



MEANING NEGOTIATION AND COMMUNICATION REPAIR IN ENGLISH AS A LINGUA FRANCA: A CORPUS-BASED ANALYSIS OF UZBEK SCHOLARS' INTERACTIONS

Khudayberdieva Malikakhon Ergashali qizi
Republic of Uzbekistan

Abstract

This article outlines a corpus-based approach to examining meaning negotiation and communication repair in Uzbek scholars' English as a lingua franca interaction within international academic settings. It focuses on how participants identify understanding problems, request clarification, reformulate contributions, and establish sufficient shared understanding to continue an exchange. The proposed framework combines corpus-assisted analysis with sequential examination of spoken interaction, treating repair as a collaborative communicative practice rather than simply the correction of linguistic errors. Relevant settings include conference discussions, research meetings, and academic seminars involving participants with different linguistic backgrounds. Particular attention is given to clarification requests, confirmation checks, repetition, paraphrase, and explanations of disciplinary terminology. The framework also considers how academic roles, disciplinary knowledge, and interactional circumstances shape opportunities for negotiation. As no empirical corpus has been supplied, the article presents a research design and analytical framework rather than verified findings about Uzbek scholars. Its pedagogical relevance lies in identifying how authentic academic interaction could inform English-language preparation that develops clarification, reformulation, and collaborative understanding alongside grammatical competence.



Keywords: English as a lingua franca, meaning negotiation, communication repair, academic interaction, pragmatic accommodation, corpus-based analysis, interactional competence.

Annotatsiya:

Mazkur maqolada o'zbekistonlik olimlarning xalqaro akademik muhitda ingliz tilidan umumiy muloqot vositasi sifatida foydalanish jarayonida ma'noni o'zaro aniqlashtirish va muloqotdagi tushunmovchiliklarni bartaraf etishni korpus asosida o'rganish yondashuvi bayon qilinadi. Ishtirokchilarning tushunishdagi qiyinchiliklarni aniqlashi, aniqlashtirishni so'rashi, fikrini qayta ifodalashi va suhbatni davom ettirish uchun yetarli umumiy tushunishga erishishi asosiy tahlil yo'nalishlari sifatida belgilanadi. Taklif etilgan yondashuv korpus tahlilini og'zaki muloqotning ketma-ket tashkil etilishini o'rganish bilan birlashtiradi. Muloqotni tiklash faqat til xatolarini tuzatish emas, balki hamkorlikdagi kommunikativ faoliyat sifatida talqin qilinadi. Aniqlashtirish so'rovlari, tushunganini tasdiqlash, takrorlash, parafraz va ilmiy terminlarni izohlashga alohida e'tibor qaratiladi. Empirik korpus taqdim etilmagani sababli maqolada tasdiqlangan natijalar emas, tadqiqot loyihasi va tahliliy asoslar beriladi. Yondashuvning pedagogik ahamiyati akademik ingliz tili ta'limida grammatik kompetensiya bilan birga fikrni aniqlashtirish, qayta ifodalash va hamkorlikda tushunishga erishish ko'nikmalarini rivojlantirish imkoniyatlari bilan bog'liq.

Kalit so'zlar: Ingliz tili umumiy muloqot vositasi sifatida, ma'noni o'zaro aniqlashtirish, muloqotni tiklash, akademik muloqot, pragmatik moslashuv, korpusga asoslangan tahlil, interaksion kompetensiya.

Introduction

International academic communication brings together scholars who use English alongside other languages. In these encounters, successful communication depends on more than grammatical accuracy or familiarity with specialist vocabulary. Participants must interpret unfamiliar expressions, connect contributions to disciplinary knowledge, and recognize when an explanation has not been understood. English as a lingua franca provides a useful perspective on



***Modern American Journal of Business,
Economics, and Entrepreneurship***

ISSN (E): 3067-7203

Volume 2, Issue 10, October, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

***This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons
Attribution 4.0 International License.***

these processes because it directs attention to communication among people with different linguistic backgrounds. Within this perspective, meaning negotiation and communication repair are central practices through which participants maintain academic exchanges and make their intended contributions accessible to others.

For scholars working in Uzbekistan, international academic participation may involve conference presentations, collaborative research meetings, postgraduate seminars, and discussions with visiting colleagues. Such encounters can require participants to explain locally situated research, respond to unexpected questions, and discuss concepts whose meanings vary across disciplinary or institutional contexts. Understanding difficulties may therefore arise from terminology, pronunciation, implicit assumptions, or insufficient contextual information. They should not automatically be interpreted as evidence of deficient English proficiency. Examining how scholars respond to these difficulties offers a more informative account of their communicative resources and of the conditions supporting participation in international academic dialogue.

Meaning negotiation concerns the interactional work undertaken when participants seek to establish or refine shared understanding. A listener may request clarification, offer a possible interpretation, or ask whether a particular term refers to an already discussed concept. A speaker may repeat an expression, replace it with another formulation, or provide an example. Communication repair encompasses practices addressing problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding, including difficulties that speakers identify within their own contributions. Although the concepts overlap, distinguishing them analytically helps avoid treating every reformulation as a misunderstanding or every correction as an attempt to negotiate substantive meaning.

A corpus-based approach can make these practices visible across multiple interactions while preserving attention to individual conversational sequences. Frequency patterns can indicate which resources recur, but numerical distributions alone cannot explain what a clarification request accomplishes or whether participants resolve a difficulty. Sequential analysis is consequently necessary to examine the relationship between a problematic contribution, the



response it receives, and the subsequent development of the exchange. For this proposed study, Uzbek scholars' interactions constitute the focal research context rather than evidence of a uniform national communication style. Differences in experience, disciplinary affiliation, academic role, and interactional setting require consideration.

The study aims to develop an analytical framework for investigating how Uzbek scholars identify understanding problems and collaboratively address them in international academic communication. It asks which negotiation and repair practices occur, how their interactional functions differ, and what observable responses suggest that communication can proceed. It also considers how these practices might inform university English teaching, particularly preparation for spontaneous discussion rather than rehearsed presentation alone. Since an empirical corpus has not been provided, the article establishes a research design instead of claiming measured outcomes. Its intended contribution is a context-sensitive basis for examining academic participation through observable communicative practices without reducing competence to conformity with native-speaker norms.

Methods

The proposed study adopts a mixed analytical design combining corpus-assisted description with sequential analysis of academic interaction. Its purpose is to investigate observable practices of meaning negotiation and communication repair rather than evaluate speakers against a predetermined proficiency standard. Because no recordings or transcripts have been supplied, the procedures described here constitute a prospective methodology. Corpus size, participant numbers, collection dates, and institutional coverage would be documented after recruitment and data collection, without assigning hypothetical values to these characteristics.

Data would comprise naturally occurring spoken exchanges involving Uzbek scholars and interlocutors with different linguistic backgrounds. Eligible settings would include research meetings, academic seminars, conference discussions, and collaborative project consultations conducted primarily in English. Prepared monologues would be retained only when necessary to understand subsequent



***Modern American Journal of Business,
Economics, and Entrepreneurship***

ISSN (E): 3067-7203

Volume 2, Issue 10, October, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

***This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons
Attribution 4.0 International License.***

interaction. Purposive sampling would seek variation in discipline, academic role, interactional setting, and international communication experience. Recruitment would rely on voluntary participation, and access arrangements would avoid suggesting that participation influences employment, assessment, or institutional standing.

Before recording, participants would receive information about the research purpose, intended data use, confidentiality arrangements, and applicable withdrawal conditions. Consent would be obtained from everyone whose contributions enter the corpus. Identifying details would be removed from transcripts, and sensitive research content would be excluded when disclosure could compromise participants or collaborators. Recordings would be stored securely with access restricted to authorized researchers. Institutional ethical approval would precede collection, and publicly accessible recordings would not automatically be treated as unrestricted research material.

Recordings would be transcribed with speaker labels, turn boundaries, pauses, overlaps, repetitions, and relevant features of delivery. Transcription detail would be sufficient to interpret repair sequences while supporting searchable text. Video, where separately consented to and available, would inform analysis of gestures or gaze; otherwise, claims would remain limited to audible interaction. Metadata would record setting, discipline, participant roles, recording duration, and available language background information. Transcripts would be checked against recordings, and uncertain passages would remain marked rather than reconstructed through assumptions.

The coding unit would be an interactional sequence containing a demonstrable trouble source, repair initiation or negotiation move, and subsequent response. Categories would distinguish self-initiated from other-initiated repair and identify clarification requests, confirmation checks, candidate understandings, repetition, paraphrase, and elaboration. These categories could overlap when a sequence combines several practices. Coding would follow contextual evidence rather than isolated expressions: a question such as “What do you mean?” would require examination of surrounding turns before classification. Routine hesitation and stylistic reformulation would not automatically count as understanding difficulties.



Descriptive analysis would report raw counts alongside rates per thousand words and recording duration where appropriate. Comparisons would account for differences in setting and opportunities to speak. Independent coding of a shared subset would assess category consistency, followed by discussion of disagreements and refinement of definitions. Sequential analysis would examine whether participants display understanding, continue negotiation, or abandon the issue. Continuation alone would not establish complete comprehension. Findings would be interpreted within the corpus boundaries, with sampling limitations and researcher decisions documented rather than generalized to all Uzbek scholars.

Results

No empirical results can be reported because the corpus has not been collected or supplied. Consequently, there is no evidential basis for estimating the frequency of repair practices, comparing academic settings, or determining whether particular strategies characterize Uzbek scholars' interactions. This section specifies the outputs that the proposed analysis would generate and the conditions under which they could be interpreted. It presents a reporting framework rather than observed findings, and no illustrative exchange is represented as an authentic participant contribution.

The output would describe the corpus composition, including recording duration, transcribed word count, number of interactions, and distribution across settings. Participant information would be reported in aggregated form to protect confidentiality. These details would establish the scope of the evidence and identify imbalances affecting interpretation. For example, a corpus dominated by research meetings could support observations about those meetings but would provide a weaker basis for claims about conference discussions. Missing metadata and inaudible passages would also be documented.

A second output would identify the distribution of negotiation and repair practices through raw counts and normalized rates. Reporting would distinguish the number of sequences from the number of moves because one sequence may contain several clarification requests or reformulations. Overlapping categories would be explained to prevent readers from treating their totals as mutually



***Modern American Journal of Business,
Economics, and Entrepreneurship***

ISSN (E): 3067-7203

Volume 2, Issue 10, October, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

***This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons
Attribution 4.0 International License.***

exclusive. Frequent use of repetition, if observed, would require contextual examination before interpretation as a clarification strategy. Repetition could also express agreement, emphasize a claim, or support turn management.

Sequential findings would describe how participants make an understanding problem relevant and how others respond. Evidence would include the positioning of clarification requests, the specificity of candidate interpretations, and the relationship between reformulation and subsequent uptake. Analyses would distinguish audible difficulty from uncertainty about a concept or reference where participants themselves make that distinction observable. Any unresolved ambiguity would remain explicit. The identification of a trouble source would therefore depend on the unfolding exchange rather than a researcher's judgment that an expression sounds unusual.

Outcome reporting would differentiate sequences displaying understanding, sequences requiring further negotiation, and sequences ending without an observable resolution. A relevant answer, accurate reformulation, or appropriate application of clarified information could provide evidence of understanding. Minimal acknowledgments would require greater caution because they may signal willingness to continue without demonstrating comprehension. Similarly, topic movement would not necessarily indicate successful repair. Reporting these distinctions would make it possible to describe interactional progress without claiming access to participants' internal interpretations or assuming that every exchange ends successfully.

Comparative outputs would examine variation across settings, roles, and available speaking opportunities only where the corpus supports such comparisons. Differences would remain descriptive unless an appropriate statistical design justifies stronger inference. Coding disagreements and revised category definitions would be reported alongside reliability information. These outputs could reveal how academic participants share responsibility for maintaining intelligibility, but that possibility remains a research question. At this stage, the study yields a structure for future results reporting; claims about strategy effectiveness, national patterns, or pedagogical outcomes must await analysis of authentic interactional evidence.



Discussion

The framework directs attention to how scholars manage understanding collaboratively during academic exchanges. Its implication is that communicative competence should be examined through participation in interaction, alongside linguistic knowledge. However, without an empirical corpus, the framework cannot establish which strategies Uzbek scholars prefer or whether particular practices improve communication. The following discussion therefore addresses analytical and pedagogical possibilities rather than interpreting observed results. Maintaining this distinction prevents a plausible research design from being mistaken for evidence about a scholarly community.

Treating repair as collaborative work creates space for examining contributions from all participants. An understanding problem may arise because a speaker provides insufficient context, a listener interprets terminology differently, or both participants assume knowledge that is not shared. Analysis should consequently avoid assigning responsibility to the Uzbek participant or the speaker with less familiar pronunciation. The relevant question is how participants make the difficulty recognizable and respond to it. This perspective permits investigation of communicative resources without turning every departure from conventional language forms into a deficit.

The relationship between meaning negotiation and disciplinary knowledge also requires interpretation. A clarification request can concern a technical concept even when the preceding sentence is grammatically clear. Conversely, an unfamiliar expression may be understood because participants share specialist knowledge. These possibilities suggest that proficiency labels alone would offer an incomplete explanation of repair patterns. Comparisons should consider the knowledge available within an exchange and the demands of the academic task. They should also distinguish misunderstanding from substantive disagreement, since challenging an argument does not necessarily demonstrate failure to understand it.

For university English teaching in Uzbekistan, the framework suggests value in activities involving clarification, paraphrase, and responses to unexpected questions. Students and researchers could practise explaining a concept to



interlocutors outside their discipline, checking an interpretation, and reformulating an answer after a request for clarification. Such activities would complement instruction in academic vocabulary and grammatical accuracy. Their effectiveness would nevertheless require separate evaluation. A descriptive interactional corpus cannot establish that a teaching intervention produces improvement unless learning outcomes are investigated through a pedagogical research design.

The analytical combination proposed here also raises methodological tensions. Corpus counts support comparison across recordings, whereas sequential analysis emphasizes the locally situated function of each contribution. Neither approach should displace the other. An expression that appears frequently may perform different functions, and a rare sequence may expose a communicative challenge. Sampling decisions affect interpretation: institutional access, recording conditions, and participants' willingness to be recorded could influence the interactions available. Findings would therefore need to remain connected to corpus composition rather than presented as representative of national academic communication.

A further concern involves the interpretation of interactional success. Participants may acknowledge an explanation to preserve conversational progress, accommodate institutional expectations, or avoid extending a discussion. Observable continuation must therefore be distinguished from demonstrated understanding. This caution is especially relevant when academic roles create unequal opportunities to request clarification. Examining participation conditions, alongside verbal practices, would strengthen interpretation while keeping claims proportionate to the evidence available within academic interactions.

Conclusion

This article has established a research framework for examining meaning negotiation and communication repair in Uzbek scholars' English as a lingua franca interactions. Its contribution is methodological and conceptual rather than empirical: no corpus has been supplied, and no claims about observed frequencies, strategy effectiveness, or participant characteristics can therefore



***Modern American Journal of Business,
Economics, and Entrepreneurship***

ISSN (E): 3067-7203

Volume 2, Issue 10, October, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

***This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons
Attribution 4.0 International License.***

be substantiated. The framework identifies how academic exchanges could be collected, transcribed, coded, and interpreted while preserving the relationship between searchable linguistic patterns and the sequential organization of interaction.

The analysis treats understanding as something participants establish through their contributions and responses. Clarification requests, candidate interpretations, repetition, paraphrase, and elaboration would be examined in relation to the problems they address and the responses they receive. This approach would allow researchers to distinguish repair addressing speaking or hearing difficulties from negotiation concerning concepts, references, or contextual assumptions. It would also discourage automatic classification of unconventional expressions as communication failures, particularly when interlocutors demonstrate that they understand and can continue the academic task.

For the Uzbek academic context, the framework offers a way to investigate participation without assuming a homogeneous national communication style. Scholars may differ in disciplinary expertise, international experience, linguistic resources, and institutional roles. Their interactional opportunities may also vary between conference discussions, research meetings, and seminars. Any future findings should reflect these differences and remain bounded by the composition of the corpus. Broader interpretations would require additional recordings, transparent sampling procedures, and evidence that the interactions examined represent the settings under discussion.

The pedagogical implications concern preparation for responsive academic communication. University English courses could incorporate opportunities to request clarification, explain terminology, check interpretations, and reformulate contributions during discussion. These practices could be integrated into work on presentations, academic vocabulary, and disciplinary communication. However, the present framework does not demonstrate their instructional effectiveness. Decisions about teaching should therefore distinguish insights drawn from interactional description from evidence obtained through intervention research. Evaluation would need to consider whether learners use



the practices appropriately and whether interlocutors display improved understanding.

Implementation requires attention to research ethics and analytical accountability. Participant consent, confidentiality, storage, and sensitivity to unpublished research are necessary conditions for constructing an academic interaction corpus. Transcription uncertainties, coding disagreements, and limitations in available recordings should remain visible throughout reporting. Quantitative summaries should distinguish sequences from individual moves and account for unequal recording lengths. Qualitative interpretation should examine surrounding turns rather than infer communicative intentions from isolated expressions. Together, these safeguards would support findings that readers can assess and other researchers can examine.

The next stage is to implement the proposed design using authentic, consented interactions involving Uzbek scholars and international colleagues. Such work could establish which negotiation practices occur, how repair develops, and when participants display sufficient understanding to proceed. Until that evidence becomes available, these questions remain open. The framework provides a basis for addressing them while maintaining a distinction between research possibilities and demonstrated outcomes. Its value lies in connecting academic language preparation with observable interactional demands and in treating collaborative understanding as an object of systematic investigation.

References

1. Mauranten, A. (2012). Exploring ELF: Academic English shaped by non-native speakers. Cambridge University Press.
2. Seidlhofer, B. (2011). Understanding English as a lingua franca. Oxford University Press.
3. Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53(2), 361–382.
4. Varonis, E. M., & Gass, S. (1985). Non-native/non-native conversations: A model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 71–90.



5. Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On “lingua franca” English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26(2), 237–259.
6. Mauranen, A. (2006). Signaling and preventing misunderstanding in English as lingua franca communication. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2006(177), 123–150.
7. Kaur, J. (2010). Achieving mutual understanding in world Englishes. *World Englishes*, 29(2), 192–208.
8. Kaur, J. (2011). Raising explicitness through self-repair in English as a lingua franca. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(11), 2704–2715.
9. Björkman, B. (2013). English as an academic lingua franca: An investigation of form and communicative effectiveness. De Gruyter Mouton.
10. Jenkins, J. (2014). English as a lingua franca in the international university: The politics of academic English language policy. Routledge.
11. Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2012). Analysing English as a lingua franca: A corpus-driven investigation. Continuum.
12. House, J. (2003). English as a lingua franca: A threat to multilingualism? *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(4), 556–578.
13. Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 209–239.
14. McEnery, T., & Hardie, A. (2012). *Corpus linguistics: Method, theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.
15. Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (1998). *Corpus linguistics: Investigating language structure and use*. Cambridge University Press.
16. Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis (Vol. 1)*. Cambridge University Press.
17. Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Blackwell Publishing.
18. Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696–735.
19. Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 20(1), 37–46.
20. Jenkins, J. (2015). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a lingua franca. *Englishes in Practice*, 2(3), 49–85.