



UNIVERSIDAD DE QUINTANA ROO

## DIVISIÓN DE HUMANIDADES Y LENGUAS

---

### Repair in English Classroom Interaction at the University of Quintana Roo, Cozumel Campus

---

#### Tesis

Para obtener el grado de  
**Licenciada en Lengua Inglesa**

PRESENTA  
**Zuri Sadai Dzul Loría**

DIRECTORA DE LA TESIS  
**Dra. Maritza Maribel Martínez Sánchez**



Cozumel, Quintana Roo, México, septiembre de 2021.



UNIVERSIDAD DE QUINTANA ROO

## DIVISIÓN DE HUMANIDADES Y LENGUAS

---

Repair in English Classroom Interaction at the University of  
Quintana Roo, Cozumel Campus

Presenta:  
Zuri Sadai Dzul Loría

---

Tesis para obtener el grado de Licenciada en Lengua Inglesa

### COMITÉ DE SUPERVISIÓN DE TESIS

Directora:

  
Dra. Maritza Miribel Martínez Sánchez

Supervisor:

  
Mtro. Martín de Jesús Islas Castro

Supervisora:

  
Mtra. Deymi Margarita Collí Novelo

Suplente:

  
Mtro. Armando Pérez Morfín

Suplente:

  
Mtro. Juan Carlos Rodríguez Burgos



Cozumel, Quintana Roo, México, septiembre de 2021.

## **Acknowledgments**

This thesis is dedicated to God, to my family and friends who have always supported me. Mainly to God for his unconditional love for me during all these years. God has shown me his support from the first day at university; without God's help, I would not have been able to finish my degree and this thesis. Likewise, to my mother Ariana Loría, who has always given me advice, to my father Israel Dzul, who has guided me in the path of God since I was little, and to my sister Jocabed Aiyana who has given me joy since her arrival almost six years ago. To my friend Cecilia Chan who has given her unconditional friendship for four years, who has encouraged me to always continue with my studies and has celebrated my achievements from afar. To Victoria Cohuo and Ixchel Sánchez who, have given me their friendship in the last two years of college.

I am also grateful to my thesis tutor, Dr. Maritza Maribel Martínez Sánchez, who has supported me as my tutor throughout my career by giving me advice, and guiding me in my academic preparation and has also given me her support since day one.

In the same way, I am grateful to the teachers of the English Language career who have been part of my masters at the university, such as the teacher Martín de Jesús Islas Castro and the teacher Deymi Margarita Collí Novelo who, in addition to being the supervisors of this thesis, have always helped me during my growth as a future English teacher.

# Contents

<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Chapter I. Theoretical Framework</b>	<b>19</b>
1.1 Early repair studies	19
1.2 Repair studies and communication	21
1.3 Different repair studies	22
1.3.1 Repair and English Language Teaching (ELT)	22
1.3.2 English as a Foreign Language (EFL)	23
1.3.3 English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)	24
1.4 Other-Repair studies	26
1.5 Conceptual Framework	30
1.5.1 Isolated terms	30
1.5.2 Important concepts comparison	33
1.6 Other important aspects of Repair	35
1.6.1 Emotional aspects	35
1.6.2 Wider views of Repair	36
<b>Chapter II. Objective and Research Questions</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Chapter III. The Research Design</b>	<b>39</b>
3.1 Contextual Framework	39
3.2 Methodology	40
3.3 Participants	41
3.3.1 Students	41
3.3.2 Teachers	42
3.4 Research Instruments	43
3.4.1 Observation and note-taking techniques	43
3.4.2 Visual data	44
3.4.3 Audio-recording techniques	44
3.4.4 Transcribing	45
3.5 Data Collection Procedure	46
3.6 Data analysis framework	48
<b>Chapter IV. Findings</b>	<b>50</b>
4.1 Other-repair extent in English classrooms	50
4.2 Activities where Other-repair is used	56
4.2.1 Other-repair in Listening and Speaking Skills	57
4.2.2 Other-repair in Reading and Writing Skills	59

<b>Chapter V. Discussion</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Appendix I. Some other transcriptions</b>	<b>78</b>

## List of Figures

<b>Figure 1.</b> English III – Group A	41
<b>Figure 2.</b> English V	42
<b>Figure 3.</b> English VII	42

## List of Tables

<b>Table 1.</b> Other-repair occurrences within classroom interaction	50
<b>Table 2.</b> Types of Other-repair	56

## Abstract

Other-repair is an Interactional Pragmatic Strategy that is used in communication. While it has been studied about classroom interactions (Seedhouse, 2010), it has not yet been discriminated in its use in English lessons. Cho and Larke (2010) said that the Repair strategies are how students resolve conversational problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding; therefore, an important feature to pay attention to in the teaching and learning processes. The objective of this thesis is to explore in which levels of English and in what activities the strategy of “Other-repair” is most present within language classrooms of the English Language major at the University of Quintana Roo, Cozumel Campus (UQROO Cozumel). The present study results from a qualitative analysis of the strategy Other-repair in English classroom spoken interaction. Based on a collection of 26 hours of class sessions of the different levels of English courses –from basic to the advanced levels– belonging to the English Language Major, an analysis of the spoken interaction was carried out in order to observe in which levels of English and in which class activities the Other-repair strategy happens more. The study participants included 6 language teachers and their students, around 114, 44 male and 70 female, all of them from UQROO Cozumel. Different research instruments were used to collect the data: in the first place, it was used note-taking and visual data (photos) were taken during the class observation, as well as audio-recordings and some video recordings of the lessons, which were organized in purposeful transcription for the analysis. Findings illustrate, on the one hand, that Other-repair occurred more in one of the courses with the lowest level. On the other hand, it was found that Other-repair occurs more in Speaking-Listening activities rather than in the Reading-Writing ones. The results may bring pedagogical implications for language teachers.

**Key words:** Repair, Other-repair, Interactional Pragmatic Strategies, Classroom Discourse



## Introduction

For years, researchers have conducted academic studies to guide teachers to improve interaction in their English classes in order to succeed in their teaching process. Such a series of interactions have been the subject of study in research fields like English as a Foreign Language, English as a Lingua Franca, and English Language Teaching. During such investigations, the "Repair" strategy was conceptualized as an important way to analyse language corrections: "Repair may be defined as the treatment of trouble occurring in interactive language use" (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 34), in other words, the direct or indirect correction that is made to a person or ourselves to have a correct communication with another person. For communication and better learning, teachers perform Repair among other various strategies. Still, they sometimes do not recognize or are not aware of the strategies they use, much less whether they are applying them well in their lessons. This thesis will focus on Repair as a linguistic phenomenon that supports the teaching and learning processes.

Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) are known to be the first researchers to study and analyze the Repair strategy in conversations, giving them the organization and function of this strategy. Schegloff *et al.* (1977) explained in their study that this strategy appears when there are difficulties in communication, more specifically in the parts of speaking, listening, and understanding, where a breakdown occurs in communication by one of the interlocutors.

According to Schegloff *et al.* (1977) Repair can be started with the person who made a mistake ("Self-initiated Repair") or by another person ("Other-initiated Repair"), and the Repair can be done by the person who made the mistake ("Self-repair") or by another person ("Other-repair"). It means that the phenomenon occurs in different ways, so Repair can subdivide into four different paths: "Self-initiated Self-repair", "Self-initiated Other-repair", "Other-initiated Self-repair", and "Other-initiated Other-repair" (Ibid.). In the classroom, both "self" and "other" may refer to either students or teachers depending on the way the repair is taken place. Later, other authors such as Ren (2018) and, Hoa and Hanh (2019) researched in depth the Repair phenomenon in different academic contexts such as monolingual, bilingual, and multilingual classroom interaction. Moreover, Ren (2018) and Smit (2010) went beyond the analysis of the conversations and bring up discourse analysis with their Repair-plus model.

In addition, Repair has been studied from a co-working perspective in which it is part of other interactional pragmatics strategies (IPS) to reach understanding (Martínez-Sánchez, 2017). Thus, the Repair strategy sometimes interfaces with IPS such as Code-switching, Repetition, and Rephrasing, that help students and teachers for a better communication. These

strategies can occur during the class and outside the classroom. In the class or outside the classroom, students want to express themselves in English, but sometimes they have difficulties doing it; they make different mistakes in their pronunciation or in the structure of the sentences; this happens more in speaking. In those cases, a friend or other students or even a teacher can be helpful to the student. When somebody corrects a mistake of a person during a conversation or the same person correct his/her own mistake is called Repair.

Research on Repair in different contexts, both educational and social, has focused more on studying and analyzing "Self-repair", which shows there is a preference towards this type of Repair. This can be seen, for example, in the research by Schegloff *et Al.* (1977) in which a preference for the use of "Self-initiated" and "Self-repair" was shown by the native speakers of English over "Other-initiated" and "Other-repair". However, this does not mean that "Other-repair" was not found both in the conversations of native speakers of English (NSE) (e.g. Schegloff, 2000) and in non-native speakers of English (NNSE) (e.g. Hodasa, 2000). On the contrary, in their work, Schegloff *et Al.* (1997) also mentioned that Other-repair could be used, more frequently, in interactions with NNSE, especially among those who are not yet well prepared. This observation fed researchers' interest in conducting studies focused on Other-repair interaction with non-native speakers (NNSE).

This thesis will focus on Other-repair in non-native speakers studying English language courses as it is aimed to contribute to research on this type of Repair that can help or support a micro investigation that is studying a wider range of interactional pragmatic strategies in which Repair is included. The thesis contribution would be able to provide potential outcomes about the Other-repair phenomenon in different areas and possible angles, that can inform and be useful for teachers and learners when they find themselves in communication breakdown situations. Thus, this is an explorative research to know how Other-repair works in the interaction of language lessons in different levels of English in a Mexican university.

There exist lots of publications around the Repair linguistic phenomenon. Some of these focus on casual conversations (Dingemanse and Enfield, 2015; Hosoda, 2000; Kendrick, 2015), and some other relate to classroom conversation (Ren, 2018; Liu and Wang, 2018; Rabab'ah, 2013). The former includes informal and formal communication in cafeterias, public attention, etc. while the later, classroom interaction like the one in this thesis. Classroom interaction studies in language teaching can be useful for teachers to encounter communicative problems with their students within classes. That is why, over the years, researchers have been studying the pragmatics strategies that teachers do in the classroom to have good communication with their students and that they understand and learn what happens during the

classes. Some pragmatics strategies that have been studying are Repair, Code-switching, Repetition, and Rephrasing. These caught my attention, especially the Repair strategy as a way to contribute not only on a theoretical base but a practical pedagogical base to language teachers.

My motivation to study Repair started two years ago, in the middle of the year 2019, when I began to participate in a research project "Interactional Pragmatics Strategies in the university language classroom" leaded by Dr. Maritza Maribel Martínez Sánchez. Shortly after I joined the project, we made a trip to Jose María Morelos, a town in the state of Quintana Roo. During our stay, we went to the Universidad Intercultural Maya of Quintana Roo (UIMQROO) to get to know the school and to interview teachers and students of the Language and Culture major. Although in the end, we were only able to interview the teachers because most of the students were doing their internships, during the interviews I was able to observe the teachers' perspectives about their language classes, as each one has a different technique to teach and to solve situations that prevent good communication within their lessons. Most of them tried to make their classes dynamic and related to situations in society, in the same way they solved the misunderstanding of the topics or to correct the errors of students at the moment and in a friendly way so that students do not feel intimidated by their errors. Back in Cozumel, I continued my participation in the project, and we were introduced to the different practical strategies that would be investigated throughout the project. Among the four strategies they presented to us –Repair, Code-switching, Repetition, and Rephrasing– the one that interested me the most was the Repair strategy since this happens when someone corrects a mistake that is committed during a conversation.

As each strategy was investigated deeper by my own, the more they became interested, especially the Repair strategy. The different studies that have already been studied over the years since the study by Schegloff *et Al.* (1997) have been focused on different areas such as school and social interaction. Among the research that has been carried out on the social environment between native and non-native speakers of a language there is the one by Fox, Maschler, and Unmann (2010) for example; also, within the school environment with native and non-native speakers of a language like the one carried out by Ren (2018); these studies will be explained in an extensive way in Unit 2. Within the last field, which is the school, what caught my attention was that the studies on Repair focused so much on the communication of students in the classroom in language subjects (Ren, 2018), in activities focused on communication such as storytelling (Rabab'ah, 2013), in conversations that students have

outside of a lesson (Kaur, 2011). This let me realize that there are different ways to study a linguistic phenomenon, in this case, as a pragmatic interactional strategy.

Another reason for my interest in this strategy was the fact this strategy often happens when one is learning a language either the mother tongue or a second language. Since one learns something new it is common that mistakes are made, but Repair can help students to improve and understand better. This situation has happened to me as a language student, often when I started studying English and French. I made a lot of mistakes, and even now I make some in the pronunciation of new words. During the time that I was beginning my learning, and I made mistakes in pronunciation, organization of ideas, or lack of understanding towards what I was told, and there were colleagues, friends, and teachers who corrected me and made me realize about my mistakes and how I could improve.

Despite the fact that most of the time, those people were kind to me, there was a time when the way they corrected me affected me, and I felt humiliated. In the second year of my school life in high school, my English classes were not the best, since the teacher did not give us classes continuously and only marked tasks, that made many students stop learning, become unmotivated, and even started to forget what they had already learned due to lack of practice. In our last classes, the teacher did a review of what we learned and during the review of the numbers he began to ask questions related to the numbers: how old we are, what year we were born, etc. When it was my turn, the teacher asked me how old I am and I tried to answer that I was 13 years old (*I am thirteen years old*), but I made a mistake in pronunciation and ended up saying that I was 30 years old (*I am thirty years old*), and the teacher instead of correcting me in a kind way, the teacher made fun of me in front of classmates making me feel bad and ashamed. Over time I began to correct my pronunciation in numbers, but that moment left a mark on me that took away a bit of motivation. This is a clear example that students must be corrected in a friendly way so that they do not feel ashamed of their mistakes and that they continue to learn and improve in English. This experience came to my mind when reading the various studies around the Repair phenomenon.

What also motivated this thesis was the comment of Schegloff *et Al.* (1997) on the preference of Self-repair over Other-repair, as they consider that Other-repair can appear more safely in non-native speakers (NNS) of a language. This motivated me to focus this study on "Other-repair" to contribute to the studies of this strategy specifically in this type of Repair within school communication in classrooms. These are the motivations that have led me to do this study, to show that the strategy used by teachers with their students to correct them and to help them in their learning during classes is called Repair. What happens when a person

corrects a bad pronunciation, lack of understanding of a topic, or the bad organization of their sentences at the time of communication and what is called Other-repair, when the one who corrected the mistake is not the one who made it.

Within an English language classroom, there are times when the student does not understand what the teacher says and effective communication cannot be made, which generates a bad acquisition of the language by the student, and a bad connection between teacher and student. In those moments the different learning strategies come into play, for example, “Code-switching” (combined two languages to make understand another people what he said), “Repetition” (replay what he said when the person does not listen or understood), “Rephrasing” (say something again in a slightly different way to make it clear), and “Repair” (correct the grammatical or pronunciation mistake by himself or another person).

In other situations, when there is a mistake in their pronunciation and in their organization of their sentences when communicating causes a gap in communication for a few moments until a person manages to see the error that was made and corrects it (Other-repair), or even the person who made it realize it and correct itself (Self-repair). These situations often happen in classrooms when learning is not well formed and, for this reason, common mistakes are made; these must be corrected and worked on so that knowledge can be successful or reaffirmed. For this, teachers or students who have realized the mistake must show and correct it. The way they do it is important, so as not to hurt the person causing demotivation and/or humiliation. Sometimes teachers let other students realize the mistake made by their classmates or themselves, leaving feedback to students. This can be very helpful since between colleagues, it is easier to expose mistakes and not to hurt feeling one another. This practice also helps students to be aware of what they and their peers say, thus working on listening comprehension and that they are aware of what happens during classes.

All of them are strategies that teachers use in their lessons for a good interaction in the classroom. And for that, this research aims to focus on investigating Repair because that is one of the most common strategies, and this happens when a person makes a mistake while talking and himself or another person corrects the mistake. Based on Schegloff *et Al.* (1997), Seedhouse (2004) stated four different types of Repair but, this time, he focused on his experience on classroom interaction: “Self-initiated Self-repair” (the same person makes and corrects the mistake), “Self-initiated Other-repair” (the person who makes the mistake and corrects it are different), “Other-initiated Self-repair” (a person makes a mistake and corrects himself), and “Other-initiated Other-repair” (one person makes the mistake and another

corrects it). This depends on the perspective in which the "Repair" happens; and he (Seedhouse, 2004) said in his same research that:

“It is important to distinguish Self-initiated Repair (I prompt repair of my own mistake) from Other-initiated Repair (somebody else notices my mistake and initiates repair). Self-repair (I correct myself) must also be distinguished from Other-repair (somebody corrects my mistake)” (p. 34).

In other words, self means the students (who did the mistake) and other could be the student or a language teacher (who correct the mistake). While there are four types of Repair, this thesis will focus on the two types of Other-repair: Self-initiated Other-repair and Other-initiated Other-repair, to explore how this strategy works in the English language classroom, and if it is effective for good communication between the teacher and the student in a Mexican educational context. According to Dingemanse and Enfield (2015)

“Other-initiated repair links language, mind, and social life. As a linguistic system, it combines a remarkable unity in broad typological terms with considerable diversity in local linguistic resources. As a mechanism for negotiating mutual understanding, it provides a window onto the social mind. As an organisation offering opportunities to redo, repair, redress or reorient social actions, it plays an important role in human sociality.” (p. 96)

Also, Chenoweth, Day, Chun and Luppescu's (1983) research shows that students prefer to have their teachers correct them with "Other-initiated Other-repair" on their language mistakes, while teachers prefer or tend to prefer to use "Other-initiated Self-repair" (cited in Ren, 2018, p. 59). In other words, the students expect teachers to correct them, leaving the responsibility to the teachers; and teachers hope that it is the students themselves who realize their mistakes and correct themselves, leaving them the responsibility of their own learning. Both Kaur's (2011) and Chenoweth *et al.*'s (1983) ideas are important to observe in the present research.

The objective of this study is to explore in which levels of English and in what activities the strategy of “Other-repair” is most present within a classroom of the English Language major at the University of Quintana Roo, Cozumel campus. For this, samples of conversations that happen within the classroom in various class sessions at the different levels of English that exist in the career were analyzed, from the basic to the advanced levels. This degree, unlike

other careers such as Tourism and Marketing and Business, focuses on preparing English teachers and, therefore, their students are always exposed to English classes even in disciplinary courses. For this reason, it is more suitable to carry out this study with the students of the English Language career because they are being prepared to become language teachers and are attentive to the mistakes that are made within the classroom in order to know how to correct them, as part of the pedagogical skills they need to apply when working as teachers in the future. This means that during the classes, they help teachers to detect and correct the mistakes, observe possibly occurrences of lack of communication and understanding among their classmates and/or the teacher and try to overcome them.

The completion of this thesis comes by making the analysis under the framework of Varonis and Gass (1985) which will be explained in depth in the methodology section of the thesis. It is expected to be helpful for further academic research and to serve as support to learn a little more about the Repair strategy; in addition, findings will feed the database of the project Interactional Pragmatics Strategies in university language classrooms. With this objective it is expected to observe the development and function of Repair within the classrooms at different English levels. This seeks to contribute to the studies carried out on Repair in the language educational context. In the classroom, sometimes, there are problems with communication among students and teachers. This makes students not to understand what the teacher is explaining about in the class, they do not know how to answer back to the teacher, and make a lot of mistakes when he or she talks. A possible solution to these problems would be to implement, consciously, the Repair strategy. In other words, a teacher can use the Repair strategy to make himself or herself understand connecting his or her own ideas with students and obtaining a good communication as possible.

Repair is one of the most used strategies in the classroom for English teachers, which can be utilized indirectly when one person makes a mistake in the pronunciation or the grammar when he or she speaks. Cho and Larke (2010) said that the Repair strategies are the ways in which students resolve conversational problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding. That is, they use Repair to clear up confusion during communication, helping each other to understand what is being said and avoid diverting the topic of conversation. Nowadays, there are a lot of studies focusing on Repair strategies based on language teaching in different contexts and situations. This study explores the form Repair is used in English interaction that takes place in a language classroom focusing on Other-repair because, to my knowledge, there

are not recent studies about this kind of Repair. Also, according to Schegloff *et Al.* (1977) cited in Hoa and Hanh (2019) it is more common to see Other-repair in English classrooms in which the student makes a mistake and the teacher or other students correct the mistake.

This way, this thesis will contribute to the area of interactional pragmatics. Pragmatics strategies have been studied with more boom in recent years, but there is still much to study and learn about them. For this reason, I decided to study Repair, focusing on Other-repair in order to explore how this phenomenon occurs within the language classrooms in a Mexican University. So far, studies on this phenomenon have been developed in contexts such as Asia and Europe, but no literature about Repair has been found in South America, specifically in the Mexican context. Therefore, it will be seen how Spanish-speaking teachers and students face communication problems and how they use Repair to correct mistakes in the classroom in order to overcome the communication that leads to learning. Also, it is expected that this research can be useful for further studies, moreover, as a contribution to English Language Teaching and pragmatics studies on strategies and their function in language courses. Knowing the role of Repair in the lessons can help students and teachers to have a real connection in the classes solving the misunderstanding they may face during the teaching and learning processes.



## Chapter I. Theoretical Framework

### 1.1 Early repair studies

Schegloff (1977) was the pioneer investigating the Repair phenomenon that takes place among native speakers of English and non-native speakers of English. From there, a series of research has been conducted in relation to Repair widening the kinds of speakers (e.g. casual conversation) and contexts (e.g. educational, business, etc.).

Schegloff (2000) research revisits his earlier work from 1992 describing another location in which 'Other-initiated Repair' is initiated – termed the 'fourth position', which elaborates the locus of Other-initiated Repair; it reports on a number of environments in which 'others' initiate Repair in turns later than the one directly following the trouble-source turn, and it describes several ways in which other-initiation of Repair which occurs in the next-turn position may be delayed within that position. The results show most 'other-initiated' which appears to have been positioned in other than the next turn after the trouble-source which it locates can be understood by reference to the organization of repair itself, the organization of turns, or the organization of turn-taking. In addition, 'Other-initiated' to be delayed while nonetheless occurring in next turn also can be understood by reference to the organization of Repair itself, the organization of turns, or the organization of sequences.

Seedhouse (2004) investigated Repair in Conversation Analysis and said Self-initiated self-repair is the most preferred and frequency of usage in a normal conversation than Other-initiated other-repair. The investigation shows means to repair a mistake and mitigate the correction when the person is not aware while talking: A correction as jokes, markets, a question or confirmation check, and offering an alternative, give the first person the opportunity to Self-repair in the next turn. Nevertheless, this could work if the first person is open to correction.

Schegloff (2007, pp. 102-123) explains that "Repair of problems in hearing or understanding some talk is initiated in the turn following the one in which the trouble-source occurred". Focus on Other-initiations of Repair, Schegloff explains that they "can occur in the next turn after any turn-at-talk; Other-initiated Repair provides its recipient an opportunity to adjust the utterance faced with incipient disagreement or rejection, to back down, to formulate an alternative to it or alternative formatting of it." And, "although it is not uncommon to find

two Repair sequences, it is unusual to find more than three. If the trouble has not been dealt with in three tries, the parties may give up and find another way of continuing the interaction”.

Ten Have (2007, pp. 133-136) says “a Repair sequence starts with a repairable, an utterance that can be reconstituted as the *trouble source*. It should be clear that any utterance can be turned into a repairable.” Furthermore, he says that “a *next turn repair initiator* (NTRI) could happen, it means when another participant initiates repair. This is often done with a short item: ‘huh?’, ‘what?’, etc. This gives the first speaker the opportunity to Self-repair the error, by offering a clearly repetition, or by using a different expression: ‘I mean’ (or something similar). Another alternative happens when another speaker may also offer a target utterance: ‘you mean X?’, which the original speaker can then accept, reject or rephrase”. In addition to ‘next turn’ is the natural place for Other-initiated Repair, and when a Repair is not done it in ‘next turn’ thereby ‘is not doing repair’; this does not exclude a repair initiated but would require more ‘work’ for reaching understanding. Such a list of items and questions that indicate the trouble source of the repairable are signaled in Varonis and Gass’s (1985) model as the Trigger turn.

Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008) explain Other-initiated Other-repair does three tasks: it assigns the trouble source to the prior turn, thereby exposing it; it locates the source of trouble, and it locates and resolves trouble in one turn. It is the Repair type which most explicitly raises the speaker’s ‘error’. Furthermore, there are a number of different structural positions in which a Repair initiation may occur in relation to the trouble source or repairable items: repair that can occur are within, or immediately after, the turn construction unit containing the trouble source; immediately at the next transition relevance place after the trouble source and during the conversation.

The early studies have provided a gist on the first research objectives in terms of Repair studies. Most of them show the position or the turn-taking organization in which the Repair phenomenon can be observed in interaction. By having these references, it is relevant to mention at this point, that the organization of turn-taking, in the case of the analysis in the thesis, was based on the Varonis and Gass’s (1985) model (see the methodology chapter) to have a homogenous way to locate the Repairable and explain how it is repaired.

## 1.2 Repair studies and communication

Repair observed from people of different nationalities has been studied too. Fox, Maschler, and Unmann (2010) carried out an investigation about the quantitative analysis of recycling and replacement Self-repairs in English, Hebrew, and German. Participants included 19 English speakers whose interaction was recorded three hours approximately; 51 Hebrew speakers, with 64 minutes of interaction; and 7 German speakers with 130 min of interaction. It was found, firstly, that English and Hebrew speakers engaged in simple recycling about two-thirds of the time, while German speakers make less frequent use of simple recycling. Secondly, it was found that English speakers frequently recycle back to the subject pronoun of a clause, while Hebrew and German speakers make much less use of the subject pronoun as a destination of recycling. Thirdly, it was found that Hebrew and German speakers recycle back to prepositions much more frequently than English speakers. There is a possibility that recycling and / or replacement Self-repair appears in the Other-repairs that appear in this investigation since, as seen in the results of this investigation, they are very likely to appear during conversations. Another study about Repair is that of Hoa and Hanh (2019).

Hoa and Hanh (2019), investigated strategies of Repair in conversations from English films and made some suggestions for applying these strategies to the teaching of the English spoken interaction skill to B2 level learners. This study was made with one hundred conversations taken from English films with centre on everyday familiar topics. The results showed six strategies of Self-repair: lexical trouble source correction, searching for a word, hesitation pauses, false start repairing, immediate lexical changes, and repetitions; and four strategies of Other-repair: using question words, repeating a part of the trouble source turn plus a question word, judging ideas from the speaker's utterance, and repeating a part of the speaker's talk with an upward intonation. All of these strategies were observed in English conversations.

The strategies for Self-repair, including *hesitation pauses*, *immediate lexical change*, and *lexical trouble source correction* are used more frequently than the other strategies (8, 7 and 6 time occurrence, respectively). The first helps speakers to gain more time to think and express their thoughts more clearly, and the other two help speakers to repair their ideas so clearly and to avoid possible misunderstanding from the hearers. In Other-repair, the strategies *repeating a part of the speaker's talk with upward intonation* and *using question words* are used more frequently, showing that the hearers want to confirm the information from the

speakers or they want to show some feeling to the speakers' utterance. Based on the findings, Hoa and Hanh (2019) suggest that teachers and learners can use these strategies to know how to maintain their conversations smoothly and also to know what they should do when the interlocutors use these strategies, for example, *Using question words* and *Judging ideas from the speaker's utterance* are two strategies that can be used when "the hearer needs some clarification from what the speaker has just mentioned to her/him" (pp. 9-10). Another example is the strategy *Repeating a part of the trouble source turn plus a question word* which should be used when "the hearer wants to get the exact information from the speaker" (Ibid.). Other study about Repair in classroom talk is that of Rafzar's (2005).

Rafzar (2005) explores the practice of Repair in classroom discourse from an ideological perspective of language and literacy. The study outlines the theoretical foundations of Repair from Conversation Analysis. The study of Rafzar (2005) takes place in an urban high school with a predominant population of Latinos. The result of this study shows a variety of Repair that occurred during the classes, some of them include: teacher repairs student English pronunciation, spelling, and word choice. During the classes, self-initiated Other-repair was used more. Rafzar concludes that although structural Repairs are easy to identify and code, the hard part is examining the multiple contexts and purposes of Repair.

As seen, some Repair studies have focused on analyzing interaction in communication. Wrapping up, we could observed that Fox et Al. (2010) quantitatively investigated this strategy and analyzed recycle and replacement Self-repairs speakers of English, Hebrew, and German. Hoa and Hanh (2019) based their investigation on English films conversation to find strategies of Repair whom can be used in the classroom. On the other hand, Rafzar (2005) based his study on repairing structurally features of language such as pronunciation and grammar in classroom discourse. These studies have been one form to realize about the way Repair can be investigated. Another set of Repair studies focus more on specific areas such as ELT and others.

### **1.3 Different repair studies**

#### **1.3.1 Repair and English Language Teaching (ELT)**

In language teaching, teachers come to encounter communication problems within their classes with students. That is why, over the years, teachers have been studying the strategies that

teachers do in their classes to have good communication with their students so they can understand what happens during the classes and learn the lesson. For example, there is a research by Ren (2018a) who studied the Repair under a conversation analysis perspective, in Chinese and American English Language Teaching (ELT). One of the principal objectives was to know how both classes use Repair as a strategy to achieve their pedagogical focus. Five American classes and three Chinese classes were studied, each one was recorded around 45-50 minutes, and the age range of participants was from 12-18 years old. There were, predominantly, junior and senior high school students. Findings show there were 19 instances of repair in American classes (actually 9 times Other-initiated self-repair, 9 times Other-initiated Other-repair, only 1-time Self-initiated Other-repair), and 26 instances of repair in Chinese classes (13 times of Other-initiated Self-repair, 9 times Other-initiated Other-repair and 6 times Self-initiated Self-repair). Another study about Repair in classroom is that of Lyster (2001).

Lyster (2001) investigated specific patterns of a reactive approach to form-focused instruction, namely corrective feedback and its relationship to mistake types and immediate learner Repair. The data analyzed include 13 French language arts lessons (7.8 hours) and 14 subject-matter lessons (10.5 hours) including lessons from science, social studies, and math. It was found that teachers tended to recast grammatical and phonological mistakes and to negotiate lexical errors; phonological repairs tended to follow recasts, whereas grammatical and lexical repairs tended to follow the negotiation of form: the teachers were on the right track in their decisions to recast phonological errors and to negotiate lexical errors and teachers could draw more frequently on the negotiation of form in response to grammatical errors. Lyster (2001) study based on the interaction during form-focused instruction in classroom.

### **1.3.2 English as a Foreign Language (EFL)**

Fotovatnia and Dorr (2013) investigated the Repair strategies employed by Iranian female and male in intermediate English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners to find out if there were differences in the usage of Repair strategies by class type (single-gender vs. mixed-gender) and the gender of the learners and the teacher. The participants of the study were 32 EFL learners (16 males and 16 females). At first, all of the learners were assigned to a mixed-gender class, and a textbook for 16 sessions (eight sessions with a male teacher and eight sessions with a

female teacher). Then the learners were divided into two single-gender classes and the use of the textbook continued for the two classes. All the sessions were video recorded. Then, the learners' Repair strategies were analyzed through the study. The results revealed, firstly, single-classes used more Repair strategies than mixed-classes. Secondly, there was no difference in using the Repair strategies based on the gender of the learners. And thirdly, there was no difference in using the Repair strategies based on the gender of the teacher.

Rabab'ah (2013) also examined how EFL learners in the non-English speaking communities (Jordan and Germany) uncovers the Repair strategies (Self-initiated repair and repetition) and handle communication in story-retelling, similar to the Lyster's (2001) study. The participants for this study were third-year volunteer students enrolled in the Linguistics Department at Chemnitz Technical University (Germany) and the University of Jordan (Jordan). Two stories were selected from the book *100 free English short stories for ESL learners*. Results revealed that both German and Jordanian non-native speakers of English resort to strategies of Repair in order to compensate for the lack of linguistic items (similar to Hoa and Hanh, 2019) or to gain time to retrieve linguistic items and maintain conversation (similar to Raftar, 2005). Also, findings show that Jordanian Arabic speaking subjects used strategies of Repair more frequently and repetition was used more frequently than Self-initiated Repair by both groups. While Rabab'ah (2013) used stories for his study, other way to study Repair is using English films such as in Hoa and Hanh (2019) study, reviewed above. Another field where Repair has been investigated is ELF.

### **1.3.3. English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)**

English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) studies, among other matters, the interaction that takes place within speakers of different first languages communicating throughout English (Jenkins, 2012). Therefore, it is quite interesting to know how Repair has been studied from this area, specially because some of their outcomes also come from educational settings. Kaur (2011), for instance, examines the notion of raising explicitness of expression by looking at some of the Self-repair practices of speakers using ELF, under -conversation analysis procedures in 15 hours of audio-recorded naturally occurring ELF conversations of international graduate students at an institution of higher learning in Kuala Lumpur. The 22 participants were from 13 different lingua-cultural backgrounds and therefore use English as the main medium of

communication. Instances of Self-initiated Repair were examined to identify the types of Repair performed and the kinds of trouble addressed. The results show that, in addition to correcting, the participants employed a variety of Self-repair practices that make utterances explicit and improve communicative clarity. Some of these practices include: make his or her reference more specific by inserting a qualifying lexical item where and when necessary, qualifying a statement by performing Self-repair, replacing a general term used in the preceding segment of an ongoing utterance with a more specific one, substituting a pronoun, and inserts the subject or object noun (or pronoun) of the sentence initially omitted in the preceding segment of an ongoing utterance” (pp. 2710-2712). While Kaur’s (2011) study focused on types of Repair, other ways to study Repair is through communication strategies.

Watterson (2008) focused his investigation on the communication strategies used to Repair non-understanding among speakers within ELF communication. In his work, Watterson (2008) explains that ELF speakers often have different pronunciation patterns when speaking English, as well as different degrees of lexical and grammatical knowledge. Thus, they have to interpret their lexical elements and pragmatic cues which are often different from each other. Participants were a small group of university students in Seoul, South Korea; one Mongolia, and five Korean. The English language ability of the participants range from intermediate to highly advanced. His methodology was by videotaping, transcribing, and analyzing the interaction of the group. First, the participants completed a series of six meetings during July and August 2006 in a primitive seminar room at a café in Seoul, where they spoke exclusively in English except for occasional snatches, usually single words. Then, interview appointments were made with each individual participant. During the interviews, part of the recorded interaction were played back to participants, like a small video screen. The part of the recording was shown illustrating where non-understanding seems to have occurred. In addition, during the interview it was made questions like: ‘Why did you say that?’, ‘What helped you to understand?’ Findings show that there were four uses of metalinguistic query to indicate intelligibility problems; one was responded to with repetition and three with the explication of meaning. In addition, the findings show that there was a strong tendency to rely on repetition in repairing intelligibility problems. Finally, the most common strategy used in the data was reformulation.

Different kinds of Repair studies were presented in this section. These included ELT, EFL and ELF, all of them enriching the Repair literature as they come out from different

settings, means of communication, and situations. Repair in English Language Teaching can be focused on different contexts; Ren (2018) investigated ELT in a Chinese and American classroom to explore how they use the Repair while Rabab'ah (2013) examined the frequency of the use of Repair strategies (Self-initiated Repair and Repetition) in Jordan and Germany students. In addition, Fotovatnia and Dorr (2013) focused on the gender of the participants who used EFL to observe the different strategies they used according to their gender (women and men). Kaur (2011) and Watterson (2008) investigated Repair in conversations in English of students who used ELF, while Watterson (2008) used ELF to study the Repair non-understanding into communication strategies. All of these studies show how Repair is used or can be used in education.

#### **1.4 Other-Repair studies**

While Repair includes four types as seen in early studies (see 2.1), this thesis will focus on Other-repair; therefore, some studies of it are commented here. All of them allow having a gist on the different ways the phenomenon has been approached in order to know not only its structural forms but also how it functions. Hosoda (2000), for example, examines conditions under which Other-repair occurs and the response to Other-repair in natural native speaker (NS) and nonnative speaker (NNS) conversations in Japanese. The participants of the studies were four male college teachers (two NNS and two NS) of English and classmates in a doctoral program in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESOL) at an American university in Tokyo. The two nonnative speakers were Americans who were advanced speakers of Japanese, and the two native speakers who know the Tokyo dialect of Japanese— were advanced speakers of English. The data analyzed were two NS/NNS conversations and one NS/NS conversation in Japanese, all three conversations were video and audio-recorded. Findings show that, in the approximately 55 minutes of conversation, there were 17 examples of Other-repair, of which 2 occurred in the conversation between NS/NS, 8 and 7 in the two conversations between NS/NNS. These frequencies show that Other-repair occurred much more often in the NS/NNS conversations than in the NS/NS conversation, similar to the Varonis and Gass's (1985) study. Other-repair made relevant the Repair recipients' display of acceptance in the subsequent turns. In the NS/NNS conversation, when the Repair recipient did not signal acceptance, this appears to have indicated a lack of recognition or comprehension of the work being performed by the Other-repair. A second study by Other-repair is that of Svennevig (2008).



Svennevig (2008) carried out an empirical investigation on how Other-initiations of Repair present a diagnosis of the trouble source and how addressees respond to this diagnosis. For this study, two data sources were used: a corpus of informal conversation between unacquainted interlocutors and a corpus of institutional interaction, namely consultations in various social welfare offices between native Norwegian social workers and non-native clients. It was analyzed a collection of 285 Other-initiations of Repair to find out which problem source was indicated by the initiation of Repair i.e. hearing, understanding or acceptability, and to what extent it specifically indicates the nature of the problems; unspecific problem indicators, category specific indicators, candidate solutions. Regarding the problems of hearing, utterances may be done explicitly, such as “what did you say?” or implicitly, such as “huh?” or “pardon?”, among others. Problem indications may be unspecific, as in these cases, or specific, as in partial repeats plus a question word (“Ross what?”). Repair initiations may merely indicate a problem, as in the prior cases, or they may suggest a solution to it, for instance, by presenting a potential hearing of the prior utterance (“Columbia?”).

Problems of understanding may be indicated by displays of incomprehension, such as for instance, “what do you mean?”. The nature of the problem may furthermore be specified by using clarification requests (“I have a – cousin teaches there.”). Finally, the problem may be attempted to be solved by presenting a candidate understanding of the prior utterance in a so-called understanding check. This may e.g. be realized by the phrase “you mean” + a paraphrase. Problems of acceptability concern to the acceptability of the contribution not just as a linguistic utterance, but also as a social action. To accept a conversational action can involve such different things as the truth of the claims made, the speaker’s right to perform the action in question, the relevance of the utterance to the current situation, etc. Specifying the nature of the problem may take the following form: “you said (0.5) in the Oxford street”. Proposing a solution may be done by proposing a candidate correction, as in: “You mean Manhattan?”.

Moving to Svennevig’s (2008) analysis, it shows that there is a preference for trying the least serious interpretation of a problem first, what turns out to be a problem of understanding or acceptability is initially addressed as a hearing problem. In cases of potential problems of acceptability, the original speakers may modify their utterances in order to make it more acceptable to the interlocutor, for instance, by correcting a mistake or by backing down from a potentially controversial position. Acceptability, in this case, is a key point for the thesis

because it depends on the student's level of acceptability of Other-repair, the success he or she can reach in learning the language in a correct way. While Svennevigr's (2008) carried out his study on how Other-initiations Repair present problems into the communication and how receivers respond to this diagnosis, other ways is to study Other-initiated repair in multi-person conversation as Bolden's (2011).

Bolden (2011) examines one aspect of Other-initiated Repair in multi-person conversation, how the progressivity and social epistemic play out in a variety of contexts and considers implications of "other"-selection for the understanding of the Repair organization, by analyzing under what circumstances "other"-selection is used. The author used video-recorded face-to-face everyday multi-person interactions between family members and friends. Using two corpora: one is a collection of recordings of the bilingual conversation in families of Russian American immigrants, and the other is a compilation of English-language recordings made in the United States. In general, 53 recordings of interactions between three to eight participants are used. The results revealed, the two considerations *progressivity* and *social epistemics* may operate concurrently, when an apparently more competent interlocutor is selected over a less competent one. First, "Other-initiations of Repair halt the progressivity since they stop the course of action that was in progress to deal with some problem in hearing or understanding talk". Second, "social epistemics—interlocutors' rights and responsibilities to socially distributed knowledge— may be involved in turn allocation and, in particular, in next speaker selection" (pp. 241-248). In addition, "other"-selection is a marked option for resolving Other-initiated repair: "other"-selection (if used) is deployed after the selection of the trouble-source speaker has failed.

In the classroom, there is a lot of multi-person interaction since during the sessions the students interact with each other and with the teacher in carrying out the class activities. As seen in this study, multi-personal interaction can give progressivity and/or social epistemic. Where the first has to do with the sequence of communication and how it is cut by having a Repair until it is solved, and the second to the context of the conversation where one or more people can help to solve the Repair since they understood what the person wanted to express. This is expected to be found within classroom interaction obtained as database in this research.

Another study of Other-repair investigates the conversational structure of Other-initiated Repair is that of Dingemane, Blythe and Dirksmeyer (2014) who reported on a cross-linguistic investigation of the conversational structure of Other-initiated Repair. For this study,

the participants were 11 researchers, who speak different languages each (English, Italian, Lao, Mandarin, etc.). It was taken stock of formats for initiating repair across languages. It was found that people sometimes have differing interactional projects, different knowledge states, sometimes start speaking at the same time, are prone to distractions from within their surroundings, and every Other-repair initiation can handle at least things at once: characterizing trouble, managing responsibility, and handling knowledge. Different languages make available a wide but remarkably similar range of linguistic resources for this function. Another study is that of Kendrick (2015) which is about the formats and practices of Other-initiation repair.

Kendrick's (2015) article describes the formats and practices of other-initiations of repair attested in the corpus and reports their quantitative distribution. A distinction is made between other-initiations that perform additional actions concurrently and those that formally resemble straight other-initiations but, analyzable, do not initiate repair as an action. It was used video recordings of informal social interaction between speakers of English from the U.K. and the U.S. (using 15 recordings with a total duration of 411 minutes). In addition, this study used a video recording of a family mealtime conversation entitled *Virginia*. The results show the use of copular interrogatives as a general format for other-initiation being one, and the three most frequent classes of action that speakers use Other-Initiated Repair (OIR) practices to perform other than initiating repair: 1) non-serious actions such as jokes and teases, 2) preliminaries to dispreferred responses such as challenges, rejections, and disagreements, and 3) displays of surprise and disbelief such as expression or emotions (similar to Schegloff, 1997, and Svennevig, 2008). Other study is that of the linguistic resources and interactional practices of Other-initiated Repair.

Dingemans and Enfield's (2015) study describes the linguistic resources and interactional practices associated with Other-initiated Repair in ten different languages. The ten participants who have different languages (Russian, English, Spanish, Italian, Lao, etc.) worked with a video corpus of maximally informal social interaction (in most cases collected by themselves). Ten-minute segments from different interactions surveyed, the total amount of data amounts to 50 hours, and over 4 hours per language on average. The study findings included three basic types of Repair initiation that appear from the cross-classification of the open request type and the restricted request type; the former, the open type, signals a problem but the Repair is open and the later, the restricted type, focuses on Repair the problem directly.

The third type refers to a request "asks for specification or clarification of something in the prior turn" (Dingemanse and Enfield, 2015, p. 105). People prefer to choose the type of Repair initiator in order to be the most specific possible in the context. It was found too that the Repair operation differs as a function of the Repair initiator type chosen in a way that is consistent across all of the languages.

The Other-repair studies presented in this section include a variety of interactions, mainly from multi-groups of speakers as well as multi-cultural backgrounds. Some of them, compare native speakers' interactions and non-native speakers' interactions. Some interactions occurred naturally in non-academic settings, and some other were interactions that emerged under controlled activities. All of them have provided a great umbrella of possible outcomes that may or may not appear in classroom interaction, the focus on this thesis.

As seen overall in the first sections of Chapter 1, from both early research and more recent publications can be said that there are many ways to study and investigate Repair from different fields, methodologies, and contexts. This thesis will be based on these studies which are considered a fundamental guide for the investigation that aims to explore in which pedagogical activities and English levels Repair is used into the classrooms of English lessons at the University of Quintana Roo, Cozumel campus.

## **1.5 Conceptual Framework**

This section presents some key terminology that is important to set clear for the sake of the thesis. As know, some terms are talked in a diverse form by different authors, and according to the purpose of their studies. That is the reason why it is relevant at this point to present this conceptual framework, starting from the definitions of isolated terms (2.1) to, secondly, present a comparison of terms (2.2.) that may represent misunderstanding.

### **1.5.1 Isolated terms**

#### **Repair**

'Repair' refers to practices for dealing with problems of hearing, speaking, and understanding talk (Schegloff et al. as quoted in Bolden, 2011, p. 238). Bolden (2011, p. 238) explains that Repair is organized by the speaker of the problematic talk (the *trouble source* or the *repairable*)

or *self* and its recipient or *other* (who is normally addressed to). Nordquist (2019) in her online page, says that Repair in conversation analysis is the process where a speaker recognizes an error of word and what has been said with a sort of. Also called: Self-repair, speech repair, conversational repair, linguistic repair, reparation, false start, and restart.

Kääntä (2010) mentions that Self-initiated self-completed repair is the most used Repair in normal conversation and Other-repair are not. However, he mentions that this kind of Repair occurs where one of the participants is still learning the language, emphasizing that Other-repair is more frequently used until sufficient competence is achieved. As it was mentioned before, there are four varieties of Repair sequence; Self-initiated Self-repair, Self-initiated other-repair, Other-initiated Self-repair, and Other-initiated Other-repair. For this work, it was selected two authors that explain these Repairs, Hutchby *et al.* (2008, p.60) and Bolden (2011, p. 238):

Self-initiated Self-repair: “Repair is both initiated and carried out by the speaker of the trouble source”. On the other hand, “the speaker initiates and resolves the Repair, typically in the same turn, e.g., when one word is replaced with another”. Self-initiated Other-repair: “The speaker of a trouble source may try and get the recipient to repair the trouble - for instance, if a name is proving troublesome to remember”. Another explanation is that “the speaker initiates repair, but the receiver provides a solution, for example: when a searched-for word is provided by another participant”.

Other-initiated self-repair: “Repair is carried out by the speaker of the trouble but initiated by the recipient. At the same time, this Repair is “a recipient initiates repair, e.g., with What?, and the trouble-source turn speaker resolves it”. Other-initiated Other-repair: “The recipient of a trouble-source turn both initiates and carries out the repair. This is closest to what is conventionally understood as ‘correction’ ”. In addition, this Repair “is a receiver initiates and resolves the repair, example: by correcting something in the other person’s talk”.

## **Pragmatics**

The Encyclopaedia Britannica (2010) defines pragmatics “as the study of how both literal and nonliteral aspects of communicated linguistic meaning are determined by principles that refer to the physical or social context (broadly construed) in which language is used”. Huang (2007, p. 2) says, “Pragmatics is the systematic study of meaning by virtue of, or dependent on, the

use of language. The central topics of inquiry of pragmatics include implicature, presupposition, speech acts, and deixis."

Verschueren (2005, p. 83) associates pragmatics with the study of language use. On the other hand, Chen (2010, p. 147) describes Pragmatics as a discipline that specializes in how people employ graceful language for communication.

Bardovi-Harlig (2013, pp. 68-69) defines pragmatics as "the study of how to say what to whom when and that L2 pragmatics is the study of how learners come to know how to say what to whom when."

### **Pragmatic Strategies**

Chen (2010, p. 147) says that Pragmatic Strategies is in a great many contexts, which is helpful to realize an ideal communicative effect. Pragmatic strategies are used for avoidance of explicitness in language and to analyze sorts of reasons for the explicitness from the perspective of pragmatics. Ren (2018, p.1) explains in his research that the Chinese bilingual professionals employed various pragmatic strategies to prevent and resolve problems of understanding in ELF communication and to facilitate understanding and ensure communicative effectiveness. Pragmatic strategies are designed to enhance the intelligibility of speech, which include topic fronting, lexical repetition, echoing, and collaborative completions (Ren, 2018, p.4, as quoted in Dererding, 2013).

### **Interaction**

The Cambridge Dictionary (n.d) defines Interaction as a situation where two or more people or things communicate with each other or react to each another. It is the interaction between somebody and somebody, interaction of something and something, interaction with somebody, interaction among something. Adaba (2017, p. 2) says that interaction or human interaction has been defined as a process whereby two or more people engaged in reciprocal actions. This action may be verbal or nonverbal. The author defines interaction as the students' participation requires a high degree of interpersonal communication skills. It refers to the exchange of information between the teacher and the students or among the students.

Hornbæk and Oulasvirta (2017, p. 5049) say interaction is not the idea promoted and repeated in folk notions that a computer and a human are engaged in some interplay. Interaction

concerns two entities that determine each other's behavior over time. Rhalmi (2018) describes the interaction as the made up of two morphemes, namely inter and action. It is a mutual or reciprocal action or influence. In English language teaching, interaction is used to indicate the language (or action) used that maintains conversation, to teach or interact with participants involved in teaching and learning in the classroom.

### **Classroom Interaction**

Adaba (2017, p. 2) describes Classroom Interaction (CI) as “a practice that enhances the development of language skills. This device helps the learners to be competent enough to think critically and share their views among their peers. Interaction in the classroom is an essential part of teaching learning process. Interaction or human interaction has been defined as a process whereby two or more people engaged in reciprocal actions. This action may be verbal or nonverbal. Defined interaction as the students' participation requires a high degree of interpersonal communication skills. It refers to the exchange of information between the teacher and the students or among the students”.

Rhalmi (2018) says that classroom interaction can be seen from different perspectives according to the approach adopted in teaching: Behaviorist perspective: classroom interaction is reduced to modeling, repetition, and drills. Cognitive perspective: classroom interaction is based on the learner processing of what's happening in the classroom to make sense of the world. Finally, Social constructivism perspective: in classroom interaction, learners make sense of the world not only by means of internal processes (what happens in mind), but also through the social dimension of learning. A Dictionary of Sociology (Encyclopedia, n.d) says that Classroom Interaction “describes the form and content of behaviour or social interaction in the classroom. In particular, research on gender, class, and “race” in education has examined the relationship between teacher and students in the classroom”.

### **1.5.2 Important concepts comparison**

#### **Mistake and Error**

Mistake and error have different meanings and these both concepts exist in the teaching and learning process. When students study a second language, they sometimes do something

wrong, which is called a mistake or an error. Harmer (2001) and Edge (1993) explain that error is when students cannot correct themselves, so they need explanation (cited in Harmer, 2001, p. 137). Tafani (2009) in her work says errors occur when the learner has not yet learned something; and mistake is a confusion, slips of tongue, this is a problem of applying the information incorrectly. That means, error takes place when the knowledge of the student is not solid and he is still learning; on the contrary, a mistake is when the student has fixed knowledge but he had a failure using a known system correctly.

According to Ellis (1997), “errors occur when the student does not know what is correct and they are reflected as gaps in the knowledge of students”. On the other hand, mistakes occur because the student is unable to apply what he knows (cited in Muhsin, 2016, p. 82). Mistakes and errors are a misstep that is made by the student, but the difference is that, in mistakes, a student can make a correction by himself or herself; but, in error, a student is unable to make a correction without the help of the teacher. For this study a mistake is used in situations where a student fails to perform what he or she knows. This means when he or she sometimes uses the correct form and sometimes not which indicates his or her knowledge is on the right form. Moreover, error is used when a student consistently uses the wrong form of the information rather than the right one, this would indicate there is a lack of knowledge.

### **Repair and Correction**

For Schegloff et al. (1977), the term "correction" is a subtype of Repair. Correction is used to replace an erroneous element of the word. Repair is, then, the more general term to deal with the type of problem that occurs in interaction. However, there is a difference between Repair and Correction concerning to the temporal occurrence of the repairable in relation to the statements: the correction generally attacks the sources of problems already, that is to say, it is retrospective, while some repairable are marked as still emerging and imminent, so prospectively oriented to Repair. Overall, Repair is an action which can, often does, delay the execution of the next relevant sequential action i.e. it is postponed until the work of is completed. When we consider Repair from this perspective, it is clear that the work of Repair disrupts the development of the current interaction and is not always directly related to the correction.

Sacks (1967) first studied the term "correction invitation devices" and then, in his work with Schegloff and Jefferson in 1977, they referred to the two terms Correction and Repair in



the same way. However, later, Schegloff in 1979 mentions that “the more generic rubric repair” has replaced the term correction. This change was made in order to reflect the nature of many Self-repairs in which no error is evident, but speaker modification occurs. (as quoted in Keating, 1993, p. 412). According to Evnitskaya (2018) investigators such as Cook (1999) who are confined to social interactions, they choose by using the term 'Repair' instead of 'correction' because it better describes what happens in everyday conversions where people do not correct the sentences of others. Evnitskaya explains that the term 'Repair' focuses on what the student can express with the use of the language, while the term 'correction' focuses on what the student still cannot do or does it incorrectly. Therefore, Repair is more related to the objectives of language learning. Evnitskaya (2018) says that one of the most common practices of teachers is the Repair or correction of errors, since these address linguistic problems or problems related to the incorrect way of applying concepts. In this thesis, Repair will be used as the key term to define the problems that occur during communication and how they are solved, being Schegloff et al. (1977) and Evnitskaya (2018) those who use the Repair in this way.

## **1.6. Other important aspects of Repair**

### **1.6.1 Emotional aspects**

Evnitskaya (2018, pg. 15-16), in her article made mention that the role of the teacher is to create an environment where students develop a positive self-image through their interactions and provide emotional classroom support. She describes Repair as a common practice that the teacher does within classroom interaction, which can address problems related to the use of concepts or problems of linguistic form. The author also mentions that Repair can be direct, indirect, or depending on the way the teacher identifies the interaction problem as well as the type of Repair; ‘Other-initiated repair’ when the teacher signals a problem in the speech of the student by correcting it. On the other hand, ‘Self-initiated repair’ happens when a student is aware of his or her performance, detects an error during the speech and attempts to self-correct. Evnitskaya (2018) stresses that it is important to perform Repairs with considerable delicacy on the part of the teacher. If insensitive feedback is given, such as correcting directly and quickly, at inappropriate times, or too often, it can damage students' self-esteem or self-image. Teachers should know the appropriate time to make the Repair to have more opportunities to improve learning, avoiding interrupting the flow of interaction or

conversation between students. Furthermore, they should carry out the Repairs in line with the pedagogical purposes of the lesson and the pedagogical objectives as a teacher.

“In classroom settings, Repair can require considerable delicacy on the part of the teacher. Providing corrective feedback in insensitive ways, such as repairing students’ utterances too directly, too frequently or at an inappropriate moment, can damage students’ self-image and lower their self-esteem” (p. 16).

The concept face-work, that the author states, deals with the public self-image of oneself, it means, the way people see themselves in relation to other people, or in other words, the seeking approval or wanting to be liked, appreciated, or acknowledged by others. For that reason, when Self-initiated and Other-initiated repair is used, it is essential to be very delicate with our actions because Repair involves face-work.

### **1.6.2 Wider views of Repair**

Smith (2010) observed 33 full lessons of three different subsets but only used nine in total; three lessons of each subset. She found 341 Repair instances that were identified during the 393 minutes of classroom interaction. With this information, she found the next information that help this study to understand better the function of Repair. Smit (2010) talks in her article about the classroom interaction of under Repair in a conversation analysis model of interactional Repair. In other words, interactional Repair refers to both Repair sequence or Repair trajectory referring to the completely interactional event. This Repair sequence takes longer than three moves, and as a result, it is finished with the third move. In addition, she mentions the trigger step of Varonis and Gass (1985), using also the name ‘repairable’, and how this is followed by the resolution, which consists of an indicator leading to a response and a reaction to the response. Smit (2010) emphasizes that the last two moves (response and Reaction to the response) have the possibility to be repeated if necessary.

Smit (2010) made her own interactional Repair Plus Model and added it all into the rank scale structural description of pedagogical discourse; the Repair trajectory starts with a repairable and is followed by the repair or Repair initiation, Repair response, and Repair reaction, joining the Repair theory (Seedhouse, 2010) with the Negotiation of Meaning Model (Varonis and Gass, 1985). Moreover, the author defines three types of repairables: 1)

intelligibility which refers to mishearing like identity of words and utterances spoken; 2) comprehensibility that indicates to the reference like referential perspectives or meaning specifications (aspects of sematic potential activated); and, 3) interpretability that indicates the illocutionary force, speaker's attitudes towards topic or frames, and perspectives adopted. In her work, she mentions that Other-repair is reported to happen rarely in casual conversation and slightly more often in classroom interaction. She emphasizes that Other-repair happens with abundance in the English Language Foreign classroom, among teachers as well as students. She mentions two trajectories: Other-repair in the same turn, and Other-repair in the next turn. The former is seen as helping and supporting the speaker, while the later refers to a next speaker self-selecting, correcting the previous speaker.

Repair categories are also mentioned in Smit's (2010) work: the three categories are the following: linguistic (pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary), interactional (mishearing, reference, and discourse), and factual (in instructional register, in regulative register). Smit (2010) mentions that repairables that are often selected within interaction include factual in the instructional register, vocabulary, mishearings and factual in regulative register. The work of Smit (2010) can be very helpful to answer the research questions that were posed for this work, as in the case of the frequency of Other-repair in the classrooms (classroom interaction) in turn, there is a possibility that some of the three types of repairables and some of the aforementioned categories are found within activities carried out in the recorded classes.

Chapter 1 attempted to provide the theoretical introduction of the Repair phenomenon and to present current studies on Other-repair. All studies have helped to have an idea on the way Repair can be investigated in various ways to be considered such as the speakers, the settings where the conversation takes place, the activities if they were controlled, the different categories in which the phenomenon can be accounted, for example, its form, its function, its interactional organization and so on. All of these characteristics have made myself to focus on two major targets in the thesis: the extent and the pedagogical activities where it is used. This will be explained in the following chapter.

## Chapter II. Objective and Research Questions

The objective of this study is to explore in which levels of English, and in what activities the strategy of “Other-Repair” is most present within a classroom of the English Language major at the University of Quintana Roo, Cozumel campus. For this investigation, it is intended to answer the following research questions:

- To what extent is Other-repair used in courses of different English levels?
- In which classroom activities is Other-repair used more?

The first question refers to how frequently Other-repair is used in the different courses of English by students and teachers in UQROO campus Cozumel. It seeks to illustrate at which proficiency levels this phenomenon occurs or is most or least used. Knowing this will help to know how Other-repair is used by teachers and students during the English classes. This shows whether what was said by Schegloff et. Al. (1977) on the frequency of Other-repair is adapted to the English classes at the UQROO and also to corroborate if this type of Repair is used more by the beginning level groups than by the advanced level groups. The second question refers to which activities, for example, reading, the practice of speaking, answering questions, etc. Other-repair is more used. In other words, which activities may represent a triggered space for errors in which the students or teachers have to use Repair in order to help to firstly realize about his/her error, and secondly, to correct it.

Previous studies have shown that Self-repair seems to be more "popular" in research as it seems to be the most used Repair in conversation (Schegloff et Al., 1977); contrarily, Other-repair seems to be less used. This thesis focuses on observing and informing occurrences of Other-repair that happen in classroom interaction in order to contribute to ELT. Focusing on one type of Repair that is not widely researched due to the apparent infrequency, would allow researchers to know more about this phenomenon in both ways: the frequency it is used among English courses of different proficiency levels and in which pedagogical activities it is used more by teachers and students. So far, there are a few studies that focus on one type of activity to study Repair, for example, conversations (Hosoda, 2000) and presentations (Rabab'ah, 2013), to mention some. Therefore, observing and sharing in a general way in which activities Other-repair is most used by students and teachers during their classes can contribute to the literature.

## Chapter III. The Research Design

### 3.1 Contextual Framework

This study was carried out at the University of Quintana Roo (UQROO), campus Cozumel. According to *Universidades de Mexico* (Universidades de Mexico, n.d), the University of Quintana Roo is the main public university in the state of Quintana Roo, based in the city of Chetumal, as well as other three campi located in the island of Cozumel, Playa del Carmen city and Cancun city. UQROO offers 29 university undergraduate programmes (24 bachelors and five engineering), nine masters and four doctorates. 17 majors are in Chetumal, four in Cozumel, four in Playa del Carmen, and four in Cancun.

Cozumel campus has undergraduate programmes and 3 postgraduate programmes (2 master programmes and 1 doctorate). The undergraduate programmes are English Language, Tourism Services Management, Natural Resources Management, and Marketing and Business. Focusing on the English Language major, this career has a Language Teaching Center (CEI due to its initials in Spanish). According to the official website of the UQROO, CEI “is the area in charge of providing academic services to the university community and to the Educational Programs (PE) in a transversal way, through the General Subjects of English (AG) and the Language Support Subjects (AA)” (UQROO, nd).

The CEI is in charge of a group of professionals in language teaching. Within its characteristics of the CEI, it has various tools for the study of languages such as academic books, computers, group room, CDs, and board games among others, in which one can learn and review writing, speaking, reading, and listening skills. In addition, the CEI carries out various activities so that students are always in contact with languages: circles of conversation, reproduction of foreign films, etc. CEI functions as a natural laboratory for students in the English Language major.

The English Language major purpose is to form English teachers. According to the Study Plan (2015), the purpose of the major is "to promote professionals in the teaching of English with a comprehensive, humanistic and ethical profile, with linguistic and pedagogical competencies for teaching general English and specialty in different contexts" (p. 16) This is due to the training and qualification needs of teachers within the areas: language teaching and assessment by competences, teaching English to children, and teaching specialized English.

The study plan was redesigned and approved in 2015, due to updates of new educational trends and social needs; also for the implementation of the educational model based on competencies. The English Language degree lasts four years. It has a socio-formative educational model based on competencies. The organization of courses includes: specific training (language), basic training, practical training, comprehensive training, specific training (teaching), and multidisciplinary training.

Students in this major have English courses differently from other bachelor programs as future professionals will focus on the teaching of English. English courses are more intense, so they are a good place to obtain a good amount of interactional data in which Repair would be possible to observe. For that, this major and this educational programme were selected to carry out this study.

### **3.2 Methodology**

This is explorative and qualitative research. Qualitative research is defined as an empirical research where the data are not in the form of numbers (Punch, 2013). Qualitative research is much more than just research which uses non-numerical data. It is an approach which similarly involves a collection or cluster of methods to obtain naturally occurring data. This study is qualitative because it analyzes the conversations that happen during English classes, in the "English Language" major at its natural state, in other words, with no intervention of the researcher; and where conversations are analyzed in order to observe in which activities the Repair strategy happens more and in which levels of English happens more.

In addition, the thesis adopts a qualitative approach as it involves the searching of empowerment "individuals' stories with the goal of understanding how they make meaning within their social world" (Hesse-Biber, 2010, p. 455). Moreover, this approach looks for multiple views of social reality from the researcher's reflections, who seeks to interpret the stories:

"One primary method of a qualitative approach involves values, reflection and listening with the goal of empowering and giving voice to respondents' experiences. Most of all, a qualitative approach privileges the exploration of the process of human meaning making" (Ibid., p. 455).

Thus, the thesis involves the gathering of participants' experiences regarding their communication strategies, specifically, the Repair strategy within classroom interaction data. This provides a wider view of how Repair works in communication that takes place among language teachers and students.

### **3.3 Participants**

The participants of this study are students and teachers of UQROO, campus Cozumel. They were in the classes of English in the 1st (groups A and B), 3rd, 5th, and 7th semesters.

#### **3.3.1 Students**

There are around 114 students in total, counting all the semesters (1st, 3rd, 5th, and 7th) of the English Language major: 44 male and 70 female; in each group, there are more women than men. Courses official names are English I, English III, English V and English VII. Into the course of English I, there are two groups: there are 16 students in group "A" (6 male and 10 female) and 29 students in group "B" (11 male and 18 female), and the age range is 18-19 years old. The English III course also has two groups: group "A" has 19 students (8 male and 11 female), and the group "B" has 16 students (6 male and 10 female). Students' age is between 19 to 20 years old. Both courses of English V and English VII have got one group each. In English V there are 17 students (6 male and 11 female), aging 20-21 years old. Finally, the English VII course has 17 students (7 male and 10 female). Students' age range is 21-22 years old.

**Figure 1. English III - Group A**



**Figure 2. English V**



**Figure 3. English VII**



### **3.3.2 Teachers**

Teachers who teach in the English language major are part of the Department of Languages. There are six teachers, four male and two female, who graciously accepted to participate in the research. Teachers' age range is 35-60 years old.



### **3.4 Research Instruments**

Research instruments consist of the recording of interactions in English courses of different levels in which Cameras and audio-recorders were used during the classes. Pictures were taken to help to remember the teacher's and students' organization during the class. Also, some notes were taken to help to remember some important events in the class. Both pictures and notes are secondary data that help the process of transcription. Primary data were the recordings and their transcriptions.

#### **3.4.1 Observation and note-taking techniques**

Two techniques were done while collecting data: the observation technique, which is a research tool used to observe the interactions and events as they actually occur (Zohrabi, 2013, as quoted in Burns, 1999, p. 80) and complement with the note-taking technique, which, according to Wilkinson and Birmingham (2003) helps to explain that “even we record each interview, either on audio-tape, on video, or mini-disc, we should take detailed notes throughout each session in case the technology lets down. It is important to try to note down facial expressions, nods of agreement or disagreement, and other gestures which are impossible to capture in an audio-recording. In these notes, we need to refer to who made them, when, and in response to what (to note down the approximate time when each of these things occurred (p. 106). In addition, according to Piolat, Olive and Kellogg (2005) “note taking is a complex activity that is often realized under severe time pressure. Note taking requires comprehension, selection of information, and written production processes. It is necessary to shorten and reduce the information in order to take notes quickly” (p. 291). That is why it was important to record the class at the same time of observing and taking notes.

During the observation of the first class, it was a bit difficult to take notes since it was aimed to write down as much as possible; however, time was not enough. During the following observations, it was getting a little easier to make the annotations since the rhythm of the class was more familiar in terms of the way in which the teachers organized their classes. After the first experience in the observations, it was possible to write down only what was important for the investigation, that is to say, only when the Repair took place within the class, specifying who did it, in what situation, for example, noting the activity, who was answering to whom, and so on.

### **3.4.2 Visual data (photos)**

Dempsey (1994, pg. 169) says that in a classroom environment, visual data can include student body language, seating patterns, and off-task behavior. Photographs capture direct observations of an environment and can serve as stimuli for interviews which in turn generate more data. Although there were no interviews, photographs helped to remember the situation and the participant in the audio recording, especially if, in that occurrence of Repair, there was not possible to video recording the session.

Caldarola (1985) says that visual data (photographic) "is derived largely from a particular epistemological conception of photographic representation, which may be summarized by the following premises: (1) that photographic images are event-specific representations, (2) that their relevance or meaning is dependent upon the context of the image-producing event, and (3) that the imaging event is a socially interactive and communicative process that involves the mutual understanding and participation of both the observer and the observed" (p. 33).

The photos were taken trying not to disturb the students, with discretion so that students can continue to behave naturally. However, there were only a few cases in which some students seemed not to feel comfortable with the photographs, but most of the time, both teacher and students graciously accepted to be photographed, from the back of the classroom, in such a way that most of their faces were not captured. The purpose of photographing this way is for them to be sure they will be anonymized in the research.

### **3.4.3 Audio-recording techniques**

All fine detail from classroom interaction is important to be noted in the audio or video-recordings. This means preserving and displaying both what is said and how it is said as this helps to a more precise analysis of data (Wilkinson and Birmingham, 2003). In other words, audio recording helps to assurance people's interaction (Thissen, Sattaluri, McFarlane, and Biemer, 2007) because speech patterns heard in audio files provide information about the veracity of the conversation. In a normal interchange, people pause between words, phrases or sentences, as they consider their answers or express their views (Kowal, O'Connell, and Sabin, 1975; O'Connell and Kowal, 1983, as quoted in Thissen et al, 2017, p. 2). The recording hours

were divided according to the level and the duration of the classes. In the case of English I, classes last 2 hours per day, so recording 8 hours (4 classes) was done, because there were 2 groups. In the other levels (English III, V and VII) the classes lasted 2 hours too, for which 6 hours were recorded it took 3 days. The total was 26 hours of recorded classes for this research.

#### **3.4.4 Transcribing**

Wilkinson and Birmingham (2003), explain that “the detail in the transcript is necessary in order to provide a full and faithful rendering of all the features of the talk” (p. 155). Cucchiarini (1993) defines transcribing as one of the most utilized techniques for written records of speech data. Transcription is the auditory representation of what people say in the audio-video recording. He says "when transcribing from tape-recordings one has to rely exclusively on auditory information" (p. 50).

Copland and Creese (2015) in their book *Linguistic Ethnography: Collecting, Analysing and Presenting Data* comment that the conventions of transcription have been made focused on the analysis of conversation (CA). Likewise, Copland and Creese (2015) make mention of two different types of conventions; accurate and detailed transcripts; and simple transcripts. In the first, he mentions authors such as Schegloff et. Al. (1977) who have developed conventions where the context is very relevant only when it is said by the speakers. On the other hand, he mentions Richards (2003) as one of the main creators of simple conventions or conventions that can be designed by oneself, which his work has been used with success by many researchers. Later on, there exist the Vienna convention (2007).

The researcher of the thesis already had previous experience in transcribing some interviews, but compared to classroom interaction, these were a bit more difficult due to the amount of time it takes to capture the conversational details as well as the amount of recordings, as there were at least 3 hours audi-recordings per level. Apart from the time of each recording, finding the moment where the Repair phenomenon occurs was also a bit complicated since, in some cases, it had not been pointed out exactly when the Repair occurs, as well as having to repeat each fragment in order to be able to correctly transcribe the phenomenon. Making transcriptions is a challenge since you need to be very attentive when transcribing the audio, avoiding not to forget any detail that may lead you to the phenomenon. That is why it is

important to use a good transcription technique and to be clear about certain conventions in order to write down all the important moments of the conversations.

The conventions used during the transcriptions were taken from the adaptation of the works of Richards (2003) and VOICE (2007). These conventions were previously used in the experience of transcribing interviews previously. So, they were adapted and complete with other ones for the classroom interaction transcriptions. -Copland and Creese (2015) mentioned in their book that Richards (2003) and his work on the transcription conventions is one of the most successful conventions that many researchers have used, emphasizing that such a set of conventions are easy to understand and apply. Richards's convention that was used in the thesis are the following:

<b>Convention</b>	<b>Explication:</b>
?	questioning intonation
!	exclamatory utterance
(.)	brief pause
(1)	longer pauses are timed to the nearest second and marked with the number of seconds in parentheses; e.g. (1)
a:h	astonishment/surprise
em	hesitation/filler
=	latched utterances
[ ]	overlapping speech. When it is not possible to determine the end of the overlapping speech, the final square bracket is omitted
< >	utterance spoken in a particular mode (eg. <imitating> </Spanish>)
//	for phonemic transcription when pronunciation is deviant
-	abrupt cut-off or false start
:	sound stretching
CAPS	emphasis; all the letters in the emphasised syllable are capitalised

(Richards, 2003, p. 173)

### **3.5 Data Collection Procedure**

For the development of this project, English classes were observed at different levels and groups of the English Language specialty. In the beginning, the teachers were asked for their authorization to audio and video record their classes. An explanation about the project was

done, and that classroom interaction would serve for an investigation. After teachers' authorization, the recording days were organized by classes from Monday to Friday, covering all levels of English. Recorders and cameras were organized too as other students use them too for their thesis. After that, audio recordings and video recordings were revised in order to note the phenomenon in more detailed way.

On the recording days, with the teacher's permission, the researcher arrived a few minutes before class to accommodate the tape recorders and video cameras, taking into account the space of the classroom. Two tape recorders were used, one was placed on the teacher's desk, and the other was placed behind the students, in the back part of the classroom. The video camera was placed in the room corner, and with the help of books or other objects, it was set a little higher to be able to record the whole room. It is important to say that from time to time a photograph of the classroom was taken. Both the video recording and photographs were captures from the back part of the classroom purposively as it was aimed not to have the faces of students due to anonymity reasons.

An audio recording of 6 to 8 hours per group was made to have enough material to work on. Annotations were made as they were useful in the analysis of the results to understand the order of the groups during the classes. Note-taking was made as the researcher was near the video camera. As the class observations progressed, the technique of taking notes, photographs and accommodating the recorders was improved little by little.

Then, in order to analyse the audios, they were watched and listen to again to detect the phenomenon. After this, purposive transcriptions were made in each part that Other-repair appeared. First, all the recordings were added to the same file. Then, the audios of the different groups that were observed were divided into different folders with the name of the group (eg: English 1), each audio was named with a code to identify which group it belongs to. (eg: Ing1\_A\_001\_G4). For audio extracts signaling the phenomenon, the Audacity application was used. It allowed to editing the audios, to cut the parts where the Repair is used. Those extracts were the ones transcribed. About 30 hours were used to make the transcripts since the audios were reviewed many times to find all the Repairs made throughout the observations.

Finally, an analysis was carried out for each separate audio where Other-repair appears, in order to note in which pedagogical activities occurred, and in which groups of different levels

of English the "Repair" was used more. Both points are part of the objective of this study. And, in the same way, we will seek to know how Repair was solved and who the participants were.

### 3.6 Data analysis framework

The analysis consists of the identification of those events in which Other-repair is present within the interaction that took place in the classroom. The framework of Varonis and Gass (1985) is the base in which the problem o mistake and its solution or correction be identified. To show if the student understood the question or the situation, four elements be considered:

- (T) Trigger, it is the beginning that denotes the indicator;
- (I) Indicator, indicates that you did not understand the message that was given (question, silence, etc.);
- (R) Response, a strategy appears, in this case the "Repair";
- (RR) Reaction to the response, an expression that indicates that the message was understood.

See the following example on the way the anlysis was carried out:

#### Extract 1 – English I, group A

<i>Line No.</i>	<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Utterance</i>	<i>Squeme</i>
1	TA	can you ask me a question S1? please	T
2	S1	why do you feel very tired on /frIdeI/?	I
3	TA	friday! S1	R
4	S1	friday!	RR

In Extract 1, the TA asked students to ask him questions to practice the WH-question (line 1), S1 asked a question, but he mispronounced the word Friday /fraIdeI/ (line 2), so TA corrected the pronunciation of the word (line 4) and the S1 understood the mistake and pronounced it correctly by repeating the word as TA did (line 4).

The methodology helps the objective and the research questions that were made for this study. This was done from the analysis of the English classes of the UQROO University of the Cozumel campus, five groups of different levels of English were all heard from the English Language degree. Parts of the audios were transcribed where other Repair occurs and be

analyzed with the framework of Varonis and Gass (1985), based on four turns that occur in conversations, focusing on short interactions where Repair occurs. The following chapter illustrates this last.

## Chapter IV. Findings

### 4.1 Other-repair extent in English classrooms

In this section, Other-repair occurrences are described in order to reveal, firstly, the extent of its use and, secondly, the pedagogical activities where it is often used. Both points are in reference to the two research questions.

In order to answer the first research question about what the extent of Other-repair use is in courses of different English levels, the following are the outcomes:

Groups	Other-repair occurrences
English I group A	15 repairs
English I group B	2 repairs
English III group A	5 repairs
English III group B	3 repairs
English V	0 repair
English VII	1 repair

Table 1 shows the different groups of English that were being observed for this investigation and the amount of Other-repair that occurred during the class recordings in each one. In the first row appears English I group A, which was the only group that had the most Other-repair events during their classes, having 15 Repairs during the 8 hours of classes that were recorded. This is the group from the first semester in which more Other-repair was used, considering that group 1B only had two occurrences of Other-repair. These two groups revealed that the level of English might not be a significant feature for Other-repair to happen. In contrast, the English III groups from the third semester of the English Language Bachelor, had the same amount of Other-repair used during the 6 hours of recorded classes. Groups of English III A and B used Other-repair 5 and 3 times. These two groups, were very different compared to the groups in the first semester.

English V is the only group in which Other-repair was not used during the 6 hours of recorded classes. In other words, no Other-repair phenomenon occurred as such, nonetheless, there were a few Repairs of other types, such as Self-repair on the part of students. The



responses of the students were not clear in the audio-recording as well as they did not comply with the framework of Varonis and Gass (1985). Therefore, these Repairs could not be considered for this investigation. The same happened with the English VII group, in which there were few Repairs, but these were not able to be heard. The responses of the students were blurred despite the fact that it was possible to identify that there was a response from the teacher. There was a problem with some of the audios as the students' responses are not distinguished in parts, but the activity continues. Only one Other-repair could be identified and complied with the model requirement.

Continuing with the findings, examples of Other-repair that happened during the classes observed will be shown next in order to illustrate the phenomenon.

### Extract 2 - English I, group A

<i>Line No.</i>	<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Utterance</i>	<i>Scheme</i>
1	TA	when is your birt- (.) birthday?	T
2	S1	/dʒʊ'li/ (.) the twelve	I
3	TA	sorry?	
4	S2	/dʒʊ'laɪ/	R
5	S1	/dʒʊ'laɪ/ twelve	RR
6	TA	/dʒʊ'laɪ/ twelve (.) not /dʒʊ'li/ (.) but /dʒʊ'laɪ/	

In Extract 2, TA was asking students when their birthday was (line 1). S1 answered the question but mispronounced the month “July” (line 2) as she pronounced it /dʒʊ'li/ when the correct form is /dʒʊ'laɪ/. TA made the question “sorry?” with the intention to make notice there was a pronunciation error (line 3). Another possibility was that the teacher did not listen to S1 well for that question. Other-repair happened then, as S2 corrected S1’s pronunciation (line 4). S1 realized about his error and repeated the word correctly this time, and completing his answer (line 5). After noticing the Other-repair, TA gave a mini-explanation to reinforce the information (line 6) by repeating with the correct pronunciation and emphasizing the wrong one.

In this extract, the participation of the other students during the classes, since the Response (R) was made by another student (such as S2), shows that both teachers and students

can make the Repair in classroom interaction. This helps to the learning environment as students are active during the classes helping their classmates to solve their errors by providing linguistics aids which turn to be the knowledge they already have in a fixed way. In turn, students themselves are a source of support for teachers during the lessons.

### Extract 3 – English I group B

<i>Line No.</i>	<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Utterance</i>	<i>Squeme</i>
1	TB	please S1 (.) please continue reading	T
2	S1	quick and easy dishes	
3	TB	quick and easy dishes	
4	S1	these /'sevəri/ cupcakes are delicious	I
5	TB	/'seIvəri/	R
6	S1	/'seIvəri/ (.) /'seIvəri/	RR

In Extract 3, TB asked S1 to continue with the reading (line 1). S1 started reading and TB repeated it (line 2 and line 3) like confirming the line was well read. S1 made an error with the pronunciation of “savory” and mispronounced it as /'sevəri/ instead of /'seIvəri/ (line 4). TB made the Other-repair of the word explaining the correct pronunciation (line 5) and S1 repeated it correctly twice to reinforce the new knowledge (line 6). After that, he continued reading. It is clear that in extract 3 a pronunciation Repair is shown, in which the student quickly understood his error and corrected it correctly. In this case, the teacher was the one who showed the error to the student.

### Extract 4 – English III group A

<i>Line No.</i>	<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Utterance</i>	<i>Squeme</i>
1	TC	S1	T
2	S1	Raul has been (.) repairing cars /saIns/ he was-	I
3	TC	=/sIns/	R
4	S1	/sIns/ he was sixteen years old	RR

In Extract 4, TC asked S1 to continue with the exercise addressing him by his name (line 1), S1 started saying the answer of the item but made a pronunciation error in the word

“since” as he mispronounced it in the wrong way /saɪns/ (line 2). TC made the Other-repair of the word pronouncing the correct form of “since” /sɪns/ (line 3), and S1 repeated the word correctly and continued with the sentence.

In this example, we can see that the Repair was about the pronunciation of a word, similar to previous extracts. In this case, it was due to the assumption of the pronunciation of the letter "i" since it is pronounced /aɪ/. On many occasions, students assume that the "i" in the word "since" is stated that way when in reality it is an exception of the normal way “i” is pronounced. These types of situations occur very frequently during English learning since each word has its specific form of pronunciation, and the letters are not always pronounced in the same way.

#### **Extract 5 – English III group B**

<i>Line No.</i>	<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Utterance</i>	<i>Scheme</i>
1	TD	e: (.) continue please S1	T
2	S1	(3) a:m i did use to sleep well	I
3	TD	no	
4	S2	i didn't	R
5	TD	i didn't (.) exactly	
6	S1	a:h	RR
7	TD	it's past (.) and negative (.) I DIDN'T use to sleep well	

In Extract 5, TD asked S1 to continue answering the exercise they were doing (line 1). S1 gave his answer but did a grammatical error (line 2). TC signaled with a “no” that S1’s answer ~~is~~ was wrong (line 3), and S2 said the right answer, that is the correct form of the auxiliary verb “do” in past tense and in its negative form (line 4). TD approved S2’s Other-repair and emphasized S2’s correction with the expression “exactly” (line 5). S1 understood his error with an exclamation that reflected his understanding and learning (line 6). TD reinforced the grammatical point recently learnt by explaining the tense and the form of the auxiliary “did” (line 7).

For this extract, we can see that it was a grammatical Other-repair. S1 answered wrongly the form of the verb. Maybe he did not read the exercise well or he did not understand

the sentence or, simply, he forgot how to use the auxiliary in past tense and in its negative form. However, he seems he understood and learnt the grammatical point after S2's Other-repair and TD's confirmation of the Other-repair.

Similar to extract 2 of the English I group A, another student was the one who performed the Other-repair in order to help their classmates. This happened during the Response (R). Showing again the active participation by other students.

### Extract 6 – English VII

<i>Line No.</i>	<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Utterance</i>	<i>Scheme</i>
1	TF	number three (.) who has number three (2) S1	T
2	S1	it is against the road ride a car-	I
3	TF	=Okey (.) it is against (.) the road-	R
4	S1	-ride a car (.) without-	I
5	TF	=ride (2) not (3) not TO-	R
6	S2	=TO drive	R
7	TF	TO drive	R
8	S1	a:h	RR
9	TF	to drive a car without @@ that is (.) it is against the	R
10		road to drive	

In Extract 6, the Other-repair was made by another student. TF requested the answer of an exercise to S1 (line 1). S1 said his answer but made an error when expressing the infinitive form of the verb “ride” (line 2). TF repeated the first part of the sentence and paused where the correction should be made, like an exercise when teachers pause the sentences so students need to complete it (line 3) but S1 made the same error again, not realizing about it maybe because he did not know how to use the infinite form of verbs (line 4). Then, TF responded again but emphasizing that the verb “ride” needs the preposition “to” (line 5). Immediately, S2 answered with the verb in infinitive correctly: “to drive” (line 6). TF confirmed S2's Other-repair emphasizing the missing word “to” (line 7). S1 understood his error which was signaled with an exclamation (line 8). Finally, TF finished completing the sentence correctly (line 9-10).

This example is the longest extract of Other-repair findings in the recorded English classes. At the same time, this extract showed a repeated action of Response (R), having five times the Response. This is not a strange behavior of this element. Smit's (2010, p. 163) study talks about the Response (R) and the other elements. She comments that on some occasions, the last two elements that are used in the transcripts of this study: Response (R) and Reaction to the response (RR), can be repeated as many times as necessary until the Repair is completed correctly. Another example of this is the extract 7.

### Extract 7 – English III

<i>Line No.</i>	<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Utterance</i>	<i>Squeme</i>
1	TC	S1 <Spanish> B </Spanish> {of the task}	T
2	S1	i (.) had been driven (1) bi- (.) bicycle	I
3	TC	ridden (1) ridden	R
4	S1	ridden	RR
5	TC	not driven (.) [ridden]	R
6	S1	[ridden] e:m bicycle	RR

In Extract 7, TC asked S1 to continue with the exercise (line 1). S1 started with his answer but made an error with the verb “drive” as he seemed to confuse it with the verb “ride” (line 2). TC made the Other-repair immediately, by saying the correct verb for the sentence (line 3). S1 understood his error and repeated TC’s utterance, showing that he understood the word selection which is appropriate to use for “bicycle” (line 4). TC repeated the verb as a brief clarification (line 5), and S1 repeated “ridden” overlapping with TC, but continued with the sentence, which may serve as a way to make connections between the verb “ride” and the noun “bicycle” (line 6).

The difference between extracts 6 and 7 is the form in which turns were organized; in other words, repetition of the last two elements of discourse –Response and Reaction to the Response were repeated according to the needs of the class. This is a form in which Repair and in these cases, Other-repair can reinforce the teaching and learning processes.

Something that deserves to highlight is the fact that, extracts 6 and 7 showed troubles in verbs. Extract 6 indicated a grammar pitfall, while extract 7 showed a vocabulary selection problem. Although this situation is not generalizable, it could provide a gist that students need

to reinforce both grammar, and vocabulary. These lead us to a second finding regarding the amount of Other-repair identified within classroom interaction. That is to say, three main problems were observed in the Trigger turns: pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary. This is explained in the next section.

#### 4.2 Activities where Other-repair is used

The second question of this research inquiries about the use of Other-repair in-activities that are developed during the classes. In this second part of Chapter V, the different activities that were found during the class recordings and during the analysis of the audios will be described in terms of Other-repair occurrences. Thus, extracts where Other-repair is used during the activities are shown. In general, as explained in section 5.1, three main linguistic Repairs were found. Table 2 presents this.

<b>English course</b>	<b>Linguistic repair</b>		
	<b>Pronunciation</b>	<b>Grammar</b>	<b>Vocabulary</b>
English I group A	13	2	0
English I group B	2	0	0
English III group A	3	1	1
English III group B	1	2	0
English V	0	0	0
English VII	0	0	1
Total	19	5	2

During the analysis of the transcription, the types of Other-repair that were identified were close to Smit's (2010) classification of Linguistic Repair due to the repairable events, which included pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary. The table 2 shows the amount of linguistic repair found. The results showed that it was a high amount of pronunciation repair with a total of 20 occurrences in the different groups of English. English I group A had the highest amount of them. This is certainly expected as it is lower level among the English courses; however, English I group B presented quite a difference. The second type, grammar

repair had a total of 5 Repairs: 2 Repairs in English group A, 1 in English III group A, and 2 in English III group B. Finally, vocabulary Repair had a total of 2 Repairs, one into English III group A and the other one in English VII. This kind of Repair had the least apparition into the classes. In summary, we can see that Other-repair supported pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary, being pronunciation the most frequent trouble source in these recorded groups.

Pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary were the most obvious sub-skills that were repaired within data. Nonetheless, these were immersed major skills such as speaking, listening, reading, and writing, as presented in the following paragraphs.

#### **4.2.1. Other-repair in Listening and Speaking Skills**

This section illustrates the Other-repair occurrences that happen during the development of activities related to listening and speaking skills. These two abilities are connected and complete one with the other. Through the analysis of the audios and the notes taken during the listening and speaking activities, a number of Other-repairs were found in comparison with the reading and writing skills (see section 5.2.2). This means that students are more likely to make errors during listening and speaking activities (Hodasa, 2000).

Other-repair was observed more in listening and speaking activities related to the improvement of grammar (11). Among the main dynamics made during the classes is the Questions and Answers (Q&A) tasks. This activity was done mainly by two teachers –TA and TC– during their classes. Those teachers made rounds of questions and answers, each with a different objective. TA did this activity in order to review the WH-questions. At first, the teacher mentioned each student a phrase or sentence, so students had to ask the teacher something related to it using the WH-questions. During this activity, a number of Other-repairs both tackling grammar errors that were generated since some students seemed not to have learned well enough how to use WH-questions structurally. The other teacher, TC, performed the Q&A activity at the end of his class; the teacher asked each student a question that needed to be answered well so they could leave the room. This activity was with the objective of reinforcing what had been studied in class and as a listening and speaking practice. Some other language troubles that appeared included pronunciation errors that students made with some words.

### Extract 8 – English III group A

Line No.	Speaker	Utterance	Squeme
1	TC	how do you do (.) to celebrate halloween with your family?	T
2	S1	um: (.) i use to watch /'hɒrɔː/ movies	I
3	TC	horror movies	R
4	S1	horror movies (.) or a special episode (.) about all my characters of (.) halloween	RR

In Extract 8, TC asked a question about how students celebrate Halloween (line 1). S1 answered and mispronounced the word “horror” (line 2). TC made the Other-repair of the pronunciation (line 3), and S1 continued with his explanation (line 4). Although there were not any Other-repair events in pronunciation activities as such, there were pronunciation repairs in listening and speaking activities. During the analysis of the audios, pronunciation activities were identified, but there were no Other-repairs in them. Nonetheless, there were pronunciation as well as vocabulary repairs.

There were vocabulary repairs in the listening and speaking activities as well. In these types of activities TA was the one who did them. During his class, TA did a review activity of the verbs that the students had already learned through a list of verbs that the teacher had given to them a few days ago. The teacher asked each student to say the verbs on the list in an orderly manner. While doing this, some students confused the verb forms in past and past participle that the TA corrected as Extract 9 illustrates:

### Extract 9 – English 1 group A

<i>Line No.</i>	<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Utterance</i>	<i>Squeme</i>
1	TA	who wants to say it all?	T
2	S1	agree (.) /ə'lad/	I
3	TA	=aloud	R
4	S1	agree (.) aloud	RR



In Extract 9, TA asked who wants to say all the verbs (line 1), the S1 began to say it, but he was wrong in the second verb "aloud" and pronounced it wrong (line 2), TA corrected the verb (line 3) and S1 began to say the verbs again, from the beginning and with a good pronunciation of these (line 4). In the same activity, many students mispronounced the verbs, which TA corrected as well, as shown in extract 10.

#### **Extract 10 – English I group A**

<i>Line No.</i>	<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Utterance</i>	<i>Squeme</i>
1	TA	so (.) S1 (.) is going to say it (.) S1 is going to say it (.) go: ahead S1	T
2	S1	/ə'grI/	I
3	TA	=no (.) agree	R
4	S1	agree	RR

In Extract 10, TA asked S1 to say the verbs (line 1). S1 said the first verb “agree” incorrectly (line 2). TA made the Other-repair by disapproving with “no” and pronouncing the verb correctly (line 3). S1 repeated the verb again in the correct form (line 4).

#### **4.2.2. Other-repair in Reading and Writing Skills**

There was less Repair performed in reading and writing activities, but like speaking and listening activities, only one category has no Other-repairs recorded that occurred during this type of activity. The activities carried out in reading and writing were generally based on the English book exercises. Three teachers had Repairs during these activities. Some of the exercises were taken from the books included activities in which teachers should ask students to answer the questions after reading a text or to complete the sentences. The teachers who carried out these activities were TF, TD, and TC.

During the development of the activities, students did different kinds of errors. One of them was in the pronunciation of some words, and others in vocabulary as well as grammar. In the latter case, there is an example in which students did not answer well since they used the incorrect grammatical form of an auxiliary verb as in the case of extract 10.

**Extract 11 – English III group B**

<i>Line No.</i>	<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Utterance</i>	<i>Scheme</i>
1	TD	continue please S1 (.) i	T
2	S1	i do not to the game clock	I
3	TD	no	
4	S2	i didn't	R
5	TD	it's past and negative	
6	S1	ah:	RR

In Extract 11, students were answering an activity in their books. TD asked S1 to continue answering an item (line 1). S1 gave his answer by using the auxiliary “do” instead of the past it was required (line 2). TD disapproved the answer by saying “no” explicitly, signaling the answer was not correct (line 3). S2 provided the correct answer then (line 4). TD explained why S2’s answer was correct indicating that the auxiliary should be in the past and in its negative form (line 5). S1 understood the Other-repair by uttering “ha” (line 6).

There were some reading activities in which the teachers asked students to read aloud. There Other-repairs were carried out. It was two teachers –TB and TC– who carried out this activity during their classes as an objective of reading comprehension and answering questions later. Teachers did Other-repairs to students due to poor pronunciation of some words that they were reading. An example of this is shown in extract 12.

**Extract 12 – English III group B**

<i>Line No.</i>	<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Utterance</i>	<i>Scheme</i>
1	TD	continue please S1	T
2	S1	e: (1) they (.) used to /ʃʌt/	I
3	TD	shoot	R
4	S1	shoot at each other (.) during the table	RR
5	TD	yes	

In Extract 12, they were doing a reading activity in their books when TD asked S1 to continue answering the exercise (line 1). S1 gave the answer but mispronounced the word “shoot” (line 2). TD Other-repaired the error by repeating the word with the correct pronunciation (line 3). S1 understood the correction and by repeating the word with a correct pronunciation, continued with his answer (line 4).

As mentioned at the beginning of the Reading and Writing activities, no Other-repairs occurred for vocabulary during the analysis of the audios and notes made during the recordings. Despite this, Other-repair of grammar and pronunciation could be observed in reading and writing activities. The outcomes presented in this chapter shows that although it is more common to find Other-repair in speaking and listening activities, Other-repair can also occur in reading and writing activities. The next chapter presents the discussion of findings.

## Chapter V. Discussion

This chapter presents the discussion of findings, taking into consideration the two research questions stated for the thesis. However, before that, it is relevant to comment on some experiences during the research process. For example, during the analysis of the audios, a situation happened the same as what Rafzar (2018), in his study comments that identifying and coding the Repair structures is easier than examining the multiple contexts and purposes of the Repair. In this case, the same happened, it was a little more difficult to examine each Repair to identify whether it meets the objectives of this investigation or not, as well as to see in which research question the Repair can serve. Nonetheless, the best effort to organize the results and this discussion was carried out.

At the beginning of this thesis, two research questions were posed, which were formulated to know the general use of Other-repair in the English classrooms of the English Language major. In the first question, it was considered to identify the extent of the use of Other-repair in the previous English courses mentioned. It was expected that within the basic levels, the teachers will correct the students; that is, they will carry out Repair since the students can make more mistakes without realizing it. It was expected that the advanced levels analyzed had fewer mistakes due to their higher level of English, thus, fewer Repairs by teachers. In general, although a greater amount of Other-repair was found in group I\_A compared to the other groups, this might be due to the activities that were used in that group, but that will be discussed later.

Thus, a number of 26 Other-repairs were found in the 26 hours of class recording from the six groups that were analyzed. 15 repairs were found in group I\_A, this being the group with the highest Other-repair number used during the classes. Group I\_B had only two Repairs, groups III\_A and III\_B had 5 and 3 Repairs respectively. Finally, group V had no Other-repair recorded, and group VII had only 1 Repair during their classes (see Table 1 above).

In the group I\_A, it was observed that the Other-repairs that occurred helped to fulfill the purpose of the activity, which was to review the verbs. This was mentioned by Rafzar (2005) when he comments that the use of Repairs serves as a strategy to fulfill the pedagogical approach of the class.

The highest Other-repair number in group I\_A compared to higher language level groups like V and VII shows that the phenomenon of Other-repair is more common to be used in beginner groups –as expected– since they continue learning the language and have not had enough knowledge yet, in comparison with advanced groups that had one or no Repair in the observed classes (Schegloff *et Al*, 1997).

Group V did not have Other-repair recorded despite the fact that the students made some errors during the classes; however, those occurrences did not comply with the analysis methodology of this research as one or two elements of the T-I-R-RR model (Varonis and Gass, 1985) were missing. The same happened with group VII, in which only one Repair was found after so much analysis of the audios. Students' errors seemed so minimal so teachers or any other student did not make use of Other-repair. In Chapter 5, Findings, it was mentioned that, in addition to the teachers, other students could also Other-repair as shown in extracts 2, 5, 6, 10. In those extracts, they showed how the other students, when they are integrated into the Response (R) helped their classmates to understand their error. This action helps to learn together with the teachers' brief explanations of the errors.

Other-repair was also found twice in one set of communication, in which the last two elements of the analysis model (Varonis and Gass, 1985) helped to identify it. That is to say, in the Response (R) and the Reaction to the response (RR). This is similar to Smit's (2010) idea in which she comments that these last two elements can be repeated the necessary number of times for the Other-repair to be achieved. In the same way, a fragment in the audio recordings was found which had two Repairs in the same extract which were correctly signaled. Schegloff (2007) talks about this type of Repair and comments that it is not unusual for two simultaneous Repairs to be found in the same conversation or sequence, this can happen, but it is not very easily found.

Regarding other kinds of Repair, Hoa and Hanh (2019) comment on the most used Repair strategies for Other-repair in their research which are: Repeating a part of the speaker's talk with upward intonation and Using question words, while Ten Have (2007) talks about short items that give the person the opportunity to correct his or her mistake. In the results of this research, only one case of each of these strategies was found, the first case in Extract 13, line 3 "June the forty? the FORTY?" (Appendix 1) and the second case in Extract 2, line 3 "Sorry?". This does not mean that they are not used for Other-repair, but that the teachers or

students who participated in the Other-repair were more direct in saying what the error was rather than letting the person try to correct themselves.

Smit (2010) and Rafzar (2005) comment, there are more Repairs during classroom interaction than in casual conversation, and these Repairs are mostly by teachers correcting student mistakes such as pronunciation, spelling, or word selection. Situations that occurred in the Repair were found. One of the situations that attracted a lot of attention when analyzing the Repairs used in the classrooms was to realize of the fact that students' pronunciation errors were made by the bad assumption that certain words are pronounced in a certain way, based only on the pronunciation of the letters in the alphabet and not according to the International Phonological Alphabet (IPA), which gives the phonetic sounds of each letter depending on the word to be said. That is the case with the word "since", which is often mispronounced as /saince/ instead of /sInz/. Although this happens more frequently in basic levels of English, it is very common to see these types of errors from time to time in advanced levels too. Therefore, it would be helpful to consider that it is important to teach the pronunciation of words in English following the IPA rules from the very beginning.

Similar to Smit (2010), who comments that the most used or selected repairable are: factual in the instructional register, mishearing, vocabulary, and factual in the regulative register, in this investigation, repairable of vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation were found. This clarification helps to answer the second research question, which focuses on the activities in which Other-repair is used.

During the classes recorded and analyzed, pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar were repaired. These form part of the linguistic category of Smit's (2010) classification of Repairs, that in this case, it was adapted to present the analysis and discussion of the thesis, specifically to answer the second research question, which seeks to know in which activities Other-repair occurs during the recorded English lessons.

The results were divided into two types of activities; Listening-Speaking activities and Reading-Writing activities, all of them closely related to the subskills of grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation, in other words, Smit's (2010) linguistic categories. This division of the Other-repairs were considered in order to better classify the types of activities that occurred within classroom interaction.

Speaking-Listening activities refer to tasks that both teachers and students developed during the lessons. These focused on the practicing of two skills: speaking and listening intertwined with the linguistic categories (Smith, 2010). In this sense, Aleksius (2017) comments that Other-initiated repair helps to improve the speaking level of students as it helps them correct their errors.

In the grammar category, activities aimed at speaking practice were placed, but based on a specific grammatical topic, as was the case with Questions and Answers (Q&A) task, in which students should practice WH-questions and review of the topic seen in the class. These activities resulted in 11 Other-repairs which occurred because the students made grammatical, lexical and pronunciation errors when answering in the WH-questions task or by answering a word wrongly what was asked or by mispronouncing some words. Despite this last, not all Repairs fell in the analytical model of Varonis and Gass (1985), thus, only the ones who did were analyzed. For pronunciation errors, for example, there were no recorded Repairs. But, there were for vocabulary, which had 7 Other-repairs recorded in the verb review activity, which aimed to review the list of verbs with the repetition of these made by each student. In this activity, the Repairs were also made because the students had many errors since they had not yet learned the correct way to say the verbs in the list, despite the fact that this list had been given to them in advanced; here comes a very important factor that is the student's performance and their initiative to learn. During the class, the teacher mentioned that students already had to say the verbs by heart because they had been given the list of some days before class.

Within the moments in which the Other-repair occurs, it was expected to be within oral activities. The student is asked to answer something, and to give the answers to an exercise or comment on a specific topic. These can happen in study book activities, and it was not the exception. This affirms Hodosa's (2000) statement in which students are more likely to make errors during speaking and listening activities as they continue to learn and polish the language. Speaking-Listening activities let group I\_A have a different amount of Other-repair compared with the other groups. During the 6 hours that the class was recorded and observed, two types of activities were carried out that generated a large amount of Other-repair by the students: Q&A and a speaking activity where a review of verbs was carried out. During these two activities, there were many Other-repairs because the students did not know the concepts and the knowledge of the topic, so they made a lot of errors. This resulted in Group I\_A having

more Repairs compared to the others. Group I\_A even had more Repair than the Group I\_B, of the same level.

The second type of activities are Reading-Writing ones, which are also sub-divided into grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary, based on Smit's (2010) linguistic category. In the grammatical part, activities were taken to review or study English grammar purposively to improve writing. In this case, Other-repairs were found when developing exercises from the English textbooks. These activities occurred in 3 different groups, in which occurred 5 Other-repairs, due to grammatical errors of tense or using incorrect verbs for the sentences, in other words, using not an appropriate vocabulary selection.

The pronunciation activities were readings from books or reading comprehension texts, in these activities 3 Other-repairs were found, which were due to the mispronunciation of certain words. During the class recordings, it was interesting to observe that not many reading activities were done with full texts; instead, reading took place only when sentences had to be completed, considering that many of the English teachers usually advise their students that reading in English is the best way to improve that language. There were not vocabulary activities as such. The activities that were planned included dictations, vocabulary games like Hangman, Word search, Memory game, and so on.

Here, the important point to highlight is that there should be an acceptance to Other-repair (Hosoda, 2000), and it happened in all the cases presented in this thesis. In other words, this happened when the students during the activities and conversations showed a lack of understanding or recognition of what was being talked about, which was reflected in their errors, but students are willing to accept the correction.

All Other-repairs observed during the Speaking-Listening activities, and Reading-Writing activities were cast in a respectful and positive environment. The teachers were positive and friendly, there was any mistreatment from teachers or students at all. In the moments that the Repairs happened, no one felt offended, on the contrary, students felt better when they were corrected. Despite the fact that in two types of activities, there were many Repairs (WH-question and list of verbs) the teacher did not lose patience or was irritated by the constant Repairs. This, in summary, reflects what Evnitskaya (2018) suggests for a good environment and a good Repair. This author mentions the importance of creating an environment where students can develop in a positive way in order to have a better interaction



in class. Likewise, Evnitskaya (2018) mentions the importance of giving good and friendly Feedback or Repair so as not to hurt the emotions of the students, as well as their performance. Situation achieved by teachers during the observed classes.

From the interactional point of view, Scheegloff (2000) in his work explains that Repairs are observed in the next turn, which matches the results of this research. In other words, it was possible to observe from the Varonis and Gass's (1985) model how Other-repair is signaled in the next turn, as in Extracts 1, 4, 7, 8, 9, and 11 in the previous chapters. Likewise, some Repairs were found where the teachers gave the students the opportunity to correct their errors through questions or confirmation checks, as in the case of Extract 2. This help towards the students is commented on by Seedhouse (2004) in his work too. As this research focuses on Other-repair and not on Self-repair, Hoa and Hanh's (2015) Other-repair were similar to the ones found in this thesis, in the way teachers repeat a part of the speaker's talk upward intonation and using question words as mentioned before.

Finally, although it is not part of the objective of the thesis, relevant to mention for further study is the set of possible factors that triggered the Other-repairs in the occurrences of this research, factors that according to Dingemanse *et Al.* (2014) are: different knowledge states among students, distraction factors that can come from their surroundings, or a lack of concentration on the part of the students.

This discussion of results helped us to see in a better way all the findings found during the class observations, as well as the analysis of the recordings and the note-taking. The results found can help to remind us that despite the fact that Other-repair is not widely used in classes, with only the basic levels using it the most, it is a strategy of importance for English students and teachers in order to achieve better communication and overcome gaps in conversations (Seedhouse, 2005) which are an important part for reaching understanding, thus, learning.

## Conclusions

The objective of this research was to explore at what levels of English classes and in which activities Other-repair was present. It was mentioned that Other-repair is expected to be more present in oral activities where the student asks, answers, and interacts during class, specially the Speaking-Listening tasks.

After analyzing and answering the research questions, it can be concluded that the objective of this research was achieved. It was possible to observe classroom interaction that allowed to illustrate Other-repair phenomenon in the different levels of English courses as well as in what type of activities these occurred. Some results were similar to previous studies. For example, it is known that some teachers allow students to correct their mistakes among themselves, as this makes it easier for each other to show their errors without affecting their feelings. This occurred in group I\_A with TD during a Reading activity, where some selected students did the reading, and then the other students gave feedback to their classmates. Another example is when there is a pronunciation error.

Another finding is that it is not possible to say that because of students' proficiency level Other-repair may occur. This can be seen in the results where one of the basic groups had more Repair than in the other basic group. Such a result might bring other opportunities to investigate further as students were in the English I course, and they were taught under the same syllabus. This difference might be due to other external factors such as institutional ones in which students need to be located in English groups that really correspond to their proficiency level. Both groups, English I\_A, and English I\_B, seemed to differ in this aspect. In addition to this comparison, when looking ahead with the rest of the groups, it is clear that there is a difference in Other-repair occurrences compared to the advanced levels. This last confirms what was mentioned by Schegloff *et Al.* (1977) in which they comment that Other-repair can be found more at basic levels and that they continue to learn the language, which means having errors because the knowledge is not fixed.

Another aspect of the objective that could be achieved was that it could be observed that Other-repair occurs more in oral activities, as assumed from the beginning. In the case of the Speaking-Listening activities, 17 Repairs by Others were found, which were divided into activities focused on grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary. As for Reading-Writing

activities, eight repairs were found, which occurred in the reading and comprehension activities in the exercises of the book in English. These activities were aimed at practicing English grammar and pronunciation of words intertwined with reading skills.

This shows that the objective of this research could be met. Furthermore, other aspects that coincided with other studies investigated during the preparation of this work could be found. As in the case where two Other-repairs occur in the same conversation (see Extract 13 in Appendix 1), the Response types are found in the Repairs as the short questions (for example: Uh?) and lastly, without mentioning more, possible repetition of Respons and Reaction to the Response according to the needs in resolving the error (see Extract 14 in Appendix 1).

One of the interesting points that were found during the investigation of Repair studies was that not much literature was found on specific Repair, like Other-repair in ELT. There were few Repair studies that focused on ELT, compared to Repair studies in ELF and EFL. Although this did not affect the development of this study since it focuses on Classroom Interaction, it was interesting to observe the scarcity of Repair studies in ELT. Further study should help to contribute to pedagogical aspects of classroom interaction. Among the studies investigated for the preparation of this work is that of Ren (2018), who based his research on two groups of churches with the aim of seeing which of the two groups use Repair as a strategy to achieve pedagogical approaches set for the class. On the other hand, Watterson (2008), studies the Repair of non-comprehension as a communication strategy based on English as a lingua franca (ELF) with the aim of showing the differences in the pronunciation that a person has when speaking English, as well as the Lexical and grammatical mistakes that are made while still learning the new language. Finally, Hosoda (2000) studies the Repair of the Other with the native speaker (NS) and the non-native speaker (NNS) where he tries to find how this type of Repair occurs in conversations with these people and it is concluded that more Repair occurs of the other in conversations with an NNS and an NS compared to two native speakers, this is because in the first case one person (NNS) does not have a fixed knowledge of English so he makes mistakes, and the other person (NS) helps him to fix it.

During a Repair, in this case, Other-repair, the active participation of teachers and students was important since, first, the teacher in his role must be aware of the errors made by students and help them solve them because they are still learning and it is normal that they have some errors. The teacher is the student's guide to acknowledge and he or she is the one who has a more fixed knowledge of the subject, so it is the students' support. Nonetheless, other

students can contribute with their more advanced knowledge to help to another student to improve too. The way in which the correction is made is also important because if it is not done correctly, it can have an effect on the performance of students, at the same time, they may feel humiliated or hurt if it is not done with the right words without affecting the attitude of the students towards the learning. As Evnitskaya (2018) says about good feedback from teachers to have a better interaction during classes and avoid the discouragement of students towards learning English.

The study had some limitations as it was planned to record all the English groups of the Bachelor of English Language in UQROO Cozumel. However, group B of English V was not included due to communication problems with the teacher. In addition, while it was planned to video record all the sessions, this was not possible in the end because some teachers did not accept the video recording, the audio recording, not even the photographs, therefore, it was very hard to note-taking in detail the Other-repair occurrences. Those groups had to be discarded, and only the six groups of English that have been presented in this investigation were considered for the analysis. There were no problems in agreeing to participate in this investigation with most teachers. A second limitation regards to the way in which audio recorders should be placed in the classrooms, since they had to be adjusted according to the way the students sat and organized during the classes to avoid that the students felt uncomfortable and could develop well during the classes, at the same time, they should be located to obtain the best audio quality by putting the recorder as close as possible to the teacher and students. There were two audio recorders in each session and a video recorder when permitted.

Another limitation was the lack of experience in researching. In the videography part, some photos and videos were lost while saving them to the computer, but this did not impede the realization of the research because there were two recorders, and notes that were taken helped to develop the results. However, due to inexperience too, there were technical problems with a video recorder since the storage drive did not last long, because it was not emptied after the first class recording, so the last part of one class was missed in the video, but not in the audios. It would have been desirable for this research to have had more hours of recording of the selected English groups since it is thus thought that other types of activities that cause Other-repair than those found would have been found and this type of Repair compared to those found in this investigation.

Finally, it is relevant to say that a good practice within the classrooms is to allow students to participate, also to detect the errors of their classmates and to provide them with the space to correct them, so students make use of their knowledge and the relationship they have to create a more familiar and less stressing environment to learn. It would be easier for them to show each other their errors without making them feel bad about committing them. To conclude, it is important that teachers continue to implement Other-repair as well as other interactional pragmatic strategy in their classes since those strategies help students to achieve success in the aspect of English communication. They can learn from their errors when there is Other-repair and improve their level of English as they advance in their knowledge. In the same way, the Repair is particularly important for students who are studying English as a second language since it helps to better understand and solve the loss of communication (Seedhouse, 2005), which at the end, is what leads developing the teaching and learning processes.

## References

- Adaba, H. W. (2017). Exploring the practice of teacher-student classroom interaction in EFL to develop the learners' speaking skills in Tullu Sangota primary school grade eight students in focus. *Arts Social Science, J, 8*, 295.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2013). Developing L2 pragmatics. *Language Learning, 63*, 68-86.
- Bolden, G. B. (2011). On the organization of repair in multiperson conversation: The case of "other"-selection in other-initiated repair sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 44*(3), 237-262.
- Britannica, The Editors of Encyclopaedia. (May 18, 2020). *Pragmatics*. <https://www.britannica.com/science/pragmatics>
- Caldarola, V. J. (1985). Visual contexts: A photographic research method in anthropology. *Studies in Visual Communication, 11*(3), 33-53.
- Cambridge Dictionary (n.d) *Interaction*. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/es/diccionario/ingles/interaction>
- Chen, P. (2010). On pragmatic strategies for avoidance of explicitness in language. *Asian Social Science, 6* (10), 147.
- Cho, E. H., and Larke, P. J. (2010). Repair Strategies Usage of Primary Elementary ESL Students: Implications for ESL Teachers. *Tesl-Ej, 14*(3), n3.
- Cucchiaroni, C. (1993). *Phonetic transcription: a methodological and empirical study*. [Sl: sn].
- Copland, F., and Creese, A. (2015). *Linguistic ethnography: Collecting, analysing and presenting data*. SAGE: London.
- Dempsey, J. V., and Tucker, S. A. (1994). Using photo-interviewing as a tool for research and evaluation. *Educational Technology, 55-62*.
- Dingemanse, M., Blythe, J., and Dirksmeyer, T. (2014). Formats for other-initiation of repair across languages: An exercise in pragmatic typology. *Studies in Language*.

*International Journal sponsored by the Foundation "Foundations of Language", 38(1), 5-43.*

Dingemanse, M., & Enfield, N. J. (2015). Other-initiated repair across languages: towards a typology of conversational structures. *Open Linguistics, 1*(1).

Encyclopedia. A Dictionary of Sociology (n.d). *Classroom Interaction*.  
<https://www.encyclopedia.com/social-sciences/dictionaries-thesauruses-pictures-and-press-releases/classroom-interaction#:~:text=oxford,and%20students%20in%20the%20classroom>.

Evnitskaya, N. (2018). Classroom interaction and language learning in CLIL contexts. *CLIL: Journal of Innovation and Research in Plurilingual and Pluricultural Education, 1*(1), 15-16.

Fotovatnia, Z., & Dorri, A. (2013). Repair Strategies in EFL Classroom Talk. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies, 3*(6).

Fox, B. A., Maschler, Y., and Uhmman, S. (2010). A cross-linguistic study of self-repair: Evidence from English, German, and Hebrew. *Journal of Pragmatics, 42*(9), 2487-2505.

Harmer, J. (2001). The practice of English language teaching. *London/New York*, 401-405.

Hesse-Biber, S. (2010). Qualitative approaches to mixed methods practice. *Qualitative Inquiry, 16*(6), 455-468.

Hoa, N. T. Q., & Hanh, N. T. M. (2015). Repair Strategies in English Conversations and Their Application in Teaching English Interaction Skill to B2 Level Learners (Doctoral's dissertation). [http://www.vnseameo.org/TESOLConference2016/materials/1\\_1.pdf](http://www.vnseameo.org/TESOLConference2016/materials/1_1.pdf)

Hornbæk, K., and Oulasvirta, A. (2017). What is interaction?. In *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 5040-5052).

Hosoda, Y. (2000). Other-repair in Japanese conversations between nonnative and native speakers. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 11*(1), (pp. 39-63)

Huang, Yan. 2007. Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Hutchby, I., and Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis*. Polity Press: Cambridge, UK.
- Jenkins, J. (2012). English as a Lingua Franca from the classroom to the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 66(4), 486–494.
- Kääntä, L. (2010). Teacher turn-allocation and repair practices in classroom interaction: A multisemiotic perspective. *Jyväskylä studies in humanities*, (137).
- Kaur, J. (2011). Raising explicitness through self-repair in English as a lingua franca. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(11), 2704-2715.
- Keating, E. (1993). Correction/repair as a resource for co-construction of group competence. *Pragmatics*, 3(4), 411.
- Kendrick, K. H. (2015). Other-initiated repair in English. *Open Linguistics*, 1(1).
- Liu, M., and Wang, T. (2018). Research on the Conversational Repair of Learners of Chinese as a Second Language in Oral Classroom. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, volume 250.
- Lyster, R. (2001). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language learning*, 51, 265-301.
- Muhsin, M. A. (2016). Analysing the students errors in using simple present (A case study at Junior High School in Makassar). *Pacific Science Review B: Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(3), 81-87.
- Nordquist, R. (August 11, 2019). *Pragmatics Gives Context to Language. Body language and tone of voice augment actual words*. ThoughtCo. <https://www.thoughtco.com/pragmatics-language-1691654>
- Nordquist, R. (March 04, 2019). *Repair in Conversation Analysis. Glossary of Grammatical and Rhetorical Terms*. ThoughtCo. <https://www.thoughtco.com/repair-speech-1692044#:~:text=Updated%20March%2004%2C%202019,start%2C%20accommodation%2C%20and%20restart>
- Piolat, A., Olive, T., & Kellogg, R. T. (2005). Cognitive effort during note taking. *Applied cognitive psychology*, 19(3), 291-312.



- Punch, K. F. (2013). Introduction to social research: Quantitative and qualitative approaches. SAGE: London.
- Rabab'ah, G. (2013). Strategies of Repair in EFL Learners' Oral Discourse. *English Language Teaching*, 6(6), 123-131
- Razfar, A. (2005). Language ideologies in practice: Repair and classroom discourse. *Linguistics and Education*, 16(4), 404-424.
- Ren, S. (2018a). 'Repair' in Chinese and American ELT classrooms: a conversation analysis perspective. *Annual Review of Education, Communication and Language Sciences*, 15.
- Ren, W. (2018b). Pragmatic strategies to solve and preempt understanding problems in Chinese professionals' emails when using English as lingua franca communication. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 21(8), 968-981.
- Rhalmi, M. (August 11, 2016). *Classroom Interaction*. My English Pages.  
<https://www.myenglishpages.com/blog/classroom-interaction/>
- Richards, K. (2003). Collecting and Analysing Spoken Interaction. In *Qualitative Inquiry in TESOL* (pp. 172-230). Palgrave Macmillan: London.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Practices and actions: Boundary cases of other-initiated repair. *Discourse processes*, 23(3), 499-545.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2000). When 'others' initiate repair. *Applied linguistics*, 21(2), 205-243.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis I (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press: New York.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). Conversation analysis methodology. *Language Learning*, 54 (S1), 1-54.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective. *Language Learning*.
- Smit, U 2010, *English as a lingua franca in higher education: a longitudinal study of classroom discourse*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Svennevig, J. (2008). Trying the easiest solution first in other-initiation of repair. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(2), 333-348.
- Tafari, V. (2009). Correcting or not Errors and Mistakes. *LCPJ Publishing*, 2(2), 49-57.
- Ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis*. SAGE: London.
- Thissen, M. R., Sattaluri, S., McFarlane, E., and Biemer, P. P. (2007). Evolution of audio recording in field surveys. *American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) 62th Annual Conference*
- Universidad de Quintana Roo. (n.d). *Centro de enseñanza de idiomas*.  
<http://www.uqroo.mx/cei/>
- Universidad de Quintana Roo. (n.d). *Oferta académica (Planes de estudio)*.  
<http://www.uqroo.mx/planes-de-estudio/>
- Universidad de Quintana Roo. (2015). *Plan de estudios. Licenciatura en Lengua Inglesa*. (pp. 4-30)
- Universidades de México. (2020). *Universidad de Quintana Roo*. Recovered from:  
<https://universidadesdemexico.mx/universidades/universidad-de-quintana-roo>
- Varonis, E.M. and Gass, S.M. (1985). Non-native/non-native conversations: a model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 71-90.
- Verschueren, J. (2005). Pragmatics. In *The Routledge Companion to Semiotics and Linguistics* (pp. 99-110). Routledge: London and New York.
- VOICE (2021). *The Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English* (version 2.0 online).  
Director: Barbara Seidlhofer; Researchers: Angelika Breiteneder, Theresa Klimpfinger, Stefan Majewski, Ruth Osimk-Teasdale, Marie-Luise Pitzl, Michael Radeka. <http://voice.univie.ac.at> (consulted 10/07/21).
- Watterson, M. (2008). Repair of non-understanding in English in international communication. *World Englishes*, 27(3-4), 378-406.
- Wilkinson, D., and Birmingham, P. (2003). *Using research instruments: A guide for researchers*. Routledge: London.

Zohrabi, M. (2013). Mixed Method Research: Instruments, Validity, Reliability and Reporting Findings. *Theory and practice in language studies*, 3(2), 254-262.

## Appendix

### Appendix I. Some other transcriptions

#### Extract 13– English I A – Repetition of Other-Repair

<i>Line No.</i>	<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Utterance</i>	<i>Squeme</i>
1	TA	S1 when is you birthday?	T
2	S1	a:h (.) june a:h (.) forty	I
3	TA	june the forty? (.) the FORTY?	R
4	S1	no (.) the fourteen	RR

In extract 13, TA was asking students when their birthday was (line 1). S1 provided the number of the day of his birthday (line 2). TA repeated that that number twice, the second time with emphasis on the number "forty" (line 3). This correction was singular as it was done as a way to confirm the number, looking for Other-repair. S1 listened to the teacher's utterance carefully, understood there was an error in the number provided and rectified saying the correct number "fourteen" (line 4).

#### Extract 14 – English III A – Double Response

<i>Line No.</i>	<i>Speaker</i>	<i>(Utterance)</i>	<i>Squeme</i>
1	TC	let's share some sentences (2) okey (.) let's start with S1	T
2	S1	a:h (.) <Spanish> no sé si está bien </Spanish> (2) S2 says that he is prefer program are the cartoons (.) and (1) he has watched tv three hours /ʊr/ at day	I
3	TC	he had	R
4	S1	he had three /ʊr/ a day	I
5	TC	hours (.) hours a day	R
6	S1	hours a day	RR

In extract 14, TC asked S1 to read the sentence he wrote (line 1). S1 started saying it but he made a grammatical error by using a preposition in the phrase “three hours at day” (line 2). TC made the repair by prompting the answer again with “he had” (line 3). S1 did not understand the teacher’s prompt and did the same error but with the pronunciation of word “hour” (line 4). TC corrected the pronunciation (line 5) and the preposition. Finally, S1 understood the corrections and repeated the phrase correctly (line 6).