

Teacher Development through Repair: A Conversation Analytic Study of Microteaching

Baikuntha Bhatta

1. Introduction

The present paper analyzes the naturally occurring interaction of microteaching lessons and looks at the role repair sequences play in the progressivity of the ongoing sequences and the opportunities for self-development on the part of the trainee teachers. How the participants, both teacher trainee and the teacher trainer, orient to the completion of the interaction and what it has to do with teacher training is the focal aspect in this study. Based on the data of about ten hours of video-record microteaching environment, this study uses the emic perspective and conversation analytic methodologies to analyze the data. Through a detailed transcript and repeated observation, the trainee teachers' self-initiation of repair and the other-initiation by the advisors is analyzed in detail and their orientation towards progressivity of the lesson and towards teacher development is highlighted as grounded in the transcripts analyzed.

2. Introduction to Microteaching

Microteaching has been used as a tool of teacher training where the prospective teachers can practice a prospective lesson in its minimal form. The minimal format of a whole lesson is grounded on three main features of the lesson: (a) reduced length, (b) narrowed scope, and (c) fewer students than usual (Allen & Ryan, 1969). It is chiefly practiced in the training of pre-service

teachers; however, it has proven equally applicable in the training of in-service teachers too. Developed in the early 1960s at Stanford University, microteaching helps the trainee teachers to attain a microscopic view of their classmates and advisors. It is considered a safe practice setting for trainee teachers since it reduces the various kinds of complexities of regular lesson, (Bush, 1969; Cooper, 1967) and gives the trainee teachers an easy way to launch their teaching experience with a strong start.

The microteaching procedure has its own basic organizational system. In a microteaching setting, the trainee teachers begin with selecting a skill to be practiced and then follow various processes to deliver the lesson. The processes they use include steps like (a) observing a model lesson, (b) planning their lesson, and then (c) delivering a model lesson. However, once the lesson is delivered, it is not the end of the process. The reviewing and feedback session begins after the class. The peer trainee teachers and the advisors comment on the lesson and put lights on the well performed aspects and the aspects that need to be further polished. To bring further refinement to their lesson, they re-plan and re-teach their lesson after receiving the feedback. The re-taught lesson is again analyzed and feedback and comments are provided. In this way, theoretically, the whole process continues till a certain level of adequacy is achieved.

As an influential tool massively used, microteaching manifests a number of advantages in the field of education. One of the advantages is its local organization of the teaching and reviewing sessions. As the review follows the teaching session, the feedback achieved in this session can be immediately implemented in the re-teaching session. Likewise, it is a minimized form of a regular class so that many trainee teachers can practice their skills in a lesson. Furthermore, providing a less stressful practice situation to the trainee teachers is also one of the main advantages of the microteaching technique. From this perspective, microteaching could be interpreted as a key technique for educators in the training of prospective teachers. However, because of the

lengthy process from planning to teaching and re-teaching, this technique has been negatively critiqued as a time-consuming activity. Similarly, because of the skill-focused nature of microteaching, it is criticized for not addressing the entire range of processes of the teaching activity. Teaching not only uses skills, but also includes practices used in decision making. With this view, the teaching activity is observed not only as science but also as an art (Kaneez & Humera, 2011) which microteaching is not oriented toward. However, in spite of these limitations microteaching is a widely accepted and massively used technique in teacher education programs throughout the world.

3. Conversation Analysis

3.1. Introduction to Conversation Analysis

Conversation analysis is one of the dominant contemporary methods for the analysis of social interaction (Heritage, 1984; Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, 2008; Levinson, 1983; Psathas, 1995; Sacks, 1992; Schegloff, 1992; Schegloff, 2007; Sidnell, 2010; Sidnell & Stivers, 2012; Ten Have, 1999; Terasaki, 1976). CA addresses the question of how talk - a central activity of social life - is organized. It studies how people perform different roles in interaction and also how the participants coordinate their talk in interaction. Participants in a talk are not simply speaker-hearers receiving and delivering messages. Rather, it is their collective orientation and collaboration to accomplish orderly and meaningful communication. CA analyzes and reveals the organized reasoning of the procedures of day-to-day life in naturally occurring talk. In naturally occurring talk, the utterances are connected to the context of their production and are available to the participants by their knowledge of being in a natural language community. Thus CA tries to define those procedures and circumstances on which speakers are confident to produce an utterance to make sense of their talk. As its name indicates, CA started with a focus on occasional, everyday conversation, but now, it broadly includes almost all aspects of social

intercommunication with both verbal and non-verbal aspects in everyday life situations. Conventionally, CA attempts to explain the orderliness, structure and sequential patterns of social interaction, whether in institutional or mundane conversation.

CA came out of the ethnomethodological tradition of sociology to study talk in interaction. Ethnomethodology examines the common sense of resources, practices and procedures that the members of society mutually recognize and use in the course of action. These ideas were described in the seminal book *Studies in Ethnomethodology* by Harold Garfinkel (1967). Garfinkel was interested in the structure of everyday life and tried to study how it is constructed. He tried to learn "how the structures of everyday activities are ordinarily and routinely produced and maintained" (pp. 35-36). According to Liddicoat (2007), "ethnomethodology proceeds from an assumption that social order appears to be orderly, but is in reality potentially chaotic" (p. 2). Ethnomethodology does not consider the existence of a certain foundation to maintain social order, but the participants of those activities construct it when they are interacting in that activity. The participants change the disorder and chaotic social order to an orderly way through understanding, which Garfinkel (1967) calls "the documentary method." In this method, certain facts of a social situation are selected to establish a pattern and after the establishment of the pattern, the pattern is used as a framework while interpreting other facts of the same type of social situation. As people attempt to understand what happens in the social world by reference to the context in which they appear, context plays an important role under this method. According to Garfinkel, people constantly use the documentary method in their everyday activities and create a "taken for granted understanding" of social activities (Garfinkel, 1967).

At around the same time, Erving Goffman (1959, 1963, 1967, 1971, 1981) developed the study of actual occurrences of social interaction, placing greater emphasis on the activities of daily life as a subject of study. He showed how

aspects of important social significance are built in everyday interaction. Goffman (1964) afforded more consideration to the study of the ordinary instances in speaking. For him talk is not only a two-way communication between an interlocutor and a recipient, but it has its own social system and it is led by communal understanding of the participants, which is ritually managed direct action. Goffman does not take language in its mere linguistic form, but rather takes it as a system and claims the relevance of the study of non-linguistic elements, rules, and structures.

Garfinkel and Goffman's investigations of the orderliness of daily life established the foundation for conversation analysis. The ideas of Garfinkel and Goffman were later taken up by Harvey Sacks in his *Lectures on Conversation* (1992). By the late 1960s and early 1970s, conversation analysis came out of sociology as an independent area of study, through the works of Harvey Sacks, Emmanuel A. Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. After it became an independent field of study, conversation analysis evolved as a method of study used to understand the social organization of talk and how talk achieves its communicative goals. As Schegloff explains it in his introduction to Sacks' *Lectures on Conversation* (1992), Sacks and he were looking for a new possibility in the field of sociology which might provide alternatives to the prevailing forms of social discourse. And they started by collecting and treating empirically evidence from naturally occurring talk. Before Sacks died in 1975, CA was already established as a paradigm in the study of sociological discourse. CA has developed into a complete methodological approach from its early beginnings in Sacks' consideration of calls to a suicide prevention center. In Sacks' *Lectures on Conversation* (1992), the calls and a series of tape-recorded group therapy sessions were analyzed. Similarly Schegloff's dissertation (partly published in Schegloff, 1968, 2004), deals extensively with the common issues of conversation analysis. Though CA was started by Sacks' consideration of the tapes of institutionally based talk, gradually, Sacks, Schegloff and their collaborators and

students expanded the field of study to the analysis of mundane conversations. The basic concept here was that naturally occurring mundane conversation would provide better examples of the pure functioning of conversational devices such as turn-taking or openings and closings as they manifest the primordial site of interaction.

However, from the 1970s onwards, followers of CA research again turned to the analysis of institution-based materials like meetings, courtroom proceedings, and news interviews. They wanted to apply the acquired knowledge of mundane conversational interaction to the understanding of institutional structure as built through interaction. John Heritage provides a lucid introduction to these two sectors of CA. He writes:

There are, therefore, at least two kinds of conversation analytic research going on today, and, though they overlap in various ways, they are distinct in focus. The first examines the institution of interaction as an entity in its own right; the second studies the management of social institutions in interaction. (Heritage, 1997, p. 162)

Ten Have (1999) refers to the first type as pure CA and the later as applied CA, for simplicity. Within the later kind, he suggests two other different interests balanced in various ways. On the one hand, there is an interest in the institutional arrangements that pertain to the organization of interaction such as turn-taking, distribution of rights to speak, etcetera, in relation to the aspects of the function of the institution. On the other hand, the interest can only be on studying the specific institutional activities, situations and the interactional requirements and the way the interactants orient to the situations and requirements.

For Sacks, talk is strategically employed to achieve communicative goals. He does not find a set of rules or recipes in the production of talk, rather the

interactional effects are achieved by the production of talk in a particular context. Sacks finds conversation to be orderly and this order is manifested at all points (Sacks, 1992). This orderly nature results from the recognizable achievement of the use of similar context. So, the core assumptions of conversation analysis are, as Psathas (1995, pp. 2-3) puts it in points: (a) order is produced orderliness, (b) order is produced, situated and occasioned, and (c) order is repeatable and recurrent.

3.2. Basic Assumptions of Conversation Analysis

In conversation analysis, one of the basic concepts that help the participants to continue their talk is the idea of recipient design. According to Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974), recipient design is one of the ruling concepts behind the system of conversation analysis. The idea of recipient design stands for the way the participants design their utterances so that they are acknowledged by the other participants. For this, the participants produce their talk in terms of the shared knowledge both the interlocutor and the recipient have. In this way, an utterance with its basis in recipient design can automatically select a next speaker to take part in the continuation of talk. Liddicoat (2007) explains that "recipient design is not only a resource which speakers use to design a talk; it is also a resource listeners can use in interpreting talk" (p. 6). The listener understands the talk applying the common framework they have and select themselves as the intended listener of the previously produced talk.

This shows that the turns in conversation are designed in such a way that some turns constrain who can speak next and can hint at what the next contribution can or should be. This indicates that turns in conversation are not independent things but clustered together. The clustering of turns at talk is known as sequence organization. The analysis of sequence organization empirically demonstrates that social action is at the heart of conversation. In

arguing about social action, CA researchers do not deny that topic may be an organizational feature of talk (Button & Casey, 1984, 1985; Jefferson, 1984) rather they place greater emphasis on the organizational feature than on topic (Schegloff, 1991, 1995). This is connected to the finding that some actions make other actions relevant as next actions. This relation between actions is the foundation of "adjacency pairs" (Schegloff, 1991; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). Analysis of interactional data has found that most instances of talk occur as pair utterances in conversation. For example, greetings follow greetings, farewells follow farewells, and a question leads the next speaker to produce an utterance with an answer. Schegloff and Sacks (1973) called these paired utterances "adjacency pairs." Adjacency pairs have various kinds of features such as they have two turns spoken by different speakers, and they are generally placed next to each other and are ordered. The utterances which make adjacency pairs are ordered in such a way that one of the pairs always occurs prior to the next one. For example, a question comes before the utterance of an answer. Therefore, we can say that in conversation, some types of talk are designed to initiate the action and some others are designed to complete the actions. The talks initiating action are called first pair parts (FPP) and the talks that complete action are called second pair parts (SPP). FPPs and SPPs are related in a way that a second pair part (SPP) does not just occur in the second position. Rather, it must be appropriate to the first pair part (FPP). For example, a farewell initiation must be followed by a farewell response.

Talk is developed by the participants' regular orientation to the basic sequence structure of first pair part and second pair part. Adjacency pairs set up expectations about how the talk will develop. And if these expectations are not met, the talk is seen as problematic (Heritage, 1984). When talk comes to a problematic stage because of the mismatch of expectations, as manifested in the interaction, conversation takes a different form. The participants use various devices to bring the talk back to the normal mode. In other words they make

adjustments in the conversation, which in the terms of CA is called "repair."

3.3. Repair

3.3.1. Repair in Conversation

This section discusses the organization of repair as studied in mundane and institutional interaction areas. This section starts with an overview of conversational repair and then moves to the types of repair based on who initiates repair and then discusses repair in relation to problematic experiences in conversation. The later part of this section focuses on the discussion of repair as observed in second language classrooms.

Repair is a term in conversation analysis that works to deal with the problems during conversation. It is a way of to get rid of the problems of hearing, speaking, or understanding during an ongoing interaction. The conversation analytic perspective of repair describes it as a shared effort of the participants to maintain a shared understanding of the ongoing interaction (Schegloff, 1992). Repair is likely to be understood as correction but Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) define correction as simply fixing errors but repair is a way to deal with both errors and other types of problems like mishearings and misunderstandings. So, the problematic item is not a 'mistake' to be corrected rather it is called 'repairable' or 'trouble source' from conversation analytic perspective.

The organization of repair is understood from the study of the difference between repair initiation (marking something as a source of trouble), and the actual repair itself. There is also a distinction between repair initiated by self (the speaker who produced the trouble source), and repair initiated by other (the next speaker to the trouble source). In the mechanism of repair, it is important to note who initiates the repair and who carries it out. Repair can be initiated either by the speaker or the hearer. Similarly, either the speaker or the hearer can make the repair. Schegloff et al. (1977) have classified repair in terms of the

repair initiator and the participant who completes it. Repair can be initiated by the speaker of the repairable item as a self-initiated repair or it can be initiated by the recipient as other-initiated repair. Likewise, the speaker of the trouble source turn can achieve repair as self-repair or the recipient of the trouble source item can complete it as other-repair. This feature of repair initiation and repair completion results in four types of possible repair trajectories: (a) self-initiated self-repair; (b) self-initiated other-repair, (c) other-initiated self-repair, and (d) other-initiated other-repair.

In what follows, I am going to briefly describe these four types of repair activities. In self-initiated self-repair, the speaker of the repairable experiences a problem with ongoing talk and initiates repair to solve the problem. The following extract is an example from Liddicoat (2007) showing self-initiated self-repair by the speaker of the trouble source item (p. 177).

(3) [AN: 04:04]

Anna: oh so then he is coming back on Thur- on
Tuesday

In this extract, Anna experiences some problem to continue her talk as soon as she starts saying "Thursday." Therefore, before the projected word completes, she orients to a problem in using a relevant word and cuts off to initiate repair.

Self-initiated other-repair deals with a problematic part in the utterance of the current speaker. In this type of repair the current speaker notes a problematic aspect in ongoing talk and initiates repair but the recipient does the repair. Schegloff et al. (1977) give the following example as an instance of this type of repair practice (p. 364).

(4) [BC: Green: 88]

B: He had dis uh Mistuh W- whatever k- I can't

think of his first name, Watts on, the one
 thet wrote that piece,

A: Dan Watts

In this extract B orients to a difficulty in finding the relevant name. B's first attempt ends in a cut-off after *Mistuh W-* and the second attempt also ends without recalling the name in whatever *k-*. Here B initiates repair with those cut-offs but fails to bring about an outcome. In the end, the recipient provides the searched for word, a name in this case, and completes the repair activity.

In other-initiated self-repair the recipient indicates a problem in the present talk but the speaker of the problematic item resolves it. The following extract, also from Schegloff et al. (1977), gives a clear example of self-repair from other-initiation (p. 370).

(5) [GTS: 3:42]

A: Hey the first time they stopped me from
 selling cigarettes was this morning.

(1.0)

B: From selling cigarettes?

A: From buying cigarettes. They [said uh

In this extract, B finds something problematic in A's utterance from *selling cigarettes*. The one-second silence could be a chance for A to initiate a self-repair. But A does not find any aspects in his utterance that are problematic at this point. Then B initiates repair with *From selling cigarettes?* with added stress and rising intonation. Only at this point does A find and orient to the problematic part of his ongoing utterance and finally replaces *selling* with *buying*, thus completing the repair.

In other-initiated other-repair, the recipient of the repairable item both

indicates a problematic part in the talk and resolves it. In this type of repair activity, the speaker of the problematic item does not display any misunderstandings with their utterance but the recipient of the utterance is not able to maintain the intersubjectivity to understand the prior speaker's utterance. The following extract, again from Schegloff et al. (1977), is an example of other-initiated other-repair (p. 369).

(6) [DA: 2]

B: How long y' gonna be here?

A: Uh- not too long. Uh just til uh Monday.

B: Til- oh yih mean like a week f'm tomorrow.

This extract shows B initiating repair to resolve a problem with understanding A's utterance *til uh Monday*. In his turn after the problematic utterance, B initiates and does the repair as other-initiated other-repair. In completing repair, B displays a possible understanding of the problematic part of A's utterance.

All the types of repair interact in certain sequential positions. "Position" in studies of repair means the location of repair relative to the problematic item or repairable. Commonly, repair is designed to resolve the trouble as quickly as possible (Schegloff, 1979), but an insertion sequence sometimes delays the repair work. From the analysis of the repair done in conversation, we can find the following varieties in the positions of repair: (a) same turn repair, (b) transition space repair, (c) second position repair, (d) third position repair, and (e) fourth position repair.

Same turn repair is repair initiation that takes place right after the trouble source within the same turn. Generally same turn repair takes place after cut-offs when the present speaker finds himself in some sort of difficulty in producing the utterance. In the example in Extract 3, as soon as Anna produces *oh so then he is coming back on Thur-* she shows some difficulty

with her ongoing talk, cuts off there, and does a repair within her own turn. This repair is accomplished in the same turn position as the problematic item, so this is an example of same turn repair.

Sometimes, the speaker initiates repair at the end of the utterance as a transition space repair. In this type of repair, the current speaker comes to the end of the current turn but finds a problematic part within their delivered utterance. And before the speaker change takes place, they do the repair activity at the end of their turn. In the following example, once again from Schegloff et al. (1977), Roger initiates repair after the completion of his utterance. It appears that he has made a wrong-word selection at the transition place and does the repair before the next speaker starts the turn (p. 370).

(7) [GTS: 5:33]

Roger: We're just working on a different thing. The same thing.

Second position repair initiation takes place in the utterance of the recipient of the trouble source. So, sequentially speaking the next turn following the turn including the problematic item is the location of second position repair, and this is the first possible sequential location for the recipient to initiate repair. The following extract from Schegloff et al. (1977) shows Roger initiating repair in the second position after Dan's turn, which carried the problematic utterance (p. 364).

(8) [GTS: 5:3]

Ken: Is Al here today?
 Dan: Yeah.
 (2.0)
 Roger: He is? hh eh heh

Dan: Well he was.

In this extract, Roger experiences a problem to maintain understanding with Dan's utterance *Yeah* and initiates a second-position repair. After the repair initiation, Dan completes the repair with *Well he was* and keeps the talk ongoing. According to Schegloff et al. (1977), speakers use various turn constructional devices to initiate repair in the second position, These are "huh?", "what?", use of question words, "you mean" plus possible understanding, etcetera.

Not only in their ongoing turn (e.g., the same turn and transition space) and the second position, but participants also have opportunities to initiate repair in the third position, that is to say, in the turns that follow the second turn position. When an interlocutor produces a strip of talk in the first turn, the recipient in the second turn displays a candidate understanding but does not attempt to deal with the possible problematic part of the talk, "virtually all such efforts are initiated in one place - the turn after the turn in which the source of the trouble occurred" (Schegloff, 1992, p. 1302). Schegloff calls this type of repair third turn repair. In the following example from Schegloff (1997), Mom does not display any problematicity to understand Louise's utterance, and lets Louise continue the story she was trying to reveal. However, Louise finds a problematic part in her utterance at the first turn and repairs in the third turn (p. 34).

(9) [Super Seedy]

Louise: I read a very interesting story today.

Mom: Uhm what's that.

Louise: W'll not today, maybe yesterday, aw who
knows
when hu-it's called Dragon Stew.

When the recipient's understanding of a prior turn seems problematic to the

speaker, the speaker initiates repair as a response to the understanding. In this type of sequence, the recipient takes a turn and displays a candidate understanding of the speaker's utterance. But the speaker discovers a problem with the candidate understanding of their recipient and so initiate repair in the turn after the recipient's turn, sequentially in the third position to the problematic utterance. Third position repair is the repair initiation by the speaker of the repairable item in their turn after the recipient's utterance. For Schegloff (1992), third-position repair can be taken "as the last systematically provided opportunity" (p. 1301) for the speaker of the trouble source item to initiate repair.

Third-position repair is different from third-turn repair in the sequential location. While third-turn repair always takes the third turn in the sequence, third-position repair might occur in the following turns after some insertion sequences. This type of repair can be seen in the following extract from Liddicoat (2007, p. 201).

(10) [Office 4:1]

Joe: have the papers arrived yet,

Mary: uh- Nuh nothin's come down from admi[n so far.

Joe: [Oh no I-

Uh not- Have the papers arrived yet.

Mary: Oh you mean the newspapers,

Joe: Yeah.

Mary: No they don' usually get here until ten.

In the above extract, Marry displays her probable understanding of Joe's utterance about papers as being about official papers by saying uh- Nuh nothin's come down from admi[n so far. But in the sequentially third position, Joe displays that Mary's manifested understanding is problematic. As a

result, Joe initiates a repair in the third position, adding a stress mark on "papers" with Oh no I- Uh not- Have the papers arrived yet. Only at that point does Mary demonstrate her further understanding of what she interpreted that Joe meant by "papers" and continues the talk.

Schegloff (1992) put forward the idea that, though not in all cases, third position repair might include any of the following four basic components: (a) a repair-initiating component, (b) an agreement component, (c) a rejection component, (d) the repair proper. These four components have a canonical ordering in that they always appear in this order, even though some elements may not be present (Schegloff, 1992).

Fourth position repair is the final possible position for a repair activity in conversation. Repair is less likely in this position because most of the problems calling for repair are already dealt with before this position is reached. This is an opportunity for the recipient of the trouble source to initiate repair to the problem of understanding of the original source that is made clear to the recipient by the speakers talk at third position. The following extract, from Schegloff (1992), gives an example of this type of repair (p. 1321).

(11) [EAS, FN]

Marty: Loes, do you have a calendar,

Loes: Yeah ((reaches for her desk calendar))

Marty: Do you have one that hangs on the wall?

Loes: Oh, you want one.

Marty: Yeah

In the above example, Marty's utterance at the first turn can be understood as either a pre request for a calendar or as a request to borrow a calendar. Loes' action in the second turn shows that she understands Marty's utterance as borrowing a calendar. But after Marty's utterance in the third turn, Loes

manifests a different understanding and produces an utterance with repair in the fourth position.

The accomplishment of repair and the initiation of repair are related in such a way that each of the positions is connected to a particular participant in repair initiation. With this basis, self-initiated self-repair and other-initiated other-repair are also organized and ordered in such a way that self-initiated self-repair always comes before the possibilities of other-initiated other-repair in conversation (Schegloff et al., 1977). Who initiates repair is in a way fixed to the position of repair initiation. Same turn repair, transition space repair, and third-turn repair are always initiated by the speaker of the current turn, that is, the speaker of the repairable item. Similarly, second-position repair and fourth-position repair are always other-initiated repair, that is to say the recipient of the problematic talk initiates repair in the second-position or the fourth-position.

In most cases of repair trajectories, self-repair is preferred over other-repair in general conversation (Schegloff et al., 1977). Extensive instances of repair activities show higher possibility of self-repair occurrences in conversation. Furthermore, the shape of the conversational sequence is also designed in a way to prefer self-repair. One of the basic features that prefers self-repair over other-repair is the position of self-repair. In fact, the first two sequential positions for repair initiation: same-turn repair and transition-space repair, provide the first opportunity for the speaker of the repairable to initiate repair. The possibility of self-repair is higher in the other-initiation of repair too. When others initiate repair, it is again the opportunity of the speaker of the trouble source item to do the repair work in the third turn. In this way, the sequential patterning of conversation also provides greater opportunity to self-initiate repair.

3.3.2. Interaction Studies in Second Language Acquisition

In language classrooms, interaction between the members is how ideas are shared, meaning is negotiated, and how learning takes place. In the organization of classroom interaction, correction and repair are very common components. In the paradigm of second language acquisition (SLA), research on correction and repair of language in the classroom has a theoretical basis in the interaction hypothesis (Long, 1996). The interaction hypothesis takes classroom interaction among teachers and learners as a facilitating device in the acquisition of the target language. It also helps to draw learners' attention to gaps in their knowledge of linguistic forms and their correct usages. In the view of Doughty and Williams (1998), teachers' correction of students' erroneous utterances does not try to induce the meaning of the activity because the students know what the activity is, but the correction activity is concerned with learners' linguistic knowledge. A large number of studies based in the idea of the interaction hypothesis have focused on the instructional nature of classroom corrective activities which teachers apply (Gass, 1997; Long, 1996; Long & Robinson, 1998; Lyster, 1998; Mackey & Philip, 1998; Morris, 2002; Pica, 2002). Error correction is an important feature that frequently occurs in teacher-student interaction in second language classrooms. Kasper (1985) uses repair to describe the corrective activity and defines repair as "modifications of trouble source which have manifested themselves in the discourse" (p. 200). While Kasper's definition of repair includes both correction and the rephrasing of utterances, van Lier (1988) makes a distinction between repair and correction. For him, repair should be taken in its generic sense and includes "the correction of errors, but also other phenomena" (p. 183). He classifies correction as one type of repair, the replacement of an error made by the speaker.

Working in the paradigm of CA, Schegloff et al. (1977), define "correction" as one variety of "repair." In correction, a problematic item of an utterance is replaced by a correct item. But "repair" is a more common term in conversation

that includes all types of problematic utterances in talk-in-interaction. Moreover, Schegloff (1979) distinguishes correction and repair in direct relation to the problematic item. Correction always deals with the problematic items in a talk that are already produced, whereas in the case of repair, there are numerable repairables in conversation which are still to be confronted in the continuation of the interaction. Still, some repair activities can also initiate repair to the previously produced problematic utterance but do not entail correction. For example, same-turn self-repair can sometimes address the previously produced utterance where the repair deals with understanding but not correcting. Schegloff (1979) has employed the terms backward-oriented and forward-oriented repair to differentiate these. This view sees repair as a device prospectively oriented to the trouble source and correction as a device retrospectively oriented to the problematic item. However, some repairs that do not consist of correction in its basic form may be seen as retrospective. In other words, correction always deals with some problematic part of an utterance that is previously produced while repair deals with both the previously produced utterance and the utterance due. According to Schegloff (1979), for the most part, cut-off repairs a previously produced utterance and sound stretches, pauses, and non-lexical utterances initiate repair to the upcoming parts in the speaker's utterance.

In CA studies of repair, repair is taken as an activity in the interaction that, in most cases, delays the sequentially appropriate next action. In other words, the next action is postponed until the repair work is accomplished (Schegloff, 2000, pp. 208–209). So, from the standpoint of conversation analysis, repair interrupts and postpones the continuation of the interaction. However, in the pedagogical setting, Schegloff, Koshik, Jakoby and Olsher (2002) note the importance of not conflating pedagogical correction with conversational repair. In the classroom settings, the activity of correction is one of the main parts in the learning process. Therefore, correction in the classroom must not be

confused by the analyst with repair as discussed from a conversation analytic perspective.

Similar to the order of pedagogical correction explained by Schegloff et al. (2002), Kaanta (2010) argues that classroom activities are certain goal-oriented activities and therefore it is natural to deal with different types of trouble in understanding and producing talk. In other words, the correction activities in language classrooms do not always create side sequences to be resolved before the restoration of the main action. It is certain to say, correction in classroom interaction cannot be considered to be the same as conversational repair. Classroom correction activities are not always disruptive for the natural ongoing interaction like repair in CA, especially corrections which are what Kaanta terms "exposed" as they can be "seen as a contingent part of teachers' and students' context-specific instructional actions, which guide towards the successful accomplishment of their pedagogical and activity-related goals" (Kaanta, 2010, p. 65). However, some classroom correction activities take a different form than simply a process of achieving pedagogical goals. In such situations, classroom correction takes a form of repair in conversation analysis and halts the main sequence. Most of the studies on repair and correction in everyday interaction have a bearing on the way repair and correction is viewed in pedagogical interaction. But a crucial point in understanding prior CA-based research on repair in pedagogical interaction is that it has often been grounded in the work and findings of Schegloff et al. (1977), which have led to comparative analysis between ordinary and institutional varieties of talk.

As discussed above, the studies in second language acquisition have used the term repair in a quite controversial way. Although there is a little research on teachers' self-repair (e.g., word search, non-lexical perturbations, etc.), there are definitely a lot of instances of non-correction types of repair, probably more than correction types of repairs. So, a clear distinction needs to be made in SLA studies of correction and repair in the classroom, where repair can be taken

to be similar to CA repair of mundane conversation and correction only has features of classroom error correction activities.

3.3.3. Repair in Conversation and Correction in Second Language Classrooms

In this section, I review some studies related to repair and correction activities from the perspective of language classroom interaction. There are abundant studies concerning the feature and structure of repair and correction in the setting of first and second language classrooms. The following section reviews some of these studies.

In studies based on classroom interaction, the relation between repair and correction has been dealt with from two distinct viewpoints: (a) explaining the relationship of repair and correction in the classroom compared to repair practices in ordinary conversation focusing on the empirical manner of repair, and (b) differentiating repair in mundane conversation and correction in pedagogical setting with theoretical basis of repair. In his study of the structure of repair in the language classroom, McHoul (1990) found that other-initiated self-correction is the dominant repair trajectory in classrooms. According to his study, with the problematic student utterance in the classroom environment, the teachers initiate repair and then the students accomplish the repair by producing a candidate repair. McHoul claims that the trajectory of other-initiated self-correction is preferred in language classrooms because of the characteristics of initiation, response, evaluation (IRE) sequences. IRE sequence provides the possibility for the teachers to initiate other-repair in the third turn, the evaluation turn. Moreover, teachers' other-initiation at the third turn provides learning opportunities to the learners through self-correction. Unlike in mundane conversation, the teachers withhold the appropriate utterance and just other-initiate to provide the students opportunities to display their better performance. Additionally, the teachers' withholding of the answer creates

opportunities for pushed output to the learners. McHoul's preference order of repair in the classroom, the preference of other-initiated self-repair, is different from the preference of repair in mundane conversation (Schegloff et al. 1977), although self-repair is preferred in both classroom and mundane interaction. In mundane conversation, the withholding of other-initiation provides the speaker of the trouble source item time to initiate self-repair. Whereas, in classroom interaction, the teachers' other-initiation takes place immediately following the student response turn. Consequently, the phenomenon of teacher-initiated correction in the third turn of IRE may not be similar to conversational repair as described by Schegloff et al. (1977).

Macbeth (2004) further clarifies conversational repair and instructional correction and notes that both repair and correction are "co-operating organizations" (p. 732) in a pedagogical setting. In his view, classroom "correction" has only the function of correcting learners' problematic experiences in the production of language or inappropriate answers. But "repair" in the classroom may address problematic occasions in conversation related to understanding and achieving intersubjectivity. In sum, for Macbeth, both instructional correction and conversational repair can occur at the same time in a pedagogical setting.

In addition to Macbeth, Hall (2007) disagrees with the prevalence among SLA researchers of adopting CA repair into classroom interaction and mistakenly mixing it with the SLA view of repair. As she argues, repair in mundane conversation creates insertion sequences because the problem of understanding and the loss of intersubjectivity has to be re-established before the continuation of the main sequence. So, in the insertion sequence, the repair is accomplished to achieve mutual understanding. Whereas, in her view, instructional correction itself is an essential part of the activities in the classroom throughout the instructional sequence. So, the sequence created by instructional correction can be taken as a regular activity of classroom since the

sequence created by correction also provides learning opportunities to the students and then displays progress towards the pedagogical objectives. In other words, the sequence created by the practices of correction in a pedagogical situation is not seen as being similar to a side sequence of mundane conversation. Hall uses different terms for the repair and correction practices in the classroom as "conversational repair" and "instructional correction" to differentiate repair and correction in a pedagogical situation.

From the above discussion, both Macbeth and Hall claim that in pedagogical settings, correction activity is only concerned with correcting inadequate utterances of students and so not similar to conversational repair because there is no problem in mutual understanding. Thus the sequence created by correction is not viewed as a side sequence because the activity of correction itself carries pedagogical purpose. However, classroom interaction does not necessarily include "instructional correction" only. In other words, even in the pedagogical setting, the interaction does have features of "conversational repair" that halts the main sequence raising problems in mutual understanding. Therefore, the distinction between instructional correction and conversational repair is clarified in the existence of side sequences because classroom interaction has both features of conversational repair and instructional correction. If the participants in the interaction show their orientation to the problems of understanding the relative utterances, and the participants lack shared knowledge, it shows the feature of "repair" similar to mundane conversation. On the other hand, if the student utterance, though it is erroneous, does not threaten the mutual understanding of the participants, then the corrective feedback is only a type of instructional correction which cannot be equated with conversational repair.

4. Research Methodology

The data for this study comes from about ten hours of video recordings of naturally occurring microteaching environments in a Japanese university. In the

microteaching program the participants make a group of four or five members and design a full lesson. But while practicing the lesson, they teach it individually in parts of which they are in charge. Each microteaching lesson was consisted of about fifteen university students acting as model students and their advisor also as a student though in some instances he provides feedback during the lesson. In the course of data collection, it was clearly notified that the video recording would not make any effects in the part of their academic evaluation. Appendix A presents the research consent form the participants filled.

The analysis is conducted remaining within the framework of conversation analysis. Since the central focus of conversation analysis is on audio or video recorded data and detailed transcript, the interaction of the microteaching is repeatedly observed and carefully transcribed using the conventions developed by Gail Jefferson (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984) presented in Appendix B. With an emic perspective (Pike, 1954; Goodwin, 1984; Markee & Kasper, 2004) the observer's psychological and mental aspects are not included in the analysis but the analysis is formulated with an un-motivated examination of the data and the participants' viewpoint of the data analysis is utilized.

5. Data Analysis

The following section deals with the analysis of the data. The transcripts presented here are some representative examples of the interaction of the microteaching environment. The extracts presented here illustrate repair leading to the progressivity of the interaction. Similarly the extracts in the later section stand for the examples exhibiting the learning opportunity the trainee teachers attain through the repair.

5.1. Self-Repairs Showing Progressivity

Various studies deal with speaker orientation to language code (Hosoda, 2006; Aline & Hosoda, 2009; Kasper, 2004). In the following extracts, the

trainee teacher displays an orientation to the language code and shows some sort of progression towards producing complete utterances through the use of self-repairs. Throughout the transcripts TT refers to the trainee teacher, S refers to the students, T1 refers to a next trainee teacher in the group who has designed the lesson together, and PS refers to the professor who is also playing the role of a student in the lesson.

Extract (1) is excerpted from microteaching interaction where the teacher is teaching relative pronouns. The teacher assesses the student response and starts giving related information about the content, in this case "Perry." She is describing the content and giving a model of the grammar form in focus.

(1) [American]

13 TT: he is perry (2.0) he is america- uh (.)

14 he was american (1.0) he came to japan

15 so he was american who came to japan

16 °okay° he was america- >°ah°< he was an american.

17 who came to japan.

18 (2.0)

19 when did he come to japan do you know,

20 when (.) did he came- (.) did he come to japan.

Before this part of the interaction began, the teacher took time to change the flow of the talk from providing an assessment to displaying information. In the continuation of her talk she starts to provide new information about the content while at the same time modeling the grammatical form in focus for this lesson. In providing the information, she displays the grammar exercise in spoken form. After saying *he is perry (2.0) he is america-* the teacher suddenly cuts off and initiates a repair. After a non-lexical perturbation *uh* and a pause, she repairs her utterance to *he was american*. This repair shows a change in

the tense of the copula in the previous utterance and moves to possible completion of her utterance. This repair shows her orientation to language code (Aline & Hosoda, 2009) in that she replaces a present tense copula "is" with a past tense copula "was" in the second try. Her second try can be seen as the teacher's progress in language delivery and can be seen as a repair activity that leads to the progressivity of the action (Schegloff, 1979). Her progressivity can be seen in the fact that the turn construction unit (TCU) that was cut off after *america-* is brought to a possible completion *he was an american this time*. Schegloff (1979) lists "each next try changes an element of prior tries" (p. 278) as one of the features of repair in progressivity. After the repair work is done, the teacher again repeats the sentence, reframing it in the target pedagogical objective of teaching relative pronouns. So, her utterance in line 15 is one of the strategies teachers apply in teaching by repeating focused model sentences.

In the same way, the repair in line 16 also has a feature of repair displaying progressivity. When the teacher continues her talk after displaying the model sentence, she again experiences some sort of problem in the ongoing talk after producing *he was america-*. So, she cuts off there and initiates a repair with a non-lexical item >°ah°<. In her next try, she repairs her utterance by adding an indefinite article "an" before *american* and says *he was an american*. This repair also has a feature of progressivity of adding certain parts to the prior attempts and bringing that stretch of talk to a form that she had attempted previously (Schegloff, 1979).

The teacher asks a known-answer question in line 19 and tries to repeat it in line 20. Though her initiation of the question does not display any problems, as she starts repeating it in line 20 she experiences a problem after *when (.) did he came-* and cuts off there. Then she repairs her utterance to *did he come to japan*. In this repair activity, the teacher shows an orientation to language code. On repeating the question, she fails to use the correct form of the verb and then repairs it by replacing *did he came* with *did he come*

in the second try.

In all repair activities discussed from extract (1), the teacher's repair activities are repairs oriented to language code since she cuts off her turn-in-progress and when she produces a second try, some grammatical points are repaired. Through the series of self-repairs, the completion of repair assists the trainee teacher to make the next item due more appropriate.

In extract (2), the trainee teacher displays an orientation to various problems related to language code and initiates repair. In this extract, the repair initiations show an orientation to the progressivity of the lesson. Through various repair trajectories, the trainee teacher displays some progress in the whole lesson. For a detailed and clear overview of the context of the interaction, the full episode of the transcript of this interaction is presented here, then the points in focus are individually presented again with the analysis below.

(2) MTA6 [6:21-8:26]

01 TT: ah:: (1.2) however (0.8) there were problems.

02 there were problems. (0.7) what is-

03 what- (0.5) ah: (0.4) what pro- uh↑ what-

04 what are(.) what are the (.) problems.

05 ah::: (2.8) if (0.6) if egyptian government built
a new dam.

06 (2.0)

07 the (1.2) the water; (.) water would rise,

08 the water would rise and [(1.8)flood the valley.

 [((picks up the picture))

10 flood the valley. this is (0.5) ah:: valley,
picture.

 ((puts the picture on the board))

11 (3.0)

12 valley is a:: (.) low land (.) between,
 13 between mountains (.) or hills. It is valley
 ((writes on the board))
 14 this is, first problem.
 15 the second problem is, ah::(1.2) the farmers
 living-
 16 living- living [there; the farmers living there.
 [((moves hand over picture, looks up))
 17 would (.) have to be moved (.) because of rising
 water.
 18 the farmers ah:: have to be moved (.) because of
 rising water.
 19 ah::
 20 (3.0)
 21 eh::(0.4) [o::kay.(.) ah- sorry.(.) ((laughs))
 [((looks at note and turns to board))
 22 eh::there is (.)mo- one m- one more, problem;
 23 S: *souka*
 "that's it"
 24 TT: ah:: the problem is; the rising water.
 25 would cover these monuments because,
 26 these monuments (.) are along the Nile.
 27 so, ah:: there are problems. okay.

As the trainee teacher moves to the content of the lesson, he starts providing related information to the students. He begins to reveal the problems the Egyptian government was having during the making of a dam, a part of his planned lesson.

(2-1) Problem

02 TT: there were problems. (0.7) what is-
 03 what- (0.5) ah: (0.4) what pro- uh↑ what-
 04 what are(.) what are the (.) problems.

In the beginning of this part of the interaction, the trainee teacher talked about the decision of the Egyptian government to build a new dam. In his starting talk he begins with an utterance revealing the problems in construction of the dam. He says, however (0.8) there were problems and in line 2 he tries to ask a known-answer question to his students beginning with a wh- format. At the moment he says what is- he faces to some kind of difficulty in the continuation of the ongoing talk and cuts off there. In this particular part of the interaction, the trainee teacher is found initiating a number of repairs to overcome the problematic part. After the cut-off in line 2, he initiates a repair saying what- in line 3. Though he initiates repair with what- he again comes to a problematic part of the ongoing utterance and cuts off here. This problematic part consequently leads the talk to a short silence and production of a non-lexical perturbation mark ah: before the second repair initiation. The trainee teacher's third attempt in the repair initiation is seen in the middle of line 3 when he starts with what pro-. This time he displays some progression by adding pro- in the prior try of saying only what-. Even though he initiates repair, he is again unable to continue his utterance smoothly and that problem results in the cut-off. After the cut-off, he makes another attempt to initiate repair with uh↑, which holds the turn. The way he produces uh↑ with rising pitch shows that he just recognized or noticed his problem. But as soon as he initiates the repair, he again faces a problem and again cuts off after what-. Finally, he repairs the problematic part in line 4 with the utterance what are, and after a micro pause repairs the full sentence as what are the (.) problems, bringing the utterance that he has started with what is- in line 2 to a possible completion in line 4

In the following extract detail taken from extract (2), the teacher is continuing the lesson and saying what the second problem of the Egyptian government was, according to the content of his lesson.

(2-2) Living

15 TT: the second problem is, ah::(1.2) the farmers
 living-
 16 living- living [there; the farmers living there.
 [((moves hand over picture, looks up))
 17 would (.) have to be moved (.) because of rising
 water.

As the talk proceeds, the trainee teacher faces one more problematic part in the continuing talk after *living-* in line 16. He initiates repair by repeating the last word *living*, but the first repair attempt fails and he cuts off again. As he attempts a second time for the initiation of repair, it becomes evident that his problem in the continuing talk is a problem of word search. Along with his repair initiation, he starts moving his hand over the valley picture on the board and looks up at once. His hand movement over the picture and his gaze upwards can be seen that he is searching for a word to use to define the area in the picture. In his second repair initiation in line 16, he uses a heuristic word to overcome the problematic part and says the *farmers living there* and does the repair.

The following extract, again an excerpt from extract (2) above, shows the trainee teachers repair-initiation activities that include progressivity. In this part, he is about to conclude the lesson, but returns to the third point in his lesson plan, which he apparently forgot to teach.

(2-3) More

20 (3.0)

- 21 eh::(0.4) o::kay.(.) [ah- sorry(.) ((laughs))
 [((looks at note and turns to board))
- 22 eh::there is (.)mo- one m- one more, problem;
- 23 S: *souka*
 "that's it"

After displaying two of the problems with the Egyptian dam to his students, the trainee teacher concludes his talk by saying *o::kay.* in line 21. But as soon as he turns to the board, he manifests a realization that he has not covered all of his teaching points by saying *ah- sorry* and apologizing to his students. He then proceeds with his teaching points. His continuation of talk in line 22 again faces some sort of problem after *there is (.) mo-* and results in a cut-off. Here the trainee teacher is likely trying to say there is one more problem but during his talk he again manifests a realization of something lacking in that there is just "one" extra problem, and he cuts off there. He initiates repair by cutting off *mo-*, goes back to say one again, and continues his utterance with *one more*, this time completing the repair.

5.2. Other Repairs and Progressivity

Speakers in conversation often but not always attempt to initiate repair concerning the many kinds of trouble they come to experience and that threaten the achievement of intersubjectivity. However, speakers sometimes do not choose to initiate repair and let the sequence continue. Firth (1996) has used the term *let it pass principle* for the way participants orient to the continuation rather than understanding. Also in the data analyzed in this study, the advising professor who is acting also as a model student adopts the 'let it pass principle' by not initiating repair in apparent infelicities of language on the part of the trainee teachers and allows more opportunities for the trainee teachers to continue the lesson. Let us consider the following extract.

(3) MTA1 [4:02-4:20]

20 S2: *oranda?*-

21 T1: [((nodding))

22 TT: [*yes, oranda. (.) Dutch. (.) Dutch. (.) yes. One
country,*

23 *More one country.*

24 *(1.0)*

25 *it is near, >to< Japan*

26 *(3.0)*

27 S2: *chugoku?=-*

28 TT: =*yes(hh), China, very good. China and Dutch (0.2)*

29 *had a relation to japan. (°ok°)*

30 *(0.8)*

31 *So, (0.2) Dutch is a country which [has-]*

32 PS: *[Dutch] is not a*

33 *country, (.) Dutch is a language. (0.4)*

34 *Holland (.) or the Netherlands (0.2) is the*

35 *name of the country.*

In this extract, S2 provides an answer to a question the teacher asked in the previous sequences. On answering S2 uses the Japanese version of the answer and says *oranda*. Then the teacher accepts the answer with a head nod, an explicit affirmative yes, and then by repeating the same word (Schegloff, 1993). Then she moves on to translate the word into English so as to fit it with the English language teaching context. After the completion of eliciting information from the students at line 29, she begins the sequence in its complete form in line 32 so as to display a model sentence of her target point in the lesson and says *So, (0.2) Dutch is a country which*, but at this point the professor, who is also a model student chooses to initiate a repair to correct her previous turn of

translating *Oranda* as Dutch. In this extract, the trainee teacher's problem in translating the word is apparent quite earlier but the professor does not attempt to immediately initiate repair. So, by not choosing to repair the problematic part at the earliest moment, the professor is orienting to providing chance to the trainee teacher to initiate repair herself so that she would probably consider it as a learning opportunity. Further, his delay in the initiation of repair is also an orientation to the continuation of the sequence as discussed by the 'let it pass principal' (Firth, 1996).

6. Conclusion

The observation and analysis of the data in the previous section has indicated some special features of the repair organization supporting teacher development: (a) repair initiation on language code helped the trainee teachers to advance their language delivery, (b) the professors' other initiation of repair provided learning opportunities to the teachers, and (c) the delay of repair by the professors oriented to the progressivity of the lesson.

To look back at the data again, the examples display the teachers experiencing problems chiefly in two aspects - language form, and vocabulary usage. In the case of the troubles related to the use of proper language form, the trainee teachers self-initiate repair through multiple attempts and finally solve the problems faced. These attempts helped the trainee teachers to notice the errors of their language use and rectify them in their following attempts. Also, it helped them to produce their utterances in a more appropriate form. In this way, the self-initiation of repair helped establish a scaffold for the trainee teachers' self-development. On the other hand, the other-initiation of repair by professors demonstrated the learning opportunities the trainee teachers obtain during the delivery of the microteaching classes. Furthermore, the delaying of repair initiation by the professors provided more opportunities to the trainee teachers to self-notice the errors in their language delivery. The professors choose not to

correct the infelicities and 'pass' them up at the time of occurrence (Firth, 1996) to let the trainees continue in the progression of the lesson and allow them to notice their own errors and learn from them for further development in their prospective profession.

References

- Aline, D., & Hosoda, Y. (2009). Orientation to language code and actions in group work. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12, 59–83.
- Allen, D. W., & Ryan, K. A. (1969). *Microteaching*. Reading, MA: Addison–Wesley Educational Publishers Inc.
- Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bush, R. N. (1966). Microteaching: Controlled practice in the training of teachers. *Communication*, 48, 201–207.
- Button, G., & Casey, N. J. (1984). Generating the topic: The use of topic initial elicitors. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 167–190). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Button, G., & Casey, N. J. (1985). Topic nomination and pursuit. *Human Studies*, 8, 3–55.
- Cooper, J. M. (1967). Developing specific teaching skills through microteaching. *High School Journal*, 51, 80–85.
- Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). Issues and terminology. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 1–11). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26, 237–259.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gass, S. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Mahwah,

NJ: Erlbaum.

- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Doubleday Anchor.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Behaviour in public places: Notes on the social organisation of gathering*. New York: Free Press.
- Goffman, E. (1964). The neglected situation. *American Anthropologist*, 6, 133–136.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essay on face-to-face behaviour*. New York: Doubleday Anchor.
- Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in public*. New York: Basic Books.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goodwin, C. (1984). Notes on story structure and the organization of participation. In M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 225–246). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, J. K. (2007). Redressing the roles of correction and repair in research on second and foreign language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 511–526.
- Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structure of social action* (pp. 299–345). Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. (1997). Conversation analysis and institutional talk: analyzing data. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: theory, method and practice* (pp. 161–182). London: Sage.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis: Principles, practices and applications*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hosoda, Y. (2006). Repair and relevance of differential language expertise in second language conversations. *Applied Linguistics*, 27, 25–50.

- Kaneez, F., & Humera, S. (2011). Teaching aptitude and academic achievement of B. Ed. trainee teachers. *Golden Research Thought, 1*, 1-4.
- Kaanta, L. (2010). *Teacher turn allocations and repair practices in classroom interaction* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Jyväskylä, Finland.
- Kasper, G. (1985). Repair in foreign language teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 2*, 200-215.
- Kasper, G. (2004). Participant orientations in a German conversation for learning. *Modern Language Journal, 88*, 551-567.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2007). *An introduction to conversation analysis*. Continuum.
- Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Long, M., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: Theory, research, and practice. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in second language acquisition* (pp. 15-41). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning, 48*, 183-218.
- Macbeth, D. (2004). The relevance of repair for classroom correction. *Language in Society, 33*, 703-736.
- Mackey, A., & Philip, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings. *Modern Language Journal, 82*, 338-356.
- Markee, N., & Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom talks: An introduction. *Modern Language Journal, 88*, 491-500.
- McHoul, A. W. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in Society, 19*, 349-377.

- Morris, F. A. (2002). Negotiation moves and recasts in relation to error types and learner repair in the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35, 395-404.
- Pica, T. (2002). Assist the interactional and linguistic needs of classroom language learners. *Modern Language Journal*, 86, 1-19.
- Pike, K. L. (Ed.). (1954). *Language in relation to a unified theory of structure of human behaviour*. The Hague, Netherlands.
- Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation analysis: The study of talk-in-interaction*. CA: Sage. Thousand Oaks.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696-735.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropology*, 70, 1075-1095.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1979). The relevance of repair for syntax-for-conversation. *Syntax and Semantics*, 12, 261-286.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1991). Issues of relevance for discourse analysis: Contingency in action, interaction and co-participant context. In E. H. Hovy & D. R. Scott. (Eds.), *Computational and conversational discourse* (pp. 3-35). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97, 1295-1345.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1995). Discourse and an interactional achievement III: The omnirelevance of action. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 28, 185-211.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Third turn repair. In G. R. Guy, C. Feagin, D. Schiffrin & J. Baugh (Eds.), *Towards a social science of language: Paper in honor of William Labov* (Vol. 2) (pp. 31-40). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Schegloff, E. A. (2000). When "others" initiate repair. *Applied Linguistics*, 21, 205-243.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2004). Answering the phone. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: studies from the first generation* (pp. 63-107). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis* (Vol. 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8, 289-327.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organisation of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53, 361-382.
- Schegloff, E. A., Koshik, I., Jacoby, S., & Olsher, D. (2002). Conversation analysis and applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 3-31.
- Sidnell, J., & Stivers, T. (Eds.). (2012). *The handbook of conversation analysis*. Willey-Blackwell.
- Ten Have, P. (1999). *Doing conversation analysis*. London: Sage.
- Terasaki, A. K. (1976). Pre-announcement sequences in conversation. G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 171-223). John Benjamins.
- van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner*. London: Longman.

Appendix A

Research Consent Form

研究承諾書

本調査は、映像及び音声資料を収集し、相互行為における言語使用を考察するためのものです。研究課題は資料分析から生ずるもので、あらかじめ設定されたものではありません。また本調査は、被験者の教授法を批判したり言語の誤りを考察するものではなく、社会的相互行為の達成に注目するものです。

被験者の名前は、その論文及び報告書においては匿名が用いられます。映像、音声、及び映像から得られた写真は本研究の目的にのみ使用され、専門の研究者によってのみ利用されます。研究発表や学術論文の出版物においても映像や写真は不鮮明に処理され、被験者が明かされるようなことはありません（例として下の写真をご覧ください）。被験者のプライバシーは固く保護されます。



私、 _____ は、上記内容の調査目的における映像、及び音声資料の使用を承諾します。

日付 _____

バッタ, バイクンタ

Bhatta Baikuntha

神奈川大学大学院 外国語学研究科

Appendix B

Transcription Conventions

Convention	Meaning	Use
[text]	square brackets	start and end of overlap
=	equal sign	continuation of single utterance
(0.5)	timed pause	indicates pause in seconds
(.)	period in parenthesis	shows a micro pause (less than 1 second)
(hh)		audible laughter within a talk
hhh		audible exhalation
.hhh		audible inhalation
<u>okay</u>	underline	stress
okay?	question mark	rising intonation
okay,	comma	low-rising intonation
okay.	period	falling intonation
OKAY	capitalized text	increased loudness
°okay°	degree symbol	decreased volume
>okay<	greater than symbols	faster than the surrounding speech
<okay>	less than symbols	slower than the surrounding speech
oka::y	colon(s)	lengthening of the preceding sound (the more colons show the more lengthening)
oka-	hyphen	cut-off of the ongoing talk
((comment))		non-verbal behavior / transcriber's comment
(okay)		uncertain transcription