Other-Initiated Other-Repair: Repair Organization While Playing a Place-Based Augmented-Reality Game

Adam C. Okoye
Portland State University

<h1 align="center">Introduction</h1>

This paper will discuss the way in which other-initiated other-repair was performed by groups of German speakers playing a place-based augmented reality game. The groups were made up of speakers with varying proficiencies in German and thus the members of the groups had differing levels of access to the German language, which they were using as a primary means of communication. Most of what has been written on repair in context of conversation analysis (CA) has not focused on other-initiated other-repair outside of classroom settings. For this reason, this study aims to shed light on the organization of other-initiated other-repair among this particular group of speakers.

According to Seedhouse (2004), "repair is the treatment of trouble occurring in interactive language use" (p. 34). A "trouble source" is what one or more of the participants orient to as hindering the flow of communication. Repair can be self-initiated or other-initiated. When repair is self-initiated, the person who produced the trouble source prompts the repair, whereas when repair is other-initiated another person prompts the repair. Similarly, the trouble source can be repaired by the self or the other. In the case of self-repair, the person who produced the trouble source is the one who does the repair and in other-repair the other does the repair. The following four excerpts illustrate self-initiated, self-repair (1), other-initiated, self-repair (2), self-initiated, other-repair (3), and other-initiated, other-repair (4).

Self-initiated self-repair:
(1) (Schegloff et. al., 1977, p. 366)
```
1  L: An' 'en bud all of the doors 'n things were taped up=
2  L: =I mean y'know they put up y'know that kinda paper 'r
3     stuff, Trouble source
4  L: the brown paper. Self-repair
```

Other-initiated self-repair:
(2) (Schegloff et. al., 1977, p. 364)
```
1  Ken: Is Al here today?
2  Dan: Yeah.   Trouble source
```

```
3  (2.0)
4  Roger: He is? hh eh heh   Other-initiation
5  Dan:  Well he was.   Self-repair
```

Self-initiated other-repair:
(3) (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 170)
```
1   Interviewer: .hh you say if you'd had (.) Jo::hn's some of
2                John's (.) > abilities or talents and he'd had
3                some of yours < which were those. Which would
4                he've [liked to ( ) between you
5   Interviewee:      [.hhh well I    think John-John er (0.2)
6                John no::w (0.2) having obviously been married
7                to Chris an-an- an- =   Self-initiation

8   Interviewer: =>Chris Evert yah.<=   Other-repair
9   Interviewee: =yeah, and basically living a lot in- in the
10               states ...
```

Other-initiated other-repair:
(4) (Schegloff et. al., 1977, p. 378)
```
1  Lori : But y'know single beds'r awfully thin tuh sleep on.
2  Sam: What?   Other-initiation
3  Lori: Single beds. [They're
4  Ellen:            [Y'mean narrow?   Other-repair
5  Lori: They're awfully narrow yes
```

Literature Review

The CA concept of preference in repair

CA studies of repair have typically only looked at it in the context of self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, and other-initiated other-repair. This may be because of how often these types of repair occur in conversational data and because of the preference for self-repair. Preference refers to the idea that individuals will follow various linguistic-cultural principles when they are interacting in communicative situations (Pomerantz and Heritage, 2012). It is important to note that preferences aren't conscious in nature, rather they are linguistic behaviors that researchers have shown occur more frequently than behaviors that are not preferred. They can be seen as societal norms that people have been socialized into performing. Research on mundane conversation shows that repair-related preferences include

performing other-initiation only after self hasn't already done a self-initiated self-repair, using embedded corrections to minimize the explicitness of the other-repair (this will be discussed later), and abdicating other-correction (Jefferson, 2007; Pomerantz and Heritage, 2012). The preference for self-repair is related to repair organization itself. There are three phases in the organization of repair organization: 1. the trouble source – the thing needing repair, 2. the repair initiation, and 3. the accomplishment of the repair (Schegloff et. al, 1977). Typically there are pauses between the trouble source and the repair initiation. In other-repair there are typically pauses between the initiation and the repair. These pauses allow space for self-initiation and self-repair to take place, thus enforcing the preference for self-repair.

The preference for self-repair might also be thought of in relation to the idea of face in linguistic pragmatics. Goffman defines face as, "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact" (1967, p. 5). "Line" refers to the ways, verbal and non-verbal, in which people express their views on a situation at hand. Participants evaluate themselves and others through the line they take and observe lines other people take. There is an expectation that interlocuters tend to act in ways that maintain both their face and the face of others. Given this expectation, a second reason for the preference for self-repair over other-repair exists is because other-repair or correction is a face threatening act (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Svennevig, 2008). The preference for repair has been validated by numerous later studies done by various researchers (Brouwer 2004; Hosoda 2000; Kasper 2004). The discovery of the preference for self-initiated self-repair is relevant to my research because the participants whose conversations I'm analyzing appear to disregard it in their production of other-initiated other-repair.

Repair in Classroom-Like Activities Outside of the Classroom

Although most of the research on repair has dealt with mundane interactions among speakers of the same language (Egbert, 1997; Kitzinger, 2012; Schegloff et. al, 1977; Sidnell, 2009), presumably expert speakers of that language, more recent research has investigated this concept in the interaction among speakers with different levels of expertise. In the research on repair by expert and novice language speakers, much of it has been done on language learners in formal learning settings like classrooms or tutoring sessions (Kasper, 1985; Seedhouse, 1999; Hellermann, 2009; Hall, 2007; Markee, 2000; Seo & Koshik, 2017). Outside of classrooms, in hybrid contexts like 'conversations for learning' (Mori, 2002, Kasper, 2004), some research on repair between experts and novices has been done. In these contexts, learners meet with native or expert speakers in order to practice speaking, with the assumption being that the novice speaker will improve their language abilities. These types of interactional contexts are typically associated with language learning classes. Research on this context done by Kasper (2004) found that found that the performance of other-repair is always self-initiated - that the native speaker (NS) only adopted the role of "language expert" in response to a self-initiation by the non-native speaker (NNS). The NNS waited until there was self-initiation to provide other-repair and at no point was there an instance of unelicited other-repair.

Conversations in the Wild

Classroom settings and 'conversations for learning' are not 'naturalistic', in that the conversations are situated around the NNS improving their language skills. There have, however, also been a number of studies done on repair among NS/NNS pairs in more naturalistic settings. This research is similar to mine in that there is no explicit goal surrounding language use among the groups that I analyzed. Despite the fact that I found instances of other-initiated other-repair in all of the groups that I analyzed, this seems to be a rare occurrence in literature that focuses on NS/NNS conversations that are not focused on

language learning (Brower et. al., 2004; Hosoda 2000, 2001, 2006; Kuhilla 2005; Theodórsdóttir 2018).

One situation where other-initiated other-repair does occur more commonly is in the context of embedded corrections. Embedded corrections consist of a turn that does both of being a second pair part as well as other-initiated other-repair. This is different than the typical other-initiated other-repair sequence because the other does not overtly correct the self. Rather, the repair is providing information that furthers the topic at hand. One feature of embedded corrections is that the person who uttered the trouble source (which is in the turn that is the first pair part) does not explicitly orient to the repair in the second pair by discussing the repair (Jefferson, 1987; Brower et. al., 2004). In this way, it orients to face issues of the speaker and does not delay the flow or progressivity of the conversation (Schegloff, 2007). The discrete nature of embedded correction shows that the person doing the embedded repair is trying not to derail the course of the interaction. Jefferson (1987) illustrated that the speaker who uttered the trouble source (self) reuses the correction provided in the embedded correction by other in subsequent turns. This is contrasted by data analyzed by Brower et. al. (2004), which demonstrated that the speaker who uttered the trouble source continued to use the term that prompted the embedded correction. Despite this contrast, both studies agree than there is no additional explicit talk about the correction.

While other-initiated other-repair is the least preferred type of repair, evidence for the preference for self-repair is evident in the embedded corrections analyzed by Brower et. al. (2004). The preference for self-repair in this instance can be seen by noting the pauses between the first and second pair parts, which provide space for self-initiation and self-repair to occur. When self-initiation and self-repair didn't occur in that transition space, other-initiation and repair did.

An additional reason that has been found for the lack of other-repair in interactions between expert and novice speakers has to do with experts wanting to maintain their current role of not being a language teacher (Kuhilla, 2001). Not wanting to briefly transform role to that of a teacher is important in Kuhilla's research because the people in their data were taking part in everyday tasks. By not orienting to non-standard language use, interlocuters are not putting themselves in situations in which their role might momentarily shift and more explicitly show a difference in language proficiency between the interlocuters.

Given the dearth of research focused solely on other-initiated other-repair outside of classroom environments, I found it important to focus my analysis on this phenomenon. In doing so I will discuss the organization of other-initiated other-repair in my data and how it differs to the repair-organization found in previous research.

Methodology

The game

The data analyzed in this study was collected by filming four groups of three individuals playing a place-based augmented reality game called ChronoOps. ChronoOps is played on an iPhone and includes a narrative which takes players to five different locations, each of which features a type of green technology. Players are situated as agents from the year 2070 who have been brought back to the past (the year they are playing the game) which is at the simultaneous dawn and dusk of green technology. When the players reach the location, they are given information about it and then given a question that they are asked to answer by making a video using their phone. They are then tasked with reporting back (to the future) about their findings by means of recording videos (Thorne et al., 2015). This game was originally developed for English language learners and has since been translated into eight different languages. The participants that I analyzed played the German translation of the game.

Participants

Group A is made up of Klara, Anna, and Moritz. Klara is the daughter of Anna and it appears that both Klara and Moritz are students. Group B is made up of Chris, Heike, and Eva. None of the members of this group are students, but Chris has been to the campus that the game takes place at a number of times. The participants in group C are Mia, Sofia, and Hannah. They are all students in a German class. The participants in group D are Erik, Richard, and Emma. Like group C, they are also all students in a German class. Of the excerpts analyzed in this paper, two are from group A, two are from group B, two are from group C, and one is from group D.

Group	Participants	Attributes
A	Klara, Anna, and Moritz	Klara is the daughter of Anna. Klara and Moritz might be students – both are familiar with the campus.
B	Chris, Heike, and Eva	Not students but Chris is familiar with the campus.
C	Mia, Sofia, and Hannah	Students from a German class.
D	Erik, Richard, and Emma	Students from a German class.

None of the groups were told that they had to speak a specific language, nor were they instructed to act in any specific way by the researcher. Each group took about 45 minutes to play the game from beginning to end. There were two groups that had trouble with the video recording component of the game. In the case of these groups, they did not video record the report that they made. All but one of the groups played the game all the way through. Group D played part of the game but could not figure out how to complete it. Despite that, the video collected from this group was 43 minutes long.

Data collection

The videos were recorded using two head-mounted cameras and a researcher operated camera. Two of the players wore the head-mounted cameras and the third player wore a

wireless microphone which was connected to the researcher operated camera. This allowed for high quality recordings of what each player was saying. Additionally, the head cameras allowed for the researcher to have a good idea where the individual players were looking. This was instrumental in aiding in detailed and accurate transcriptions of the audio and video.

Analytic methods

Conversation Analysis

CA is a methodology aimed at analyzing the way people use language to co-construct social order. It was developed in the 1960s and 1970s by Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, Gail Jefferson (ten Have, 2007). Data is collected by means of audio or video recordings which are then transcribed and analyzed. CA looks at conversations from an emic view and describes elements of conversation from the point of view of the participants (Goodwin 1990). Because the analysis comes directly from reading the transcripts, listening to the audio, and watching the video (in cases where the participants were video recorded), researchers don't bring theory into their analysis. The importance of the data is what necessitates the detailed nature of the transcription done in CA. Some of the analysis in CA is typically done in data sessions which involve multiple researchers observing the data. Frequently researchers aren't trying to find or analyze specific features in the data, rather they make note of what stands out to them. This is called unmotivated looking (ten Have 1997).

After the data that I analyzed collected, it was transcribed using CA transcription conventions and translated. I analyzed the data both alone and in a research group. Analyzing the data in the research group allowed me to make sure that my analyses were accurate. While I did choose excerpts based on there being other-initiated other-repair, I didn't set out with the thesis that I am discussing in this paper in mind. My interest in other-initiated other-repair came out of noticing the ways in which speakers of varying proficiencies in German interacted with each other. I was initially interested in how they responded to their differing

proficiencies, and that interest transformed into being interested in how their other-initiated other-repairs were being carried out.

Analysis and Discussion

Previous research in CA shows that the typical organization of other-initiated other-repair can be summarized into a six-step process.

1. The turn with the trouble source is produced.

2. A pause occurs.

3. Other-initiation occurs.

4. A pause occurs.

5. Other-repair occurs.

6. Post-expansion occurs. (Egbert, 1997; Schegloff, 1977).

This method of organization allows for the preference for both self-initiation and self-repair. We can see this when looking at where the pauses occur. After the trouble source occurs there is typically a pause. This allows for the person who uttered the trouble source space to repair the trouble source. If that does not happen and an other-initiation occurs, a second pause typically occurs. This, like the first pause, allows for a self-repair to be done.

Out of the four groups that I analyzed, I found seven instances of other-initiated other-repair. These instances can be categorized into three categories: lexical, pronunciation, and grammatical[1].

Trouble Source	Number of Occurrences	Groups
Lexical	4	A, B C, D
Pronunciation	2	A, B
Grammatical	1	C

Unlike what has typically been shown, all but one of the examples of other-initiated other-repair in the data that I analyzed fall in to a three-step sequence.

---

[1] This is not the primary focus of my research.

1. The trouble source is produced.

2. Other-initiation and other-repair takes place in the transition relevance

space (usually single words).

3. Post-expansion occurs[2].

The post-expansion is typically always done by the person who produced the trouble

source. One thing that is notable about this is that there are no pauses in this type of repair

organization. The lack of these pauses means that this organization does not allow for self-

initiation in subsequent turns nor does it allow for self-repair. The following three examples

illustrate aspects of the repair that are unique to my data.

Repair organization
     Excerpt (5) shows the typical three-part organization in the data that I analyzed.

```
(5) Group A: Building
01  ANN: was   genau   suchen  wir jetzt [das  ist das gebäude
         what exactly looking we  now     that be  the building
02       hierher
         here
          what exactly are we looking for now is that the
        building here

03  MOR:                                        [um:

04  ANN: #das ist lincoln hall?
         that is
    a    #points to the right
         is that lincoln hall?

05  MOR: uh nein next one   ← Trouble source
            no
         uh no the next one

06  ANN: nächstes gebäude=   ← Other-initiated other-repair
         next     building
         the next bulding=

07  MOR: =gebäude  ja  nächste bäude gebäude   ← Post-expansion
          building yes next         building
          =building yeah the next ding building
```

---

[2] Post-expansion refers to the elongation of a sequence past the second-pair part. They are often in response to the second-pair part. Post-expansions do not act in such a way to start new sequences.

The trouble source occurs in line 5, the other initiated-other repair occurs in line 6, and the post-expansion occurs in line 7. In this excerpt the participants are walking to one of the destinations and Anna has asked Moritz which building they're looking for. Anna responds to Moritz' usage of English in his reply to her question in line 5. Moritz says *next one* in his turn in 5 which is the trouble source and referred to the building that they were walking to. Anna then immediately performed an other-initiated other-repair in the next turn, line 6 without leaving space for a self-repair to occur. This repair sequence consisted of her saying what Moritz had previously but did so using German. In the next turn (line 7), Moritz repeats the word *gebäude* and then repeats the whole utterance, ending with a self-initiated self-repair.

A lack of pauses

The lack of pauses that occur in the other-initiated other-repair sequences in my data are notable because they are an example of the disregard for the preference for self-initiated self-repair. This is the case because the absence of pauses means that there is neither space for self-initiation nor is their space for self-repair. Excerpt (6) illustrates this.

```
(6) Group C: fahren
01  HAN: ((reading)) welche transportmittel
                      which  mean of tranportation

02            benutzen  sie wenn sie zur uni       oder anderen
              use       you when you to  university or   other

03            orten fahren
              places go
              Which type of transportation do you use when you
              travel to school or other locations

04  MIA: ((points to self))

05  SOF: okay du (.) erst
          okay you    first
          Okay you (.) first
      s   #looks at Mia
```

```
06   HAN: du
          you
          you

07   HAN: [du   zuerst
           you  first
           you first

08   MIA: [ich ich fährt
           I    I   drives
           I I drives

09   SOF: fahre
          drive
          drive

10   MIA: ja ehehe fährt. ich ↑fahre.
          Yes        drives I   drive
          Yeah ehehe drives. I ↑drive.
```

The participants in this excerpt are at the last stop in the game which asks about the modes of transportations players use to get to school and other places. In line 4, Mia nominates herself to answer the question by pointing to herself. Sofia and Hannah respond to this by telling her to go first. The trouble source is in line 8 when Mia says *fährt*. There is repetition of the word *ich* which is likely to do with the overlap in Mia and Hannah's turns. Immediately after this, Sofia performs an other-initiated other-repair in line 9, providing the word *fahre*.

The repair organization in this excerpt is similar to that of excerpt (5). There is a trouble source in line 8, followed directly by an other-initiated other-repair, and the repair sequence is finished by a post-expansion in line 10. The lack of a pause between the other-initiation and other-repair in excerpt (6) does not allow for the possibility of self-repair going against the preference for self-repair.

Words in isolation

In all but one of the instances of other-initiated other-repair that I analyzed, the turn that the other-repair was in only consisted of the words that were oriented to as being

mispronounced, conjugated in a non-standard way, or said in English. When the repair would

take place, the other-repair would typically only consist of a different version of the word that

was deemed to be the trouble source. The word would either be pronounced in a different

way or it would be said in German. The excerpt below is an example of this. In the following

excerpt, (7), the participants have arrived at the first location and Anna has begun reading the

game text.

(7) Group A: Parkplätze

```
01 KLA: ((reading)) es gibt mehr als 25 fahrrad parkplatze
                    it give more than   bike   parking speces*
                     there are more than 25 bike parking pleces*

02  ANN: plätze
          spots

03  KLA: plätze [auf dem PSU campus
          spots   on   the PSU campus
          spots   on   the PSU campus

04  ANN:        [auf dem campus
                 on   the campus
                 on   the campus

05  ANN: was  sind die vorteile   oder nachteile    mit  dem
          what are  the advantaces or  disadvantaces with the

06       fahrrad zur Uni       zu f::ahren? dokumentieren sie
          bike    to  university to ride     document         you

07       ihre antwort auf video in dem heft    nennen Sie das
          your answer   on  video in the notebook name    you the

08       video video eins
          video video one
          what are some of the advantages or disadvantages of
          riding your bike to the university? Document your
          answers in the notebook as a video. name the video
          video one.

09  ANN: Ok
```

In (7), the trouble spot occurs in line 1 when Klara says the word *parkplatze* as

opposed to the standard German *parkplätze*. Anna performs an other-initiated other-repair in

line 2 focusing on the pronunciation of the word. While Anna was not looking at the phone at the time, she likely understood that the plural of the word was what Klara meant to say. This is evidenced by her repair of the word. In line 3 Klara repeats the word *plätze* and continues to read the prompt, at which point Anna starts reading in overlap. By line 4 Klara has stopped reading and Anna continues reading the rest of the game text. As in the previous excerpts, there are not pauses that allow for self-initiation or self-repair.

A deviant case

There is one instance of other-initiated other-repair in my data in which the person who uttered the trouble source didn't orient to the other-repair. In the following excerpt, (8), the participants have are trying to figure out how to play the game. They haven't made it to any of the stops yet and Anne is manipulating her phone.

(8) Group D: Excerpt 2 - Swearing
```
01   ANN: °what the fuck is happening?°

02   RIC: fick
          fuck

03   ERI: hahahaha
```

The trouble source in this excerpt is the word *fuck* in line 1. Richard then performs an other-initiated other-repair in line 2, exchanging the English word for German. Erik responds to this with laughter and Anne doesn't orient to his other-repair. As discussed, this is not an embedded repair. Richard's turn in line 2 is not a second pair part and his repair is oriented to by Erik. While the first two parts of this repair sequence, the trouble source and the other-initiated other-repair, were similar to the typical other-initiated other-repair sequences, the third part is unexpected because the post-expansion was not done by the person who uttered the trouble source. The post-expansion was done by Erik as opposed to by Anne.

What's interesting about the other-repair in this excerpt, is that the word *fick* is not used in German as an expletive about the state of something, rather it's used as a slang word

for having sex (Duden; M, Pöll, personal communication, July 20, 2018). This is in contrast to how Anne is using the English word *fuck*.

Potential influence of the location

The number of other-initiated other-repairs were nearly evenly split between the four groups. Groups A, B, and C had two instances of other-initiated other-repair each and group D had one. This is the opposite of what I would expect given that groups C and D were in a German class at the time of the recording and are likely acustomed to their language being other-repaired while speaking German on a college campus. I suspect that the game taking place on a college campus played a role in the amount of other-initiated other-repair that took place across the four groups. While groups A and B had members who weren't college students, they were all familiar with cultures of higher education and the idea that a part of being in university courses means that they will be corrected, both by professors and by peers.

<div align="center">

Conclusion

</div>

Despite the fact that most language use happens outside of classrooms, there has been relatively little research done on other-initiated other-repair outside of classroom related contexts. One reason for this could be the preference for self-initiated self-repair. According to this preference, self-initiated self-repair should be the most commonly occurring repair type because of conventions of politeness in western society. The opportunity to do self-repair allows for the person who uttered the trouble source to maintain a positive face by repairing what might be heard as an error. Additionally, according to the principle of preference, other-initiated, other-repair should be the least frequent repair trajectory. The fact that embedded corrections occur as a mitigated other-initiated other shows that it is a dispreferred trajectory (Jefferson, 1987; Brower et. al., 2004).

What I was able to discover in my analysis is that other-initiated other-repairs in my data are organized in a way that is different than typical repair organization. The sequences in my data consisted of trouble source → other-initiated other-repair → post-expansion by the utterer of the trouble source. This repair organization disregards the preference for self-initiated self-repair because the lack of pauses don't allow for self-initiation. The other-repair taking place in the same turn as the other-initiation also means that there is not an opportunity for self-repair to take place.

Limitations of this this paper include the fact that it was a small case study of 12 people and that, because of this, the phenomena that I found is not generalizable. Subsequent research would benefit from analyzing a larger number of groups and controlling those groups for proficiency. Future research on other-initiated other-repair in expert-novice interaction outside of classroom environments will be able to compare the types of other-initiated other-repair done by students in language classes as well as other expert-novice pairs to that done in language classrooms. The results have implications for language teachers in how they develop curriculum with regards to using place-based augmented-reality games to augment lessons. The use of other-initiated other-repair by the participants whose conversations I analyzed showed that they were aware of non-standard language use by the other members of their group and that they were willing to repair that language.

References

Brouwer, C. E. (2004). Doing Pronunciation: A specific type of repair sequence. In Gardner, R., & Wagner, J. (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 93-113). London: Bloomsbury Publishing PLC.

Brouwer, C. E., Rasmussen, G., & Wagner, J. (2004). Embedded corrections in second language talk. In Gardner, R., & Wagner, J. (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 75-92). London: Bloomsbury Publishing PLC.

Egbert, M. M. (1997). Some interactional achievements of other-initiated repair in multiperson conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *27(5)*, 611-634. http://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(96)00039-2

Goffman, E. (1967). Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior. Pantheon: New York.

Goodwin, C., & Heritage, J. (1990). Conversation analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *19(1)*, 283-307. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.an.19.100190.001435

Hall, J. K. (2007). Redressing the roles of correction and repair in research on second and foreign language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, *91(4)*, 511–526. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00619.x

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. http://doi.org/10.1080/00313830902757550

Hosoda, Y. (2000). Other-repair in Japanese conversations between nonnative and native speakers. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, *11(1)*, 39-65. Retrieved from https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9rb6b1m6

Hosoda, Y. (2001). Conditions for other-repair in NS/NNS conversation. *The Language Teacher*, *25(11)*, 29-31.

Hosoda, Y. (2006). Repair and relevance of differential language expertise in second

    language conversations. *Applied Linguistics*, *27(1)*, 25-50.

    https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ami022

Jefferson, G (1987). On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In Button, G. &

    Lee, J.R.E. (Eds.), *Talk and social organization* (pp. 86-100) Clevedon: Multilingual

    Matters.

Jefferson, G. (2007). Preliminary notes on abdicated other-correction. *Journal of Pragmatics*,

    39(3), 445-461. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.07.006

Kasper, G. (2004). Participant orientations in German conversation-for-learning. *The Modern*

    Language Journal, *88(4)* 551-567. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.t01-

    18-.x

Kurhila, S. (2001). Correction in talk between native and non-native speaker. *Journal of*

    Pragmatics, *33(7)*, 1083-1110. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(00)00048-5

Kitzinger, C. (2012). Repair. In Sidnell, J., & Stivers, T. (Eds.), *The handbook of*

    conversation analysis (pp. 229-256). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Markee, N. (2000). Conversation analysis. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Mori, J. (2002). Task-design, plan and development of talk-in-interaction: An analysis of a

    small group activity in a Japanese language classroom. *Applied Linguistics, 23*, 323-

    347. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/23.3.323

Pomerantz, A & Heritage, J (2012). Preference. In Sidnell, J., & Stivers, T. (Eds.), *The*

    handbook of conversation analysis (pp. 210-228). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Seo, M.-S., & Koshik, I. (2010). A conversation analytic study of gestures that engender

    repair in ESL conversational tutoring. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(8), 2219–2239.

    http://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.01.021

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the

    organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, *53(2)*, 361-382.

    http://doi.org/10.2307/413107

Seedhouse, P. (2004). Conversation analysis methodology. *Language Learning*, *54(S1)*, 1-54.

    https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2004.00268.x

Seedhouse, P. (2006). Conversation analysis and language learning. *Language Teaching*,

    38(4), 165-187. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444805003010

Sidnell, J. (2010). Conversation analysis: An introduction. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Stivers, T. (2012). Sequence organization. In Sidnell, J., & Stivers, T. (Eds.), *The handbook*

    of conversation analysis (pp. 191-209). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Svennevig, J. (2008). Trying the easiest solution first in other-initiation of repair. *Journal of*

    Pragmatics, *40(2)*, 333 – 348. http://10.1016/j.pragma.2007.11.007

Ten Have, P. (1997). *In the presence of data: Conversation analysis as 'empirical*

    philosophy'. Retrieved from www.paultenhave.nl/presence.htm

ten Have, P. (2007). *Introducing qualitative methods: Doing conversation analysis*. London:

    SAGE Publications Ltd. http://doi.org/0.4135/9781849208895

Theodórsdóttir, G. (2018). L2 teaching in the wild: A closer look at correction and

    explanation practices in everyday L2 Interaction. *The Modern Language Journal*,

    102(S1), 30-45. http://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12457

Thorne, S. L., Hellermann, J., Jones, A., Lester, D. (2015). Interactional practices and artifact

    orientation in mobile augmented reality game play. *PsychNology Journal*, *13(2-3)*,

    259 – 286. Retrieved from www.psychnology.org