Repair Practices by Japanese Third-Age Learners in Communicative Lessons Online

*Gabriel Teruo Misaka**
Nagiso Board of Education, Japan

Abstract
This paper analyzes repair practices during online communicative tasks by Japanese senior adult learners of English at the low to intermediate levels. The analysis demonstrates that even low-level learners can employ self-initiated self-repair for *accuracy* and *interactional purposes*. Accuracy-focused repairs generally took longer than interactional-focused repairs, entailing long pauses, vowel stretches, and repetition. Furthermore, student-student interaction afforded learning and teaching opportunities through other-repair sequences. Moreover, learners could employ other-initiated self-repair and other procedures (e.g., letting it pass) in orientation to task progressivity by indirectly providing linguistic support to their peers. The findings suggest that beginning-level senior students are sophisticated L2 communicators, capable of complex repair sequences both for linguistic and communicative purposes. Hence, this study advocates for providing student-student communicative tasks as a means of improving learners' linguistic and communicative skills simultaneously.

Introduction

This paper aims to explore how Japanese senior adults learning English as a second language employ repair practices to resolve problems with speaking, hearing, and understanding in classroom interaction. Research in older learner education recommends that second language education be student-centered and communicative (Pikhart & Klimova, 2020; Yamamoto, 2019). However, open communication tasks increase the likelihood of problems in communication to occur. Therefore, in order to better teach students communicative skills, it is vital for L2 teachers to know how students deal with communication breakdowns. This paper will analyze how older learners repair troubles in their discussions. It will demonstrate that even novice learners have sophisticated interactional competencies (see Firth 2009; Firth & Wagner, 2007). Finally, it will present practical teaching ideas and suggest how to fill gaps in interactional competence.

Communicative Language Teaching, Interactional Competence, and Conversation Analysis

Communicative language teaching (CLT) is broadly defined as a language teaching approach which theorizes that students best learn a second language (L2) through the exchanges of ideas and negotiation of meaning rather than the drilling of isolated grammatical forms (Lightbown & Spada, 2013). The goal of CLT is to develop communicative competence (CC; Savignon, 2002), which is composed of four competencies: grammatical, discourse, sociolinguistic, and strategic

Misaka, G. T. (2023). Conversation analysis of Japanese third-age learners' repair practices in communicative lessons online**.** *TESOL Working Paper Series, 21*, 43-58.
Website: Hawaii Pacific University http://www.hpu.edu
*Email: gtmisaka@gmail.com. Address: Nagiso Kaikan, Nagano-ken, Kiso-gun, Nagiso-machi, Azuma 52-4 399-5302, Japan.

(Canale & Swain, 1980). Although invaluable in expanding the perception that communicative ability relies on more than just linguistic prowess, CC assumes an individual's skills are static. Hence, Kramsch (1986) introduced the concept of interactional competence (IC) by building upon the concept of CC and adding the idea of intersubjectivity – the ability of participants in a conversation to predict each other's utterances, emotions, and actions based on situational and contextual clues (Abdulrahman & Ayyash, 2019; Brown, 2014). IC proponents perceive communication as "variable and co-constructed by participants' interaction" (Seedhouse, 2011, p. 348). Thus, in contrast to CC, IC views communication as a *dynamic* ability that is influenced by the context and participants.

In conversation analysis (CA), IC is defined as "the ability to achieve actions locally, contingently and collaboratively with others in contextualized social interaction" (Nguyen, 2019, p. 60). As Nguyen (2011) explains, "[p]articipating in social activities requires ongoing monitoring and analysis of how the sequential organization of the activity unfolds, between and within turns" (p. 173). The ability to dynamically monitor and organize communication in real-time is at the core of IC.

In order to understand how IC works, we need to use CA, a methodology in sociology designed "to discover how participants understand and respond to one another in their turns at talk, with a central focus being on how *sequences* [original emphasis] of actions are generated" (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 14). In order to accomplish this goal, CA approaches data from an emic perspective – "a way of looking at language and social interaction from an 'insider's' perspective" (Wong & Waring, 2021, p. 6). Although CA is not always directly associated with L2 teaching, it has provided new models and tools to assess learners' spoken interactions in L2 learning and teaching research (May et al., 2022). Due to cross-cultural differences, Bushnell (2015) recommends using the existing English corpus as a stepping stone but warns that "analysts must excersize [sic] caution in importing CA findings from English to describe and account for their FL data" (p. 117). For example, Carroll (2005) demonstrated that Japanese students' extra consonant attached at the end of words (e.g., "good-u") is not necessarily an error in pronunciation but a tool used to initiate repair and manage turn-taking. Therefore, Carroll argued that even "novices… [can] display a degree of interactional sophistication previously unimagined" (p. 234). Extending upon prior research on L2 IC, this paper aims to understand how Japanese senior adults conduct repair operations in communicative tasks.

Repair in Conversations

Schegloff (2000) defined repair as "practices for dealing with problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding the talk in conversation" (p. 207). Repair operations are systematically organized and they are important communicative tools to resolve misunderstandings (Hayashi et al., 2013). Every repair involves three key components: a trouble source (an element that needs to be repaired), an initiation action, and a solution to the trouble source (Hayashi et al., 2013; Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Wong & Waring, 2021). It should be noted that the trouble source is defined endogenously by the participants of the talk-in-interaction and is not limited to errors (Wong & Waring, 2021). Moreover, repair initiation and solution can be produced by either the producer of the trouble source or its recipient (Hayashi et al., 2013; Wong & Waring, 2021). Thus, repair can be arranged into four broad categories: (1) self-initiated self-repair, (2) self-initiated other-

repair, (3) other-initiated self-repair, and (4) other-initiated other-repair. It should be noted that other-repair is dispreferred over self-repair for two reasons: (1) the delayed placement within a turn construction unit (TCU) sequence, and (2) the potential negative repercussions correcting someone else could create (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, pp. 66-67). Furthermore, Schegloff (2013) identified ten types of same-turn self-initiated self-repair operations: replacing, inserting, deleting, searching, parenthesizing, aborting, sequence-jumping, recycling, reformatting, and reordering. Replacing is of particular relevance to this study and involves exchanging part of an utterance mid-TCU for another while retaining the original meaning (Schegloff, 2013). Dealing with communication breakdowns is important in everyday communication. In language learning, arguably, due to L2 learners' limited linguistic skills, repair can play a vital role in their ability to effectively exchange ideas and overcome challenges in communication.

Third Age Learners

Life-long learners' education is a relatively new area of research. However, as the demand for older adult education rises, so does the need for research in this field (Pfenninger & Polz, 2018). Third-age learners (TALs) are often defined as healthy retirees, often 65 years or older, interested in continuing to learn (Gabryś-Barker, 2017). Matsumoto (2019) further elaborated that the third age is "an era for personal achievement and fulfillment after retirement" (p. 112), hence indicating that retirement may be the beginning of a new stage in life.

Changes in third-age learners' mental state could impair their working memory (Singleton, 2017), and their ability to process and remember new information (Ware et al., 2017) negatively affects their ability to learn. Furthermore, visual and auditory deterioration impacts learners' reading and listening skills (Bosisio, 2019). Changes in physical abilities and lifestyle patterns may also lead individuals to feel inept, reducing their self-confidence and motivation (Grognet, 1997). Therefore, teachers need to be conscious of TALs' challenges to serve them more effectively.

On the other hand, TALs tend to be highly intrinsically motivated to learn (Kacetl & Klímová, 2021, p. 315) and generally learn for pleasure and to socialize (Matsumoto, 2019). Unlike young and adult learners, TALs do not suffer from the pressure to learn languages for jobs or higher education purposes. Furthermore, TALs have accumulated plenty of life and learning experiences for instructors to draw upon (Mackey & Sachs, 2012, p. 4). In fact, TALs benefit from discussing familiar topics about which they can share their experiences (McNeill & Misaka, 2022). Thus, TALs have various strengths that can be utilized by instructors to develop practical and engaging classes.

Furthermore, research in L2 learning has demonstrated various benefits for TALs. Antoniou et al. (2013) illustrated that L2 learning requires multiple skills, such as sound discrimination, working memory, inductive reasoning, and task switching. Their research demonstrated that learning an L2 stimulates the brain and helps maintain its plasticity, potentially delaying or avoiding dementia. Moreover, Pfenninger and Polz's (2018) study discovered that learning an L2 boosted learners' self-confidence and promoted social interaction and integration for third age learners. Moreover, Pikhart and Klimova (2020) reported that while learning an L2, older learners indicated improved life quality, regardless of progress in their language skills. Matsumoto (2019) claimed that learning an L2 benefits TALs' communicative,

cognitive, and mental skills and well-being by "adding to their [TALs] sense of meaning in life" (p. 113). Hence, language learning provides benefits far beyond the development of linguistic skills.

Research Question

Given the importance of studying third-age learners' language learning processes, and given the prevalence of repair in learner-learner interaction, this paper aims to address the following question: How do third-age learners employ repair practices in their language-learning interaction?

Data

This study was conducted in an online (Zoom) adult course over a two-year period in Japan. The number of participants ranged from six to 10 students (aged 18 to 73), with four TALs that remained consistent over the study. Most participants were native Japanese adults. Students reported studying English for a minimum of 10 years prior to joining the study, with their level ranging from beginner to intermediate (assessed by the instructor). Before joining the course, every participant was briefed on the purpose of the study and filled out a consent form agreeing for their data to be used for research and educational purposes. The consent form followed Norton's (2009) guidelines, granting permission for participants to withdraw from the research at any point. All names used in this paper are pseudonyms.

Classes were student-centered with activities based on a CLT approach developed by Lee and VanPatten's (2003) in their book, *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen* (2nd edition). Each month, a topic, communication strategy, and grammatical form were selected by the instructor with input from the students. Over the month, students performed a variety of tasks in pairs (in breakout rooms) ranging from input, noticing, output, and a final information-exchange task. The final information exchange task provided three questions to help students launch their conversation. Students had a minimum of five minutes to discuss the topic. Their five-minute video recordings were used as data for this study. Segments of the conversations that contained repair were transcribed based on Gail Jefferson's (2004) transcription system.

Analysis

Self-Initiated Self-Repair for Accuracy and Interactional Purposes

Self-initiated self-repair is defined by Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) as "repair (that) is both initiated and carried out by the speaker of the trouble source" (p. 60). This form of repair occurs regularly in talk-in-interactions, often being resolved within the same turn that the trouble transpires. The increased likelihood for self-initiated self-repair is due to "(1) the sequential position from which repair is initiated, and (2) the speaker's relation to the trouble source (i.e., self- or other-)" (Hayashi et al., 2013, p. 12).

Excerpts 1–3 will show that learners' repair sequences seem to target two distinct aspects of their language use: *accuracy* and *interactional purposes*. A repair sequence for *accuracy* focuses on maintaining language accuracy rather than performing a social action. In contrast, a repair sequence for an *interactional purpose* achieves a social action. In the analysis below, I will describe in detail how learners carried out each of these two types of repair sequences.

Excerpt 1 exemplifies a self-initiated self-repair by a TAL. It demonstrates that low-level TALs are competent communicators, capable of employing repair for accuracy and discourse functions. In this excerpt, two women (Toko, a low-level TAL, and Chiko, a low-intermediate level TAL) are discussing their ideal class. Toko launches the discussion by stating that she would choose Mathew, a fictional teacher provided in the activity, to lead the lessons. In all excerpts, in bold type is used to highlight parts of the learners' turns of analytical interest and gray color in bold type is used for Japanese words and their translation, which appear underneath the Japanese words.

Excerpt 1: Toko and Chiko (Topic – Ideal Class; June 13th, 2023)
https://youtu.be/EK39d6xmChs?t=14 [0:14-0:28]

1	Toko:		I:'m think (.) °uh:° (0.3) think about uh:: dream
2		→	class? ah::: (0.3) **we will:. (0.3) do::, (.) °uh::°**
3			chose:, (.) >I think-u:.< (.) Ma↑thew:?

In line 2, Toko performs a replacing operation, through self-initiated self-repairs within a single turn. She *repairs for accuracy* by replacing the trouble source "do" with a more lexically suitable repair-solution "chose." It should be noted that while her word choice is more appropriate, her tense conjugation became linguistically incorrect ("will do" is repaired to "will chose"). The replacement is initiated by the lengthening of the trouble source "do::" and the micropause (.) before prefacing her repair with "uh::." In this way, Toko signals to her recipient that a self-repair is forthcoming.

This repair operation contains components typically employed in L1 repair interactions, including the trouble source, repair-initiation, repair-preface, and repair-solution (Schegloff, 2013; Wong & Waring, 2021). This indicates that even low-level TALs can competently repair conversations via similar methods as L1 speakers.

Excerpt 2 provides two more examples of self-initiated self-repairs by a TAL. It introduces the idea that TALs' *interaction-focused repairs* are implemented more quickly than *accuracy-focused repairs*. Excerpt 2 takes place on a different day, but students are still tasked with discussing their dream class. After greeting each other, Chiko, the TAL from Excerpt 1, asks Saya, an intermediate adult student, if Saya's work was busy. Saya replies that it was not a busy day. Chiko then adds that it was a possibility (line 1).

Excerpt 2: Chiko and Saya (Topic – Ideal class; June 15th, 2023)
https://youtu.be/4FZUq-0vqd8?t=38 [0:39-1:05]

1	Chiko:	→	maybe: (0.5) en (0.8) eh **i- i- it is (0.5) it was**
2			busy (hehe[he)
3	Saya:		[ar- are you busy today?
4	Chiko:	→	yes **e:to** (.) uh:: **I worked-u: (0.4) at a:, (.) station?**
			えっと
			well
5		→	(.)
6	Saya:		[>um hm,<

```
7    Chiko:  →   [>Nagiso station?<
8    Saya:        <mm mm::>
9    Chiko:       a: >sokosoko< huhu[huhehehehehe
                  あ そこそこ
                  It was quite busy
10   Saya:                          [sok- hahaha
11   Chiko:       .h .h many visitors (0.4) came.
```

The first repair (line 1) focuses on *accuracy*. Chiko treats the utterance "it is" as a trouble source, and performs a self-initiated self-repair with a pause (0.5). This time, however, no repair-preface is used. Instead, she immediately replaces the trouble source "is" with the grammatically correct form "was" ("it was busy"). The repair in line 1 showcases another example of replacement being deployed to solve a perceived linguistic blunder.

The second self-initiated self-repair (line 7) focuses on an *interactional purpose*. In this instance, Chiko self-repairs after the completion of her turn and after a pause, thus ending up in a transitional overlap with Saya's receipt token (line 6). This self-repair is not to correct a grammatical error, but to add the name of the station where she works, "Nagiso." Saya shows recognition of this new information via the emphasis in her receipt tokens "mm mm" (line 8).

The difference between the first and the second repair seems to be in their orientation. During the replacement operation, Chiko focuses on improving *accuracy* by replacing the trouble source for a more suitable word. In contrast, the second repair performs the discourse function of specifying her place of work. The difference in orientation can also be observed in the pace of delivery: the *repair for accuracy* is slower and contains a 0.5-second pause (line 1), while the repair for an *interactional purpose* is quicker and relatively uninterrupted (line 7).

Excerpt 3 provides four other examples of self-initiated self-repair. The first three reinforce the observation that *repairs for accuracy* employ longer pauses and stretches, while *repairs for interactional purposes* are quicker. However, the fourth example demonstrates that *accuracy repairs* of certain grammatical forms may not always require long pauses and stretches. Excerpt 3 is a continuation of Excerpt 2. After talking about their days, Chiko and Saya shift their conversation to the class task, their ideal class. They both agree that a fun and educational class would be best. Saya then questions Chiko about her definition of a fun class (line 1).

Excerpt 3: Chiko and Saya (Topic – Ideal class; June 15th, 2023)
https://youtu.be/4FZUq-0vqd8?t=183 [3:03-4:34]

```
1    Saya:        ha (0.5) uh? (0.5) how will you do? (0.2) for have
2                 fun?
3                 (2.0)
4    Chiko:       °hm:::° (0.8) eh:::: <for example? (0.3) eh (0.2)
5            →    °the° the (0.6) Ma- if-u: (0.4) Ma- Matthew-u: e:n
6            →    (0.5) is-u: (0.5) ah: (0.2) will- will (1.0) will be:
7                 the (.) teacher? for (0.2) us? (0.5) eh many stories:
8                 (0.3) eh::: (1.5) e:to:: (0.4) mm he: travel (1.5)
                                    えっとー
                                    well
9                 en:: (1.0) and experienced?
10   Saya:        hm hm
```

```
11  Chiko:      and (1.0) we can (.) we can (.) hear? (0.7) and-u
12          →   (1.0) have fun.
13          →   (.)
14  Chiko:  →   have our fun.
15  Saya:       hm hm hm hm
16  Chiko:  →   so (0.7) hm i- it (0.3) it will (2.0) be- (0.3) it
17          →   will be enjoyed? chigauka
                                 違うか
                                 that's wrong
18  Saya:       °hm hm [I know° I know hahaha
19  Chiko:  →          [ah hahaha we:: (.) we will (0.2) enjoy
20              he[hehe hm (0.5) °the° class
19  Saya:         [°yeah yeah yeah I think so° hehehe
```

Chiko's *accuracy-focused* self-initiated self-repair can be seen twice in lines 5–6. Here, she is providing an extensive response, with the gist being along the lines of, "for example, if Mathew [were our] teacher, we [could] hear many stories [of his] travel experience[s]." Both repairs replace the trouble source to improve *accuracy*, in pronunciation and grammar respectively. First, in line 5, the utterance, "Ma- if-u:" is treated as a trouble source. Similarly to Excerpt 1, the repair is initiated through a stretch in the epenthetic vowel (Ma- if-u:) and a 0.4-second pause (line 5) (see Carroll, 2005, on how vowel marking by Japanese learners to hold turn space). Moreover, the initial solution is abruptly cut off (Ma-) and then completed (Matthew-u:). In the second instance, "is-u:" is treated by Chiko as the incorrect tense. The replacement is initiated through another stretch of the epenthetic vowel (is-u:) and a 0.5-second pause (line 6). The solution "will be" is preceded by the prefacing "ah:", another 0.2-second pause (line 6), and "will" twice. Adding to Excerpts 1 and 2, Excerpt 3 shows that repairs focusing on pronunciation and grammatical *accuracy* employ vowel lengthening, long pauses, and, in this case, repetitions.

In line 12, Chiko employs a self-initiated self-repair that seems to achieve an *interactional purpose*. She treats "have fun" as a trouble source and initiates a transition-space repair after a possible completion point to add "our," thus, clarifying who will have fun. As seen in Excerpt 2, the repair for an interactional purpose is completed quickly and with little delay.

The final self-initiated repair to be analyzed happens in lines 16, 17, and 19. The utterance "it be will be enjoyed" is identified as a trouble source. Chiko initiates repair through the raised pitch at the end of "enjoyed." This is a repair for accuracy because the turn content remains the same. Moreover, she switches to Japanese to produce the repair-preface "*chigau*" [that's wrong]. Despite Chiko's treatment of her own utterance as being grammatically problematic, Saya seems to orient towards the meaning by producing a token of agreement and claiming epistemic access (line 18). Chiko repairs the trouble source by replacing the passive voice "it will be enjoy(able)" with the active voice "we will enjoy the class." Her laughter during the repair solution indicates her stance toward what she is saying. The fact that the laughter is only layered on the repair solution and not the trouble source suggests that Chiko orients to meaning only after the side-sequence to resolve the trouble source. Interestingly, although this is a *repair for accuracy*, the solution does not utilize stretches or long pauses. Unlike the previous instances, this *repair for accuracy* replaces grammatical forms, from passive to active. The change in

grammar may have influenced the speed of this repair for accuracy since the active form is learned much earlier than its passive counterpart.

Excerpts 1–3 explored how TALs employ self-initiated self-repair during conversations in an L2. It demonstrated that even low-level students are capable of sophisticated repair operations, utilizing components in a similar manner to L1 speakers. Furthermore, self-initiated self-repairs generally focused on accuracy or interactional purpose, with the former typically requiring more time to complete due to longer pauses, vowel stretches, and repetitions.

Self-Initiated Other-Repair for Vocabulary Learning

Self-initiated other-repair occurs when a repair is initiated by the producer of the trouble source but solved by someone else (Wong & Waring, 2021). Due to the dispreferred nature of other-repair, this form of repair is also rarely encountered in my data set. However, TALs sometimes repair each other's utterances.

Excerpt 4 illustrates two instances in which a TAL self-initiates the repair sequence but solicits assistance to complete the repair. Taka (a low-level TAL man) and Chiko (the TAL in Excerpts 2 and 3) are tasked with comparing old habits and current habits. The students were provided three starting questions. Before this excerpt, Chiko indicates an interest in discussing question C, "what is something you rarely did when you were younger but frequently do now?" Taka double checks if he understood her correctly (line 1). Following Chiko's confirmation (line 2), Taka starts reading the question (lines 3 to 6). The repair sequence is initiated when Taka shows signs of struggle reading the word "frequently" (line 6), thus leading Chiko to offer a solution by correcting his pronunciation (line 7) .

Excerpt 4: Chiko and Taka (Topic – Past habits; July 26th, 2022)
https://youtu.be/bJERWzVN1Mg?t=54 [0:54-1:42]

1	Taka:		cee: ((C))?
2	Chiko:		°chi°
3	Taka:		c **ne** what is something you: (0.2) °rare↑ly°
			ね
			right?
4	Taka:		did-u when you were younger?
5			(0.8)
6		→	but-ch (0.4) **fr- frecuentri:?**
7	Chiko:	→	**frEquentury:.**
8	Taka:	→	**frEquentury:**
9	Chiko:		°hm°
10	Taka:	→	**frEquentu me ((mean)) is-u often?**
11			(0.8)
12	Chiko:	→	**>>hm?<<**
13			(0.3)
14	Taka:		often. (.) often? (0.4) frequen[tury: means
15	Chiko:	→	[**often? >ah no no no<**
16	Taka:	→	>**same same same jana-?< same-u (0.2) meaning-u.**
			じゃな

```
                                    isn't it
17                  (0.5)
18              →   often
19                  (1.0)
20  Chiko:      →   >↑often?<
21  Taka:           ch- (0.2) often often
22  Chiko:      →   ah:: >°oh°< frequentry?
23  Taka:           frequently:
24  Chiko:      →   hm yes yes-u
25  Taka:       →   o- often? same same same meaning?=
26  Chiko:      →   =hm (0.2) a:lmost same (.) hm
27  Taka:       →   °oh yeah yes°
28                  hm ja what is something you rarely? (.) eh:::

                       じゃ

                       well
29                  >wakai toki yaranakatta ima< (0.2) >°wa°yaruYO

                    若い 時 やらなかった 今                は やるよ

                    didn't do when [you] were young now  [you] do
30                  tteiukotone< (.) >ima yatteirukototteimi?<

                    っていうことね       今 やっていることって意味

                    I guess, right?   meaning [you] are doing
31  Chiko:          n so ne

                    んそうね

                    hm that's right
```

Taka's reading is mostly fluent, with only one short pause (0.2) until he reaches a trouble source, "fr- frecuentri:?," in line 6. Even though Taka does not directly verbalize his struggle, he produces multiple indicators of "frequently" being a trouble source: (1) the 0.8-second gap and the mid-TCU 0.4-second pause before attempting to read the word, (2) the cut-off "fr-", and (3) the rising intonation in his attempted reading (lines 5–6). Chiko perceives Taka's hesitance as a repair initiation, prompting her to provide a solution, "frEquentury:.," without any delay or hesitation markers (line 7). Taka uptakes her repair solution in line 8 by repeating her solution. Thanks to the repair sequence, Taka reproduces "frequently" in a more recognizable pronunciation than his initial attempt. This demonstrates that students can aid one another in improving their accuracy while focusing on communicative tasks.

Apparently, although this self-initiated other-repair sequence is closed (line 9), Taka re-initiates the repair, this time focusing on the meaning of *frequently* ("frEquentu me is-u often?" in line 10). On a side note, perhaps because he mixes *frequent* and *means* together, Chiko initiates an other-initiated self-repair sequence (line 12). In line 15, Chiko seems to misunderstand Taka as using the word "often" in his question and responds with a refusal, "often? >ah no no no<." However, Taka seeks confirmation that this is the correct answer. He demonstrates disbelief

through his faster than usual rate, repeating "same" three times and inserting "*jana*-?," a Japanese form meaning "isn't it" in (line 16). Taka then reformulates his question into a statement: "[frequently has the] same-u (0.2) meaning-u (0.5) [as] often" (lines 16 and 18). After another repair initiated by Chiko (line 20), Chiko produces a change-of-state tokens (Endo, 2018; Heritage, 1984) to mark her new understanding that Taka is confirming the meaning of "frequently" (line 22). Once this mutual understanding is reached, Taka recycles his self-initiation for other-repair of the meaning of *frequently* once again (line 25), potentially to confirm whether Chiko's comment "hm yes yes-u" was an answer to his question in lines 16 and 18. Chiko revises her previous answer (line 24; cf. line 15) but downgrades her confirmation by adding "a:lmost." before "same [meaning]" (line 26). At this point, Taka accepts Chiko's repair solution by agreeing in a softer voice (line 27) and proceeds to return to the task at hand by translating the question into Japanese (lines 29 and 30) and beginning to address the question.

Thus, Taka's insistence on clarifying his understanding in self-initiated other-repair sequences (lines 10, 16, 18, 25, 29, and 30) provided him with a clearer understanding of a lexical item and enabled him to attend to the language learning activity. This suggests the importance of self-initiated other-repairs as both necessary for task completion and opportunities for language learning.

Excerpt 4 illustrated an extensive self-initiated other-repair sequence employed by TALs to acquire new vocabulary, in this case, orienting to the word "frequently" as learnable. In this situation, the recipient of the repair-initiation displayed IC in not only picking up indirect indicators of a trouble source but also offering a satisfactory solution. Furthermore, the student initiating the repair exhibited an uptake of both pronunciation and meaning of the trouble source word.

Other-initiated Self-repair and 'Let-it-Pass' Procedure for Task Progressivity

Other-initiated self-repair occurs when the repair is initiated by the recipient of the talk but then repaired by the trouble source producer. This type of repair is often initiated in the second turn and resolved within the third turn (Wong & Waring, 2021). As indicated earlier, self-repair is preferred over other-repair due to its turn position and to avoid conflict.

Excerpt 5 illustrates a complex other-initiated repair sequence in which the 'let-it-pass' procedure is employed to manage the progressivity of the language learning task. 'Let it pass' is defined by Bushnell (2015) as a passive tactic that avoids addressing a misunderstanding "in hopes that it will be made clear in the subsequent interactional sequences" (p. 109). In this excerpt, Chiko (low-intermediate TAL) and Hanako (intermediate TAL) initiate the conversation with a short greeting (lines 1 and 2). Within the same turn (line 2), Hanako requests permission to ask the question first. After a repair sequence (lines 2 to 4), Chiko grants permission (line 5). Instead of inquiring about the assigned topic of conversation (winter vacation plans), Hanako changes the topic to travel plans in spring (lines 7 and 8), thus leading to the target other-initiated repair sequence.

Excerpt 5: Chiko and Hanako (Topic – Winter Vacation Plans; December 6th, 2022)
https://youtu.be/7awIFs5XsDk [0:00-1:35]

```
1   Chiko:      hello? (huhu)
2   Hanako      hello: can I ask?
3   Chiko       (°ah°)
4   Hanako      can I? (0.2) can I? (0.8) okay?=
5   Chiko       >°okay°<
6               (1.2)
7   Hanako      are you- a:re there any plan (0.3) to go for a TRIP
8               (1.0)
9   Hanako      hm: next spring.
10              (2.0) ((Chiko stares directly at the camera))
11  Hanako      are there any: (.) plan?
12              (1.0)
13  Chiko   →   plan. hm
14  Hanako  →   °hm° to go:? (0.5) for trip?
15              (1.0)
16          →   uh next spring: (0.3) or next year:.
17  Chiko   →   where?
18  Hanako      °°uh-°° (0.3) °oh-°
19              (0.8)
20  Hanako  →   >no no< are you (.) any plans? (0.3) °plans°
21          →   (0.2) °oh° it's oka:y, any: (.) where. any (0.3)
22          →   places:
23              (0.4)
24  Chiko   →   uhm::: (.) eh- (1.0) you: (0.5) didn't d- dis-
25          →   eh you:: (0.2) you have-u no: (0.3) no plan:?
26          →   (0.3) where (0.5) you: (0.3) >you< go (0.5)
27          →   you've go:.
28              (0.8)
29  Hanako      ME?
30  Chiko       hm:
31  Hanako  →   me? (0.5) °oh:° (0.2) I'm going to::, (0.3) go.
32              (0.8)
33          →   °oh:° I'm going to visit (.) my uh (0.2)
34          →   cousin's house? (0.5) uh next spring
35  Chiko       °°hm°°
36  Hanako  →   yah (0.2) >I have a< (.) plan?
37              (1.0)
38              °I'm going to[ (.) yeah°
39  Chiko                    [°ah:  um:°
40  Hanako  →   >°um hm° how about< you:?
41          →   (1.0)
42  Chiko   →   uh::::: my- (0.3) eh my: (0.3) my plan?
43  Hanako  →   [°um hm°
44  Chiko   →   [during (0.8) winter break?
45  Hanako  →   °um hm° okay?
46  Chiko       hm:: (0.3) a- after Christmas?= and my three children
47              are coming to my place.
```

In line 7, Hanako begins the task by inquiring about Chiko's travel plans in spring. The lesson instructed students to ask the question, "what will you do this winter break?" Instead, Hanako effectively asks, "are there any plans to go for a trip?" The lack of response from Chiko in line 8 seems to lead Hanako to add an increment, "next spring" in line 9. In line 11, Hanako pursues yet again a response by recycling part of the question, "are there any: (.) plan?"

After a 1.0-second gap, Chiko initiates repair with a partial repetition "plan. hm" (line 13), referring to Hanako's question in lines 7 and 11. Hanako's solution is to add the second part of her question "°hm° to go: (0.5) for trip? (1.0) uh next spring (0.3) or next year" which complements Chiko's utterance of "plan."

However, this appears to be insufficient for Chiko to proceed with an answer, and she initiates another other-initiated repair sequence in line 17 with a *Wh*-question, "where?" This informs Hanako of Chiko's misunderstanding of her question, and so Hanako initiates a third-position self-repair with explicit rejection of Chiko's understanding and repetition of her own question (in lines 20–22).

At this point, instead of answering Hanako's question, Chiko produces a question directed at Hanako (lines 24–27). Clearly, this is not the projected second pair-part to Hanako's question; however, instead of pursuing Chiko's response to her question once more, Hanako lets it pass and answers Chiko's question, which essentially is an answer to her own question (lines 31–34). She then ties her answer back to the initial question (line 7) by recycling the word "plan" (line 36). In line 40, Hanako elicits Chiko to answer the question again by asking, "how about you?". Chiko displays uncertainty about the topic through the 1.0-second gap (line 41) and a stretched "uh:::::" token (line 42). After some further repair initiations by Chiko and confirmation by Hanako ("my plan? during (0.8) winter break?" in lines 42 and 44), Chiko finally provides the answer to Hanako's question in line 16.

In effect, by letting it pass, Hanako provided a sample answer to her own question, which enabled her to elicit an answer from Chiko. Hanako's strategy to let it pass and answer her own question was tutorial in nature and effectively solved Chiko's problem in understanding her question. Moreover, she found a way to tie her topic back to the initial trouble source. Although Hanako initially asked about Chiko's spring break plans, she accepted Chiko's response to the original task, their winter break plans.

Excerpt 5 exemplified TALs' refined IC. Other-initiated self-repair was used to indicate a misunderstanding, thus leading to multiple repair operations until a common understanding was reached. Furthermore, learners demonstrated skills in employing the 'let it pass' procedure and providing a sample answer as strategies, hence, leading to linguistic support and task progressivity.

Discussion and Conclusion

This study demonstrates that TALs can adequately employ a variety of self- and other-initiated repair techniques, regardless of their proficiency level, to overcome communication breakdowns or attend to linguistic accuracy. It shows that L2 learners can use self-initiated self-repairs to solve for accuracy and interactional purposes. The analysis indicates that *accuracy-focused* repairs often involve long pauses, vowel stretches, and repetition. This is potentially due to students requiring more time to access and process language during accuracy repair sequences (except when they

are very familiar with the language forms). The self-initiated self-repairs indicate that L2 learners monitor their own language both in terms of accuracy and meaning. Furthermore, they are capable of repairing themselves through similar methods. Hence, it may be valuable to provide conversation or discussion opportunities for L2 learners to hone their self-repairing skills.

The TALs demonstrated that peer-interaction and repair can positively improve their linguistic accuracy. In addition, even low-level students have demonstrated the ability to reject solutions they deem incorrect. Excerpt 4 illustrates a situation in which a student produced uptake of a partner's solution that is more accurate and another situation where the same student resisted uptake until he was satisfied with the solution. The factors that seem to influence the uptake acceptance or resistance seem to relate to the level of asymmetry between learners' and the receiver's level of knowledge. Moreover, the students can provide corrections in a similar manner to teachers (Wong, 2005), that is, direct and without delays. This evidence reinforces sociocultural theory's notion of the zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978). Therefore, developing student-centered lessons in which students have opportunities to interact with each other through communicative activities can develop students' linguistic and interactional competence.

Moreover, in contrast to behavioristic claims that student-student interaction can lead to the formation of bad habits (VanPatten & Williams, 2015), the interaction in Excerpt 4 provides a concrete example of a low-level TAL discerning that the peer's advice was inappropriate and renegotiating until a satisfactory solution was reached. The finding that learners did not blindly accept other-repairs they perceive as incorrect, even in low-level student interactions (Excerpt 4), suggests that peer interaction can be helpful in improving linguistic skills. More research in this area will be needed to understand what factors influence peer-to-peer uptake.

Lastly, TALs learners are capable of dealing with complex repair sequences, through the utilization of various repair operations. In Excerpt 5, a student effectively overcame a trouble source that required numerous turns to be solved through letting it pass and answering her own question. This case further demonstrates how L2 students are sophisticated communicators who can support each other's learning through communicative tasks. The candidate answer served both as a means of communication while also offering a sample desired solution. Thus, providing enough time for communicative tasks that offer opportunities for meaning negotiation and repair can be valuable in helping L2 learners develop linguistic and IC skills.

References

Abdulrahman, N. C., & Ayyash, E. A. S. A. (2019). Linguistic competence, communicative competence and interactional competence. *Journal of Advances in Linguistics*, *10*, 1600–1616. https://doi.org/10.24297/jal.v10i0.8530

Antoniou M., Gunasekera, G. M., & Wong, P. C. M. (2013). Foreign language training as cognitive therapy for age-related cognitive decline: A hypothesis for future research. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, *37*, 2689-2698. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2013.09.004

Bosisio, N. (2019). Language learning in the third age. *Geopolitical, Social Security and Freedom*

Journal, *2*(1), 21-36. https://doi.org/10.2478/gssfj-2019-0003

Brown, H. D. (2014). *Principles of language learning and teaching: A course in second language acquisition* (6th ed.). Pearson.

Bushnell, C. (2015). Lost in translation?: On using conversation analysis to examine cross-linguistic data. *Area Studies Tsukuba*, 36, 107-126.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative language approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(1), 1-47. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/I.1.1

Carroll, D. (2005). Vowel-marking as an interactional resource in Japanese novice ESL conversation. In K. Richards, & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), Applying conversation analysis (pp. 214-234). Palgrave Macmillan.

Endo, T. (2018). The Japanese change-of-state tokens a and aa in responsive units. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 123, 151–166. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.06.010

Firth, A. (2009). Doing not being a foreign language learner: English as a lingua franca in the workplace and (some) implications for SLA. *IRAL*, *47*, 127–156.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (2007). Second/foreign language learning as a social accomplishment: Elaborations on a reconceptualized SLA. *The Modern Language Journal*, *91*, 800–819.

Gabryś-Barker, D. (2017). *Third age learners of foreign languages.* Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783099412

Grognet, A. G. (1997). *Elderly refugees and language learning.* Center for Applied Linguistics.

Hayashi, M., & Hayano, K. (2013). Proffering insertable elements: a study of other-initiated repair in Japanese. In M. Hayashi, G. Raymond, & J. Sidnell (Eds.), *Conversational repair and human understanding: Studies in interactional sociolinguistics* (pp. 293-321). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511757464

Hayashi, M., Raymond, G., & Sidnell, J. (2013). Conversational repair and human understanding: An introduction. In M. Hayashi, G. Raymond, & J. Sidnell (Eds.), *Conversational repair and human understanding: Studies in interactional sociolinguistics* (pp. 1-40). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511757464

Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299–345). Cambridge University Press.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis: Principles, practices and applications.* Polity Press.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13-31). Benjamins.

Kacetl, J., & Klímová, B. (2021). Third-Age Learners and Approaches to Language Teaching. *Education Sciences*, *11*(7), 310-318. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11070310

Kitzinger, C. (2013). Repair. In J. Sidnell, & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 229-256). Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118325001.ch12

Kramsch, C. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *The Modern Language Journal*, *70*(4), 366-372.

Lee, J. F., & VanPatten, B. (2003). *Making communicative language teaching happen* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill Companies.

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Mackey, A., & Sachs, R. (2012). Older learners in SLA research: A first look at working memory, feedback, and L2 development. *Language Learning, 62*(3), 704–740. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00649.x

Matsumoto, D. (2019). Exploring third-age foreign language learning from the well-being perspective: Work in progress. *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal*, *10*(1), 111-116.

May, L., Nakatsuhara, F., Lam, D., & Galaczi, E. (2020). Developing tools for learning oriented assessment of interactional competence: Bridging theory and practice. *Language Testing*, *37*(2), 165-188. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532219879044

McNeill, S., & Misaka, G. T. (2022). Developing third-age learners' communicative competence using communicative language teaching. In P. Ferguson, & R. Derrah (Eds.), *Reflections and New Perspectives*. JALT. https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTPCP2021-06

Nguyen, H. t. (2011). Achieving recipient design longitudinally: Evidence from a pharmacy intern in patient consultations. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek-Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 173-205). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847694072-009

Nguyen, H. t. (2019). Developing interactional competence in a lingua franca at the workplace: An ethnomethodologically endogenous account. In H. t. Nguyen, & T. Malabarba (Eds.), *Conversation analytic perspectives on English language learning, teaching and testing in global contexts* (pp. 59-84). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788922890-005

Norton, L. S. (2009). *Action research in teaching and learning: A practical guide to conducting pedagogical research in universities*. Routledge.

Pfenninger, S. E., & Polz, S. (2018). Foreign language learning in the third age: A pilot feasibility study on cognitive, socio-affective and linguistic drivers and benefits in relation to previous bilingualism of the learner. *Journal of the European Second Language Association*, *2*(1), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.22599/jesla.36

Pikhart, M., & Klimova, B. (2020). Maintaining and supporting seniors' wellbeing through foreign language learning: Psycholinguistics of second language acquisition in older age. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *17*(21), 8038. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17218038

Schegloff, E. A. (2000). When 'others' initiate repair. *Applied Linguistics, 21*(2), 205-243.

Schegloff, E. A. (2013). Ten operations in self-initated, same-turn repair. In M. Hayashi, G. Raymond, & J. Sidnell (Eds.), *Conversational repair and human understanding: Studies in interactional sociolinguistics* (pp. 41-70). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511757464

Savignon, S. J. (2002). *Interpreting communicative language teaching: Contexts and concerns in teaching education.* Yale University Press.

Seedhouse, P. (2011) Conversation analytic research into language teaching and learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning: Volume II* (pp. 345-363). Routledge.

Singleton, D. (2017). Really late learners: Some research contexts and some practical hints. In D. Gabryś-Barker (Ed.), *Third age learners of foreign languages* (pp. 46- 57). Multilingual Matters.

https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783099412-004

VanPatten, B., & Williams, J. (2015). Early theories in SLA. In B. VanPatten, & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction* (2nd ed.) (pp. 17-33). Routledge.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Ware, C., Damnee, S. Djabelkhir, L. Cristancho, V., Wu, Y.-H., et al. (2017). Maintaining cognitive functioning in healthy seniors with a technology-based foreign language program: *A pilot feasibility study*. *Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience*, *9*(42), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnagi.2017.00042

Wong, J. (2005). Sidestepping grammar. In K. Richards, & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *Applying conversation analysis* (pp. 159-173). Palgrave Macmillan.

Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2021). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers*. Routledge.

About the Author

Gabriel T. Misaka earned an MA in TESOL at Nagoya University of Foreign Studies, Aichi, Japan. He is currently teaching elementary school at various schools and volunteers teaching adult classes. His academic areas of interest include Processing Instruction (PI), Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), Self-Determination Theory, and Conversation Analysis.