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Abstract. Communication breakdowns usually occur in teaching and learning interactions, necessitating repair. This study investigated the types of conversation repair organisations utilised by both lecturers and students during classroom interaction at the Takoradi Technical University. The study adopted the Conversation Analysis (CA) theory as a framework and methodology. The repair organisations identified in the study included self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair and other-initiated self-repair. Also, during classroom interaction, lecturers and students use paralinguistic elements such silence, cupping of the ear and smiling to convey their feelings and thoughts. Some implications of the study are that university lecturers should repair in their classroom interactions to make them more aware of communication breakdowns and what to do when there are issues with comprehensibility and intelligibility. Additionally, they have to design courses that will educate students on the application of various types of repair organisations and paralinguistic features in classroom discourse to engender effective communication.
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Introduction

Studies of teaching and learning practices in the English as a second language classroom are important [1] and the ability for interlocutors to interact successfully, especially in English as a second language classroom has gained increasing importance [2]. In this regard, a number of studies have advanced definitions for repair in conversation [2, 3, 4, 5]. [3] define repair as behaviours that emerge soon after a communication breakdown. Also, [2] indicates that repair in conversation refers to efforts directed at dealing with trouble sources within ongoing interaction. On their part, [5] suggest that repair is a term used to describe the situation in which there is an attempt to deal with a trouble source at a particular moment in a conversation. Pertaining to the domain of repair, [3] indicates that repair addresses issues such as speaking, hearing or understanding of talk that crop up in discourse. Generally, repair in conversation is essential in ensuring effective communication, and the English as a second language (ESL) classroom is no exception [5]. According to [4], in second language classrooms, repair is
practiced to clear up both form-related and linguistic problems (pronunciation, lexicon, syntax or discourse errors) and meaning-related problems (problems of fact, content or conversational problems).

One way to understand students’ classroom conversational behaviour is through a study of their repair strategies in respect of their verbal or non-verbal answers to lecturers and other student’s incorrect, partial or silent responses [6]. Consequently, scholars have paid considerable attention to repair strategies adopted by teachers and students in the classroom [7, 8, 5]. For example, [8] investigated the pattern of language use and classroom interactions among English teachers in English language institutes in Tehran and found that self-initiated self-repair (repetition and replacement) are commonly used in classroom interaction. Also, [7] analysed teacher-led clarification sequences in a university second language classroom setting at Newcastle University from a conversation-analytic perspective using the Conversation Analysis (CA) methodology and found that most teachers in L2 (second language) classrooms mainly use rephrasing and understanding checker whenever there is a breakdown of classroom interaction.

Despite the strides that have been made in other jurisdictions to understand repair organisation in classroom interaction and specifically in the ESL classroom, evidence from the extant literature suggests that studies that examine repair organisations and paralinguistic features in classroom discourse within the Ghanaian context are virtually non-existent. Existing studies [9, 10] have concentrated on phonetic descriptions, interactional patterns and repair in Ghanaian Pidgin English at the neglect of types of conversation repair organisations applied by both lecturers and students during classroom interaction. For instance, [9] described the interactional patterns and linguistic structures associated with other-initiated repair in Siwu (a Kwa language spoken in eastern Ghana). Similarly, [10] investigated turning taking, overlaps and repair in Ghana Pidgin English with the aim to examine the communicational strategies in Ghanaian Pidgin English outside the classroom. This prevailing situation constitutes a knowledge gap that needs to be addressed to allow practitioners and other stakeholders to better understand repair organisation and paralinguistics features in the Ghanaian classroom discourse, especially in universities, to improve andragogy. Consequently, this study aims to fill this niche by investigating the types of conversation repair organisations utilised by both lecturers and students during classroom interaction at the Takoradi Technical University. The study was guided by the following research questions: (1) which repair organisation occurs in classroom discourse in an English as a second language environment such as the Takoradi Technical University? and (2) what are the kinds of paralinguistic features in classroom discourse in an English as a second language environment such as the Takoradi Technical University?

Two reasons underpin the conduct of this inquiry. First, because there is virtually a shortage of studies on types of conversation repair organisations utilised by both lecturers and students during classroom interaction in an ESL setting such as Ghana, this study makes a valuable contribution by revealing the practices of repair on the part of both lecturers and students at the Takoradi Technical University. This is expected to inform the practice of classroom discourse within the domain of educational linguistics, especially on the interventions needed to make communication within the ESL classroom context more effective. Second, as the first study on types of conversation repair organisations utilised by both lecturers and students during classroom interaction in Ghana, this inquiry is envisioned to set the pace for further researches to be conducted into other germane areas of repair in classroom discourse to improve andragogical practices in L2 settings, including the Takoradi Technical University.
Review of literature

*Repair organisation in classroom discourse in ESL environment*

[11] identifies four possible approaches to repair organisations in classroom discourse: Self-Initiated Self-Repair (SISR), Self-Initiated Other-Repair (SIOR), Other-Initiated Self-Repair (OISR) and Other-Initiated Other-Repair (OIOR). [3] avers that SISR is a sort of conversational repair where the speaker of the repairable utterance performs two functions – indicating the problem and repairing it using his/her own words. The speaker stops his or her speech to address breakdown that has developed due to what he/she has said, began to say or about to say. On his part, [12] suggests that SISR occurs most often when an interlocutor is speaking. People sometimes forget essential information such as people’s names, locations, products and events in the middle of discussions [12]. This instance may result in the conversation repair phenomena, known as SIOR [7]. The present speaker indicates a fault with his or her speech, but the recipients or other speakers are responsible for correcting it [3]. For OISR, [3] suggests that the listener or another speaker takes the role of problem-initiator in conversation. The other speaker starts the talk but does not finish it. The speaker of the trouble source performs the repair e.g., by filling in a missing word. Pertaining to OIOR, [13] avers that it is used by a recipient to identify and repair an element in a prior turn, for example, replacing the speaker’s incorrect grammar during foreign language acquisition. As [6] indicates, the choice of a specific repair organisation depends on a number of factors, one of which is the pedagogical purpose of the interaction. In the classroom setting, pedagogic goals such as form and accuracy, meaning and fluency, task-oriented and procedural context influence the type of repair organisation chosen by interlocutors.

[14], [15] and [16] are among the scholars who have attempted to address the practice of repair organisation in the classroom between teachers and learners. Specifically, [15] explored other-repair organisation in English as a Foreign Language (ELF) communication to identify sequential features and patterns of other-repair practices used to initiate the negotiation of meaning with the use of CA as the framework. [15] found that second/foreign language learners of English employ other-repair strategies to deal with communication breakdown in the classroom setting. [16] findings corroborates [14], as the former found that English as a Foreign Language (EFL) college students address understanding problems by resorting to the use of other repair strategies such as: WH-interrogatives, partial repeat plus WH-interrogatives, repetition or partial repetition, candidate understanding, correction, request for repetition and non-verbal. Others are: asking for definition, explanation, translation, example, or spelling, explicit display of non-understanding and request to speak up. [22] argues that other-initiated self-repair frequently occurs in L2 (second language) settings rather than among L1 (mother tongue) speakers.

Kinds of paralinguistic phenomena in a repair initiation

Communication may take various forms, one of which is oral or spoken [12]. However, when people interact, they generally do not limit themselves to words [17]. They also use their hands (gestures), head moments, eyes (eye contact), lips (smile), bodily postures and symbols to communicate, which always accompany oral discourse intended or not. These nonlinguistic cues in conversation are called paralinguistic phenomena [12]. Paralinguistic communication has some functions such as substituting, complementing, regulating and contradicting the verbal message [12]. The role of paralinguistic phenomena in second/foreign language classrooms has only been studied recently with the increase of interest in multimodality in L2 classrooms [12, 17, 18]. For instance, [17] studied leaning forward in a classroom discourse in Demark and
found that leaning forward combined with utterances contributed to better interaction. [17] again found that leaning forward is used in repair turns. On his part, [19] found that leaning forward is used by teachers for nomination in pre-schools. The teachers would use it as a part of several resources (e.g. crouching, shifting posture and walking toward the students), including cupping the hand behind the ear to initiate a student’s response. There is no problem in these instances, but the teacher uses them as an embodiment to show that it is that specific student’s turn to talk. [12] suggested that leaning forward can be a resource for teachers to help students contribute via showing interest. These observations on cupping the hand behind the ear were also reported by [19] who suggested that this move indicates a hearing problem when it is stand-alone; however, verbal repair initiation indicates that there is no hearing problem. This is in line with [18] findings which suggested that cupping the ear with a hand accompanies verbal prompts, and this leads to a nomination for a student to respond.

**Theoretical framework**

The framework adopted for this study is Conversation Analysis (CA). Started by Harvey Sacks and Emmanuel Schegloff in the early 1960s, CA is a naturalistic observational discipline that could deal with the details of a social action rigorously, empirically and formally [2]. Also, CA is an approach to social research that studies the chronological organisation of talk to access participants’ understanding of and collective means of organising natural forms of social interactions [20]. CA emerged out of ethnomethodology developed by Garfinkel in the 1960s which is purposed on studying ‘the common-sense resources, practices and procedures through which members of society produce and recognise mutually intelligible objects, events and courses of action [3]. A distinctive methodological feature is that CA gathers its data from naturally-occurring interactions as they unfold in real-time using video or audio-recording technology [25]. Recordings are transcribed in close detail to allow for fine-grained analysis of the design, exchange and coordination of actions within social interaction [20]. Therefore, all CA researches are based on the analysis of tape recordings of naturally-occurring behaviour. The term ‘naturally-occurring behaviour’ refers to behaviour that would have taken place whether or not the researcher intended to record it. Hence, behaviour recorded in a classroom interaction falls within the domain of CA. For CA, it is the tape-recording itself rather than the transcript which is thought of as the primary data. The aim is to analyse the data (the recorded interaction) using the transcript as a convenient referential tool. The transcript is, therefore, regarded as a ‘representation’ of the data; while the tape recording is regarded as a ‘reproduction’ of a determinate social event.

**Methods**

**Study area**

The Takoradi Technical University (TTU) was established in April 1954 as a Government Technical Institute. An Act of Parliament, the Technical University Act 2016 (Act 922), subsequently converted eight of the then ten Polytechnics, including Takoradi Polytechnic, into Technical Universities after meeting the requirements. To that end, Takoradi Polytechnic Council adopted the new name “Takoradi Technical University” (TTU). The University offers two-year Master of Technology, four-year Bachelor of Technology, two-year Bachelor of Technology (top-up), three-year Higher National Diploma, two-year Diploma of Technology and Non-tertiary programmes. The Department of Secretaryship & Management Studies is a Department of the Faculty of Business Studies. The participants of the study consist first and second year Bachelor of Technology in Secretaryship and Management Studies.
students and their lecturers (3) of the Secretarial English course. This department was selected because it is the only Department that offers Secretarial English apart from the generic Communication Skills course that all first years of the University offer. Therefore, the researchers believed that the results from these groups will have far reaching implications for the rest of the students. For the lecturers, the researchers chose topic-specific experts in English language as participants based on their specialised expertise (lecturing Secretarial English). The choice of the Takoradi Technical University was informed by two reasons: 1) it is one of the prime technical universities in Ghana, and 2) most of the researchers are members of TTU community, so this afforded us the opportunity to better understand the linguistic behaviours of the participants which further enhanced the understanding and presentation of the analysis.

Study design and related issues

This qualitative single case study [21] aimed to investigate the types of conversation repair organisations utilised by both lecturers and students during classroom interaction at the Takoradi Technical University, and, therefore, required the recording and in-depth analysis of the L2 classroom data [16, 8]. The participants of the study were three lecturers (Male = 1; Female = 2) and 161 students from first and second years of Bachelor of Technology in Secretaryship and Management Studies Secretarial English lessons. All the lecturers and students were second language speakers of the English language. The participants are presented with pseudonyms L1, L2, L3 (for the lecturers) and S1 S2, S3 etc (for the students). L1 had 85 students, L2 had 32 students and L3 had 44 students in their lessons. The first and second year Secretaryship and Management Students were purposively selected because they offer English language (Secretarial English) as an elective course. Because the Bachelor of Technology in Secretaryship and Management studies is a relatively young programme, enrolment in TTU had not reached years three and four at the time of conducting this study. The recording was done after the researcher sought permission from the lecturers and students to record their regular classroom lessons. These were done to satisfy their rights to informed consent. According to [3], the amount of data needed for a sound CA study is between 5 to 10 hours of classroom recordings because they are enough for making generalisations and drawing conclusions about a particular context. Therefore, 6 hours (2 hours from each lesson) of video and audio recordings from three different ESL L2 classroom discourse were conducted.

Data transcription is crucial to CA studies, and it involves converting the data into a format that microanalysis can undertake [7]. The study, consequently, adopted [2] transcription conventions used by most CA studies because it helps researchers to achieve a consistent transcription system. A consistent transcription system assures trustworthiness of data and allows the readers to easily understand the extract [7]. [2] steps for CA data analysis were adopted for this study. That is, firstly, an unmotivated look at the data was done. Here, the researchers read through the transcript without taking into consideration any research objectives. Secondly, the researchers carried out an inductive search throughout the data to establish a collection of instances of the phenomenon; the researchers read through the transcript with the research questions in mind, underlining portions that fit the objectives of the study. Thirdly, the researchers established regularities and patterns in relation to the occurrences of the phenomenon. To achieve this, the researchers grouped the transcripts to types of repair organisations (OISR, SIOR, OISR and OIOR) and kinds of paralinguistic features. Finally, the researchers produced a more generalised account of how the phenomenon relates to interaction in the broader sense. Here, the researchers linked the findings to extant literature.
Results
The results of the study are presented in two subsections. The first subsection focuses on repair organisation in classroom interaction while the second subsection deals with paralinguistic features in classroom discourse.

RQ 1: Which repair organisation occurs in classroom discourse in an English as a second language environment such as the Takoradi Technical University?
The types of repair organisation that appear in the classroom discussions are self-initiated self-repair, other-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair and other-initiated other-repair. The researchers attempted to find out which of these occur in the classrooms, and the results are presented forthwith.

OISR
In OISR, the listener or another speaker takes the role of problem-initiator in conversation [3]. This type of repair was found in this study, as shown in Extract 1.

Extract 1: Evidence of OISR

| L1: Ok, we thank group four for your presentation (.) can we now move to group five? |
| S5: thank you sir, good morning, sir and colleagues, we↑ are going to present on illegal miners and its effects on the environment. |
| L1: say that again? |
| S5: we are going to talk about illegal miners and its effects on the environment |
| L1: Illigal Miners? |
| S5: (_,) sorry, illegal mining. |
| Class: ((laughing)) |

From Extract 1, the students used laughter in registering their evaluation of their colleague student’s speech as unacceptable. That is, the student mistakes illegal mining with illegal miners. To ensure that the speaker could correct the error by herself or otherwise, the lecturer sought clarification by asking the student to repeat the statement. The student repeated the wrong word, which prompted the lecturer to repeat the incorrect portion of the statement. This way, the student identified the error, rechecked the part mentioned by the lecturer, and corrected herself, thus engaging in self-repair initiated by others.

SIOR
SIOR shares act commencement and completion with the SIOR [6]. The data in Extract 15 is a representative example.

Extract 2: Evidence of SIOR

| S10: mining increases the incidence of sexually transmitted diseases such as go, go.(.) |
| S11: gonorrhoea |
S10: gonorrhoea, syphilis and HIV/AIDS
S10: some of them adopt new cultural traits like prostitution, prostitution, (.) (look around for help)
S12: smoking and gambling
S10: yes.

In Extract 2, Student 10 finds it difficult to produce the word gonorrhoea; instead of mentioning gonorrhoea, she repeats go, go, until Student 11 other repaired with the right word gonorrhoea. That then enabled Student 10 to list all the examples of sexually transmitted diseases he intended to mention. In the same extract, Student 10 sought help when she was listing the cultural traits of people that illegal mining could adversely affect; after mentioning ‘prostitution’, she found it challenging to mention the rest. She looked around to signal for help. The other repair came from Student 12.

SISR
For SISR, the lecturer and his/her students have awareness of trouble sources in conversations [3]. The first utterance in Extract 3 happened when the lecturer was introducing a new topic. In every standard classroom discussion, the lecturer warms the students up on the subject whenever a new topic. After the usual review of the relevant previous knowledge of learners, the lecturer tried to introduce the new topic. Before he repaired his words, he referred to himself. He then realised that the use of the word ‘I am’ was less involving. His short pause signals that realisation.

Extract 3: Evidence of SISR
As I mentioned earlier, so, I am going to (.) we’re going to discuss report writing and how to effectively write a good report.

He resultantly repairs the mistake with “we’re” to represent all the class. For the second utterance, the lecturer initially instructed his students to sit in pairs but quickly released that he needed to group them into four groups, so he paused briefly and self-repaired his statement to reflect what he wanted to be done.

OIOR
Only one participant, the interlocutor or second speaker, is responsible for initiating and completing this repair [11]. In Extract 11, Student 6 produces the word livestock /laiv.stok/ instead of livestock /laiv.stok/. This caused a communication breakdown because the lecturer did not understand what he meant. Then Student 8 provides the correct pronunciation to help him by supplying the correct pronunciation, livestock /laiv.stok/. Student 6, who was corrected, responded to the correction by repeating it after the class.
Paralinguistic features of classroom discourse
The body language of individuals, including students, reveals a variety of paralinguistic features [12, 17]. During classroom speech, teachers and learners use paralinguistic elements to convey their feelings and thoughts. The most common nonverbal characteristics found in this study are silence, cupping of the ear, smiling, leaning forward and nodding. It was found that the usage of silence in the classroom resulted in discourse breakdown and inconsistencies, which required mending. Another nonverbal sign observed, as indicated in Table 1 is nodding. Nodding indicates agreement to a concept or an idea [12].

Table 1: Evidence of Silence and Nodding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Trouble source</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Incomplete information</td>
<td>Next, we go to (. ) ((Dismiss)) ((pointing at a student))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>S8</td>
<td>((silence))</td>
<td>What topic did you group present on?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Importance of tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>S8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alright, ((nodding))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S8 was silent because the lecturer gave incomplete information, and the silence of S8 suggested that S8 could not understand the intended purpose of the lecturer because of the lecturer’s initial silence. The nodding performed by the lecturer is indicative of the fact that the lecturer was satisfied with the response from S8 and had, thus, achieved his aim in that conversation.

Other paralinguistic features found are leaning forward and cupping the ear. From Table 2, the salient nonverbal behaviour observed to engender repair is leaning forward and cupping the ear. It not only accompanies some repair initiation turns (lines 24 and 27), but it also works as a repair initiator which becomes imperative for the other interlocutor to respond.

Table 2: Evidence of Lean Forward and Cupping the Ear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>S8</td>
<td>Can we mix the American and the British English when writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>((leans forward))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>S8</td>
<td>Can we mix both Englishes when writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Consistency is important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>S8</td>
<td>((Cupping the ear)), madam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>We should not mix both Englishes ↑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alright, madam

Another paralinguistic feature identified smiling and clapping of hand as found in Table 3.

Table 3: Evidence of Clapping of Hands and Smiling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>I was impressed with your presentation ((smiling))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>((clapping of hands))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>S12</td>
<td>Thank you, madam (smiling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>That was well researched</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The smile of interlocutors in the classroom promotes learning as it eases tension. Learners become comfortable and that promotes language acquisition. The smile by the L3 in line 44 invites another paralinguistic feature (clapping of hands) which is a nonverbal feature that suggests approval.

Apart from clapping and smiling, other paralinguistic features identified were raising of hands, facial expressing and long aside. The examples are found in Table 4.

Table 4: Evidence of Raising of Hands and Facial Expressing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Verb is a key part of the predicate, without the verb there won’t be predicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>((facial expressing))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Yes, the verb alone can be the predicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>S32</td>
<td>(raising hand) sir, that meaning in ‘Ama danced’ “danced” alone is the predicate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>That is true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>S32</td>
<td>Thank you, sir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students facial expressing in line 103 prompted the lecturer to further explain himself. His explanation prompted S32 to seek further explanation by raising his hand – a paralinguistic feature which indicates attention seeking. And accordingly, the lecturers respond by directing his attention to S32.

Discussion

The study reveals that students and lecturers of TTU employ all four types of repair organisations and seven paralinguistic features; this suggests that a myriad of these repair strategies is in operation and are context driven to aid achieve effective communication. For SIOR, the finding that both the lecturers and students indirectly seek help when conversations
breakdown through recourse to clues such as questioning and repetitions to signal the need for assistance is consistent with the findings of [22]. The present study’s findings further suggest that, as an andragogical technique, lecturers employ SIOR strategies rather than seek assistance from other interlocutors to repair their conversations. [22] concludes that even though occasionally lecturers correct their students’ language problems directly, the lecturers tend to adopt a cluing type of SIOR than direct correcting of verbal errors. It can be observed that both self-initiated and repair explicit repairs employed in the classrooms perform other functions besides the essential functions of simply repairing trouble in speaking, hearing or understanding. These repair strategies serve as andragogical instruments that enable teachers and students to communicate and learn more effectively, as advanced by [16]; [16] indicates, after examining the repair strategies used by both teachers and students in the ESL classroom that the repair mechanism employed in the classroom, besides helping the conversational partners to repair trouble in speaking, hearing or understanding in during classroom discourse, serves as a teaching and learning tool that enhances effective communication and efficient teaching and learning of both students and teachers.

The classroom interaction also featured SISR. The finding that SISR was used was expected, as it is evident that this type of repair is the most used type of repair in discourse, especially turn-taking [23]. As corroborated [2], speakers employ more SISR in everyday conversation than any other repair type. Regarding SIOR, the finding that the students forgot aspects of what they wanted to communicate and sought help from others is consistent with the posit of [11] who found that SIOR is mostly employ in natural conversation interlocutors seek help whenever they stacked. With respect to OIOR, it is evident that the students engaged in this type of repair to good effect. [7] study on conversational nature of guidance and counselling discourse to identify inconsistencies that may lead to breakdown and misunderstanding and also the effects of the repair strategies used to address them found out that OIOR were common among peers.

Regarding the paralinguistic features, silence, cupping of the ear, raising of hand, nodding of the head, smile, laughter and facial expressing were observed to be predominantly used. According to [24], what interlocutors hear is either supported or challenged by what they see shown by their body language. [24] and [5] are among the scholars who aver that body language does reveal deeper, often unconscious sentiments. Therefore, lecturers must be aware of their students’ body language, and it is also lecturers’ responsibility to interpret it to enhance teaching and learning. [5] content that nonverbal behaviour alone can initiate repair. [17] argued that leaning forward combined with utterances contributes to better interaction. In her data, Rasmussen found that leaning forward was used in the repair phases and is valid for the current study, as leaning forward physically embodies meanings in interaction. Cupping the hand behind the ear was observed to be understood as a repair initiation for hearing problems, and it sometimes accompanied leaning forward to other-initiate repair. [18] found that cupping the ear with the hand indicates a hearing problem when it was stand alone; however, a verbal repair initiation indicated that there was no hearing problem. However, in the context of the current study, it was observed to initiate repair for only hearing problems. On the other hand, the finding of cupping the hand behind the ear is in line with [18] and [19], considering the fact that it accompanied verbal initiation (line 26).

**Conclusions**

The aim of the study was to investigating the types of conversation repair organisations utilised by both lecturers and students during classroom interaction at the Takoradi Technical
University. The data was obtained through video and audio recordings of classroom interaction in three separate lectures in the 2020/2021 academic year. Three major conclusions were drawn based on the findings. Firstly, all the four types of repair (SISR, SIOR, OISR, OIOR) are used in classroom interaction, but are dependent on the context. That is, different circumstances prompted the application of one repair organisation or the other. Essentially, the ultimate goal was to ensure effective communication within the ESL classroom. Secondly, repair or corrective feedback as an andragogical tool promotes the students’ active participation in ESL classrooms. This is because, it afforded them the opportunity to express their thoughts precisely to achieve their communicative needs, as they got help in the form of cues or other forms of repair either from their colleagues or from their lecturers. Thirdly, nonverbal cues alone could be understood as initiating repair. That is, visual cues have the potential not only to speed up repair initiations but also to signal understanding and to indicate when a conversation is once again back on track, and this was evident in the TTU classrooms used in this study. This is in consonance with the supposition of [23] who asserts that body language and other non-verbal cues help interlocutors understand one another.

**Implications**

The findings in the research have some implications for language policymakers and teachers. For example, lecturers should be encouraged to repair in their classroom interactions, which will allow them to become more aware of communication breakdowns in the classroom and what to do when there are issues with comprehensibility and intelligibility. That is, repair strategies help teachers to become more conscious of their actions and feelings in and outside the classroom [11]. Similarly, students should be encouraged to repair since that can potentially aid them to communicate more effectively, especially within the classroom setting. Also, lecturers in institutions responsible for training students in language competencies have to design courses that will educate students on how to employ repair strategies such as repetition, rephrasing and replacement whenever there are communication challenges in the classroom. There is, therefore, the need for lecturers to be aware of various repair organisation and paralinguistic features; this will help provide learners with sufficient information about the benefits of repair organisation and paralinguistic features and assist them in making connections between the theories they have learned and their actual application in their classrooms. Repair techniques can also be effective in language testing. In speaking tests, examiners might ask examinees to utilise self-repair methods to assess examinees capacity to repair communication failures and to discover how acquainted they are with repair strategies, as well as which types they use more frequently to maintain a conversation. Regarding future research, a longitudinal study can be conducted to find out the performances and understanding levels of students whose lecturers encourage repair in the classroom as against students whose lecturers do not. In addition, studies can be conducted to elicit students’ and lecturers’ perceptions on the use and types of repair organisations they find most useful, if any.
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