

Doing exposed correction in the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective

František Tůma
Masaryk University
tuma@phil.muni.cz

Nicola Fořtová
Masaryk University
fortova@phil.muni.cz

Abstract

Exposed correction can be seen as a tool whose use on the one hand temporarily stops the progressivity of the talk, but at the same time makes it possible for the speakers in interaction to clarify problems that have occurred, both in mundane conversation and institutional talk. Using conversation analysis, a dataset of 18 teaching hours (1585 minutes of video-recordings of whole-class work in total) was examined to identify and describe the practices used by learners and teachers in English as a foreign language (EFL) classrooms when conducting exposed correction. The analysis shows that in exposed correction sequences there seems to be a requirement for the learners to produce a reaction to teacher correction. While learners typically repeat the correct form after the teacher has corrected them in a correction sequence that the learners initiated by displaying trouble producing the target language form, teacher-initiated sequences tend to generate minimal post-expansion on the part of the learners. When no student response comes, the teacher may expand the correction sequence.

Keywords: conversation analysis; correction; repair; classroom interaction; English as a foreign language.

1. Introduction

It is of great interest to applied linguists as well as to language teachers and teacher educators how learners acquire and use language. Language production on the part of the learner may include some imperfections, such as clumsy or incomplete formulations, inappropriate word choices and errors. In foreign

language classrooms, it is one of the institutional tasks of language teachers to develop more accurate language production on the part of the learners, which can be done through correction.

Correction in classroom interaction can be analyzed from various perspectives in second language acquisition (SLA). From the wide range of theories and traditions (Ellis 2008) we select cognitivist and social traditions, which illustrate two distinct research perspectives. Researchers in the cognitivist traditions may build on the concept of interlanguage (Selinker 1972; see also Han and Tarone 2014) and, relatedly, employ error analysis (Corder 1975), in which language is viewed as knowledge “in the head” of the speaker or writer (Cook 2010). Similarly, researchers in the tradition of focus on form may concentrate on corrective feedback in the classroom (e.g. Lyster and Ranta 1997; Fu and Nassaji 2016). On the other hand, in social SLA the focal point may be repair and correction as actions that the speakers or writers perform in close coordination with each other in order to resolve misunderstanding or other troubles. From this perspective error (or trouble) is conceived as a social phenomenon and the use of language corresponds to social action (Cook 2010). Such studies may reveal the social and interactive aspects of language learning and language use (e.g. Firth and Wagner 2007). It is this latter perspective that we adopt in our study.

More specifically, we employ conversation analysis to explore how foreign language teachers and learners do correction in classroom interaction. We understand correction as one aspect of whole-class interaction through which teachers and learners perform the institutional tasks of teaching and learning a foreign language (Seedhouse 2004: 183). At the same time, we find it productive to study correction in classroom interaction, as speakers perform it in rather specific ways that may not occur in mundane conversation.

2. Conversation-analytic research on correction and repair

In conversation analysis, repair is one of the central concepts, as it denotes the procedure of the speakers’ dealing with some kind of trouble, which may include problems with production, reception or understanding. The actions that the speakers undertake in repair sequences may therefore reveal how they restore and maintain mutual understanding (Schegloff 2007: xiv), yet at the same time the repair and correction may hinder the progressivity of talk (Clift 2016: 232; see also Schegloff 1979: 278). In everyday conversation speakers typi-

cally repair word replacement, person reference and nextspeaker selection (Schegloff et al. 1977: 370). While repair is a more general term, as defined above, correction can be seen as repair in the narrow sense of the word: speakers in interaction may replace something that they perceive as wrong or problematic with something that they find more correct (Schegloff et al. 1977: 363). It should be pointed out that not all erroneous elements produced by speakers are actually corrected in interaction (Clift 2016: 232). If something is to be corrected, speakers may employ either embedded or exposed correction (Jefferson 1987), which means that they may either correct as the conversation continues or they may initiate a correction sequence and after that resume the conversation. In conversation-analytic research it is central to scrutinize how speakers produce the turns where errors occur, whether and how they indicate that there might be a problem and how the others respond to this, i.e. how they do the correction. Correction is therefore seen as social action and the aim of the analysis is to study the sequential unfolding of the correction sequence.

Although there seems to be an overlap between the above-mentioned conversation-analytic line of research and research on corrective feedback, these lines of research are distinct conceptually and methodologically (Fasel Lauzon and Pekarek Doehler 2013). While in the corrective feedback tradition researchers start by identifying errors and subsequent (non-)treatment of the errors in order to determine the effectiveness or distribution of the correction strategies, which may inform the understanding of how meanings and forms are negotiated and processed in the classrooms (e.g. Lyster and Ranta 1997), the conversation-analytic approach, which we adopt in this study, takes correction, i.e. the speakers' own orientation to rectifying something that has occurred in interaction, as a starting point. This, in turn, may inform the understanding of how speakers maintain intersubjectivity, how they (re)focus their attention and how they recruit help when a problem arises in interaction inside or outside institutional settings.

When speakers conduct repair or correction, who initiates the repair (i.e. the speaker – self-initiation, or the recipient – other-initiation) and who completes the sequence (e.g. Schegloff 2007: 100–106) can be distinguished. This way the trajectories of such sequences, as well as the resources that the speakers draw upon, can be studied. As speakers typically project and produce transition relevance places at the ends of their turns (Sacks et al. 1974; see also Selting 2000), there is a systematic possibility for speakers to self-correct within the same turn (Schegloff et al. 1977). Other possibilities include self

initiated other-repair, other-initiated self-repair and other-initiated other-repair (Kitzinger 2013; Clift 2016: 236–264).

Studies of institutional talk have shown that the practices that speakers use reflect the institutional goals and tasks as well as their roles within the institution (Drew and Heritage 1992; Heritage and Clayman 2010; Drew and Sorjonen 2011). One such instance is classroom interaction, in which teachers and learners do institutional tasks in order to achieve institutional goals. This results in a number of systematic differences between mundane conversation and classroom interaction (for a review of differences in turn-taking and repair see Markee 2000: 68–96). More specifically, McHoul's (1990) study of classroom interaction uncovered the important features of classroom correction sequences: they are commonly initiated by teachers, who typically do not explicitly accept or reject the answers but start "cluing", and thus the correction sequence can be completed by learners. The author has also shown that teachers tended to do other-correction when there was an error in pronunciation (McHoul 1990: 365). McHoul's study represents a starting point for many other studies. For example, Macbeth (2004) holds that McHoul's view is too narrow and proposes that classroom repair (in the wider sense, as defined above) should also be studied. Some other researchers have focused on second or foreign language contexts, for example by studying the development of the self-correction practices of one adult (Hellermann 2009), the role of gestures in repair initiation in conversational tutoring sessions (Seo and Koshik 2010) and the ways in which incomplete utterances on the part of a teacher can initiate correction (Koshik 2002). As the data for our study come from Czechia, we also find relevant other Czech conversation-analytic studies on code-switching and repair in English as a foreign language (EFL) lower-secondary classes (Tůma 2017b) as well as studies from higher education settings that focus on repair and correction in whole-class interaction in an EFL seminar (Tůma 2017a: 87–110) and in an English as a lingua franca environment (Hanusková 2019).

Relevant to our study is also Seedhouse's (2004) distinction between form-and-accuracy and meaning-and-fluency contexts, as it makes it possible to distinguish activities in which the teacher and the students focus on the language systems or on communication in the target language, which has some implications for the ways in which repair and correction sequences occur in frontal teaching.

Pekarek Doehler and Fasel Lauzon (2013) have showcased the strength of conversation-analytic research in illuminating the social processes that underlie teacher correction in French L2 classes, especially the focus of attention on the part of the teacher and students, which problematizes the notion of recast, as established in research on corrective feedback. The authors also present evidence to conclude that the precise sequential position of teachers' corrective feedback plays a key role in what happens in the interaction and how the correction is treated by the students (Fasel Lauzon and Pekarek Doehler 2013). Our study adds to this conversation-analytic line of research by addressing the problem of focus of attention on the part of teachers and students in English as a foreign language settings.

3. Data, participants and method

Our study builds on a dataset of 18 teaching hours taught by five different teachers in five different schools in Brno, Czechia, in autumn 2018. Before we began the recording process, we sat and observed each class for an hour and then informed the students of the purpose of our study, explained the data collection procedures and asked them to sign informed consent forms. With the learners who did not wish to be recorded we sensitively negotiated the next steps; we typically asked them to sit outside the camera foci and did not place voice-recorders onto their desks. We then recorded classroom interaction in three to five subsequent lessons. As non-participant observers we noticed that the learners and teachers quickly became accustomed to our presence as well as the recording equipment. There were no instructions regarding the content or activities in the lessons; our aim was to capture everyday classroom interaction.

The selection of schools and teachers was guided by the requirement for our sample to be heterogeneous, yet at the same time we wanted to collect data from comparable sites. We therefore decided to select three grammar schools and two other schools where some specializations are offered. Upper-secondary education in the selected types of schools finishes with the school-leaving (*maturita*) examination. When contacting schools and teachers, we drew on our network of graduates and colleagues and purposefully selected five teachers from the five schools who had Master's degrees in teaching English in upper-secondary schools and thus were fully qualified, who had been working in the school for at least three years and had taught the group/class for at least

two years. This ensured that the teachers knew the school environment and their students very well, and could therefore be comfortable with the groups and consistent in their performances.

In addition, due to various levels of EFL courses at different schools, we recorded classes in the final (fourth) grades, in which the students were supposed to have attained a minimum of a solid B1 level (*CEFR* 2001), which also corresponds to the level of the Czech state school-leaving examination in English. The teachers reported that the classes were between B1 and C1 levels (B1: programs in fine arts and economics; B2–C1: grammar schools).

Each class was recorded by using two video cameras: typically, one was placed at the back of the classroom and captured the teacher's activity, while the other focused on the students and was usually situated at the front. The primary data for our analysis were video recordings from the two cameras (1585 minutes in total). In addition, we placed several voice-recorders onto some desks to capture students' utterances. We also collected the copies of materials that the learners and teachers used during the lessons, such as worksheets and textbook activities. During the transcription and analysis we occasionally referred to the audio recordings (2729 minutes in total) and classroom materials in order to check the accuracy of the transcript or to get access to the prompts that the participants used.

We transcribed the video-recordings using the conventions of conversation analysis (see the Appendix). All names mentioned in the transcripts are pseudonyms.

When transcribing and reviewing the data we noticed that while the majority of lessons were communicatively focused, that is, the students were supposed to discuss some issues or solve problems in pairs or groups and then respond to teachers meaningfully, there were also many situations in which correction occurred. Therefore we assembled a collection of exposed correction and repair sequences from the video-recordings of whole-class work (for comprehensive and systematic data treatment see ten Have 2007: 147–149). Our collection comprised over 100 sequences in which the teachers and learners initiated and conducted repair and correction sequences. Within this collection there were many instances of teacher-initiated student-repair as well as instances of peer correction, of delayed correction after student presentations and of "organizational" repair, especially when the teachers gave instructions. In this study we build on a sub-collection of 15 instances of exposed teacher correction which followed immediately after student utterances. These sequences were either teacher- or student-initiated, as will be shown below. We

employed conversation-analytic procedures: after carrying out turn-by-turn analyses of individual sequences, we compared and contrasted the sequences in detail to explore the practices that the teachers and learners used during exposed correction sequences (for more details see ten Have 2007; Sidnell 2013).

4. Results

When analyzing the 15 sequences in which teachers conducted correction immediately after a student utterance, we realized that in the majority of sequences a student reaction followed, and when it did not follow, the teachers enforced it by expanding the correction sequence. At the same time we realized that the ways the speakers conducted the correction of pronunciation, grammatical and lexical problems were sequentially very similar within our sub-collection. Therefore we present the findings according to the sequential organization of the correction sequences in our sub-collection. First, we analyze the most common type of correction sequences, in which the learner who produced the incorrect utterance repeated the correct form after the teacher. Second, we present the way that students produced a minimal reaction to the correction. Finally, we show that a student reaction is normatively required in exposed correction sequences by analyzing instances in which student responses to the exposed correction were absent.

4.1. Teacher correction followed by learner repetition

It was common in our data that after the teacher correction the students repeated the correct form, as shown in the following examples. The first extract comes from a lesson in which the learners were working with new lexis related to finance. The learners had read a gapped text and their task was to insert the new vocabulary items into the gaps. In the sequence set down below the teacher is conducting open class feedback. Mirka is asked to read the first sentence from the text. She has problems pronouncing the word *relative*, which is subsequently modelled by the teacher.

Extract 1 (Gymn3hod4K1, 07:28)

1 Tea: so we'll read the text together (.) with the parts
 2 or extracts (.) inserted in the text (.) and then
 3 we'll talk about the text.
 4 ((somebody coughs))
 5 Tea: Mirka, could you start reading please.
 6 (0.8)
 7 Mir: the unhappy answer to whether or not your happiness
 8 expands in line with your wealth is yes, but, no but
 9 e:r it's seems it does er: if (.) you:r riches rise
 10 </releitif/>
 11 (0.9)
 12 Mir: [to]
 13 Tea:→[re]lative=
 14 Mir: =/relativ/ e:h to that of the Joneses?=
 15 T: =mhm

Having started reading the text from the textbook (lines 7–9), Mirka encounters the word *relative*, which she reads as /releitif/ (line 10). By using try-marked intonation and also by pronouncing the word slightly more slowly than the rest of her previous turn she indicates that she has problems pronouncing the word. This way she initiates the correction sequence. Unfortunately, the position in which Mirka is seated does not make it possible for us to analyze her eye-gaze, yet the position of her head remains the same in lines 7–14. Despite that, the pause that follows (line 11) confirms the above interpretation – Mirka has displayed uncertainty about the pronunciation of the word “relative” that she was reading and stopped reading the text. As no correction comes, she resumes reading. However, the teacher starts modelling the correct pronunciation of the word in an overlap with Mirka’s turn (line 13), thus doing correction. Mirka immediately repeats the word (line 14), by which she concludes the correction sequence, and continues reading.

While Extract 1 shows how pronunciation was corrected by the teacher in an activity in which both the student and the teacher focused their attention on form-and-accuracy (i.e. reading a text out loud to check answers), the following extract shows how the teacher corrected pronunciation in a more meaning-and-fluency oriented activity. Before the sequence in Extract 2 the students

were instructed to ask their peers about how they relate to culture. In Extract 2 the students are reporting to the class.

The teacher has nominated Martina, who says that she has talked to Barča, who reads horrors. The pronunciation of this word becomes problematic for Martina.

Extract 2 (Ekon1hod1K2, 29:59)

- 1 Mar: +em: I have Barča,
+looks down at her notes
- 2 (0.5)
- 3 Tea: ehe,
- 4 (0.4)
- 5 Mar: she reads /horro+;↑::/=
+looks ahead and then down
- 6 Tea:→=okay horrors![ehe]
- 7 Mar: +[\$horr]or\$ °horrors° ((exaggerates))
+looks at Barča and down
- 8 [((laughter in class))]
- 9 Tea: [ehe]
- 10 (1.1) ((some students keep laughing))
- 11 Mar: eh+
+tilts head slightly and looks at Tea
- 12 Tea: okay- okay, fair enough I see that you've got a book
13 there as well is it any good?

Martina starts looking down at her notes and feeds back to the class that the student she has spoken to – Barča – reads horrors (line 5). Whilst trying to pronounce the word *horrors*, Martina stumbles on the second syllable, which she prolongs significantly with rising intonation and during which she gazes ahead, towards the teacher, briefly. By doing this she indicates that she is having problems saying the word and clearly shifts her attention to the spoken form of the word. Her eye-gaze towards the teacher can then be interpreted as an attempt to recruit his help. Indeed, latching on to the end of Martina's pronunciation the teacher models the correct pronunciation (line 6), and Martina then repeats the word twice with an amused tone of voice and exaggerated pronunciation (line 7), which confirms the interpretation that she focuses on the spoken form of the word and which also results in laughter in class (lines

8–10). After that Martina looks down at her notes again. The teacher acknowledges Martina's correct pronunciation of the word (line 9) and after a short pause, Martina produces a hesitation sound and establishes eye-contact with the teacher (line 11), who then continues whole-class feedback by directing a question to another student in the class (lines 12–13).

Whilst Extracts 1 and 2 above capture teacher correction focused on pronunciation that was triggered by students who recruited the teachers' assistance, Extract 3 provides an example of teacher correction of grammar. Prior to the sequence in Extract 3, the students were speaking in pairs and answering questions from the coursebook on the topic of art and paintings. In the following sequence the teacher is conducting open class feedback on the activity and asks two students, Míša and Lucy, to ask and answer a question from the activity in front of the class. Míša asks Lucy whether she agrees that art should not be locked away in galleries. Lucy replies saying that she agrees. When she tries to justify her opinion, Lucy has trouble formulating that she does not go to galleries.

Extract 3 (Ekonom1hod2K2 35:19)

- 1 Tea: okay e:r moving on e:
 2 (0.6)
 3 Míša
 4 (1.1) ask (away) (1.3) read the second,
 5 Míš: \$°co sme° okhay\$ e \$Lucy\$ hheh, °mám se zeptat (tebe hh)?°
 what have we shall I ask you
 6 +e: do you agree thats (.) art eh shouldn't (0.5) e: be
 +Lucy looks down
 7 /lokit/ away in gallery? why? or why °not°
 8 Luc: <yes I eh agree with (.) that,>
 9 (1.1)
 10 <<because>> (1.2) <I usually eh (0.5) didn't go (1.1)
 11 °the (gallery?)°> +hhh=
 +looks ahead towards Tea
 12 Tea:→=you usually don't go [to to galleries]
 13 Luc: [+don't go to] galleries
 + nods, looks at Tea
 14 (0.5)
 15 Tea: ehe ehe is there anyone who does?
 16 do you guys go to galleries?

As soon as Míša starts asking a question, Lucy starts gazing down at her notes. In answer to Míša's question about whether art should not be locked away in galleries (lines 6–7), Lucy then agrees with this statement (line 8). After a pause (line 9) Lucy justifies why she agrees (line 10), while still looking down. After some hesitation after the word “because” (line 10) Lucy, more slowly in tempo, begins to say what she usually does. She produces “I usually didn't go to the gallery” with hearable difficulties (lines 10–11). Through hesitation and pausing (line 10) and the softening of her voice to the point where the utterance in line 11 is almost inaudible, plus sighing after she has finished speaking, Lucy looks up and starts gazing towards the teacher. This can be analyzed as an expression of uncertainty and, at the same time, a projection of a transition relevance place while turning to the teacher, thus potentially selecting him. The teacher in the next turn corrects Lucy's utterance (line 12), which indicates that he has interpreted her production as initiation of a correction sequence. Lucy, in an overlap with the end of the teacher's correction, repeats the correct part of the utterance with the correct use of the verb tense and the object (line 13), during which she nods and thereby also acknowledges the acceptance of the teacher's correction and completes the correction sequence.

Extracts 1–3, above, show typical examples of teacher correction sequences triggered by the learner. In all these instances prolonging some sounds of the problematic word and using pauses and hesitation sounds indicated that the learners focused their attention onto the target form. In Extracts 2 and 3 the students also observably turned to the teacher, who was thereby selected as the next speaker to do the correction. This joint (shift of) focus of attention on the correct form occasioned the subsequent repetition of the problematic part of the utterance by the learner who initiated the sequence.

4.2. Teacher correction followed by minimal post-expansion

There was another group of correction sequences which were completed by the teacher and which were further expanded by the teacher or by the learner. One such example is Extract 4, in which the teacher is asking the learners about their results in a job-related questionnaire. The questionnaire had several sections which differed in thematic focus and which were distinguished by different colours. In Extract 4 Pavel is discussing his results and the teacher corrects the way he reports on his score.

Extract 4 (Gymn1hod2K2, 42:56)

- 1 Pav: so yeah but I +think the blue one is like (probably
+sits straight and looks at Tea
2 the most) right=
3 Tea: =mhm and do- do you have the *most tick °in the blue°?=
*looks at Pav
4 ((points at the book))
5 Pav: =in three (.) from four
6 Tea:→*three out of four (.) [mhm]
*looks at her textbook and then ahead
7 Pav: [yeah]
8 Tea: alright ehm (0.7) I have eh one not the homework
9 >because you're going to start with it now,<

The teacher asks a clarification question in which she checks whether Pavel ticked the majority of boxes in the blue section of the questionnaire (lines 3–4). As Pavel is seated in the corner, the teacher turns towards him as she poses the question. Pavel responds by reporting the exact number (“in three from four”, line 5). So far both the teacher and Pavel have been focusing on the results of the questionnaire, i.e. on meaning. Nonetheless, the teacher then corrects Pavel’s response (“three out of four”, line 6). However, she does not look at Pavel when doing the correction, which results in an ambiguous action: the teacher, on the one hand, corrects Pavel’s utterance, by which she focuses her attention on the correct form, on the other hand, by looking down and at the class, the teacher closes the exchange with Pavel and thus her “three out of four (.) mhm” can be heard as an acknowledgement of Pavel’s response, thus retaining the focus on meaningful communication. Pavel, in turn, produces “yeah” (line 7), which is a minimal post-expansion of the correction sequence (Schegloff 2007: 118–127), by which he confirms the teacher’s acknowledgement and, at the same time, he contributes to the closing of the sequence. This interpretation is also visible in the teacher’s following turn, as she brings the sequence to a close and starts another activity (lines 8–9).

There are three sequences in our collection which were produced by the speakers like the one in Extract 4. What they all have in common is that the students produced their initial turns with confidence, and thus, unlike in the sequences in section 4.1, their turns could not be heard as initiations of correction sequences, as the students’ attention was focused on meaning, like Pavel’s in Extract 4. Despite this the teachers corrected the utterances in the following

turns, and the students in all three sequences produced “yeah” as minimal post-expansion, by which the correction sequences were closed.

4.3. Expansion of the correction

The analyses of the excerpts in sections 4.1 and 4.2 support the claim that when correction is done by the teacher in an exposed way, the students typically respond to it, either by repeating the correct utterance or by producing a sequence closing third. When such response to the correction does not occur, the teacher may expand the correction. The following excerpt captures a sequence in which the teacher is conducting open class feedback on an activity where the learners had to match the definition and job. The pronunciation of the word “plumber” becomes a source of trouble and the teacher further expands the correction sequence.

The teacher asks a student to say the word that is visualized in the textbook, thereby focusing on the spoken form of the word. The student says the word *plumber*, but mispronounces it (line 4), which is corrected by the teacher (line 6) after a pause. What follows is another pause (line 7), in whose position a student may repeat the correct form if he or she hears the utterance as correction (see also section 4.1) or produce minimal post-expansion if he or she hears the teacher’s utterance as an acknowledgement of their response (see section 4.2). As no such response comes in line 7, the teacher repeats the word again and asks Bětka to write the word on the board (lines 8–9) and invites all the students to think about the correct way of pronouncing the word, as it causes trouble to the majority of them (lines 12–15). The teacher then asks Robert to read the word for the whole class (line 17) and Robert does so. The teacher then accepts the word by repeating it and then further elicits the “rule” for pronouncing the word by producing a designedly incomplete utterance (Koshik 2002). After Robert finishes the rule (“plumber is pronounced without /bi:/”, lines 21–23), the teacher repeats the answer and the word again, and then closes the correction sequence by starting a new activity (line 25). It follows that there seems to be a requirement that learners somehow respond to the exposed correction by the teacher. As no such response comes in line 7, the teacher starts expanding the correction in line 8 by inviting a learner to write the word on the board, to pronounce it and to complete the rule for the pronunciation of a silent letter, thus focusing the learners’ attention on the spoken form.

Extract 5 (Gymn1hod1K2, 16:09)

1 Tea: mhm a:nd the job you already have a picture with it,
 2 so.
 3 (0.5)
 4 (): /plambə/,
 5 (0.6)
 6 Tea:→plumber
 7 (0.4)
 8 yeah, plumber. .hh ((clears throat)) ehm Bětká could
 9 you please again write eh the word on the board,
 10 (1.9) ((Tea puts a marker onto a desk))
 11 ((Bět comes to the board))
 12 Tea: a:nd everybody think about how to pronounce it
 13 because you always pronounce it
 14 in [a- in an incorrect way, (.) (most of you)]
 15 [((Bět starts writing on the board))]
 16 (4.3) ((Tea looks at Bět, who finishes writing))
 17 Tea: okay Robert read the word [for us]
 18 [((Bět goes back to her seat))]
 19 Rob: plumber
 20 (0.7)
 21 Tea: plumber (0.2) without (.) Rob (.) without,
 22 (0.7) ((the class becomes noisy as Bět sits down))
 23 Rob: without /bi:/=
 24 Tea: =without /bi:/ wonderful. mhm plumber. (.) okay
 25 ehm (1.0) now can you see the highlighted words?

The next example further confirms the above observation. The excerpt comes from the end of the lesson and the teacher asks the students what they have learnt during it. In addition to mentioning some language-related content (e.g. the past perfect tense), Petra mentions that her classmate, Domča, is “always on the time”, which is then corrected by the teacher, but not taken up linguistically by the learners.

Having been nominated by the teacher to answer what she has learnt in the lesson (line 1), Petra says that she has learnt that her classmate (Domča, who is seated in the back row, behind Petra) is always “on the time” (line 2). In these two lines it can be observed that while the teacher’s attention seems to be focused on language (and thus accuracy and form), his question has actually invited a communicative response related to learning something new about the

Extract 6 (Ume11hod5K1, 43:01)

1 Tea: a:nd (.) e:h Petra,
 2 Pet: +I have learnt h- that Domča is always on the time,
 +looks at Tea
 3 (1.1) ((Domča mumbles something))
 4 Tea:→al+ways on [time]
 +Pet turns back and looks at Domča
 5 Dom: [(I think)] yo- you knew that
 6 (0.7)
 7 Pet: >no but< [I- I hm::: I knew that] you <are> but not
 8 [((laughter in class))]
 9 like so strict,
 10 (0.6)
 11 () : °hm°
 12 (0.6)
 13 Tea: okay, how could you say that in e:h in English in a
 14 different word,
 15 (0.5)
 16 to be on time- be always on time,=
 17 Jan: =punctual,
 18 Tea: punctual, good. .hh alright?
 19 (0.4) ((Tea looks at his watch))
 20 so let's go (with) break

classmates on the part of Petra, who thus visibly orients to meaning and fluency. It might be this tension or the nature of Petra's observation that has caused a noise in the class and Domča starts saying something, probably in response (line 3), which can be interpreted retaining the focus on meaning and communication. However, the teacher corrects the erroneous use of the definite article by saying Petra's utterance correctly (line 4), which reflects his focus on accuracy and form. During the teacher's utterance Petra turns back and establishes eye-contact with Domča, so when the teacher finishes his correction of Petra's utterance, Petra has turned her back to him. In this constellation it is highly unlikely that Petra, whose attention is focused on Domča's response, would repeat the correct form. In an overlap with the teacher's correction, Domča finishes her comment on Petra's finding ("I think yo- you knew that", line 9). Petra responds to Domča communicatively (lines 7–9) and

does not acknowledge the teacher's correction at all, as she evidently responds to Petra's observation, thereby focusing on meaning. After some pauses (lines 10 and 12) the teacher resumes the correction sequence, thus shifting the focus of the ongoing interaction towards language and accuracy by asking for a synonym of the expression "to be on time" ("how could you say that in English in a different word", line 13). It should be pointed out that at this moment Petra remains seated towards Domča, not the teacher. As no response comes (line 15), he repeats the expression for which he would like a synonym ("to be on time / be always on time", line 16), by which he also recycles the corrected expression and further enforces the focus on the accurate form on the part of the learners. In response, another student, Jan, provides the synonym that the teacher sought ("punctual", line 18), which is acknowledged by the teacher, who repeats the word and praises the students (line 18). The teacher then closes the lesson.

This sequence demonstrates, much like extract 5, above, that the teacher required a response to his exposed correction. It follows from the nature of correction that its occurrence in interaction shifts the speakers' attention towards form and accuracy, which corresponds to the teacher's "agenda" as introduced in line 4, and probably in the whole concluding sequence, in which the learners were asked to report on what they learnt in the EFL lesson. However, the learners (at least Petra and Domča) interpreted the question more communicatively, and garnered no response related to the form or accuracy (lines 5–9). The teacher, requiring a response, resumed the correction sequence by exposing the learners to the correct phrase ("to be on time") and by asking for a synonym (lines 13–18). To conclude, Extracts 4 and 5 illustrate that the teachers may enforce the focus of attention on form on the part of the learners by asking language-related questions, such as eliciting synonyms and rules, or by asking the learners to write something on the board.

5. Discussion and conclusions

In this study we employed conversation analysis to explore some of the correction practices used by teachers and learners. The student reactions to teacher exposed correction typically included repetition of the correct form (Extracts 1–3) or, less commonly, minimal post-expansion (Extract 4), depending on the initiation and sequential position of the correction sequence. The student-initiated sequences, in which the students observably oriented to the

form, occasioned teacher correction followed by student repetition. On the other hand, teacher-initiated correction sequences of student utterances in which student attention was focused more on meaning and communication were followed by sequence closing thirds on the part of the students, thus interpreting the teacher utterance as an acknowledgement, not as a correction. Finally, where there was no response to teacher correction, the teachers expanded the correction sequence to draw the focus of student attention to the correct form (Extracts 5 and 6). In these respects our findings concur with other studies (e.g. Fasel Lauzon and Pekarek Doehler 2013; Hanusková 2019; Seedhouse 2004; Tůma 2017a, 2017b) in that it does matter in what sequential environment the teacher correction occurs and what the attention focus of the student whose utterances is being corrected is. What our study adds to this body of research is the analysis of practices that teachers may employ when no student repetition or sequence closing third follows in order to focus the student's attention on the form – the teachers in our data expanded the correction by asking for synonyms or rule formulation, or invited a student to come to the board to write the problematic word on the board, thus focusing the students' attention on form and accuracy.

The analyses of the sequences in which learners repeat the corrected form after the teacher indicate that exposed teacher correction seems to play an important role in EFL classroom interaction. In such sequences (Extracts 1–3) the learners visibly orient to the target language learning by problematizing the correctness of the form that they have been producing – for instance by using try-marked intonation, pauses, hesitation sounds and also by establishing eye-contact with the teacher, who, in turn, feeds in the correct form, which the learners then repeat. This way our study of exposed correction sequences contributes to the understanding of how teachers and learners co-construct the knowledge of language structures (in our data mainly pronunciation and grammar), which represents one of the ways of developing learners' accuracy of spoken language production. This way our study reveals how some institutional tasks, such as foreign language learning and rectification of forms perceived as problematic by the participants, are visibly and publicly done by the teachers and learners in foreign language classroom interaction.

The range of student foci of attention from which the correction sequences emerged includes both form-and-accuracy (Extracts 1 and 5) and meaning-and-fluency (Extracts 2–4 and 6). While exposed correction would probably not be expected in the latter (e.g. Seedhouse 2004: 149–153; see also Lewis and Hill 1992: 95; Scrivener 2011: 286; Gower et al. 2007: 168), it is evident

from the extracts that it was the students themselves who initiated some of the sequences, for example by saying the target word with try-marked intonation (Extracts 1 and 2) or by producing their turns with hearable disfluencies (Extract 3) and also by turning to the teacher (Extracts 2 and 3) – it is not surprising that the learners in these cases repeated the correct forms immediately after the teacher or even in overlap with the teachers' correction turns. On the basis of the analysis of our collection we argue that even exposed correction can be a part of communicative (i.e. meaning-and-fluency-oriented) exchanges, within which the students, and subsequently the teachers, temporarily shift their orientation to form and accuracy by means of initiating and completing the exposed correction sequence. If the learners do not adhere to such a shift while the teacher does, the teacher may resume the correction sequence after the learners' communicative responses, as shown in Extract 6. These findings demonstrate that accuracy and fluency participant orientations cannot be seen as static; it is the situated and dynamic nature of classroom interaction and the ways in which the learners and teachers produce interaction that reveal on what the speakers focus their attention in their turns.

Our findings can also be related to the body of literature on foreign language teaching, where error correction is also discussed (e.g. Edge 1990; Ur 1996; Brown 2007; Harmer 2001). An implication for the EFL classroom apparent from the analyses in the study is the importance of sequential position and timing in teacher correction; it is not as clear cut as the favoured dichotomy of immediate or delayed presented in the aforementioned general teacher development literature. Our findings demonstrate that when learners themselves initiate a correction sequence in an activity with communicative or fluency-oriented focus, attainment of the accurate form can be achieved. This study thus contributes to the discussion of and research into the timing and sequential positioning of teacher correction.

We believe that the micro-perspective that conversation analysis affords can be useful for shedding more light on the processes that occur in the language classroom. As Seedhouse (2004) demonstrates throughout his book, there is a reflexive relationship between interaction and pedagogy, which we have exemplified by studying how teachers and students conduct exposed correction sequences.

6. Acknowledgement

This work was supported by the Czech Science Foundation (grant GA 18-02363S: Classroom interaction in frontal teaching and groupwork in EFL classes in upper-secondary schools)

References

- Brown, H.D. 2007. *Teaching by principles*. 3rd ed. White Plains: Pearson.
- Clift, R. 2016. *Conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment 2001. Council of Europe.
- Cook, V. 2010. "Prolegomena to second language learning". In: Seedhouse, P. et al. (eds.), *Conceptualising 'learning' in applied linguistics*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. 6–22.
- Corder, S.P. 1975. "Error analysis, interlanguage and second language acquisition". *Language Teaching* 8(4). 201–218.
- Drew, P. and J. Heritage. 1992. "Analyzing talk at work: An introduction". In: Drew, P. and J. Heritage (eds.), *Talk at work. Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 3–65.
- Drew, P. and M-L. Sorjonen. 2011. "Dialogue in institutional interactions". In: van Dijk, T. A. (ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*. 2nd ed. London: Sage Publications. 191–216.
- Edge, J., 1990. *Mistakes and correction*. White Plains: Longman.
- Ellis, R. 2008. *The study of second language acquisition*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fasel Lauzon, V. and S. Pekarek Doehler. 2013. "Focus on form as a joint accomplishment: An attempt to bridge the gap between focus on form research and conversation analytic research on SLA". *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 51(4). 323–351.
- Firth, A. and J. Wagner. 2007. "Second/foreign language learning as a social accomplishment: Elaborations on a reconceptualized SLA". *The Modern Language Journal* 91(s1). 800–819.
- Fu, T. and H. Nassaji. 2016. "Corrective feedback, learner uptake, and feedback perception in a Chinese as a foreign language classroom". *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching* 6(1). 159–181.
- Gower R., D. Phillips and S. Walters. 2007. *Teaching Practice: A Handbook For Teachers in Training*. UK: Macmillan.
- Hanusková, M. 2019. "Interactive repair among English as a lingua franca speakers in academic settings". *Brno Studies in English* 45(2). 35–52.
- Han, Z. and E. Tarone (eds.). 2014. *Interlanguage: Forty years later*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Harmer, J. 2001. *The practice of English language teaching*. 3rd ed. Harlow: Longman.

- Hellermann, J. 2009. "Looking for evidence of language learning in practices for repair: A case study of self-initiated self-repair by an adult learner of English". *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research* 53(2). 113–132.
- Heritage, J. and S. Clayman. 2010. *Talk in action. Interactions, identities, and institutions*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Jefferson, G. 1987. "On exposed and embedded correction in conversation" In: Button, G. and J. R. E. Lee (eds.), *Talk and social organization*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 86–100.
- Kitzinger, C. 2013. "Repair". In: Sidnell, J. and T. Stivers (eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. 229–256.
- Koshik, I. 2002. "Designedly incomplete utterances: A pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences". *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 35. 277–309.
- Lewis, M and J. Hill. 1992. *Practical techniques for language teachers*. Hove: Language Teaching Publications.
- Lyster, R. and L. Ranta. 1997. "Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms". *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 19(1). 37–66.
- Macbeth, D. 2004. The relevance of repair for classroom correction. *Language in Society* 33(5). 703–736.
- Markee, N. 2000. *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- McHoul, A.W. 1990. "The organization of repair in classroom talk". *Language in Society* 19(3). 349–377.
- Richards, J.C. and T.S. Rodgers. 2014. *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H., E.A. Schegloff, and G. Jefferson. 1974. "A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation". *Language* 50(4). 696–735.
- Schegloff, E.A., G. Jefferson and H. Sacks. 1977. "The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation". *Language* 53(2). 361–382.
- Schegloff, E.A. 1979. "The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation". In: Givon, T. (ed.), *Syntax and semantics*. New York: Academic Press. 261–286.
- Schegloff, E.A. 2007. *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scrivener, J. 2011. *Learning teaching*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Macmillan.
- Seedhouse, P. 2004. *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. University of Michigan: Blackwell.
- Selinker, L. 1972. "Interlanguage". *IRAL – International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 10(3). 209–232.
- Selting, M. 2000. "The construction of units in conversational talk". *Language in Society* 29(4). 477–517.
- Seo, M.-S. and Koshik, I. 2010. "A conversation analytic study of gestures that engender repair in ESL conversational tutoring". *Journal of Pragmatics* 42(8). 2219–2239.
- Sidnell, J. 2013. "Basic conversation analytic methods". In: J. Sidnell and T. Stivers (eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. 77–9.

- ten Have, P. 2007. *Doing conversation analysis*. London: SAGE.
- Tůma, F. 2017a. *Interakce ve výuce anglického jazyka na vysoké škole pohledem konverzační analýzy*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
- Tůma, F. 2017b. “Střídání kódů ve výuce angličtiny u učitelů-expertů pohledem konverzační analýzy”. *Slovo a slovesnost* 78(4). 283–304.
- Ur, P. 1996. *A course in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Corresponding author:

František Tůma
 Department of English and American Studies
 Masarykova univerzita
 Filozofická fakulta
 Arna Nováka 1
 602 00 Brno
 Czech Republic
 Email: tuma@phil.muni.cz

Appendix: Transcription conventions

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| (2.1) | length of silence |
| (.) | micro-pause |
| = | latched utterances |
| <u>underlining</u> | Relatively high pitch or volume |
| °soft° | Quiet or soft talk |
| ?/./, | Rising/falling/slightly rising intonation respectively |
| : | Stretched sound |
| - | Cut-off or self-interruption |
| hh | Audible aspiration |
| .hh | Audible inhalation |
| >< | Increase in tempo |
| <> | Decrease in tempo |
| () | Uncertainty on the transcriber's part |
| (()) | Transcriber's description of events |
| [] | Overlapped speech |
| česky | Utterance in Czech (with <i>English translation</i> in italics below) |
| /releitif/ | Non-standard pronunciation |

- +looks at Tea Students' embodied actions that accompany the talk in the above utterance; + also marks the beginning of the action in the actual utterance
- *looks down Teachers' embodied actions that accompany the talk in the above utterance; * also marks the beginning of the action in the actual utterance