Tsui-Ping Cheng

The interactional achievements of repair and correction in a Mandarin language classroom

Abstract: This study examines the different interactional achievements of repair and correction in a Mandarin language classroom from a conversation analysis perspective. The sequential analysis of teacher-initiated repair and correction shows that while repair indicates participants' relative epistemic stance and makes visible the contingent process of securing intersubjectivity, correction serves to monitor students' language production and accomplish teaching. By means of various repair practices, teacher and students are able to maintain and restore a shared understanding of the instructional activity that they are doing together. This intersubjectivity is the foundation upon which a space for teaching and learning is created, maintained, and defended. In correction sequences, the practices of repetition and overlap underscore teacher and students' alignment with a pedagogical focus of linguistic accuracy and make relevant their situated institutional identities. Regardless of the distinctive achievements in interaction, repair and correction are both practical resources that enable and sustain classroom instruction.

Keywords: conversation analysis, repair, correction, Mandarin pedagogy

1 Introduction

Repair practices have been a fruitful theme in classroom-based ethnomethodology (EM) and conversation analysis (CA) research. EM focuses primarily on the procedures that people use to make sense of their worlds and generate social order (Garfinkel 1967). This emphasis is reflected in EM's approach to classroom repair as a socially ordered and locally accomplished educational phenomenon (McHoul 1990, Macbeth 2004). For instance, McHoul (1990) examined the

Tsui-Ping Cheng: E-mail: tsuiping@hawaii.edu

regularities of self-correction and other-correction in high school geography lessons and compared the results with findings of conversational repair to illustrate the distinctive organizations of classroom correction. On the other hand, CA research has provided empirical evidence on how repair is embodied in instructional contexts and language learning activities (Hellermann 2011, Jung 1999, Kasper and Kim 2007, Koshik 2002, Liebscher and Dailey–O'Cain 2003, Rylander 2009, Seedhouse 1999, 2004). By analyzing actual classroom discourse, CA findings demonstrate the intricate and distinct architectural details of classroom repair. Seedhouse (2004), for example, explicitly argues for a reflexive relationship between pedagogical focus and the organization of repair. He maintains that "what constitutes trouble varies with the pedagogical focus, which means that what is repairable is different in each context" (Seedhouse 2004: 142). To illustrate this view, Seedhouse identified repair trajectories in three different learning contexts – form-and-accuracy, meaning-and-fluency, and task-oriented – and brings to light "the context-dependent nature of pedagogical repair" (Wong and Waring 2010: 253).

In most of the classroom-based EM and CA studies, repair is used as an umbrella term that subsumes correction. While correction is commonly understood as an action that replaces an error with what is correct, repair is regularly initiated even when there is no apparent error. As Schegloff et al. (1977: 363) note, repair is "neither contingent upon error, nor limited to replacement." Repair and correction are, in many cases, used interchangeably, based on the assumption that correction is part of the repair phenomena. For example, Seedhouse (2007) utilizes this approach, viewing classroom correction as part of repair, adapted to the specific pedagogical focus of language learning. However, other scholars have questioned whether the terms are equivalent and interchangeable. Macbeth (2004), in his critical reading of McHoul's (1990) treatment of classroom repair, proposes that the repair and correction should be treated as separate organization phenomena; he asserts that "while the literature on repair understands correction as of one piece with repair's organizational domain, our classroom materials offer grounds to consider whether correction may be a different organizational province" (2004: 723).

Macbeth's stance is echoed in Hall's (2007a, 2007b) discussion on the conceptual and analytical confusion resulting from treating repair and correction as identical in classroom-based research. To demonstrate this confusion, Hall reviewed examples from CA literature on repair and points out that repair and instructional correction are different practices in classroom interaction. Her call for a distinction between repair and correction rests on the argument that "conflating the two practices conceals the distinct and important work that each one does" (2007a: 522). For example, Hall reviewed Excerpt (1), an example of a form-and-

accuracy context provided in Seedhouse (2004), and explains how the interaction is an instance of institutional correction rather than CA repair.

(1) 1 T: right, the cup is on the top of the box. ((T moves cup))
    2   now, where is the cup?
    3 L: in the box
    4 T: the cup is (.)?
    5 L: in the box.
    6 T: the cup is in (.)?
    7 L: the cup is in the box.
    8 T: right, very good, the cup is in the box.
      (Seedhouse 2004: 144)

According to Seedhouse, the instructor (T) initiates repairs in lines 4 and 6, even though the learner (L) produces linguistically correct answers in lines 3 and 5. The repairs are conducted by T to ensure that L produces the exact linguistic patterns targeted by T's intended pedagogical focus. Contrastingly, Hall points out that T's turns appear to be instructional correction, rather than CA repair, given that T does not display any trouble understanding or hearing L's responses in lines 3 and 5. The correction takes the form of prompts to help L provide a correct response, which he does in line 7. T then gives an affirmative response and marks the response as correct. From Hall's point of view, correction is the evaluative feedback turn in the IRE (initiation-response-evaluation) sequence of action that is distinctively specialized for classroom instruction.

However, in response to Hall's argument, Seedhouse (2007) contends that identifying instances of IRE only leads to etic descriptions,[1] rather than an emic analysis of how participants use and adapt repair mechanism to perform social actions within a particular institutional setting.[2] According to Seedhouse (2007:

---

1 Lee (2007) and Waring (2008) provide concrete examples of how CA can be used to examine local actions of IRE. Rather than simplifying evaluative feedback as a default response to student's answers, the studies analytically detail the complex and dynamic interactional work embedded in teachers' evaluation turns in IRE sequences.
2 Concerning the emic–etic contrast, Pike (1967: 37) proposes that "the etic viewpoint studies behavior from outside of a particular system, and as an essential initial approach to an alien system. The emic viewpoint results from studying behaviors as from inside the system." However, different disciplines interpret these two constructs in other ways and the conceptual difference remains among ethnographers (Markee and Kasper 2004). In CA, the emic viewpoint is understood as a member's perspective, focusing on revealing members' knowledge and methods in use.

530), "the institutional goal and focus determine what constitutes trouble." In this view, T's actions in lines 4 and 6 demonstrate her understanding of a mismatch between L's responses and the pedagogical focus. T's other-repair is therefore employed to address a misunderstanding by L and talk the "form-and-accuracy" context into being. Even though the discussion between Hall and Seedhouse does not result in any resolution, it illustrates why researchers should rethink the relation of repair to correction and demonstrates the necessity for more empirical work on the complexity of classroom repair and correction.

This paper aims to continue this dialogue by examining the organizational differences of repair and correction in classroom interaction from a CA perspective (Hall et al. 2011, Kasper and Wagner 2011, Pallotti and Wagner 2011). It documents a teacher and her students' orientations to various repair and correction sequences in a beginning level Mandarin as a foreign language classroom. In this paper, repair refers to the practical means by which a breakdown in mutual understanding between teacher and student is remedied, whereas correction refers to the process of fixing an error with a correct linguistic form, without any demonstration of problematic understanding from participants. In other words, correction is used to address errors in speaking (Jefferson 1974), rather than problems in hearing, speaking, or understanding. Employing these definitions, I focus on the local and sequential accomplishments of teacher-initiated repair and correction in classroom interaction. This study's analysis empirically shows that repair invokes the participants' relative epistemic rights and makes visible the contingent process of restoring a shared understanding in local actions. In contrast to repair's interactional achievement, correction functions as a practical means to accomplish teaching and make relevant the situated identities of instructor and students.

2 Repair and intersubjectivity

Central to CA research is its concern with the notion of intersubjectivity, or what Heritage (1984a: 254) calls "an architecture of intersubjectivity." Intersubjectivity refers to the ways in which interlocutors come to understand each other and make sense of their interaction. This public display of understanding is based on the sequential architecture of interaction as each turns-at-talk displays a recipient's analysis of a previous turn-at-talk. For example, by producing an answer, the speaker shows that the prior turn is to be understood as a question. Through this sequential analysis of each other's interactional moves, intersubjectivity is maintained in each speaking turn as participants "attend to what has been said,

what it entails, what it called for next, and figure out when and how to say it" (Lee 2006: 357).

When interlocutors encounter problems of understanding and the progress of conversation is disrupted, they can modify the talk in progress and re-establish mutual intelligibility through repair. Schegloff (1992: 1299) refers to the organization of repair as "a self-righting mechanism built as an integral part of the organization of talk-in-interaction." In short, repair is a procedural means for interlocutors to arrive at mutual understanding. Schegloff et al. (1977) were the first to describe repair as a set of practices that resolve problems of speaking, hearing, and understanding in an organized fashion. According to Schegloff et al. (1977), a repair trajectory consists of a trouble source turn, a repair initiation, and a repair outcome. In light of the trajectory, repair is seen as a sequence of actions and a process of social construction, locally managed and constantly negotiated by participants (Markee 2006, Schegloff 1992). Schegloff et al. (1977) also observed that repair can be initiated and completed by either oneself or others, yielding four repair types: self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, other-initiated self-repair, and other-initiated other-repair. Excerpt (2) provides an example of using other-initiated self-repair to deal with trouble that threatens shared understanding in talk.

(2) Vera: Does he have hair?
               (0.6)
    Huang: Pardon me?
    Vera: Does he have haiR?
    Huang: Yes.
    Vera: Ohh huh-huh-huh-huh
    (Wong 2000: 248)

Huang initiates repair with her question "pardon me?", displaying her difficulty understanding what Vera has said. Vera completes the repair by repeating her question in the next turn. A shared understanding is thus restored with Huang's affirmative response. Repair actions, therefore, offer participants a set of normative resources that they can employ in pursuit of mutual understanding (Hayashi et al. 2013).

3 Data collection

The data used in this paper comes from classroom observations in an elementary-level Mandarin course at a North American university. The class consisted of

fourteen students who would meet with the teacher daily, Monday to Friday for a period of fifty minutes. There were eight native speakers of English, three heritage students (English L1), and three advanced non-native speakers of English with different L1s. The teacher was a female native speaker of Mandarin with advanced English proficiency. English was the shared medium of communication in this classroom. The excerpts examined in this paper were extracted from a database that consisted of audio-recordings of approximately 6-hour-and-40-minutes of classroom instruction. Written consent from the students and teacher was gathered for the purpose of recording and analyzing the classroom activity. Segments of the data were transcribed and translated, following CA transcription conventions (Atkinson and Heritage 1984, see Appendix. Also see ten Have 2007, for a more detailed discussion on transcribing verbal interaction). Following a three-line format, the materials are presented in their original language in the first line, with a morpheme-by-morpheme gloss in the second line and a translation into idiomatic English in the third line (see Appendix for grammatical glosses).

Class instruction was organized into five components: writing, grammar, vocabulary, oral practice, and drills. Occasionally, the teacher opened the class with a variety of topics such as weather, weekend plans, or test results. At other times, the teacher would start the class either with a new lesson or review the materials from the day before. When a new lesson was introduced, the teacher explained new grammatical items and the students were asked to repeat the grammar examples by reading aloud. Most of the class activities highlighted the importance of reading aloud as a means of practicing the learned linguistic items. In the end, seven excerpts were selected for analysis because they were the ones that offer a good opportunity to examine teacher-initiated repair and correction sequences.

4 Analysis

4.1 Repair as a practice to display epistemic stance and pursue intersubjectivity

Prior to Excerpts (3) and (4), T introduced three Mandarin phrases that asked for a favor; the students were then asked to initiate a conversation with T by using the phrases. For what follows, T stands for 'teacher,' S (1, 2, 3, etc.) for an identified student, Ss for the whole class or some students. In Excerpts 3 and 4, S1 and S2 were called on to have a "Do-me-a-favor" conversation with T.

(3) Two o'clock
39   T: ° *shenme shihou*°
                What-Q time
                'What time?'
40   Ss: (   )° *what time*°=
41   S1:   =*o:*h um (4.4) u:m: (0.4) *er* (0.8) ° *wai(t)*° um: (.) wan-
                                        Two
                                        'Two'
42   *wanshang* °*er*° *dian*
                night   two MSR
                'Two o'clock at night'
43 →   T: ↑*wan:shang* (.) *liang dian* ?
                Night   two   MSR
                'Two o'clock at night?'
44   Ss: ((laughter))
45 →   T: *you mean two* (0.5) ↑*a.m.?*
46   S1:   °*p.m.*°=
47   T: = ↓*p.m.* ↑*xia:wu*   *liang* [*dian.*
                Afternoon   two   MSR
                'two o'clock in the afternoon'
48   S1:   [$↑*o:*h:$ °*xiawu*°=
                                        Afternnon
                                        'Afternoon'

        In line 39, after agreeing to help S1 practice dancing, T poses the question
shenme shihou (what time). The other students in the class scaffold T's inquiry
by translating her question into English. S1 starts to schedule her appointment
with T in lines 41 and 42, which is marked with several false starts and multiple
pauses. T repeats S1's suggested time ↑*wan:shang* (.) *liang dian* ? with prosodic
emphasis, question intonation, and the correct form for two (*liang*) (line 43). S1's
problematic usage of time is recognized by other students and acknowledged
through their subsequent laughter in line 44. T then switches to English and initi-
ates another repair, starting with the uncertainty marker *you mean* (Schegloff
et al. 1977) and ends her candidate understanding of S1's suggested time *two (0.5)*
↑*a.m.?* with a pause, higher pitch, and question intonation (line 45). Note that T's
turn in line 43 consists of a repair on the problematic status of S1's usage of time
wanshang (at night) and an embedded correction on the lexical item *liang* (two).
It becomes apparent from T's code-switched understanding check and its pro-
sodic features (pause, high pitch, and intonation) in line 45 that her puzzle-
ment arises not from S1's pronunciation of the lexical item *two*, but from S1's

unreasonable appointment time *two a.m.* By reformulating S1's suggested time in English, T's repair serves to better articulate her understanding of what S1 said and isolate the time *two a.m.* as the trouble source in S1's prior turn. S1's confirmation in line 46 completes the repair and resolves the communication trouble. With this revised understanding, T provides the correct form for *two p.m.* in Mandarin in the next turn. In this excerpt, T uses two practices of other-repair, a declarative question (43) and code-switched candidate understanding with the reformulation marker *you mean* (45). T and S1's ability to locate the repairable is increased as T moves from a less specific (repeat of the prior turn) to a more specific repair initiator (*you mean* plus a possible understanding of the prior turn). In both repairs, T claims to know the information in question, thereby seeking confirmation of the "known information" from S1. However, as T uses stronger repair initiator, she accesses more information about S1's request, indicating a narrower information gap between them. Excerpt (4) presents another instance in which T increases the power of her repair initiators to alter her epistemic positions.

(4) Can you make my dinner?

14	S2:	*uh (0.5) um (0.6) °can you say° keyi ni?*
		can you
		'Can you*'
15		(1.0)
16	S2:	*can you?*
17		(0.4)
18	T:	*ni̲ keyi*
		you can
		'Can you'
19	S2:	*o̲h:: ni keyi zuo wo de (0.9) wo de ∘ fan ma∘*
		you can make I POS I POS meal Q
		'Can you make my meal?'
20	Ss:	((laughter))
21	S2:	*°wo de wanfan°*
		I POS dinner
		'My dinner'
22 →	T:	*↑A::?*
		PRT
		'Uh?'
23	S2:	*wanfan*
		dinner
		'Dinner'

24 →	T:	*wo keyi:?*
		I can
		'Can I?'
25		(1.3)
26	S2:	*keyi ni=*
		can you
		'Can you*'
27	T:	*=ni keyi*
		you can
		'Can you'
28	S2:	<u>*ni:*</u> *keyi (.) zuo (.) wo de (0.5) wanfan?*
		you can make I POS dinner
		'Can you make my dinner?'
29	Ss:	((laughter))
30 →	T:	*can I cook for you?*
31	Ss:	((laughter))

In line 14, S2 switches to English to initiate repair. The perturbations at the beginning of the turn show S2's uncertainty about the accuracy of the Mandarin phrase *keyi ni*.[3] After a 1-second pause, S2 asks *can you?* to elicit a response from T. The correct word order of *can you* in Mandarin is then provided by T in line 18. After displaying his understanding by producing a token *oh* (Heritage 1984b), S2 resumes the task and incorporates the correct form *ni keyi* into his request. The subsequent laughter from the class (20) indicates their orientation toward S1's request as a laughable matter. In line 21, S2 makes his request more specific by changing the request from a meal to dinner in a soft voice. In line 22, by using the Mandarin particle ↑*A::?* with a louder voice, longer sounds, and noticeably rising intonation, T displays her trouble with S2's prior turn without locating where or what the repairable is. The particle ↑*A::?* is used as an open-class repair initiator (Drew 1997) and leaves open what needs to be repaired with the prior turn, thereby marking the entire previous turn as troublesome. Given that S2's request in line 19 is grammatically correct, it is unlikely that T initiates the repair to prompt a correction on S2's part. However, it is still unclear from the sequential context of

---

3 Even though the translation of lines 14 and 26 is provided, the sentences are not grammatical in their original language. Unlike English, there is no change in word order for questions in Mandarin. Simply adding a question particle at the end can turn a statement into a question. In Excerpt (4), it is likely due to transfer from English that S2 is confused with the correct word order of *can you* in Mandarin.

the excerpt whether it is S2's decrease in volume in line 21 or the meaning of S2's request that T's repair is responding to. In employing this repair initiation, T does not identify a specific repairable item and, therefore, elicits S2 to analyze and respond to what T finds problematic. By repeating part of his prior turn, *wan-fan* (dinner), S2 offers his understanding of where and what the trouble source could be. T's subsequent turn (24) shows her continuing problem with the request by presenting an alternative repair initiator in the form of an incomplete utterance (Koshik 2002) and stretching the final syllable *wo keyi:?* (Can I) with rising intonation to reorient S2's attention toward repeating his request.[4] More specifically, T's incomplete utterance is designed to project the remaining portion of S2's request as the candidate trouble source, as she provides a sequential space for S2 to complete her turn-in-progress. The repair initiation also demonstrates that S2's self-repair in line 23 is still problematic and that the trouble source needs to be dealt with further. After a 1.3-second pause, rather than continuing the turn as prompted by T's incomplete utterance, S2 produces the self-repair *keyi ni* with wrong word order; consequently, T provides a correction to this error in line 27. With T's correction, S2 repeats his request (28) and completes the repair, drawing laughter from the other students. T then offers her candidate understanding of the request in English by asking *can I cook for you?*, which is verified in line 31 by the class' resulting laughter. Upon closer inspection of T's code-switched understanding check in line 30, it becomes clear that the trouble source of the repair sequence lies not in the grammatical form of S2's request, but in the meaning of S2's rather unexpected request (i.e., asking his teacher to cook for him).

In this excerpt, while S2 orients to the form of the request, T orients to the meaning of the request. In light of T and S2's diverging orientations, a mutual understanding of what they are doing together needs to be re-established though repair work. Schegloff (2000a: 207) argues that "[M]uch of the working of the organization of repair is shaped by features of repair *initiation*." T's two open and non-specific repair initiators in lines 22 and 24 clearly demonstrate the ambiguity that can arise from weak repair initiators as they do not specify the repairable within the turn and thus require more effort to remedy. How S2 goes from the correct word order (19) of *ni keyi* to the wrong one (26) and back to the correct one (28) shows his confusion with T's repair. Even though an incomplete utterance is

---

4 Koshik (2002) coined the term Designedly Incomplete Utterances (DIU), referring to incomplete utterances that are designed by teachers as a pedagogical practice to prompt self-correction of language errors by students in second language writing conferences. The similarities and differences between DIU and anticipatory completions are noted with respect to institutional goals.

designed to elicit self-repair (Koshik 2002), the way the utterance is constructed in line 24 appears to confuse S2 about what is expected of him. This analysis corresponds to Brouwer's (2004: 104) observation that interlocutors need to agree on the nature of the trouble, otherwise "substantial work has to be done to arrive at a repair outcome." Throughout the sequence, T uses three forms of repair: an open-class repair initiator (22), an incomplete utterance (24), and a code-switched understanding check (30). The repairs are done in order of increasing strength to gradually target the trouble source.[5] The "natural ordering" of repair initiation (Schegloff et al. 1977: 369), therefore, brings into focus the relative capacity of repair initiators to locate communication troubles and the process of establishing intersubjectivity as the course of action unfolds.

This analysis of Excerpts (3) and (4) shows that interlocutors' epistemic rights are indexed within their talk (Heritage and Raymond 2005), as the repair initiations between teacher and student acknowledge the relative distribution of information between the parties. As Heritage (2010: 48) argues in his illustrative work on questioning in a medical context, "[T]he design of questions communicates the questioner's epistemic stance toward the response, particularly in relation to the questioner's access to the information solicited." Likewise, in Excerpts (3) and (4), the teacher-initiated repair invokes the participants' relative epistemic stance: it establishes a knowledge gap between the participants by positioning the teacher as an unknowing questioner and projecting the student as a knowledgeable answerer. Moreover, the way the teacher formulates her questions indexes her progressively knowing stance toward the information requested. By initiating her repair with increasing power, the teacher proposes a stronger epistemic position toward the trouble source, which the student has the primary right to affirm or reject. Consider Excerpt (4) in this respect. As T advances her repair from an open-class initiator to a declarative question, the "epistemic gradient" (Heritage 2010, Heritage and Raymond 2012) between T and S2 becomes shallower. As a result of this diminished knowledge gap, the likelihood of restoring intersubjectivity is sequentially increased.

4.2 Correction as a means to accomplish teaching

In this section, Excerpts (5–7) draw attention to how the teacher's situated identity as an instructor is made relevant in correction sequences and how the teacher and students respond to correction through overlap and repetition. Excerpt (8)

---

5 See Sidnell (2010: 118) for a scale of other-initiation forms.

traces the teacher's correction on two linguistic forms and presents evidence that accepting correction in the form of repetition should not be treated as an indicator of comprehension on the student's part.

(5) Phone conversation

```
1      S5   wo::: wo    (S5's name)
             I     I
            'I, I xxx.'
2 →    T:    wo   shi:   (S5's name)=
             I    COP
            'I am xxx.'
3      S5:  =wo shi    [(S5's name)]
              I   COP
             'I am xxx.'
4      T:               [o:::        ] (S5's name)   ni    hao   ni    hao
                                                     you   good  you   good
                                                    'Oh, xxx, hi, hi.'
```

During this phone conversation exercise with T, S5 introduces himself in line 1 but he drops the Mandarin copula *shi,* making the turn ungrammatical. To highlight the error, T keeps the first-person pronoun *wo* (I), stresses and also stretches the last syllable. Rather than performing a deictic shift to the second person *ni* (you), T uses the first-person pronoun to animate S5's utterance and thus provides a correct model for S5. By speaking from S5's perspective, T changes her footing (Goffman 1974) from an interlocutor to her institutional role as a language teacher. The way T frames the phrase indicates that she orients to the error in S5's language production, although the linguistic error does not lead to any misunderstanding. S5 repeats the correction in line 3 while his name overlaps T's subsequent turn. Jefferson (1987: 97) explains that, in exposed correction sequences, the progress of the talk is halted as it isolates the correction, "making of it an interactional business in its own right; i.e. exposing it." Jefferson also notes that exposed correction is typically followed by a repeat, creating a X, Y, Y pattern, in which X stands for the original trouble source, Y for a correction proffered by a subsequent speaker, and the final Y for the repetition of the correction produced by the speaker of the trouble source (1987: 88). The correction sequence here corresponds to the X, Y, Y series proposed by Jefferson, for the correction becomes the interactionally salient activity.

Similar to the change-of-state token *oh* in English (Heritage 1984b), the Mandarin particle *o* in line 4 is used to express sudden realization and display a change in the recipient's state of knowledge. With the production of *o* and the

greeting *ni hao*, T indicates that the correction sequence is finished and the phone conversation should be resumed. T starts up precisely after S5 repeats the targeted linguistic feature *shi*. Without hearing the whole turn, T considers the correction completed and returns to the main sequence of interaction. Given its sequential position in the flow of talk, the overlap serves to minimize the length of the correction sequence and move the interactional business forward. This analysis illustrates how overlap is locally managed and interactionally accomplished by participants in correction sequences. Excerpt (6) presents a similar case where correction disrupts the action-in-progress.

(6) Help me practice Mandarin

```
5        T:    o::  bang shenme mang?
               PRT help  what-Q favor
               'Oh what kind of favor?'
6              (2.5)
7        S4:   wo (1.0) wo °I forgot° (1.0) wo  lianxi (1.0) shuo (.) zhongwen
               me       me               me practice    speak  Mandarin
               'me, me, I forgot, me practice speaking Mandarin'
8 →      T:    hm bang wo lianxi   [shuo
                  help me practice speak
               'Hm help me practice speaking'
9        S4:                       [bang wo-   bang (1.2) °wo lianxi° (0.7)
                                    help me    help       me practice
                                   'Help me, help me practice'
10 →     T:    bang wo
               help  me
               'Help me'
11             (0.4)
12       S4:   bang wo=
               help  me
               'Help me"
13       T:    =hm
14       S4:   lianxi (0.8) shuo   zhongwen.
               practice     speak Mandarin
               'Practice speaking Mandarin'
15       T:    o:: hm >hao  ah   hao  ah     hao  ah<   uh   shenme shihuo
               PRT    good PRT good PRT    good PRT.       What-Q time
                  'Oh, hm okay, okay, okay. uh when?'
```

In Excerpt (6), S4 is nominated to initiate a "Do-me-a-favor" conversation with T while the rest of the class listens. In line 5, T asks S4 what kind of favor he

needs from her. In line 7, after a 2.5-second pause, S4's response is marked by multiple false starts and pauses; then, in the middle of the turn, he switches to English and states, with decreased volume, °*I forgot*°, offering a reason for his trouble-filled speech. Lowering his voice allows S4 to preserve the participation framework of the classroom while making an off-stage comment (Goffman 1959) in English. In line 8, T repeats a part of S4's utterance and offers an outright correction of the missing verb *bang* with prosodic emphasis. As in Excerpt (5), T retains the use of the first-person pronoun *wo* (I) to speak on behalf of S4, attending to S4's linguistic error without displaying any problem in understanding S4's prior turn. The correction is incorporated by S4 in the following turn (9), with a cut-off and a 1.2 second pause, showing that he still has problems delivering the answer without hesitation. T orients to S4's persistent production problems by further reducing S4's utterance to the target of the correction, *bang wo*. Eventually, S4 is able to produce the turn more fluently (12). In turn 15, the Mandarin change-of-state token *o* by T signals whatever was problematic before has been resolved (See also Cheng 2013 on T's use of code-switching). Therefore, the course of action that was put on hold with the correction sequence can now be resumed.

The exposed corrections (Jefferson 1987) given by T in line 8 and 10 are interactionally disruptive in that they disturb the activity in progress and create a side sequence as a result. The interaction cannot move forward without S4 delivering the linguistic form accurately. Hence, the pedagogical focus on fluently producing accurate linguistic forms is explicit in this sequence. T's use of emphatic stress, choice of pronoun, and the repetition and gradual reduction of the ill-formed utterance become a focused strategy used to enhance the didactic function of the correction and T orients to S4's accurate repetition of the proffered correction as sequence-closing. Excerpt (7) further exemplifies the sequence-closing status of accurate repetition in correction sequences.

(7) Weekend 1
11   T: >*haowan ma*<
            fun   Q
            'Was it fun?'
12   S2: *mei* ↑*wan?* °*can you say that?* °
            NEG   fun
            'No fun'
13   T: *bù:*   *haowan*
            NEG   fun
            'Not fun'

```
14      S2:     oh bū haowan=
                   NEG   fun
                   'Oh not fun'
15 →    T:      =↑bù:     haowan=
                   NEG    fun
                   'Not fun'
16      S2:     = bù     [haowan]
                   NEG    fun
                   'Not fun'
17      T:               [o:::   ]   na   ni   hai    xihuan zuo shenme
                   PRT           then you still   like    do  what-Q
                   'Oh, what else do you like to do?'
```

Prior to this sequence, S2 mentioned that he went to a gay bar the prior weekend. In line 11, T asks S2 if the gay bar was fun. S2 switches to English, asking *can you say that?*, orienting to the possibility that *meiwan* is ungrammatical. By doing so, T offers other-repair with added stress on the negative form *bu* to make it more salient (13). S2 repeats the repair in line 14, but his tone on the negative form *bu* is rather flat. T then offers a correction with higher pitch and stress to highlight the falling tone of the negative form *bu*. It should be noted that the correction arises as a result of a pronunciation problem, rather than a failure in mutual understanding. As in the previous excerpts, S2's repetition in line 16 serves as an indicator of his acceptance of T's correction, assembling their situated identities as student and teacher. S2's acceptance of T's correction resembles Hosoda's (2000, 2006) findings that accepting other-repair in the form of repetition could invoke participants' differential language expertise in second language conversations. In Excerpt (7), despite the fact that the multiple repetitions of the correct form are discursively redundant, the participants treat them as normal in the correction sequences. Before S2 finishes repeating the correction in line 16, T's Mandarin change-of-state token *o* comes in right after S2 produces the targeted linguistic form *bu*. As soon as T hears the uptake on the corrected item, T acknowledges the correction and resumes the topical talk. This simultaneous talk reveals T's recognition of S2's repetition as a sign that he accepted her correction. Moreover, the location where the overlap occurs further brings the corrected feature *bu* into focus, isolating it as the interactional business in progress. Even though overlap is considered a departure from the normative no-gap no-overlap transition (Schegloff 1987, 2000b), the interactional import of overlap in correction reveals the participants' orientation to the activity as convergent.

The three excerpts (5–7) above show that practices of repetition and overlap are used to keep correction sequences compact and economical, while the next

excerpt reveals that doing the correction *en passant* (Kurhila 2001) does not necessarily indicate comprehension from the recipient.[6]

(8) Weekend 2

29	T:	*ni- ni zuo fan ma?*
		you you make meal Q
		'Do you cook?'
30		(1.2)
31	S2:	*hm (0.5) wo mei zuo fan*
		I NEG make meal
		'I no cook'
32		(0.3)
33 →	T:	*ni bu̲ zuo fan?*
		you NEG make meal
		'You don't cook?'
34		(0.4)
35	S2:	*uh: wo bu zuo fan*
		I NEG make meal
		'I don't cook.'
36		(0.3)
37	T:	*hm::: (0.4) na ni:: >da qiu ma<?*
		then you play ball Q
		'Do you play any sports?'
38		(1.7)
39	S2:	°*da qiu*°?
		play ball
		'Play sports?'
40	T:	*Hm*
41		(0.4)
42	S2:	*uh:: (0.6) yah: wo: (.) bu da qiu*
		I NEG play ball
		'I don't play any sports.'
43	Ss:	((laughter))
44	T:	°*damn*°
45	Ss:	((laughter))

---

6 Kurhila (2001: 1099) describes "doing the repair *en passant*" as the native speaker's overt way of doing correction without any delay or hedging in conversations between native and nonnative speakers.

46	T:	*hm::: (0.7) ni zuotian wanshang (.) xue zhongwen le*
		you yesterday night study Mandarin PRT
		ma
		Q
		'Did you study Mandarin last night?'
47		(1.2)
48	S2:	*wo-*
		I
		'I'
49	Ss:	((laughter))
50	S2:	( ) *to tell myself wo bu (0.5) uh:::[:*
		I NEG
		'I not'
51 →	T:	[*wo $mei: xue zhongwen$*
		I NEG study Mandarin
		'I didn't study Mandarin.'

In the previous excerpt, S2 accepts T's correction of the negative form *bu* without any delay. They then continue their conversation on what S2 likes to do on the weekend. In response to T's question, S2 again uses the wrong negative form (31). T's subsequent question in line 33 achieves two things: first, it embeds a correction of S2's wrong negative marker *mei*. According to Jefferson (1987), and in contrast to exposed correction, embedded correction incorporates correction into the ongoing talk without interrupting the conversation in progress. Through this non-intrusive form of correction, T places a priority on maintaining the flow of the conversation while addressing the error.

Second, T initiates a repair to request confirmation of her understanding of S2's answer. In contrast to her yes/no interrogative question in line 29, T formats the question in line 33 as a negative declarative, indexing a shift in her epistemic commitment to the information requested (Heritage 2010, Heritage and Raymond 2012). While questions in interrogative form claim no access to the information under question, declarative questions claim a stronger knowing stance, and are used to seek confirmation rather than elaboration or "answering" from the recipient (Heritage 2010, Raymond 2010). By virtue of T's epistemic strength, the preferred response from S2 is a confirmation because it aligns with the action that T's negative declarative question seeks to accomplish. In line 35, S2 displays an English acknowledgment token *uh* and provides a confirmation with the correct negative form, thereby showing his orientation to the response made relevant by T's declarative question. Taken together, both participants treat the maintenance of intersubjectivity as primary while attending to grammatical correctness as a

subsidiary concern. The binary purpose of T's negative declarative question is therefore demonstrated in the sequential environment.

Once S2 completes the repair, T resumes the topical talk in progress in line 35. After a few exchanges, in line 46, T asks S2 another question about whether he studied Mandarin the night before. After a 1.2-second pause, S2 produces the subject pronoun *wo* (I) as a cut-off, which invites laughter from the class. It is possible that the sizeable silence and the incomplete utterance are heard as implying a negative answer and provoke the subsequent laughter. In line 50, S2 responds to the question by switching to English, followed by an account in Mandarin. After he produces the negative form *bu*, he displays uncertainty about it, marked with a 0.5-second pause and a lengthening *uh*. As a response to his uncertainty marking, T directly provides a correction of *mei* with added stress and merely completes the response without further negotiation about the correct form (51). Again, by using the first person pronoun *wo* (I), T underlines the corrective force and makes relevant her role as a language instructor.

Additionally, the correction sequence parallels Kurhila's (2001: 1104) analysis of overt corrections in native and non-native speaker talk outside of classroom settings, as "[N]o negotiation about the correct form emerges and no explanations or justifications for the modifications are given or asked for" due to the linguistic asymmetry between the speakers. The sequence-closing quality of repetition and the brevity of correction could possibly suppress an interactional space for participants to discuss the error or question the correct form. Given S2's constant erroneous use of the negative form in Excerpts (7) and (8), such a space might be needed to ensure that his understanding of the error is not merely claimed in the form of repetition, but demonstrated in interaction.[7]

4.3 Intersubjectivity as a prerequisite for instruction

Through a sequential analysis of second language (L2) learners' repair, Lee (2006) proposes a respecification of communicative competence as an enabling condition and resource for language learning, rather than simply an outcome of instruction. According to Lee, L2 learners' competence to analyze, monitor their talk, and locate potential problems that threaten intersubjectivity is the very thing that organizes and enables classroom instruction. In other words, L2 learners rely on this analytic competence to achieve local and practical understandings of classroom interaction. Lee (2006: 369) further concludes that "*learning* begins in the practical fields of *understanding* and that understanding is the practical

---

7 See Sacks (1992) for a distinction between claiming and demonstrating understanding.

undertaking of the parties engaged and embedded in their analysis of their discourse, which is visible in the detail of its production." Therefore, intersubjectivity is necessary to sustain instruction and for instruction to proceed, as illustrated in Excerpt (9).

(9) Vocabulary

31   S4:   *um (2.0) xia (1.0) xia::(1.3) xia   ke   shengci*
                             next   next   next lesson vocabulary
                             'Next, next, vocabulary in the next lesson'
32   *I don't know as long as this one*
33 →   T: ↑*shang yi   ke*
               last   one lesson
               'The last lesson'
34   S4:   *oh shang yi   ke (0.5)   bi: (2.0)   zo   yi   ke?*
                 last   one lesson   compare   NF   one lesson
                 'Oh the last lesson, compared to one lesson?'
35 →   T: *zhe yi   ke*
              this one lesson
              'This lesson'
36   S4:   *zhe yi   ke   zhe yi   ke (2.3) hen   duo (0.7) wai(t)-*
             this one lesson this one lesson   very-EMP many
             shengci (0.5)
             vocabulary
             'This lesson, this lesson, a lot of, wait- vocabulary'
37   °*sorry*° *I don't know what I'm saying* [*shengci*
                                        vocabulary
                                        'vocabulary'
38   T: [*zenme shuo*
                                        How-Q say
                                        'How to say that?'
39 →   ↑*what do you wanna say*
40   (0.8)
41   S4:   *the vocabulary in the second dialogue (0.3) is (0.6) more. there's*
42   *more vocabulary, right?* ↑*there is, right?*

S4's turn in line 31 is marked with several pauses, false starts, and sound stretches, showing his difficulty in delivering the sentence in Mandarin. His subsequent code-switched account *I don't know as long as this one* invites T's correction of the semantic lexical item *shang* with emphatic stress to specify the error in the prior turn. In line 34, S4 mispronounces the word *zhe* as *zo* (a non-existing

form in Mandarin), to which T provides another correction. T's exposed corrections (Jefferson 1987) emphasize the importance of linguistic accuracy in the interaction between T and S4, putting the conversation on hold as the corrections become the focus of the interaction. However, S4 still struggles to finish the sentence in Mandarin as he switches to English, saying *sorry, I don't know what I'm saying* in line 37. With this statement, S4's struggle in producing the sought after utterance becomes more pronounced and becomes a practical problem that needs to be resolved in the unfolding interaction. In response, then, T re-shifts her focus from language practice to intersubjectivity by initiating a repair in English *what do you wanna say?* (39), in an attempt to restore mutual understanding with S4 (See also Cheng 2013 on T and S4's code-switching practices). With S4's response in lines 41 and 42, a shared understanding is restored, allowing the instruction to proceed. In this sequence, T adjusts her assistance by means of both repair and correction to help S4 construct a meaningful turn in Mandarin. However, considering S4's linguistic struggle and T's switch in interactional focus in Excerpt (9), it leads to the observation that intersubjectivity should be secured before correction takes place because it is in the presence of intersubjectivity that correction reveals its relevance for instruction (Macbeth 2004).

In this section, I have examined the sequential organizations of classroom repair and correction. Both repair and correction are viewed as interactional achievements, assembled by the participants' mundane discursive practices. This perspective allows researchers to describe their situated nature in their sequential and local context as well as brings us closer to acknowledging their individual contribution to the educational order. While sequential analysis reveals that repair and correction achieve distinct interactional ends, the analysis also empirically shows that they are both procedural and contingent resources the teacher employs to analyze her students' responses, assess their needs, recognize their difficulties in interaction, and tailor her method of assistance accordingly.

5 Conclusion

The primary purpose of this paper is to rethink the relation of repair to correction from a CA perspective. By focusing on what participants actually accomplish with repair and correction in classroom interaction, this paper aims to put their distinct organizations into perspective. This analysis of classroom repair shows how the participating teacher adjusts her epistemic stance through various repair designs, including an open-class repair initiator (Drew 1997), an incomplete utterance (Koshik 2002), declarative questions, and code-switched understanding

checks. The use of these repair forms relies on the teacher's knowing stance toward the student's response and the scale of the repair initiation invokes the teacher's relative epistemic commitment toward the information requested. As the teacher initiates repair with increasing strength, the knowledge gap between her and the participating student is gradually minimized and a shared understanding is sequentially re-established. It is by virtue of the teacher's epistemic stance display in repair sequences that the process of securing intersubjectivity is made visible in local actions. Moreover, the different knowledge claim asserted by the repair makes different forms of response relevant, such as confirmation, repetition, and completion of the prior turn. The choice of response is tied to how the repair is formulated in terms of participants' information state.

In correction sequences, the teacher makes learner-produced errors explicit with prosodic emphasis such as added stress and a sound stretch in the last syllable. In tandem with the choice of person pronoun and a reduction of learner utterance, the corrective purpose in the targeted word is linguistically signaled, as a result, correction becomes the primary focus. In other words, the correction sequence is brief, focused, and didactic. In response to teacher-initiated correction, the students display acceptance in the form of repetition, which acts as a signal of closing off a correction sequence, while the teacher provides acknowledgement by resuming the topical talk. Once the recognition of a correction is shown, the teacher uses overlap to keep the correction sequence to a minimum and move the interaction forward. Hence, overlap is exploited by the teacher to display her interactional authority with the effect of shutting down the turn of the students. With respect to its sequential placement, overlap highlights the targeted linguistic feature, enhances the linguistically accurate behavior, and minimizes the intrusion of correction. Together, the practices of repetition and overlap not only underscore participants' alignment with the pedagogical focus of linguistic accuracy, but also make relevant their institutional identities as teacher and students. Therefore, correction is a practical and normative achievement of classroom instruction "in which members display and recognize that instructing is going on" (Macbeth 2004: 729).

Even though correction is highly instructional, a closer look at the local level of talk-in-interaction reveals that signs of acceptance do not necessarily correspond to a student's understanding of the error. Repetition is often used by the student to claim understanding without the need to actually demonstrate what is understood. For this reason, opportunities for students to display understanding and non-understanding need to be created in order to transform correction into an instructional practice that not only teaches, but also promotes learning.

When discussing the feasibility of implementing focus on form into a communicative classroom, Doughty and Varela (1998) pointed out the dilemma a

teacher faced when trying to attend to both form and meaning; from this observation they note that "the teacher must remember to pay attention to what the student is saying as well as the formal realization of the message" (Doughty and Varela 1998: 136). The teacher in this Mandarin class attends to the same dilemma and copes with the same struggle, manifested in her shift between repair and correction sequences. The analysis also reveals that without mutual understanding, it is difficult, if not impossible, for any instruction to proceed and become meaningful to both parties. It is upon intersubjectivity, then, that a space for teaching and learning is created, maintained, and defended.

In sum, results of the study show that repair and correction achieve different interactional goals in classroom teaching. However, they are practical resources that the teacher draws on to sequentially adjust her assistance. It is through the achievements of both repair and correction within local sequential contexts that classroom instruction is realized in interaction. This sequential understanding of teacher-initiated repair and correction illustrates that both repair and correction are indispensible to the accomplishment of classroom instruction (Hall 2007a, 2007b) and, therefore, are better understood as "co-operating organizations" (Macbeth 2004: 723). Hopefully, this analysis illuminates the distinctive achievements of repair and correction in classroom interaction and helps us appreciate the complicated pedagogical work that our teachers are engaged in.

References

Atkinson, J. Maxwell and John Heritage (eds.). 1984. Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brouwer, Catherine E. 2004. Doing pronunciation: A specific type of repair sequence. In Rod Gardner and Johannes Wagner (eds.), Second language conversations, 93–113. London: Continuum.

Cheng, Tsui–Ping. 2013. Code-switching and participant orientations in a Chinese as a foreign language classroom. Modern Language Journal 97. 869–886.

Doughty, Catherine and Elizabeth Varela. 1998. Communicative focus on form. In Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams (eds.), Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition, 114–138. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Drew, Paul. 1997. 'Open' class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in Conversation. Journal of Pragmatics 28. 69–101.

Garfinkel, Harold. 1967. Studies in ethnomethodology. New Jersey: Prentice–Hall.

Goffman, Erving. 1959. The presentation of self in everyday life. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books.

Goffman, Erving. 1974. Frame analysis. New York: Harper and Row.

Gumperz, John J. 1982. Discourse strategies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, Joan Kelly. 2007a. Redressing the roles of correction and repair in research on second and foreign language learning. Modern Language Journal 91. 510–525.

Hall, Joan Kelly. 2007b. The devil's in the details: A response to Seedhouse. Modern Language Journal 91. 534–536.

Hall, Joan Kelly, John Hellermann, and Simona Pekarek Doehler (eds.). 2011. L2 interactional competence and development. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Hayashi, Makoto, Geoffrey Raymond and Jack Sidnell (eds.). 2013. Conversational repair and human understanding. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hellermann, John. 2011. Members' methods, members' competencies: Looking for evidence of language learning in longitudinal investigations of other-initiated repair. In Joan Kelly Hall, John Hellermann, and Simona Pekarek Doehler (eds.), L2 interactional competence and development, 147–172. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Heritage, John. 1984a. Garfinkel and ethnomethodology. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Heritage, John. 1984b. A change of state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage (eds.), Structures in social action: Studies in conversation analysis, 299–345. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, John. 2010. Questioning in medicine. In Alice F. Freed and Susan Ehrlich (eds.), "Why do you ask?": The function of questions in institutional discourse, 42–68. New York: Oxford University Press.

Heritage, John and Geoffrey Raymond. 2005. The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction. Social Psychology Quarterly 68(1). 15–38.

Heritage, John and Geoffrey Raymond. 2012. Navigating epistemic landscapes: Acquiescence, agency and resistance in simple responses to polar questions. In Jan de Ruiter (ed)., Questions, 179–192. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hosoda, Yuri. 2000. Other-repair in Japanese conversations between nonnative and native Speakers. Issues in Applied Linguistics 11(1). 39–63.

Hosoda, Yuri. 2006. Repair and relevance of differential expertise on second language conversations. Applied Linguistics 27(1). 25–50.

Jefferson, Gail. 1974. Error correction as an interactional resource. Language in Society 2. 181–199.

Jefferson, Gail. 1987. On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In Graham Button and John R. E. Lee (eds.), Talk and social organization, 86–100. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Jung, Euen Hyuk. 1999. The organization of second language classroom repair. Issues in Applied Linguistics 10(2). 153–171.

Kasper, Gabriele and Younhee Kim. 2007. Handling sequentially inapposite responses. In Zhu Wei, Paul Seedhouse, Li Wei and Vivian Cook (eds.), Language learning and teaching as social interaction, 22–41. Houndsmill, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kasper, Gabriele and Johannes Wagner. 2011. Conversation analysis as an approach to second language acquisition. In Dwight Atkinson (ed.), Alternative approaches to second language acquisition, 117–142. New York: Routledge.

Koshik, Irene. 2002. 'Designedly incomplete utterances': A pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences. Research on Language and Social Interaction 5. 277–309.

Kurhila, Salla. 2001. Correction in talk between native and non-native speaker. Journal of Pragmatics 33. 1083–1110.

Lee, Yo-An. 2006. Towards respecification of communicative competence: Condition of L2 instruction or its objective?. Applied Linguistics 27. 349–376.

Lee, Yo-An. 2007. Third turn position in teacher talk: Contingency and the work of teaching. Journal of Pragmatics 39. 1204–1230.

Liebscher, Grit and Jennifer Dailey–O'Cain. 2003. Conversational repair as a role-defining mechanism in classroom interaction. Modern Language Journal 87. 375–390.

Macbeth, Douglas. 2004. The relevance of repair for classroom correction. Language in Society 33. 703–736.

Markee, Numa. 2006. A conversation analytic perspective on the role of quantification and generalizability in second language acquisition. In Micheline Chalhoub–Deville, Carol Chapell, and Patricia Duff (eds.), Inference and generalizability in applied linguistics: Multiple perspectives, 135–162. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Markee, Numa and Gabriele Kasper. 2004. Classroom talks: An introduction. Modern Language Journal 88. 491–500.

McHoul, Alexander. 1990. The organization of repair in classroom talk. Language in Society 19. 349–377.

Pallotti, Gabriele and Johannes Wagner (eds.). 2011. L2 learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Pike, Kenneth Lee. 1967. Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior. The Hague: Mouton.

Raymond, Geoffrey. 2010. Grammar and social relations: Alternative forms of yes/no type initiating actions in health visitor interaction. In Alice F. Freed and Susan Ehrlich (eds.), "Why do you ask?": The function of questions in institutional discourse, 87–107. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rylander, John. 2009. Repair work in a Chinese as a foreign language classroom. In Hahn thi Nguyen and Gabriele Kasper (eds.), Talk-in-interaction: Multilingual perspectives, 245–280. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Sacks, Harvey. 1992. Lectures on conversation [1964–72], 2 Vols.. Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1987. Recycled turn beginnings: A precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organization. In Graham Button and John. R. E. Lee (eds.), Talk and social organization, 70–85. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1992. Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. American Journal of Sociology 97. 1295–1345.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2000a. When 'others' initiate repair. Applied Linguistics 21. 205–243.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2000b. Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation. Language in Society 29. 1–63.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., Gail Jefferson, and Harvey Sacks. 1977. The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. Language 53(2). 361–382.

Seedhouse, Paul. 1999. The relationship between context and the organization of repair in the L2 classroom. International Review of Applied Linguistics 37(1). 59–80.

Seedhouse, Paul. 2004. The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective. Oxford: Blackwell.

Seedhouse, Paul. 2007. On ethnomethodological CA and "linguistic CA": A reply to Hall. Modern Language Journal 91. 527–533.

Sidnell, Jack. 2010. Conversation analysis: An introduction. Wiley-Blackwell.

ten Have, Paul. 2007. Doing conversation analysis. 2nd edn. London: Sage.

Waring, Hansun Zhang. 2008. Using explicit positive assessment in the language classroom: IRF, feedback, and learning opportunities. Modern Language Journal 92. 577–594.

Wong, Jean. 2000. Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/non-native speaker English conversation. Applied Linguistics 21. 244–267.

Wong, Jean and Hansun Zhang Waring. 2010. Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers. New York: Routlege.

Appendix

1. Transcription Conventions

[	overlap
(1.0)	length of silence in tenths of a second
(.)	micro-pause less than 2/10 of a second
-	a cut-off
.	a stopping fall in tone
,	a continuing intonation
?	a rising intonation
::	lengthened syllable
=	latched utterances
word	marked stress
(word)	transcriber's unsure hearings
( )	unintelligible stretch
°word°	relatively quieter than the surrounding talk
> <	speeding up
< >	slowing down
↑	higher pitch in the utterance
↓	lower pitch in the utterance
$	smile voice
*	ungrammatical in Mandarin

2. Grammatical Glosses

COP	copula
EMP	emphatic marker
MSR	measure word
NEG	negative marker
POS	possessive
PRT	sentence, vocative or nominal subordinative particle
Q	question marker
NF	non-existing form

Bionote

Tsui-Ping Cheng graduated with a PhD in Second Language Acquisition from the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa in 2013. She is currently an adjunct assistant professor at the Graduate School of Commerce and Management at the Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo, Japan. Her main research interests include classroom code-switching, video analysis of embodied actions, and the application of conversation analysis to second language interaction and materials development. E-mail: tsuiping@hawaii.edu