تحليل الخطاب لتتابعات الإصلاح في تفاعل المعلم والطالب داخل الصف الدراسي

A Discourse Analysis of Classroom Repair Sequences in Teacher-Student Interaction

م. د. افراح عبد القادر جاسم   أ.د. أمير سليمان صالح

تاريخ القبول	تاريخ استلام البحث
2025/12/6	2025/11/20

Lect. Dr. Afrah Abdul Qader Jassim   **Assit. Prof. Ameer Sulaiman Salih**

University of Mosul /College of Basic Education   **University of Mosul /College of Basic   Education**

Afrah.abed@uomosul.edu.iq   ameer.suleman@uomsul.edu.iq

Abstract: The present study explores the repair between lecturers and students during the classroom discourse at the university level. based on an eclectic model, the analysis includes Conversation Analysis and sociolinguistic theories. The researchers analyse classroom discourse to identify how repair is initiated, accomplished, and determined, to provide valuable insights into how students understand each other. In this study, the researchers aim to find out classroom discourse, where the teacher always corrects students' mistakes to preserve the flow and unity of the lesson. The participants are several university lecturers who interact with their students from the Department at first, second and third levels. The data will be analysed in the form of questions and responses between the lecturers and students, in various subjects. The levels of the students are chosen because students continuously make mistakes in various subjects such as conversation, phonetics, grammar, and linguistics. Moreover, the lecturers frequently use repair sequences to solve these mistakes during lessons. These repair sequences are vital in an effective communication, helping to avoid confusions, and supporting cooperative knowledge. The analysis emphases on the kinds of repairs, their purposes, and their influence on the accepting discourse through interaction. The results tell that instructor's usage a diversity of strategies, such as clarification demands, rephrasing, and explicit mistake adjustments, to aid comprehension and continued interaction. Besides, it exposes that repair sequences function not only to address language or content discourse, but also to achieve power relations, support learning, and encourage communicative competence.

Keywords

Classroom Discourse, Conversation analysis, diversity, Repair Sequences Teacher-student interaction,

المستخلص

تتناول هذه الدراسة آليات الإصلاح الحواري بين الأساتذة الجامعيين والطلبة أثناء التفاعل الصفي، مستندةً إلى منهج تحليل المحادثة (CA) ونظريات علم اللغة الاجتماعي. وتهدف إلى تحليل المشاركات الصفية حول كيفية بدء إصلاح الحوار وإدارته، بوصفه أداة أساسية لفهم المتحدثين بعضهم بعضًا. ويُعرَّف الإصلاح بأنه معالجة مشكلات التواصل ومساعدة الأفراد على تجاوز صعوبات النطق أو الاستماع أو الفهم، سواء من خلال الإصلاح الذاتي الذي يقوم فيه المتحدث بتصحيح خطئه بنفسه، أو الإصلاح من قبل طرف آخر لتصحيح الخطأ. وترتكز الدراسة بشكل خاص على الخطاب الصفي، حيث يقوم الأستاذ غالبًا بتصحيح أخطاء الطلبة للحفاظ على استمرار الدرس ووحدته. وشملت العينة عددًا من الأساتذة الجامعيين من قسم اللغة الإنجليزية الذين يدرّسون مواد المحادثة، وعلم الأصوات، والقواعد، واللسانيات في المستويات الجامعية الأولى والثانية والثالثة. وتم اختيار هذه المواد والمستويات نظرًا لكثرة الأخطاء التي يرتكبها الطلبة فيها، وكثرة اعتماد الأساتذة على استراتيجيات الإصلاح لمعالجة هذه الأخطاء. ومن خلال التحليل الوصفي

لخطاب التفاعلات الصفية المسجلة للطلاب لتحديد وتصنيف استراتيجيات الإصلاح المعتمدة من قبل الاساتذة الجامعيين، مع التركيز على أنواعها ووظائفها وأثرها في بيئة الخطاب الصفي. وقد كشفت النتائج أن الأساتذة يوظفون مجموعة متنوعة من الطرق، مثل طلبات التوضيح، وإعادة الصياغة، والتصحيح الصريح للأخطاء، وذلك بهدف تسهيل الفهم وتعزيز التفاعل والحفاظ على انسيابية ووحدة الخطاب في الصف. كما أظهرت النتائج أن تتابعات الإصلاح لا تقتصر على معالجة القضايا اللغوية أو المعرفية فحسب، بل تؤدي أيضًا دورًا في إدارة علاقات الاجتماعية، ودعم عملية تعليم اللغة، وتنمية الكفاءة التواصلية لدى الطلبة.

1. Introduction

In verbal discourse, failures are common among students through interaction, due to mistakes made during speaking. Such as misunderstandings, or gaps in linguistic knowledge, hesitating, and pronunciation. Classroom discourse plays a vital role in maintaining any language, through using a variety of vocabulary and negotiating different subjects related to everyday life situations. The basic part of through interaction is the tactic of repair sequences, which functions to aid misunderstandings, mistakes, or breakdowns in the lecture or interaction. The pioneer who describes repair as "a mechanism for addressing ongoing challenges in speech production, reception, or comprehension." For instance, Schegloff et al. (1977, p. 361) mention mistakes in pronunciation, word choice, grammar, and other broader communicative faults in conversations.

According to Aitchison (2003), "other-repair occurs when the speaker is uncertain about their statement or suspects the listener has made an error." The current study focuses on this type of "other-repair," as it is crucial for maintaining clear and coherent discourse. Thus, repair is a frequent characteristic of spoken interaction that appears when speakers identify flaws or errors in their communicative strategies.

Despite extensive research, several gaps exist that focus on children or beginner levels (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 36), with limited attention to university-level EFL learners who may have different interactional dynamics. There is a tendency to focus narrowly on grammatical correction, overlooking repair's multi-functional nature, including conversational and semantic negotiation (Walsh, 2011, p. 90). Conversation Analysis (CA), though a powerful tool for interactional detail, is underutilised in EFL university classroom research (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 75). The present study addresses this gap by providing a fine-grained CA-based analysis of repair sequences across multiple linguistic domains in university-level classroom discourse to explore how teachers and students use language to initiate and manage repairs among students through interaction.

2. Research Questions

The following are the major questions:

1. What types of repair sequences occur in teacher-student classroom interactions?

2. Who initiates the repair, teachers or students, and under what circumstances?

3. How do repair sequences contribute to language learning and classroom communication?

3. Aims of the Study

1. To analyse the structure and function of repair sequences in classroom discourse.

2. To examine the distribution of repair initiation between teachers and students.

3. To understand how repair sequences reflect pedagogical intentions and power dynamics.

4. Literature Review

Early classroom discourse research, such as Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), identified classroom interaction patterns but paid limited attention to repair mechanisms. Repair was originally studied within the Conversation Analysis (CA) framework by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1977, pp. 360–376), who demonstrated its essential role in maintaining conversational coherence and mutual understanding. Initially, the focus was on spontaneous, informal conversation. Schegloff et al. (1997, p. 361) categorise repair into four main types: self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, other-initiated self-repair, and other-initiated other-repair, with a preference for self-correction being dominant. Research on classroom discourse has long recognised the role of interactional structures such as repair in facilitating communication and learning. Repair sequences are mainly significant because they offer insights into how speakers deal with misunderstandings, errors, or interruptions in the flow of communication.

The teacher generally holds epistemic authority and directs the course of discussion. Heritage (2005, pp. 103–147) notes that institutional talk is characterised by goal orientation, restrictions on turn-taking, and specific inferential frameworks. Walsh (2006, p. 32) also highlights the importance of teachers' interactional competence in managing classroom discourse to support learning.

4.1 Repair in Classroom Discourse

Repair is a fundamental aspect of spoken interaction, addressing errors in speech production, reception, and comprehension (Schegloff et al., 1977). In the educational context, repair sequences serve both pedagogical and interactional functions. According to Sinclair and Coulthard (1975, p. 28), state that \ "The classroom has a distinct discourse structure, often organised around the IRF pattern (Initiation–Response–Feedback), where repair tends to occur during the feedback stage". Thus, repair can be divided into two main type, the first one is called other-repairs, the correction made by another person , whom correct the speaker at time., while the second one is named by self-repair where the speaker himself correct his /her mistake (Verschueren, 1999, p. 41).

Seedhouse (2004, p, 99) emphasises that repair is not only about correcting linguistic form but also about negotiating meaning and participation. Schegloff (2007), repair extends beyond linguistic corrections to include factual inaccuracies, social appropriateness, and interactional coherence. According to Walsh (2011, p 86), he further builds on this by showing how teacher-led repair sequences can scaffold learning by adjusting linguistic input to the learners' level, a process he calls "contingent scaffolding".

4.2 Foundational Frameworks of Repair

The study of repair stems from the work of Schegloff et al. (1977), who discovered that users' discourse can be resolved speaking difficulty through interaction by using a special tactic called repair in terms of the construction of initiation and its end correction. Regarding (Sacks et al.,1977, p. 370), repair can be divided into four categories:(self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, other-initiated self-repair, and other-initiated other-repair), to identify user language in terms of who initiated and concluded the repair.

4.3 The Scopes of Repair in Sociolinguistics

From a sociolinguistic perspective, repair sequences reveal the power imbalance in teacher-student interactions. According to Gee's (1999, p. 35, 99) view, "discourse as a socially situated practice, where control over repair reflects broader discursive power structures." Likewise, Cazden notes that "teachers have institutional authority to correct, student-initiated repairs are often signs of emerging learner agency" (Cazden, 2001, pp. 83–84). Hall and Walsh (2002) highlight that repair sequences are "opportunities for instructional conversation, where both form and meaning are negotiated." Their emphasis on the dialogic nature of effective classroom interaction underscores that mutual repair fosters a more cooperative learning environment.

Furthermore, Crystal (2003, p. 396) divided repairs into two types: self-initiated, which are made by the speaker without the listener's involvement, such as spontaneous usage, and other-initiated. and self-initiated repair. Aitchison also categorize repair into two kinds, the first one the listener or the person who definitely asks the speaker, to repairs the fault in utterance, while in the later the speaker himself spontaneously knows his or her mistake and corrects it directly (Aitchison, 2003, p. 111).

Research in educational discourse, such as Seedhouse (2004, p. 78), and Fasold (2006:179) illustrates the same idea, that repair can be handled by the speaker who made the mistake him/herself or by another participant (other), so they believe in two types of repairs. Teachers often use the strategy of repair not only to clarify misunderstandings but also to guide students towards higher-order thinking and more precise language use. Classroom discourse thus serves both communicative and instructional functions, with repair being a key interactional resource (Hall, 2007, p. 512).

Liddicoat (2007, pp. 173-174) believes that there are four possible types of repairs:

1. Self-initiated and self-repair: here the speaker designates a problem in the talk and corrects it by him/herself."
2-Self-initiated other-repair: when the speaker specifies a problem in the talk, but the receiver corrects it.
3. Other–initiated self–repair: the receiver specifies a problem in the talk, and the speaker resolves it.

4- Other initiated other-repair: the receiver indicates and resolves the problem in the talk.

5. Definitions of Repair

Repair is regarded as a common phenomenon in conversation, which has important implications for CA. Due to different starting points, many scholars have defined repair from several perspectives. Schegloff et al (1977, p. 361) define repair as "dealing with recurrent problems in speaking, understanding and hearing despite other linguistic problems, vocabulary, syntax, pronunciation, etc". In other words, Repair is a conversational mechanism for addressing communication breakdowns. Repairs can be self-initiated (where the speaker corrects their own mistake) or other-initiated (where the receiver, such as a teacher, intervenes).

According to Bahar (2019, p. 246), "Repair constitutes a self-righting mechanism that addresses repeated mistakes in speaking, hearing and understanding. The occurrence of repair in conversations in general is said to be enormous as participants discuss the difficulties that appear in the interaction in a continuing manner". Repair is not an attempt to put things right, but it is trying to make language clear and explicit (Gramkow, 2001, p. 87). It can provide additional understanding of how humans

understand each other. Due to conversation breakdowns, not always running smoothly, because individuals can not express everything correctly via making mistakes, these breakdowns must be repaired or corrected (Aitchison, 2003, p. 110).

Another scholar defines repair as a concept used through interaction, specifically in learning to correct mistakes made by students through interaction. Crystal (2003, p .396). According to Fasold (2006, p. 179), repair is a situation among speakers who make mistakes, in which the repair can be handled by the initiator who uttered and made the mistake him/herself or by another speaker. Schegloff (2007) expands the idea of repair, including language rules, phonation, covering precisely incorrect statements, and misunderstandings. Thus, classroom discourse contains repair not only for language accuracy but also for sustaining coherence and relevance.

Furthermore, Khoddamy adds, "repair means the way speakers or listeners of a conversation correct their mistakes or misunderstandings". This strategy is could be done by speaker himself or by others, this phenomenon has almost happened in various situations, especially in an educational environment. For instance, talking to someone about such a subject, suddenly you utter a word includes humor or painful meaning, including a sense of bullying or insulting others, ,but after a while, you find out the listeners are insulted. Immediately, the corrections are made by apologising to the person who has been insulted during or after the conversation (Khoddamy, 2015, p. 60).

6. Kinds of Trouble Source through Interaction

According to Schegloff (1987, p.57), students face breakdown because some problems or troubles arise in the interaction. For instance, speed speaking, poor qualities in hearing, or misunderstanding the content of speech. Likewise, Svennevig (2008) expands the types of trouble sources based on these difficulties:

a. Hearing problem, the students commonly provide signals to the speaker to repeat the speaker's previous utterance, which was caused by the students who found it difficult to hear what had been said in the conversation. The signals given by the teacher to get the attention of the students include terms as "what" and "again". These were the indications of the problem of hearing. It was also supported by the gesture of the teacher who put her/his ear to the source sound.

b. Understanding the problem was the most serious trouble that appeared within the conversation. As a consequence, the teacher was the one who asked for an initiation for the students to clarify and explain much more about their previous particular statements. A trouble source happened when the student lacked comprehension related to the topic.

c. The problem of speaking refers to the trouble source which occurs quite often during the conversation. The reasons for the emergence of this trouble were that the students' dominance resulted in a trouble source. It was mostly due to the students' lack of lexical, grammatical, and pronunciation knowledge, referring to the form and accuracy issues.

d. In addition, the most common problems were the lack of vocabulary, inability to distinguish between different words with the same pronunciation, and grammar. Similarly, several causes included seldom using words after memorizing them, rarely learning grammar books, and pronouncing words regularly.

7. Repair in Relation to Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) examines power dynamics, social hierarchies, and ideologies embedded in language use (Fairclough, 1992). In classroom discourse, repair is not merely about correcting faults; it also reflects the teacher's power in shaping discourse, whether direct or indirect, which influences classroom interaction, student confidence, and motivation. For instance, a teacher's harsh or extreme correction may discourage students, while supportive repair strategies can foster more positive interactions.

8. Classification of Repair Strategies in Classroom Discourse

In educational settings, the following are the major repair strategies used by university teachers, directly or indirectly:

1. "Clarification requests": the teacher asks the students to illuminate their mistake, using this type of correction prompts the students to self-correct by requesting clarification (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). For example:

"Teacher: Could you say that again? Or what do you mean by that?"

The purpose: here, the teacher inspires student self-awareness and independent learning.

2. "Recasts way ": By correcting students' mistakes subtly.

Here, the teacher reformulates the student's utterance without stating the mistake (Long, 1996). For instance :

Student: "She don't like coffee."

Teacher: "She doesn't like coffee."

The purpose, this subtle direct correction to promote implicit learning.

3. Explicit correction: directly correcting mistakes. This a common way states by the teacher to correct form after making mistake (Ellis, 2009). For instance, the teacher asked the student to give him a sentence in the present tense

"Student: He go to the market."

Teacher: "No, we say 'He goes to the market.'"

The usage of this type of correction may discourage student confidence if overused.

4. Elicitation, prompting students to self-correct. The teacher delivers explanations, questions, and hints about the nature of the mistakes without direct correction (Walsh, 2011). For instance, the teacher asks the student to give an example in subject agreement.

Student: "He go to school."

Teacher: "Think about subject-verb agreement."

The purpose: here, the teacher gives a chance to encourage analytical thinking and self-correction.

5. Paraphrasing and Repetition": The teacher repeats or rephrases the student's utterance by emphasising the correct form. For example:

Student: Yesterday, I go to park.

Teacher: Oh, you went to the park yesterday?

The function: Highlights correct structures through repetition.

6. Body Language Repair Strategies: The teacher uses gestures, facial expressions, or writing to indicate errors. (Walsh, 2011). For instance:

"Raising an eyebrow or pointing at a verb chart to prompt self-correction."

The purpose: here, the teacher makes the student less intrusive and enables them to recognise their mistake independently.

9. The significance of repair in interaction discourse

According to Jefferson (1987), the consequence of repair in retaining discourse coherence is mentioned. He introduces a distinction between self-initiated repair (where the speaker directly corrects his mistake) and other-initiated repair (where another speaker mediates). This repair is a foundational structure that is often used in classroom discourse for examining the teacher's role in managing communication encounters. In addition, repair strategies are vital for increasing student understanding through classroom interaction. Schegloff et al. (1977), focus on the role of taxonomy repair, the self-repair over other-repair in interactions, as a principle that reverberates with the classroom setting. Through this tactic, the teachers often encourage students to identify and correct their own mistakes. Concerning Koshik (2002), discoveres "how intentionally incomplete utterances prompt self-repair among students, which improves their learning independence". Likewise, Seedhouse (2004, p. 23) discovers that "teachers use repairs not only to address errors but also to guide students' attention to specific linguistic forms".

Finally, teachers apply repairs not just to address linguistic mistakes, but also to explain difficult subject matter and inspire critical thinking (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). Besides, Repair strategies vary depending on related factors such as subject matter, interaction type, and student ability. For instance, Walsh (2011) classifies differences in repair strategies between "teacher-fronted lectures" and cooperative discussions, signifying that repair functions as a dual purpose of keeping clarity and enhancing student engagement.

10. Gender Differences in Repair Strategies

Gender is considered a major factor in conversational style, specifically when teachers use repair strategies in classroom discourse. Lakoff's (1975, p. 56) view that women are "more likely to be attentive to others' responses and to question their own speech". Female students are more motivated to be involved in "self-repair" or seek clarification. Brown and Levinson highlight that "politeness strategies are more frequently adopted by women, who tend to avoid imposing or embarrassing the speaker. In other words, 'Face-threatening acts are often redressed by women through indirectness and positive politeness" (Brown and Levinson, 1987, p. 61).

Tannen (1990) states that "for many women, talk is a way to establish rapport; for many men, it is a way to negotiate status, which can influence how they use correction strategies"(Tannen, 1990, p. 25). Likewise, Holmes (1995) notices that female speakers have a tendency to use more supportive

language and explicit forms of repair: for instance, "Women are more likely to mitigate face-threatening acts with hedges and supportive feedback" (Holmes, 1995, p. 2).

According to Mills (2003, p. 87), in classroom discourse, structures were preferred to be used by female teachers quickly, such as "Are you sure that's right?" instead of direct corrections. Mills supports this view that women's speech often reflects a greater concern for how they are perceived, foremost to more frequent self-monitoring and correction. By contrast, Coates notes that "men tend to use language to assert power and control over the conversation," which can be revealed in direct repairs: "That's wrong, it should be...". (Coates, 2013, p. 115). See table (1), which summarises some ways based on gender differences.

Table (1): Gender Differences in the Use of Repair Strategies

Aspect	Male Teachers/Students	Female Teachers/Students
Use of Direct Repair	Tend to use more explicit, direct corrections (e.g., "That's wrong, it should be...")	More likely to use indirect or polite repair (e.g., "Are you sure?" or "Let's try that again")
Interactional Style	May use authoritative or factual tones	Often use collaborative, supportive tones
Response to Correction	May respond defensively or with brief acceptance	More likely to show elaboration or seek further clarification
Feedback Style	Focus on accuracy and clarity	Focus on the relationship and encouragement

Methodology

11.1 Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative method based on Conversation Analysis (CA). The samples were gathered during the lectures, through observation and audio recordings. Transcripts were submitted based on the Jeffersonian conventions model (2004). The following steps are used in the analysis

1. Observation: The researchers took screen recordings of EFL classroom tasks were utilised to collect visual data on teaching and learning dynamics. The interactions that happened among the students at the second and third levels and their instructors during direct lectures were documented, supplemented by an observational checklist. This step aimed to capture instances of repair strategies initiated by the instructor.

2. Note-taking by the researchers to assign the student utterances during lectures was transcribed to enable detailed analysis of conversational exchanges, including teacher-student and peer-to-peer

dialogues. This procedure helped to give a rough understanding of repair devices within real classroom discourse.

3. The samples of this study were spoken discourse that restricted repair phenomena stated by lecturers in the Department of English at the College of Basic Education. Each lecture takes 45 minutes on various subjects such as phonetics, grammar, conversation, and linguistics.

4. Ethical considerations, the students were informed about the study's aims and the protection of their privacy and were promised their names would not be mentioned throughout the study. The students were 40 students, males and females, at the age (19–21, and four lecturers, two male and two female, during the first course (2025-2026).

11.2 Data Collection and Procedure

1. The researchers were recording the voices of classroom interactions, which capture the real-time through lecture, focusing on repair sequences used by the lecturers.

2. Then the speech which recoded transcribed into graphic letters to be analysed later on based on the Jeffersonian conventions model (2004).

3. Furthermore, the researchers notice and take notes which support the analysis, such as verbal cues and interactional patterns i.e body language.

11.3 Model of Analysis

This study adopts a qualitative discourse analysis approach, examining recorded classroom interactions using Schegloff et al.'s (1977) repair framework and insights from CDA. Additionally, the analysis focuses on the following areas:

a. Identifying repair strategies used by teachers.

b. Classifying repairs accord

ing to their function (e.g., explicit versus implicit correction).

In addition, the data transcription is based on Jeffersonian transcription conventions to capture micro-details (pauses, overlaps, stress, etc.) in other words, the recorded interactions were transcribed following Jefferson's (2004) transcription conventions, which capture pauses, overlaps, intonation, and other interactional features critical for analysing repair. Transcripts were then closely examined to identify instances of repair, their initiation types, sequential placement, and resolution patterns. See table (Jefferson, 2004, p. 17) represents the Jeffersonian model.

Table (2): Jeffersonian Model of Transcription Symbols

11.4. Data Analysis

This section presents a micro-analysis of examples where students' speech is recoded through interactions that reflect repair sequences at the University's second and third classes. The focus is on the interactional structure of each repair, the type and initiator, and the function it serves in classroom discourse. The examples were selected from various subfields: phonetics, syntax, linguistics, and conversation. Each excerpt is transcribed using simplified Jeffersonian conventions to capture overlapping speech, pauses, and self-corrections.

Symbol	Sense
(.)	Micropause (less than 0.2 seconds)
(0.5)	Timed pause (in seconds)
:	syllable lengthening (e.g., so:: rry)
↑ / ↓	Pitch rise or fall
=	Latching (no pause between turns)
[/]	Overlapping speech (brackets mark overlap)
.hh / hh	In-breath / out-breath
Underlining	Emphasis on the word or syllable
?	Rising intonation (usually a question or check)
-	Cut-off or self-interruption

11.5 The Analysis

This section includes real examples of repair sequences recorded from the two levels (second and third) at the University of Mosul / Basic Education /Department of English. Each example includes a transcript of the interaction between the lecturer and his students. excerpt, each speech will be analysed according to repair type according to (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1977), to identify the types of repair used by the lecturer in the lecture. The examples focus on various subjects such as linguistics, grammar, phonetics and conversation.

The following speeches are chosen to be the data analysis in various subjects:

Example (1) in Grammar

The context: the classroom at university, the participants: (T / S1 / S2)and the material includes the teacher asking students about past events to practice the formula of the simple past tense.

Transcript:

1. T: So, yesterday, what *did* you do?
2. S1: I go to the library and *study* for the exam.
3. T: (slight pause) You *go*? Or you *went*?
4. S1: I *went* to the library and studied for the exam.
5. T: Good. Remember, we use *went* because it's the past tense.
6. S2: Yesterday, I *watch* a movie with friends.
7. T: You *watch* or *watched*?
8. S2: I *watched* a movie with friends.
9. T: Excellent.

Table (3): Repair Sequences Analysis

Line	Type of Repair	Initiator	Repair Sequence Type	Explanation
3-4	Other-Initiated Self-Repair (OISR)	Teacher	Teacher initiates repair by prompting student to correct; the student self-repairs	When the teacher notices students' mistake about the past tense of the verb "go". The teacher directly asked the student to repeat the verb and gave him self-correction "went."
7-8	Other-Initiated Self-Repair (OISR)	Teacher	Teacher initiates repair; student self-repairs	The teacher repeats the incorrect verb "watch" as a question, prompting the student to self-correct to "watched."

Discussion

The above table shows that the repair sequences are Other-Initiated and Self-Repair (OISR), when the teacher recognises the student's mistake, he started to use his authority by giving the student time to produce the corrected form independently. And guide the student towards the correct answer. These tactic function to achieve accuracy, interactional flow, and provide corrective feedback which encourages the students to self-correct. The teacher makes a slight pause and rising his voice (intonation) as in the example above ("You go? Or you went?"), highlighting the mistake indirectly

without explicit correction. This way encourages students to self-monitor and self-correct to get more effective knowledge.

Example (2) Grammar Repair (Subject-Verb Agreement)

The subject: subject agreement.

The teacher examines the students' comprehension by asking them to describe their daily routines.

Transcript:

1.T: Can you tell me what time you get up in the morning?

2.S: I *gets* up at 7 o'clock every day.

3.T: You *gets* or *get*?

4.S: I *get* up at 7 o'clock. on the morning

5.T: Yes, remember we say "I get" not "I gets ", and **in** not **on** See table (4)

Table (4): The Analysis of Repair Sequences

Line	Type of Repair	Initiator	Repair Sequence Type	Explanation
3-4	Other-Initiated Self-Repair (OISR	Teacher	Teacher initiates repair; student self-corrects	The teacher notices that the student used the incorrect verb form "gets", and the preposition (on), then the teacher initiates to prompts correction. The student repairs the error by producing the correct verb "get."

Discussion

The above table illustrates that the teacher uses a rising intonation to highlight the incorrect verb "gets," encouraging the student to self-monitor and correct. This indirect repair helps learner assurance and highlights grammar rules within real interaction.

Example (3) in Grammar (Tense Correction)

Here, the teacher is checking students' responses in a speaking activity about past experiences through their daily life.

1. S: Yesterday, I *go* to the museum with my friends.

2. T: You *go*? Actually, it's *went* — "Yesterday, I went to the museum."

3. S: Oh, yes, I *went* to the museum.

Table (5) : The Analysis of Repair Sequences

Line	Repair Type	Initiator	Repair Sequence Type	Explanation
2	Other-Initiated Other-Repair (OIOR)	Teacher	The teacher started and offered direct correction	Explicit repair: the teacher corrects the student's wrong tense form by providing the precise form.
3	Self-Repair (following teacher correction)	Student	Student repeats correct form	The student acknowledges the teacher's correction.

Discussion

The teacher notices the incorrect past tense "go" instead of "went." He directly corrects the mistake by supplying the right form rather than asking the student to self-correction. This approach is commonly used when the teacher believes the learner might not be able to self-correct independently, particularly in lower-intermediate contexts. Although this method is less conducive to learner autonomy than self-repair, it ensures immediate accuracy and clearly models correct forms.

Example (4) in the Conversation-Based Repair Sequence

Example (4) in conversation: the subject making a request.

Context: During a discussion, a student's response is unclear.

Transcript:

1.S: Yesterday, I was very busy because I had to *prepare* many thing for

my project.

2.T: Many *thing*? Do you mean *things*?

3.S: Yes, many *things*.

4.T: Okay, good.

Table (6): The Analysis of Repair Sequences

Line	Type of Repair	Initiator	Repair Sequence Type	Explanation
(2-3)	Other-Initiated Self-Repair (OISR)	Teacher	Teacher initiates repair; student self-corrects	The teacher detects an ungrammatical noun phrase "many thing" and requests clarification. The student self-corrects to plural form "things."

Discussion

The above table shows the meaning and grammatical correctness. The teacher uses indirect repair and frames as a question, which helps preserve the student's face and encourages learner participation.

Example(5) in Conversation

Context: The teacher asks students to describe their favourite hobby.

T = Teacher
S = Student

Transcript:

1. T: What is your favorite hobby?
2. S: My favorite hobby is *cooking* because I like to make many *food*.
3. T: Many *food*? Do you mean *foods* or *dishes*?
4. S: Ah, yes, I mean many *dishes*.
5. T: Great! So you like to prepare many different *dishes*.
6. S: Yes, I love to cook different dishes.

Table (7): The Analysis of Repair Sequences

Line	Type of Repair	Initiator	Repair Sequence Type	Explanation
3-4	Other-Initiated Self-Repair (OISR)	Teacher	Teacher signals a problem with vocabulary; student self-corrects	The teacher notices the uncountable noun "food" used incorrectly with "many," and asks the student to choose the correct countable noun. The student self-corrects to "dishes."

Discussion

Table (7) shows that the teacher noticed a problem with the student's word choice; he initiates the repair by repeating the incorrect phrase with a question intonation and offering choices. This type of repair is implicit and supportive, due to the teacher gives the student time to choose another from, promoting engagement and learning without embarrassment. Using vocabulary repair enhances students' lexical knowledge and accuracy in classroom discourse.

Example (6) in Conversation

The subject: the teacher asks the student (What did you do yesterday?). The Student replied by using an incorrect synonyms words during a class discussion, and the teacher facilitates this mistake by correcting them in form of question.

Transcript:

1. S1: Yesterday, I was very **exhausted** after studying for the exam.
2. T: **Exhausted**? Do you mean *exhausting*?
3. S1: No, I mean I was very *tired*.
4. T: Ah, yes, *tired* fits better here because *exhausted* means very tired, but *exhausting* means something that makes you tired.
5. S1: Thank you, I understand now.

Table (8): The Analysis of Repair Sequences

Line	Repair Type	Initiator	Repair Sequence Type	Explanation
2-3	Other-Initiated Self-Repair (OISR)	Teacher	Teacher initiates repair; student self-corrects	Teacher questions the use of "exhausted," prompting clarification and self-correction.
4	Other-Initiated Other-Repair (OIOR)	Teacher	The teacher explains the difference between "exhausted" and "exhausting"	The teacher provides a detailed semantic explanation to clarify vocabulary use.

Discussion

The above table shows another type of repair sequences. The student explains his daily action by saying words not fit the exact meaning of what he means. He used the lexical word "exhausted", and the teacher initiates repair by questioning the student using another word which fits the meaning "tired". Then the teacher elaborates the semantic difference between "exhausted" (adjective describing a feeling) and "exhausting" (adjective describing something causing tiredness). This repair not only corrects lexical vocabulary, but also expands the student's lexical knowledge which promotes a deeper understanding rather than simple correction, aiding long-term learning.

Example (7) in Phonetics.

The context: Teacher corrects a student's pronunciation of a word during a classroom discussion.

Transcript:

1. S1: I like to *receeve* many emails every day.
2. T: *Receeve*? Do you mean *receive*?
3. S1: Ah, yes, *receive*.
4. T: Good. Remember, it's pronounced /rɪˈsiːv/.

Table (9): The Analysis of Repair Sequences

Line	Repair Type	Initiator	Repair Sequence Type	Explanation
2-3	Other-Initiated Self-Repair (OISR)	Teacher	Teacher initiates repair; student self-corrects	The teacher signals incorrect pronunciation and prompts the student to correct. Student self-repairs pronunciation.
4	Other-Initiated Other-Repair (OIOR)	Teacher	The teacher provides explicit pronunciation correction	Teacher models correct pronunciation to reinforce learning.

Discussion

The teacher observes a pronunciation mistake ("receeve" instead of "receive") and starts to correct it by asking the student to pronounce it again. The student consciously corrects it and gives a phonetic spelling for reinforcement. This repair process helps students to enhance their phonological accuracy and develop listening and speaking skills without threatening, i.e politely encouraging the students to participate actively without feeling embarrassed.

Example (8) in Linguistics

The Context: the third class at the linguistics subject attempts to define "phoneme," but confuses it with "morpheme."

Transcript:

1. **S1:** A phoneme is the smallest unit of meaning in a word.
2. **T:** Not quite. That's a *morpheme*. A *phoneme* is the smallest unit of *sound*.
3. **S1:** Oh yes, phoneme is about *sound*, not *meaning*.
4. **T:** Exactly like /p/ and /b/ they change sound, not meaning directly.

Table (10): The Analysis of Repair Sequences

Line	Repair Type	Initiator	Repair Sequence Type	Explanation
2	Other-Initiated Other-Repair (OIOR)	Teacher	The teacher corrects the student's misuse of a technical term	The teacher provides full and immediate correction of the linguistic definition.
3	Uptake / Confirmation	Student	Student reformulates after correction	indicates learning and clarification of the concept.

Discussion

Table (10) illustrates another type of repair is educative and content-specific, commonly used in linguistics lectures. The teacher directly corrects the students' misunderstanding about the concept "phoneme" which is considered a core subject in studying linguistics. Such repairs enhance the knowledge of the student and ensure a theoretical accuracy in explaining language discourse in an easy way that supports their background about discourse concepts.

Example (9) in Linguistics

The topic Semantics (Word Meaning)

Context: The teacher discusses a subject in the third class in a linguistic course, about the meaning of a polysemous concept.

The topic "the meaning of the lexical word (bank).

 Transcript:

1. S: The word *"bank"* always means the place where we keep money.
2. T: Always? What about *"the river bank"*? What does the word bank mean?
3. S: Ah, yes! *Bank* can also mean the side of a river.
4. T: Exactly *bank* is polysemous. Two related meanings, in different contexts.

Table (11): The Analysis of Repair Sequences

Line	Repair Type	Initiator	Sequence Type	Function
2–3	Other-Initiated Self-Repair (OISR)	Teacher	Teacher prompts repair with a counterexample	Raises awareness of polysemy and lexical nuance

Discussion

Table (11) shows that the teacher uses new repair, led questioning, and guides the students to revise their answers about the lexical meaning of "bank." Showing a deeper conceptual understanding of the concept of polysemy, and how a particular word can convey several meanings, depending on contextual meanings. Besides, such repairs are useful in the semantics subject to address vagueness, meaning shifts and ambiguity.

In conclusion, the examples which were analysed determine the variety of repair sequences employed by teachers at university-levels such as linguistics, conversation, phonetics and grammar. these repairs are used not just to correct mistakes or misunderstanding, but to support deeper understanding, promote meta-awareness, and guide students towards learning language in various subjects. Finally, the teacher's role as an initiator of repair becomes instrumental tool in facilitating students weakness , and socially communication.

12. Conclusions

The following are the main conclusions of the present study:

1. Throughout the classroom interactions, the researchers saw that most university instructors confirmed indirect repair tactics. Function as enhancement tools for students' confidence and encourage continuous influence without affecting the movement of the interaction or causing embarrassment throughout the lecture. Such repair sequences help in maintaining discourse coherence and interactional smoothness within the classroom context**.**

2. Some instructors use explicit repair to offer clear and speedy correction in linguistics, grammar, phonetics and conversation about students' mistakes during classroom discourse, which is based on accuracy, and is central to the learning process.

3. At times, instructors employed repetition-based repair tactics, wherein the correct form was directly repeated following the student's response. This repetition was often supplemented by stress or intonation shifts and covered through gestural language, such as facial expressions, raising eyebrows, which effectively drew the student's attention to the mistakes and their correction.

4. During these interactional repair sequences, the researchers observed that instructors often encouraged other students to correct the mistake made by their peers, promoting a sense of cooperative learning. This indirect correction not only reduced the focus on the individual mistake but also enhanced peer participation and revealed patterns of student dominance and cooperative engagement within the classroom discourse.

5. It has been observed that instructors employ positive humour, using a gentle or soft tone or affirmative feedback either before or after making corrections, to lessen tension and maintain rapport with their students. This approach is often recognised through motivational expressions, smiling or helpful facial expressions, and body language. Using these strategies helps create a more comfortable and cooperative atmosphere for engagement in the discourse classroom.

6. Gender appeared as important dynamic in repair sequences. Female teachers were more likely to use indirectness and supportive forms of discourse through repairing mistakes. Such as clarification requests and recasts, which fostered a cooperative learning environment. While, male teachers tended to use direct corrections, aggressive tone in speaking reflecting a focus on accuracy and efficiency.

7. Finally, repair should be viewed as a dynamic and contextual sensitive part of educational discourse that contributes into effective knowledge at various subjects at university levels.

References

- Aitchison, J.(2003). Linguistics. Hachette United Kingdom.

-Bahar, A. (2019).A discourse analysis of repair in selected English

conversations. Journal of the University of Garmian. Vol.6, No.3: 246.

 https://doi.org/10.24271/garmian.196352

-Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language*

 usage. Cambridge University Press.

-Coates, J. (2013). *Women, men and language: A sociolinguistic account of*

 gender differences in language (3rd ed.). Routledge.

-Coulthard, R. (1975). *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English Used*

  by Teachers and Pupils. Oxford University Press.

-Cazden, C. (2001). *Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and*

 Learning (2nd ed.). Heinemann.

-Ellis, R. (2009). *Corrective feedback and teacher development. L2 Journal,*

  1(1), 3-18.

-Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*.

-Falson, R. (2006). An Introduction to Language and Linguistics.

 Cambridge University Press.

-Gee, J. (1999). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*.

  Routledge.

-Hall, J. (2007). Redressing the roles of correction and repair in research on second and foreign language learning. Modern Language Journal, 91(4), 511–526.

-Hall, J. K., & Walsh, M. (2002). Teacher–student interaction and language

 learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 186–203.

-Heritage, J. (2005). Conversation analysis and institutional talk. In K.

-Hutchby, I. and Wooffitt, R. (2008) Conversation Analysis 2nd.

  Cambridge University.

-Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, men and politeness*. Longman.

-Khoddamy ,F.(2015). Turn Taking in Conversation Analysis.

International Journal of Educational Investigations.

www.ijeionline.com. Vol.2, No.6: 58-63, (June).

Maybod Branch, Islamic Azad University

 -Koshik, I. (2002). *Designedly Incomplete Utterances: A Pedagogical Strategy for Eliciting Self-Correction from L2 Learners.* TESOL Quarterly, 36(2), 279–302.

-Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and women's place*. Harper & Row.

-Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.

-Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37–66.

-Liddicoat, A. (2007). *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis*. New York.

-Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and politeness*. Cambridge University Press.

-Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1977). A simple systematics for the organisation of turn-taking in conversation. *Language*, 3(4), 361–382.

-Schegloff , E.(1990). Introduction and Questions for: On the Organization of Sequences as a Source of "Coherence" in Talk in Interaction.   US. New Jersey.

-Schegloff, E. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis*.

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

-Svennevig , J.(2008). Trying the easiest solution first in Other-Initiated of Repair. University of Oslo, Norway. City of Oslo

conversation. William Morrow.

-Verschueren, J. (1999). Understanding Pragmatics. Oxford University Press.

-Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Harvard University Press.

-Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action*.   Routledge