

Linköping University 2014

Department of Culture and Communication

120 ESTC Master's Program

Language and Culture in Europe



Linköping University

**Unfolding Correction Sequences in Classroom Interaction
and its Relevance to
Face-work**

By

Inaam Hassan Rauf Alyasiri

Supervisor: Dr. Anna Ekström

Examiner: Professor Leelo Keevalik

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Aims & Research Questions.....	2
1.2 Outline of the Thesis.....	3
2. Theoretical Background	4
2.1 Conversation Analysis	4
2.2 Second Language Studies from CA Perspective	5
2.3 Characteristics of Teacher-Student Interaction	8
2.4 Repairs & Correction Sequences	9
2.4.1 Forms of Correction.....	11
2.4.1.1 Exposed Correction.....	11
2.4.1.2 Embedded Correction.....	14
2.5 Face-work & Politeness	15
2.6 Chapter Summary	17
3. Methodology & Data	18
3.1 Conversation Analysis Approach.....	18
3.2 Data	19
3.2.1 Ethical Considerations.....	20
3.2.2 Selecting Specific Sequences	21
3.2.3 Transcription & Analyzing Data.....	21
4. Classroom Corrections	22
4.1 Correction through Extended Negotiation.....	23
4.2 Correction through Fragmentation.....	26
4.3 Socialization.....	30
4.4 Direct Correction.....	33
4.5 Chapter Summary.....	36
5. Discussion, Results & Conclusions	37
5.1 Types of Correction & Face-work.....	37
5.2 Other-correction & Second Language Classroom.....	39

5.3 Conversation Analysis Approach.....	40
5.4 Limitations of the Findings.....	41

Acknowledgement

I would like to acknowledge and thank my supervisor Dr. Anna Ekström for her precious commentaries, constructive critiques and useful suggestions. Dr. Alia Amir, thank you for your support. I am grateful to your efforts, without which this work would not be completed. I would like to thank my examiner Professor Leelo Keevallik for her precious comments on the last version of this work.

Special thanks are due to Professor Françoise Monnoyeur-Broitman, for invaluable discussions which were the source of inspiration that helped me link the study to some philosophical perspectives. I am indebted to Dr. Nigel Musk and Mr. Lars Liljegren for their valued contribution in carrying out the recordings of this study, as I am thankful to Rizwan Ul-Huq for proofreading and everlasting support. Thanks to all the staff at the Program of Language and Culture in Europe for their support during the period of study at Linköping University.

My gratitude also goes to all my friends who endlessly supported me to achieve this study.

Finally but foremost, special thanks to my family, without whom this study would have never existed.

Linköping University, 2014

Inaam

List of Abbreviations

SL Second Language

CA Conversation Analysis

T Teacher

S Student

L2 Second Language

Introduction

In classrooms like other institutional and everyday situations, interaction takes place in diverse ways. This study explores particularly the teacher-student interactions, focusing on the relevance of face-work when teachers correct students' answers. The focus of this study is the correction sequences which are widespread in classroom. The correction sequences usually take place when a teacher asks a question, and one of the students gives an incorrect answer for it. A student's answer is followed by the teacher's assessment, evaluation or feedback to the prior answer. Therefore, the teacher is the person who evaluates and validates the reliability of students' answers. The correction sequences contribute to enhancing the learning process (Manke 1997:65) because it provides students with new knowledge and correct information from the teacher's perspective.

It is pertinent to mention that the correction process is a part of the wide system of repair which is used extensively in ordinary conversations to repair the various problems in talk-in interaction (Macbeth 2004:707). Repair, as defined by Seedhouse, is "the treatment of trouble occurring in interactive language use" (2004:143). It should be noted that correctional sequences in classroom interaction "belong to the less desirable features in the classroom" (Arminen 2005:115). The process of correction is a double-edged tool which should be manipulated carefully in order to help students have the benefit of learning, gain the essential knowledge, and to "foster a feeling of worth or self-esteem" (Gordon 2003:58). Thus, the correction sequences represent "a vehicle for maintaining order" between teachers and students (Arminen 2005:115-16).

This paper focuses particularly on the relationship between the correction sequences and "face-work" (Goffman 1967). Face-work refers to the mutual respect among participants during the various social encounters to accept each others' face, and to sustain the positive feelings during interaction. Therefore, the substantial reason of using face-work in everyday social interaction is to avoid face threat of other participants.

As teacher-student interaction is a part of the generic social interaction, face-work is essential in order to maintain the status of participants, and protect the positive feelings of the cohort. This indicates that face-work is indispensable to sustaining the individual positive image in classroom interaction.

Accordingly, the purpose of this paper is exploring whether teachers provide interactional work to save students' face, and support the image of "self" during the correction process, or not.

This point will be explored through examining several correctional categories, which have been taken from data of video recordings of English language learning sessions at tertiary level. The data is from English second language classroom of a Swedish University undergraduate class. Learning a second language in the classroom means learning a second language in formal circumstances where learners and teachers can practice the targeted language together. This reflects the significance of teaching the second language, which is developing "learners' communicative competence" and improving their linguistic skills with minimum focus on correcting errors (Wong & Waring 2010:12).

Conversation Analysis (CA) has been used as a method of study. CA is a scientific methodological approach that examines "talk-in-interaction" (Psathas 1995:1) and studies the verbal and non-verbal actions of participants in everyday life. CA also represents "a unique way of analyzing language and social interaction" (Wong & Waring 2010:4) because it analyzes natural conversations among participants, depending on their interpretations of each others' turns. Furthermore, a conversation-analytic study focuses on verbal and non-verbal actions of participants, which can help us gaining better understanding of interaction during the learning process. Therefore, CA was applied in this study to investigate the correction sequences and examine the techniques used to achieve the correction, and principally to reveal, if any, the relevance between the correction sequences and face-work.

1.1 Aims and Research Questions

The study aims at investigating the techniques used by the teacher to correct students' incorrect answers, and its relationship to face-work. It also pursues the interactional work which may be offered by teachers during the correction process in order to avoid face threat to students. The following questions will be answered through this study:-

1. Which types and techniques of correction does the teacher use to correct students' answers?
2. Is there any relationship between types of correction in the classroom and face-work?

1.2 Outline of the Thesis

The thesis includes 5 chapters. The first chapter is the introduction which is about to complete. The second chapter includes literature review of previous studies that focus on classroom interaction and second language studies from Conversation Analysis (CA) perspective. The main aim of chapter 2 is to provide a theoretical framework related to classroom interaction, and the relevance between correction sequences and face-work. Chapter 2 provides discussion about Conversation Analysis (CA) as a methodological scientific approach, as a tool used to explore participants' actions through analyzing their talk. Then, second language studies from CA perspective, and some relevant studies that focus on classroom interaction will be discussed. Chapter 2 also includes discussion about the characteristics of teacher-student interaction as a distinctive subfield of institutional interaction; differences between repair as a main domain and the correction as a sub-domain; and forms of corrections in classroom interaction. As this thesis focuses on exploring the relevance between various techniques used to achieve the correction and face-work, chapter 2 provides an argumentation about face-work theory, as it will present previous studies that discuss face-work in classroom interaction.

In chapter 3, CA as a method of study will be presented. CA's main features and its role in exploring social actions through analyzing participants' talk will be argued. The data used in this study will also be introduced, in addition to the technical and ethical considerations that should be taken into account when a researcher intends collect video recordings data. Lastly, the chapter includes how data is transcribed and analyzed.

Chapter 4 presents the transcription and analysis of the selected extracts. The analysis part is the core of the study since it reveals and discusses all the details that take place in teacher-student interaction during the correction process, even the tiny and small utterances and gestures conducted by participants, and how participants perceive each others' verbal and non-verbal actions to structure the interaction.

Chapter 5 is the last part which deals with the discussion, results, and conclusions that are obtained from the study in relevance to results of previous studies, as it will provide answers to the questions of the current study.

2. Theoretical Background

This chapter will present the main theoretical framework of this study. It will introduce Conversation Analysis (CA) as the main theoretical framework used for this study. The section on CA will follow classroom interaction studies from CA perspective. The chapter also includes description to the main characteristics of teacher-student interaction. It also discusses the differences between repair phenomenon and correction sequences in the classroom, forms of corrective sequences, and lastly face-work and its impact on the social interaction, and subsequently on classroom interaction.

2.1 Conversation Analysis

So, what is Conversation Analysis? CA represents and it can also be defined as the study of talk-in-interaction which examines the naturally occurring interchanges among people in everyday life (Psathas 1995:1). CA aims to demonstrate that the social activities are significant for their producers (Psathas 1995:2). Furthermore, CA explores the order of social actions and the structure of participants' interaction. In a CA study, both verbal and non-verbal actions conducted by participants, and the meaning behind these actions (Heritage 2011:209) are investigated. CA is based on video recordings as they would enable the researcher to follow the smallest details of interlocutors' actions by running the recording repeatedly.

Seedhouse argues that talk-in-interaction can be investigated because it is "systematically organized and deeply ordered" (2004:2). Hutchby and Wooffitt also, discuss that talk-in-interaction is quite organized and socially ordered (2008:11). This means that participants' talk is organized, and it follows a social system used by participants for social aims to keep the interaction flowing, and to achieve the goals intended behind the interaction. This opinion about talk is the opposite of the linguists who argued in the last century that "ordinary talk could not be the object of study for linguistics since it is too disordered" (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008:20).

Seedhouse argues that CA as a method of study is pertinent because it investigates "language as a form of social action" (2004:225) which reflects CA's target at investigating language use in the interaction and not the language itself (Seedhouse 2004:7). A CA perspective helps us explore the social world through analyzing the social interaction among participants. CA is interested not only in language per se. Rather; the actual interest is in how social activities are organized through interaction.

Conversation Analysis is based on an emic perspective as opposed to an etic perspective which is a research-relevant perspective. By emic perspective, it is meant taking participants' perspective and reporting "how participants display to each other their understanding of the context" (Seedhouse 2004:43). Emic focuses on how participants manifest to each other "their understanding of 'what is going on'" (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008:13). This means that it is not possible for the analyst to guess the reasons behind the participants' verbal or non-verbal actions, or what participants might think in minds. Accordingly, emic perspective displays how the interaction is achieved by participants according to their own interpretations to each others' turns.

Another feature of CA is that, it focuses on the next turn proof procedure and sequential organization of interaction. The next turn proof procedure is the basic tool for an analysis based on participants' emic perspective rather than "being based merely on the assumptions of the analyst" (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008:13). Hence, the next turn proof procedure ensures that participants show mutual or shared understanding of the previous turns of each other (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008:41). That is to say, participants display during the interaction "an understanding of what the 'prior' turn was about" (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008:13). What the prior speaker says then, is going to be revealed through the next turn, which is going to be achieved by the next speaker. Accordingly, the analyst's task is to claim how the listener receives and interprets the utterances or non-verbal actions produced by the speaker, because "any 'next' turn in a sequence displays its producer's understanding of the 'prior' turn" (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008:14).

Therefore, CA is an appropriate approach to research classroom interaction, and seek the social methods that can be applied by teachers to avoid students' embarrassment during correction process in the classroom.

2.2 Second Language Studies from CA Perspective

Learning a second language (SL) from CA perspective focuses on the social and interactional dimensions of the second language. Sociolinguists believe that second language "is built on language use" (Firth & Wagner 2007:806). This means that learning second language is a social action that can be achieved and enhanced through participation among participants. Furthermore, SL from CA's perspective conceives learners as "active agents, who transform task-as-activities on a moment-by-moment basis" (Markee & Kasper 2004:496). Firth and Wagner refer this point when they argue that people often can make a

successful conversation in a foreign language with limited interactional resources (1997:761). This means that participants have the ability to “perceive” each other’s verbal and non-verbal actions, as they react according to this perception (Merleau-Ponty 2005:205-8). Therefore, one cannot consider participants as passive learners whose function is transferring linguistic information “from one individual’s head to another’s” (Firth & Wagner 1997:760). Also, SL from CA perspective takes the interactional and contextual dimensions into consideration in language learning since language is “socially and contextually oriented” (Firth & Wagner 1997:758). This stresses the centrality of language use among participants here and now, as it confirms language as a social phenomenon which can be acquired through interaction among social members (Firth & Wagner 1997:759). Furthermore, CA for SL aims to trace how interlocutors understand the actions of each other to build developed intersubjectivity of their interaction (Seedhouse 2004:13), as it does not focus on learning language as an inner process; rather as “a form of social action” performed and enhanced by its users (Seedhouse 2004:225).

Second language studies from CA perspective have established field of study which has followed Firth and Wagner’s (1997) call to use CA in studies on second language classrooms. The studies highlight the “social dimension and emic perspective” in second language (Seedhouse 2004:236). Moreover, they demonstrate CA as a vigorous method to investigate L2 and the language “coconstructed by participants rather than being fixed and static” (Seedhouse 2004:224).

To demonstrate what has been mentioned, let’s discuss the results that are extracted from Seedhouse (2004) and Markee (2000) about CA for SL. These results are important because they show the significance of the interactional dimension of second language learning. The results explicate that language use among participants is pertinent to maintain intersubjectivity, develop the language, and gain new information.

Seedhouse explicates the correction process in classroom interaction (2004:176-8) as he discusses that the interactional dimension is essential in second language because it affects the pedagogical task-as-work-plan and transforms it to task-in-progress. This means that, sometimes the activities which are planned to be introduced in the classroom cannot be carried out as teachers expect, but they would be under impact of various circumstances in the classroom.

Seedhouse also supports using CA as a participant-relevant method to investigate classroom interaction as it can reveal the interactional sequences during the correction process at the micro level. He explains that CA unfolds the various techniques used by the teacher to correct students' answers. Every single technique used has an impact on the current interaction. Moreover, Seedhouse argues that CA enables us to gain insight into teachers' techniques used to correct wrong answers, and avoid face threat to students. Seedhouse concludes that the correction process in L2 classroom is crucial, that is why it should be treated carefully in order to avoid offending L2 learners by "direct, unmitigated other-initiated other-repair" (Seedhouse 2004:178).

Markee also discusses that correction process is essential in classroom interaction for maintaining intersubjectivity, because it is more "socially important to conversationalists than learning new language, even when, as in formal language instruction, language learning is the avowed purpose of engaging in talk-in-interaction" (Markee 2000:113). In other words, the social dimension of interaction during the conversation is more important to participants than learning a new language without a mutual understanding.

Then, what can we understand from the discussion above? We can conclude that participants, co-jointly, work through interaction to overcome communicative troubles in order to establish "intersubjectivity and meaning" (Firth & Wagner 2007:807). It can also be understood that learning is achieved through social interaction among interactants since the teacher's role is as "a language expert who is transferring know-how to a nonexpert" (Firth & Wagner 2007:807) and the correction process could be considered as "learning-in-action" (Firth & Wagner 2007:800). In other words, interaction among participants is based on the mutual understanding of each others' turns. And the first step toward learning is the social contact among members of society where experienced members transmit knowledge to those who have least experience.

Finally, in order to explore how language can be learned and developed, we are surely committed to observe and investigate language during interaction since social practice is the way to the learning process.

2.3 Characteristics of Teacher-Student Interaction

Classroom interaction is a part of the major wide field of institutional interaction. The characteristics of classroom interaction are distinct from those of ordinary interaction. Ordinary interaction is open, unrestricted mundane conversation that occurs among family members, friends, and peers. Classroom interaction includes various types such as “expert-learner and learner-learner interactions” (Hellermann 2008:4).

Classroom interaction is organized by the teacher as he has the privilege to question the students, and assess their contribution later on. The activities in the classroom cannot be conducted without the “conversational structure and regularity” between the teacher and the students (Macbeth 1990:193). This shows that the teacher asks the question, and a student gives an answer, then the teacher provides a third turn evaluating the student’s prior answer. What is pertinent in the third turn is that, it is used as “either closure or expansion relevant” (Macbeth 1990:199) which means that the third turn is used to terminate the current activity and/or to extend it until the teacher and the student reach reconciliation. This process is repeated according to the activity which might take place in the classroom.

Another characteristic which is really distinctive about pedagogy is the order of the adjacency pairs in teacher-student conversation since “a question will be followed immediately by an answer” (Mehan 1979:50). What is of interest in the question-answer form in teacher-student interaction is that, the teacher’s questions are “questions with known answers” (Macbeth 2011:444). The teacher knows the answers of his questions, but he asks the students to get feedback on what they have learned, and subsequently to “assess whether they have absorbed that information” (Seedhouse 2004:144).

A third characteristic of teacher-students interaction is “a specialized turn-taking system” (McHoul & Rapley 2001:210). The teacher’s turns seem to be more than the students’, as teachers “hold the floor more often and longer than students” (McHoul 1990:353) because they know the subject at issue, and it is their task to teach it.

According to Macbeth, there is a fourth remarkable feature which is related to the turn-taking system in the pedagogical field. It is “teacher-student talk, two-person talk produced for all to see and hear” (1990:94). This means that the initiated question is oriented to all students until one of them attempts to take the turn to answer. Then, the conversation between the teacher and the student is oriented toward the cohort, that is why all students should pay

attention to what the teacher and the student say. Accordingly, it can be concluded “[t]he teacher is addressing the class as a whole and is thereby getting them to act as a unit” (Payne & Hustler 1980:54). This displays that the students act as a cohort not as individuals; therefore, when a student takes a turn, s/he represents the whole class. Hence, other students should listen and wait for their turns.

Hellermann argues some characteristics relevant particularly to adults learning classrooms. These aspects reflect that the goal behind learning is interactional one rather than being grammatical (Hellermann 2008:5). The first characteristic is the “mutual engagement” which refers to the reciprocal participation and commitment between interlocutors. This mutual engagement would enable them understand their roles and keep interaction flowing. For example, the students show attention to the teacher’s role, as the teacher shows orientation toward students’ actions, so that both parties can enhance classroom interaction, and achieve intended goals. The second one is “shared repertoire” which indicates all activities, things used in the communication in classroom interaction, such as verbal and non-verbal actions, tools and symbols that enable participants communicate and interact with each other easily. Shared repertoires are essential in classroom interaction because they facilitate shared understanding among participants, and subsequently facilitate participation in classroom activities. Lastly, the third characteristic is “economies of meaning” which means that the shared understanding of the meaning between interlocutors would increase the participation in the classroom and enhance the interaction. Sharing the same meaning is crucial since working without fixing intersubjectivity among participants during classroom interaction would impede learning process (Hellermann 2008:10-13).

Thus, we have seen several characteristics that differentiate classroom interaction from other types of interaction. One may infer that institutional context affects both the verbal and non-verbal behaviour achieved by participants in classroom interaction.

2.4 Repairs and Correction Sequences in the Classroom

In this section, the focus will be on the terms “repair” and “correction” and how they have been used in CA studies of classroom so that the concept of correction sequences will be understandable. I will discuss the use of repair in general, and the use of correction in the classroom, as I will also present the correction as a relevant subfield of the wide system of repair.

Repair is a prevalent phenomenon that happens overwhelmingly in the various encounters of social life. Even children are used to repair process since they are accustomed seeing and hearing adults' repair phrases and gestures from the early stages of childhood. Then, one may say that the device of repair is widely used in public life. Repair "is sometimes found where there is no hearable error, mistake or fault" (Drew & Heritage 2010:112). That is to say, the device of repair is used in everyday situations to correct pronunciation and information among interlocutors. Furthermore, repair may include "incorrect word selection, slips of the tongue, mis-hearing, misunderstanding and so on" (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2005:59). Thus, the repair may exceed to repair "no apparent error" (Mehan 1979:113). As such, "[r]epairs cover any kinds of problems in talk in interaction" (Arminen 2005:129) and they may exceed to encompass the social actions.

Seedhouse points out that there are two different types of repairs; self-repair when a speaker corrects his/her own error; and other-repair when someone else initiates and achieves the repair of the speaker's error (2004:34). Furthermore, repair "shows a structural preference for self-initiation AND self-repair" (Macbeth 2004:707) as participants prefer to repair their own mistakes rather than being repaired by others. Therefore, other-initiation other-repair is dispreferred.

On the other hand, the correction refers to special types of trouble sources (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2005:59) since it refers to the "replacement of an 'error' or 'mistake' by what is 'correct'" (Macbeth 2004:708). The correction is related to correcting students' answers, and it is a prevailing phenomenon in classrooms (Macbeth 2004:704). The correction accordingly, is used in exclusive conditions to correct students' wrong or dispreferred answers. Hence, the correction takes place when there is an error related to the participant's (the student) answer.

Whereas self-initiation self-repair is preferred and widespread in mundane conversation, one may observe that "[o]ther-initiation and other-correction are far more commonplace on instructional occasions than in ordinary conversation" (Macbeth 2004:729). Though McHoul discusses "other-initiations overwhelmingly yield self-correction" (1990:366), Macbeth points out that other-correction is "a device for dealing with those who are still learning" (2004:708). Thus, it might be possible to say that the correction is expected in the classroom because the teacher is the person who has the "power and authority" to assess and correct the students' errors (Macbeth 1991:281). Accordingly, whereas other-initiation other-correction is widely used, self-initiation self-correction is "rare" in SL classrooms (Markee 2000:110).

Furthermore, "repair can entail correction; correction is a lesser domain both conceptually and empirically" (Macbeth 2004:707). Repair is embedded in the correction process, as it is still understood as the wide field which encompasses correction (Macbeth 2004:730). Thus, correction is a "kind of repair" (Macbeth 2004:707) as repair is wider than correction since repair deals with all problems in conversational interaction. Repair as a broad system is at play simultaneously as the correction system since they are relevant to each other. So, when correction sequences take place, the repair is occurring too. It can be concluded then, that the repair process is the central idea behind the correction sequences in classroom interaction.

According to Arminen's opinion that is related to the correction sequences in the pedagogical cycle, the correction approach may have various forms "depending on the student's answer" (2005:114). The teacher may follow different techniques to correct the students' answers. He may reformulate the student's response to cope with the given question, or he sometimes reformulates the question to be more understandable and reachable to students. So, there are various forms of correction that will be illustrated in detail in the next section.

2.4.1 Forms of Correction

I will present in this section the forms of correction that take place in the classroom; the exposed and the embedded correction. The exposed correction is overt, prevalent, and the core of the activity of correction happens in the classroom. The embedded correction is implicit, and can be achieved "without emerging to the conversational surface" (Button & Lee 1987:86).

2.4.1.1 Exposed Correction

According to Jefferson (1987), the exposed correction refers to the explicit correction that may take place during the interaction among participants. That is to say, the correction is "now the interactional business of these interchanges" (1987:88). The explicit correction includes several types. Self-correction may be initiated and achieved by the student who gives an incorrect answer. In this case, it is called self-initiation self-correction (Seedhouse 2004). It is worth noting that literatures argue self-initiation self-correction is the preferred (e.g. Weeks, 1985; McHoul, 1990; Macbeth, 2004; Seedhouse, 2004; Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2005) type of

repair in mundane and classroom interactions as speakers prefer to correct their own errors; however, this type is uncommon in classrooms (Macbeth 2004:709).

The second type of the exposed correction which is also non prevalent in classrooms is self-initiation other-correction. It indicates the correction that is initiated by the student with the trouble source, but the correction is done by the other participant (the teacher or another student). In other words, when the student does not give the right answer, the teacher would give the floor to another student to achieve other-correction, or the teacher himself carries out the other-correction.

The third type as it is mentioned by McHoul (1990) is other-initiation self-correction. It is that type of correction which takes place when the teacher or a student initiates the correction. McHoul points out other-initiations often lead up to self-correction (1990:366). Also, Seedhouse argues that, in L2 classrooms, the correction is initiated by the teacher, especially in “form-and-accuracy contexts” (2004:145). This type is pervasive in classrooms and natural conversations since other-initiation leads to self-correction in most cases.

The fourth type of the exposed correction is other-initiation other-correction which exists mostly in the classroom when the teacher or one of the students initiates and accomplishes the correction instead of the student who gives an incorrect answer. Jefferson calls this correction the “correction of one speaker by another” (2010:270). She points out that this correction entails correcting one participant’s error in the conversation in an overt way. Accordingly, the correction is oriented toward the “lapses” in the conversational interaction.

It is worth mentioning that the exposed correction may include “accountings” which may involve various instances to locate the trouble source in the speaker’s turn, to help her/him out to self-correct. The accounting might include “explanation of the error, ridicule, and apology” (Button & Lee 1987:96).

What is of interest in the exposed correction for this study is the strategies that are used to help students to self-correct. The teacher resorts to use various techniques, to initiate correction until a student makes the right answer. The result of these techniques is an “extended sequence” turns that may take place to highlight the trouble source, and help the student self-correct (Mehan 1979:52). The teacher extends the negotiation of the student’s answer “without evaluation until a correct reply appeared” (Mehan 1979:57). For instance, the teacher may initiate another question to caution the student who holds the floor in order to

self-correct, or he may use a “partial repeat of the trouble-source turn” (Drew & Heritage 2010:118) to draw the student’s attention to the trouble source. Furthermore, the teacher may use the technique of clarification to ask the student “*Y’ mean plus* a possible understanding of prior turn” (Weeks 1985:205 italics in original). Another type of teachers’ techniques to initiate correction is dividing the questions “into as many parts as possible, and as many as were required to solve them in the best way” (Descartes 2006:17). This displays that the teacher breaks down the question into small parts, and makes small animations referring to the correct answer, so that the students can make the right choice (Macbeth 1994:316). Moreover, the teacher may use further pauses to show “uncertainty” towards the given answer (Macbeth 2004:718). The uncertainty might orient the student’s attention to another appropriate answer.

As teachers try to avoid face threat to students, it can be noticed that teachers show tendency to extend the negotiation turn, instead of making bald, negative evaluation of students’ incorrect answers (Seedhouse 2004:171). Seedhouse shows that, teachers apply various techniques to correct students’ errors “while simultaneously avoiding direct and overt negative evaluation” since the direct negative evaluation is considered by methodologists “to involve loss of face and demoralization for the learner” (2004:168-70).

However, there is a case in the exposed correction by which the teacher corrects promptly, and without a probable negotiation of the student’s wrong reply. It is through using the technique of “mitigated negative evaluation” (Seedhouse 2004:168). The teacher uses “no” as a response to the student’s wrong answer. In this case, the direct “no” is usually followed by a “mitigating comment” (ibid). It is necessary to refer that this “no” is not a negative evaluation to the student’s answer; however, its function is “providing an answer to learner’s question or initiation” (Seedhouse 2004:170). This type of the exposed correction reflects the teacher’s identity, his social position, and his role in teaching the students. Accordingly, if one approves the theory of socialization, it can be supposed that the direct exposed correction does not threaten the dignity or the face of the students, because the goal behind it is to assure “the recurrence of intersubjectivity-in-conversation” (Macbeth 2004:707).

2.4.1.2 Embedded Correction

On the contrary of the exposed correction where the correction process is visible, the embedded correction is achieved without referring to the correction process, and without opening “a side sequence” of the ongoing activity (Wagner 2004:75). The embedded correction is another type of correction where teachers correct students’ answers in an implicit way and without indicating that the given answer is unacceptable (Macbeth 2004:710). Accordingly, the embedded correction is done by teachers during the conversation, as it is another technique used by teachers to avoid face threat to students. Embedded correction takes place in classroom when the teacher implicitly corrects the students’ lexical and grammatical errors. By implicitly, we mean the teacher corrects students’ linguistic errors without holding the students accountable. Hence, the main task of the teacher in this case is on “this next action and not on the correction” (Wagner 2004:75).

As it occurs in mundane conversations, as Jefferson (1987) argues that, the embedded correction occurs in teacher-student interaction, and especially in second language classrooms since learners may produce a wide range of lexical and syntactic errors. Embedded correction deals with talk problems, and targets the trouble source of students’ answers without interrupting the ongoing activity. This means that the teacher does not supply the correction overtly to what has been said, but he uses instead, the embedded correction to reformulate “all or part of what the student has said; it remains open whether something was wrong or not” (Dalton-Puffer 2007:206). Therefore, the teacher initiates the embedded correction in order to correct the error on one hand, and keep the ongoing activity proceeding on the other. Furthermore, Jefferson argues that the embedded correction takes place during the activity while the “talk in progress continues” (2010:276). She points out that the embedded correction may take place when the second participant makes a correction within the speech, then the first participant repeats the same alternative which is suggested by the second participant (Drew & Heritage 2010:278).

It is pertinent to mention that when the embedded correction takes place, it is not followed by pauses to indicate the end of the activity, as it takes place in the exposed correction (Wagner 2004:78). In embedded correction, the error is repaired without pauses, and without mentioning that the given answer is wrong. Hence, the ongoing activity continues without interruption. Nevertheless, it should be mentioned here that the embedded correction

“does not allow the learner the opportunity to self-repair” (Seedhouse 2004:167) because the correction is achieved in an implicit way.

Thus, it can be concluded that the embedded correction is used extensively in the second language learning sessions because of students’ lack of experience of the grammar and the pronunciation of the learned language, the teacher’s tendency to encourage students to practice the language. Furthermore, the teacher corrects students’ linguistic errors without holding the ongoing activity or accounting the students. Accordingly, one may understand that the embedded correction is another technique used to correct students’ errors and save their face during the interaction.

2.5 Face-work and Politeness

As it has been mentioned in the title of the thesis, this paper is being carried out to investigate the relationship between different types of correction in classroom and face-work. Therefore, it is important to define what “face-work” means, and its role in classroom interaction.

Theory of Face was established by the Canadian Sociologist Erving Goffman, in the 1950s of the last century (Manning 1992:3). According to Goffman, the concept of face refers to “the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact” (Goffman 2005:5).

To shed light upon the definition of face, it can be argued that “face” represents the social honour and respect of individuals. Face is considered the social solidarity among participants to maintain each other’s face. Moreover, face reflects the individual’s positive image, the social position and prestige in society, which should be sustained in social encounters. People realize the significance of face in their network because it enhances their social status. Face can be treated then as one of the “social frameworks” (Goffman 1986:22) that is pertinent in interaction. Face as a social framework means that participants’ behaviour is restrained by social limits; such as social conventions, traditions and social norms. Therefore, individuals’ conduct will be restricted to social motives and intentions. Furthermore, face illustrates the social value and respect of the social member, this respect will be “withdrawn unless he conducts himself in a way that is worthy of it” (Goffman 2005:10).

Additionally, Goffman introduces two other related phenomena. The first is “being in wrong face” (Goffman 1982:9) which refers to the loss of social respect and reverence because of conducting unacceptable verbal or non-verbal behaviour. Also, one may lose face because of a disruptive incident made by others. The second is to be “in face” which means that a person can save his honour and his social position, subsequently save his face (Goffman 2005:8-9).

In addition to Goffman, Brown and Levinson (1987) put another definition of “face” based on Goffman’s Theory. They reemphasize that face is “something that is emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be constantly attended in the interaction” (Brown & Levinson 1987:61). That is to say, the self-image is existed and eminent in every social encounter, as the definition also reflects the universality of social necessity to save participants’ face during interaction. In addition to their discussion of face, Brown and Levinson introduce new expressions related to face phenomenon. The first is the “negative face” which attributes the want of every social member that “his actions be unimpeded” by others’ requests, orders, and advices (Brown & Levinson 1987:62-6). The second is the “positive face” that indicates the want of individuals to be accepted and “desirable to at least some others” (ibid). The acceptance means that co-participants work together to reduce disagreement and avoid dissention and criticism during interaction. This reflects that participants orient themselves to show politeness and avoid hurting the negative face of each other, at the same time; they show mutual engagement to each others’ positive face. Furthermore, Brown and Levinson present two additional terms in relevance to face-work. “Positive politeness” is the first term which is directed toward “the positive face” of the hearer. Positive politeness indicates that the hearer’s wants are desirable and approved by the speaker. The second term is “negative politeness” which is mainly directed toward the hearer’s negative face as it refers that the speaker realizes and values the hearer’s desire to be free and unimpeded by others. Then, one may understand that “there are clear links between matters concerning the structure of every conversation and face consideration” (Tzanne 2000:199) as face has an apparent impact on interaction in the various social encounters.

As face is an important aspect in social interaction, its significance is indispensable in classroom interactions as a student is also a member in a social gathering and s/he wants others “to think highly of him” (Goffman 1990:15).When a student loses face in the class, because he could not give the right answer, he might be embarrassed. The impact of losing face will not only make the student feel ashamed, but it might “threaten the line of activity in

which the participants are involved” (Drew & Wootton 1988:138). Moreover, it may affect the cohort in the class, and disrupt the interaction between the teacher and the cohort. Therefore, teachers spend a lot of time on interactional work to avoid face threatening actions to students (Seedhouse 2004:171). Thus, teachers adopt the “protective practices” which ensure students’ self-respect and safeguard their positive feelings (Goffman 1990:25). In addition to what has been discussed, it would be substantial to mention that teachers adopt politeness in dealing with students because they wisely “did not want to subdue students’ thinking or provoke them to the point of rebellion” (Manke 1997: 90).

Seedhouse 2004 argues that face-work is taken into consideration in classroom interaction by teachers. He argues that teachers use several techniques to correct students’ wrong answers, and spend time and efforts to avoid face threat to students. He also adds that teachers “perform a great deal of interactional work to avoid performing direct and overt negative evaluation of learner linguistic errors” (Seedhouse 2004:171). Moreover, he points out that teachers avoid “no” as an explicit evaluation to students’ wrong answers. And if they use “no” the correction will be followed by mitigation to be “less face-threatening” (Seedhouse 2004:169). Accordingly, face-work is taken into account in order to increase students’ participations in classroom activities. Subsequently, the learning process will also be enhanced and sustained. This confirms that face-work motivates the organization of classroom interaction in order to be compatible with “ethnomethodological conceptions of affiliation and disaffiliation” (Seedhouse 2004:180). As such, this paper is an endeavour to support necessity of face-work in classroom interaction, as it is an attempt to expand awareness of face-work in the pedagogical field.

2.6 Chapter Summary

The chapter included the theoretical background which is related to this study. First, the chapter provided the reader with description about CA as a methodological approach, its role in investigating language use in the social world, and how CA can explore the daily needs of teachers and students in classrooms. Second, the chapter introduced second language from CA perspective, which demonstrates that language acquisition is a social phenomenon that can be developed through participation among social members in real life. Third, the chapter explicated the characteristics of classroom interaction, and how the institutional context affects the verbal and non-verbal conduct of the interlocutors. Fourth, the concept of correction in the classroom and its relevance to the broad domain of repair is introduced. It

has been also discussed the explicit, and embedded correction as forms of correction, in addition to the techniques used to achieve and mitigate the correction. Lastly, the chapter provided description of face-work and its impact on generic and classroom interaction.

3. Methodology and Data

In this chapter, I will discuss the conversation analysis approach as a method used to examine the correction sequences in the classroom. Then, I will present the data, which consists of recorded films collected for this study. The chapter will show how recordings were conducted, and inform the ethical considerations that have been undertaken during the process of video recordings. Furthermore, this chapter includes why specific extracts have been chosen from numerous sequences of the recorded films. Lastly, the process of transcription will be discussed, in addition to the process of analysing data; focusing on the next turn proof procedure and sequential organization of interaction.

3.1 Conversation Analysis Approach

CA is a scientific methodological approach, which depends principally in its work on the audio and video technology. CA's main task is studying "the organization and order of social action in interaction" (Seedhouse 2004:12). This means that the major aim of CA is to describe how interaction is organized by participants, and how activities are orderly arranged during interaction. Seedhouse argues that CA's aim is to "uncover the norms to which participants are orienting and the emic logic or rational basis for their actions" (2004:259). That is to say, CA analyzes participants' actions according to their own perspective which is reflected through their talk. In other words, CA describes how the context of talk has been understood by participants themselves, a part from any external perspectives.

In this study, I try to describe "what" participants do, how they perform the social actions, and how they show understanding of each others' social actions. The essential device to achieve an analysis, based on the interlocutors' perspective, is the next-turn proof procedure. By using this device, CA analyst would be able to uncover what the previous speaker intended by her/his prior turn, since this would be displayed through the next turn of the next speaker.

One may outline work steps of CA since they will be discussed later on in the section of data collection. It was pointed out in the literature review that a CA work uses naturally occurring talk-in-interaction. It means that the spontaneous recorded conversation among

teacher and students during classroom interaction would enable the analyst to decide which phenomenon would be identified for further investigation. After identifying the correction process as a selected phenomenon, the analyst should select a number of comparable extracts of the naturally occurring conversation. Then, a transcription is made for the selected extracts so that the analyst is being able to allocate variations among them. After the transcription, analyzing data is the next step, which is based on analyzing the single extract turn by turn. Thus, it would be possible for the analyst and the readers to see patterns of speech for each sequence. Subsequently, it would be easy for the analyst reaches the sources used by the teacher and the students to achieve the correction.

Lastly, it is essential to emphasize that CA's domain is restricted to investigate "naturally occurring spoken interaction" among participants (Seedhouse 2004:260) but not artificial conversations which might be prepared beforehand.

3.2 Data

The data used for this study was collected from a corpus of video recordings which is 5 hours of video recordings. The data was recorded during spring term 2013 in a university in Sweden. The data consists of video recordings of three English language learning sessions given by one teacher to more than 40 participants. Those participants were undergraduate university-students of both genders, as they were non-native speakers of English. The sessions include both written English and English grammar language where the teacher gives the students several written and oral exercises, to improve their abilities and skills in English language. During the sessions, the teacher and the students go through the rules of English grammar. The teacher helps the students to practice the rules and apply them to the translation of the texts. The main focus of these sessions is to enable the students use language and practice it with others so as to teach them how to write essays in the course.

Fieldwork helps the researcher to know about the target group and to be familiar with the features of the place where the recording is supposed to be done (Heath & Hindmarsh 2002:16). It is crucial for the researcher to make first a fieldwork visit in order to "take field notes that provide a basic outline of the events" (Derry, Pea et al. 2010:18) and observe the activities in which the teacher and the students engaged. Therefore, I attended a session to observe the teacher, the students, and the environment (the class) where the activities were held. Attending the session enabled me decide which positions are more suitable for cameras. The position of the cameras is critical since it determines how much details of the participants' talk and gestures could be captured. In the recording sessions, the cameras were

installed before the participants' arrival to reduce the confusion and ensure that they are "distracted as little as possible by the recording equipment" (Heath & Hindmarsh 2002:18). Two fixed cameras were available to be used; one of them was positioned to record the teacher, and the other to capture some of the students in the classroom. It is worth to mention that using only one static camera to record students limits the ability to capture all students' actions. As a result, the ability to collect more data was bound to some students who were sitting in front of the camera, whereas the actions of other students were absent because they were sitting apart of the camera. This limitation had an impact on the choice of the extracts which were selected for analysis since I was restricted to a limited number of correctional sequences.

However, the recordings allow me to reach the tiny details of participants' conduct, as they enable me to see the events repeatedly for further accurate investigation. Thus, the video recordings have the advantage of "staying much closer" to what is going on among participants, as they would reflect the actual events that take place among teacher and students moment by moment (Jordan & Henderson 1995:50).

3.2.1 Ethical Considerations

The researcher should consider ethical concerns during data collection. S/he should take into account the principles of respect of persons, as s/he should show honorable treatment to participants and respect their desire to be recorded or not.

As there are regulations and requirements that organize the researcher's work with individuals, I prepared a consent letter to the students after discussing the matter with the teacher. The consent letter included information about the purpose of the research. Also, the participants were told (in the consent letter) that their contribution is voluntarily and they can withdraw from participation at any time. Furthermore, they were promised confidentiality, that participants' identities, names, and even the name of the university wouldn't be published. Moreover, it would be a restricting access to the recordings even by researchers who intend to use the recordings in the future. I sent the consent letter by e-mail to the students. After one week, I got the consent letters back as all the students document their approval to make the recordings.

3.2.2 Selecting Specific Extracts

After examining the video recordings repeatedly, I found out that the correction phenomenon is interesting as the teacher uses several techniques to help students to reach the right answer. I chose four extracts that show different types of correction used by the teacher to correct students' incorrect answers. The reason why these extracts have been chosen is that, they are the clearest examples the fixed camera could capture, and the most salient fragments that best clarify, and show how the interaction is achieved between the teacher and the students during the correction process. Further, the extracts show how the teacher uses words, gestures, and silence of correcting the students' wrong or dispreferred answers. Finally, the chosen extracts show the participants' orientation and understanding toward each others' actions, subsequently make the meaning behind their interaction visible and understandable to the recipient.

3.2.3 Transcription and Analysing Data

To make the transcription for the chosen extracts, the researcher should make the first step, which is listening to the extracts attentively. This may demand watching and listening the selected parts many times. As I have two separated recorded films which have been taken from two fixed cameras, I was committed first to monitor the teacher's actions and write them down, then transcribe the students' actions, then, put the two parts together to examine the interaction. This process demands time and effort to be achieved accurately. The transcription should describe as accurately as possible the verbal and non-verbal actions of participants, and "the precise beginning and end points of turns, the duration of pauses, audible sounds which are not words" (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2005:75). The transcription provides the reader with what and "*how* the persons were speaking" (Psathas 1995:11 italics in original).

Mondada argues that transcripts cannot stand alone since "[t]ranscripts and recordings are reflexively tied together" (2007:812). Therefore, doing conversational analysis should be based on coupling both transcription, and video records since transcript is conceived as a "representation" of the analyzed data, and video recording as a "reproduction" of the interactional event (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2005:74). It is worth noting that, in the transcripts for presenting data, there are numerous types of actions (verbal and non-verbal) going in the classroom. Therefore, in the transcripts, we select only those events that are important and marked to the participants. It would be necessary to mention that the transcription was made according to the conventions of transcription of the analysts Gail Jefferson (2004) and Lorenza Mondada (2007). Lastly, it is also essential to mention, that the process of

transcription is a critical step since the practice of transcription is a very critical phase in analyzing data later on.

In the analysis process, the main target is focusing on analyzing the activities, line by line in order to see the “significant interactional detail in the ongoing production of singular sequences of talk-in-interaction” (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008:113). I mean by line by line, that everything is going to be analyzed. Not only the words, gestures and gazes are analyzed, but the silence, the intonation, and sound stretch are also included.

Since the extracts that have been chosen in this study are extended ones, the technique of a “single case analysis” has been used for tracking and describing the events that exist in each extract. Further, the single case analysis is used to discover the patterns and the general features of talk in interaction for each extract (ibid). The process of analyzing data does not follow, as it is mentioned earlier, the researcher’s guess work and her interpretation of the sequences of events. Rather, it follows the participants’ understanding and their orientation to each others’ turn. Therefore, focusing on the next turn proof procedure, would display how the prior and next turns are relevant to each other, as it would show the understanding “of what the prior speaker was intending” (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008:113). Subsequently, it would manifest the sequential organization of the conversation among co-participants.

4. Classroom Corrections

This chapter provides an analysis of types of correction in classroom and its relevance to face-work. Four categories have been chosen, to show the relationship between the correction process and face-work. Analyzing the first category shows the extended negotiation technique which is used by the teacher to correct the students’ answers. It also displays two types of correction used; the explicit and the embedded correction. The extended negotiation and the embedded correction are used to mitigate the correction process. The second category illustrates how the process of correction is achieved through fragmentation, which is dividing the question to small units so that students are able to self correct. The third category reveals how the correction is done through socialization. The last one shows the direct correction technique whereby the teacher corrects the linguistic error directly, without a delay. It is worth noting that in the direct correction, face work is also present, and has been taken into consideration. In other words, this chapter displays the techniques used by the teacher to negotiate the incorrect answers (4.1, 4.2, and 4.3), as it explicates the direct correction that is used in limited cases (4.4).

4.1 Correction through Extended Negotiation

The correction in this case is based on negotiating the wrong answer in order to attract students to the trouble source, then to help them to self correct. In this extract, the teacher reads a paragraph which is written by one of the students. The teacher initiates the activity by asking a question “any comment for the first sentence?” A student raises her hand to give an answer. The teacher shows hesitancy to accept her answer. After several turns from the teacher to initiate the correction, he comes up with the following question:

Extract no. 1

“How complicated” (1:00-1:57)

1. T >What do you *think about the level of < *style?
2. ((The teacher leans his head and looks at Mette while he makes the turn))
3. (1.5)
4. Mette e:::m↑ (0.3) + its (0.6) ((waving her hands))
5. + (XXXX) ↓ well I + think ↑it is feels + more English.
6. ((She smiles, waves her hands, and shrugs))
7. (0.5) ((The teacher presses his lips together))
8. T .hh it ↑*does feel more English* (0.1) and >i(t) *certainly< works* (0.5)
9. ((He raises his eyebrows, nods his head, looks at the text))
10. ((After several omitted turns, the teacher comes up with the following turn))
11. T → But *I ↑ (2.0) I *have↓(0.3) a better s > *no sorry*<
12. ((He drops one pen and picks another, then he smiles, and looks at Mette and waves his hands))
13. ⌈ another ⌋ suggestion ↓ (.) right? (1.0)
14. Mette ⌊He+hee ⌋
15. ((Mette laughs and moves her body forward. The teacher smiles during his turn, he points to another student who raises her hand))
16. S2 How+ever ° ↓ (.)? ((she gazes at the teacher))
17. T → *However ↑ (0.2)is what ↑I* would (0.7) go for↓
18. ((He writes on the slide, and looks at S2))

In the various types of social interaction, there is a probable threat to participants’ face; therefore, it is anticipated that “in every social encounter the primary concern of the

interactants will be to maintain their own face as well as that of their interlocutors” (Tzanne 2000:190).

In this extract, the teacher asks a question, he does not use words such as “correction” or “repair” but he uses “comment”. Using “comment” may indicate that the teacher downgrades students’ hesitation. “Comment” may also display that the teacher’s turn will be heard positively. The teacher’s question “any comment for the first sentence?” which is not included in the transcript, represents the first part of an adjacency pair which demands an answer to be completed. The teacher’s strategy of the session is that he does not nominate a student to answer a question, but he picks a student whose hand goes up first. Accordingly, he nominates the first participant ”Mette” who raises her hand, to give another answer. The picture below illustrates the students while they were listening to Mette’s answer.



Mette suggests “no matter” in an interrogative and falling tone which displays uncertainty of the answer. From a face perspective, Mette’s uncertainty may reflect that she takes politeness in consideration as she does not impose her choice to be accepted. She gives the answer to be negotiated, and this means she shows respect to the teacher’s “negative face” as he may prefer another answer (Brown & Levinson 1987:62). After several turns made by the teacher to “capture the student’s attention” to initiate self-correction (Arminen 2005:119), the technique of “a question-redirection” (McHoul 1990:358) is used to mark out “style” as a trouble source (line 1). Mette produces inaudible utterances while she is looking at her text (line 5). This may indicate that she tries to find the answer while reading the text again. Mette rises her pitch to complete the answer (line 5). The rising tone interprets that Mette realizes that the absence of her turn becomes “noticeable and accountable” (Have 2007:101). She resumes quickly “it is feels more English” which is an ungrammatical sentence. A pause (0.5) appears (line 7). During the pause, after giving Mette the answer, the teacher presses his lips together. The teacher’s reaction to Mette’s prior answer indicates that he notes Mette’s ungrammatical sentence. The gesture (pressing lips together) may be an indication to the

teacher's negative evaluation. The teacher's next turn "it does feel more English" (line 8) supports the interpretation of the negative evaluation to Mette's answer. The teacher's turn can be interpreted as an "embedded" correction of Mette's prior answer (Arminen 2005:128). The teacher's correction in this case addresses the trouble source of the student's answer; yet, the teacher avoids hurting the student's "negative face" as he does not impose an overt correction to her answer (Brown & Levinson 1987:62). At the same time, he protects her "positive face" when he shows an agreement to accept her choice and appreciate it (ibid). The teacher's correction cannot be considered a threat to the student's face "as no overt disagreement or rejection" has been made (Tzanne 2000:202). One may understand that the teacher avoids imposing a direct correction, as he avoids disagreement and challenge during interaction. Hence, the correction in this case is not explicit as the teacher performs the correction without making the student accountable, and without interrupting the activity. Then, the teacher corrects the student's answer implicitly so that she can cooperate with the teacher without the feeling of being embarrassed, or being out of the context of the activity. Thus, face-work has been used to protect the student's face as it involves "all actions taken by a person to make whatever he is doing consistent with face" (Goffman 1967:12).

The teacher completes his turn (line 8) confirming that "no matter" is a valid choice in the spoken English. The teacher points out that he has a better suggestion (lines 11-14). However, after a (0.3) "within-turn pause" (Have 2007:101), the teacher completes promptly his turn apologizing to Mette. The teacher's turn indicates that he initiates the correction; at the same time, he mitigates the correction process by apologizing to the student. The teacher supposes that a face threatening act has taken place against Mette when he suggests "a better" suggestion (line 11). The teacher as a member in a social community is bound by "norms of good manners" (Goffman 1986:500). Hence, the teacher avoids dissension with Mette as his verbal and non-verbal actions show orientation toward avoiding sanctioning her. He offers interactional work to show sympathy and approval to her participation. Moreover, he uses "no sorry" because he used the word "better" which may bear the meaning that Mette's answer is less in value than others. Showing apology by the teacher reflects that he holds himself responsible as he seems to damage his "positive face" (Brown & Levinson 1987:66) to protect the student's face. Moreover, this displays that the teacher uses a chosen language in order to allow the student presents herself "in a light that is favourable to [her]" (Goffman 1990:18).

It can be understood that politeness and face-work are evoked in classroom interaction, as face-work demands cooperation from the speaker and the hearer to be maintained. The

student shows politeness to the teacher when she suggests an alternative in an interrogative way, and the teacher uses several techniques, to help the student self correct before other-correction has been achieved. The various techniques have been used in order to mitigate the correction and avoid face threatening acts that may occur on the student. Furthermore, by using Goffman's Theory of Face, the teacher's actions can be understood as attempts to avoid putting the student in the "wrong face" which may cause tension, disruption, and increase negative feelings not only of Mette, but of all hearers in the classroom (Goffman 1982:9).

It is necessary to end the analysis with another remarkable point that appears in this extract. It is the teacher's uncertainty about which answer is right and which one is not. The teacher uses the word "better" (line 11) indicates that he does not completely rejecting "no matter"; nevertheless, he prefers another alternative. This demonstrates that using one of these words "no matter" and "however" is not a crucial matter because using anyone of them may affect the style, but still, make the same meaning. Thus, using "no matter" is not wrong grammatically, but it makes an impact on the meaning, and the style of written English.

4.2 Correction through Fragmentation

It is the second type of correctional techniques which is used to help students to self correct. This technique is based on breaking up the question into two parts or more so that students can achieve self-correction. In the following extract, the teacher reads a group's text where students should substitute nouns by pronouns. The teacher and the students work together to correct the erroneous pronouns. The teacher asks the students to provide with an alternative that is referring to the noun "nation" in the text. A student gives "the" which is an incorrect answer. Therefore, the teacher asks the students again to give another alternative.

Extract no.2

"Its" instead of "nation" (12:23-13:42)

1. T *I suppose↑ instead of <the> (0.3) we could use something ↑else to help the
2. reader out* ↑(1.0)
3. *((During his turn, the teacher looks at the students))*
4. *((After several omitted turns made by the teacher, he gives the floor to a*
5. *student who raises her hand))*

6. T °Yes please° (0.8)
7. ((During the teacher's turn, two students raise their hands to give an answer,
8. the teacher points to the student who raises her hand to participate for the first
9. time))
10. S1 °Nati+on °? (0. 5) ((she puts her hand on her chin))
11. T I * think (.) *so↑ ((he raises his eyebrows, then he looks at the text. S1 outs her
12. hand from her chin))
13. T And *you could then refer to this nation by ↓writing*? (0.4)
14. ((He looks at S1 again))
15. S1 + Of ? ((she looks at the teacher))
16. (1.5) ((the teacher looks at the text))
17. T e:: * ɾ::: e::: ɿ rr ↓am just trying to see* (.) (then)
18. S1 ↳he+hee↓
19. ((He looks at the text, S1 looks at her text also, she laughs and raises her
20. eyebrows in a quick movement. Then, she puts her hand on her lips.))
21. T *So (.) if *you read it to me then how you thought abou(t) that? (2.0)
22. ((He looks at the text and points to S1 by his hand. During the pause, S1 looks
23. at her text and wipes her lips by her fingers. She makes a circular movement
24. by her fingers around her lips))
25. Y' *mean (the) *f ? * (4.0)
26. ((He looks first at the text, then, looks at S1. S1 keeps looking at her text and
27. removes her hand from her lips. Another student raises her hand. the teacher
28. returns to look again to the text))
29. S1 (X) ↓ + nation e: ↓(I do no know) + I didn't write (XX) (I) + probably <say>
30. + e::m
31. ((She looks first at her text, and then she looks at the teacher and puts her
32. hand on her lips. Then, she waves her hand and smiles))
33. (1.5)
34. ((During the pause, S1 puts her hand on her lips in a quick movement,
35. removes it and looks at her text))
36. T Well * (I) am thinking is we * might supply another word instead of <the:>?
 37. (5.5) < to refer to nation>° (2.5) to refer back to a word in the <singular>°
 38. (1.0)
39. ((The teacher puts the pen on the table and looks at S1. S1 looks at her text.
40. She taps the table by a pen in her hand, and then she looks closely at the text
41. on the board))
42. T —————> *This is so easy↑ > * am (I) making ↑(it)harder for you< by

43. Γ*just asking the question↑?
44. S1 └He+he+he+┘
45. *((The teacher keeps putting his hand on the pen and looks at the students and*
46. *smiles. The students start laughing. S1 scratches her chin and smiles lightly.*
47. *Then she laughs and rubs her fingers))*
- ((The teacher waits for 2 seconds and initiates a question to another student))*
48. T And so?
49. S2 °(Its)°?
50. T → * (Its) ↑? (0.5) how *about its (.)?
51. *((The teacher looks at S1 and smiles))*
52. S1 +Y+a↓ *((During her turn, she nods her head and smiles. She presses her lips*
53. *together, smiles and rubs her chin by her hand))*

At the beginning of this extract, the teacher initiates a question asking the students to substitute the definite article (the) by a pronoun corresponds to the noun "nation". The teacher accentuates "the" which indicates that he attracts the students' attention to the definite article as a trouble source. The teacher's question is the first part of an adjacency pair which should be followed by an answer to complete it.

The teacher allows (line 6) a student (S1) who raises her hand to answer the question (line 10). S1 suggests "nation?" as an alternative to the definite article. By giving an answer in an interrogative tone, S1 shows uncertainty toward her answer, as she may show politeness and consideration toward the teacher and his social position as an authoritative person in the classroom. A short pause (0.5) appears (line 10) after S1 made her answer. The pause displays that the given answer is not the right one. The pauses play an integral role in maintaining the students' positive feelings as the pauses may indicate opportunities by which the teacher "shows compassion and sympathy toward others" (Goffman 1982:12). Therefore, the teacher provides S1 opportunities to respond and correct her answer.

The teacher responds (line 11) to initiate correction, in a rising and accentuated tone, with "I think" which is as a "means of mitigation" and reduces the impact of the correction (Seedhouse 2004:36). Moreover, the "I think" device seems to be used to help S1 to stay on the floor and gives another alternative. S1 gives another answer "of" (line 15) in an interrogative tone. The teacher's reaction is returning his eyes to look at the text on the table (line 16) which indicates that he shows hesitancy to assess S1's answer. Then, he points out in a falling pitch that he is trying to see the text (line 17). This reaction displays that the teacher offers "protective practices" to avoid embarrassing S1, help her to stay in face, and

subsequently to save her self-image (Goffman 1967:13-4). The teacher's reaction also shows his uncertainty toward S1's prior answer. Furthermore, the teacher's previous turns can be "perceived" (Merleau-Ponty 2005:5) as attempts "to lead students to correct answers by small steps" (McHoul 1990:355).

The teacher attempts again (line 25) to initiate correction by using the device "*Y' mean* plus a possible understanding of prior turn" (Weeks 1985:205 italics in original) to question S1. Consequently, the question shows the teacher's rejection of S1's answer. Moreover, the question displays that the teacher shows "positive politeness" (Brown & Levinson 1987:70) as he rejects the given answer; at the same time, he keeps S1's achievement accepted and appreciated. According to Seedhouse, one can conclude that "self-initiated self-repair being most preferred" in the classroom (2004:145). Therefore, the teacher gives S1 additional opportunities to self correct. Furthermore, it seems that the teacher may wait for "a proper turn" to make a point of departure whereby he allows another student makes other-correction (Arminen 2005:126).

Another technique used to help students to self-correct, is breaking down the question into easier parts (lines 36-37) so that the students are able to reach an easy part of the question. This technique "invokes general rules" (Weeks 1985:212) to help the students find out the answer. Using the pronoun "we" by the teacher to eliminate the social distance between him and the students (line 36), and dividing the question into easier parts (line 37) are indicators to the teacher's endeavor to avoid face threat to the student during the interaction. These techniques have been employed for both protecting the students' negative and positive face. Moreover, holding the teacher himself accountable, and admitting his responsibility (line 42) are acts that threaten the teacher's positive face (Brown & Levinson 1978:73). Hence, the teacher shows sympathy toward the cohort and sacrifices his positive face in order not to break the students' spirit, as he shows knowledge as a skillful person who can communicate effectively and skillfully with his students. This demonstrates that rational individuals try to avoid face threatening acts, and adopt different strategies to minimize dissension and face threatening acts during social encounters (Brown & Levinson 1987:68).

From what has been seen in the data, one may conclude that, the teacher could make the activity shorter by allowing another student achieves the correct answer instead of S1. However, the teacher made several attempts to orient S1 toward the right answer, because "other-initiated other-repair being most dispreferred and least common" (Seedhouse 2004:145). Accordingly, the teacher gave S1 more than an opportunity to find out the right answer. Furthermore, he withheld others from gaining the floor when she was trying to make

an answer. All those steps which were made by the teacher can be related to two lines of reasoning. The first one, in the pedagogical process, teachers prefer students achieve self-correction, so that they can enhance their learning (Manke 1997:65). The second is the “negative politeness” (Brown & Levinson 1987:70) which indicates that teachers recognize and respect the students’ negative face and accordingly, they delay the correction as much as they can during the correction process to enable students self correct. That is to say, politeness and face-work are not only significant, but they are the focus of interaction to keep the interaction going in the classroom. Furthermore, politeness prevents face threat to students which can be considered as “a personal constraint on the behaviour of the individual” (Drew & Wootton 1988:137).

According to Goffman, saving face is a “moral right” which should be taken in consideration (1982:12). Goffman emphasizes “a person’s social face can be his most personal possession and the center of his security and pleasure” (2005:10); therefore, it has been seen the teacher minimizes the consequences of correction, and keeps the flow of the activity in progress without offence. Moreover, the teacher takes students’ face “into account when correcting, even at the risk of damaging her/his own positive face” (Tzanne 2000:205). It has been observed the teacher states that he is “making the question harder” (line 42) to hold himself accountable and be responsible of the students’ failure of understanding the question. The teacher’s endeavor to save the student’s face through several attempts made to make S1 “stay[s] in character” has been also seen (Goffman 1990:166). Finally, the teacher’s conduct displays that he shows awareness to sustain the relationship with his students, as it displays that “talk can separate the teacher from students or move them closer together” (Gordon 2003:3).

4.3 Socialization

It is another technique used by the teacher to highlight the trouble source and help the students to carry out the right answer. The teacher reads a paragraph written by a student. The teacher accentuates the trouble source, as he uses the repetition and bodily movements to attract the students’ attention. In the following extract, the teacher uses verbal and non-verbal actions to draw the students’ attention to the definite article so that the students can remove it.

Extract no. 3

“Annual Precipitation” (27:06-27:47)

1. T Ok *so* (0.3) ((the teacher looks at the text, rubs his head, some students talk
2. to each other))
3. Pretty good e:: * few things we might ↓(2.0) polish↑(1.5)
4. ((The teacher looks at the students while he makes his turn. The students look
5. at their texts, some of them look at the board))
6. ((After several omitted turns, the teacher provides his first question))
6. T Well *a: (.)my↑ first(0.4) question (.) would be:↑ thi annual precipitation↑(1.0)
7. ((During his turn, he looks at the students))
8. e::m o (.) if this is an annual↑ thing (0.5) i(t) < happens *year after year after
9. year*> is it then (0.1) very specific? (1.5)
10. ((A pen in his hand, he moves his hand in a circular move))
11. S1 +No↓ (.) ((during her turn, she shakes her head while she keeps looking at her
12. text))
13. T → =N*O↑ (0.3) I don't think it is (.)*and <so> *therefore? (3.0)
14. ((He pushes his body forward while he makes his turn, looks at the students
15. and prepares himself to write on the slide, then he looks curiously at the
16. students and listens to their answers))
17. S2 (X) ↓
18. S1 Take away ↓ ((she looks at the board, smiles and looks at her text again, some
19. students smile))
20. T → =Take *<away> the definite article (0.7) annual precipitation.
21. ((He nods his head, then he looks at the text and starts writing))

In their discussion about face-work, Muhleisen and Migge argue that social interaction requires “greater attention to participants’ face” (2005:132).

In this extract, the teacher begins with “ok, so” to start the discussion. As a response to the teacher’s turn, the students stop talking to each other. It seems that “ok, so” is used as “calls for attention” (Manke 1997:64) instead of using “now, listen to me” or “now, pay attention”. The teacher uses an elegant language and positive words, rather than using orders to sustain “the social system of face-to-face interaction” (Goffman 1990:24). The teacher produces the utterances “pretty good” which may indicate a positive evaluation of the students as they respond to his call “ok, so” and stop talking (line 3). The teacher points out that there are few things to be polished in the sentence. “Few things” may indicate to the recipient that the teacher refers to “few errors” or “few mistakes” found in the sentence which need to be corrected. Consequently, “few things” may display that the teacher mitigates the correction,

and downgrades the students' embarrassment. Moreover, in the same line, the teacher uses the pronoun "we" with a falling pitch which displays that he includes himself as one of the participants who should work with the polishing of the sentence. Furthermore, the pronoun "we" indicates that the teacher avoids the social differences between him and the students. Then, using the pronoun "we" is to help the students overlook "the performer's social statuses" which may cause confusion to hearers (Goffman 1990:34). At the same line, the silence may refer that the teacher is looking for a word to complete and make his turn understandable. After the pause, the teacher produces the word "polish" giving it a high and accentuated tone. The rising and accentuated tone perhaps reflects that the teacher finds the word which he is looking for. Hence, using "polish" instead of "correct" could be a "redressive action" (Brown & Levinson 1978:74-5) used to redress and reduce the impact of correction sequences upon students. This refers that the teacher does not use bald and direct correction, but he initiates the correction with modification to avoid face threatening acts.

The teacher questions the students in a rising tone, about "the" annual precipitation (line 6). The teacher accentuates the definite article displays that he highlights the trouble source by the accentuation. Accordingly, it can be understood that the teacher uses the technique of the "partial repeat of the trouble source turn" (Weeks 1985:205) to initiate the correction. The teacher slowly repeats "year after year" and uses his hands (line 10) to make a circular move, to refer to a thing that happens regularly. What is of interest in this turn, that the teacher plays an intrinsic role in transmitting the "shared knowledge" to the students (Drew & Heritage 2010: 218). As a result, the students will have an "intersubjective grasp of reality" about some rules of English language (Drew & Heritage 2010:217). The role of the teacher seems clear in socialization process since the teacher represents the "more expert member[s] of society" (Ochs 1996:408) who works to transmit knowledge to incompetent members. This leads to conclude that second language can be learned through using it among participants as "socially distributed cognition rather than as an individual cognitive phenomenon" (Cummins 2007:1024). It is not enough to learn words and keep them in mind. Rather, it is the application of what has been learned with those who have more experience.

Then, it has been noticed that the teacher spends long times to initiate corrections, giving explanations to highlight the trouble source, to carry out the right answer, and more importantly, to save students' face. Thus, using the strategies of saving face by teachers represents "solidarity and commonality" with students (Tzanne 2000:195). Furthermore, the teacher avoids using the direct corrective expressions so that students can "define the situation and start[s] to build up lines of responsive action" (Goffman 1990:22). Also, the extract

shows the teacher's attentiveness toward the significance of the concept of "face" because "when a person senses that he is in face, he typically responds with feelings of confidence and assurance" (Goffman 1982:8). As a result, the students would feel relief to respond to the teacher's tips, and openly participate in the activities of the class.

On the other hand, the teacher also appears aware that, if he uses bald and unmitigated feedback to the student's answer, it will affect the student's participation and create a sense of frustration since s/he will be "in wrong face" (Goffman 1982:8) which means she feels embarrassed, and fails presenting herself to other students. Thus, through various correctional techniques, the teacher seems "to offer some kind of extra protection for performers" (Goffman 1990:33). Hence, one may understand that the methodology that is used by the teacher to redress face threat in classroom is "a universal sociological principle" which reflects that face is socially created, as it demands interactional work made by participants to be maintained (Brown & Levinson 1978:262). Furthermore, it can be concluded that face-work is not only essential in interaction, but it is "part of linguistic and cultural socialization" (Muhleisen & Migge 2005:13).

4.4 Direct Correction

The form of the direct correction exists where the teacher corrects directly the student's wrong answer. In this extract, the teacher asks the students to insert the adverb "often" in a phrase. A student raises his hand to suggest "oftenly" which is grammatically wrong. The teacher corrects the error promptly without delay.

Extract no. 4

"Oftenly" (15-35:15-52)

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 1. | S | e::: |
| 2. | | (0.2) |
| 3. | T | *Yes ((the teacher looks at the student)) |
| 4. | S | Could you say(.) where oftenly the roads were (0.4) completely impassable ↓ |
| 5. | | (1.0) ((the teacher looks at the student then looks at the text)) |
| 6. | T | *Wh*ere? |
| 7. | | ((During his turn, the teacher pushes his body forward, looks at the student |
| 8. | | and makes a facial expression, as if he is looking at something far away)) |
| 9. | | (0.2) |
| 10. | S | Oftenly↑ |
| 11. | | (1.2) ((the teacher looks at the text)) |

12. T * Oftenly? (0.3) (*the teacher looks at the text while he makes the turn*)
13. S Ya (0.1)
14. T → No (.) you *can't * (0.1) (*during his turn, he looks at the text, then looks at the student*)
- 15.
16. S O+k↓ (*the student moves his hands and makes a sniff*)
17. T → e:: (.)I think >you're thinking< aw: its an adverb (.) so I need to add(.) ly?
18. S = (mm)(.)
19. T But many: adverbs don't take ly (.) (*he looks at the student during his turn*)
20. S O+k (*he nods his head and blinks for a moment*)

The activity starts when a student raises his hand to give an answer. The student suggests inserting “oftenly” after “where” in the phrase (line 4). It is worth mentioning that the student gives the answer in an interrogative way. It seems to the recipient that the student asks a question as he displays his uncertainty about the answer. From a face perspective, by showing uncertainty, the student displays politeness and attention to face as he avoids imposing suggestions on the teacher. Moreover, he shows respect to the teacher’s negative face as he leaves the decision to be taken by the teacher himself (Brown & Levinson 1987:66). Accordingly, the student introduces his answer in a form of a question. There is a (1.0) pause which displays that the answer is incorrect (line 5). The pause shows orientation that the teacher makes a “dispreferred evaluation” to the given answer (Macbeth 2004:718). Responding to the student’s prior answer, the teacher asks the student “where?” in order to make the formulation a bit more straightforward (line 6). The teacher’s question might be an indication to other-initiation to highlight the error. Teachers tend to avoid the direct correction since it leads to threatening the self respect of the students. According to the theory of repair-initiation discussed by Seedhouse, the teacher uses the technique of “repeating the word which the learner used immediately prior to the error” (2004:146). This indicates that the teacher heard the student’s answer, but he made the turn in a form of question to mitigate the correction to avoid face threatening acts that may occur on the student, and give him an opportunity to self-correct (Tzanne 2000:192). Accordingly, we can claim that the teacher attempts not to hurt the student’s positive face as he pretends a deliberate misunderstanding when he says “where?” (line 6).

The teacher produces a turn; repeating the student’s answer “oftenly” in an interrogative tone (line 12) which shows hesitancy and uncertainty toward the student’s prior answer. The teacher’s turn thus represents another opportunity given to the student to self-correct. Responding to the teacher’s inquiry, the student confirms his prior answer (line 13). Hence,

the student seems confident to use “oftenly” and he just wonders where it can be placed in the sentence.

The teacher achieves the direct correction (line 14) by stating “no” as a clear answer to show the disagreement on an “error of linguistic form” (Seedhouse 2004:163). The teacher uses bald, apparent, and negative assessment to the given answer (Seedhouse 2004:164). The correction has been achieved “without redress” as the teacher has the authority and he is “superior in power” in classroom (Brown & Levinson 1978:74). After several attempts to help the student initiate self-correction, the teacher answers the student’s question clearly without hesitation. He produces “no” followed by an immeasurable pause. The pause gives an indication that its function here is as a full stop. Accordingly, “no” is the answer to the student’s question. Moreover, it can be considered as other-correction made by the teacher to correct the student’s wrong answer. In cases like this, as Seedhouse puts it, the “no” is not considered as unmitigated, negative evaluation of the student’s answer because the teacher has already made several attempts to help the student to self-correct (2004:169). More importantly, the “no” does not include loss of the student’s face as it does not refer to a “negative evaluation” (Seedhouse 2004:170). The function of “no” is as “an answer to a learner’s question” (ibid). Hence, the question of the student and the answer of the teacher seem to be an “adjacency pair” (Seedhouse 2004:171) rather than a negative evaluation made on a student’s dispreferred answer.

Responding to the teacher’s turn, the student answers “ok” (line 16) in a falling tone as he moves his hands and sniffs. The student’s reactions display to the recipient that the student feels embarrassed of the teacher’s direct correction. The teacher also shows orientation toward the student’s verbal and non-verbal actions and makes a prompt comment in alignment with the student’s prior actions (line 17). The teacher’s turn displays that he is performing an “interactional work” (Seedhouse 2004:171) to avoid face threat and to “temper that rejection” made in the prior turn (Lerner 1994:28). Then, the teacher involves the mitigation of correction through initiating a new turn to avoid “an open conflict” (Goffman 1990:21) with the student who gave the wrong answer. The teacher does not extend the turn of negotiation as he did in the previous extracts because people accept the truth of the grammatical rule “without scruple” (Descartes 2006:28). Thus, the activity is “handled politely but firmly” (Goffman 1990:23) by using the “no” as a clear response to answer the student’s question and the followed turn of mitigation. Then, it is concluded that both, the teacher and the student show reciprocal engagement in face-work to save each other’s face.

In this extract, the teacher's direct correction cannot be interpreted a face threat to the students because it supplies a correction to the misconception that is related to a matter of fact in the grammatical rules. The direct correction is inevitable for a convincing answer to the student's question. Direct correction accordingly, will have a dual function as Seedhouse outlines of similar cases: the first is to provide the students with correct information, and the second is to save the teacher's face (Seedhouse 2004:170). Further, it makes the students believe that "the character they see actually possesses the attributes he appears to possess" (Goffman 1990:28). In this respect, the teacher produces "no" so as to maintain "both his own face and the face of the other participants" (Goffman1982:11). Thus, giving the answer in a clear way is to sustain the teacher's social position, and to save students' face when the teacher responds to their questions and reacts positively to their actions.

4.5 Chapter Summary

In this chapter, the relationship between different types of correction and face-work in classroom has been demonstrated with the help of extracts. The techniques and types of correction used by the teacher illustrate that face-work has an impact on teacher-student interaction. It has been noticed that several techniques used by the teacher to correct students' linguistic errors, as it has been seen how the teacher takes into account avoiding face threat to the students. In the first extract, the teacher negotiates the dispreferred answer with the student, produces several attempts to help her reconsider her choice, and apologizes to her because he rejects her choice and selects "a better" suggestion (line 11). In addition to the explicit correction, the teacher adopts the embedded correction in order to correct the linguistic errors (line 8) for two reasons; the first is to save the student's face, the second is to keep the activity going on without hindrance.

In the second extract, face-work seems also applicable when the teacher discusses the given answer with the student before allowing other-correction to be achieved. It has been seen the several attempts of initiation-correction made by the teacher, such as breaking the question into segments to be easy for the students to self correct. Further, the teacher takes the responsibilities and apologizes implicitly to the students because he makes the situation "harder by just asking the question" (lines 42-43).

The third extract reveals, while the teacher invites the students to consider the correction, he mitigates the correction by using chosen positive words, and helping the students grasp the shared knowledge by verbal and non-verbal actions.

In the last one, the teacher corrects the wrong answer directly to transmit true information to the students. The teacher seems to be concerned with his own face, in addition to that of the student. Then, one might conclude face-work is present and influential in the correctional activities in the classroom, as it helps the interaction flows without obstructions to ensure convenient environment of learning process.

5. Discussion, Summary and Conclusion

I discuss here the findings of this study in relevance to some previous studies which argue the correction process and face-work in classroom. The main points which are going to be discussed are: the correlation between types of correction and face-work; the prevailing type of correction in second language classrooms and SL from CA perspective; CA as a method of study; and finally, the limitations of the findings of this research.

5.1 Types of Correction and Face-work

I discuss in this paper that the correction process is an important aspect of teacher's work since it takes place in order to fix understanding and intersubjectivity among participants. The correction also refers to correcting what is considered as an error what is considered as correct (Macbeth 2004:708). This study is build upon analyzing some extracts which were taken from recordings of SL classroom. The main findings which are obtained in regard to types of correction and face-work are:-

1. The teacher uses several types of correction in order to mitigate the correction process. The teacher has been seen going to great lengths "to avoid uttering the words no and wrong" during the interaction with the students (Seedhouse 2004:168). Using various techniques to correct the erroneous answers demonstrates that, face-work is taken into account during the correction process. Namely, in the explicit correction, the teacher extends the turn of negotiation when the students give dispreferred answers (Mehan 1979:52). The extended turn might be used either to help the students out to self correct, or to avoid the direct negative evaluation that might cause face threat to the students (Seedhouse 2004:170-1). Moreover, the turn of negotiation may be expanded to the extent that the correction process requires a fragmentation into smaller segments (Macbeth 1994:316). This fragmentation is displayed

when the teacher uses the technique of dividing the question into smaller parts in order to highlight the problem and make it easier for the students discover the right answer (Descartes 2006:17).

By the help of the extracts, I could explain that the teacher shows orientation to avoid face threatening acts, by mitigating the negative evaluation and offering extensive interactional work (Seedhouse 2004:171). The teacher uses the embedded correction to correct students' errors implicitly, and without opening "a side sequence" of the current conversation (Wagner 2004:75). Using the embedded correction as a technique, is to correct the students' wrong answers in a mitigated way, without referring that the given answers are wrong or dispreferred (Macbeth 2004:710). Further, the embedded correction is used to "display[s] a correct version" of the linguistic error of the previous answer, avoid making students feel disconcerted, and to keep the activities proceeding without interruption (Seedhouse 2009:7). This study reveals that there are other techniques have been used to mitigate the correction, such as using the pauses to show skepticism toward the given answer (Macbeth 2004:718). The pause might reflect uncertainty, as it might draw the student's attention that her/his answer is dispreferred. The "partial repeat" of the wrong answer is also used as a technique to initiate the correction and capture the students' attention to the trouble source (Drew & Heritage 2010:118). The technique of "you mean" plus a probable understanding of the previous answer is also used to initiate the correction process (Weeks 1985:205). All these techniques, which have been used for initiating the correction in this study, are employed at the same time, for correcting errors in "a mitigated way" (Seedhouse 2009:7) in order to save the student's self-image. And finally, these techniques are used to approve that the aspects of face are "basic wants" which individuals maintain in various social occasions (Brown & Levinson 1987:62).

2. The teacher and the students show mutual engagement in face-work as the students also show politeness when they give answers in an interrogative way in order not to impose their wants or hurt the teacher's negative face. The teacher uses in limited situations the direct negative evaluation to correct students' wrong answers (Seedhouse 2004:168-70). The direct correction is used when the student himself asks a question to display his doubt about the answer. In this case, the teacher corrects directly without delay. The direct correction doesn't reflect the teacher's inflexibility and the tendency to use bald and negative expressions. Instead, it reflects the main goal of pedagogy in transmitting facts and true knowledge, saving the teacher's social positions as an authoritative person in the classroom, and demonstrating

that the teacher is not only avoiding face threat to the students, but he avoids threatening his own face as well (Seedhouse 2004:170).

According to what has been mentioned above, I conclude that face-work is evoked in classroom interaction, as there is a clear tendency to shape the interaction in such a way to save students' self-respect during the correction process. By analyzing the selected extracts, this study demonstrates that, interactional work is present and inherent in classroom interaction, as the study approves that doing direct negative evaluation without redress is dispreferred in second language classrooms. Subsequently, face-work has intelligible effects on the structure of conversation in teacher-student interaction as it is necessary to maintain interaction among participants. Face-work is not an inner state that can be generated inside an individual's body, but rather, it is something participants can produce and enhance in interaction. Furthermore, face-work is a prevalent social aspect which is worthy of respect and essential not only in the various social encounters, but it is also indispensable in the pedagogical field because pedagogy is a part of the generic social world. Then, one may conclude that face-work has to be maintained in teacher-student interaction. Accordingly, using the extended negotiation, indirectness, and silence as means or techniques of mitigating the correction, is essential in the teacher-student interaction, to help the students to self correct, keep the interaction going in classroom, subsequently to enhance learning process which is the primary task in teacher-student interaction.

5.2 Other-correction and Second Language Classroom

This study reveals that, though the teacher initiates the correction by negotiation, reformulating the question, and repeating the incorrect answer in an interrogative tone, other-correction is the most prevalent type in second language classrooms. The reason why other-correction is prevalent is that, the students produce numerous of lexical and syntactic errors because of their lack of experience in the grammar and the pronunciation of the learned language (Wagner 2004:75). Furthermore, other-correction is "relevant to the not-yet-competent in some domain without respect to age" (Macbeth 2004:708). This demonstrates that the other-correction is used to fix "intersubjectivity" among participants, as it seems to be the "vehicle for socialization" (ibid) which proves that second language learning is a social action whereby "evaluation and feedback are central to the process and progress of language learning" (Seedhouse 2009:3).

Then, it can be concluded, in formal situations, SL aims to afford students the opportunity to practice the language with a competent member (the teacher), and subsequently build and develop their own linguistic skills that would enable them to be competent members in social life. Accordingly, it has seen in the selected extracts that the learners have been given more time to self correct, and they are allowed to participate to use the language at issue. This would also lead us to conclude that SL from CA perspective focuses on the language as a social action, which indicates that language is dynamic since it is organized and reshaped by its users.

5.3 Conversation Analysis Approach

This work presents CA as a participant-relevant methodological approach which studies “talk produced in everyday situations of human interaction” (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008:11). This reflects the scope of CA’s work which focuses on the naturally spoken interaction among participants, and interests in the construction of social actions through language (Seedhouse 2004:234). This study shows that CA is able to reveal the fine details of teacher-student interaction during the correction process. The study displays CA’s ability to show the relevance between the interaction in the classroom and its institutional and social contexts. Subsequently, it reflects CA’s efficiency to show the connection of the “interactional sequences on the micro level to the macro level of the institutional goal” (Seedhouse 2004:230). Further, the study reflects CA’s ability to trace “the progress of intersubjectivity or socially distributed cognition” between the teacher and the students. This means that CA traces the mechanism used by the teacher and the students to analyze and understand each others’ verbal and non-verbal actions, and then go forward in interaction. CA also contributes in revealing the organization and the construction of learning process by showing “the use of interactional resources” among interactants (Seedhouse 2009:8-11).

Applying CA in this study approves that the verbal and non-verbal actions in teacher-student interaction have an organized structure which shows the mutual understanding among participants to each others’ turns. By the next turn proof procedure, this study could show the participants’ understanding and their orientation toward each other’s turns. Therefore, it has been observed how the teacher orients his verbal and non-verbal actions in the next turn, to avoid face threat to the students, especially when the students show confusion through the verbal and non-verbal actions of their prior turns.

Moreover, this research demonstrates CA can be applied to search language use among participants in terms of competence is recomposed in different contexts by language users themselves, instead of exploring it as a fixed cognition in the individuals' minds.

By using CA approach, this study could reveal some of the social norms (face-work and politeness) that stand behind participants' verbal and non-verbal actions in classroom interaction. Thus, CA as a promising scientific approach would enable sociolinguists to pursue the social changes that may take place in classroom interaction, and specify teachers' and students' everyday needs. Finally, CA would be then, a proper scientific method to seek the various phenomena in teacher-student interaction, and explore the social activities that can be used by teachers to prevent face threatening acts during learning process.

5.4 Limitations of the Findings

It is substantial to discuss the limits of this study as it adopts CA as a method of research to seek classroom interaction. Numerous studies realize the significance of CA in the field of language learning as CA has been used extensively to investigate SL studies. However, CA as an approach is still controversial because it depends mainly on the visible events among participants, as it bases on the emic perspective which is a participant-relevant approach that follows participants' interpretations to the observable actions in interaction. Hence, CA is insufficient to investigate individuals' inner state, participants' thinking, and why they choose this or that utterance in different occasions.

Another limitation, by which my findings are bound, is using a fixed camera. The constant camera was able to catch only the actions of those students who were close to it. Accordingly, the opportunities of getting more correctional sequences that show face-work were limited. Moreover, I adopt in this study, the single case study to research one classroom setting. The single case study decreases the probability of investigating different groups of adult participants in various environments. The research should follow instead, the multiple case study to investigate various classrooms for gaining more solid findings.

References

- Arminen, I. (2005) *Institutional interaction: Studies of Talk at Work*. Burlington, UK: Ashgate Publishing Limited
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1978) "Universal in language usage: Politeness Phenomena". In Goody Esther (Ed.) *Questions and Politeness: strategies in social interaction*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1987) *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Cummins, J. (2007) *International Handbook of English Language Teaching*. Canada: Springer
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007) *Discourse in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Classrooms*. Amsterdam, NLD: Benjamins Publishing Company
- Drew, P. and Heritage, J. (2010) *Conversation Analysis Volume I*. Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, Washington DC: SAGE
- Drew, P. and Wootton, A. (1988) *Erving Goffman Exploring the Interaction Order*. Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Basil Blackwell
- Derry, S., Pea, R., Barron, B., Engle, R., Erickson, F., Goldman, R., Hall, R., Koschmann, T., Lemke, J., and Sherin, B. (2010) "Conducting Video Research in the Learning Sciences: Guidance on Selection, Analysis, Technology, and Ethics". *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 19 (1), pp. 3-53
- Descartes, R. (2006) *Discourse on the Method of Rightly Conducting the Reason and Seeking Truth in the Sciences*. UK: Oxford University Press
- Firth, A. and Wagner J. (1997) "On Discourse, Communication and (some) Fundamental Concepts in SLA Research". *Modern Language Journal* 81, pp. 285-300
- Firth, A. and Wagner, J. (2007) "Second/Foreign Language Learning as a Social Accomplishment: Elaborations on a Reconceptualized SLA". *The Modern Language Journal* 91, pp. 800-819

- Goffman, E. (1967) *Interaction Ritual. Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. USA: Penguin Press
- Goffman, E. (1982) *Interaction Ritual*. New York: Pantheon
- Goffman, E. (1986) *Frame Analysis*. Boston: Northeastern University Press
- Goffman, E. (1990) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. England: Penguin Books
- Goffman, E. (2005) *Interaction Ritual*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers
- Gordon, T. (2003) *Teacher Effectiveness Training*. New York: Three Rivers Press
- Have, P. (2007) *Doing Conversational Analysis*. London: Sage Publication
- Heath, C. and Hindmarsh, J. (2002) "Analysing Interaction: Video, Ethnography and Situated Conduct". In Tim May (Ed.) *Qualitative Research in Practice*. London: Sage, pp. 99-121
- Heritage, J. (2011) "Conversation Analysis: Practices and Methods". In David Silverman (Ed.) *Qualitative Research 3rd Edition*. London: SAGE
- Hellermann, J. (2008) *Social Actions for Classroom Language Learning*. Clevedon, U.K: Multilingual Matters
- Hutchby, I. and Wooffitt, R. (2005) *Conversation Analysis*. USA: Blackwell Publishing Inc
- Hutchby, I. and Wooffitt, R. (2008) *Conversation Analysis*. USA: Blackwell Publishing Inc
- Jefferson, G. (2004) "Glossary of Transcript Symbols with an Introduction". In G. H. Lerner (Ed.) *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp.13-23
- Jefferson, G. (1987) "On Exposed and Embedded Correction in Conversation". In Button, G. And Lee (Eds.) *Talk and Social Organisation*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, pp. 86-100
- Jordan, B. and Henderson, A. (1995) "Interaction Analysis: Foundations and Practice". *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 4 (1), pp. 39-103

- Lerner, G. (1994) "Responsive List Construction: A Conversational Resource for Accomplishing Multifaceted Social Action". *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 13, pp.20-33
- Macbeth, D. (1990) "Classroom Order as Practical Action: The Making and Unmaking of a Quiet Reproach". *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 11 (2), pp.189-214
- Macbeth, D. (1991) "Teacher Authority as Practical Action". *Linguistics and Education*, 3, pp.281-313
- Macbeth, D. (1994) "Classroom Encounters with the Unspeakable: 'Do you see, Danelle?'". *Discourse Processes*, 17 (2), pp. 311-335
- Macbeth, D. (2004) "The Relevance of Repair for Classroom Correction". *Language in Society*, 33(5), pp. 703-736
- Macbeth, D. (2011) "Understanding as an Instructional Matter". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(2), pp. 438-451
- Manke, M. (1997) *Classroom Power Relations. Understanding Student-Teacher Interaction*. New Jersey, London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers
- Manning, P. (1992) *Erving Goffman and Modern Society*. Oxford: Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers
- Markee, N. (2000) *Conversation Analysis*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Markee, N. and Kasper, G. (2004) "Classroom Talks: An Introduction." *Modern Language Journal*, 88, (4), pp. 491-500
- McHoul, A. (1990) "The Organization of Repair in Classroom Talk" *Language in Society*, 19, pp. 349-77
- McHoul, A. and Rapley, M (2001) *How to Analyse Talk in Institutional Settings: A Casebook of Methods*. London: Continuum
- Mehan, H. (1979) *Learning Lessons: Social Organization in the Classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (2005) *Phenomenology of Perception*. London, New York: Routledge

- Mondada, L. (2007) "Multimodal resources for turn-taking: pointing and the emergence of possible next speakers". In *Discourse Studies*, 9 (194)
- Mondada, L. (2007) "Commentary: Transcript Variations and the Indexicality of Transcribing Practices". *Discourse Studies*, 9 (6), pp. 809-821
- Muhelsein, S. and Migge, B. (2005) *Politeness and Face in Caribbean Creoles*. USA, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing
- Ochs, E. (1996) "Linguistics Resources for Socializing Humanity". In Gumperz, J and Levinson, S (Eds.) *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Payne, G. C., & Hustler, D. (1980) "Teaching the Class: The Practical Management of a Cohort". *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 1(1), pp. 49-66
- Psathas, G. (1995) *Conversation Analysis. The Study of Talk-in-Interaction*. USA: Sage University Press
- Seedhouse, P. (2004) *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective*. USA: Blackwell
- Seedhouse, P. (2009) "The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom". *Journal of Teaching and Learning Language and Literature*, 1 (1), pp.1-13
- Tzanne, A. (2000) *Talking at Cross-Purposes*. Philadelphia, PA, USA: John Benjamins Publishing Company
- Wagner, J. (2004) "The Classroom and Beyond". *The Modern Language Journal*, 88, pp. 612-616
- Weeks, P. (1985) "Error-correction Techniques and Sequences in Instructional Settings: toward a Comparative Framework". *Human Studies*, 8(3), pp. 195-233
- Wooffitt, R. (2005) *Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis*. London, New Delhi: Sage Publications
- Wong, J. and Waring, H. (2010) *Conversation Analysis and Second Language Pedagogy. A Guide for ESL/EFL Teachers*. New York, London: Routledge

Appendix: Transcription Glossary

(0.5)	The number between brackets refers to a time silence in tenths of a second.
(.)	A dot in brackets indicates to an immeasurable pause in the conversation.
[]	Square brackets are indicating to an overlapping talk between interlocutors.
.hh	It is referring that the speaker is in-breath.
(())	Double brackets are indicating to non-verbal actions the transcriber describes.
Sou:::nd	It refers to stretching the preceding sound by the speaker.
()	Empty parentheses refer to unclear word.
(word)	A ward between single brackets refers to the observer's best guess of unclear word.
↑↓	Pointed arrows are referring to a falling or rising pitch.
<u>Word</u>	Underlined word refers to a speaker emphasis.
WORD	Word in capitals indicates to a word pronounced louder than other words surrounding it.
°word°	Degree signs refer to a ward that is pronounced quieter than surrounding speech.
>word<	Inward chevrons refer to a word or an utterance pronounced quicker than other surrounding speech in the same line.
< word >	Outward chevrons are indicating to a word or an utterance pronounced slower than other speech in the same line.
→	Arrows in the left side refer to the discussed issue in the text.

- (x) Refers to inaccessible words or utterances.
- = Latching between utterances
- * * Delimit description of the teacher's actions
- + + Delimit description of the students' actions