MASARYKOVA UNIVERZITA

FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA

Conducting repair in an advanced EFL secondary school classroom

Magisterská diplomová práce

Bc. Aleksandra Stojanovik

Vedoucí práce: doc. Mgr. František Tůma, Ph.D.

Program Učitelství anglického jazyka a literatury pro střední školy

Brno 2022

MUNI
ARTS

Bibliografický záznam

Autor:	Bc. Aleksandra Stojanovik Filozofická fakulta Masarykova univerzita
Název práce:	Conducting repair in an advanced EFL secondary school classroom
Studijní program:	Učitelství anglického jazyka a literatury pro střední školy
Vedoucí práce:	doc. Mgr. František Tůma, Ph.D.
Rok:	2022
Počet stran:	90
Klíčová slova:	konverzační analýza, oprava, interakce ve třídě, angličtina jako cizí jazyk, lexikální otázky, učení se v interakcí

Bibliographic record

Author: Bc. Aleksandra Stojanovik
Faculty of Arts
Masaryk University
Department of English and American Studies

Title of Thesis: Conducting repair in an advanced EFL secondary school classroom

Degree Programme: Upper Secondary School Teacher Education in English Language and Literature

Supervisor: doc. Mgr. František Tůma, Ph.D.

Year: 2022

Number of Pages: 90

Keywords: repair, Conversation Analysis, lexical trouble-source, other-initiated, learning in interaction, EFL classroom

Anotace

Tato diplomová práce zkoumá opravné strategie používané učitelkou a jejími studenty ve třídě s pokročilou úrovni výuky angličtiny na střední škole v České republice. K transkripci a detailní analýze souboru dat sestávajícího se ze 180 minut videonahrávek interakce ve třídě byla použitá metodologie konverzační analýzy. Z těchto dat bylo vybráno 10 ilustrativních příkladů opravných sekvencí, které jsou v této studii podrobně představeny. Práce zkoumá případy oprav, kde zdroj problému představuje význam slov. Učitelka následně tyto opravy přetváří v objekty učení. Ve většině případů jsou opravné sekvence řešeny pomocí online slovníku, přičemž celý proces je ovlivněn epistemickým statusem účastníků a institucionální povahou interakce.

Abstract

This diploma thesis explores repair strategies used by the teacher and her students in an advanced EFL secondary school classroom in the Czech Republic. The methodology of Conversation Analysis was used to transcribe and analyse in detail a dataset comprising 180 minutes of video recordings of classroom interaction. The thesis presents 10 illustrative examples. The results show that repair is initiated and conducted both by the teacher and her students. The trouble-sources are lexical items which are subsequently turned into objects of learning by the teacher. In most cases, repair is conducted by the teacher with the help of an online dictionary, while the whole process is influenced by the participants' epistemic status and the institutional nature of the interaction.

Declaration

I hereby declare that the thesis titled **Conducting repair in an advanced EFL secondary school classroom** that I have submitted for assessment is entirely my original work, and that no part of it has been taken from the work of others unless explicitly cited and acknowledged within the text of my thesis.

Brno May 3, 2022 .....

Bc. Aleksandra Stojanovik

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, doc. Mgr. František Tůma, Ph.D. for his endless patience, professional guidance, support and encouragement throughout the whole process of writing this diploma thesis.

I would also like to thank my family and friends for their love and support, and especially my husband Jan Tichý for his constant help and personal sacrifice, without whom the completion of this work would never have been possible.

Contents

1 Introduction 12

2 Sociocultural theory and learning in interaction 14

2.1 Sociocultural theory: Learning as a cognitive and social activity 14

2.2 Classroom interaction as institutional talk 16

3 Repair 20

3.1 Introduction to repair 20

3.2 Repair in classroom interaction 23

4 Overview of literature 24

5 Research method and data 33

5.1 Conversation Analysis (CA) 33

5.2 Research data 35

5.3 Transcription and analysis 37

6 Data analysis 38

6.1 Student-initiated repair 38

6.1.1 Student-initiated repair completed by the teacher with the help of an online dictionary 39

6.1.2 Student-initiated repair completed by the teacher without the help of an online dictionary 51

6.1.3 Student-initiated repair completed by another student 55

6.2 Teacher-initiated repair 60

6.2.1 Teacher-initiated repair resolved by the teacher with a help of an online dictionary 60

6.2.2 Teacher-initiated repair resolved by a student 66

7 Discussion and conclusion 72

7.1 Limitations, further research and implications for teaching practice 78

Bibliography 79

Appendix A (Transcription symbols) 83

Appendix B (Collection of excerpts) 84

1 Introduction

The aim of this diploma thesis is to explore other-initiated repair practices employed by the teacher and her students, non-native speakers of English, in an EFL (English as a Foreign Language) secondary school classroom in the Czech Republic, and answer the following questions: how do the teacher and her students conduct repair, i.e., what repair strategies they use when trouble-sources, or utterances perceived as problematic, arise in the course of the interaction; in what way their epistemic status and the institutional character of the interaction play a role in the repair process, and how could repair management encourage student involvement and learning.

In the context of classroom interaction, learning is seen not only as a cognitive, but also a social activity which is facilitated through interaction with others. The speakers' ability to use language in order to communicate effectively in a range of social contexts is part of their interactional competence, and repairing problems with speaking, hearing and understanding is one of its key components. Maintaining mutual understanding is a basic prerequisite of social interaction and there are practical strategies that the speakers use to deal with communication breakdowns. In the field of Conversation Analysis (CA), repair is part of the sequence of talk in which meaning is negotiated, and this process of negotiation of meaning is thought to facilitate the route to language acquisition (Pica, 1988).

The students and the teacher enter the interaction with their knowledge of the world and their experience and expertise in certain informational domains which they draw upon in the course of the interaction. Given the specific character of the interaction which takes

place in an educational institution, they orient to their institutional roles of teachers and students and perform their institutionally relevant duties of teaching and learning. When faced with an utterance perceived to be problematic, they aim to fix it by employing various repair strategies, taking part in negotiation of meaning and thus maintaining mutual understanding. Focusing on repair is important because it is part of their interactional competence, and for the speakers and their coparticipants it is also a resource and an object of learning (Kasper, 1986).

The thesis is divided into two parts: theoretical and empirical. The theoretical part is covered in chapters 2 and 3, in which the sociocultural theory of learning, the features of classroom interaction as institutional talk and the phenomenon of repair with focus on classroom repair are presented. An overview of literature relevant to this study is presented in chapter 4. The research method, Conversation Analysis, is presented in chapter 5, along with the details of how the data for the study was collected, transcribed and analysed. In chapter 6, 10 excerpts featuring repair sequences are presented and analysed. They are divided into two main categories based on the repair trajectory, i.e., whether the repair was student- or teacher-initiated and the way the trouble-source was dealt with and resolved. The findings from the study are summarized and concluded in chapter 7, together with an outline of the research limitations and its possible implications for EFL teachers.

2 Sociocultural theory and learning in interaction

2.1 Sociocultural theory: Learning as a cognitive and social activity

The sociocultural theory as an interactional approach to second language acquisition (SLA) developed in the 1990s (Lantolf & Appel, 1994), although the idea that learning is strongly influenced by and takes place in social interaction had existed even before that. It was based on Lev Vygotskij's (1962) pioneering work on cognitive and linguistic development in children which emphasized the socio-cognitive aspect of learning, and stressed that the cognitive processes underlying language acquisition are profoundly influenced by the participants' social interactional practices (Pekarek Doehler, 2013).

Sociocultural theories highlight the social aspect of learning which is facilitated through interaction with others: the participants communicate with one another, participate in discussions and interact with those who might be more experienced and knowledgeable than they are, while simultaneously making shared sense of the new knowledge and constructing their own understanding (Walsh & Li, 2013).

The sociocultural theory laid the foundations for the concept of interactional competence, which has been increasingly popular since the beginning of the 21st century. The term 'competence' in linguistics was first used by Chomsky (1965) and referred to the innate knowledge of language, as opposed to performance, i.e., the actual use of language in concrete situations. The idea of competence as a knowledge of language irrespective of its use was criticized by Hymes (1972) who argued that competence does not only entail one's knowledge of the structures and forms of the language in an ideal language system, but also the way language is used to communicate effectively in different social contexts.

This idea was further developed by Canale and Swain (1980) who proposed four major components of communicative competence, i.e., grammatical, discourse, sociolinguistic and strategic.

According to the sociocultural theory, learning is seen as a social process and language as "a complex and dynamic system which is locally managed by the interactants in response to emergent communicative needs. Instead of analysing processes that take place in the head, learning should be viewed in terms of the interactions that take place between learners and other learners, or learners and teachers" (Walsh & Li, 2013, p. 249).

In second language (L2) classroom research, the above-mentioned notion of competence is called interactional competence (Markee, 2000), and is said to comprise of so-called interactional practices (IP), which are the systematic verbal and non-verbal methods the speakers use when they engage in social interaction (Wong & Waring, 2010). These interactional practices, which collectively turn conversation into a system, subsume the following: turn-taking practices, i.e., the ability of the speakers to take turns when speaking in an organized manner and to be aware of when one turn finishes and another one begins; sequencing practices, namely the speakers' ability to understand and produce speech acts in sequential contexts; repair practices, i.e., the ability to deal with breakdowns in communication; and the speakers' ability to express their epistemic and affective stance (Pekarek Doehler, 2013). These interactional practices enable the learners to participate in the process of negotiation of meaning and co-construction of mutual understanding, which is key to the process of learning in interaction (Sert, 2015).

2.2 Classroom interaction as institutional talk

It has been argued that classroom interaction is a form of social interaction taking place in a classroom as an institutional setting. Its institutional fingerprints (Drew & Heritage, 1992) are found in the exchanges between the teacher and the students, and between the students themselves. The participants in the interaction orient to their relevant institutional roles, i.e., the roles of teachers and students, and perform their institutionally related responsibilities, which in turn strongly influence their behaviour, language use and the decisions they make on a moment-by-moment basis.

The interaction in language classrooms as educational institutions is understood to arise from the principal institutional goal which is that the teacher is going to teach the learners a second language (Seedhouse, 2004). One of the main properties of this goal is that language is both the vehicle and object of instruction (Long, 1983), which means that the teacher usually manages the interaction in the target language (in which case the language is the vehicle), while at the same time pursuing her pedagogical goals of the moment. Moreover, the learners may be aware of what they would like to say but may find it difficult to express themselves in the target language, or the form and structure of their utterances may need to be corrected by the teacher, which is something that does not normally occur in other types of classrooms.

What distinguishes mundane, everyday talk from the one occurring in the classroom is that, unlike everyday conversation, the organization of turn-taking and the interactants' participation rights in institutional settings tend to be restricted; the participants do not share equal responsibility for the management of the interaction and the progress of the

discourse, and the learners and their teacher in the classroom usually do not have the same social status (Seedhouse, 2004).

Another difference between everyday conversation and classroom talk lies in the type of questions asked. When people ask questions in everyday conversations, they usually do so because of their genuine lack of knowledge of the state of affairs, so they orient to the recipient as a knowledgeable person who should provide them with the information they do not have (Heritage & Clayman, 2010). They often confirm that that has happened by using the acknowledgement token 'oh' (Heritage, 1984). Despite not being completely absent from classroom talk, this type of questions, i.e., referential questions, tend to be outnumbered by display questions in the context of the classroom. Display questions, which are said to occur in most learning and educational contexts, as well as in interactions between parents and their children in pre-school years, follow the core institutional goal of teaching and learning in the classroom and mainly depend on the pedagogical focus of the activity (Seedhouse, 2004). The teachers usually know the answers to most of the questions they ask, but their aim is to check understanding, elicit a response, guide learners towards a particular answer or promote student engagement. This routine emphasizes the institutional nature of the classroom interaction and is one of the most striking differences between everyday conversation and classroom talk (Walsh, 2011).

In addition to the difference in the type of questions asked in institutional and mundane conversations, the practice of turn-taking as an interactional feature is also performed differently in the aforementioned contexts. According to Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1974), turn-taking in everyday conversation is "locally managed and interactionally

contingent system" in which only one speaker speaks at a time; there is a minimum of gaps and overlaps and certain rules apply: 1. the current speaker selects the next speaker, 2. the next speaker self-selects, 3. the current speaker continues. On the other hand, turn-taking in formal settings, e.g., in frontal teaching in the classroom, is less flexible and the participants' contributions in talk are more limited. It mostly involves question-answer sequences in which the professional, i.e., the teacher poses a question and the clients, i.e., students answer it (Drew & Sorjonen, 2011). Formal classroom talk usually consists of a three-part sequence: a question, an answer and an evaluation, namely Q-R-E, (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1974), in which the teacher evaluation of the students' answers asserts the teacher's epistemic supremacy and emphasizes the pedagogical context of the interaction (Heritage & Clayman, 2010). Nevertheless, according to Seedhouse (2004), this also depends on the pedagogical focus which is said to have strong influence on the organization of the interaction. In form-and-accuracy contexts, turn-taking is tightly managed; adjacency pairs usually consist of a teacher's prompt leading to learner's production, followed by an evaluation and a follow-up action. On the other hand, the interaction in meaning-and-fluency contexts is less rigid. Learners display certain amount of control over the turn-taking system, may initiate their topics of interaction, and are able to locally manage the interaction to some extent by being able to nominate themselves rather than having the teacher allocate them (Seedhouse, 2004).

In this respect recent research has shown a shift in language teaching pedagogy from more traditional classrooms to rather learner-centred and task-oriented ones, in which the organization of classroom interaction is more dependent on the pedagogical focus. Furthermore, in such classrooms students ask more questions, initiate sequences more often, self-select, select other speakers and initiate repair more regularly. The roles of

teachers and students continue to reflect the institutional nature of the classroom, but are not as fixed and invariable as it had been suggested before (Gardner, 2013).

Second language classroom discourse is said to be characterized by four important features mainly on the part of the teachers, because they are the ones who bear primary responsibility for the flow of the interaction. Those features are: control of the interaction, speech modification, elicitation and repair (Walsh, 2011). The organization of repair in talk-in-interaction as one of the major components of interactional competence and a resource for learning a new language (Markee, 2000) will be investigated more closely in the following chapter.

3 Repair

3.1 Introduction to repair

An in-depth and exhaustive analysis of the phenomenon of repair in everyday conversation was first conducted by the founders of Conversation Analysis (CA), Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977). While in the field of second language acquisition (SLA), repair is mainly concerned with error correction or misunderstanding caused by linguistic errors, repair in CA refers to the practices that the speakers adopt when dealing with any problems in hearing, speaking and understanding the talk in conversation and other forms of talk-in-interaction (Schegloff et al., 1977). It is triggered when a certain element in a speaker's utterance, referred to as the 'trouble-source', or a 'repairable', is treated as problematic by the participants. At that moment, the immediately preceding talk is halted until the repair is completed, although not all repairs lead to a successful completion (Schegloff et al., 1977). The repair outcome can either mean a resolution of the problem, or its abandonment. The nature of the trouble-source can by no means constitute only a mistake that needs to be corrected. Repair initiation can also be triggered in response to a hearing problem due to background noise interference, hearing and understanding issues in the search for confirmation, unavailability of a word when it is needed etc. (Schegloff, 2000).

From the viewpoint of CA, repairs in L1 talk are usually indicated by different markers such as silences, sound stretches, cut-offs and pauses, whereas in classroom settings repair may come in the form of comprehension and confirmation checks, clarification and

definition requests, verifications of meaning and expressions of lexical uncertainty (Markee, 2000, p. 84).

Repair is considered to be a course of action which has its sequential organization, or trajectory. The organization of repair can be analysed either in terms of who initiates and who completes the repair, i.e., the producer of the trouble-source or the interlocutor; or in terms of the position of the repair relative to the initial trouble-source.

If the speaker of the problematic talk identifies the trouble source on their own, the repair is self-initiated. This stands in opposition to other-initiated repair which is pointed at by the recipient of the problematic talk, i.e., the listener. Correspondingly, if the repair outcome is provided by the speaker of the trouble-source, it is self-repaired. If the repairable is resolved by somebody other than the speaker of the trouble-source, it is termed other-repair. In summary, repair initiations and completions can either be conducted by the speaker of the trouble-source or the recipient, and this leads to four types of repairs: self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, other-initiated self-repair and other-initiated other-repair.

In terms of the position of the repair, first and third position repairs are usually initiated by the self, i.e., the speaker of the trouble-source, whereas second and fourth position repairs tend to be other-initiated. Self-initiated repair is usually dealt with by the speaker of the trouble-source in the same turn, whereas other-initiated repair triggered by the recipient leaves the trouble-source to be dealt with by its speaker in the following turn (Schegloff, 2000). Repairs initiated by other than the speaker of the trouble-source in the next turn may take multiple turns to get accomplished (Schegloff et al., 1977).

In everyday conversation, there is a decisive structural preference for self-initiation and self-repair over other-completed repair (Schegloff et al., 1977). Other-initiations are usually withheld past the completion of the trouble-source turn in order to provide an opportunity for the speaker of the trouble-source to self-initiate repair.

Other-initiated self-repairs use special repair initiation techniques which point at the trouble-source with varying intensity. Those which refer to a problematic talk in the least specific way are called open class repair initiators (Drew, 1991), and are represented by words such as: *Huh?, Pardon?, Sorry?, What?,* or *Excuse me?.* The second group consists of wh-interrogatives like: *who, when* or *where*. Repair can also be initiated by a partial repetition of the trouble source sometimes accompanied by a wh-interrogative, and usually uttered with a rising intonation which implies uncertainty. The strongest repair initiation technique in terms of its ability to call attention to the trouble-source with high precision is the understanding check, often prefaced with *You mean*.

According to Schegloff et al. (1977), all repair initiated by other than the speaker of the trouble-source is initiated in the turn immediately following the trouble-source turn, and based on the locations of its occurrence has been termed NTRI – next turn repair initiation (Schegloff, 2000). However, later research has reported many instances in which other-initiated repair happened in turns later than the one immediately following the trouble-source turn, i.e., repair initiation was delayed, especially in interactions between non-native speakers of English (Wong, 2000). This has also led to the change in terminology from NTRI to simply other-initiated repair, or OI, because "the occurrence in the next turn after the trouble-source is not a pre-condition, or a defining criterion, but rather an empirical finding" (Schegloff, 2000, p. 211).

Researchers such as Pica (1988) and Long (1983) theorize that by making a joint effort to deal with the trouble-source in the discourse and come to a solution, the speakers take part in the negotiation of meaning, which is subsequently thought to facilitate language acquisition.

3.2 Repair in classroom interaction

In learning contexts, repair practices used for dealing with problems of comprehension and production fall under the category of pedagogical repair. This type of repair can be other-initiated either by the teacher or the students, and its goal is usually to facilitate learning (Wong & Waring, 2010). Pedagogical repair practices are considered to be strongly influenced by the context in which they are taking place, i.e., whether it is a form-and-accuracy context aiming at the correct use of language forms, or a meaning-and-fluency context in which the content of what is discussed is given priority over language forms and grammatical accuracy (Seedhouse, 2004).

Repair is oriented to the achievement of common understanding by the means of the speakers addressing themselves to the prior talk and revealing aspects of their understanding of that prior talk (Schegloff, 1992). Repair has been analysed sequentially in order to demonstrate how speakers make use of it on a moment-by-moment basis as a conversational resource for learning a new language. Foreign language learners can use a range of repair strategies in order to obtain clarification from their interlocutors. By taking part in negotiating meaning, they modify each other's talk, get content words that they may have missed or have not been familiar with and acquire L2 vocabulary (Markee, 2000, p.84). This repertoire of activities also reflects their interactional competence.

4 Overview of literature

In this chapter, an overview of research thematically related and relevant to my study will be provided. It starts with research studies looking at repair practices in classroom settings, with a special focus on different repair initiators and elicited solutions which are thought to encourage student participation and increase opportunities for learning. Then, it proceeds with a review of studies investigating repair strategies in an educational setting that emphasize the participants' institutional roles and the implications for language learning and teaching. Finally, it concludes with the notion of epistemics in conversation and its impact on repair organization sequences and their management in interaction in both non-educational and educational settings. A summary of the studies and their implications for this thesis will be provided at the end of the chapter.

In the field of conversation analysis, the organization of repair is considered to be one of principal organizations of human interaction (Lilja, 2014). While research on repair originally focused on informal L1 discourse in non-educational contexts (Schegloff et al., 1977), substantial amount of research on repair has also examined interactions between L2 language speakers in educational settings. Its aim has been to investigate in what way, if any, repair practices adopted in the classroom are different from those employed in an everyday conversation.

McHoul (1990) conducted extensive research into the organization of repair in classroom talk. Despite the strong preference for self-initiation and self-repair documented in everyday conversation, he found self-repair also to be the case in classroom interaction, although only to a certain extent. However, unlike natural conversation, his studies showed other-(teacher) initiated repair to be the dominant one in classroom interaction.

A study by Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2003) aimed to explore the ways in which the students and their teacher in a content-based German FL class used repair in order to negotiate meaning and form. Through the means of qualitative and quantitative analysis, they investigated the differences between repair conducted in the classroom and that in an everyday conversation, as well as the different ways in which the students and the teacher used repair. They concluded that the teacher and the students did not use the same strategies for repair initiation which are commonly used in everyday conversation, but rather used repair in a way that emphasized their classroom roles as students and teachers. Their study was based on the supposition that repair strategies are not solely a tool for dealing with troubles in speaking, hearing and understanding, but also a technique which helps students learn more effectively.

The data for the study by Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2003) came from eleven 45-minute recordings made during a seminar for advanced speakers of German at the University of Alberta in Canada. There were 12 participants, and they were all women between 20-30 years of age. The first stage of the data analysis involved identifying sequences of other-initiated self-repair and coding them based on whether the repair was initiated by the teacher or the students, whether the language of the utterance was German or English, whether the repair included a code-switch from one language into another, and the different ways in which repair was initiated. The results showed that unlike everyday conversations in which speakers start from the most non-specific repair initiation type and proceed with more specific ones only in cases of necessity, the students in the classroom interaction used the most specific one, i.e., a direct request for teacher's definition, translation or explanation, or asked for a specific vocabulary item. On the other hand, candidate understandings, which are commonly used in mundane talk, were used

almost with the same frequency by the teacher and the students. The results also confirmed that by initiating repair, both parties engaged in negotiation of meaning. Unspecified repair initiators were used only by the teacher and never by the students. The authors believe that these repair initiators might be face-threatening because letting the teacher know that the student has not heard something might be interpreted as student inattentiveness, which is not a desirable learner trait.

Partial repetitions as another type of repair initiators used in other-initiated repair sequences were investigated in a study by Lilja (2014). The dataset for her study came from 13 hours of everyday conversations between first and second language speakers of Finnish, out of which 322 other-initiated repair sequences were subjected to closer analysis. The study set out to discover why first language speakers choose to treat the repetitions produced by L2 speakers as signals of language-related troubles with understanding, and concluded that their decisions to do so are based on the identification of the asymmetric linguistic knowledge of the participants and the risk it may pose on mutual understanding.

The second aim of the study was to find out in what way other-initiated repair sequences may contribute to language learning and what particular practices the speakers adopt in order to turn the trouble source items into objects of learning. The analysis showed that such opportunities arise when the second language speaker asks a question about the trouble source word explicitly, or tries to incorporate it in his own speech, which sometimes may lead to a word search in which the first language speaker is called upon to help. Incidentally, previous research has shown that when learners of English provide a word solution to the search and conclude it with a rising intonation in order to solicit

confirmation from their native speaker co-participant, they exhibit their status of a language learner, i.e., they are 'doing being the language learner' (Koshik & Seo, 2012). The study by Lijla (2014) further illustrates the interconnectedness of language learning and other ongoing activities, i.e., the way the learning activity is constructed little by little with other conversation activities happening simultaneously in the background.

Finally, the research results suggest that the speakers mainly engage in learning vocabulary items. This has been supported by previous research in the field of CA-for-SLA in which learning opportunities appear to be mostly associated with vocabulary (Brouwer, 2003). The reason for this may be that for common language learners, words are the most noticeable and important aspect of language and the easiest to be marked and singled out as problematic (Lilja, 2014). The study emphasizes the importance of studying repair practices when looking for evidence of learning (Hellermann, 2009) because the difference in language knowledge opens up opportunities for engaging in learning activities even in such interactions which are not explicitly pedagogical in nature (Lilja, 2014).

The role of epistemics of expertise in the organization of conversational repair in multi-person interaction has been thoroughly investigated in a study by Bolden (2013). Epistemics refers to the specific knowledge that the speaker and the recipient in an interaction possess. According to Kamio (1997), they each have their 'territories of information', or 'epistemic domains', and specific areas of knowledge may fall into each person's territory, to the same or a various degree (Heritage, 2012). The interactants have relative epistemic access to a domain of information and they may hold different positions on an 'epistemic gradient' (Heritage, 2012), the more knowledgeable interactant being

marked as [K+] and the less knowledgeable as [K-]. The epistemic status of each interactant "varies from domain to domain, may change over time and on a moment-by-moment basis owing to particular interactional contributions" (Heritage, 2012, p. 4).

The data for the study by Bolden (2013) came from 60 video recordings of mundane face-to-face interactions between family members and friends, most of whom were bilingual Russian American immigrants. It consists of video recordings of between 30- to 90-minute length, which were transcribed and analysed within the Conversation Analysis framework. The findings are based on about 150 sequences in which other-initiated repair is completed by a speaker other than the producer of the trouble-source, i.e., the study focused on examining other-initiated repair sequences, in which repair is undertaken by the listener. She starts off by stating the well-known structural preference for self-repair over other-repair, according to which the speaker of the trouble source is the one who normally completes the repair on his own trouble source (Schegloff et al., 1977). However, based on the research findings by Bolden (2013), it is also the case that other speakers may engage in providing a response to a repair initiation which has been directed (explicitly or implicitly) to the producer of the trouble-source. This is based on the observation that the right of the producer of the trouble source to repair his own talk in not automatic, but sometimes has to be asserted, negotiated or contested. Bolden claims that the interactants who take the initiative to provide a repair solution on somebody else´s behalf, do so on the basis of their epistemic primacy granted by their own experience or expertise related to a certain informational territory (Kamio,1997). She argues that this epistemic authority comes from their specialized, professional or linguistic subject knowledge which is enacted and becomes relevant in the course of the interaction (Heritage, 2013). When the repair of the trouble source is undertaken by

somebody other than the trouble source producer, the repair initiator may be orienting to the asymmetries in the interactants ´expertise. In that case, the trouble source producer is assigned the role of a novice, whereas the selected speaker assumes the role of an expert. Consequently, the organization of repair sequences is strongly influenced by the speakers' orientations to their epistemic knowledge and their territories of information (Kamio, 1997).

A similar study acknowledging the importance of the participants' orientation to epistemic stance in interaction, yet in an educational context of L2 learners, was conducted by Reichert and Liebscher (2012). Its aim was to explore learning opportunities arising from word searches in peer interaction. Within the CA framework, word searches represent a particular kind of repair (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks, 1977), which is forward oriented and reveals knowledge gaps as trouble sources that the participants have to deal with in order to maintain intersubjectivity (Tůma & Sherman, 2022). As such they are regarded as learning opportunities, especially when another interactant is invited to take part in the search and the interactants orient to their language expertise, in which one of them is considered the expert and the other one the novice in the interaction (Brouwer, 2003). The data for the study by Reichert and Liebscher was corpus based and came from beginner and intermediate classes of German as a foreign language at a Canadian university. The study was based on interactions of groups of two to three students who designed a role play and performed it in front of the class, with one specific group later chosen for closer investigation. The students had to meet outside of the classroom to compose and practise their role play without the presence of the teacher. Throughout the interaction, the learners negotiated meaning, expressed disagreement and re-assertion over language expertise and used an online

dictionary as a language authority which helped resolve their word search. The data showed that even though one of the interactants provided the candidate word, their peers did not always accept it automatically. On the contrary, they often requested additional, authoritative source of information. The learning opportunity was created by searching for the target word while at the same time negotiating positions of expertise and developing personal stance towards the solution.

Certain problematic aspects of interactional competence specified as claims of insufficient knowledge, i.e., "I don´t knows" (CIK) as another type of repair initiation have been investigated by Walsh and Sert (2012). Their microanalytic study, which applied a multi-modal methodology for the first time, aimed to describe the sequential unfolding of the occurrence of CIK, the way it is manifested by the students and tackled by the teacher. They attempted to pinpoint the interactional strategies used by the teacher when dealing with CIK, which are considered to be part of the teacher´s´L2 interactional competence. CIKs have been regarded as the most commonly used epistemic stance markers, and in the above-mentioned study they are interchangeably used with the so-called 'claims of no knowledge' provided in response to a teacher´s question. CIKs can be used to express a range of underlying meanings such as uncertainty, neutrality or aiming to bring a topic to a close.

The data for the study by Walsh and Sert (2012) came from two public school classrooms in Luxembourg and entailed 16 classroom hours. The transcriptions of sequences were closely examined, including those with non-verbal features of talk, such as gaze, body movements, gestures etc. The general finding was that the sequence organization of CIK remained stable and predictable: when students initiate a CIK, the teacher either allocates

the turn to another/other students or utters a 'you don't know? epistemic status check and then proceeds with the turn allocation. The interactional resources that the teacher uses to deal with CIKs are both verbal and non-verbal: deictic gestures (when the teacher says 'you don't know?', he reveals the participant who lacks knowledge at that moment), embodied vocabulary explanations (hand gesture accompanied by a simultaneous verbal explanation), code switching, and DIUs (Designedly Incomplete Utterances) (Koshik, 2002), which the teacher uses when he elicits an answer from the students. DIUs have proved successful in triggering student participation and, in some instances, in demonstrating student understanding. In other words, the student's claim of no knowledge pushes the teacher to provide an explanation and this, in turn, may lead to a micro-moment of understanding. Although the authors concede that the strategies used by the teacher do not lead to demonstrable learning or language acquisition, they do play a role in pushing the interaction forward and encouraging student participation, and in certain cases lead to displays of understanding. The study emphasizes that the successful management of CIKs by the teacher is an important characteristic of L2 interactional competence.

In summary, the research studies above show that some repair strategies used in language classrooms are similar to those pursued in everyday conversations, such as candidate understandings and unspecified repair initiators used by the teachers. On the other hand, unlike in everyday conversations, classroom learners clearly orient to their institutional roles by using the most specific repair initiators like direct requests for teacher's clarification, explanation or translation and avoiding unspecified repair initiators which could be interpreted as inattentiveness and possibly loss of face. Furthermore, other-initiated repair sequences in the form of partial repetitions may

contribute to language learning when the trouble-source is turned into an object of learning, i.e., a learnable (Majlesi & Broth, 2012). This happens when the language learner asks a question about a problematic word explicitly, tries to include it in his own speech and asks the expert, or the more knowledgeable co-participant to help. As far as social epistemics is concerned, it has shown to play an important role in dealing with trouble-sources in interaction because repair solutions are often provided by speakers other than the trouble-source producer on the basis of their perceived epistemic primacy which is closely related to their personal experience or expertise. In a non-native peer interaction, learners re-assert their positions of language expertise and turn to the online dictionary as an authoritative source of information. Finally, even claims of no knowledge as epistemic stance markers play a role in the interaction by pushing the teacher to provide an explanation, which in turn leads to student engagement and reveals micro-moments of understanding.

5 Research method and data

5.1 Conversation Analysis (CA)

Conversation Analysis is an empirical research method which emerged in the late 1960s and early 1970s as a subfield of sociology. It was established in the pioneering work of the American sociologist Harvey Sacks, and the work of his close collaborators and co-founders Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson. It set out to investigate and describe the organizational structure of casual, everyday talk, conducted between friends and acquaintances, either in face-to-face encounters or in telephone conversations. Its main aim was to describe the organizational structure of sequencing, turn-taking and repair practices in talk-in-interaction (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks, 1974). However, since the 1970s CA has widened its interest and started to analyse talk in institutional contexts, such as expert consultations in medical facilities, courtroom hearings, radio and television interviews and educational contexts (the language classroom). Consequently, CA research nowadays incorporates both casual conversations and institutional talk (Drew & Heritage, 1992).

As a data-driven, microanalytic and qualitative research method, CA has been used as a tool for analysing and understanding second language acquisition. Its aim has been to demonstrate how micro-moments of socially-distributed cognition found in talk-in-interaction may lead to changes in the speakers' knowledge of the language and its use (Markee, 2000).

According to CA, social contexts are not static, but are being constructed by the participants on a moment-by-moment basis through their use of language and the way

turn-taking, sequences of actions, openings and closings of the interaction are locally managed. That is why it is said to be context-shaped and context-renewing: each participant's contribution is dependent on the previous one and creates the context for the one that follows; each speaker's contribution is inextricably linked to that of another participant in the interaction (Schegloff et al., 1974).

The participants' behaviours such as turn-taking, sequences and repair practices, which come under the umbrella term of interactional practices, turn conversation into a highly structured system (Wong & Waring, 2010). They are the three organizational features of talk-in-interaction which are used by the interactants to sustain communication and build common understanding. By engaging in these procedures, the interactants adjust, maintain and defend their interpretations of the situation and their actions in order to foster mutual understanding. (Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2014).

Conversation Analysis's main sine qua non is naturally occurring data, which are recorded and subsequently transcribed, as opposed to artificial conversations in experimental settings which are not considered appropriate material for analysis. The benefits of the naturally occurring data being video and audio recorded is that the footage can later be replayed by the researchers, used to re-examine the data, be reconsidered from a different point of view, or with a different research question in mind (Wong & Waring, 2010).

The transcription of the data is conducted using a CA transcription system which, apart from the speakers' words, also indicates their pauses, hesitations, silences, sound stretches, volume, cut-offs, rising and falling intonation etc.; each with its underlying interactional meaning (Pomerantz & Fehr, 1977)

Within the CA framework, data is analysed from an emic perspective, i.e., from the point of view of the speakers, and the aim is to understand the speakers' motives and reasons for their behaviour at any given moment. In compliance with its inductive nature, the data is approached without any presuppositions or a priori formulated hypotheses. The researchers may have a general idea about their area of interest, but must remain open-minded and alert to possible unforeseen findings (Wong & Waring, 2010).

CA can draw conclusions based on detailed analyses of a particular interaction, so even a very small number of participants suffices, because the goal is to describe the interaction between any number of participants in a multi-participant talk. In addition, CA has been used in many studies whose focus has been on a single teacher or a student (Hellermann, 2009)

5.2 Research data

The purpose of my study is to investigate the strategies that teachers and students employ when conducting repair on trouble-sources that arise in an everyday teacher-student classroom interaction.

To that end, the collected data for the study came from four 45-minute-long video and audio recordings of EFL lessons. They were taught to students in a 6-year public secondary school in the Czech Republic. The school is selective, reputable and a highly sought-after in the region.

The recordings were made in November 2021 over a period of two weeks, and the work was done in tandem with a colleague of mine, who is working on similar research. The lessons were taught to two groups of learners, aged 15 through 18, who were attending

their third and fifth year of secondary school respectively. Their language proficiency ranged between intermediate and advanced level, and the teacher used the same coursebook for both groups, English File Upper-Intermediate. In terms of gender, there was a balance, with no distinct male or female dominance. The number of students who attended the recorded lessons varied between 9 and 12 participants. Both groups were taught by a fully-qualified non-native secondary school English teacher who had more than four years of teaching experience, and at the time when the data was collected, she taught 21 hours per week.

Before we were given permission to come to the school and record the lessons, the teacher and the students were sent a project description and consent forms. The students who were already 18-year-old at that time signed the consent forms by themselves, whereas all the younger students had the forms signed not only by themselves, but by their parents as well, one week prior to our arrival.

The lessons were recorded using two cameras, one positioned at the front of the classroom, and the other one at the back, so that the students and the teacher could both be captured. In addition to the cameras, three voice recorders were placed on different desks in the classroom, one of which was always near the teacher. The purpose of the voice recorders was to enhance the quality of sound, because the sound captured only by the cameras was not always clear, especially in those classrooms that generated echo. The audio and video recordings were subsequently downloaded into a computer, and the sound and image were synchronized using Shotcut ©-, a free open source, cross-platform video editor.

5.3 Transcription and analysis

The data was analysed using the Conversation Analysis framework, as outlined in 5.1 above, and transcribed following CA conventions by Jefferson (2004) and Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008). In order to protect the anonymity of the students, all their names were changed.

The 180-minute-length of video and audio recordings generated transcripts which were in total 12 500 words long and were written in a MS Word document, because I found that it suited me more in practical terms than using a transcription software. Therefore, the process of transcription involved watching and listening to the recordings in Shotcut and writing the transcript in a Word document simultaneously.

In the collected pool of data, I identified 10 repair sequences, which I analysed turn-by-turn in line with CA (section 5.1) and categorized in two main sections based on the trajectory of the repair sequence, i.e., whether they were student- or teacher- initiated. These were further divided into five subsections, depending on how the repair sequence was completed, whether by the teacher or by a student, and with or without the use of an online dictionary.

6 Data analysis

In this chapter, the findings from the data collected for the purposes of this research will be presented and analysed.

The data (a total of 10 excerpts) is divided into two main sections on the basis of the trajectory of the repair sequence, i.e., whether it is initiated by a student or by the teacher. The main sections are further divided into three and two subsections respectively, depending on the way in which the trouble-source was repaired.

Section 6.1. presents a total of six excerpts of **student-initiated repair** which are further divided into three subsections, depending on whether the repair was completed by the teacher with the help of a dictionary (6.1.1), without the help of a dictionary (6.1.2), or the repair was completed by a student (6.1.3).

Section 6.2 presents four excerpts of **teacher-initiated repair** with two subsections: 6.2.1 features two excerpts of teacher-initiated repair resolved with the help of a dictionary, and 6.2.2 presents two teacher-initiated repair sequences resolved by a student.

6.1 Student-initiated repair

In the following excerpts, repair was initiated by one of the students in the classroom and resolved by the teacher with the help of an online dictionary.

6.1.1 Student-initiated repair completed by the teacher with the help of an online dictionary

Excerpt 1 (5A811-83-100) comes from a lesson in which the teacher tested the students on vocabulary items taught in the previous lesson. She read the words to them, one by one, in Czech, and their task was to write down their English equivalents. After the students finished writing, the teacher checked answers with the whole class. The teacher's aim was to elicit and explain the word 'conform to', but its meaning and translation into Czech became a stumbling block in the interaction. The first other-initiation of repair was conducted by a student, Katka (Kat in the transcript) in line 8, and two more other-initiations by other students follow in lines 14 and 15. The repair was completed by the teacher in line 16.

Apart from the other-initiation of repair by Katka in line 8 which is the main focus of analysis in this excerpt, there are other four self-initiated repair sequences by the teacher in lines 3, 5, 7 and 9, and three other-initiated repairs by other students in lines 8, 14 and 15.

Excerpt 1

```
1     T     přizpůsobit se čemu?
2     Ss    no ((some Ss shake their heads to show that they don´t
            know))
3     T     říká se v češtině konformita, že?
4     Ss    (xx) ((there is no clear answer))
5     T     conform to?
6     Ss    (the students are looking at the teacher, but nobody
            answers))
7     T     uh-hu::h, to se neříká?
8     Kat   to je jako (x) konfirmace? =
9     T     = $jako fakt ne$?
10          (2.0) ((T is searching for the word in an online dictionary))
11          conformity, yeah? (.) °whuuh°=
12    Ss    ((laughing))
```

```
13   T    you are right (..) přizpůsobit se, konformnost
14   S2   konfor[mnost?]
15   S3         [konformnost?]=
16   T    so, conform to ((T bending forward)) (.) something
17   Jana okay
18   T    zranitelný?
```

The teacher initiates her turn by asking the students to translate the Czech phrase ´**přizpůsobit se čemu**´ in line 1. This was an answer-check part of the activity, and the students had had time to think about it. However, they respond negatively in line 2, claiming insufficient knowledge (CIK). Some of the students shake their heads to manifest that they cannot provide an answer. The teacher probably interprets their silence and their CIKs as a display of trouble and initiates a self-repair sequence in the next line with a question tag ('říká se v češtině konformita, že?') implying a request for information or a confirmation of her view. She tries to elicit the English word by offering a hint in the form of the similarly sounding Czech word 'konformita' in line 3. Given that in the next turn the students do not provide an answer, the teacher reveals the word in line 5 with a rising intonation, which may signal her persisting uncertainty and a pursue of another conformation request. In line 6 the students repeatedly fail to respond, and the teacher initiates a third repair sequence in line 7 by asking a negative question and uttering the response token uh-hu::h, which in this context, and pronounced with a prolongation, resembles the change-of-state token 'oh' (Heritage, 1984) implying a change of the speaker´s knowledge – the teacher realized or learned something new that she had not been aware of before that moment. In this case it is the realisation that contrary to her belief, the English verb 'conform to' is not commonly known as 'konformita' in Czech.

A student-initiated repair sequence in launched in line 8 by one of students, Katka, which is framed as an understanding check with a rising intonation ('to je jako konfirmace?').

However, Katka is latched by the teacher with another attempt at repair, with a smiling face, implying that the teacher is aware the students do not know the answer, and this had just been confirmed by Katka's incorrect assumption. At that moment, the teacher starts looking the word up in an online dictionary. In line 11 she announces the result of her search: it is the English word ´conformity´, and she accompanies it with the acknowledgment token 'yeah' (Jefferson, 1983). She subsequently produces a non-lexical vocalisation 'whuuh' in a slightly quieter voice, suggesting surprise, maybe because what she found in the dictionary was different from what she had expected to find, and that had made her realize her mistake: that the Czech word 'konformita' is not common and therefore not listed in the dictionary. She does that while still smiling and the students start laughing in line 12. In line 13, she acknowledges that the students had been right and provides a new Czech translation of the English word conformity, 'konformnost', because this is what she had found in the dictionary. This new contribution causes two other students to initiate repair in the form of a repetition of the trouble-source in lines 14 and 15, suggesting that they may not be familiar with the second solution either. However, the teacher responds by uttering the word 'so' in line 16, and then by repeating the phrase 'conform to something', which sounds like a recapitulation of what was previously said, brings the sequence to a close. This is followed by the affirmative token 'okay' uttered by Jana in line 16, which implies that she accepts the teacher´s explanation. Given that the rest of the class is silent and there are no further questions, which implies agreement, the teacher considers the topic to be closed and moves on to the next vocabulary item on her list in line 18.

In this excerpt, the teacher clearly orients to the dictionary as a source of knowledge when a lexical problem presents itself. The dictionary is considered an authoritative language

source which is rarely doubted, and it plays a role in negotiating epistemic roles in the course of the interaction (Reichert and Liebscher, 2012). In this particular case, the dictionary assisted in clearing up the misunderstanding concerning the correct translation of the English word 'conform to' into Czech. For the teacher and the students alike, the benefit of its use manifested in the teacher's realization what is and what is not an acceptable translation of that particular lexical item and it also helped to resolve confusion.

Excerpt 2 (5A1111-83-97) comes from a lesson with the same class whose aim was to revise and teach new vocabulary related to clothing. The teacher started the activity by asking the students to brainstorm all the words related to clothes that people wear on their body. The trouble source is the meaning and the translation of the Czech word 'potítko' into English. The repair sequence is initiated by Tom in line 7 and it is resolved by the teacher in line 14.

Excerpt 2

```
1     T     uh-huh, anything else?
2     S     long sleeves?
3     T     yeah yeah, I mean, it's a part of clothing, so (.) yeah
4     San   how do you call the (..) the (..) ((Sandra is pointing at her
5           wrist, making circular movements)) potítko?
6     T     uh, good question (.) it´s a-it´s a=
7     Tom   =wristband, wristband je potítko, ne? ((looking at the teacher))
8     Jan   headband
9     Tom   nebo headband, to je potítko na čele=
10    T     =headband je toto ((T pointing around her head)), right, but I
11          mean it´s horrible, in British and American English it means
12          different things, and I never remember (..) ((The teacher sits
13          down and opens her notebook)), so there is hea-but that´s head
14          so that later, but wristband - I think it´s wristband
15    Tom   yeah ((two students sitting in front of him turn to him with a
16          smile and a nod as a sign of praise and acknowledgement that
17          he had been right))
18          ((T is writing the word on the board))
19          (4.0)
```

In this excerpt, Sandra (San in the transcript) self-selects in line 4 by asking the teacher what the English word for 'potítko´ is, pointing simultaneously at her wrist to show which object specifically she has in mind. The teacher acknowledges her question in the following turn, and after a very short pause starts providing an answer in line 6. She initiates a self-repair with a cut-off on 'it's' and a repetition, which may have been interpreted as a trouble-source by another student, Tom, so he offers a solution by supplying an answer ('wristband') in line 7. At the same time, he initiates a repair sequence in the form of a confirmation check with a negative question and rising intonation. Although he is looking at the teacher while doing so, possibly expecting her to verify what he had said, another student, Jan, self-selects and makes a contribution by providing another solution ('headband') in line 8. Tom may have interpreted this as a confirmation of his suggested answer, because by saying '**nebo** headband', he clearly accepts it as another possible solution and goes on to clarify its meaning ('to je potítko na čele'). He is latched by the teacher in line 10, who provides accompanying visual clarification of the word ´headband´ by pointing at her head. Although at first it sounds as if the teacher confirms and accepts this word, she goes on to express uncertainty over its meaning by saying that it has different meanings in British and American English, and she cannot remember which one is which. So, the teacher does not explicitly and immediately validate the word ´wristband´ offered by Tom, but rather starts to problematise the meaning of the word ´headband´. The reason for this is the fact that it is translated as 'potítko' in British English, and as 'čelenka' in American English, but this is not explicitly said in this part of the lesson. Consequently, the teacher becomes involved in resolving the uncertainty and providing a solution to two lexical trouble-sources, one of which was

initiated by the students, and the second of which was initiated by herself. The repair process that follows consists of other-initiated repair of the trouble-source 'wristband' and a self-initiated repair of the second trouble-source, the word 'headband', and its correct meaning and translation into Czech.

By openly claiming insufficient knowledge ('I never remember') in line 12, the teacher initiates self-repair on the trouble-source 'headband' and turns to her notebook to look up the word in an online dictionary. However, she decides to postpone its resolution to later by saying so in line 14 ('so that later'), probably because that was not the problematic item that the students originally pointed at in line 7. In line 14, she confirms 'wristband' to be the correct answer to the question asked in line 4. Tom, the student who first came up with it, reacts to the news with the acknowledgment token ´yeah´ in line 15, implying satisfaction with the outcome. Two of his classmates sitting in front of him turn around and express their praise for his expert knowledge with a smile and an encouraging nod.

Tom had obviously been granted the status of an ´expert´ by his classmates in that context and in that particular learning situation (Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2014). This could illustrate how the expert-novice roles in their broadest sense are locally constructed and the participants perceive themselves and others as experts with regard to the context (Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2014).

Moreover, although the participants' epistemic roles are continually negotiated, the institutional nature of the classroom interaction and the teacher's role of a primary knowledge source manifests itself in the way the students behave. Although at the beginning of the interactional sequence a direct request for a specific vocabulary item made by a student (Sandra in line 4 in excerpt 2) is successfully dealt with by other

students (Tom and Jan in lines 7 and 8 respectively), the student who comes up with the solution (Tom in line 7) nevertheless turns to the teacher for help and expects her to provide a confirmation and/or clarification, i.e., to validate and confirm their suggested answers. He is 'doing being the language learner' (Koshik & Seo, 2012), whilst the teacher is performing her institutional role of a professional by having the last say in the process, deciding when a trouble-source language item will be dealt with and closing off repair sequences. This is also in line with previous research by Reichert and Lienscher (2012) in which although peers provide a word, the others do not accept it automatically, but request additional, authoritative source of information.

When the teacher is not in a position to resolve a repair sequence instantly and satisfactorily, she consults an online dictionary to clarify and resolve uncertainties and provide correct answers. The online dictionary, with its immediate availability and practicality in terms of use, serves as an indispensable support tool not only because of its reliability, but also because of its status as an undisputed language source, especially in an EFL classroom (Reichert & Liebscher, 2012).

Excerpt 3 (5A1111-144-154) comes from the same lesson dealing with clothes vocabulary. It is another example of a student-initiated repair sequence which gets resolved by the teacher, again with the help of an online dictionary. In the context preceding this sequence, the word which the students discussed was ´stilettos´, and it was defined as a specific type of formal footwear for women. Its second meaning, 'dagger', becomes a trouble source in this excerpt. The repair sequence is initiated by Jana in line 1 and resolved by the teacher in lines 9 and 10.

Excerpt 3

```
1     Jana  is-is stiletto a dagger too?
2     T     I´m not sure=
3     Jana  =´cause, I think once I searched it in a dictionary and what came
4           up wasn´t like high heels but like a:: e:eh dýka
5     T     yeah, shoe with a very pointed heel ((The teacher is reading the
6           definition for 'stiletto' in an online dictionary)) (..) and
7           that´s all I have here
            ((T still looking at her notebook))
8     Jana  okay
9     T     ah, but it´s learner´s dictionary (.) wait (2.0) oh yes, a small
10          knife with a long thin blade. Looks like this ((T is turning her
11          notebook towards her students, so that they can see the picture))
12    Ss    oooh
13    T     I didn´t know (.) so you can literally kill someone with that
14          haha. even, okay, what else?
```

This repair sequence is initiated by Jana in line 1, in the form of a confirmation check with a rising intonation. Her question includes a self-initiated repair with a cut-off on 'is'. The teacher makes her epistemic stance clear in the next turn by saying that she is not sure, thus expressing uncertainty. She is latched by Jana in line 3 in which she reveals what she knows about the word. This suggests that her question in line 2 was not a genuine request for information that she lacks, but a request for confirmation of something she already knows. In other words, although her inquiry is framed as a straight interrogative syntax (Heritage, 2012), her epistemic status can by no means be marked as K-, as it becomes clear in the following turn. As such, it is definitely not a search for information, but rather a means of seeking confirmation (Heritage, 2012). She supports her explanation by saying that she had looked up the word ´stiletto´ in a dictionary before (an authoritative source of information which implies credibility), and had been surprised to find a meaning different from the one related to footwear. Jana might have interpreted the teacher´s expression of uncertainty in line 2 as a claim of insufficient knowledge (K-), so that could be the reason why she doesn´t repeat the English word from line 1, but translates it into Czech in line 4 ('dýka'). By this time, the teacher is already looking up the word in a

dictionary and confirms the meaning of ´stiletto´ as a "shoe with a very pointed heel". She adds that that is the only meaning she could find, which is accepted by Jana in line 8. This could be another proof that Jana´s question in line 1 was actually only informing, revealing what she knows and a possible display of her epistemic superiority, after it became clear that neither the teacher, not the rest of her classmates shared the same knowledge. The teacher, however, continues her search, and by saying 'but it´s learner´s dictionary' in line 9 indicates that that could be the reason why she had not been able to find the requested meaning. She asks the students to wait, and after a short pause confirms the meaning of the word stated by Jana in line 1, that it is 'a small knife with a long, thin blade'. As in other instances, she turns her notebook towards her students so that they could see the picture. The students again respond with a surprise in line 12, with a stretched change-of-state token ´oh´ suggesting that they had learned something new. The teacher shares their surprise by admitting that she also did not know. She closes the sequence in line 13 and 14 by making a humorous remark about the literal meaning of the word and moves on with the lesson.

This excerpt could serve as an example of learning in social interaction, by turning a lexical item initiated by a single student into a 'learnable' (Majlesi & Broth, 2012) for the whole class. In addition, it could also be used to illustrate how the use of an online dictionary can foster learning, because by the end of the sequence the whole class including the teacher had learned something that they did not know before. Furthermore, the use of an online dictionary could help bridge the gap between interactants occupying different positions on an epistemic gradient, thus restoring symmetry and epistemic balance (Heritage, 2012). It may also foster the teacher´s confidence, professionalism and

expertise in her institutional role as well as teach students invaluable learning strategies, e.g., using a dictionary as a source for learning a second language.

Excerpt 4 (5A1111-179-210) was taken from a vocabulary lesson in which the teacher and the students were brainstorming vocabulary related to clothes. In this excerpt, the focus is on shoes, and the teacher is trying to elicit the word 'wellington boots', which becomes the main trouble-source in this interaction. The repair sequence is initiated by Helena (Hel in the transcript) in line 6, and it is resolved by the teacher first in line 9, and finally in line 26.

Excerpt 4

```
1     T     that too (…) and if it is raining, and you want to go for a walk
            in the forest↑
2     Ss    aah
3     T     you need this British kind of shoes (2.0) and I think we had it
            in British history
4     Ss    (xx)
5     T     the famous admiral, was he? Wellingtons, wellies?
6     Hel   eeh, wellington is meat
7     Bet   yeah, haha
8     T     am I lying to you? ((T is looking the word up in an online
9           dictionary)) (3.0) no, these are wellingtons ((She turns her
10          notebook towards the students and shows them a picture in the
11          dictionary))
12    Ss    oooh
13    T     according to the admiral, was he=
14    Hel   = but I've been watching Peppa Pig[1] for a long [time]
15    T                                                     [yeah?]
16    Hel   and they never mention wellingtons, they always say 'we go play
17          in the mud and they never mention=
18    T     =and they never-they never=
19    Hel   =I think they call it=
20    T     = but in German I think they do because my friends are learning
21          German now and they are watching-I mean they are the same age as
```

[1] *Peppa Pig* is a British preschool animated television series by Astley Baker Davies which has been broadcast since 2004 in over 180 countries. It features an anthropomorphic female piglet called Peppa and her everyday adventures with her family and friends ("Peppa Pig," 2022)

```
22          me and they are watching Peppa Pig and I think they learned
23          gummistiefel there
24    Hel   but like wellingtons↓=
25    T     = and wellingtons, wellies eeh
26    Hel   maybe wellies
27    T     but eh US or Australian English have rubber boots (.) ((T is
28          checking this information also in a dictionary)) boring, $I
29          mean wellies much better, right$?
30    Ss    gumboots, haha
31    T     so wellingtons, wellies or rubber boots. Okay, eeh on your head?
32    Ss    a hat
```

The teacher starts eliciting the word 'wellies' by describing the weather conditions in which such boots are usually worn. The students do not respond, so in line 3 the teacher gives them more hints ('British kind of shoes'). She reminds them of the context in which the word was encountered, but neither this attempt achieves the desired outcome. Therefore, in line 5, she reveals the word. However, Helena immediately initiates a repair sequence in line 6 by stating that 'wellington is meat', which is acknowledged with laughter by her classmate Betty (Bet in the transcript) sitting next to her. Helena's counter-informing (Heritage, 1984) and her blunt denial of the word may have caused the teacher to start doubting her knowledge, so she reacts by asking a rhetorical question and initiating a self-repair sequence in the following turn. The teacher finds the word in an online dictionary and turns her notebook in the direction of the students to show them the picture. The students reply with the prolonged interjection 'oooh' in line 12, which may indicate surprise, or a change-of-state token (Heritage, 1984) revealing that their state of knowledge had been altered and they learned something new. The teacher initiates her next turn by mentioning the admiral with the same name again, possibly in an attempt to wrap up and close the sequence, but is interrupted by Helena in line 14 who self-selects and starts to challenge the meaning of the word again by initiating another repair sequence. The fact that she does not consider the issue to be resolved and pursues

it further indicates that her doubt may be very serious indeed. It looks as if neither the teacher's expert knowledge nor the authoritative power of the dictionary as a language resource had been able to dispel it. She offers a personal anecdote (Peppa Pig) in line 14 to prove her point and stress the implausibility of the existence of such a word. She supports her view by saying that the word had never been used in the Peppa Pig series, where it is most likely to be used, because the piglets are constantly jumping in mud, but their shoes have never been called wellingtons. Helena's reference to Peppa Pig, which is a British series, might suggest that she perceives it to be an equally reliable and authentic source of knowledge on a par with the dictionary. The teacher replies in line 18 with a partial repetition and a self-initiated repair with a cut-off, which could indicate surprise, or a request for more information. Helena probably treats it as a confirmation of her view because in line 19 she tries to come up with that other word used in the series ('I think they call it'), suggesting that this is her epistemic domain (Heritage, 2012). However, before she recalls the word, she is latched by the teacher in line 20, who offers her own cross-cultural anecdote related to the same source, which could be interpreted as an epistemic counterbalance ('but in German') and yet another reliable source of authoritative knowledge. This could also indicate that the teacher is trying to persuade Helena that such a word really exists and it is commonly used. In line 23 she provides the German equivalent of the word wellingtons, and Helena replies with the words 'but like Wellingtons' with a falling intonation which may indicate that her negative feeling toward the word still persists. The teacher reiterates the two words in line 25, and Helena expresses her willingness to accept the short form 'wellies' in line 26 by saying 'maybe wellies'. The teacher offers an alternative in the form of the Australian and US equivalent of the word in line 27 ('rubber boots'). However, she adds with a smile that this word

sounds boring and wellies is a much better one. So, she closes the sequence on a positive note in line 29, asking for confirmation. The students make up the word ´gumboots´ in line 30 and laugh at it, while the teacher moves on to the next word on her list.

In this excerpt, the teacher and the student each occupy the same position on the epistemic gradient (Heritage, 2012), but inhabit different territories. The teacher orients to her domain of knowledge (the word wellingtons with the meaning of boots), while Helena's domain is a different one, though equally legitimate (the word wellington with the meaning of meat).

According to Reichert and Liebscher (2012), the participants enter the interaction with their real or subjectively perceived knowledge about themselves and the others, their histories and biographies. Their expertise and knowledge are negotiated and co-constructed in the learning process, so "they rely on their learning histories and previously constructed expertise to negotiate new knowledge".

This interaction may also reveal that apart from the dictionary as an authoritative source of knowledge that offers support when resolving lexical issues, there could be another one similarly authentic: reference to linguistic phenomena in British or American pop culture.

6.1.2 Student-initiated repair completed by the teacher without the help of an online dictionary

In this subsection, one example of a student-initiated repair resolved by the teacher will be presented and analysed.

Excerpt 5 (5A811-338-367) is taken from the first 10 minutes of a lesson in which the teacher is testing the students' knowledge of vocabulary which had been learned and

discussed in the previous lesson. In the part preceding this excerpt, she dictated several Czech words, and the students were asked to translate them into English. In this particular example, the trouble-source is the difference in meaning between the phrases 'take into account' and 'take into consideration' and the meaning of their Czech equivalent 'vzít v potaz'. Repair is initiated by the student Michal (Mich in the transcript) in line10 and it is gradually repaired: the first attempt comes in lines 12-15, then in lines 19-20, and it is finalized in lines 23 -24, partly with the help of another student, Terka (Ter in the transcript). Even though the teacher looks up the words in an online dictionary, in this particular excerpt it does not help resolve the problem.

Excerpt 5

```
1     T     a::nd the last two ((The teacher is looking at her notes)) (2.0)
            vzít něco v potaz
2     Mich  take into consideration?
3     T     yeah, or?
4           (2.0)
5           (xx)lepší překlad, já jsem řekla take into-potaz je into
6           consideration or take into↑
7           (3.0)
8     S     account=
9     T     =account, yes
10    Mich  to je asi také vzít v potaz, nebo $já nevím$. není to vzít v potaz?
11    T     (T sits down at her notebook)) I´m not sure which one is which
12          in Czech. But it means take-take into consideration like thin
13          about it ((T is gesturing with her hands)) (.) when you are making
14          a decision, and take into account I would say (.) like really
15          follow-ah I don´t-I can´t explain this, it´s not so easy. Can
16          anyone explain the difference?
17          (3.0)
18    Mich  isn´t it [the same]
19    S           [I think]=
20    T     = a-a, it's not completely the same, I remember in my-in one of
21          my articles my supervisor corrected it, because I said take into
22          consideration and he said take into account
23    Ter   není account jako že se tím budete řídit=
24    T     =no no no, tak to myslím, že se tím bude-tady se tím budu řídit
25          a take into consideration jenom to jako zvažte ((T is looking up
26          the phrases in an online dictionary and starts reading the
27          definition out loud)). take something into account is to consider
28          something when judging a situation, so it didn´t help much (.)
```

```
29          jo, but-but that´s the difference, yes. And the last one, do you
30          know what chinos are?
```

This extract starts with the teacher asking the students to come up with the English translation of the Czech phrase 'vzít v potaz'. The answer is immediately provided by the student Michal (Mich in the transcript) in line 2 in the form of a confirmation request, with a rising intonation. The teacher expresses agreement in line 3 with the acknowledgement token 'yeah', but proceeds with the conjunction 'or' with an upward intonation which suggests that his answer is not complete and that she is expecting something more. Her elicitation is followed by a two-second pause which might be interpreted as a request for clarification, so she initiates a self-repair sequence in line 5, with a cut-off on 'take into' and an insertion of the word 'potaz'. It seems that by doing this, the teacher is explaining the reason for the possible confusion that might have caused the silence in line 2 – she claims to have used the word 'potaz', which is the correct translation of the English word 'consideration', but asks the students to come up with another phrase, also starting with 'take into'. Her explanation implies that the second phrase, which she is trying to elicit, is not translated as 'potaz', but is slightly different. In line 8 another student provides the expected answer and it is validated by the teacher in a latch in the following line. However, the implied difference in meaning in line 5 is now problematized by the same student, Michal, who self-selects in line 10. First, he states that the phrase 'take into account' also means 'vzít v potaz', and then he expresses uncertainty by saying 'nebo já nevím' with a smiley face, followed by a question tag which indicates that he is actually requesting confirmation. The teacher's reply in line 11 reveals uncertainty because she openly states that she is not sure about the meaning of the two phrases and the way they are translated into Czech. At the same time, she sits down at her notebook to look up the phrases in a

dictionary. (This becomes clear later in the sequence, in lines 27 and 28). In line 12 she starts to explain the difference by saying that to take something into consideration means to think about it, whereas to take something into account means to 'really follow'. This is followed by a self-initiated repair whose outcome is a cut-off and an abandonment. It may indicate that she had given up on her attempt to finish explaining the difference. In line 15 she announces that she is not able to explain, and provides the reason for that ('it is not easy'). She finishes her turn by delegating the repair (Wong & Waring, 2010) she had just initiated and seeks its completion from the students by asking if anyone can explain the difference. This repair initiation is followed by a three-second pause after which the same student, Michal, self-selects and produces his turn with a negative interrogative syntax (Heritage, 2012). This indicates his K+ position on the epistemic gradient and could be interpreted as a request to be agreed with rather than a genuine request for information. Another student makes an attempt to express his view, but is cut off and latched by the teacher who rejects Michal's proposition by asserting the students that the phrases are certainly not the same. She supports her explanation by providing a personal anecdote from the time when she was a student and was writing her PhD thesis. She remembered that the difference in meaning was pointed out to her by her thesis supervisor. This could be interpreted as an attempt to enhance her epistemic status by relating it to her academic experience as an authoritative source of knowledge.

Another student, Terka, self-selects in response to the teacher's previous turn and offers an explanation for the meaning of 'take into account' in line 23. This could be interpreted as a second attempt at clarification. The teacher accepts it, expresses her concurrence and expands on it in lines 24 and 25. Then she reads out loud the definition for the phrase 'take into account' from an online dictionary, but dismisses it as useless in line 28 ('it

didn't help much'). Given that none of the students make further comments, the teacher brings the sequence to a close in line 29 by uttering the Czech colloquial affirmative 'jo' and confirming the validity of the explanation she provided in lines 24 and 25. Then she moves on to the next vocabulary item on her list.

What characterizes this interactional sequence are the multiple instances of self- and other-initiated repair. The student launches other-initiated repair, whereas the teacher engages in both self-initiated and delegated repair. Even though it is the teacher who confirms and disconfirms students' responses and ensures that the exchange of information is completed, she is not always in the position of a primary knower, despite the institutional nature of the interaction (Nassaji & Wells, 2000). Nor is she the one who always initiates sequences. The participants' epistemic roles are frequently subject to negotiation and are dependent on the particular context. They have significant freedom to choose when to participate in talk (Markee, 2000). The participants in this interaction are actively involved in the negotiation of meaning and there is a joint effort in trying to fix the lexical issue.

6.1.3 Student-initiated repair completed by another student

In this subsection, an excerpt in which a student-initiated repair sequence is resolved by another student is presented. Excerpt 6 (5A1111-268-286) was taken from a vocabulary lesson whose main focus was on clothes vocabulary, and in particular adjectives used to describe clothes.

The trouble-source is the meaning and the usage of the word 'immaculate', with respect to its register. The word is brought up by one of the students, and its meaning and usage become subject to clarification requests and subsequent repair.

Excerpt 6

```
1     T     smart?
2     Ann   dumb
3     T     hahaha, but when we are talking about clothes what does it mean
4           to-what does it mean?
5     Jana  immaculate
6     T     ooh, wow, that's a word. Do you know-do the others know what it
7           means,immaculate-this is not necessarily=
8     Jana  =it's internet slang
9     T     really?
10    Mat   no::::, immaculate is proper=
11    T     =it's like perfect, without=
12    Mat   =but it's proper English, no?
13    T     yeah, and that's proper=
14    Jana  =it is, but it's also=
15    T     =it used to be proper English=
16    Jana  =but it's also widely used on the internet I would say
17    T     right, uh-huh
18    Jana  like the vibes are immaculate
19    T     ooh, okay. Again, I'm learning something here, hahaha, good.
```

At the beginning of the sequence, the teacher elicits the meaning of the word 'smart' in the context of clothes vocabulary. Anna (Ann in the transcript) immediately responds by providing its antonym 'dumb' in line 2, suggesting that she knows what the meaning of 'smart' is, i.e., a synonym to intelligent. The teacher reacts with laughter implying that Anna's attempt to describe the meaning of the word was a good try, but not the right one in the given context. The teacher's immediate reaction in the form of laughter could also suggest that she might be using it as a substitute for a direct rejection of the answer, or negative assessment (Petitjean & Martinez, 2000). The teacher proceeds to fish for the correct answer by reminding the students that she is looking for its meaning in the context of clothes. Another student, Jana, instantly answers by providing the word 'immaculate' in line 5. The teacher provides a third-turn evaluation by expressing surprise (ooh, wow, that's a word) implying that she didn't expect a student to know such advanced piece of vocabulary. As she probably considers the word to be uncommon, she initiates a

pedagogical, delegated repair (Kasper, 1986), passing its completion onto the other students in the class. Her repair initiation consists of a self-repair with a cut-off on 'do you know', probably as a result of her having to deal with a local and immediate contingency (Lee, 2007) and deciding on a moment-by-moment basis to initiate a delegated repair instead of providing the answer on her own, so that the rest of the class could be involved as well.

Jana immediately comes up with an explanation in the following turn, describing it as 'internet slang'. The teacher responds with the exclamation 'really' with a rising intonation, implying big surprise, and is immediately latched by Mat in line 9 who expresses a strong rejection of Jana's statement with a prolonged 'no'. His rejection and the subsequent exclamation 'immaculate <u>is</u> proper', suggest that he is problematising the register of the word, which he considers to be standard English, and not slang, thus initiating a repair sequence in line 9. The teacher responds to it with an affirmative 'yeah, that's proper', implying that she accepts his comment and agrees with him. In the next turn, Jana also expresses agreement that the word is used in standard English by saying 'it is', but adding 'but it's also' suggests that she wants to argue her point further and provide more support for her claim. She is latched by the teacher in line 14 who says that the word used to be proper English. This could be interpreted as a confirmation of Mat's view and her knowledge of its commonly-known meaning, but also as an implication that she concedes that the meaning and use of the word might have changed over time, thus expressing acceptance of the proposition made by Jana. In line 15, Jana reiterates her previous claim, and her adding of 'I would say' implies that she is the role of the knowing expert in this interaction (Reichert & Liebscher, 2012). The teacher accepts this in the next turn by saying 'right, uh-huh' and this could have served as an encouragement for

Jana to further support her claim by providing an example of its use in line 17 ('like the vibes are immaculate'). The teacher closes the sequence with the acknowledgment token 'okay' and a personal remark that she had learned something new.

An interesting aspect in this sequence is the fact that the meaning of the word 'immaculate' is hardly explained, apart from the single attempt by the teacher in line 10 where she says, 'it's like perfect, without'. The dynamic negotiation is mostly about its register and the question whether it is part of standard language or slang. Although Jana does not provide a clear explanation regarding its different meaning as an internet slang, both the teacher and the students seem to automatically accept her as the knowing expert in this case. The question is whether this is not due to the fact that Jana supports her claim by referring to its use on the internet, which might be perceived as an authentic and authoritative source of knowledge, especially by EFL learners.

The only issue which arises in this sequence seems to be the insistence to have its standard English meaning confirmed. It is also surprising that the teacher, except for her initial surprise with the proposed meaning, seems to take Jana's proposition for granted and does not challenge it further. This is interesting because this is the same teacher who relies on her online dictionary quite significantly and uses it every time a lexical issue comes about, especially with this group of students. On the other hand, foreign language internet slang is something which is not only language-, but also age-specific, so for a non-native teacher of English of a certain age it may be extremely time-consuming, if not impossible, to search for and confirm the validity in terms of meaning of such and similar student-presented lexical items. This could be the reason why the only sensible solution is to accept it and enable the interaction to move forward.

In summary, the repair sequences in section 6.1 are other-initiated by the students and they are all concerned with the meaning, use or Czech and English equivalents to lexical trouble-sources. In all of the examples presented above, the students self-select and initiate repair by asking the teacher directly to provide them with the meaning of the specific vocabulary item, or by partially repeating the trouble source, by making clarification and confirmation checks, and in one example by counter-informing. The repair process which is subsequently triggered turns the trouble-sources into objects of learning that all the students may benefit from. The students and the teacher perform their institutional roles: the students by being language learners who turn to the more knowledgeable person, the teacher, for help; and the teacher by being the professional who has the final say in providing solutions to problems, and opening and closing sequences.

The solutions to the lexical issues raised by the students in the course of the interaction are often provided by their classmates and subsequently dealt by and/or confirmed by the teacher. When the teacher expresses uncertainty over the meaning or use of certain lexical items, she turns to the online dictionary for help, and the results yielded by the online dictionary word search are accepted by the students. Both the teacher and the students enter the interaction with their personal knowledge of the world, experience and expertise and their epistemic knowledge is revealed in the course of the repair .

6.2 Teacher-initiated repair

This section presents four excerpts with sequences of teacher-initiated repair. In the first subsection 6.2.1, there are two excerpts in which the repair was initiated and resolved by the teacher with the help of an online dictionary, and the second subsection, 6.2.2, features two excerpts with teacher-initiated repair resolved by a student.

6.2.1 Teacher-initiated repair resolved by the teacher with a help of an online dictionary

The first example in this subsection, excerpt 7 (5A1111-233-243), was taken from a vocabulary lesson in which the main focus was on items of clothes worn on the head. The students were engaged in a brainstorming session and they were shouting out their answers. The trouble-source in this excerpt is the meaning of the word 'balaclava' provided by one of the students in line 3 and resolved by the teacher with the help of a dictionary in line 11.

Excerpt 7

```
1     Tom   bandanna?
2     T     huh? =
3     Mat   =balaclava, do you call it that way?
4     T     we are-after this lesson we are going to be experts in clothing
5           ((T walks towards her notebook)), how-what did you say?
6     Mat   balaclava (..) you [can put it]
7     T                      [I always] confuse it with eeh, like the dessert? =
8     Jana  baklava
9     T     yeah, haha ((T is looking the word up in her notebook))
10          (3.0)
11          yeah balaclava, balaclava yeah (..) and it's spelled like this
12          ((T is writing the word on the blackboard))
13    S     hijab?
```

The sequence starts when one of the students, Tom, offers the word bandanna in line 1. However, at that moment in the video recording the teacher is far from the student and

the class is quite noisy, so that might be the reason why she only responds with an open class repair initiator huh? with a rising intonation. This could be interpreted either as a hearing issue or a lack of understanding and a request for repetition. However, this turn is immediately latched by Mat who brings forward the word balaclava in line 3, so the repair initiation by the teacher from line 1 is abandoned. Mat accompanies the suggested word with a question ('do you call it that way') which, in this case, implies a request for confirmation. The teacher walks towards her notebook and expresses a personal comment that they are all going to become experts at clothing after that lesson. This could imply that she cannot provide a confirmation at that moment and is not sure of the exact meaning of the word. Then she other-initiates repair with a wh- interrogative in line 5, which is an embedded self-initiated repair with a cut-off and an abandonment ('how-what did you say?'). Mat repeats the word 'balaclava' and attempts to explain its meaning possibly in response to the teacher's-initiated repair in line 6, but is overlapped by the teacher who says that she always confuses this word with another one, meaning dessert. The implied word, baklava, is immediately supplied by Jana in line 8, and is acknowledged and accepted by the teacher in the next turn. There is a three-second pause in which the teacher is looking at her notebook. Then, she confirms the word 'balaclava' and repeats it twice, emphasizing the stress on the third syllable after which she points out the spelling and writes it on the board. The lesson continues when another student self-selects and offers the word 'hijab'.

This excerpt could serve as an example of learning in social interaction, when a trouble-source lexical item is turned into an object of learning, mainly thanks to the teacher's on-the-spot decision to accept it as something worth pedagogically focusing on, similarly to the situation in excerpt 3.

The teacher's behaviour shows certain consistency in the excerpts analysed so far. When a lexical item is brought up by a student and the teacher considers it relevant to the pedagogical task at hand, but is not sure of the meaning or use of the word, she turns to the dictionary for clarification, as in the case above. However, when a lexical item is brought up by some of the students whose meaning the teacher is confident about, she engages in pedagogical repair in the form of a delegated repair, as in excerpts 5 and 6, for example.

The second example, in excerpt 8 (5A1111-424-458), comes from one of the vocabulary lessons on clothes and features a very similar case. The repair sequence analysed below is the only example in this study in which the teacher engages in a self-initiated self-repair and the resolution is again provided with the help of the dictionary. The teacher´s aim is to elicit the word ´drying rack´, but the students take the interaction into a slightly different direction. The trouble-source is the word ´tumble dryer´. The repair sequence starts in line 16 and it is self-initiated and self-repaired by the teacher in lines 27 – 30.

Excerpt 8

```
1     T     OK, hang clothes up, tell me quickly
2     Mon   I never do that
3     T     you never-you never do that↓[you use, what do you use] instead
4     Bet                                [I do that after ironing]
5     Mon   a chair, I just threw it on a chair
6     T     oh, okay, I didn't expect that, haha
7     Ss    hahaha
8     T     okay, there is a machine, right?
9     Anna  machine? =
10    Mon   = [washing machine]
11    S           [dryer]
12    T     but afterwards when you want it-when you want [your clothes to
            dry you]
13    Bet   [dryer]
14    Ss    dryer=
15    Mon   = drying machine
16    T     (xx) tumble-dr-=
```

```
17    Jan   =dryer=
18    T     =to tumble dry is to- ((T is typing on her notebook))
19    Ss    (xx)
20    T     I've just forgotten the word
21          (3.0)
22    Ss    sušička
23    T     tumble-dryer, what is it? ((T is looking at her notebook))
24    Jana  isn´t it just a dryer?
25    Mon   I think it´s a dryer
26    Tom   jo
27    T     it´s a tumble dryer, I was right. I just need to trust myself,
28          haha ((The T is writing the word on the word, with two spellings:
29          dryer and drier)) so it´s a tumble dryer like this or like this,
30          and in American English just dryer
31    Ss    ah, yes
32    Tom   here we go
33    T     to tumble dry is like - it says sometimes on your clothes do not
34          tumble dry, right? But it´s not very eco-friendly, is it?
35    Mon   doesn't smell good
```

The aim of this activity is to revise vocabulary learnt in the previous lesson. The students are expected to supply the vocabulary item for each of the definitions given by the teacher The teacher starts this sequence by trying to elicit the word ´drying rack´ and she provides a definition for it in line 1. Providing definitions for specific vocabulary and asking the students to say the word is this teacher's common practice and the students are used to this way of revising vocabulary. However, Monica (Mon in the transcript) self-selects and says that she never does that. Her answer reveals that she had misunderstood the teacher´s elicitation by assuming that the requested word is a 'clothes hanger' as it is confirmed in the following lines. Moreover, she does not answer the question directly by providing the expected vocabulary item, but rather seems to initiate a topic for conversation. However, although her response is not exactly what had been expected, the teacher reacts to it by changing her pedagogical focus, which is checking the students' knowledge of the particular vocabulary item, and asking Monica a referential question in line 3. This obviously encourages participation by another student, Betty (Bet in the transcript) in line 4, who says that she does that only after ironing, i.e., putting the clothes

on a clothes hanger. This answer confirms that Monica was not the only student to misunderstand the word elicited by the teacher. In line 5, Monica answers the teacher's question by saying that she only throws her clothes on a chair. The teacher laughs and provides third-turn evaluation expressing her personal opinion and using the acknowledgement token 'okay' (Beach, 1993) which in this case likely signals closing the preceding sequence and moving on to a new topic. In line 8 the teacher goes back to her original agenda by continuing to elicit the same vocabulary item. It seems that by saying 'okay, there is a machine, right', she wants to point at the chronological order in which the activities are performed, where the 'drying rack' comes after the clothes have been washed. However, to this, the student Anna responds with a repetition of the word in line 9 suggesting uncertainty or a clarification request. Two more students in lines 10 and 11 join in with their contributions which now leads to the assumption that the teacher is eliciting a word related to a machine used for drying clothes. The teacher steers the interaction back to the word she has in mind in line 12 by providing another hint ('afterwards, when you want your clothes to dry'). This obviously does not help because the teacher's turn is followed by Betty in line 13 offering the word 'dryer' and more students repeating the same word in line 14. Another contribution is provided by Monica in line 15 in the form of 'drying machine'. There are some overlaps in this part of the lesson as the students are shouting out their answers. By this time, it may have become clear that the vocabulary focus had shifted from what the teacher had originally intended, so she joins the word search by trying to recall the word the students are obviously aiming at, which is a 'tumble dryer'. In line 16, she utters the first part of the word but abandons it with a cut-off implying that she is not sure of its exact form. Another student, Jan, repeats the word 'dryer' in line 17 while the teacher is already looking the word up in an online

dictionary. In line 18, she is thinking out loud by suggesting that she is aware of the existence of the verb 'to tumble dry' but may need to check its meaning. While she is doing that, she says that she 'has forgotten the word' in line 20, which could be interpreted as an explanation for bringing the interaction to a halt and the three second pause that follows. Her claim of no knowledge seems to have encouraged the students in line 22 to take part in the interaction. They may have interpreted the teacher's CIK as an initiation of repair, so they provide a solution in the form of the Czech translation 'sušička'. The teacher asks a rhetorical question while looking for the answer online in line 23, and at the same time more students (Jana, Monika and Tom) self-select to provide a solution in lines 24,25 and 26 by revealing their epistemic stance. The teacher announces the answer in lines 27 – 30 by confirming the word ´tumble dryer´ and providing more information related to its spelling and the difference between British and American English. The students accept it in line 31 and the teacher moves the interaction forward by expanding on the use of the tumble dryer and expressing environmental concerns.

This repair sequence is another example of a joint effort to deal with a trouble-source in classroom interaction and another demonstration of the online dictionary being an indispensable tool for learning in EFL classrooms. The teacher´s openness to her students' contributions and her flexible approach help turn the repairable into an object of learning. The online dictionary does not only help the teacher satisfy the students´ immediate learning needs, but also provides additional input which the teacher utilizes and thus broadens the learning experience.

6.2.2 Teacher-initiated repair resolved by a student

The sequence in excerpt 9 (5A1111-125-136) comes from one of the lessons on clothes vocabulary in which the students were asked to brainstorm words related to footwear. The trouble-source is the spelling of the word 'stiletto', which was brought forward by one of the students. The repair sequence is initiated by the teacher and repaired by a student, with the teacher's assistance.

Excerpt 9

```
1     T     and on your feet?
2     S     socks
3     T     yeah
4     Jana  stilettos=
5     T     =stilettos?
6     Jana  uh-huh
7     T     with double /t/ like this, right? ((T is writing the word on the
8           board))
9     Jana  I think-isn't it double /l/? (..) I don't know, let me check that,
10          it's weird
11    T     and I'm not sure about this either, hahaha ((T is pointing at the
12          letter /e/ in the word)), so check the plural, Cambridge online
13          dictionary is better for this one ((T is looking up the word in
14          the dictionary))
15    Jana  it's double /t/, and only /o/
16    T     ah, a-ha, thank you
```

At the beginning of the sequence the teacher is eliciting examples of footwear by asking a question in line 1. A student self-selects and offers the word 'socks'. The teacher accepts it with the acknowledgment token 'yeah' in line 3. Then another student, Jana, comes up with the word 'stilettos' in line 4. The teacher initiates other-repair by repeating the trouble-source in line 5 with a rising intonation, which indicates uncertainty. It seems that Jana interprets this as a hearing issue or a request for confirmation, so she confirms it by uttering 'uh-huh' in line 6. In this sequence, the teacher is standing in front of the board, so she starts writing the word and initiates repair in line 7 by asking Jana to confirm the

correct spelling, i.e., whether the word is spelled with a double /t/. By asking a question, the teacher is positioning herself in the role of the unknown participant, whereas Jana's role is that of the knowing expert, because she is the one who is assumed to know the answer. This is in contrast with the general view of the classroom as an institutional setting in which the teacher assumes the role of the professional and that of the knowing expert (Heritage & Clayman, 2010).

Jana makes an attempt at resolving the repair in line 9, in the form of a question tag and an embedded self-initiated repair with a cut-off. She suggests writing a double /l/, but then expresses uncertainty by claiming insufficient knowledge ('I don't know') and asks for permission to check the word. She also expresses uncertainty by saying 'it's weird'. The teacher admits that she is not sure about the spelling of the word either, not only with reference to the letters /t/ and /l/ in the middle of the word, but also with regard to the spelling of the plural form, because the teacher points at the letter /e/ in the plural ending she had written on the board. The teacher also advises Jana on the source, and recommends Cambridge dictionary online in line 12, which could be interpreted as providing expert advice. Jana announces the correct spelling in line 15, which the teacher acknowledges and goes on to close the sequence.

In this excerpt, the spelling of the word 'stilettos' becomes a shared pedagogical focus (Majlesi & Broth, 2012). The epistemic status of the interactants, in this case the teacher and the student, is being negotiated in the course of the interaction.

Excerpt 10 (3C811-89-124) comes from a lesson in which the students were looking at personality adjectives in the broader context of the topic on stereotypes, and were asked to determine which of them are often used to describe teenagers, and which are used

more often in connection to elderly people. The trouble-source is the difference in the meaning of the words 'narrow-minded' and 'stubborn'. The repair sequence is initiated by the teacher in line 21, and completed by the student Petr in line 28.

Excerpt 10

```
1     T     yeah (.).h what does it mean to be narrow-minded? because it's
2           not an easy word
3     Ss    (xx)
4     T     d'you remember↑ (.) it's the opposite of what?
5     Tom   úzkoprsý
6     T     yeah, and I´m not really sure $what it means in Czech$ ((T starts
7           laughing)) eeeh, ho-is anyone able to explain it in English (.)
8           what narrow-minded means↓
9     Tom   well like someone who doesn't really change his opinions
10    T     yeah, exactly ((nodding)), people who don't change their opinions
11          who [don't accept new] opinions,
12    Tom         [přesně úzkoprsý]
13    T     so the opposite is↑
14    Jan   stubborn=
15    T     = I mean, it´s connected with [it]
16    S1                                  [open-]minded
17    T     yes.hh would we describe as rather stubborn if you don´t change
18          your mind? eeh change your opinions
19    Tom   well maybe stubborn is like-stubborn is like an argument, I mean
20          (.) more than narrow-minded
21    T     ma:ybe↓. well narrow-minded is-is like you are un-well (.) it´s
22          similar actually ((T looking up))
23    Ss    mm ((they are all looking at the teacher))
24    T     hahaha ((T starts laughing)) but narrow-minded i::s like you-eeh
25          no, it is similar
26    Petr  it´s the way you think
27    T     mhm? ((T turns towards Petr and points at him with her hand))
28    Petr  the way you think in general
29    T     yes (.). in general, that you are unwilling to accept any new
30          ideas, you are not very liberal, uh-hu::m. I think we all feel
31          the difference, but we are-eeh including me I´m unable to explain
32          it very well ((T starts laughing)). $I'll think about it$ and-
33          but yeah, I would say that the stereotype is that old people-or
34          the elderly are unwilling to accept new ideas, so they are narrow-
35          minded (…) eehm but it's connected with being stubborn, I think.
36          self-centred?
```

The teacher starts the sequence by asking the students what the meaning of 'narrow-minded' is. She then adds that it is not an easy word, which could imply justification for

her decision to devote some classroom time on it. The students don't provide an answer, so she continues with her elicitation effort in line 4 by directing their focus to the antonym of the word ('it's the opposite of what'?). Tom replies with the Czech word 'úzkoprsý' in the following turn (line 5), suggesting that he knows what the meaning of 'narrow-minded' is. The teacher replies by expressing uncertainty and saying with a smiley face that she is not sure what the meaning of 'úzkoprsý' is in Czech. Then she initiates a pedagogical, delegated repair on Tom's turn in 5, which could indicate that she is not sure whether the rest of the class knows the meaning of the word, so this could be interpreted as an attempt at remedy. Tom provides repair outcome in line 9 by explaining that it refers to those who do not want to change their opinions. The teacher acknowledges and accepts his answer, and also expands on it in lines 10 and 11. She then continues to pursue the answer to the question she posed in line 4, i.e., what is the opposite meaning of 'narrow-minded'. To this, another student, Jan, responds in line 14 by offering the word 'stubborn'. The teacher rejects it implicitly in line 15 by conceding that that word is somehow connected to the one she is looking for. The correct answer is finally provided by a student S1 in the following turn. However, it seems that the word 'stubborn' had caught the teacher's attention because despite receiving the answer she had been originally eliciting ('open-minded'), she directs the focus of the interaction back to the word 'stubborn' in line 17 and asks the students whether it could be used to describe someone who is narrow-minded. This is the turn when she starts to problematise the extent to which these two words are interchangeable in meaning, and the beginning of a repair initiation sequence. Tom again self-selects in line 19 and contributes to the repair outcome by saying that 'stubborn is like an argument more than narrow-minded'. The teacher validates his reply only partially by saying 'maybe' with a falling intonation, suggesting that there could be

another explanation. She then starts to provide an explanation in line 21, whose second part is a self-initiated repair with a cut-off on 'is' and a subsequent abandonment. By saying that the meaning of the two words is similar, the teacher implies that she is not in a position to explain the meaning, whereas her taking her gaze off the students and looking up could be interpreted as a display of thinking. The students are looking at the teacher, but there are no comments or turn initiations. The teacher makes another self-initiated repair in line 24, but arrives at the same conclusion in line 21, by repeating that the meaning of the words is similar. The repair outcome is provided by Petr in line 26 with the statement 'it's the way you think'. The teacher responds to his answer with the non-verbal acknowledgement token 'mhm' with a rising intonation, which could be interpreted as a display of listenership or an invitation to extend his turn. Petr provides a longer explanation in line 28 by saying that 'it is the way you think in general'. The teacher accepts his answer in the following turn with a straightforward 'yes', by repeating the supplement 'in general', which may suggest that this is the exact word which could finally clarify the definition of 'narrow-minded'. She expands on it in lines 29-30. In line 31, she expresses her uncertainty again by stressing that she is not able to explain in well, thus claiming insufficient knowledge. In line 32 she says that she would think about it, which suggests that she may be not be entirely satisfied with the explanations provided until then and she would continue to look for a better one. She summarizes the issue in lines 34 and 35 and mentions again that the word 'narrow-minded' is in a way similar to 'stubborn'. The sequence is finally closed in line 36 when the teacher moves on to the next word on her agenda.

The interaction taking place in this excerpt could be interpreted as a joined effort by the teacher and the students to come up with a satisfying explanation of the difference in

meaning between the words 'narrow-minded' and 'stubborn'. The solution is presented by a student, and the teacher almost accepts it, but she promises the students that she would think about it and possibly let them know later, which implies that she is not entirely satisfied with the resolution. By doing that, she is asserting her role of the language professional as well as her epistemic supremacy in the interaction, deciding on the appropriacy and acceptability of the answers offered by the students and the amount of time which she is willing to set aside for their discussion and resolution.

The excerpts presented in 6.2. feature teacher-initiated repair sequences, which are either resolved by the teacher with the help of an online dictionary or by a student. The teacher initiates repair by using open-class repair initiators such as huh? as in excerpt 7, by repetitions and partial repetitions of the trouble source, cut-offs sometimes accompanied by a wh-interrogative (how-what did you say?), asking the students to provide an explanation or a definition (as in excerpt 10) and claiming insufficient knowledge (excerpt 8). When that happens, the students get the chance to take on the role of an expert and provide solutions. At the same time, another source of expert knowledge is taken advantage of in the process of repair and that is the English online dictionary. However, the teacher and the students' institutional roles remain stable and unwavering in that the students are there to learn the language and are active in their role of language learners and the teacher is the one who is expected to teach them and the ultimate responsibilty to achieve that goal rests with her.

7 Discussion and conclusion

As outlined in the introduction of Chapter 1, the aim of this thesis was to investigate repair practices employed by the teacher and her students, all of whom are non-native speakers of English, in an advanced EFL secondary school classroom in the Czech Republic, and pay special attention to the following: how do the teacher and her students initiate and conduct repair, i.e., what particular repair strategies they use when trouble-sources, or utterances perceived as problematic, arise in the course of the interaction; does their epistemic status and the institutional character of the interaction play a role in the process, and in what way focus on repair could encourage student involvement and learning.

In the context of classroom interaction, learning is seen as a social process, i.e., a cognitive and social activity that takes place in interaction with other participants, while language is a key tool in the learning process which helps in the construction of understanding. In educational settings the social process of learning is mainly conducted between the teacher and the student(s) or between the students themselves. This understanding of the processes of learning based on the sociocultural theory of learning was presented in Chapter 2.

The concept of repair was presented in Chapter 3 and it was discussed with reference to the practices that the speakers use when dealing with any problems in hearing, speaking and understanding the talk in conversation and other forms of talk-in-interaction. In the context of classroom interaction, repair practices fall under the category of pedagogical repair, which is usually other-initiated either by the teacher or the students and its main goal is to facilitate learning. Previous research has shown that by conducting repair, the participants take part in the process of negotiation of meaning and co-construction of

mutual understanding, which is key to the process of learning in interaction. Repair practices are considered to be one of the major components of interactional competence and one of the key resources for learning a new language.

An overview of literature relevant to this thesis was presented in Chapter 4. Some of the findings of research into repair have shown that the repair strategies the speakers use to deal with breakdowns in communication depend on the environment in which the interaction is taking place, i.e., whether it is a mundane conversation between friends and acquaintances in an informal context, or a more formal interaction taking place in an institutional setting. In the latter case, the interaction is influenced by the institutional roles of the participants, e.g., in educational institutions that is the role of teachers and students in the classroom. Another important factor influencing repair organization and management has shown to be the epistemic status of the participants and their orientation to epistemic stance in interaction, i.e., their personal, specialized knowledge and expertise that is enacted and becomes relevant in the course of the interaction.

For the purposes of this study, 10 illustrative examples featuring student and teacher-initiated repair sequences were presented and analysed in Chapter 6. They were selected from 180-minute-long video and audio recordings of EFL lessons made in a 6-year grammar school in the Czech Republic which were transcribed and analysed using the methodology of Conversation Analysis. The process of their collection, selection, transcription and analysis was presented in chapter 5.

The excerpts were categorized into two main sections based on the trajectory of the repair sequence, and were further divided into three and two subsections respectively, based on the way in which the trouble-source was repaired.

Section 6.1. presented a total of six excerpts of student-initiated repair which were further divided into three subsections, depending on whether the repair was completed by the teacher with the help of a dictionary (6.1.1), without the help of a dictionary (6.1.2), or the repair was completed by a student (6.1.3).

Section 6.2 presented four excerpts of teacher-initiated repair with two subsections: 6.2.1 comprises of teacher-initiated repair sequences resolved with the help of a dictionary, and 6.2.2 teacher-initiated repair sequences resolved by a student.

Based on the data analysis, the following conclusions can be drawn:

The repair sequences in 6.1 were all other-initiated by one of the students whereas the repair sequences in 6.2, except for excerpt 8, were other-initiated by the teacher. In both sections, the repair was initiated on a trouble-source in the form of a lexical item whose meaning, use, register or translation into Czech or English was problematised in the course of the interaction. In most of the cases presented in the data, the students self-selected and initiated repair in the form of an understanding check with a rising intonation (as in excerpt 1), repetition of the trouble-source (excerpts 1 and 8), a direct request for a specific vocabulary item (excerpt 2), a confirmation request with a rising intonation (excerpts 2,3,5) or a clarification request (excerpt 6). These repair initiators all point to the trouble-source in a very straightforward way, and this is what distinguishes them from the rather non-specific repair initiators used by L1 speakers in everyday, mundane conversations. On the other hand, when the teacher engages in other-initiation of repair in excerpt 7, she uses an open-class repair initiator (huh?) which is highly non-specific and is said to be common in repair sequences taking place between L1 speakers in informal, everyday talk. In this respect, the results are in line with the findings

from previous research, particularly the study by Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2003) outlined in Chapter 4, which states that the teacher and the students in classroom interaction use different repair initiators, with direct repair initiators being fairly characteristic of repair conducted by the students in classroom interaction and open-class repair initiators used mainly by teachers.

The repair strategies employed by the students in the data emphasize their institutional roles because they are 'doing being the language learner' (Koshik & Seo, 2012) by using repair as a learning tool, i.e., to resolve uncertainty or confusion and learn new vocabulary. Another aspect of the interaction that underlines the institutional roles of the students and the teacher is the fact that the teacher is viewed as the expert participant who is expected to confirm the validity of an answer and provide solutions to trouble-sources. Even when another student provides a correct answer or offers a satisfactory solution, as in excerpt 2, the teacher is the one who not only has the final say in what is and what is not an acceptable solution, but she also decides how much pedagogical time will be dedicated to coming up with a resolution, at what point during the interaction the resolution will be provided and when the repair sequence will be closed down. This is the case in excerpt 2 in which the teacher decides to postpone the repair of the trouble-source to a later time so that the interaction does not get side-tracked and can move forward, and a similar occurrence takes place in excerpt 10.

When lexical ambiguities as trouble-sources arise in the course of the interaction, both the teacher and the students reveal their epistemic status by claiming insufficient knowledge (CIK) or expressing uncertainty, saying 'I don't know' or 'I'm not sure' (e.g., in excerpts 3, 8, 9). In such cases, the teacher usually turns to the online dictionary to look

for the answer and this usually brings results by clearing up uncertainties and learning something new (excerpts 1,2 and 3). Hence, despite the institutional character of the interaction, the teacher in her expert role is not always in the position of a primary knower, as suggested in the study by Nassaji and Wells (2000), nor is she the one who always initiates repair sequences, as the repair examples in section 6.1 reveal. On the contrary, the epistemic roles of the teacher and the students are under constant negotiation and are locally constructed, i.e., they always depend on the specific context (Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2014).

In addition, although the classroom interaction is characterized by frontal teaching style, the students often self-select to initiate repair and aim to assert their epistemic status in the form of confirmation checks and confirmation requests (as in excerpt 3 and 5). These interactional practices imply self-confidence which may stem from their high L2 proficiency. They also claim their epistemic status by referring to the dictionary (excerpt 3), British pop culture: animated television series (excerpt 4), and internet slang (excerpt 6).

As regards providing repair solutions, it is mainly the teacher who resolves trouble-sources by looking up the problematic lexical items in an online dictionary or asking the students to provide a solution (as in excerpt 5). The teacher orients to the dictionary when she claims insufficient knowledge or verbally expresses uncertainty by saying 'I'm not sure'. However, when the teacher is confident about the correct answer, she engages in pedagogical, or so-called delegated repair (Kasper, 1986), i.e., turns to the other students in the class and invites them to provide an answer (excerpt 6).

On the whole, in most of the excerpts presented in this study, the repair processes triggered by lexical items perceived as problematic are turned into objects of learning by the teacher. As they mostly occur unplanned during the interaction, the teacher makes on-the-spot decisions to accept them as learning opportunities worth of shared pedagogical focus by consciously deciding to spend some time on their clarification, explanation and definition, which leads to the whole class learning something that they did not know at the beginning of the interaction. The teacher's claim of insufficient knowledge or expressions of uncertainty seem to serve as an indirect encouragement for greater students' involvement (excerpts 5 and 10). Most of the repair solutions are provided with the support of an online dictionary whose results are accepted by the students. The online dictionary is not only used as a teaching resource for clearing up misunderstanding, resolving uncertainties and providing answers, but also as a tool which may help to foster the teacher's confidence, strengthen her professionalism and indirectly teach the students learning strategies based on dictionary use. However, only in one instance (excerpt 4), a reference to British pop culture as authentic source of knowledge was given priority over the dictionary, although the fact that the lexical item does occur in it and the students were shown the word together with an image could also have played a role in resolving the issue.

Finally, the classroom interaction in the data has many features which had previously been described by Seedhouse (2004) and Gardner (2013): it is the opposite of rigid in the sense that the learners have quite a lot of freedom in taking turns (excerpt 8), initiating topics of interaction by themselves (excerpts 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9) and being able to initiate sequences, i.e., nominating themselves without waiting for the teacher to call them out or give them permission to speak. In addition, the data from the four lessons also shows that

the students ask a lot of questions and initiate repair very often. In this respect, even though the teaching style is technically teacher-fronted, the interaction is rather student-centered in that it considers the needs and the initiatives of the students.

7.1 Limitations, further research and implications for teaching practice

As far as the limitations of the study are concerned, the data for the analysis came from only 4 x 45-minute lessons and focused on a total of 10 excerpts with repair sequences. Most of them occurred during the course of two lessons in which the interaction was mainly content-based and one of the main pedagogical goals was to teach and revise vocabulary. The students were all fairly advanced L2 users, and in addition they were exceptionally extrovert and talkative. The question remains whether a dataset comprising more hours of recorded interaction, thus potentially leading to a higher number of repair sequences, would bring additional findings, and whether the same repair strategies would be used in a form-and-accuracy context with a focus on grammar, for example. Moreover, it would be interesting to explore what repair strategies are used by less advanced EFL students and whether the interaction with the same teacher but with a different group of students would proceed in a similar way and give comparable results.

Finally, the major implication for EFL teachers is the encouragement to use an online dictionary as an invaluable and authoritative source of knowledge, which not only provides reliable solutions, but also fosters the teacher's confidence and promotes student engagement and learning, especially when it comes to vocabulary. Another implication arises from the realization that an open-minded, honest and forthcoming attitude to students' initiatives contributes substantially to satisfying their learning needs, and makes the time spent in the classroom worthwhile.

Bibliography

Beach, W.A. (1993). Transitional regularities for casual 'Okay' usages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *19*(4), 325 – 352. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(93)90092-4.

Bolden, G. B. (2013). Unpacking "Self": Repair and Epistemics in Conversation. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *76(4),* 314–342. https://doi.org/10.1177/0190272513498398

Brouwer, C.E. (2003). Word Searches in NNS–NS Interaction: Opportunities for Language Learning? *The Modern Language Journal*, *87* (4), 534-545. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00206

Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*, 1-47.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. MIT Press.

Drew, P. (1991). Asymmetries of knowledge in conversational interactions. In I. Marková & K. Foppa (Eds.), *Asymmetries in Dialogue* (pp. 29-48). Barns & Nobles Books.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). Analyzing Talk at Work: An Introduction. In P. Drew, & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at Work. Interaction in Institutional Settings* (pp. 3-65). Cambridge University Press.

Drew, P., & Sorjonen, M, L. (2011). Dialogue in institutional interactions. In T. A. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Second Discourse Studies. A Multidisciplinary Introduction Teun A. van Dijk* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Gardner, R. (2013). Conversation Analysis in the Classroom. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers, *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 593 – 611*).* Blackwell Publishing.

Hellermann, J. (2009) Looking for Evidence of Language Learning in Practices for Repair: A Case Study of Self-Initiated Self-Repair by an Adult Learner of English. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 53(2), 113-132. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313830902757550

Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. Maxwell Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action* (pp. 299 -345). Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J., & Clayman, S. (2010). *Talk in action: Interactions, identities, and institutions*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Heritage, J. (2012) The Epistemic Engine: Sequence Organization and Territories of Knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *45*(1), 30-52. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2012.646685

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis*. Polity.

Hymes, D. (1972). On Communicative Competence. In J. Pride, & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-285). Penguin Books.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*. (pp. 13-31). John Benjamins.

Kamio, A. (1977). *Territory of Information*. John Benjamins.

Kasper, G. (1986). Repair in foreign language teaching. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Learning, teaching and communication in the foreign language classroom* (pp.23-41). Aarhus University Press.

Kasper, G. (2006). Beyond Repair: Conversation Analysis as an Approach to SLA. *Aila Review, 19* (1), 83-99. https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.19.07kas

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. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327973RLSI3503_2

Koshik, I., & Seo, M. (2012). Word (and other) search sequences initiated by language learners. *Text & Talk*, *32*(2), 167-189. https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2012-0009

Lantolf, J.P., & Appel, G. (eds.) (1994). *Vygotskian approaches to second language research*. Norwood, N. J: Ablex Pub.Corp

Lee, Y.A. (2007). Third turn position in teacher talk: Contingency and the work of teaching. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *39 (6)*: 1204-1230. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.02.004

Liebscher, G., and Dailey O'Cain, J. (2003). Conversational Repair as a Role-Defining Mechanism in Classroom Interaction. *The Modern Language Journal*, *87* (3), 375-390. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00196

Lilja, N. (2014). Partial repetitions as other-initiations of repair in second language talk: Re-establishing understanding and doing learning. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *71*, 98-116. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.07.011

Long, M.H. (1983). Inside the 'Black box'. In H. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition* (pp.3-36). Newbury House.

Majlesi, A.R., & Broth, M. (2012). Emergent learnables in second language classroom interaction. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, *1*(3-4), 193-207. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2012.08.004

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation Analysis*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

McHoul, A. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in Society*, *19*(3), 349-377. http://doi:10.1017/S004740450001455X

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning Lessons: Social Organization in the Classroom*. Harvard University Press.

Mondada, L., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2004). Second Language Acquisition as Situated Practice: Task Accomplishment in the French Second Language Classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, *88*(4), 501–518. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.t01-15-.x

Nassaji, H., & Wells, G. (2000). What's the Use of 'Triadic Dialogue'?:An investigation of teacher-student interaction. *Applied Linguistics*, *21* (3), 376-406. Oxford University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/21.3.376

Pekarek Doehler, S. (2013). Social-interactional approaches to SLA: A state of the art and some future perspectives. *Language, Interaction and Acquisition*, *4* (2), 134 – 160. https://doi.org/10.1075/lia.4.2.02pek

Peppa Pig. (2022, April 16). In Wikipedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peppa_Pig

Petitjean, C., & González-Martínez, E. (2015). Laughing and smiling to manage trouble in French-language classroom interaction. *Classroom Discourse*, *6*(2), 89-106. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2015.1010556

Pica, T. (1988). Interlanguage Adjustments as an Outcome of NS-NNS Negotiated Interaction. *Language Learning*, *38* (1), 45-73. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1988.tb00401.x

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). Sage Publications.

Reichert, T., & Liebscher, G. (2012). Positioning the Expert: Word Searches, Expertise, and Learning Opportunities in Peer Interaction. *The Modern Language Journal*, *96* (4), 599-609. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2012.01397.x

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language*, *50*(4), 696–735. https://doi.org/10.2307/412243

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation. *Language, 53*(2), 361–382. https://doi.org/10.2307/413107

Schegloff, E.A. (1995). Discourse as an interactional achievement III: The Omnirelevance of Action. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 28* (3), 185-211. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi2803_2

Schegloff, E.A. (2000). When 'Others' Initiate Repair. *Applied Linguistics*, *21*(2), 205 - 243. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/21.2.205

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

Seedhouse, P. (2009). The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom. *Bellaterra: Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, *1* (1), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2004.00266.x

Sert, O. (2015). *Social Interaction and L2 Classroom Discourse*. Edinburgh University Press.

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

Tůma, F., & Sherman, T. (2022). Recruiting help in word searches in peer interaction: A multimodal conversation-analytic study. *Linguistics and Education*, *67*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2021.100999

Vaníčková, K. (2014). Transkripce v konverzační analýze. *Studie z aplikované lingvistiky/ Studies in applied linguistics, 5(1),* 48-64. Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Filozofická fakulta.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society*. Harvard University Press.

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. Routledge.

Walsh, S., & Sert, O. (2012). Interactional management of claims of insufficient knowledge in English language classrooms. *Language and Education*, *27*(6), 542-565. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2012.739174

Walsh, S., & Li, L. (2013). Conversations as space for learning. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 23* (2), 247-266. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12005

Wong, L. (2000). Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/non-native speaker English conversation. *Applied Linguistics*, *21* (2), 244–267. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/21.2.244

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

Appendix A (Transcription symbols)

The transcription conventions were adapted from Jefferson (2004), Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008) and Vaníčková (2014).

T	–	teacher
S	–	student
Ss	–	students
(1.0)	–	pause length in seconds
[ ]	–	overlapping talk
=	–	talk which starts immediately after the preceding one
(.)	–	a brief interval, micro pause
(..)	–	a relatively short pause
(...)	–	a longer pause
<u>wo</u>rd	–	the underlined part indicates stress
wo:rd	–	sound stretch, prolonged preceding sound
°word°	–	word pronounced more quietly than the surrounding speech
$word$	–	word spoken in a smiley voice
-	–	a word cut-off
((writing))	–	description of a non-verbal activity
(xx)	–	unclear speech
.	–	a stopping fall in tone
,	–	continuing intonation
↓↑	–	a marked fall or rise in intonation
?	–	a rising inflection. It does not necessarily indicate a question.
.h	–	speaker´s in-breath
dýka	–	a code switch from one language into another
e, ee, eee	–	hesitation sounds
mhm	–	sound expressing affirmation
uh-huh	–	sound expressing acknowledgement and agreement

Appendix B (Collection of excerpts)

Excerpt 1

```
T     přizpůsobit se čemu?
Ss    no ((some Ss shake their heads to show that they don´t know))
T     říká se v češtině konformita, že?
Ss    (xx) ((there is no clear answer))
T     conform to?
Ss    (the students are looking at the teacher, but nobody answers))
T     uh-hu::h, to se neříká?
Kat   to je jako (x) konfirmace? =
T     = $jako fakt ne$?
      (2.0) ((T is searching for the word in an online dictionary))
      conformity, yeah? (.) °whuuh°=
Ss    ((laughing))
T     you are right (..) přizpůsobit se, konformnost
S2    konfor[mnost?]
S3          [konformnost?]=
T     so, conform to ((T bending forward)) (.) something
Jana  okay
T     zranitelný?
```

Excerpt 2

```
T     uh-huh, anything else?
S     long sleeves?
T     yeah yeah, I mean, it’s a part of clothing, so (.) yeah
San   how do you call the (..) the (..) ((Sandra is pointing at her
      wrist, making circular movements)) potítko?
T     uh, good question (.) it´s a-it´s a=
Tom   =wristband, wristband je potítko, ne? ((looking at the teacher))
Jan   headband
Tom   nebo headband, to je potítko na čele=
T     =headband je toto ((T pointing around her head)), right, but I
      mean it´s horrible, in British and American English it means
      different things, and I never remember (..) ((The teacher sits
      down and opens her notebook)), so there is hea-but that´s head
      so that later, but wristband - I think it´s wristband
Tom   yeah ((two students sitting in front of him turn to him with a
      smile and a nod as a sign of praise and acknowledgement that
      he had been right))
      ((T is writing the word on the board))
      (4.0)
```

Excerpt 3

```
Jana  is-is stiletto a dagger too?
T     I´m not sure=
Jana  =´cause, I think once I searched it in a dictionary and what came
      up wasn´t like high heels but like a:: e:eh dýka
T     yeah, shoe with a very pointed heel ((The teacher is reading the
      definition for 'stiletto' in an online dictionary)) (..) and
      that´s all I have here
      ((T still looking at her notebook))
Jana  okay
T     ah, but it´s learner´s dictionary (.) wait (2.0) oh yes, a small
      knife with a long thin blade. Looks like this ((T is turning her
      notebook towards her students, so that they can see the picture))
Ss    oooh
T     I didn´t know (.) so you can literally kill someone with that
      haha. even, okay, what else?
```

Excerpt 4

```
T     that too (…) and if it is raining, and you want to go for a walk
      in the forest↑
Ss    aah
T     you need this British kind of shoes (2.0) and I think we had it
      in British history
Ss    (xx)
T     the famous admiral, was he? Wellingtons, wellies?
Hel   eeh, wellington is meat
Bet   yeah, haha
T     am I lying to you? ((T is looking the word up in an online
      dictionary)) (3.0) no, these are wellingtons ((She turns her
      notebook towards the students and shows them a picture in the
      dictionary))
Ss    oooh
T     according to the admiral, was he=
Hel   = but I've been watching Peppa Pig[2] for a long [time]
T                                                      [yeah?]
Hel   and they never mention wellingtons, they always say 'we go play
      in the mud and they never mention=
T     =and they never-they never=
Hel   =I think they call it=
T     = but in German I think they do because my friends are learning
      German now and they are watching-I mean they are the same age as
```

[2] *Peppa Pig* is a British preschool animated television series by Astley Baker Davies which has been broadcast since 2004 in over 180 countries. It features an anthropomorphic female piglet called Peppa and her everyday adventures with her family and friends.

22 me and they are watching *Peppa Pig* and I think they learned
23 **gummistiefel** there
24 Hel but like wellingtons↓=
25 T = and wellingtons, wellies eeh
26 Hel maybe wellies
27 T but eh US or Australian English have rubber boots (.) ((T is
28 checking this information also in a dictionary)) boring, $I
29 mean wellies much better, right$?
30 Ss gumboots, haha
31 T so wellingtons, wellies or rubber boots. Okay, eeh on your head?
32 Ss a hat

Excerpt 5

1 T a::nd the last two ((The teacher is looking at her notes)) (2.0)
vzít něco v potaz
2 Mich take into consideration?
3 T yeah, or?
4 (2.0)
5 (xx)**lepší překlad, já jsem řekla** take into-**potaz je** into
6 consideration or take into↑
7 (3.0)
8 S account=
9 T =account, yes
10 Mich **to je asi také vzít v potaz, nebo $já nevím$. není to vzít v potaz**?
11 T (T sits down at her notebook)) I´m not sure which one is which
12 in Czech. But it means take-take into consideration like thin
13 about it ((T is gesturing with her hands)) (.) when you are making
14 a decision, and take into account I would say (.) like really
15 follow-ah I don´t-I can´t explain this, it´s not so easy. Can
16 anyone explain the difference?
17 (3.0)
18 Mich isn´t it [the same]
19 S [I think]=
20 T = a-a, it's not completely the same, I remember in my-in one of
21 my articles my supervisor corrected it, because I said take into
22 consideration and he said take into account
23 Ter **není account jako že se tím budete řídit**=
24 T =**no no no, tak to myslím, že se tím bude-tady se tím budu řídit**
25 **a** take into consideration **jenom to jako zvažte** ((T is looking up
26 the phrases in an online dictionary and starts reading the
27 definition out loud)). take something into account is to consider
28 something when judging a situation, so it didn´t help much (.)
29 **jo**, but-but that´s the difference, yes. And the last one, do you
30 know what chinos are?

Excerpt 6

```
T     smart?
Ann   dumb
T     hahaha, but when we are talking about clothes what does it mean
      to-what does it mean?
Jana  immaculate
T     ooh, wow, that's a word. Do you know-do the others know what it
      means,immaculate-this is not necessarily=
Jana  =it's internet slang
T     really?
Mat   no::::, immaculate is proper=
T     =it's like perfect, without=
Mat   =but it's proper English, no?
T     yeah, and that's proper=
Jana  =it is, but it's also=
T     =it used to be proper English=
Jana  =but it's also widely used on the internet I would say
T     right, uh-huh
Jana  like the vibes are immaculate
T     ooh, okay. Again, I'm learning something here, hahaha, good.
```

Excerpt 7

```
Tom   bandanna?
T     huh? =
Mat   =balaclava, do you call it that way?
T     we are-after this lesson we are going to be experts in clothing
      ((T walks towards her notebook)), how-what did you say?
Mat   balaclava (..) you [can put it]
T                        [I always] confuse it with eeh, like the dessert? =
Jana  baklava
T     yeah, haha ((T is looking the word up in her notebook))
      (3.0)
      yeah balaclava, balaclava yeah (..) and it's spelled like this
      ((T is writing the word on the blackboard))
S     hijab?
```

Excerpt 8

```
T     OK, hang clothes up, tell me quickly
Mon   I never do that
T     you never-you never do that↓[you use, what do you use] instead
Bet                               [I do that after ironing]
Mon   a chair, I just threw it on a chair
T     oh, okay, I didn't expect that, haha
Ss    hahaha
T     okay, there is a machine, right?
Anna  machine? =
Mon   = [washing machine]
S           [dryer]
T     but afterwards when you want it-when you want [your clothes to
      dry you]
Bet   [dryer]
Ss    dryer=
Mon   = drying machine
T     (xx) tumble-dr-=
Jan   =dryer=
T     =to tumble dry is to- ((T is typing on her notebook))
Ss    (xx)
T     I've just forgotten the word
      (3.0)
Ss    sušička
T     tumble-dryer, what is it? ((T is looking at her notebook))
Jana  isn´t it just a dryer?
Mon   I think it´s a dryer
Tom   jo
T     it´s a tumble dryer, I was right. I just need to trust myself,
      haha ((The T is writing the word on the word, with two spellings:
      dryer and drier)) so it´s a tumble dryer like this or like this,
      and in American English just dryer
Ss    ah, yes
Tom   here we go
T     to tumble dry is like - it says sometimes on your clothes do not
      tumble dry, right? But it´s not very eco-friendly, is it?
Mon   doesn't smell good
```

Excerpt 9

```
T     and on your feet?
S     socks
T     yeah
Jana  stilettos=
T     =stilettos?
Jana  uh-huh
T     with double /t/ like this, right? ((T is writing the word on the
      board))
Jana  I think-isn't it double /l/? (..) I don't know, let me check that,
```

```
10          it's weird
11    T     and I'm not sure about this either, hahaha ((T is pointing at the
12          letter /e/ in the word)), so check the plural, Cambridge online
13          dictionary is better for this one ((T is looking up the word in
14          the dictionary))
15    Jana  it's double /t/, and only /o/
16    T     ah, a-ha, thank you
```

Excerpt 10

```
1     T     yeah (.).h what does it mean to be narrow-minded? because it's
2           not an easy word
3     Ss    (xx)
4     T     d'you remember↑ (.) it's the opposite of what?
5     Tom   úzkoprsý
6     T     yeah, and I´m not really sure $what it means in Czech$ ((T starts
7           laughing)) eeeh, ho-is anyone able to explain it in English (.)
8           what narrow-minded means↓
9     Tom   well like someone who doesn't really change his opinions
10    T     yeah, exactly ((nodding)), people who don't change their opinions
11          who [don't accept new] opinions,
12    Tom         [přesně úzkoprsý]
13    T     so the opposite is↑
14    Jan   stubborn=
15    T     = I mean, it´s connected with [it]
16    S1                                  [open-]minded
17    T     yes.hh would we describe as rather stubborn if you don´t change
18          your mind? eeh change your opinions
19    Tom   well maybe stubborn is like-stubborn is like an argument, I mean
20          (.) more than narrow-minded
21    T     ma:ybe↓. well narrow-minded is-is like you are un-well (.) it´s
22          similar actually ((T looking up))
23    Ss    mm ((they are all looking at the teacher))
24    T     hahaha ((T starts laughing)) but narrow-minded i::s like you-eeh
25          no, it is similar
26    Petr  it´s the way you think
27    T     mhm? ((T turns towards Petr and points at him with her hand))
28    Petr  the way you think in general
29    T     yes (.). in general, that you are unwilling to accept any new
30          ideas, you are not very liberal, uh-hu::m. I think we all feel
31          the difference, but we are-eeh including me I´m unable to explain
32          it very well ((T starts laughing)). $I'll think about it$ and-
33          but yeah, I would say that the stereotype is that old people-or
34          the elderly are unwilling to accept new ideas, so they are narrow-
35          minded (…) eehm but it's connected with being stubborn, I think.
36          self-centred?
```