

*Does task-type matter?  
A case study into the interactional organization  
of correction in an L2 French task-based classroom*

Jeanne Rolin-lanziti ✉

The University of Queensland, Saint Lucia, Australia

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5205-4818>

[j.rolinlanziti@uq.edu.au](mailto:j.rolinlanziti@uq.edu.au)

Abstract

Arguing that teaching approach impacts on the practice of correction in the L2 classroom, the present study analyzed, within a conversation analysis framework, the effect of task-based language teaching (TBLT) on repair. The investigation examined the effect of three task-types, that is, a listening task, a production task, and a report task, on the discursive achievement of correction in the context of one L2 French beginner task-based classroom. Findings revealed that task-type was a factor that affects the participants' enactment of correction in the classroom. Whereas during the completion of the listening task the teacher played a dominant role (that associated with the traditional teacher-led classroom), the implementation of the production and report tasks introduced participatory dimensions that can be attributed to TBLT.

*Keywords:* practice of correction; repair; conversation analysis; task-based language teaching; L2 classroom-based research

## 1. Introduction

Task-based language teaching (TBLT) has been introduced into many second language (L2) contexts worldwide, and is now an “established approach” to L2 teaching (Ellis, 2017, p. 112). A task-based syllabus is organized around a number of

task-types, each holding its own features such as for example instructions on how to complete the task in the classroom setting (Breen, 1989; Ellis, 200:). The implementation of TBLT results in interactions between the participants who are actualizing the task in the classroom. Though TBLT is now an institutionalized teaching approach, there is still relatively little research on the discursive outcomes of specific task-types. We particularly do not have much information on the ways participants in task-completion interactively perform key pedagogical activities such as error correction, even though corrective strategies have been the object of extensive descriptive research (Ellis, 2010; Nassaji, 2016; Seedhouse, 2004). More generally, not many studies have taken into account the influence of the teaching approach on the achievement of correction. As the main characteristic of a TBLT syllabus is its organization around a range of tasks, it is relevant to focus the following inquiry on examining whether or not there is an impact of task-type on correction.

The overall objective of the present study is to find out if divergent task-types affect the interactional organization of correction as it is practiced in the L2 classroom between teacher and students. The investigation of this issue was thought to be worth undertaking as it has the potential to assist in teacher training. Specifically, the study's outcomes may help teachers identify corrective strategies that could be usefully put into practice in the task-based classroom. In order to meet this objective, a case study approach was adopted. The activity of correction in a specific L2 classroom was recorded *in situ* during task-implementation. The participants' corrective discourse was analyzed within the conversation analysis (CA) framework. Some researchers, conceptualizing teacher talk as "specialized" work, advocate using the CA approach to describe the discursive features of such talk (Hall, 2019, p. 228). In addition, results from the examination of classroom interactions with the CA method have proven useful for developing teaching guidelines on how to perform pedagogical activities such as the provision of corrective feedback (Wong & Waring, 2010).

## 2. The CA approach: Uncovered structures to manage conversation

CA research focuses on the medium through which participants jointly construct social activities – that is, the approach analyzes the interaction occurring in real time between conversation partners when they socially achieve actions through the use of talk. For Schegloff (2006, p. 66), interaction is "the primordial site of sociality" where interlocutors' actions are observable, along with the social dimensions involved in the accomplishment of these actions. Through a detailed analysis of samples, collected by recording conversations in particular settings, CA researchers have uncovered a number of structures, which, "shared" by the conversational

partners, help in managing the accomplishment of the interaction (Hall, 2019, p. 230). Three structures, that is, the turn-taking system, repair, and sequential organization of repair, are relevant for observing the actions that teacher and students perform in order to accomplish correction within the L2 classroom. As those dimensions will help us examine our data, we will briefly discuss them.

The turn-taking system deals with the allocation of turn at talk between partners in conversation. Two main methods to select the next speaker occur when there is a transition between two turns at talk: either the present speaker selects a speaker to take the next turn, or the next speaker selects herself to take the next turn (McHoul, 1985; Sacks et al., 1974).

Another key structure which organizes interaction is the practice of repair. This dimension helps participants solve problems of miscommunication, which arise during conversation and prevent interaction from moving forward. The issues, named "troubles," that must be addressed before the participants are able to resume the conversation, include "problems in speaking, hearing or understanding" (Schegloff, 2007, p. 100), such as for examples the use of "a wrong word," "failure to hear or be heard," or "trouble on the part of the recipient in understanding" (Kitzinger, 2013, p. 229). An additional problem, which frequently crops up within the L2 classroom, is not related to issues of intersubjectivity, but to linguistic incorrectness. Participants may stop the ongoing interaction to correct language errors. For Schegloff et al. (1977), correction does not involve solving issues of miscommunication but "the replacement of an error by what is correct" (p. 363). Though repair and correction pertain to distinct discursive organizations, the two discourses may nevertheless co-exist in the enactment of the correction. As shown by Macbeth (2004), there are instances in the classroom when the teacher and students must first establish a common understanding of the trouble through repair work before they proceed to correction. In this paper, we will maintain the distinction between correction for trouble involving error, and repair for trouble in understanding, as well as further investigate the relevance of repair for L2 classroom correction.

The third structure which help partners manage conversation is its organization into sequences. In the case of repair, the structure is identifiable as a separate type of exchange in the ongoing talk. In the exchange, the participants accomplish three main actions: first the emission of the trouble (an error or a misunderstanding); second, the initiation of repair, by one of the participants to address the trouble; and third, the completion of repair, by a conversational partner who re-establishes communication, or corrects the error. The basic organization of repair is then "ternary" including the emission of an utterance containing the trouble followed by the initiation of repair and the correction of the trouble (McHoul, 1990, p. 350). After the emission of the trouble, the organization of

repair varies depending on which partner, the error emitter or the recipient of the error, accomplishes the actions of initiation and correction. CA research (Schegloff, 2007; Schegloff et al., 1977) has uncovered the four following sequential organizations or “trajectories,” based on which participant – “the self” (the trouble emitter) or the “other” (the recipient of the trouble emitter) – initiates and completes repair before the on-going conversation resumes:

- 1) *self-initiated self-repair trajectory*, when the emitter of the trouble initiates and completes repair in her own speech;
- 2) *other-initiated other-repair trajectory*, when the recipient accomplishes both the initiation and the completion of repair of a trouble that has occurred in a prior turn at talk;
- 3) *other-initiated self-repair trajectory*, when the recipient of a trouble source initiates repair, and asks the emitter to correct the trouble;
- 4) *self-initiated other-repair trajectory*, when a participant initiates repair of a trouble, which is repaired by the recipient.

Each of the four trajectories is a basic sequence in which the participants perform two actions, the initiation and the completion of repair. In addition, each trajectory may have “expansions” in which conversation partners perform other actions. The “forms of sequence expansions,” built up around the basic sequence, are the following: the *pre-expansion*, which “can precede” the sequence, the *insert-expansion*, which “can intervene in the sequence,” and the *post-expansion*, which “can follow” the sequence (Stivers, 2013, p. 193).

### 3. Factors affecting conversational structures

#### 3.1. Institutional factors

Scholars have also studied interaction in educational settings as a “form of institutional talk” (Gardner, 2013, p. 593) that holds specific characteristics. In particular CA has shown that there are differences in the turn-taking system and in the sequential organization of repair when one compares their implementation in the educational context to that practiced in ordinary conversation (Kasper, 1985; Macbeth, 2004; McHoul, 1985, 1990; Seedhouse, 2004).

In instructional settings, the most frequent turn-taking system is the teacher “pre-allocation of turn”: the teacher gives the floor to a student or to the whole class who must wait to be called upon before speaking (Heritage & Clayman, 2010, p. 38). This type of turn-taking allows the teacher to maintain control over classroom

talk. It has however “the potential to alter” or “restrict” the students’ opportunities to initiate speech (Heritage & Clayman, 2010, p. 37). The social context of the educational setting also shapes the sequential organization of repair in such a way that there is a “preference” accorded to some trajectories over those that are “preferred” in ordinary conversation. The notion of “preference” does not refer to the participants’ “likes and dislikes” (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 22), but to the organization of the repair sequence (Schegloff et al. 1977, p. 361). In contrast to repair as it occurs outside the classroom, where the “self-initiation” patterns are preferred, the two “other-initiated” trajectories are prevalent in the classroom context (Kasper, 1985; Lee, 2020; Macbeth, 2004; McHoul, 1990; Seedhouse, 2004). Translated into the terminology of descriptive second language acquisition (SLA) research (Lyster & Ranta, 1997), the two most common repair practices in the L2 classroom are *recasts* (the teacher initiation and completion of repair) and *prompts* (the teacher elicitation of student self-correction).

Though the teacher pre-allocation of turn and the two teacher repair initiation patterns are frequent in the education environment, this does not mean that the procedures of ordinary conversation are never to be found in classroom settings. As shown by Garton (2012, p. 29), students may self-select to take the floor during the most “rigid form” of “teacher-fronted interaction.” One also needs to be aware that the specific educational context selected to examine repair organization may well impact on research results. Most research has been done in traditional teacher-led classrooms where the teacher tests the class on a preset knowledge, with display questions requesting known answers. This formal context explains, for example, the conclusions of McHoul’s (1985) study, which found a prevalence of teacher-initiation patterns during the correction of previously taught geography lessons. In other pedagogical settings which support student-centered learning, as in the TBLT approach, the activity of correction might hold other structural dimensions (Gartner, 2013).

### 3.2. L2 classroom factors

Though to our knowledge there is no research on the impact of TBLT on the organization of correction, the CA approach has nevertheless shown that factors within the L2 classroom boundaries exert constraints on repair patterns. Studying repair within secondary school English as a foreign language lesson, Kasper (1985) demonstrated that the goal of the lesson determines the preference for a specific trajectory. In the “language-centered” phase of the lesson, the “preferred” exchange follows the teacher elicitation of student self-correction (Kasper, 1985, p. 209). Instead, in the “content-centered” phase of the lesson, the teacher initiates

and completes repair (Kasper, 1985, p. 213). Similarly, for Seedhouse (2004), who studied repair practices in several L2 pedagogical contexts, factors such as the purpose of the activity performed by the classroom participants exercise an influence on the practices of correction. In teacher-fronted classroom organization, when the class focuses on accuracy, there is a prevalence of teacher-initiation and completion of correction. But in group work, when the students work on fluency, the trajectory of repair is more similar to that found in ordinary conversation. A recent study by Lee, re-examining Seedhouse's (2004) conclusions on "the relationship between L2 repair and L2 classroom contexts," largely supports this claim (Lee, 2020, p.18).

To our knowledge, only one study has examined the influence of task-type on L2 correction. Chen et al. (2022) investigated repair using data from an English-medium instruction class offered in China. The analysis of transcribed peer interactions in groups of students working on two different tasks, a "topic discussion" activity and a "simulation" task, showed the role of task-type in determining how "various trouble sources are addressed" (Chen et al., 2022, p. 1). While the topic discussion task predominantly generated linguistic errors and "form-related repair," the simulation task mainly produced miscommunication troubles, as well as "procedural and processing related repair" (Chen et al., 2022, pp. 7 and 14). The article concludes that the task-type provides different learning opportunities for students. Whereas the topic discussion "informal" task encourages learners to "attend to form more frequently," the simulation "formal" task helps learners "construct disciplinary knowledge" (Chen et al., 2022, p.15). This study is an example of a recent reorientation of CA research which, situated in the field of CA for SLA, aims at finding "the evidence of L2 learning in interaction" (Gartner, 2019, p. 220).

## 4. The present study

### 4.1. Aim

The present study, which investigates the impact of task-type on the social enactment of correction, is not located in the CA for SLA framework. Its goal is to add to research on the description of interaction in L2 education. Hypothesizing that the introduction of TBLT in the classroom has changed the interactional use of language, the purpose is to observe the sequential organization of the actions that teacher and students jointly achieve to accomplish correction through talk in one task-based classroom with the hope that this will inform "teachers' decision making" on how to practice repair in other L2 educational contexts (Hall, 2019, p. 229). In order to clarify the purpose of the study, the following research questions were formulated:

1. Does task-type-completion affect the discourse unfolding in a specific classroom where the participants are achieving the activity of error correction?
2. How can results, uncovered in a particular classroom environment, inform the corrective practices of future teachers in other educational contexts?

## 4.2. Methodology

To meet these aims, a class of beginners in French was audio recorded when the participants were implementing three task-types: a listening task, a production task and a report task. Corrective sequences were identified in the transcript (see Appendix for transcription conventions) of the recordings, and a CA analysis was applied to the sequences to observe the participants' corrective practices during the completion of each task.

### 4.2.1. The class

Two French lessons, one 30-minutes-long, the other 60-minutes-long, were recorded with digital audio recorders, which were placed on the participants' desks to tape both the students' and the teacher's interactions. There were about 25 students in the class. The students were enrolled in a course offered in an Australian University for beginners in L2 French, which aimed at the development of oral proficiency. The teacher, a French native, did not have any formal training in language teaching, but had extensive experience in the teaching of French at University level (20 years).

### 4.2.2. The description of the three tasks

As for teaching materials, the class was assigned to work on tasks either selected from the course textbook *Rond Point* or designed by the teacher of the course. During the recording of the two consecutive lessons, the class was working on three tasks. In the 30-minute lesson, the class was engaged in a listening comprehension task from the textbook. The students were instructed to listen to an audio document in which a French Chef explains how to make a *Quiche Lorraine*, then to summarize the recipe by completing unfinished sentences. In the 60-minute recording, the class was working on the MasterChef task, which, designed by the teacher, included two phases. First, the class created a recipe out of a list of ingredients in a group setting; second, individual students from each group reported the created recipe to the whole class.

During the two lessons, the class implemented in fact three related tasks, each being a phase of the activity of working on recipes. Task 1 instructed students to listen to a recipe, Task 2 to produce a recipe, and Task 3 to report the outcome of Task 2. Moreover, all three tasks are “meaning focused,” thus meeting the main criterion established by research on TBLT for qualifying as “a task” (Ellis, 2017, p. 109). Task 1 instructed students to focus not on L2 forms but on the comprehension of a recipe, task 2 asked students not to practice grammatical forms, but to invent their own recipes, and task 3 told the students not to reflect on L2, but to report the content of the recipes previously created in groups.

Though all three tasks are meaning-focused, each nevertheless holds its own “design features.” The list of the five characteristics outlined in Ellis’s (2003) “framework for describing tasks” as “work plan”, that is, as task-type before implementation in the classroom, helps bring out the specificities of each task. For Ellis (2003), a “task design” first includes some general communicative goal; second, it gives some “input data” or verbal component; third, it instructs on how to operationalize the input data; fourth, it indicates how to organize the classroom participants for working on the task; and finally, there is a “predicted outcome,” or some indication of the task “final product.” As for the “final product,” it can either be “closed,” that is, it will allow only one possible answer, or “open,” that is, it will allow several possible solutions or answers (Ellis, 2003, p. 21).

The application of the Ellis (2003) framework to the task-types in our study allows us to describe their differences. The general goal of task 1 is to develop the ability to understand a recipe, that of task 2 the ability to create a recipe, and that of task 3 the ability to communicate a recipe in the public setting of the classroom. The instructions for task 1 are to listen to a recipe and to complete unfinished sentences, for task 2 to produce a recipe, and for task 3 to report the created recipes to the class. The input data includes respectively an audio recording of the *Quiche Lorraine* together with unfinished sentences summarizing the recipe for task 1, a list of ingredients for creating the recipe for task 2, and the students’ created recipes for task 3. Each task requires a specific classroom organization to correct the task. Whereas task 1, after its completion by an individual student, is corrected in a teacher-led classroom, task 2 requires a group setting organization; as for task 3, individual students report the recipe to the whole class. Finally, the predicted outcome for task 1 differs from that for task 2. Whereas the task 1 outcome is “closed” (the unfinished sentences have to be completed only with specific words picked up from the audio document), that of task 2 is “open” (not one but several unknown recipes are expected). Table 1 lists the features of the three task-types, each type being titled according to the main goal of the task. As for the analysis of extracts below, task 1 will be referred to as “listening task,” task 2 as “production task” and task 3 as “report task.”



Table 1 Description of the three task-types

Features	Task 1 (listening to a recipe)	Task 2 (producing a recipe)	Task 3 (reporting a recipe)
Goal	Developing the oral ability to understand a recipe	Developing the oral ability to produce a recipe	Developing the ability to communicate a recipe
Instructions	Listen to a recipe and complete unfinished sentences	Create a recipe	Report the group created recipe to the class
Input data	Audio recording on how to make a <i>Quiche</i> and written unfinished sentences	A written list of ingredients	The students' created recipes
Participation classroom organization	Teacher-led	Group setting	Teacher-led
Predicted outcome	Completed sentences; closed (only one known answer is possible for each blank to be completed)	A recipe; open (several recipes are possible)	The corrected recipes; open (several corrected recipes are possible)

#### 4.2.3. Data analysis

The repair sequences identified in the transcript were analyzed with the help of the structures uncovered by CA (see above). The search for interactional variations to manage repair across the three tasks focused on the turn-taking system, the trouble source, and the sequential organization. For the turn-taking system, the analysis looked into whether the teacher pre-allocates turns to students, as frequent in education, or whether students have the opportunity to take the floor. For the trouble source, the inquiry observed whether the issue the participants address was related to miscommunication, as frequent in ordinary conversation, or to linguistic incorrectness, as prevalent in the L2 classroom environment. For the sequential organization of repair, the analysis looked into whether the two teacher initiation sequences were the preferred patterns, as found in most education contexts, or whether the two other student initiation trajectories also emerge in our classroom environment.

Besides the identification of trajectories, observation also searched for expansions which could occur either before (pre-expansion), in (insert-expansion) or after (post-expansion) the basic sequence. For example, in the following excerpt from our data, coming from the implementation of the listening task, there is a case of post-expansion:

- 1 T: *qu'est-ce qu'elle ne met pas dans la quiche.*
- 2 S: *elle ne met pas de sel*
- 3 T: *très bien*

After the basic trajectory, where the teacher initiates repair in a first turn, and the student completes repair in a second turn, the teacher gives positive feedback in a post-expansion third turn.

In addition to the CA analysis, two categories coming from SLA research on 'oral corrective feedback' (Lyster & Ranta 1997; Nassaji, 2016) helped examine the data. First, the notion of "feedback" was used in conjunction with that of "correction," as both categories, though issued from different research fields, address the same issue. Second, the category of "learner uptake," developed in Lyster and Ranta's (1997) article, was useful for analyzing sequences where there is a student's response to the teacher's repair turn. The authors define "uptake" as a learner's move in reaction to the teacher's correction, and identify three types of learner repair: "repair" (the error is corrected), "in need of repair" (the error is not corrected), and "partial repair" (only one aspect of the error is corrected) (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 51).

## 5. Findings

The following excerpts illustrate the repair practices that were observable during the participants' completion of each task-type. In Excerpt 1, the participants are doing correction during the implementation of the listening task; in Excerpt 2, during the implementation of the production task; and in Excerpt 3, during the implementation of the report task.

### 5.1. Repair practices during the implementation of the listening task

In the following Excerpt 1, the students have completed the listening task, which instructs them to listen to an audio recorded recipe and to complete unfinished sentences. In a teacher-led organization, the class is now correcting the students' answers for each sentence:

#### Excerpt 1

- 1 T: OK on va corriger, (1.0) ALORS: EUH ELLE NE MET PAS DE  
*((reading))*  
LAIT LA RECETTE VIRGINIE? ELLE NE MET PAS DE LAIT ? ELLE REMPLACE LE  
LAIT ? PAR QUOI. S1,
- 2 S1: °\*la crème fraîche°  
*((barely audible))*
- 3 T: pardon?
- 4 S1: \*crème fraîche
- 5 T: par de la crème fraîche vous êtes tous d'accord ?
- 6 S: oui
- 7 T: tous les groupes ? toutes les paires ? très bien. donc elle remplace euh
- 8 le lait par de la crème fraîche,
- 9 T: elle fait des trous dans la pâte avec quoi: °S2°,

- 10 S2: [*hem*  
11 T: ça c'est difficile]  
12 S2: avec une four- avec une FOURCHETTE chette?  
13 T: OK donc elle pique la pâte Brisée avec  
14 une fourchette. (4.0) hein donc ça c'est une FOURCHETTE. (2.0)  
(*drawing a fork and a knife on the board;*  
*writing 'fourchette'*)  
15 OK, et ça ? en français ? (1.0) comment ça s'appelle ça en français ?  
(*showing the knife*)  
16 S: un couteau  
17 T: un couteau, très bien (3.0) °très bien donc° elle ne fait pas? des trous  
(*writing 'couteau' on board*)  
18 avec un couteau, elle fait des trous? elle pique la pâte Brisée avec  
19 une fourchette? BRAVO (1.0) très bien

The whole excerpt contains two main sequences, the first one covers lines 1 to 8, the second starts line 9 and ends line 19. Though there are variations, both sequences have actional similarities.

They have the same basic trajectory: the teacher initiates correction (line 1 and 9) which the student completes in the following turn (line 2 and line 12). Moreover, for initiating correction, the teacher performs the same actions. First, he reads one unfinished sentence, extracted from the verbal component of the task-type; then he transforms the blank at the end of the sentence into a question. Finally, he allocates the floor to a student in the class by calling her name (line 1 and line 9). Furthermore, to initiate the trajectory, the teacher asks a "display" question: knowing the answer, he does not ask the question for requesting information, but to test the students' understanding of the recipe (Lee, 2006, p. 691). As for the student's answer, it is a "closed one" (Ellis, 2003, p. 21): only one "known answer" is allowed, the words *par de la crème fraîche* in sequence 1 and *avec une fourchette* in sequence 2, extracted from the audio document.

To the basic trajectory, there are expansions. Both sequences have a post-expansion, in which the teacher assesses the student's response. Whereas at the end of the first sequence, the teacher recasts the partially correct student's answer into the correct model (line 5), the second sequence ends with the teacher's provision of positive feedback (lines 18-19). Both trajectories also have insert-expansions. In the first one (lines 1-8), the teacher initiates repair with the word *pardon?* as he has not heard the *barely audible* student's answer (line 3). In the next turn, the student completes repair, repeating the erroneous utterance (line 4), which the teacher is now able to recast into the correct model in the next turn (line 5). In the second trajectory (lines 9-19), the teacher opens an insert-expansion (lines 14-17), not to *correct*, but to *teach* additional culinary vocabulary: he *draws a fourchette* and a *couteau* and he *writes* the word *couteau* on the board.

In sum the excerpt illustrates a corrective pattern, which, occurring during the implementation of the listening task, holds the following characteristics: in an opening turn the teacher pre-allocates the floor, prompting a student with a display question; in a following turn, the designated student provides the expected known answer. In a post-expansion, the teacher gives feedback to the class either recasting the student's error into the correct model, or repeating the student's correct response. Two insert-expansions may occur. The teacher may initiate repair when he cannot hear a student's inaudible response; he may also take the opportunity of doing correction to teach L2 forms, such as vocabulary, related to the verbal component of the task.

## 5.2. Repair practices during the implementation of the production task

In Excerpt 2, three students are writing the last sentence of the script they are producing to create the MasterChef recipe. They are working in a group setting while the teacher is moving around the class to assist students. In the excerpt, the word *probably* is inserted where the transcript was difficult to establish because of the similarity between *-er* and *-ez*, both pronounced /e/ in French.

### Excerpt 2

- 1 S1: *serve hot. °how do you say serve hot. °*  
*((starting to create the last sentence of the recipe))*
- 2 S2: *hem*
- 3 S3: *hem*
- 4 S1: *hem (2.0) serv- serv- \*server (/serve/)?*  
*((hesitating on ending; probably incorrect infinitive '\*server'))*
- 5 S2: *I think so +servez (/serve/)*  
*((probably correct imperative '+servez'))*
- 6 S1: *\*server [chaud ?*  
*((probably incorrect infinitive '\*server'))*
- 7 S2: *chaud]*
- 8 S1: *\*server (5.0) serve to serve hem*
- 9 S3: *\*le servi ? no that s-*
- 10 S1: *xx oh yeah to serve \*server so it would be*
- 11 *\*servez (/servez/) +S . E . R . V . E . Z .*  
*((incorrect pronunciation)) ((spelling correctly in L1))*
- 12 S2: *yeah*
- 13 S1: *so \*ser: vez ? (/servez/) chaud (2.0) et \*bon [\*appétit (/ bõn*
- 14 *appetit/)*  
*((probably writing))*  
*((Teacher, going around the class, gives instructions to all students; not shown))*

- 15 S1: °comment dit-on *to serve*  
((stopping and addressing T))
- 16 T: pardon?
- 17 S1: comment dit-on *to serve*
- 18 S2: \*servez (/servez/)  
((probably imperative; incorrect translation of infinitive “to serve”))
- 19 T: servir hein ? (2.0) donc euh serve +servez  
((correct infinitive)) ((correct imperative))
- 20 S1: +servez xx
- 21 T: hein servez S . E . R . V . E . Z c'est le verbe servir  
((spelling in L2)) ((writing servir on the board))
- 22 S1: +servez chaud.

(Rolin-lanziti, 2018, pp. 349-350)

The overall excerpt is made up of two main sequences. The first one starts in line 1 and ends in line 14. The second one covers lines 15 to 22. In both sequences, the same student, S1, takes the floor by asking the question *how do you say serve hot?* By so doing, she twice requests help in order to express in the L2 form the L1 meaning *serve hot*.

In the following turns of both sequences, S1's question triggers answers but coming from different interlocutors. In the first sequence, S1 addresses the question to her peers; then in the following turns, S1 and peers search for an answer to S1's request. However, they visibly are not up to the task as they lack L2 knowledge. S2 recasts S1's first attempt at finding the L2 form for *serve hot*, but she precedes the reformulation with *I think so* (line 5), which shows uncertainty about the correctness of the answer. As for S3, she provides an erroneous answer: in line 9, she suggests, *le servi*, which she self-assesses as wrong in the same turn by saying *no that's-*. The first sequence closes on a partially correct L2 form to express *serve hot*: though S1 pronounces incorrectly the ending of the imperative (\*servez (/servez/)), she spells the form correctly (S.E.R.V.E.Z).

S1's re-initiation of the second sequence with the same *how do you say* question, but addressed to the teacher, indicates that she is looking for feedback to the answer reached at the end of the first sequence. After the re-initiation, there is an insert-expansion in which the teacher initiates repair with the word *pardon* (line 16), showing that he did not understand the student's question. When the communication is re-established, the teacher *teaches* the forms of *servir*. She first says orally the infinitive *servir* and the imperative *servez* (line 19). Then she spells and writes the two forms on the board (line 21). Her teaching generates two S1's uptakes. Following the oral correction, S1 repeats the correct form of the last syllable of the imperative (line 20), whereas in the turn following the written feedback, she uptakes the whole L2 sentence *servez chaud* (line 22), which answers the *how do you say* question, raised at the opening of the first sequence.

In sum, in Excerpt 2, a student, S1, takes the floor twice with the same *how do you say* question, which is a request for how to say in L2 form an L1 expression. In each of the two sequences of excerpt 2, the participants perform different interactional roles. The student plays the role of *requester* for feedback whereas the peers and the teacher play the role of *providers* of linguistic resources. However, the outcome of the sequence differs depending on the level of L2 knowledge of the provider. When the *requester's* peers complete repair, the sequence closes on a partial uptake from the *requester* who, re-addressing the request to the teacher, shows that she is unsure of the peers' answer. Contrary to the peers' hesitations and wrong answers, the teacher, whose *teaching* responses enable S1 to *uptake* the correct L2 form, reveals her higher level of L2 knowledge. Though the same student takes the floor, her request is addressed to interlocutors who do not have the same level of L2 knowledge. This "epistemic" asymmetry (Drew & Heritage, 1992, p. 49) is visible in the respondents' answers, but also in the student's behavior. By re-initiating a sequence to address the request to the teacher, S1 shows that she regards the teacher as having the most expertise in L2.

### 5.3. Repair practices during the implementation of the report task

In Excerpt 3, the three students, who were working in a group setting in Excerpt 2, are now reading the written script of their recipe to the whole class:

#### Excerpt 3

- 1 T: OK on va- vous avez terminé ? (2.0) on va écouter ? les (0.5)
- 2 les recettes les noms des recettes ? OK ? donc (1.0) fini (0.5) S1 S2
- 3 et S3 s'il vous plaît ? OK on va commencer par ce groupe ? alors
- 4 comment s'appelle votre plat, comment s'appelle votre plat S1,  
*((nominating S1 in group 1))*
- 5 T: votre plat, comment s'appelle votre plat,  
*((addressing student 1 in group 2))*
- 6 S1: il s'appelle le \*risotto super:  
*((sounding humorous and proud))*
- 7 Ss: *((laughing))*
- 8 T: le super risotto? (0.5),super risotto oui,  
*((very loud)) ((class laughing))*
- 9 alors s'il vous plaît le super risotto la recette,
- 10 S1: tout d'abord coupez un oignon un poivron  
*((reading with assertive voice))*
- 11 T: [hum
- 12 S1: trois] tomates un demi \*piment (/pimët/)?

- 13 T: un demi +piment (/pimã/) oui.  
14 S1: +piment *hem* 400 grammes de lardons \*et (/et/) un poulet entier  
15 T: très bien. (3.0) continuez s'il vous plaît  
(*addressing student 2 in group 2*)  
16 S2: *ah* ensuite bouil- \*bouillez (/bouillez/)  
17 T: +bouillez  
18 S2: +bouillez \*l'eau (/œ/) et ajoutez trois \*tasses (/tuset/) de \*riz  
19 (/ris/)  
20 T: trois : ? (1.0)  
21 S?: tasses  
22 S2: trois tasses  
23 T: ah trois tasses trois tasses de riz. Très bien continuez  
(*addressing student 2*)  
24 S2: puis bou bouillez du riz  
25 T: oui  
26 S2: pour 30 \*minutes (/minyts/)  
27 T: très bien. Continuez  
(*addressing student 3*)  
28 S3: ensuite ver *hem* versez de *hem* de \*l'huile (/ol/) *hem* d'olive  
29 T: oui de +l'huile d'olive versez de l'huile d'olive  
30 S3: \*à la \*poêle (/poel/)  
31 T: dans une +poêle (/pwal/) (0.5) dans une poêle (1.0) *in a frying pan*  
32 S3: oui [oui  
33 T: dans (1.0) dans une poêle hein?  
34 S3: dans une +poêle  
35 T: oui  
36 S3: et chauffez la poêle x ?  
37 T: chauffez la poêle  
38 S3: *yeah*  
39 T: OK  
40 S3: puis a[jou  
41 T: °puis c'est bien°]  
42 S3: tez oignons et mé- *hem* mélangez ?  
43 T: oui  
44 S3: pour huit minutes  
45 T: oui mélangez pendant huit minutes pour huit minutes oui c'est  
46 bien  
47 S3: après égouttez le riz  
48 T: oui  
49 S3: et mettez dans un très grand bol  
50 T: oui c'est bien (3.0)  
51 S3: *ah* \*enfin (/ãfã/)  
52 T: +enfin oui  
53 S3: +enfin a- ajoutez : les autres \*ingrédients (/ẽngridiãt/)  
54 T: oui  
55 S3: au \*riz (/ris/) et : mélangez

56 T : et mélangez très bien.

(Rolin-lanziti, 2018, pp. 352-354)

The excerpt is composed of three sequences, the first covers lines 1 to 15, the second lines 15 to 27 and the third lines 27 to 56. The organization of the three sequences holds similarities. At the opening of each sequence, the teacher pre-allocates a turn to one student (in lines 5, 15 and 27). After the teacher pre-allocation of a turn, the designated student reads part of the created recipe, then the teacher initiates and completes correction in a third turn. Frequently, there is a post-expansion to this ternary pattern in which the student uptakes the correct form. The same pattern is observable throughout the excerpt. After selecting the error from the student's reading turn in line 13 for *piment*; line 29 for *huile*; line 31 for *dans une poêle*; line 33 for *dans une poêle*; line 52 for *enfin*, the teacher recasts the student's error into the correct model. The recast triggers the student's uptake of the correct form in lines 14, 34 and 53.

However, an example of insert-expansion in this basic organization is noticeable in the excerpt. After the student's reading turn in line 18, the teacher initiates a repair sequence (line 20: *trois?*), showing that the word *\*tasses (/tuset/)*, is *unintelligible* to him. Then S?, a peer of S2, completes repair in line 21, which S2, the error emitter, uptakes in line 22. In line 23 the teacher's repetition of *ah trois tasses de riz* indicates that the communication is re-established, and shows that the teacher positively assesses S? and S2's repair completion.

In sum, the excerpt offers an example of a teacher initiation repair trajectory, in which the teacher plays a leading role in the corrective process. Not only does he pre-allocate turns to individual students, but he also selects and recasts errors. An insert-expansion may, however, occur within the basic trajectory, which is due to one feature of the report task: namely, the outcome of the task, which is *open*. The teacher, not knowing the student's answer, might have to initiate repair after a student's turn, which contains an *unintelligible error*. Only after the intersubjectivity has been re-established between the classroom participants can the teacher proceed to the correction of the error.

## 6. Discussion

Arguing that TBLT has changed repair practices, the purpose of this study was to examine how teacher and students jointly achieve error correction within the site of the task-based L2 classroom. More specifically, the study investigated, within the CA analytic framework, the impact of three task-types on the interactional organization of correction. The investigation's ultimate goal was to help



inform the teaching of correction in other L2 classroom environments where the TBLT approach has been introduced. From the analysis of the excerpts collected in the L2 French class during the implementation of three distinct task-types, the following conclusions can be drawn.

The organization of correction varies according to the task-type the class is completing. During the completion of the listening task, the trajectory follows the teacher elicitation of student's self-correction trajectory (teacher prompt). During the completion of the production task, the trajectory visible in our data is student initiation to ask peers' help to articulate an L1 meaning in an L2 form, followed by student-re-initiation to request teacher's feedback. During the completion of the report task, the observed trajectory is the teacher-initiated teacher-correction trajectory (teacher recast). We may then conclude that *task-type does matter* in our L2 beginner classroom environment: it is a factor which potentially changes the talk participants produce to achieve correction.

The divergence in task-type features explains the variations. For the listening task, the participation structure, which is teacher-led, combined with the *closed* outcome of the task and the overall goal of developing the ability to understand, explain why the teacher plays a leading participatory role in correction. As in traditional classroom settings, the teacher is socially recognized as the participant who, holding authority and having the L2 expertise, takes the charge of allocating the floor and correcting errors. As prevalent in the educational context, she initiates correction with display questions to test students' comprehension of the previously heard audio document. The excerpt from our data shows that teachers, in other environments, may expect to enact correction using the traditional teacher initiation/student known answer pattern already found in other contexts, such as for example in McHoul's (1990) classroom, where the teacher tests high school students' knowledge of geography with the same pattern. However, as observed in the insert expansion of Excerpt 1, the teacher achieves another goal during correction in the TBLT classroom. He may take the opportunity to test comprehension with the use of prompt to introduce the class to additional L2 forms which are related to the content of the listening document. As discussed by TBLT research, listening tasks, re-named "input tasks" (Ellis, 2003, p. 25), together with checking comprehension, may also have the objective of presenting L2 forms to learners. This double objective – the one of testing comprehension and the other of introducing the L2 – could be met through the use of technology. The features of the task-type, in particular the predicted outcome, make feasible the development of teaching material -including audio document, provision of known answers and additional L2 vocabulary- which students could perform on-line outside of the classroom.

The use of technology, however, is not feasible for the performance of correction during the completion of the production task. In this case, the teacher plays an essential role within the enactment of the student-initiated teacher-correction trajectory. Though previous research in L2 correction has already observed this trajectory, in particular in “meaning-oriented” phases of lessons (Kasper, 1985; Seedhouse, 2004), this repair practice has not been found to be the most prevalent in the educational context. The introduction in our context of the TBLT approach, which promotes group work as the best participation structure for L2 learning, and which focuses L2 teaching on students’ expression of their own *open* outcomes, explains its emergence in our data. The lack of L2 knowledge to express their communicative intents in L2 forms moves students to request help from peers during group work and feedback on the correctness of the group’s L2 findings from the teacher. During correction in the group setting, the teacher performs a crucial but also a very challenging role, distinct from the one requested from correction in the traditional teacher-led classroom. As visible in excerpt 2, the teacher is expected to correct and to teach L2 forms in response to students’ demands. This job requires the ability to understand which meanings the students wish to express and to correct errors on the spot, without preparation before class. Such ability needs special teacher training. One exercise, based on findings in our data, is conceivable and could be introduced into teacher development sessions. Following the model of the teacher who responds to the S1’s question *how do you say serve hot*, the exercise would instruct the trainees to work in groups. One party would choose an L1 meaning and ask the question *how do you say* the L1 meaning in L2 form to the other members of the group who would practice teaching the requested form, with no preparation and no teaching material.

For the report task, the teacher’s goal is not to test students as in the listening task, or to answer students’ requests as in the production task. The aim is to assess the linguistic quality of the previously created L2 productions. Correction accordingly follows another trajectory. First, the teacher must give the floor to a student who is asked to present to the class the linguistic content of the group created text. This content is unknown to the teacher, as the outcome of the task is *open*. After the student’s answer, the teacher’s role is to select errors and recast them into the correct models. Though this trajectory is quite frequent in the educational context, the impact of the TBLT approach is nevertheless noticeable in excerpt 3. As the outcome of the task is unknown to the teacher, the student’s answer may be *unintelligible* to the teacher, mainly because the student is unsuccessful at communicating meanings in correct L2 forms. The teacher then may be required to initiate repair before being able to complete correction. As in Macbeth’s study, there are instances in our task-based classroom environment when both repair and correction co-exist because repair is a “prerequisite” to the teacher achievement of

correction (Macbeth 2004, p. 723). This is the case in our data when the class is involved in correction during the completion of a report task.

## 7. Conclusion

The TBLT approach introduces into the classroom a range of corrective practices whose variations rest on the design of the task-type which participants implement during correction. Teachers may expect to perform different corrective actions depending on the goal of the task-type. When the goal is to develop listening ability in L2, the teacher will have to check students' responses to known answers with the use of display questions as in most traditional L2 classrooms. However, the goals of the production task and of the report task introduce new corrective practices into the L2 classroom. The emergence of these new practices stems from the introduction of the TBLT approach. When the goal is to develop the ability to produce L2, the teacher has to provide the correct L2 forms that the students request in the L1. When the goal is to correct student group work, the teacher may first have to establish the meanings that the students want to communicate, before recasting errors.

Concluding, it is necessary to acknowledge the limited nature of our findings. Data provided for the foregoing investigation was restricted to that collected in a single task-based classroom. Ideally, within the CA framework, the study of classroom discourse should be based on data collected from several classes with participants from various social backgrounds. The conclusions of our study, particularly those on teaching, need therefore to be assessed in the light of these limitations. This study should be considered only as a possible guide to pursue further research on the influence of the TBLT approach on L2 classroom correction.

## References

- Breen, M. (1989). The evaluation cycle for language learning tasks. In R. K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 187-206). Cambridge University Press.
- Chen, X., Zeng, C., & Dalton-Puffer, C. (2022). Learner repair during task-based peer interactions in an EMI classroom: A case study of a marketing class in a Chinese higher education setting. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2022.2046757>
- Drew, P. & Heritage, J. (1992). *Talk at work: interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2010). A framework for investigating oral and written corrective feedback. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 335-349.
- Ellis, R. (2017). Task-based language teaching. In S. Loewen, & M. Sato (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of instructed second language acquisition* (pp. 108-125). Taylor and Francis.
- Gardner, R. (2013). Conversation analysis in the classroom. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 593-611). Blackwell.
- Gardner, R. (2019). Classroom interaction research: The state of the art. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 52, 212-226.
- Garton, S. (2012). Speaking out of turn? Taking the initiative in teacher-fronted classroom interaction. *Classroom Discourse*, 3, 29-45.
- Hall, J. H. (2019). An EMCA Approach to capturing the specialized work of L2 teaching: A research proposal. In M. Haneda, & H. Nassaji (Eds.), *Perspectives on language as action* (pp. 228-245). Multilingual Matters.
- Heritage, J. & Clayman, S. (2010). *Interactions, identities, and institutions*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Kasper, G. (1985). Repair in foreign language teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 7, 200-215.
- Kitzinger, C. (2013). Repair. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 229-256). Blackwell.
- Labascoule, J., Lause, C. and Royer, C. (2004). *Rond Point. Méthode de français basée sur l'apprentissage par les tâches*. Presses Universitaires de Grenoble.
- Lee, H. (2020). A longitudinal study of sequential organization of L2 repair in classroom contexts. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 21, 1-20.
- Lee, Y. (2006). Respecifying display questions: Interactional resources in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40, 691-723.
- Lyster, R. & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37-66.

- Macbeth, D. (2004). The relevance of repair for classroom correction. *Language in Society*, 33, 703-736.
- McHoul, A. W. (1985). Two aspects of classroom interaction: turn taking and correction. *Australian Journal of Human Communication and Disorders*, 13, 53-64.
- McHoul, A. W. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in Society*, 19, 349-377.
- Nassaji, H. (2016). Anniversary article. Interactional feedback in second language teaching and learning: A synthesis and analysis of current research. *Language Teaching Research*, 20, 535-562.
- Rolin-lanziti, J. (2018). Variations on the IRE pattern in a French beginner task-based classroom. *The Language Learning Journal*, 46, 343-356.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696-735.
- Schegloff, E. (2006). Interaction: The infrastructure for social Institutions, the natural ecological niche for language, and the arena in which culture is enacted. In N.J. Enfield and S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of human sociality: Culture, cognition and interaction* (pp. 66-93). Berg.
- Schegloff, E. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53, 361-382.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Blackwell.
- Stivers, T. (2013). Sequence organization. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 191-209). Blackwell.
- Waring, H. (2011). Learner initiatives and learning opportunities in the language classroom. *Classroom Discourse*, 2, 201-218.
- Wong, J. & Waring, H. (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers*. Taylor and Francis.

## APPENDIX

### Transcription conventions

#### IDENTITY OF SPEAKERS

T:	teacher
S1:	identified student
Ss:	several students together

#### IDENTIFY ERRORS AND LANGUAGE

*	an asterisk in front of a word indicates an error
+	a cross in front of a word indicates corrected error
L1:	<i>italics</i>
L2:	regular font

#### CHARACTERISTICS OF SPEECH DELIVERY

?	raising intonation
yes.	period indicates falling intonation
:	colons indicate the lengthening of the preceding sound
no-	hyphen indicates an abrupt cut-off
<u>because</u>	<u>underlined type</u> indicates stress
° <i>put</i> °	degree signs indicate decreased volume
S.E.R.	spelling
(0.5)	(0.5) = pause of 0.5 second
(1.0)	(1.0) = pause of one second
T: [yes	brackets indicate simultaneous overlapping talk by two or more
S1: oh]	speakers

#### COMMENTARY IN THE TRANSCRIPT

(( <i>laughing</i> ))	description of actions such as reading or gesturing.
xx	indicates one or more words are unintelligible
(/me/)	slashes indicate phonetic transcription