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Dealing with ‘Trouble Spots’ in Interaction in the English as a Foreign Language Classroom

This study focuses on ‘trouble spots’ that occur in the English as a Foreign Language classroom. A trouble spot is an umbrella term for all types of language problems that arise. This means that it covers the trouble sources of repairs, corrections as well as problematising activities in the classroom. Ten different instances of trouble spots are identified and documented in the study. These are grouped into four different categories depending on how the trouble spot occurred, who initiated it and how it was resolved. To investigate the classroom interaction Conversation Analysis was chosen as a method and two different English lessons in two different Swedish upper-secondary schools were filmed.

In order to investigate the trouble spots the following research questions are addressed:

- What types of trouble spots arise in the English language classroom and how are they signalled as trouble?
- How are the trouble spots dealt with by teachers and students?

The results confirm that most trouble spots are identified and handled by the speakers themselves and that the second-most involved person is the teacher. This is expected as there is a preference for self-initiated self-repair in ordinary conversation. However, in classroom interaction the preference organisation is not always similar to that of ordinary conversation. Correction in the classroom is often other-initiated without it being face-threatening. Furthermore, the context of the task at hand is very important when it comes to how trouble spots are resolved.
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1. Introduction

An everyday task in the teaching profession is to correct language students’ utterances. The correction that takes place in a classroom differs from correction in ordinary conversation\(^1\). To explicitly tell a person in the street that they are wrong, or correct someone is regarded as rude and thus it does not happen often. In a language classroom, it is not as strange, since correction is an everyday practice.

I became interested in how interaction in the classroom was performed. Especially when the interaction regarded problems or when teachers decide to elaborate on a specific item. Since correction is an everyday occurrence in the teaching profession some questions arose: Why do teachers sometimes problematise an item even though no one has had any trouble with it? And why do teachers let some errors slip through, as not all errors performed in the classroom are picked up? What is it that is the problem or ‘trouble spot’? When talking about conversational repair, the term “trouble source”, coined by Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977), is often used to describe the item that needs repairing. However, in the present study not all trouble has to do with repair or correction. Thus, the terminology ‘trouble spot’ has been used as an umbrella term for all types of language problems that arise. The term ‘trouble spot’ therefore encompasses the trouble sources of repairs and corrections as well as problematising activities in the classroom that halt the ongoing task.

I decided to investigate classroom interaction to see if I could find any answers of how interaction in an English as a foreign language (EFL) classroom occurred.

1.1 Aim

The aim of this study is to analyse what types of ‘trouble spots’ that can arise in the classroom and what it is that makes them problematic. I chose to use a Conversation Analytic approach (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008; Seedhouse 2004a) and thus the research questions emerged from the data I collected. The research questions that arose were:

- What types of trouble spots arise in the English as a foreign language classroom and how are they signalled as trouble?
- How are the trouble spots dealt with by teachers and students?

---

\(^1\) By “ordinary conversation” I mean talk outside an institutional setting, like chatting at home, in the street, with friends and the like.
Video-recordings were made in two English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms at a Swedish upper-secondary school and make up the data of the present study. The material was categorised depending on the type of trouble and transcribed taking multimodal features (such as gaze, hand gestures and head movements) into account, following transcription conventions used within (CA) and then analysed.
2. Theoretical Background

In the theoretical background, the theoretical foundations within CA, followed by a discussion of empirical studies that have been conducted within the field of CA investigating repair, word searches, or the problematisation of vocabulary are presented. These studies focus on either "ordinary" conversation, or conversation within the classroom context. Similarities and differences between "ordinary" and classroom conversation settings will be brought out.

2.1. Conversation Analysis

This study rests upon the foundation of CA, which is "the study of talk" with the primary focus, not so much just talk, but how talk is organised and why it is organised in that specific way in a certain piece of talk-in-interaction (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008:11). CA bases the research on recordings of real interactions and these recordings are then transcribed (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 12). That is, in order to perform CA one must record real interaction and it is these recordings that are the data. CA is a “bottom up” approach which is data-driven (Seedhouse 2004a: 15). Kasper and Wagner (2011: 122), Seedhouse (2004a: 15) as well as Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008: 20) state that no part of the data can be disregarded as unimportant beforehand, and that one should investigate the material with “no prior theoretical assumptions”. Furthermore, Kasper and Wagner (2011: 122) highlight the fact that CA does not make use of theoretical frameworks in which to situate a study, as these perspectives may “make some aspects of the data analytically salient and render others less conspicuous”.

The aim of CA is to “discover how participants understand and respond to one another in their turns of talk, with a central focus on how sequences of actions are generated” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 12). Sacks et al. (1974: 700-701) state that there are some features that often occur in conversation, e.g. that “one party speaks at a time”, the speakers take turns at talk, the turn sizes are different and “the ordering of turns varies”. Moreover, transitions between turns are “finely coordinated” and the shifts in turns often occur with no or slight pauses and overlaps. Similar to this, Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008: 11) claim that one fundamental assumption within CA is that “talk is a highly organized, social phenomenon”. The talk is organised into turns and when talking, “speakers display in their sequentially ‘next’ turns an understanding of what the prior turn was about” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 13). When a person says something, it is responded to, and whether it was responded to in a correct or predicted manner will be displayed in the next turn (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008:12). Kasper
and Wagner (2011: 122) state that “participants in interaction are competent agents who constantly produce and understand their social world together” (Kasper & Wagner 2011: 122). When analysing talk, it is not for the researcher to second-guess the “competent dealings” of the agents, but to instead describe how people “conduct their activities” in a methodical fashion (Kasper & Wagner 2011: 122).

The reason for me to choose a CA-approach is because I wanted to study what really happens in classroom student-teacher interaction in “naturally occurring data” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 20). Before recording, I had no idea what type of phenomena I would find, and it was by watching and listening to the recording that the phenomenon ‘trouble spots’ was found and the research questions emerged. In order to investigate the phenomenon ‘trouble spots’, I needed to categorise the different occurrences of trouble spots into categories. To investigate these categories, knowledge within the following three fields were needed: repair, word searches, and the problematisation of vocabulary. These fields are presented in the following three subsections.

2.2 Empirical Studies – Repair

Schegloff et al. (1977) study produced a lot of the groundwork for future studies on repair. The terminology they put forward is still used and will be defined below. When it comes to repair, Schegloff et al. (1977: 363-364) present a three-step trajectory with the first step being an occurrence of a trouble source, the second an initiation of repair and thirdly a repair outcome. How the repair is then performed is in one of four repair types: self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, other-initiated self-repair or other-initiated other-repair, where self-initiated self-repair is the most preferred type of repair and other-initiated other-repair the least preferred (Schegloff et al. 1977). ‘Self’ refers to the person who is holding the turn and ‘other’ is anybody other than the person him- or herself. Furthermore, to define repair Schegloff et al. (1977: 363) state that “[a]n ‘organization of repair’ operates in conversation, addressed to recurrent problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding”. Moreover, Schegloff et al. (1977: 363) call the item that produces the trouble “the ‘repairable’ or the ‘trouble source’”. However, their definition of repair regards standard conversation and the repairs that occur within a classroom context are somewhat different. Therefore, the definition made by Seedhouse (2004b: 143) about repair where “repair [is] the treatment of trouble occurring in interactive language” and “trouble is anything which participants judge to be impeding their communication”. Similar to Schegloff et al., Seedhouse (2004b: 143) uses the term “repairable item” as the term for the item that “causes trouble for participants”.

...
Kasper (1985) builds on the four repair types set forth by Schegloff et al. (1977) but she situates her study within a classroom context. What she finds is that self-initiated self-repair is not always the preferred repair type depending on the activity in the classroom. In an activity that focuses on language correctness, the self-initiated self-repairs made by students were dispreferred in favour of teacher-initiated other-repair, that is the repair is initiated by the teacher and the repair is performed by either the teacher or another student. Whereas in a content-centred activity, self-initiated self-repair performed either by a student or the teacher, where the teacher or the student is repairing their own talk, was highly preferred (Kasper 1985: 214).

A more recent study of repair in the classroom was conducted by Seedhouse (2004b). Seedhouse (2004b: 179) makes the same claim as Kasper (1985), stating that there is “a reflexive relationship between the pedagogical focus and the organization of repair” and that “as the pedagogic focus varies, so does the organization of repair”. Furthermore, Seedhouse (2004b: 177) states that a “direct and unmitigated other-repair by the teacher [marks] linguistic errors as unimportant and unembarrassing on an interactional level”, which is in direct contrast to what Schegloff et al. (1977) argue in their article about ordinary conversation. Jung (1999) makes the same claim as Seedhouse (2004a: 42; 2004b: 142) that the context of an activity is of importance. Jung (1999: 166) concludes that in a learner role-playing activity, the student often did incorporate the repair into her next turn, whereas if a repair is made in a teacher-fronted activity students does not incorporate the repair into their next turn utterance (Jung 1999: 165-166). The results Jung (1999) presents are different from those put forward by Fasel Lauzon and Pekarek Doehler (2013: 330), who state that repetition of the correction when a teacher has corrected the item is more often than not repeated by the student as a signal of having acknowledged the correction and accepted the correction as appropriate.

Mazeland (1987), similar to Kasper (1985) also develops the ideas set forth by Schegloff et al. to fit in a classroom context. The repairs made in the classroom are not always similar to those of ordinary conversation. It is not so common to explicitly correct someone who has made an error in ordinary conversation, but in a classroom context this happens quite often. Depending on the task in the classroom, the correction can either be “on-the-fly” in order to halt the task as little as possible, a sequence to pin-point where the trouble is or in an exposed manner where the business of correction halts the previous task (Mazeland 1987: 3). Mazeland (1987: 12) concludes that in conversation some errors are “less focusable” and the
correction then occurs “on-the-fly” whereas in some cases where the teacher initiates repair the repairs are “more focusable” and thus they take over and become the business at hand. Jefferson (1987) makes a similar claim even though she does not write about correction in a classroom context. Jefferson (1987: 97) distinguishes between exposed and embedded correction in the same manner, where correction made in the ongoing talk is embedded and thus does not halt the conversation much whereas exposed correction halts the conversation and makes correction the “business” at hand.

Fasel Lauzon & Pekarek Doehler (2013: 326) investigates how teachers react to errors made by students. According to Fasel Lauzon and Pekarek Doehler (2013: 341), the teacher provides the corrective feedback in one of five ways: 1) by “explicit correction”; 2) recasts, “where the teacher implicitly provides a correction by reformulation”; 3) isolated recasts, where the reformulation does not contain any additional information; 4) embedded recasts, “where the teacher provides additional information to the recast by embedding the reformulation into a longer statement or question”; and 5) by the teacher using prompts to make the student correct his or her error by using “metalinguistic clues, elicitation, repetition, clarification request[s]”. In their study, Fasel Lauzon and Pekarek Doehler (2013: 341) found that embedded recasts as corrective feedback, are a way for the teacher to “provide corrections without interrupting the flow of the activity”. Moreover, embedded recasts mitigate the correction so that it gains a “position of secondary importance compared […] to the display of understanding” (Fasel Lauzon and Pekarek Doehler 2013: 341).

2.3 Empirical Studies – Word Searches

Goodwin and Goodwin (1986: 52) investigated how people act during word searches and state that a word search “is not simply a cognitive process […] but rather a visible activity that others can not only recognize but can participate in”. When searching for a word the speaker often “gaze[s] away from their recipients” and these withdrawals of gaze often occur where the speaker has produced some sort of speech perturbation with a “thinking face” (Goodwin & Goodwin 1986: 57). When a speaker performs a word search and gives out such signals, the recipients do not interrupt until there is a signal of “help” from the speaker. Word searches can be a process that involves more than just the speaker but as long as the signals for “looking for a word” are sent out there is little likelihood of someone stepping in to help. When help comes it is often after a “wh-question” (Goodwin & Goodwin 1986:63).
Brouwer (2003) also writes on word searches and whether they are opportunities for learning in the classroom. Brouwer (2003: 542) found that for word searches to be a learning opportunity “[an]other participant [should be] invited to participate in the search” or one of the “interactants demonstrat[e]s an orientation to language expertise”. Similar to what Goodwin and Goodwin (1986) found, Brouwer (2003: 539) found that a “wh-question” is a common way to invite help. Moreover, Brouwer (2003: 539) argues that in word searches there is a preference for self-repair, when the speaker of the trouble asks a question that may signal help, it does not always gain a response immediately.

2.4 Empirical Studies – Problematisation of Vocabulary

Waring (2016: 88) discusses what she calls “unplanned vocabulary teaching” that is, vocabulary teaching that happens in “naturally occurring classroom interaction”. Moreover, Waring (2016: 92) discusses “unilateral problematizing” where a teacher problematises an item that he or she treats as “potentially problematic” for the students. When a teacher does this he or she often problematises by asking a question, most commonly: “You know what “X” is?” with the “X” being the problematised item that can have arisen from what the teacher has said, what a student has said or something that is read in a book, etc. (Waring 2016: 92). Waring (2016: 97) points out that the teacher can problematise an item that is not seemingly any problem for the students, often by asking for the meaning of the word. Teachers can problematise an item in two positions, either immediately after the item is produced or circle back to it (Waring 2016: 97). When a teacher is circling back to an item the teacher needs to retrieve the context of how the item was used. To circle back takes a little extra work, and is often signalled by “boundary marking” such as “okay, um, now, so” to signal to the students that “we are going to do something different for a minute now” (Waring 2016: 93).

Many of the empirical studies presented are quite old, the oldest written in 1977 (Schegloff et al.) and many of them are written in the late 20th century. However, the more recent articles referred to here build on the foundation of the same articles that are used in this study. By using both the early articles published within this particular field along with those more recently written I feel that I have obtained a good overview of the research conducted in this field. Since almost all the articles I have read refer back to Schegloff et al.’s article from 1977, it seemed only reasonable to have this article as the foundation for this study, even though complemented with Seedhouse’s (2004b) view of repair in the classroom.
There has been a lot of research in this field both regarding ordinary conversation as well as conversation in a classroom context. When it regards multimodal analysis of classroom interaction only a few studies could be found (but see Leila Käntää’s (2010) dissertation about Finnish classrooms). Within a Swedish classroom context, Majlesi (2014) investigates how different activities in the classroom can be learnable moments for students of Swedish as a second language. Majlesi (2014: 72) states that a “learnable”, or a learning opportunity, can arise in different context but is often displayed as word searches, “vocabulary inquiry[s], explanation[s], description[s], correction[s], formulation[s] and reformulation[s]”. The learnables can then emerge in “sequential activities whether they are unplanned and sequentially initiated by students, or initiated and spotted by teachers either in formal tasks, e.g. a grammar task, or in informal talk” (Majlesi 2014: 72). In order to investigate these learnables, Majlesi (2014: 57-58) uses multimodal analysis along with ethnomethodology and CA. From his multimodal analysis Majlesi (2014: 73) could draw the conclusion that, within a classroom context, “bodily actions are used for different purposes such as clarification, compensation for an expression, display of grammatical relation, and completion of an action”. Even though, Käntää (2010) as well as Majlesi (2014) have investigated a similar area, this study investigates classroom interaction within an EFL classroom context set in Sweden, by using CA as well as multimodal features. Therefore, this study can contribute to the field of how ‘trouble spots’ are treated within classroom interaction.
3. Methodology

In this Method chapter, I will present the nature of my data and how I collected it as well as how it was processed and analysed. Furthermore, I will present the specific problems I had with collecting and analysing data as well as the ethical principles considered for this study.

3.1 The Nature of the Data

The data used in this study consists of two video recordings, in total 145 minutes. Recording 1 was of a 75-minute-long English lesson in year one at a Swedish upper secondary school in which seven students agreed to participate in the study. This video recording was collected for the purpose of a course about the English language classroom by one of my fellow students and myself. During the recorded lesson the class were working with a new chapter in their text book called *The History of Film*. The recorded lesson contained different activities: discussions in small groups and whole class discussions, reading a text aloud, working with questions about the text and orally going through the answers to the questions. During these activities, the seven students were sitting in three small groups around a long table. The lesson recorded was planned by the teacher and was a “normal” lesson. “Normal” means that the lesson was not pre-planned for our purpose of filming it. Recording 2 was a 70-minute-long English lesson. During recording 2, a class of 22 students agreed to participate. This recording was of an English lesson in the third year at a Swedish upper-secondary school. This second recording was collected by myself. In the lesson recorded, the students were working with idioms. In pairs, they were supposed to find information about the idiom they had received regarding its meaning and origin. They also had to give an example of how it could be used in a sentence. The information found by the pairs was then presented in front of the whole class. Both recordings were from two different Swedish upper-secondary schools, recording 1 from a first-year class and recording 2 from a third-year. It is worth mentioning that even though both classes were at a high level of learning English, there was a difference in proficiency between the two classes where the class in recording 2 were very proficient in English.

My fellow student and I tried to be as invisible as possible and not affect the classroom interaction in order to observe what actually happened in the classroom. The same goes for the second recording. However, our presence probably affected the behaviour of everyone in the classroom to some extent. Labov (1972: 209) describes the effect the observer has even though not trying to affect the results as the observer’s paradox. The observer’s paradox is that researchers want to “find out how people talk when they are not being systematically...
observed” but they “can only obtain these data by systematic observation”. It can be seen in the recordings that the students were sometimes looking into the camera, which shows that they are aware that the camera is recording them. On one occasion in the second recording, one of the students talks to me, the researcher, and justifies his comment.

To record the first lesson, a digital camera and a cell phone were used. We used this equipment because it was what we had available, otherwise a video camera might have been a better choice. Since the lesson was recorded with two different devices the groups could be recorded from different angles. In much of the video recorded, it is possible to either see or hear all three groups simultaneously from two different angles. In the second recording, a video camera and a cell phone were used. The complementary cell phone was to record different angles as well as to record more groups of students and receive a better sound uptake from the other side of the classroom.

3.2 Collection of Data

To gain access to the classroom my peer and I sent an e-mail to an English teacher asking whether it was possible to come and record one of her classes. In order to prepare the students in the first recording for the recording session we went to the school one week in advance and explained who we were, the purpose of the recording and handed out a letter of consent (see appendix 1). During the second recording the class were given the information and the letter of consent from their teacher one week in advance because I did not have the time to visit the class myself. The recording sessions followed the ethical principles set up by the Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet 2002).

Some problems arose when collecting the data. The biggest problem was to find participants for the study. I contacted ten different English teachers in total via e-mail, however, often the teachers contacted did not respond. There was one other teacher who agreed to participate in the study and two lessons were to be filmed. However, on the day of the recording none of the students wanted to participate despite some of them already having signed the consent forms. During the recording of the second classroom, I accidentally hit the pause button on the camera and thus part of the recording does not exist.

3.3 Procedure for Processing and Analysing the Data

To analyse the data recorded, (CA) was chosen as a method. In order to analyse the data, I first watched and listened to the material a couple of times and then I made a rough
transcription of the data. I found that a simple orthographic transcription of the data gave me a better overview and since the aim of the study was to be determined depending on what I could find on the recording, a simple orthographic transcription made the process easier. Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008: 69-70) state that transcription is an important part of CA to “gain an intimate acquaintance with the recording at the necessary level of detail”.

Transcription in CA are more detailed than just a transcription of talk. These transcriptions have more features to demonstrate how something was said, what intonation was used, laughter, inbreaths, stress and so on, following established transcription conventions developed by Gail Jefferson (Atkinson & Heritage 1984) as well as Mondala’s (2014) transcription conventions of visual behaviour. The used transcription conventions can be found in Appendix 2. Transcription of the talk as well as of multimodal features were performed to enable a more comprehensive analysis. In order to transcribe the data, a free sound-editing programme called Audacity® was used to play the sound track of the video recordings. To watch the recording and also to take frame-grabs the program VLC® was used. The reason VLC® was chosen was because it too was a free software and that it was easy to slow down the recording in the programme. To write down the transcription Word® was used. There were some problems with analysing the data because of the quality of the recordings. At times it is almost impossible to hear what is being said. In most cases this could be resolved since the groups were recorded from two angles and the parts that were troublesome could sometimes be heard in the other recording. Furthermore, in one recording, one of the groups recorded are speaking louder and can be heard much better than the other groups, so that they sometimes drown out the sound from the other groups.

Seedhouse (2004a: 38) highlights the importance of performing “unmotivated looking”, that is, being open minded beforehand of what type of phenomena to find. When most of the data was transcribed, I went through it to see if any specific phenomenon or pattern could be found. The phenomenon found was how the teacher notices and deals with different trouble spots. To analyse this phenomenon, a collection of the identified instances was made. A collection is often needed in CA (Seedhouse 2004; Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008). Thus, this study is a collection-based study. A collection is several instances of the phenomenon to be analysed. The phenomenon here was then divided into the four categories presented in the result section.

Seedhouse (2004b: 142) argues that the context of a task is important when it comes to repair “what constitutes trouble varies with the pedagogical focus, which means that what is
repairable is different in each context”. In accordance with what Seedhouse (2004b) states, tables 1 and 2 below describe how the lessons were built were drafted to help in making the analyses.

Table 1. Activities during the first lesson recorded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 1</th>
<th>Small groups/pairs. Discussion about film preferences and habits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2</td>
<td>Whole class. Presenting the discussion in whole class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3</td>
<td>Reading text aloud in whole class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 4</td>
<td>Answering questions about the text in small groups/pairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 5</td>
<td>Presenting answers to questions in whole class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Activities during the second lesson recorded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction for task</th>
<th>Teacher explaining the task along with listening to the song “Water under the bridge” by Adele</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1</td>
<td>Pair work researching one or two idioms, using the Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2</td>
<td>Whole class presentation of their idioms, their meaning, origin and sentences using their idioms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3</td>
<td>Short dialogue using 2 or more idioms (accidentally only partly recorded)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total number of trouble spots found in the data were far more than ten. However, the excerpts chosen are illustrative examples of recurring categories. That means that even though more trouble spots occurred, some were omitted since they were already represented in one of the excerpts.

3.4 Ethical Considerations

To fulfill the ethical principles, set by the Swedish Research council, everyone who wanted to participate had to sign a letter of consent (Vetenskapsrådet 2002). The letter explained the purpose of the study, that the video recordings were only to be used for research purposes and ensuring the anonymity of the students, teacher and school. The letter also informed the participants that participation was voluntary and that they had the right to discontinue their participation at any time, in accordance with the ethical principles outlined above (Vetenskapsrådet 2002).
On the days of the recordings some extra consent forms were brought in case anyone had changed their mind. In the first recording, seven students in the class wanted to participate in the study and they were asked to sit at one of the two long tables in the classroom. The reason the participants were asked to sit at a specific table was to ensure that only those who had given their consent to participate were being filmed. In the second recording, all students in the classroom wanted to participate.

In order to enforce the promises about anonymity that were posed in the letter of consent, I decided not to name the cities or schools where the data was recorded. Also, as a video-recording can be seen as an imposition of the participants’ privacy, I wanted to anonymise the participants. In order to fulfil the promise of anonymity no names of students or teachers are revealed in this study. I decided to call the teachers only “T” in the transcriptions and teacher in the analysis. The students were called “S’X’” in the transcripts, with ‘X’ being a number depending on how many students participated in the excerpt. If a participant did mention another participant’s name in the excerpt, this has been changed to a pseudonym. Furthermore, as I made a multimodal analysis I decided to blur the screen shots that were taken of the students and teachers in order to hide their identities and make it difficult to recognise the person in the screen shot.
4. Results

In this section I will present the findings from the analyses of the data. The phenomenon found was divided into four categories depending on whether it contains a repair sequence or another type of trouble. The different instances of repair sequences have been divided into three categories depending on who initiates and who performs the repair. The final category is devoted to instances when the teacher problematises an item in the whole class. Thus, the categories are named as follows:

1. Self-initiated self-repair
2. Self-initiated other-repair
3. Other-initiated other-repair
4. Problematisation of Vocabulary

I will present the different categories and highlight the features similar of all the examples in each category, followed by transcriptions including multimodal features to exemplify each specific phenomenon. Below each transcription there is an analysis line by line of the trouble spot, how it is initiated and how it is resolved in each of the excerpts.

4.1 Self-Initiated Self-Repair

In this category, the examples are all characterised by self-initiated self-repair, that is, when a repair is initiated and repaired by the speaker him or herself. In the second recording the students were at a very high level and there were only a few instances of repair but those that occurred were of this type. Self-initiated self-repair is the type of repair which occurs most frequently in conversation (Schegloff et al. 1977: 365). Within a classroom context Kasper (1985: 204) concludes that the preference for self-initiated self-repair depends on the context of the activity. In an activity that focuses on meaning, producing language, the self-initiated self-repair type is the most frequently used one in the classroom (Kasper 1985: 209). In the following excerpts, the activity was an oral presentation in front of the whole class and because of the type of activity the students were not interrupted after their initiation of trouble.
Participants: one student (S)

In excerpt 1, the student is explaining the origin of the idiom “hit the hay” in an oral presentation in front of the whole class. For words spoken in Swedish, a translation into English is provided in the transcript using italics.

1   S   #and the mattress were often (0.9) filled with sacks (0.6)  
im   #im.1.1 ((looking at computer))

2   nej (0.3) $(h)e$ $(h)e$ (1.1) the (0.3) the sa-nej (0.3)  
   no
im   #wait (0.4) the mattress were often sacks filled with
   #im.1.2

3   hay

Im.1.1 {{student looking down at notes on computer}}

Im.1.2 {{student saying wait and gestures}}

In excerpt 1 the student is having problems producing the explanation of the idiom “hit the hay”. The student begins her utterance while looking down at her notes on her computer (image 1.1) and then pauses for 0.9 seconds before continuing. This relatively long pause is an indicator that there is trouble here and the continuation of line 1 shows this. After the 0.9 second pause the student says “filled with sacks” and then pauses again for 0.6 seconds. She then continues line two by saying a Swedish word “nej”, pauses and laughs at herself. This “nej” (line 2) can be seen as a repair initiator as the student signals that no, I have done something wrong here. The “no” is then followed by a laugh, Jefferson (1987: 97) argues that
laughter is a way for the speaker to account for an error he or she has just made. Here, in excerpt 1, the student has made a mistake, she pauses after it (line 1) and then says “nej” to signal that what she said was not what she had intended to and then laughs at herself as a way of mitigating the error. The continuation of line 2 consists of stops and starts, and in the beginning of line 3 she produces a “wait” (image 1.2). After saying “wait”, the gaze of the student is turned to an area of the classroom where no one is sitting. This is what Goodwin and Goodwin (1986: 56) describe as “gaze away from the recipients” which is a way of signalling a word search. This “wait” can mean that she needs a moment to reorganise the utterance and with her hand she puts her thumb and forefinger together in a “grabbing” gesture. When the student then continues, her hand is lowered and the utterance is reorganised from the beginning. The student recycles the phrase “the mattress were often” from line 1, and continues with the part that was the trouble source, reorganised in the correct order to “sacks filled with hay” in an almost problem-free manner (line 3 and 4). This recycling of the phrase before the trouble source followed by the correct word, or phrase is what Hellerman (2009: 123) calls a “post-positioned repair”. The student herself initiates the repair and completes the repair sequence in lines 3 and 4. Since this activity is an oral presentation in front of the whole class, no one interrupts her as she is clearly trying to fix her mistake, and eventually she does so.

In excerpt 2, the student instead produces a word wrong and replaces this word with the correct one.

**Excerpt 2**

**Participants: one student (S)**

In excerpt 2, one student is doing an oral presentation about the idiom “close but no cigar” in front of the whole class and pronounces a word wrong, which he then corrects.

1  S  eh and it erog-$^\#$ (0.4) hh originates from (4.0) nineteenth
    in $^\#$in.2.1
2  century fairs in America {writes 19$^{th}$ century on board)
In excerpt 2 the student is describing the origin of the idiom “close but no cigar” when he mispronounces the word “origin”. The student cuts off when saying “erog-” (line 1) before having pronounced the whole word. This “erog-” the student produces is the beginning of the word “originates” but with the vowels reversed. Plejert (2004: 90) observes that when a word is mispronounced it is often cut off, which is the case for the student here in line 1. After having cut off the word the student pauses, exhales and reorganises the vowels in the word he just said. During the pause after “erog-” the student is looking down at a piece of paper in his hands (image 2.1) where the idiom is written and he produces what can be a “thinking face” (Goodwin & Goodwin 1986: 57). The exhaling after the trouble source “erog-” may indicate that the student expresses some sort of frustration. When the student has reorganised the vowels in his word he starts writing the sentence on the board. Furthermore, Plejert (2004: 92) states that the speakers of the mispronounced words often feel the need to repair the item even though it may not be a problem with understanding the utterance even if the repair was not performed.

4.2 Self-Initiated Other-Repair

In this section the excerpts are categorised by the trouble spot being self-initiated, that is, the trouble source is somehow signalled as trouble by the speaker of the turn. Schegloff et al. (1977: 366) state that the self-initiation often occurs in one of three main positions: it can be placed “within the same turn as [the speaker’s] trouble source”, in the speaker’s “turn transition space”, or within the “turn subsequent to that which follows the trouble-source turn”. In the following excerpts, the self-initiation is within the same turn as the speaker’s trouble source. The repair initiation is often signalled by speech perturbations, cut-offs or by try-marking (Brouwer 2003; Schegloff et al. 1977). The repairs in the excerpts in this section are other-repair, that is, repair being made by someone else than the initiator of the trouble spot, in these instances either the teacher or another student.
Excerpt 3.

**Participants: student 1 (S1) and the teacher (T)**

S1 is reading a passage out loud from the text book when she says the wrong word.

1  S1: committed suicide during a personal crisis and is  
2  concerned.  
3  T: [consider= concerned=]  
4  S1: =consider= considered a victim of the personal cult  
5  hollywood created among the stars  
6  T: thank you >thank you very much< (0.5)

In excerpt 3, S1 is reading a passage from the text book but after the word “considered” in the first turn the student takes an inbreath and pauses for 0.2 seconds (line 2). When the student continues, the teacher performs a correction in overlap, thus making it an other-correction. The third turn here involves the student repeating the corrected item before continuing reading the passage (line 4).

The correction, or repair, made here is an exposed correction (Jefferson 1987). An exposed correction is a type of correction that halts the previous activity and turns the focus on the item being corrected (ibid: 88). In this excerpt the student repeats the corrected item “considered” before continuing reading. Jefferson (1987: 89) describes the repetition of this type as an “(X, Y, Y) series” with the correction (Y) being accepted and repeated by the speaker. This is not always the case though as will be shown in the following example.

Excerpt 4.

**Participants: one student (S) and the teacher (T)**

In a whole-class discussion (S) is discussing her habits when watching films or series.

1  S: eh yeah it is often one series that I have  
2  looked so many times that I #(0.7) eh# that I [can  
3  in ]  in.1  in.2  
4  T: [mm  
5  S: all the movie and so-  
6  T: okay, so you know everything.  
6  S: yeah
In excerpt 4, the student pauses and repeats “that I” in line 2, which can be a signal of potential trouble. Brouwer (2003: 541) states that “pauses and uh’s” within CA “are described as nonlexical speech perturbation[s] and [are] regarded as self initiations of repair”. Here, there is both a pause of 0.7 seconds and an “eh” along with a repetition which can indicate that this is a self-initiation of repair. Interestingly, the multimodal transcription in this excerpt tells us that the student may initiate repair by turning her head toward the teacher when she pauses and repeats “that I” (line 2). The fact that the student turns her head can indicate that she is looking for help. Goodwin and Goodwin (1986: 63) states that by returning the gaze towards the recipient the speaker might signal that he or she is looking for help from the recipient. When the student then continues by saying “can” (line 2) the teacher says “mm” in overlap (line 3). The “mm” from the teacher is possibly what Heritage (1985: 306) calls a “continuer”. That is a word, in this case from the teacher, that signals to the student to continue. The student then finishes her turn but trails off towards the end on line 4. However, in line 5 the teacher rephrases the trouble spot and repairs the item. This type of repair is what Jefferson (1987) describes as embedded correction. Embedded correction is used to not focus the attention on the problem but as a “by-the-way occurrence in […] ongoing talk” (Jefferson 1987: 95). Since it is a discussion exercise, the focus is to produce talk and not to discuss grammar and thus, the teacher may be using a more discrete type of repair. In this case the correction of “can” to “know” is done in passing and the focus here is more on content than language.

The teacher not only repairs “can” to “know” but she also rephrases “all the movie” (line 4) to “everything” (line 5). Kasper (1985: 213) explains these types of reformulations as “confirming rather than rejecting the response”. When the teacher rephrases the student’s statement in this example, the teacher’s turn is marked with an “okay” as an acceptance of the content but with the reformulation, the teacher also corrects the grammar. The uptake after the repair is in this case ambiguous; the student produces a “yeah” which can mean that the
student is accepting the repair in the (X, Y, Y) fashion described by Jefferson (1987) and that the student does not notice the repair and is answering the teacher’s rephrasing as a question of whether the teacher got it right as an acceptance of the reformulation.

In excerpt 4 the task is to discuss habits of watching films. Since it is a discussion task it may be the case that the teacher is less focused on correct language and focuses more on producing speech which may be the reason for the teacher using embedded repair. Apart from other-repair being accepted in the (X, Y, Y) fashion as shown in this example, there are also instances when the repair is rejected, which will be shown in excerpt 5, below.

Excerpt 5

**Participants: Three students, student 1 (S1), student 2 (S2) and student 3 (S3)**

Three students are having a group discussion trying to answer the question “Several ways to improve the technique of filming are mentioned in the text. Give two examples” by reading in their text book.

1. S1: they can move like different ankles.
2. S2: yeah
3. S1: the[y ([writing down sentence])
4. S3: [give two examples
5. S1: can mo[ve ([writing down sentence])
6. S2: [they can change the size of the picture
7. S1: the camera (1.3) different (1.4) ([writing down sentence])
8. S3: they also learned to do [simple tricks
9. S1: [ankles det ska vara #ankles;
   it should be
   im #im.4.1

10. S3: ‘angles’
11. S1: ‘ankles’ (1.4)
12. S3: un#cles $(h)e (h)e$
   im #im.4.2
In a discussion between students themselves S1 pronounces the word angles as “ankles”. S1 then writes down the sentence agreed upon in line 1 of excerpt 5. The writing of the sentence happens at the same time as S2 and S3 discuss the second example they should use. Since writing takes S1 some time there is a delay before the initiation and repair sequence begins (line 9). S1 then asks her peers if the word should be “ankles”. This word has a rising intonation which may indicate that it is being try-marked. When she asks this, she turns her head to face them. Both the question and the turning of S1’s head are repair initiators. The repair-initiation(s) are followed by an other-repair made by S3, where she says “‘angles’” softly (line 10). After the repair made by S3 there is no uptake from S1. One possible explanation for this is that the repair was said softly and S1 might not have heard S3’s repair. S3 then initiates repair again by saying the word “uncles” (line 12) which is said with laughter. Yet again, there is no uptake from S1.

The repair series here can be described as Jefferson’s (X, Y, X) series. Jefferson (1987: 90) describes that when a correction is rejected it can often take the form of an “(X, Y, X) series” that is an incorrect item (X), being corrected (Y) but then rejected for the same incorrect item it began with (X). The incorrect item, (X), “ankles” is corrected to “angles” but then there is a rejection of the corrected item to end up with the same item as it started with, in this case “ankles” (line 15). Furthermore, Jefferson (1987: 88) describes that in these types of exposed corrections there can be instances of “ridiculing” the mistake; in this excerpt when S3 initiates repair the second time (line 12) by saying “uncles” whilst chuckling.
4.3 Other-Initiated Other-Repair

In this section the trouble spots are characterised as other-initiated other-repair. The nature of the trouble sources in this section are picked up by the teacher and then corrected by the teacher as well. Other-initiations of repair can be made in several different ways. Schegloff et al. (1977: 367-368) mention the following ways of performing other-initiations of repair in ordinary conversation: by using words such as “[h]uh, [w]hat?, who, where, when”; by making a “partial repeat of the trouble-source turn, plus a question word”; by only making a “partial repeat of the trouble-source turn”; and by “Y’mean x”. Furthermore, Mazeland (1987) writes about repair sequences in a classroom context and found that teachers initiate repair other ways than those proposed by Schegloff et al. (1977). Mazeland (1987: 3-4) states that teachers may “overtly reject” an error, often by using the word “no”, or “explicitly assert the occurrence of an error”. Mazeland (1987) also states that teachers may “locate the trouble source very precisely through carefully formatted repeats of the trouble source element”.

Excerpt 6.

Participants: one student (S) and the teacher (T)

While (S) is reading a passage from the textbook out loud she says the wrong word as well as having trouble pronouncing the word journalists.

1   S:       they were, they were allowed by journa=journals=
2   T:       =they were followed (0.2)
3   S:       jaha followed (0.3)        oh
4   T:       by journa[lists
5   S:       [by journalists and photographers

In excerpt 6, the student reads from the textbook and reads the word followed as “allowed” as well as having problems with pronouncing the word “journalists” (line 1). The teacher picks up on the word “allowed” which should be followed rather than the word S has more problems producing. Thus, the teacher can be seen as repairing the item which is relevant to her in this context (line 2). The teacher initiates repair, in the form of other initiation, and places the repaired word in a partial repeat of the trouble-source turn or “recast” as Fasel Lauzon and Pekarek Doehler (2013: 326) calls it. The student is unaware of the mistake she has made and this is signalled by her saying “jaha” or “oh” (line 3). “Oh” is here what Heritage (1985) calls a “change-of-state token”. By this Heritage (1985: 318) means that the
person who is being corrected undergoes “a change in his or her state of information”. In Excerpt 6, the student is unaware of having made a mistake and the “oh” (line 3) signals that she has undergone a change of state of information. The repaired word is then repeated by the student and is followed by a pause, which can be a further signal that the student had not realised that she had made a mistake. By repeating the word the offered correction is accepted (Jefferson 1987: 89). Moreover, in line 4 the teacher repeats “by journalists” which may be a way of targeting the word the student had some problems producing in line 1.

The activity performed in excerpt 6 is reading a text out loud. In this context, the focus of the task is language and thus a sequence of exposed repair is likely used in order to deal with the problem.

In excerpt 7 below, the initiation of repair is done in another way. Here, the teacher prompts repair by repeating part of the student’s turn up until the trouble source.

Excerpt 7.  

Participants: one student (S1) and the teacher (T)

Excerpt 7 comes later on during the same lesson as a previous excerpt (excerpt 5). Here there is a whole-class discussion about the questions answered in the text book. The question presented here is “Several ways to improve the technique of filming are mentioned in the text, give two examples”.

1. S1: they can move the camera different ankles and
change the size of the picture
2. T: (0.5) yes (0.8) eh what did you say move the camera--
3. S1: (0.2) in different ankles. {gestures angles}
4. T: (0.3) angles angles yes (0.3) angles I thought you
5. S1: [a an a--
6. T: said uncles. §h)e (h)e§

In excerpt 7, the student is producing the answer to the question and once again pronounces “angles” as “ankles”. The teacher gives a partial repeat of the trouble-source turn, an other-initiation, and provides an opening for a self-repair (Schegloff et al. 1977: 376). The teacher saying “what did you say, move the camera” (line 3) is potentially an other-initiation. The
teacher is here performing what Mazeland (1987: 4) calls “locating the trouble source element” for the student. In line 3 she is initiating repair by saying “what did you say move the camera” which indicated that the trouble is after camera. The student then repairs (line 4) by repeating but the teacher is not satisfied as the item is still not repaired. However, as Jung (1999: 155) points out, “[t]o lessen the face-threat to that speaker, the hearer tends to take the blame for miscommunication as if there were problems with hearing or understanding the talk”. This initiation of trouble is perceived by the student as a problem of hearing and thus, the student repeats her answer making a self-repair. However, the initiation from the teacher was not due to a problem of hearing and the self-repair made by the student was not the one the teacher was asking for. Here, the teacher could continue with pinpointing the location of the trouble, but instead the repair of the word ankles is produced by the teacher in the form of an other-repair. The teacher then follows up by saying “I thought you said uncles”, which may indicate that the problem here actually was one of hearing but the word the teacher thought she heard does not fit in this context either. When the teacher in this instance of repair asks “what did you say?” the risk of a face-threat of the speaker is lessened and also gives the speaker an opportunity for self-repair. Also, when the teacher says “I thought you said uncles” she is laughing. The laugh may be the teacher ridiculing her own statement as to lessen the risk of threatening face of the student.

4.4 Problematisation of Vocabulary

In this section, the trouble spots are items that the teacher brings up for discussion. This type of problematisation is described by Waring (2016: 92) as “unilateral problematizing” and refers to when a teacher brings up an item for discussion in class even though it may not always seem to be a problem for the students. Waring (2016: 97) states that problematisation can be done in two ways, either immediately after an item has appeared, or remotely, which means that it is circled back to. The trouble spots in this section are items with seemingly no trouble or words that the students have had problems pronouncing when reading from the text book. The first example in this category is one where the there is no indication of trouble; the teacher simply picks up on an item from the paragraph just read by a student. The student who read that paragraph did not, however, have any problems pronouncing the item.
Excerpt 8.

Participants: the teacher (T) and two students (S1) and (S2)

In excerpt 8, one student has finished reading a passage out loud and the teacher is problematising an item.

1 T: thank you, what’s a villain? (1.4)
2 S1: ’typ invånare’
   like inhabitant
3 T: (0.6) sorry
4 S1: typ invånare
   like inhabitant
5 T: (0.2)#(0.4) no no# I no not really
   ((Teacher briefly looks down into the textbook in image 5.1))
6 S2: skurk
   villain
7 T: yes? it’s a bad guy. (0.6) a villain. (2.0) but
8 it was a good try. (0.9) okay good

In excerpt 8, the word villain was read out loud by a student without any trouble. Waring (2016: 93) argues that teachers can either deal with an item immediately after it has appeared or circle back to a potential problematic item by some sort of “boundary marking” to mark transition. In the example above the teacher is circling back marking the transition by a “thank you” (line 1) so as to show the student that read the passage out loud that he or she has finished reading the passage. Following the transition, the teacher initiates that the word “villain” might be a problematic word to understand and problematises the item by asking “what’s a villain?” (line 1). Waring (2016: 92) states that teachers often problematise an item by asking the students if they know what “X” is. S1 answers the question somewhat silently “’typ invånare’” (line 2). As an answer to the produced explanation in line 2 the teacher pauses for quite some time 0.6 seconds (line 3) before saying “sorry”. The hesitation and the “sorry” (line 3) signals that there is a problem here. According to Drew (1997: 72), a “sorry”
may occur as an “open class” repair initiator. Although the “sorry” (line 3) may also be a problem of hearing as S1 was speaking silently, the teacher’s response in line 3 and the pause before signals that there is a problem here. In line 4, there is a repetition from S1, “typ invånare” in a louder voice. The teacher’s response to this is to look down at the book (image 5.2), even though the teacher should already know that “invånare” (inhabitant) and “villain” are not the same word. The teacher in this case, has epistemic primacy, that is she should have greater knowledge than the students because of her social position as teacher (Stivers et al. 2011: 17-19). Following the teacher looking down into her book, she pauses and then repeats the word “no” (line 5) several times. Mazeland (1987: 3-4) points out that the word “no” is often used to “overtly reject” an error. Here the teacher rejects the error in line 5 by repeating the word “no”. Following the rejection, the teacher does receive the correct answer, “skurk” (line 6), which is marked as correct by her accepting the response with a “yes”. However, the teacher continues to define the word in English (line 7). The reason for the translation may be because the teacher never used a Swedish word during the whole class and wanted to continue by only speaking English.

In excerpt 9 below, there is a clear trouble spot. In fact, excerpt 9 is the continuation of a previous excerpt (3) that dealt with the mispronunciation of the word “considered”. Now the word “considered” is problematised by the teacher to see whether the students know what it means.

**Excerpt 9.**

*Participants: the teacher (T) and one student (S2)*

In excerpt 9, one student has finished reading a passage from the text book. The student who read the passage mispronounced the word “considered”.

7 T: ↑thank you >thank you very much< (0.5) SO eh what is
8       something that is considered what does it mean. (1.0)
9 S2: ansatt
      considered
10 T: (0.7) yeah (0.2) yeah (0.2) good. (0.6) did you hear (0.8)
11       okay good thank you

Here, the teacher is treating the previously mispronounced word as a potential trouble spot and discusses the word “considered” with the whole class. In this excerpt the teacher circles back to the item by using the boundary mark “thank you” (line 7) to mark transition (Waring
This is followed by the word “SO” to signal that the reading activity is put on hold. Following the transition the teacher wants to know if the students know what the word “considered” means. Waring (2016: 92) argues that teachers often problematise an item by asking the student if they know what “X” is and this is what the teacher is doing here.

The response to the teacher’s question here comes rather quickly and without any problem (line 8). The item picked up by the teacher did not seem to be a specifically problematic one at least for one student. Interestingly, the student who provided the answer was another than the student who read the passage. And the correct answer is followed by an acceptance and then a question to the whole class to see if everybody heard the answer. This is thus a potential learning opportunity for the whole class. Majlesi (2014: 72) states that a “learnable” can be “a vocabulary inquiry” in an activity where the “pedagogical focus emerges in an ongoing activity”. Here in excerpt 9, the opportunity for a leaning activity comes from the student who is initiating, what Majlesi (2014: 72) calls the “sequential activity”, by not being able to pronounce the word “considered” correctly, which is then picked up on be the teacher.

In the excerpt 10 below, the trouble spot arises in a different way. Here the trouble is signalled by the student and problematised by the teacher. Furthermore, the trouble is not circled back to, but rather, the problematisation is done right away.

Excerpt 10.

**Participants: the teacher (T) and two students, (S1) and (S2)**

In excerpt 10, S1 is reading a passage from the text book and is reading the word approached twice. The teacher problematises the word with the whole class.

1 S1: and people screamed when the train approached #im #im.6.1

2 #appr#↑oached (0.2)

im #im.6.2 #im.6.3
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In excerpt 10, S1 is having some trouble when pronouncing the word “approached” (line 1) and the second time he reads it is try-marked (line 2). Sacks et al. (1979: 18), Jung (1999:158), Brouwer (2003: 540) amongst others describe try-marking as pronouncing a word with a rising intonation followed by a “brief pause” to signal the need for help. When S1 says “approached” the second time it is not only try-marked; S1 also looks deep into the book and then he turns his head toward the teacher, image 6.6. The try-marking, the brief pause along with S1 turning his head signal to the teacher that he needs help here, he wants a confirmation whether the pronunciation was correct. Goodwin and Goodwin (1986: 62-63) point out that a change in activity (looking down and then toward the teacher in this example) leaving a pause as well as returning his gaze is a signal for help. In line 3 the teacher confirms the pronunciation but then problematises the word by asking “do you know what it means”. In this excerpt (10), the teacher addresses the student who read the passage. The reason for targeting S1 is that, as opposed to excerpts 8 and 9, the problematisation is made right away,
the student has try-marked the word “approached” in line 2, as well as the student having turned his head toward the teacher. Waring (2016: 92) states that problematisation done immediately after a problem has occurred is often done by the teacher asking “do you know what ‘x’ is”. Since the problematisation is done immediately the student who experienced the trouble is targeted for the problematisation. When S1 cannot produce the correct explanation (line 4), the teacher in this case acts out the word by walking toward the student closest to her (line 5) (image 6.5). Majlesi (2014: 73) comes to the conclusion that bodily actions can be used for “practical purposes” in the classroom and in excerpt 10, the teacher “approaching” (image 6.5) a student is a way of clarifying the word “approach”. The student she is approaching (S2) then gives the correct translation of the word (line 6). In line 7 the teacher immediately accepts the correct answer and (S1) continues reading his paragraph.
5. Discussion and Conclusions

In this chapter, I will condense my results and then answer my research questions, followed by a discussion regarding my findings. Finally, the chapter draws some brief conclusions and makes suggestions for future research.

5.1 Research Questions

This study categorised the results and examples into four categories;

- Self-initiated self-repair
- Self-initiated other-repair
- Other-initiated other-repair
- Problematisation of vocabulary

The categories are based on who performs the trouble spot and who initiates the repair as well as the fourth category being the teacher problematising vocabulary.

5.1.1 What Trouble Spots Arise and How Are They Signalled as Trouble

In this investigation, ten show-cases of trouble spots occurring in the data were analysed. They were categorised into one of the four categories and presented in Table 3.

Table 3: The ten different examples of trouble spots together with the activity they arise in and which category they have been placed in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpt</th>
<th>In Category</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Signal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Self-initiated self-repair</td>
<td>Oral presentation</td>
<td>Muddled up sentence (the words of the sentence are phrased in an incorrect order)</td>
<td>Self-initiation by pause and retrying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Self-initiated self-repair</td>
<td>Oral presentation</td>
<td>Mispronunciation of a word, vowel switch</td>
<td>Self-initiation by cut-off word, then pause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Self-initiated other-repair</td>
<td>Reading out loud</td>
<td>Wrong word produced</td>
<td>Self-initiation by inbreath and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>Correction</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Self-initiated other-repair</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Replacing of word</td>
<td>Repetition of item, followed by pause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Self-initiated other-repair</td>
<td>Group discussion among students</td>
<td>Wrong word produced due to mispronunciation</td>
<td>Self-initiation by questioning/try-marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other-initiated other-repair</td>
<td>Reading out loud</td>
<td>Wrong word produced</td>
<td>Recast (Fasel Lauzon &amp; Pekarek-Doehler 2013) by teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Other-initiated other-repair</td>
<td>Presenting answers</td>
<td>Wrong word produced</td>
<td>Partial repeat of trouble source turn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Problematisation of vocabulary</td>
<td>Reading out loud/problematisation</td>
<td>Circled back to word that did not appear to be problematic</td>
<td>No signal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Problematisation of vocabulary</td>
<td>Reading out loud/problematisation</td>
<td>Circled back to a word that was previously mispronounced</td>
<td>By student mispronouncing word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Problematisation of vocabulary</td>
<td>Reading out loud/problematisation</td>
<td>Immediate problematisation due to try-marking</td>
<td>Try-marking, gaze for help</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The column “signal” reveals how the trouble spot arose. The difference between excerpt 6 and 7 is that the trouble is corrected in a different manner.

There are a number of examples where the trouble spot arises due to mispronunciation of a word: excerpts 2, 3, 6, 7 and 9. Excerpt 2 is a self-initiated self-repair when performing an
oral presentation. Here the trouble spot, or trouble source, arises by the student pronouncing a word wrong, e.g. “originates” becomes “erog-” which is cut off. It is then further signalled as trouble by exhaling, pausing and looking down performing what Goodwin and Goodwin (1986: 57) describe as a thinking face, the student also looks away from the class which can be a signal of a word search, before producing the word with the vowels in the correct order. Excerpt 3, is a self-initiated other-repair where a student reads a passage out loud and pronounces the wrong word. The trouble source is then signalled by a pause in an unnatural place in the sentence before she continues reading, which may indicate that she did not quite grasp how the word fit into the sentence. The teacher picks up on the word and corrects it. Excerpt 6 is very similar to excerpt 3, but is an other-initiated other-repair. The trouble source for the teacher is when a student produces the word “allowed” instead of “followed”. The trouble spot for the student on the other hand is a problem of pronouncing the word “journalists”. The teacher initiates and repairs by using what is called a recast with the mispronounced word corrected (Fasel Lauzon and Pekarek-Doehler 2013: 331). The teacher then picks up on the word the student had trouble producing, “journalists”, by using a recast here as well. In excerpt 7 the task is presenting answers to questions, and the repair type here is other-initiated other-repair. The student produces the wrong word when presenting her answer, the word that should be “angles” is produced as “ankles”. The teachers initiate repair using a partial repeat of the trouble source turn (Schegloff et al. 1977: 376). This way of initiating repair is to pin-point for the student where the trouble is (Mazeland (1987: 4). The student misreads this repair initiation as a trouble of hearing and does not repair what the teacher wanted, so the teacher repairs the error. Excerpt 9 has to do with problematisation of vocabulary. A previously mispronounced word “considered”, is brought up because the teacher thought it might be a problematic word for the students. Waring (2016: 95) states that problematisation made by the teacher is often phrased as “what does ‘X’ mean?” and that is the case in excerpt 9. However, the student who answers her question does not have any problems with producing the correct explanation of the word and the problematisation ends quickly.

Some of the trouble spots arose by try-marking, excerpts 5 and 10. In excerpt 5 the activity is a group discussion between students and the repair is performed as self-initiated other-repair. In this excerpt the student who is initiating asks her peers if the word is supposed to be “ankles”. The word “ankles” is try-marked, which is signalled by rising intonation (Brouwer 2003; Schegloff et al. 1977). Another student in the group repairs in a slightly softer voice
“angles” but there is no uptake from the first student. In Excerpt 10, the trouble spot arises from trying to mark the word “approached”. The student not only tries to mark the word, he turns his gaze toward the teacher an action that Goodwin and Goodwin (1986: 63) state is a signal for help. The teacher confirms the pronunciation of the word and then problematises it. Waring (2016: 92) describes this type of problematisation as immediate and part of “the learner’s just produced talk”. The student does not know the answer to the question so the teacher decides to act out the word, when she does so another student provides the correct answer.

Excerpt 8 arose by the teacher deeming the item as potentially troublesome or difficult but with no student having had any problem pronouncing the word. Thus, in the case of excerpt 8, the trouble spot is student-initiated, but rather the teacher chooses to problematise the word. Waring (2016: 102) states that teachers usually do this in order to draw attention to the item and to make sure that all students in the class understand the word. The word then receives the wrong explanation in excerpt 8, which is met by a chance for self-repair but is again wrong. Here the teacher gets the signal that this was in fact a problematic word for at least one student, and thus the problematisation continues. The teacher here “overtly rejects” the incorrect response by repeating the word “no”.

Excerpt 1 arose during an oral presentation in front of the whole class and was resolved using self-initiated self-repair. The trouble source arose when saying a sentence where the words came out in the wrong order in the second part of the sentence. The signal for trouble here is a rather long pause before the misplaced word and the word is then followed by pauses, the student saying no, laughing, stops and starts, until she finally says wait and recycles the beginning of the sentence and the order of the words is sorted. The trouble spot is partly signalled as trouble by a word search with the student looking away from the class as well as producing speech perturbations (Goodwin & Goodwin 1986: 57). The student also laughs at one point, which can be seen as what Jefferson (1987: 96) describes as ridiculing her own mistake, thus also signalling that she is very much aware that there was a mistake made.

In Excerpt 4 the student signals trouble by the repetition of the words “that I” which is then followed by an “eh”. Brouwer (2003: 541) argues that repetition followed by speech perturbations is a clear signal of trouble. The student then produces the problematic part of her sentence and ends up with “that I can all the movie and so” when she says this the student turns her head toward the teacher, a signal that shows that she needs help in her search for an
appropriate word (Goodwin & Goodwin 1986: 63). The teacher on the other hand produces a continuer (Heritage 1985: 306) and then rephrases the student’s utterance.

### 5.1.2 How are the trouble spots dealt with?

The ten identified trouble spots are handled somewhat differently. The ways these are dealt with are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4. How the ten excerpts were dealt with.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpt</th>
<th>In Category</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Self-initiated self-repair</td>
<td>Oral presentation</td>
<td>Recycles phrase, reorganising words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Self-initiated self-repair</td>
<td>Oral presentation</td>
<td>Word search, replacing word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Self-initiated other-repair</td>
<td>Reading out loud</td>
<td>Exposed correction. Uptake in third turn. (Teacher corrects, student repeats the correct item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Self-initiated other-repair</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Student looking for help followed by embedded correction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Self-initiated other-repair</td>
<td>Group discussion among students</td>
<td>Exposed correction. X, Y, X rejection (Jefferson 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other-initiated other-repair</td>
<td>Reading out loud</td>
<td>Exposed correction. Uptake in third turn with change-of-state token (Heritage 1985). (Teacher corrects, student acknowledges the error and repairs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Other-initiated other-repair</td>
<td>Presenting answers</td>
<td>Exposed correction. Opportunity for self-repair given, student misunderstands and the teacher corrects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Problematisation of vocabulary</td>
<td>Reading out loud/problematisation</td>
<td>Circling back when paragraph is finished. Open-ended repair. Explicit rejection by teacher, correct answer given by another student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Depending on the type of task the trouble spots are dealt with in different ways. When the focus of the activity is on language, as in the reading out loud (excerpts 3 and 6) and presenting answers (excerpt 7) activities, the repair is performed in the form of exposed correction. This type of activity is what Seedhouse (2004c: 215) calls a “form-and-accuracy context”, even though there might have been a problem with understanding from the teacher, by her hearing “uncles”. In these types of activities the task at hand, i.e. reading or presenting answers is put on hold giving way for the business of correction (Jefferson 1987: 97; Kasper 1985: 214). In excerpt 3 the teacher only repairs the mispronounced word, which is followed by a repetition from the student. However, in excerpt 6 the teacher performs the other repair by a recast of the phrase the student has just read which is followed by a “change-of-state token” (Heritage 1985) signalling that the student was unaware of her mistake before repeating the repaired word. In excerpt 3 and 6, the repaired item is repeated by the student which is something that Fasel Lauzon and Pekarek-Doehler (2013: 334) describe as the student acknowledging the correction and accepting it as suitable. However, in excerpt 7 this is not quite as evident. In the transcription, the student tries to produce something after the teacher has corrected the item. Whether it is an attempt at repetition of the word is hard to say but it might be an attempt even though the student is cut off by the teacher elaborating on her repair. In excerpt 5 there is also the matter of exposed correction. However, in this case the explicit correction comes from another student within the group. This exposed correction is somewhat different in the uptake from the student who initiated repair as she rejects the repetition and finally ends up with the same word as she started with. This is what Jefferson (1987: 90) calls a repair in the “X, Y, X” series where the correction is rejected.

In a task that primarily focuses on producing speech and the meaning as in excerpts 1, 2 and 4, the error is either self-initiated self-repaired or performed by the teacher in the form of embedded repair (Kasper 1985; Jefferson 1987). Seedhouse (2004: 215) calls this a "meaning-and-fluency context”. Self-initiated self-repair is according to Kasper’s (1985: 214) study more efficient in terms of “ongoing communication, as they interrupt the discourse to a lesser
degree than repair activity involving both the self and the other”. In both excerpt 1 and 2 the students show signs of an ongoing word search. They both looked away from the class in the room when having produced a trouble source and returned their gaze after having performed the self-repair, these features are described by Goodwin and Goodwin (1986: 57) as characteristic for a word search. Thus, it is not so strange that nobody interrupts in excerpts 1 and 2, partly because the task itself is one that focuses on meaning, and partly because the students talking were showing signs of an ongoing word search. In excerpts 1 and 2 both students are repairing their utterance even though the indication of trouble is, what Plejert (2004: 92) calls a “subtle indication of ‘trouble’” signalled by cut off words and some short hesitations. However, the utterances are repaired which is something that Plejert (2004: 92) states is common for the speakers of the mispronunciation even though there might not problem of understanding of the utterance without the repair being performed. Excerpt 4 is a little different; here the student discusses her film habits with the teacher and produces the word “can”, which the teacher later replaces and reformulates the sentence the student just said. By replacing and reformulating the correction of the utterance is embedded (Jefferson 1987: 95 and Fasel Lauzon & Pekarek Doehler 2013:331).

Excerpts 8, 9 and 10 are all in the category “problematisation of vocabulary” performed by the teacher. And the different excerpts have different features when it regards how they are dealt with. Excerpts 8 and 9 are both circled back to after the student who read the passage where the items occurred has finished reading. In excerpt 8, the word that is problematised was not produced with any apparent trouble but when called upon produced trouble in comprehension for at least one student. The student who gets the translation wrong is given a chance to repair it, but repeats the same answer. This time the answer is what Mazeland (1987: 3) calls “overtly rejected” by the teacher by her saying “no”. This type of rejecting an error is commented on by Seedhouse (2004b: 177) arguing that in a classroom context a “direct and unmitigated other-repair by the teacher […] mark[s] the error as unimportant and unembarrassing”. The correct translation for “villain” is the produced by another student. In excerpt 9, the teacher circles back to a previously mispronounced word “considered” which seemed to be a problem earlier on but when problematised is resolved quickly by a student providing the correct answer right away. In excerpt 10, the problematisation is performed immediately, indicated by a student repeating a word, try-marked the second time. When the student called upon to explain what “approached” means he cannot perform the explanation
and the teacher continues to act out the word by approaching another student, who then gives her the translation of the word.

5.1.3 Discussion of method

The method of this study is fitting for the purpose. However, the amount of data analysed in this study was of 145 minutes in total. Since it is a relatively small amount of data used for this study, it is difficult to draw any conclusions with absolute certainty. Also, the classes recorded were with students of different levels of proficiency, which might be worth noting as the only types of repair in recording 2 were of the type self-initiated self-repair. However, as previous research, as well as this study demonstrates, there is a very likely correlation between the findings of this study and the findings in previous research. As was shown in the results of this study, there is a correlation between the activity type and what kind of repair it generates. As other studies have shown similar results, the conclusions that can be drawn from the results of this study are likely to be valid. It should, however, be noted that from the small amount of data used in this study the claims that are made in the conclusion are likely to be valid but would benefit from the analysis of more data.

5.2 Conclusion

The conclusions that can be drawn from the results are that the context of a task seems important when it comes to how trouble spots are dealt with. When the focus of the activity is on language, as in the reading out loud exercise and in the presenting of answers in front of the whole class the repair is explicit. This correlates directly to the findings of Kasper (1985) and Seedhouse (2004c), who state that when the focus of the activity is on form and accuracy and producing language correctly, the type of repair that occurs is often in the form other-repair. In these types of activities, the repair is what Jefferson (1987) and Mazeland (1987) calls an exposed repair. This type of repair halts the task and brings the focus of the whole class to the mistake and how to resolve it. This is evident in excerpts 3 and 6, where the activity was reading, in excerpt 5, where the students themselves were working with questions, and in excerpt 7 where the groups presented their answers to the questions they were working with. As was evident in the results, when exposed correction is performed, the student more often than not repeats the corrected word. Kasper (1985) and Fasel Lauzon and Pekarek Doehler’s (2013) findings are the same: when the teacher explicitly corrects a student, the corrected item is repeated in most cases.

When having a discussion in whole class about the students’ own habits the repair was performed as embedded repair (Jefferson 1987). The discussion activity, in a meaning-and-
fluency context (Seedhouse 2004c), focused more on producing English and thus the focus of the task was not so much on correctness and thus embedded repair was used so that the focus of the task would not change to the business of correcting. In classroom activities where the focus is more on meaning as in excerpt 1, 2 and 4 the repair is, according to Kasper (1985: 214) preferably preformed as self-repair or as a by-the-way occurrence so as not to switch the focus from the task at hand. In excerpts 1 and 2, the task is an oral presentation and in these types of activities it is uncommon for someone else to step in and perform the correction and thus the type of repair becomes self-initiated self-repair.

When it comes to the problematisation of vocabulary, the teacher has the opportunity to choose what words should be problematised. In this study, one of the words used for problematisation was produced without trouble (excerpt 8), one word was previously produced with trouble but when problematised did not seem to be a problem at all (excerpt 9). And in the third case the trouble was signalled by the student’s try-marking and the teacher problematised this word (excerpt 10). In the third case the need for a problematisation is clearly signalled to the teacher. These types of problematisations could provide a learning activity in the classroom as the focus is not completely set on just one student but invites the rest of the class to participate in the problematisation. As this study is fairly small, only two lessons recorded, this needs to be investigated further in order to be able to say anything with absolute certainty. However, the results in this study correlates with the findings of Majlesi (2014) who conducted a similar study based on a larger amount of data. One feature that can be further investigated is what affordances trouble spots can have for learning and investigate what pedagogical consequences trouble spots might have.
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Appendix 2

Transcription Conventions (Atkinson & Heritage 1984)

[word] overlapping speech

[.word] micropause (0.2 s or less)

(0) measured pause in seconds and tenths of seconds

= latching (no pause, no overlap)

. falling, final intonation

, continuing, relatively flat intonation

? rising intonation

? clearly rising intonation

wo- cut-off

! marked shift in intonation (refers to the next syllable)

[word'] more silently than surrounding speech

.hh inbreath

.hh out-breath

$(h)e$ laughter

{(word)} comment from the transcriber
Transcription conventions for visual behaviour (Mondala 2014)

# indicates the exact moment at which the frame grab was recorded

++ delimit descriptions of one speaker’s actions

+-+-+ action described continues until the same symbol is reached