

A Conversation Analysis of Repair Strategies in Indonesian Elementary EFL Students

¹Tita Novitasari, ²Ernie D. A. Imperiani, M.Ed.
English Language and Literature
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

¹titanovitasr23@gmail.com, ²ernie_imperiani@upi.edu

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to investigate the types of repair strategies and techniques of repair initiation used by Indonesian Elementary EFL students during the classroom interaction with their teacher. The participants were Elementary EFL students at the beginner level. By using qualitative research, the study used four types of repair strategies by Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) and techniques of repair initiation from Finegan (2008). The data sources were in the form of video recorded of classroom interactions that were transcribed by applying Jefferson Transcription Notation (2004). The findings of the study revealed that the students used all types of repair strategies. The most frequently is OISR which obtained 23 occurrences (37.1%). Besides, the three techniques were found in the conversation. Asking question toward the problem is the dominant one which occurred 31 (50.0%). Another technique was revealed which is giving possible understanding toward the problem. The results of the present study indicate that the speakers produced the trouble source more which affected the recipient to initiate asking for the repair. It means that the trouble source identified by the teacher, but the students did the repair. The trouble source that appeared was affected by the students' proficiency and the lack of knowledge that they had toward the topic. Also, the teachers initiated asking for explanation to raise the students' ability in terms of their English knowledge and speaking fluency. However, the teacher should consider that the students should have a chance to repair their trouble source or problem by themselves.

Keywords: *Conversation analysis, EFL students, repair strategies, repair techniques,*

INTRODUCTION

Conversation is the way people communicate with others. It also shows how they interact with others and exchange information. However, in a conversation, people do not only maintain their relationship and exchange information. There are still other numbers of features of conversation that can be studied. In the recent time, the conversation has been extended into spoken discourse such as doctor-patient consultations, news interviews, talk show, and classroom interaction (Paltridge, 2006). To examine conversation, Conversation Analysis (CA) becomes a suitable approach because it is the organization of social action through talk (Mazeland, 2006).

The sociologist Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1973) developed Conversation Analysis (henceforth, CA). It is the approach of social interaction and action focusing on investigating interaction by analyzing how the participants use to construct it. Paltridge (2006) believes that CA is an analysis of talk which focuses on how people maintain their everyday conversational and also the study of spoken discourse that looks at how people manage their conversational interaction. Furthermore, CA focuses on the practical details of how

talk-in-interaction is organized (Schegloff, 2007). However, in every conversation, either formal or informal context, it is possible if the speakers who interact with interlocutors or hearers make some mistakes while exchanging and delivering information. Therefore, if there are communication breakdowns during the conversation, either interlocutors or hearers have to correct it to avoid misunderstanding or misinterpretation. So the messages of the conversation can get across.

In a study of CA, the phenomenon above is called as repair. It is an aspect of conversational interaction and becoming a crucial thing in a conversation. According to Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) define repair as a tool used in conversation to correct an error made by speaker or trouble source and state that repair deals with recurrent problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding. Clark and Schaefer (1989) explain that there are four problems which cause of repairs happen which are: I didn't hear you speaking, I heard you speak but didn't hear what you said (utter), I heard what you said but didn't know what you referred to (refer), I know what you referred to but didn't understand what you mean (intend). In addition, repair is the way speakers rectify things they or someone else has said. It

also checks what they have understood in a conversation (Paltridge, 2006). Sometimes, the speakers do not realize if they made a mistake. Therefore, the recipient should give a signal to inform and initiate the repair of a previous statement (Tiara, 2018). To study repair in a conversation, Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) categorize repair into several types.

There are two main types of repair strategies, namely self-repair and other-repair. Schegloff et al. (1977) explain that self-repair occurs when the speaker repairs the problem, while other-repair occurs when the recipient is the one who corrects the problem. They also describe repair can be initiated and resolved by the speaker who utters the mistake during a conversation or by the interlocutor who hears it. Someone who initiates repair is not necessarily the one who accomplishes. It can be done through self-initiation and other-initiation. Therefore, Schegloff et al. (1977) define four types of repair. First, self-initiated self-repair (SISR). It occurs when the trouble source is the speaker him/herself and he/she who repairs it. Second, other-initiated and self-repair (OISR) appears when the interlocutor causes repair completion, which is done by the speaker. Next, self-initiated and other repair (SIOR) appears when the

producer of the trouble source initiates then the interlocutor completes it. The last is other-initiated other-repair (OIOR) happens where the interlocutor notices the problem and repairs it for the speaker.

Besides the types of repair strategies, Schegloff et al. (1977) proposed repair techniques. There are two techniques of repair initiation. First, self-initiation within the same turn use a variety of non-lexical speech perturbation such as cut-offs, sound stretches, 'uh'. The second, other-initiation use a group turn-constructive devices to initiate repair that is divided into several parts such as *huh, what?*, use question words *who, where, when*, partial repeat of the trouble-source turn, plus a question word, partial repeat of the trouble-source turn, and the last is *Y' mean* plus a possible understanding of prior turn. Different with Schegloff et al. (1977), Finegan (2008) developed four techniques of repair initiation such as ask question toward the problem, repeat part of the utterance to be repaired, use particle and expression like 'uh,' 'I mean,' or 'that is,' and abruptly stop speaking.

Generally, repair is used when the participants need to adjust something in the interlocutor's statement to maintain the conversation. Therefore, when the trouble appears in a conversation, it can

disrupt the flow of conversation and interlocutors need to keep the conversation (Tiara, 2018). The ability to maintain the conversation can be done in different fields, for example, in spoken interaction, such as in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom.

Repair strategies in EFL classroom interaction become one of the fascinating objects to be analyzed because EFL students have limited competence of English. The students' limited competence will lead to such a miscommunication between the students and their teachers, and the students themselves (Cho, 2008). Hence, English users struggle to transmit a message to their interlocutors, and sometimes they fail to do so (Rababah, 2013). Therefore, they try to solve a communication breakdown involving speaking, hearing, and understanding to get a proper understanding.

Regarding repair analysis, there are some studies of repair strategies that have been conducted in various contexts. For example in text-based communication (e.g., Schonfeldt & Golato, 2003; Zaferanieh, 2004; Meredith & Stokoe, 2014; Tiara, 2018), movie (e.g., Hidayah, 2015; Swastiastu, 2017), radio hosting (e.g., Wongkhat, 2012), talk shows (e.g., Rheisa, 2014; Rahayu, 2016), students

with autism (e.g., Ohtake, Yanagihara, Nakaya, Takahashi, Sato & Tanaka, 2005; Ohtake, Wehmeyer, Nakaya, Takahashi, Yanagihara, 2011), and classroom (e.g., Cho & Larke, 2010; Fotovatnia & Dori, 2013; Rabab'ah, 2013; Wisrance, 2017).

In addition to the studies above, the study of repair in EFL students has been investigated. Khodadady & Alifathabadi (2014) analyze repair in Iranian intermediate and advanced learners while they are interacting with their teachers. Chalak & Karimi (2017) examine turn-taking and repair strategies in Intermediate EFL learners. Meanwhile, Aleksius & Saukah (2018) investigate repair strategies that focus on the use of other-initiated (OIR) in solving the understanding problem in EFL learners' conversation and how the types of trouble sources that prompt the use of OIR.

The previous studies above show that the study of repair is still important to handle communication, to overcome communication breakdowns, and to pass comprehensible messages to the interlocutors (Rabab'ah, 2013). Even though most of the repair studies have been conducted, repair strategies in EFL students have rarely been discussed mainly at the beginner level. It is because most of the previous studies analyzed repair in intermediate and advanced

levels. Therefore, the present study is conducted to fill the gap.

Different from previous studies, this study examines types of repair strategies in EFL students at Elementary School. They are chosen as the participants because of their level of English competence as a beginner. Besides, the Elementary students at beginner level or as English young learners are still in the process of learning many things at the same time (Clark & Clark, 1977). Vygotsky (as cited in Cameron, 2001) also states that children learn to think through interaction with adults in their social context. Additionally, this study also identifies the techniques of repair initiation. To analyze repair, this study used types of repair strategies theory proposed by Schegloff et al. (1977) and repair techniques by Finegan (2008). Thus, this study aims to see how Indonesian beginner EFL students solve miscommunication problems involving speaking, hearing, and understanding in their class, and also how they initiate the repairs.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study was qualitative because the data were conversational interaction in the classroom. Qualitative research is a kind of social science research that deals with

non-numerical data. It focuses on the micro-level of social interaction that composes everyday life (Crossman, 2018). Whereas, Wray and Bloomer (2006) state that qualitative research involves more descriptions and analysis than computation. Therefore, qualitative research is suitable for this study because the study aimed to analyze the use of repair strategies and techniques of repair initiation by collecting, transcribing, and analyzing the data.

The participants of the study were Elementary EFL students at one private Elementary School in the Northern part of Bandung. They were chosen as the data because this school uses EFL curriculum to teach its students. Besides, the students' level of English competence was at the beginner. In this study, the bilingual class consisted of 10 males and 15 females with the same level ranging from 10-11 years of age were selected.

Since the study is a conversation analysis in the classroom, the data were taken by placing a camera in the corner of the class to record the interactions between students and the teacher while they were learning English subjects. Before the observation, the English teacher had to sign the consent form as permission to record the activity in the class. The bilingual class with one session

for about 40 minutes was chosen. Besides, the researcher had a role as the observer to increase validity in the analysis.

The analysis investigated into several steps. After the video was recorded, the researcher transcribed the conversation. Transcribing is a part of analysis in the Conversation Analysis (CA) study (Paltridge, 2006). It aimed to ease the analysis. The researcher used Jefferson's Transcription Notation (2004) (as cited in Rahayu, 2016) that was presented in table 1. Then the collection data analyzed by using the types of repair strategies framework proposed by Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) to find out the occurrence of repair strategies employed by Elementary EFL students.

According to Schegloff et al. (1977), types of repair strategies are divided into four types which are self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, other-initiated self-repair, and other-initiated other-repair. After identifying the types, then calculating the occurrence of repair strategies into a percentage. The next one was analyzing the repair techniques proposed by Finegan (2008) to see the techniques of repair initiation. The techniques of repair

classify into four techniques, namely asking question, repeat the part of the utterance to be repaired, use particle and expression like 'I mean' or 'uhh,' and abruptly stop speaking. From these techniques, the use of techniques of repair initiation by the participants in the conversation could be investigate.

Furthermore, in analyzing the repair strategies, there are two essentials terms of repair that need to be understood, namely repaired segment and repairing segment (Schegloff et al., 1977). According to them (as cited in Liddicoat, 2007), the bold clause is as a repaired segment. It is as the trouble source or repairable, and the thing in talk which needs to be repaired. Meanwhile, the repairing segment is the segment of utterance that repairs the trouble source. It also must follows the initiation (\rightarrow) given by another participant. The repairing segment can be do in several ways for example by asking question, repeating the misheard or misunderstood, or using particle and expression. After analyzing the data through the steps above, the last step was that the results were interpreted and conclusions were drawn.

Table 1.
Jefferson's Transcription Notation

Symbol	Description	
(.)	Period in Parentheses	A pause or gap that is discernible but less than a tenth of a second
_____	Underscoring	Stress
.	Period	Closing, usually falling intonation
,	Comma	Continuing, slightly upward intonation
?	Question Mark	Rising intonation
::	Colons	Elongation or stretch of the prior sound – the more colons, the longer the stretch
-	Hyphen/dash	A sharp cut-off of the just-prior word or sound
(())	Word(s) in double parentheses	Transcriber comments or description of a sound
↓↑	Arrows	Shifts into especially high or low pitch
=	Equal	Latched utterances – no break or of gap between stretches talk

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The study aims to examine types of repair strategies and techniques of repair initiation used by Indonesian Elementary EFL students at the beginner level. The analysis analyzed through the framework of types of repair strategies developed by Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) and techniques of repair initiation by Finegan (2008). The findings of this study revealed that there are 62 occurrences of repair strategies used by EFL students that are shown and discussed below.

The Types of Repair Strategies

The analysis of types of repair strategies used the theory proposed by Schegloff et al. (1977). The results showed that the participants used all types of repair strategies during the conversation, which are self-initiated self-repair (SISR), self-initiated other-repair (SIOR), other-initiated self-repair (OISR), and other-initiated other-repair (OIOR). The results of the types of repair strategies are shown in the following table (table 2).

Table 2.
The Types of Repair Strategies

No	Types of Repair Strategies	Frequency	Percentage
1	Self-initiated self-repair (SISR)	15	24.2%
2	Self-initiated other-repair (SIOR)	8	12.9%
3	Other-initiated self-repair (OISR)	23	37.1%
4	Other-initiated other-repair (OIOR)	16	25.8%
Total		62	100%

In table 2, it shows that the participants used all types of repair strategies. The most dominant type is other-initiated self-repair, which obtained 23 occurrences (37.1%). It is followed by the occurrence of other-initiated other-repair that appeared 16 times (25.8%). It is slightly different from self-initiated self-repair that occurred 15 repairs (24.2%). The least is self-initiated other-repair with 8 occurrences of repair (12.9%) out of 62. The explanation of each type of repair strategies employed by Elementary EFL students is discussed as follows.

Other-Initiated Self-Repair (OISR)

According to Schegloff et al. (1977), other-initiated self-repair (OISR) occurs when the interlocutor identifies the trouble source, and the speaker repairs it for the interlocutor. It occurs when the interlocutor initiates to ask the speaker for explanations or clarification for what the speaker has said to get a proper understanding. In the analysis, there are

23 occurrences (37.1%) for this type. The example is exemplified in excerpt 2 below.

Excerpt 1

Student 1: I go to the school with motorcycle.

Teacher : Huh?

Student 2: → *Bukannya* went?

(Isn't it "went"?)

Teacher : → Why, why, why?

Student 2: *Karena sudah:: (2.0) sudah terjadi.*

(Because it's already:: (2.0) already happened.)

In this excerpt, the students here were discussing the past tense. One of the students (student 1) tried to answer the question, but the teacher and another student (student 2) identified there was a problem in the student's 1 utterance. In the conversation, when the participants are more than two, it is possible for the trouble source is initiated by more than one recipient (Tiara, 2018). Then, the teacher used the particle of "huh?" when he noticed the trouble source. Also, the student 2 initiated asking student 1 a question by saying, "bukannya went?"

(isn't it went?). The teacher also immediately asked the students the reason why the answer was "went" instead of "go." The symbol (→) was the initiation for the problem. In the next turn, student 2 repaired the trouble source by answering the teacher's question and switching into Indonesian "karena sudah (2.0) sudah terjadi" (because it's already (2.0) already happened).

From the excerpt above, the teacher or the recipient acted as the initiator; it is someone who initiates the trouble source, while the student 2 or the speaker was the one who repaired the utterance. So, the teacher got more explanation from the student who answered the question to get a better understanding toward the problem. In this case, when the recipient identifies the trouble source in the speaker utterance and initiate to get a clarification or explanation toward the trouble source to the speaker, and the speaker repairs it for the interlocutor, it is called as other-initiated self-repair (OISR) according to Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977). It means that the teacher identified the trouble source, and the student did the repair (Chalak & Karimi, 2017). Besides, the students in the conversation answered the question by using Indonesian because he was afraid

that the answer would be incorrect if he answered it using English.

Other-Initiated Other-Repair (OIOR)

There are 16 occurrences of other-initiated other-repair (OIOR). OIOR is how the trouble source is identified and repaired by the interlocutor or recipient. According to Schegloff et al. (1977), other-initiated other-repair occurs when the recipient completes the repair. In the analysis, this type appeared 16 times (20.8%). This is an example of how this type occurred in the conversation.

Excerpt 2

Student : I fell (2.0) bicycle.

Teacher : → **I fell off a bicycle.**

In this excerpt, the participants were discussing the past tense. The teacher asked the students to give an example of a sentence in past tense form. In the next turn, one of the students gave an example. The trouble source appeared when the student uttered the example by saying, "I fell (2.0) bicycle." The teacher here indicated there was a trouble source in the previous turn in terms of grammar. However, the student unaware the mistake in his utterance. Then, the teacher simultaneously initiated and repaired it into the correct one for the student by saying, "I fell off a bicycle."

The conversation among the teacher and the student above showed that the teacher initiated and repaired the student's utterance into the correct one. As Schegloff et al. (1977), when the interlocutor initiates and completes the trouble source, it is categorized as other-initiated other-repair. Tiara (2018) in her study states that OIOR occurs when the initiation and completion are done simultaneously. Sometimes, the initiation from the interlocutor is disguised as a solution of the trouble source. Also, this strategy is used to correct the problem that is produced by the current speaker as well as give the correct answer.

Self-Initiated Self-Repair (SISR)

Self-initiated self-repair (SISR) is slightly different from the occurrence of OIOR. In the analysis, SISR obtained 15 repairs (24.2%). This type is similar to OIOR. However, SISR appears when the speakers indicate their own mistake in their utterance while conveying the message to the interlocutor. The aims of this strategy can be for adding information from the previous statements or restating the utterance or information to the recipient. The following excerpt is an example of SISR.

Excerpt 3

Teacher : Ok. So (2.0) Ssstt! Helo? (3.0). Today, we are going to discuss what we have studied yesterday, eh:: last week, and before, and before, and before (2.0).

Ok, now, uhh, how did you go to school today? Huh? By? By motorcycle? So, how do you say "*saya pergi ke sekolah dengan motor tadi pagi?*" ("I went to school with motorcycle last morning")

Student : I'm go:: (1.0) I'm (3.0)

Student : → **I go to school (2.0) I go to the school with motorcycle.**

In excerpt 3, the teacher asked the students what they already studied in the last meeting. They were discussing the material first before the class was started. The teacher asked the students to translate the sentence into English, "how do you say '*saya pergi ke sekolah dengan motor tadi pagi?*'" When the student tried to answer the question in the next turn, he was repeating the word "I'm go (1.0) I'm (3.0)", and cuts-off for three seconds. But after he got the answer, he immediately repaired his utterance to make the message was conveyed well to the interlocutor by saying "I go to school (2.0) I go to the school with motorcycle". In the student's statement, he realized that there was a trouble source in terms of his grammar that needed to be corrected. Therefore, he initiated to repair his utterance by repeating his statement.

In accordance with Schegloff et al. (1977) theory, the excerpt showed how self-initiated self-repair (SISR) used by the student in the conversation. According to them, SISR takes the form of initiation with a non-lexical initiator, followed by the repairing segment. To repair the errors in the conversation, language users repeat words to achieve communication goals. Besides, SISR appears when the interlocutor is responsible for the trouble source both initiates and completes the repair. Also, Rahayu (2016) states that SISR occurs when the speaker is aware toward the problem in his/her utterance and directly resolves it in his/her turn of speaking by cuts-off, repeats, and replaces the incorrect word or statement.

Self-Initiated Other-Repair (SIOR)

Self-initiated other-repair (SIOR) is the least type of repair strategy used by EFL students. This type refers to the situation when the initiation of repair is given by the recipient, while the speaker does the repair completion (Schegloff et al., 1977). This strategy emerged 24 occurrences (31.2%). The following excerpt is the sample of SIOR.

Excerpt 4

Student : → ‘Was’ *itu kalau dibalik jadi ‘saw’?*

(Does ‘was’ in reverse become ‘saw’?)

Teacher : Huh:: *Beda lagi*, it’s different.

(Huh:: it’s different, it’s different)

Student : → ‘Was’ *itu untuk apa?*

(‘Was’ is for what?)

Teacher : **For ‘is’**

In excerpt 4, the participants were discussing the past tense form. The student in the conversation initiated asking the teacher if the word ‘was’ was exchanged, would it become “saw.” The teacher answered the question by saying, “it’s different.” After the student got the answer, he thought that he needed more explanation for the previous turn. Therefore, the student initiated to ask another question to get a repair by saying, “‘was’ *itu untuk apa?*” (‘was’ is for what?). Then, the teacher repaired the trouble source by answering “for ‘is.’”

The following excerpt showed the speaker acted as the trouble maker, and he would be the one who initiated the repair. However, the person who completed the repair was the interlocutor. It is called as self-initiated other-repair (SIOR) (Schegloff et al., 1977). SIOR strategy also occurs when the speaker wants to confirm the recipient’s answer to the speaker’s question by asking another question (Tiara, 2018). She also states that this strategy aims to confirm something that the speaker has known but unsure. Besides, Rahayu (2016) explains the speaker indicates the error, but he/she

cannot resolve the error by themselves, so the interlocutor repairs the error.

The Techniques of Repair Initiation

Besides the types of repair strategies, this study also investigated techniques of repair initiation. The theory based on the

framework proposed by Finegan (2008). In the analysis, there are only three techniques used. However, another technique was found, which is giving a possible understanding toward the trouble source. The following table shows the result.

Table 3.

The Techniques of Repair Initiation

No.	Techniques of Repair Initiation	Frequency	Percentage
1	Asking question toward the problem	31	50.0 %
2	Repeat part of the utterance to be repaired	13	21.0 %
3	Use particle and expression ‘uhh’	2	3.2 %
4	Abruptly stop speaking	-	-
5	Other (giving possible understanding toward the trouble source)	16	25.8 %
Total		62	100%

From the table above, the most-frequently technique is asking question toward the problem in which 31 occurrences (50.0%). The second is giving possible understanding toward the trouble source which occurred 16 occurrences (25.8%). It is followed by repeat part of the utterance to be repaired which obtained 13 occurrences (21.0%), and the last is use particle an expression ‘I mean’ ‘uhh’ for about twice (3.2%). The explanation for each technique is discussed below.

Asking Question

Asking question toward the problem is the most dominant one in the conversation among students and teacher. It reached 31

occurrences (50.0%) out of 62. It means that this technique used almost in the half of the discussion. This technique appears either the speakers or the recipients ask a question to the interlocutor for repairing the trouble source. The question is started when the speaker initiates asking for the repair to get a further explanation or clarification toward the problem. In the analysis, asking question technique appeared in both OISR and SIOR strategy. The explanations are shown below.

Asking question in OISR

In the conversation, asking question occurred in other-initiated self-repair. The participants used this technique in order to

get a clarification for the trouble source. Therefore, when the recipient initiates the repair to the speaker by giving a question, the speaker will correct the trouble source. The following excerpt is the example of asking question toward the problem in other-initiated self-repair.

Excerpt 5

Teacher : Yes. 'Saw,' do you find it, 'saw'? Yes, diagonal.

Student : It's easy!

Teacher : → Huh? Is it easy?

Student : **Yes!**

In excerpt 5, the students were doing an exercise in the form of a puzzle. One of the students thought that the task that was given by the teacher was too easy, then he said: "it's easy!". Hearing to the student's statement, the teacher initiated asking a question to the student by saying, "Huh? It's easy?" In the next turn, the student repaired for clarification on her statement to the teacher by answering, "Yes!". Finegan (2008) claims the technique of repair initiation above is asking question toward the problem. This technique begins with an interrogative word. Besides, when the participants find the trouble source in the conversation, they will actively offer a question to get more explanations or clarifications for proper understanding (Tiara, 2018).

Asking question in SIOR

Asking question toward the problem did not only occur in other-initiated self-repair, but it also appeared in self-initiated other-repair. In SIOR, the speaker used this technique to get an explanation and clarification toward the trouble source to the recipient. Excerpt 6 shows the example of SIOR in the conversation.

Excerpt 6

Student : *Kenapa:: kenapa banyak yang bilang 'I had'?*

(Why:: Why do many people say 'I had'?)

→ 'I had' itu 'aku benci'?

(Does 'I had' mean 'I hate'?)

Teacher : *Itu 'hate'. Nah:: ini 'I had.'*

(It's 'hate'. Nah:: this is 'I had')

In excerpt 6, the student was wondering why other students said 'had'. Then, he initiated to ask the teacher for clarification what 'had' was by saying 'I had' itu 'aku benci'? (Does 'I had' mean 'I hate'?). The teacher, as the recipient, clarified that the word 'had' did not mean 'hate' by saying "Itu 'hate.' Nah:: ini 'I had.'" (It's 'hate.' Nah:: this is 'I had)').

As can be seen in excerpt 6, according to Finegan (2008) the student used asking question toward the problem technique because he wanted to get a repair by asking the teacher a question toward the trouble source. The technique was used to avoid misunderstanding

between the teacher and the student. Thus, the message could be understandable by each other. Besides, the teacher asked questions to the students because he wanted to raise the students' ability in terms of their English knowledge and speaking fluency. However, when the students tried to answer teacher's question, they sometimes switched English into Indonesian or even combining both language.

Giving Possible Understanding toward the Trouble Source

Another technique was found in the conversation, which is giving possible understanding toward the trouble source. This technique is a combination of 'Y mean plus a possible understanding of prior turn' technique proposed by Schegloff et al. (1977) in their theory of techniques of repair initiation. Based on the analysis, the occurrences of this technique occurred 16 (25.8%). The excerpt 7 shows the example.

Excerpt 7

Teacher : Nahh:: saw (2.0). Saw is not just see,
 tapi uhh (2.0) meet.
 Do you know meet?
Student1: *Engga*.
 (No)
Student2: *Daging?*
 (Meat?)

Teacher : → *Bertemu*, meet (write the word on the board).

In excerpt 7, the teacher and the student were talking about the vocabulary. The teacher said and asked what the translation of 'meet' in Indonesian. The student's 1 answer was he did not know what 'meet' was, but another student (student 2) said that the translation of 'meet' means that it was '*daging*' (meat). However, the student's 2 statement caused the trouble source in which the answer was incorrect. In the next turn, the teacher immediately initiated and repaired the student's utterance by himself into the correct one by saying, "*bertemu*, meet."

In the conversation, the participants used other-initiated other-repair strategy. And the technique of repair initiation that was employed is giving possible understanding toward the trouble source because the teacher gave his understanding of the mistake to repair student's statement. So, when the interlocutor provides his/her understanding toward the speaker's utterance, it is called as giving possible understanding toward the trouble source (Schegloff et al., 1977).

Repeat Part of the Utterance to be repaired

Repeating part of the utterance appeared 13 occurrences (21.0%) in the conversation. The participants used this technique of repair initiation. It is because they recognized their own mistakes and tried to repair it by repeating their utterance to get the correct answer, as can be seen in excerpt 8 below.

Excerpt 8

Teacher : Between, what is between?

Student : → *Di antara (1.0) Di tengah-tengah!*
(→ *Between (1.0) in the middle!*)

In the example of the repeat part of the utterance above, the participants were talking about the preposition. When the teacher asked the students the Indonesian translation for the word “between” by asking “between, what is between?”. The student tried to answer the question, but she recognized the trouble source in her utterance. Therefore, she had a role as the one who initiated and repaired her statement by herself by repeating “*Di antara (1.0) di tengah-tengah!*” because she wanted the interlocutor to understand her intended.

In excerpt 8, the student used self-initiated self-repair strategy. She acted as the initiator and the person who repaired her utterance by herself. According to Finegan (2008), repeat part of the

utterance to be repaired technique is when repair initiation that appears in the same turn as the speaker talks. Moreover, the repetition occurs when the participants recognize their trouble source in the conversation and repairs it for the other participants (Tiara, 2018). Also, Rieger (2003) states that repetition is the type of self-repair in which the repairable and repairing segments happen in the same turn, and the repair is performed by the initiator of the repairable.

Use particle and expression ‘uhh’

The particle and expression of ‘*uhh*’ appeared only twice (3.2%). It occurs when in the middle of conveying the message to the interlocutor, there is a pause for less than a tenth of a second in the speaker’s utterance. The following excerpt explains the example of use particle and expression ‘*uhh*.’

Excerpt 9

Teacher : Which one is odd one?

Student : Kick.

Teacher : → Kick, why?

Student : *Karena dia nendang (1.0) yang lain mah – uhh – (3.0) bagian tubuh, anatomi.*
(Because he kicks (1.0) and the other – *uhh* – (3.0) is a part of body, anatomy)

In excerpt 9, the participants were discussing the vocabulary. When the teacher said, “which one is odd one?” the student answered, “kick.” Then the

teacher initiated to ask why the reason was 'kick.' The trouble source appeared when the student responded to the question using Indonesian by saying, "*Karena dia nendang (1.0) yang lain mah – uhh – (3.0).*" However, when the student tried to deliver the message, the expression of "uhh" appeared in the middle of his utterance. After that, there was a pause for about three seconds after the expression. Then, he continued and completed his statement by saying, "...– *uhh – (3.0) bagian tubuh, anatomi*".

According to Finegan (2008), this act is called a use particle and expression 'uhh' when there is a pause in the middle of the speaker's utterance. The participant used this expression because she wanted to give the best answer by explaining her statement carefully. Also, to make sure that the answer was correct, so the recipient could understand the message that she tried to convey.

Furthermore, the result of the present study is in line with the previous study in which Chalak & Karimi (2017) claim that OISR is the most preferred repair strategy at an intermediate level. It means that the teacher identified the trouble sources, and the students did the repair. Even though in terms of students' level of English competence, they were different, the present and the previous

study revealed the same result in which OISR is the most dominant one. However, other-initiated is not a desirable strategy, so EFL teachers should consider it (Chalak & Karimi, 2017). According to Schegloff et al. (1977), self-initiated self-repair is the best strategy because the trouble makers can correct the trouble source by themselves.

Furthermore, Khodadady & Alifathabadi (2014) also say that students at the intermediate level used other-repair more instead of advanced learners. The intermediate learners got difficulties in conveying the meaning on their first turn. Therefore, the role of the teacher was to initiate the repair to the students

However, the present study contradicts with the results from other previous studies in which they examined repair strategies at the advanced learners (e.g., Khodadady & Alifathabadi 2014; Canonio et al., 2017; Utami, 2018). They explain that the students at a high level prefer to use self-initiated self-repair (SISR). The students tend to use this strategy because they initiate and repair the trouble source by themselves. It is also because they have a high ability to learn English instead of the students with beginner and intermediate level. It means that they are knowledgeable and have a good grasp as regards content (Nonato &

Manuel, 2017). Besides, the topic or the teacher may affect the use of repair strategies (Utami, 2018).

CONCLUSIONS

Other-initiated self-repair (OISR) is the most frequently used repair strategy among the students at the beginner level. The occurrence of OISR appeared 23 repairs (37.1%) out of 62. This shows that the recipient identifies the trouble source more from the speaker's statement during the conversation. Then, the speaker repairs his/her utterances for the speaker in the next turn. Therefore, the conversation can be understandable with each other. In the conversation among the students and their teacher, this OISR appeared because the students produced the trouble source more which affected to the teacher to initiate asking for the repair. The trouble source was affected by the students' level of English competence that was still at the beginner.

The finding also revealed that asking question toward the problem gained 31 occurrences (50.0%). The teacher mostly initiated asking for clarification or further explanation to the students' statement. It is because the teacher wanted to raise the students' ability in terms of their knowledge of English and speaking fluency by asking

questions and letting the students corrected the repaired segment or trouble source by themselves. However, when the students tried to repair the repaired segments, they were sometimes confused. Their confusion caused repeating some part of the utterances, or cut-off for more than a second during conveying the message because the lack of knowledge that they had. Although, the present study showed that Elementary EFL students still could answer the question by switching from English into Indonesian or combining both languages. It depended on their knowledge of English toward the topic in the discussion.

Hence, the students and their teacher used other-initiated self-repair (OISR) in the conversation. However, this strategy is not a desirable error correction. Therefore, the teacher should consider that the students should have a chance to repair their trouble source or problem by themselves. This chance is designed for the students to improve their ability.

For the further research, the researchers may analyze Elementary EFL students in language in society perspective. It is because in the present study found that the students switched English into Indonesian, and sometimes combined both languages.

REFERENCES

- Aleksius & Saukah. (2018). Other-initiated repair strategies in solving understanding problems in EFL learners conversation. *Journal of Education and Learning (Edu Learn)*, 12(1), 105-117. doi: 10.11591/edulearn.v12i1.7530
- Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching languages to young learners*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Canonio, J., Nonato, R., & Manuel, J. B. (2017). Repair strategies on spoken discourse. *Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 7(11), 662-671. Retrieved from <http://www.ijsrp.org/research-paper-1117.php?rp=P716985>
- Chalak & Karimi. (2017). Analysis of turn taking and repair strategies among male and female Iranian intermediate EFL learners. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 4(2), 1-9. Retrieved from <http://jallr.com/index.php/JALLR/article/view/508>
- Cho & Larke. (2010) Repair strategies usage of primary elementary ESL students: Implication for ESL teachers. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, 14(3), 1-18. Retrieved from <http://www.tesl-ej.org/pdf/ej55/a4.pdf>
- Clark & Clark (1977). *Psychology and language: An introduction to psycholinguistics*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovic.
- Clark & Schaefer. (1989). Contributing to discourse. *Cognitive Science*, 13(2), 259-294. doi: 10.1207/s15516709cog1302_7
- Crossman, A. (2018). *An overview of qualitative research methods*. Retrieved from <https://www.thoughtco.com/qualitative-research-methods-3026555>
- Finegan, E. (2008). *Language: Its structure and use* (5th ed.). USA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Fotovatnia & Dorri. (2013). Repair strategies in EFL Classroom Talk. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(6), 950-956. doi: 10.4304/tpls.3.6.950-956
- Hidayah, N. (2015). *An analysis repair on utterances in the conversation of The Magic of Belle Isle movie manuscript*. Published Paper. Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta. Retrieved from <http://eprints.umc.ac.id/36514>
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Learner (Ed), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13-31). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Khodadady & Alifathabadi. (2014). Repair in EFL talk: A case of Iranian intermediate and advanced EFL learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(10), 2129-2137. doi:10.4304/tpls.4.10.2129-2137
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2007). *An introduction to conversation analysis*. London: Athenaeum Press Ltd.
- Mazeland, H. (2006). Conversation analysis. *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, 3, 153-

163. doi: 10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00314-X
- Meredith, J. & Stokoe, E. (2014). Repair: Comparing facebook ‘chat’ with spoken interaction. *Discourse & Communication*, 8(2), 181-207. doi: 10.1177/1750481313510815
- Ohtake, Y., Yanagihara, M., Nakaya, A., Takahashi, S., Sato, E., & Tanaka, M. (2005). Repair strategies used by elementary-age beginning communicators with autism: A preliminary descriptive study. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities*, 20(3), 158-168. doi: 10.1177/10883576050200030401
- Ohtake, Y., Wehmeyer, L. M., Nakaya, A., Takahashi, S., & Yanagihara, M. (2011). Repair strategies used by verbal students with autism during free play. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities*, 26(1), 3-14. doi: 10.1177/1088357610396079
- Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse analysis: An introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Rabab’ah, G. (2013). Strategies of repair in EFL learner’s oral discourse. *English Language Teaching*, 6(6), 123-131. doi: 10.5539/elt.v6n6p123
- Rahayu, G. (2016). *Repair strategies in television talk show: A conversation analysis*. Undergraduate Thesis. Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.
- Rieger, C., L. (2000). *Self-repair strategies of English-German bilinguals in informal conversations: The role of language, gender and proficiency*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Alberta.
- Rheisa, N. S. (2014). *A conversation analysis of repair in The Oprah Winfrey Show: A special episode with Michael Jackson*. Undergraduate Thesis. Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8(4), 289-327.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preferences for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53(2), 361-382. doi: 10.2307/413107
- Schegloff, E. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Schonfeldt, J & Golato, A. (2003). Repair in chats: A conversation analytic approach. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 36(3), 241-284. doi: 10.1207/S15327973RLSI3603_02
- Swastiastu, A., N. (2017). A conversation analysis of repair performed by the characters in Easy A movie. *Journal of Student UNY*, 6(5), 552-557
- Tiara, A. (2018). *Repair strategies in online chat: A conversation analysis*. Undergraduate Thesis. Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.
- Utami, I. A. (2018). *Conversational repair organization in an Indonesian EFL classroom and its implications to the classroom dynamics*. A Thesis. Universitas Diponegoro Semarang.
- Wongkhat, P. (2012). Repair in Thai conversation: A case study of the 94.0 EFM Radio Hosts. *Journal of*

Language and Culture, 31(2), 68-92. Retrieved from <https://www.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/JLC/article/view/20287>

Wray, A. & Bloomer, A. (2006). *Projects in Linguistics A Practical Guide to Researching Language* (2nd edition). Retrieved from <http://qisar.fssr.uns.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/Qisar-Alison-Wray-Aileen-Bloomer-Projects-in-linguistics-A-practical-guide-to-researching-language.pdf>

Zaferanieh, E. (2004). *Conversation analysis of online chat*. Undergraduate Thesis. Islamic Azad University.