakamura (2008) posited, repair sequences are co-managed because repair is a communicative move rather than an evaluation.

These findings may contribute to the study of repair in two ways. First, they demonstrate the significance of CA methodology in SLA research

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

because it deals with not only linguistic errors, but also various understanding problems in interaction. Rather than using pre- and post-tests, and the presence or absence of uptake, locating the evidence of repair efficacy in the very details of the instructional interactions can thus further elaborate previous studies of classroom interaction. Moreover, using a contexts analysis seems to contribute to the teacher's interactional awareness of their dialogic interaction and its relation to learning opportunities.

This study has its own limitations. First, the study was conducted in a large mix of courses, and the participating teachers and students were quite different in many respects. Thus, the generalizability of the findings should be established in future research. Second, the study was restricted to the analysis of only two classroom contexts. It would be desirable to replicate this study in different contexts, with a range of learners carrying out different sorts of activities. And, of course, we did not assess learning outcomes, which should be a critical component of future investigations. And finally, the presence of the video camera may have influenced the participants' awareness of being recruited for research, probably led them to behave more self-consciously.

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

5. References

Aljaafreh, A., & Lantolf, J. P. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal. *The Contextrn Language Journal*, *78*(4), 465-483.

Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all? Recasts, prompts, and L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 543-574.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Donato, R. (2000). Sociocultural contributions to understanding the foreign and second language classroom. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learnin*g (pp. 27-50). New York: Oxford University Press.

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

Ferreira, A., Moore, J., & Mellish, C. (2007). A study of feedback strategies in foreign language classrooms and tutorials with implications tor intelligent computer-assisted language learning systems. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 17*, 389-422.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research.* Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Co.

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.

Hall, J. K., & Walsh, M. (2002). Teacher-student interaction and language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 22,* 186-203.

Hellerman, J. (2009). Looking for evidence of language learning in practices for repair: A case study of self-initiated self-repair by an adult

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

learner of English. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 53*(2), 113-132.

Hosoda, Y. (2006). Repair and relevance of differential language expertise in second language conversations. *Applied Linguistics, 27*(1), 25-50.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis.* Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Iles, Z. (1996). Collaborative repair in EFL classroom talk. *York Papers in Linguistics, 17*, 23-51.

Jefferson, G. (1987). On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In G. Button & Lee, J. R. E. (Eds.), *Talk and social organization* (pp. 86-100). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Jung, E. H. (1999). The organization of second language classroom repair. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 10*, 153-171.

Kasper, G. (1985). Repair in foreign language teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7*(2), 200-215.

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. (2005). Alternative questions used in conversational repair. *Discourse Studies, 7*(2), 193-211.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, Y. (2010). Learning in the contingency of talk-in-interaction. *Text and Talk*, 30(4), 403-422.

Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 60*, 309-365.

Loewen, S. (2011). Focus on form. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning. Volume II* (pp. 577-592). New York and London: Routledge.

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19,* 37-66.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learners' uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19,* 37-61.

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2012). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching, 46,* 1-40.

Macbeth, D. (2004). The relevance of repair for classroom correction. *Language in Society, 33,* 703-736.

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

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.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Muramoto, N. (1999). Gesture in Japanese language instruction: The case of error correction. In L. K. Heilenmann (Ed.), *Research issues and Language Program Direction* (pp.143-175). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Nakamura, I. (2008). Understanding how teacher and student talk with each other: an exploration of how repair displays the co-management of talk-in-interaction. *Language Teaching Research, 12(2),* 265-283.

Nassaji, N. (2015). *The interactional feedback dimension in instructed second language learning: Linking theory, research, and practice*. London: Bloomsbury.

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

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). Continuum, London.

Pawlak, M. (2014). *Error correction in the foreign language classroom*. Berlin: Springer.

Pomerantz, A. & Fehr, B. J. (1997). Conversation analysis: An approach to the study of social action as sense making practices. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed), *Discourse as social interaction*. (pp. 64-91). London: Sage Publications.

Rolin-Ianziti, J. (2010). The organization of delayed second language correction. *Language Teaching Research, 14*(2), 183-206.

Schegloff, E. (1997). Practices and actions: Boundary cases of other-initiated repair. *Discourse Processes, 23*(3), 499-545.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, *53*, 361-382.

Schmitt, N. (2008). State of the art: Instructed second language vocabulary acquisition. *Language Teaching Research*, *12*, 329-363.

Seedhouse, P. (1997). The case of the missing "NO": the relationship between pedagogy and interaction. *Language Learning*, *4*(3), 547-583.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective.* Blackwell Publishing. University of Michigan.

Seo, M., & Koshik, I. (2010). A conversation analytic study of gestures that engender repair in ESL conversational tutoring. *Journal of pragmatics*, *42*, 2219-2239.

Sidnell, J., & Stivers, T. (2013). *Handbook of conversation analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

Silverman, D. (2005). *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook (2nd Ed.).* London: Sage.

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

Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (2007). Gestures in foreign language classroom: an empirical analysis of their organizations and functions. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of Second Language Research Forum, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Ten Have. P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide.* London: Sage.

Van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner*. London: Longman.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or obstruction: Teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, *6*, 3-23.

Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Waring, H. Z. (2013). Managing Stacy: A case study of turn-taking in the language classroom. *System, 41*(3), 841-851.

Waring. H. Z. (2015). Promoting self-discovery in the language classroom. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 53*(1), 61-85.

Webb, S. (2005). Receptive and productive vocabulary learning: The effects of reading and writing on word knowledge. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 27*, 33-52.

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

Wertsch, J. V. (1985). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wong, J. (2005). Sidestepping grammar. In K. Richards & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *Applying conversation analysis* (pp. 159-173). Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

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

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.

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

Appendix

Conversation Analysis Transcription Notations

T:	teacher
L1:	learner (identified as learner 1)
L:	unidentified learner
LL:	several learners simultaneously
(.)	a short untimed pause
…	deleted part
(2.0)	timed silence
[ ]	overlapping utterances
foo-	an abrupt cut-off of the prior word
<u>stock</u> holder	stress
.	falling intonation
↑	rising intonation
➔	focus for analysis
,	continuing intonation
yea::r	prolonging of sound
WORD	very emphatic stress or loud speech
°word°	quiet speech
↑word	raised pitch
↓word	lowered pitch
>word<	quicker speech
<word>	slowed speech
=	latch
( )	inaudible talk
(word)	transcriptionist doubt or translation of L1
((gazes))	nonspeech activity or transcriptionist comment
Present	shift to L1

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]

Notes on Contributors:

Fatemeh Mozaffari is currently a PhD candidate of TEFL at Yazd University. Her areas of research interest include classroom discourse analysis, conversation analysis for SLA, teacher talk, questioning practice, repair treatment, and teacher education.

Hamid Allami is associate professor in Applied Linguistics. He is a senior lecturer at Yazd University. His areas of research interest include discourse Analysis, pragmatics, interlanguage pragmatics, and sociolinguistics.

[DOI: 10.29252/ijal.20.1.151]