

OTHER-INITIATED SELF-REPAIRS IN STUDENT-STUDENT INTERACTION: THE FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE AND MECHANISM

Denanda Pratiwi Putri¹, Ahmad Munir², & Oikurema Purwati³

Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia

¹*denanda.17070835029@mhs.unesa.ac.id*, ²*ahmadmunir@unesa.ac.id*, &

³*oikuremapurwati@unesa.ac.id*

Abstract: The current study is intended to explore the typology of other-initiated self-repair in term of its frequency of occurrence and to investigate the mechanism of self-repair in an academic setting. To obtain the required data, a classroom conversational analysis was conducted in which the researchers observed a group of graduate students (19 active EFL speakers) in a state university in East Java, Indonesia. Based on the qualitative data analysis, the results of the study revealed that all typologies of other-initiated self-repair were used depending on the aims the interlocutors try to gain since all typologies have diverse aims and ways. Of all typologies, confirming checks were dominantly used by the participants. Regarding the mechanisms, three types of mechanisms were found; full two-cycle repair, background check, and short-cut repair sequence.

Keywords: other-initiated self-repair, trouble sources, student-student interaction, speech production

INTRODUCTION

Troubles in speech production naturally appear in spontaneous speeches and conversation in student-student interaction. The use of English as second or foreign language may trigger the natural troubles in speeches as a part of learning process. When the troubles are detected, acts to repair may occur. The act of repairing can be initiated by the speakers or the interlocutors. The act of repairing which is initiated by the speaker is called self-initiated

Putry, D.P., Munir, A. & Purwati, O. (2019). Other-Initiated Self-Repairs in Student-Student Interaction: The Frequency of Occurrence and Mechanism.

self-repair (e.g., Wisrance, 2017; Trisanti, 2017; Sato & Takatsuka, 2016) while the act of repairing initiated by the interlocutor is called other-initiated self-repair (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977).

To the both topics, other-initiated self-repair is infrequent to discuss since the phenomena of self-initiated self-repair is more frequent to occur in daily communication. The self-initiated self-repairs in EFL teaching are frequently revealed to know whether or not self-initiated self-repairs arise in the classroom discourse (e.g., Wisrance, 2017; Trisanti, 2017; Sato and Takatsuka, 2016). The study regularly involves learners from higher education. Lyster & Ranta (1997) stated that the occurrence and the success of repairing possibly will only happen when learners have acquired an adequate level of English proficiency.

The studies of other-initiated self-repairs are existent eventhough these are not as burst as the study of self-initiated self-repairs. In 2008, Svennevig employed a study to investigate whether or not there is a frequent preference in the choice of repair initiation techniques. Svennevig (2008) claimed a preference to address troubles in conversation as a hearing trouble is used mostly rather than to address them as troubles of understanding or acceptability. In requesting for hearing repair, mostly the interlocutor shows explicit request by saying "what did you say?" (Svennevig, 2008). Furthermore, a library-research of other-initiated self-repair was done by Dingemane and Enfield (2014). In their research, they provided an overview of research methods and conceptual framework of other-initiated self-repairs study. Based on the review, they recommended the qualitative analysis of individual cases and their environment in linguistics systems can be collaborated with a quantitative and comparative perspective to struggle on the organisational details of a possibly universal system for other-initiated repair.

However, the investigation of other-initiated self-repairs in depth and in details focusing mainly on frequency of the occurrence and the mechanisms of repairs has not been done. Thus, in addressing other-initiated self-repairs of graduate students' of EFL, the present

research is intended to depict the frequency of occurrence and the mechanism of other-initiated self-repair in an Indonesian academic setting.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Speech Production in Student-Student Interaction

In the classroom contexts, speech production possibly will occur during student-student interaction. Interaction among students occurs when students interact to other students. Student-student interaction arises during answering and asking questions, making comments, and conducting open discussions (Robinson, 1997). To add, discussion may offer any condition which highlights on sharing activities of the students.

In particular, EFL university student in Indonesia put into practise a lot to speak English fluently by doing many kinds of activities such as individual or group presentation, asking and questioning activity, and open discussion. Open discussion in cooperative group, for instance, can craft clarification of ideas and perspectives in a context free of teachers' initiation in the classroom (Gillies, 2006). During classroom discussion, students with confidence become more independent to interact with the other students. Students will not rely on the teachers who consistently initiate to build any communicative interaction (Nunan, 1992). By having discussion in the classroom, it is potential to build up student-student interaction. They are projected to be more active and initiative in the classroom by interacting with others: commenting, asking, answering, and sharing their best knowledge to other. In these activities, students may utter sentences with intension and other may notice mistakes of others' utterances.

Trouble Sources in Student-Student Interaction

In student-student interaction, trouble may occur and it potentially interrupts the flows of interaction in the classroom. In terms of troubles faced by the interlocutor, troubles of hearing,

Putry, D.P., Munir, A. & Purwati, O. (2019). Other-Initiated Self-Repairs in Student-Student Interaction: The Frequency of Occurrence and Mechanism.

understanding, and acceptability, a study has been conducted by Svennevig (2008). The findings showed that in repairing troubles of hearing and understanding there was a strong tendency towards providing nominee solutions to the trouble (checking hearing and understanding) over merely representing the presence of a trouble or specifying the nature of it. Referring to the universal frequency of those trouble sources and the ways to repair the troubles, speakers are subjective towards expressing solutions offered to troubles of hearing and understanding and towards merely demonstrating the nature of the trouble regarding the troubles of acceptability (Svennevig, 2008).

Repairing Strategy: Self-Repair

Self-repairs are formed in response to a linguistic problem in speech, such as the use of inappropriate lexis, pronunciation, or syntax (Pillai, 2006). Self-repairs arise when speakers discover and modify errors in the speech production (e.g., Levelt, 1989, 1999). Self-repair has two unlike types which are self-initiated and other-initiated self-repairs (Schegloff et al., 1977). Self-initiated self-repair is employed when speakers grasp that they need to repair their utterances without encouragement from another participant, for example, *'They are going to New -um, Zealand'*. Differently, other-initiated self-repairs arise where other participant prompt a communicative need and signs a particular utterance for the need in communication, such as asking about part(s) of the preceding utterance.

The Overlooked Self-Repair: Other-Initiated Self-Repair

Self-repair can be initiated by an interlocutor when an interlocutor detects any inappropriate or even does not catch what the speaker is saying. Schegloff et al. (1977) stated that self-repairs can be from other initiation -known as other-initiated self-repairs. In his study, Björkman (2014) reported that there are six typologies of other-initiated self-repairs: paraphrasing, repetition, overt questions, clarification request, co-creating the messages, and word replacement.

Fundamentally, paraphrasing is done to state the same contents expressed with different words (William et al., 1997: 312). Repetition is a frequent approach which is important to achieve as collaboration (Mauranen, 2010). Just as Rieger (2003) assumed that repetition is the most communal type of repairs of a particular segment. Overt question strategy is basically employed when the interlocutor raises questions about the preceding utterances due to unclear statements, and the interlocutor confirms to check (Jamshidnejad, 2011). Clarification request is used when interlocutors ask for additional or extra explanation or more details of what the speaker has uttered (Dornyei and Scott (1997). Co-creating the messages of anticipation introduced by Björkman (2014) occurs when speakers fill in gaps in each other's utterances in an effort to produce a comprehensive utterance (Kirkpatrick, 2007). Word Replacement in this content is as same as immediate lexical changes notion promoted by Schegloff et. al. (1977). Word Replacement depicts clearly language use or the content matter. This strategy relates to the changes of inappropriate words into the appropriate words to elude misleading mainly to the interlocutors' interpretation.

Other-Initiated Self-Repair Mechanisms

The mechanism of other-initiated self-repair portrays the patterns of self-repairs by speakers due to other's initiation. It habitually involves the use of interruption marker, such as *'sorry'*, *'excuse me'*, or the reuse of element of the preceding speech (Schegloff, 1977). The other-initiated self-repairs sequences are arranged by adjacency pairs, and that they are sequences per se (Schegloff, 2007). Hutcby and Wooffitt (1998) recommend three positions of repairing; representing trouble source, depicting next-turn repair insertion (NTRI), and representing the process of repairing. In more detailed, the mechanism of other-initiated self-repair is elaborated as follows (adopted from Svennevig, 2008).

Putry, D.P., Munir, A. & Purwati, O. (2019). Other-Initiated Self-Repairs in Student-Student Interaction: The Frequency of Occurrence and Mechanism.

Full two-cycle repair sequence:

Trouble source turn	B: Bankerjob is that good or no?
Hearing repair initiation (hearing check)	A: Bankerjob?
Hearing repair (confirmation)	B: Yeah
Understanding repair initiation	A: Yeah work at the bank, is that what you mean?
Understanding repair	B: Mh: banker in: it's at Oxford.

Background check:

Trouble source turn	B: After Cobie Smulders got famous
Hearing repair initiation	A: After Cobie?
Hearing repair	B: Cobie Smulders, are you with who that is?
Background check	A: Nope
Negative response	B: She's an actress
Background update	

Short-cut repair sequence:

Trouble source turn	B: The girl is sad.
Hearing repair initiation (hearing check)	A: sad?
Understanding repair	B: She's in her mourning

METHOD

This study is qualitative in nature; which for all objectives and purposes is emphasized on human beings in social circumstances (Robson, 2011). It uses the qualitative paradigm despite the fact that it espouses the methodological approach of Conversational Analysis (henceforth CA). Furthermore, this study scrutinized the organizational features of talk among students in the classroom interaction and the data was analysed using CA. The subjects of this research were a group of graduate students, 19 students, who learn English actively. They were involved because the researcher has personal interest to the group. The group is well-known as very active EFL-speakers in the classroom primarily at the moment when they have unlimited time to do questioning-and-answering troubles. This study was done in a class of graduate students of EFL in a state university in Surabaya.

In this study, observation was the main instrument used. The observation was done for 100 minutes in a linguistic class when there are three students presenting published scientific articles. The rest of students were listening to the presentation. Afterward, the group came to sections to discuss the papers; asking and answering activities. While doing the observation, the researchers recorded the students' interaction in the classroom by audio recording. It was then transcribed to complete the data taken during observations. To obtain the data, the researchers attended the classroom and note down all activities in the classroom particularly the occurrence and mechanism of other-initiated self-repair in student-student interaction. While observing, the researchers recorded all the utterances during the observation to notice all students' speech during the classroom activities through audio recording.

To answer the research questions, the data were analysed through several phases. The first procedure was to ascertain any kinds of phenomena occurred in the classroom interaction among the participants in this study. In this stage, the researchers re-read the notes they got from the observation to detect the occurrences of frequency and the mechanism of other-initiated self-repairs in the student-student interaction. Secondly, the researchers condensed the data that had been noted and transcribed. The researchers selected, eliminated, focused, simplified, and transformed the data that are linked with the phenomena of other-initiated self-repairs. The researchers then categorized the data based on the typologies of the repairs so that the researchers could exhibit the data clearly for the research question 1 and 2. The next step was to form regularities and patterns with respect to the occurrences of the phenomena and to display that these regularities were methodically produced and oriented to by the participants as normative organizations of action (Heritage, 1984). Finally, the data were displayed and reported in the form of sentences. The data were exhibited by using next-turn proof procedure since the data for those research questions involved conversational analysis.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The frequency of other-initiated self-repair occurrence in student-student interaction

To answer the first research question, the researchers scrutinized the data in depth to exhibit the empirical proofs of the use of repairing strategies in speech errors through observing and recording transcription. Table 1 and 2 are presented to show the researchers' findings related to the frequency of other-initiated repair strategies based on the typology and trouble sources used by graduate students mastering English as FL in the classroom.

Table 1 The frequency of other-initiated self-repair occurrence based on typology

Other-initiated self-repairs		Frequency of occurrence
Confirming checks	Paraphrasing	5 times
	Repetition	8 times
	Overt questions	7 times
Clarification requests		8 times
Co-creating of the message or anticipation		6 times
Word replacement		2 times

The table envisions the frequency of other-initiated self-repair occurrence based on typology. Based on the observation and the audio transcription, the researchers found that clarification request, an interlocutor ask for explanation or more details of what the speaker has told, is dominantly used as other-initiated self-repair. It is used 8 times in 100 minutes. Similar to the study of Björkman (2014), clarification request was used dominantly as strategy to initiate others to repair, popularly known as other-initiated self-repair. Repetition then becomes the second typology of other-initiated self-repairs that is mostly used by students in the classroom context. In this study, students in 100 minutes used repetition 8 times to initiate others to repair the trouble sources in speaking. Meanwhile, overt questions were used 7 times and paraphrasing was used 5 times during the class discussion. Yet, co-creation of the message or anticipation occurred 6 times and word replacement was used only 2 times in 100

minutes. Therefore, to list the typology based on the frequency of occurrence in the classroom setting, the researchers concluded that the sequence of the typology are clarification request, repetition, paraphrasing, co-creation of message of anticipation, and word replacement. The result of this study is certainly similar to Björkman’s seminar work written in 2014.

The findings on other-initiated self-repair occurrence based on trouble sources were presented in table 2. Based on the trouble sources, the frequency of occurrence of other initiated self-repair has no significant difference.

Table 2 The frequency of other-initiated self-repair occurrence based on trouble sources

Troubles	Format of troubles	Frequency
Trouble of hearing	Unspecific trouble indication	3 times
	Specific indication	4 times
	Candidate indication	2 times
Trouble of understanding	Unspecific trouble indication	3 times
	Specific indication	4 times
	Candidate indication	4 times
Trouble of acceptability	Unspecific trouble indication	3 times
	Specific indication	2 times
	Candidate indication	3 times

Table 2 shows that based on trouble sources, troubles of understanding were significantly used. In total, other-initiated self-repair used due to trouble of understanding occurs 11 times. Meanwhile, other-initiated self-repair used due to trouble of hearing occurs 9 times and other-initiated self-repair used due to trouble of acceptability occurs 8 times. The difference of the frequency of occurrence of other-initiated self-repair may be influenced by the setting and the moment when the research conducted the observation. As mentioned previously, the researchers administered the study when graduate students were doing presentation and having discussion on the published journals presented in the classroom. The discussion activity, such as asking and answering activities, may provide the tendency of having troubles of

understanding since in asking-answering activity what students mostly did were asking what they do not understand or things that were not clear so that they need extra information about certain issues. The result of this study reported similar result of Svennevig's (2008) study revealing that hearing trouble occurred more dominant rather than other troubles. Svennevig (2008) reported based on his finding that trouble of understanding occurred 99 times, troubles of hearing occurred 71 times and trouble of acceptability occurred 50 times. To conclude, the result of this study in terms of the frequency of occurrence of other-initiated self-repair based on trouble sources is in line with the result of Svennevig's seminar work.

In addition, in the case of revealing the frequency of other-initiated self-repair occurrence based on trouble sources in microlinguistic elements, the result of the study is exhibited as follows.

Table 3 The frequency of other-initiated self-repair occurrence based on trouble sources in microlinguistic elements

	Grammar	Lexis/ Word choice	Pronunciation
Frequency	2 times	5 times	once

The researchers found that the grammatical incorrectness and the lexis could guide the interlocutor to initiate others to repair. After analysing the data, the researchers found that grammar and pronunciation mistakes triggered the interlocutor to initiate others to repair the errors. The grammar error occurred twice and word choice error occurred and triggered the interlocutor to initiate others to repair the troubles 5 times and the inappropriate pronunciation occurred once.

The mechanism of other-initiated self-repair in student-student interaction

To respond to the second research question, the researcher used a similar instrument to the research question 1. The mechanisms of other-initiated self-repairs occurred in three different forms; full

two-cycle repair sequence, background check, and short-cut repair sequence. To portray the details, the findings of the study were presented as follows.

Full Two-Cycle Repair Sequence

The full two-cycle repair sequences were found when students communicated with intention to check whether both the speaker and the interlocutor have similar comprehension about the topic they were discussing. Excerpt (1) displays how the mechanisms in the form of full two-cycle repair sequence occurred.

Excerpt (1)

Trouble source turn	S1: <i>So (.) what about the questions? (2.0) Should the researcher make it by themselves or... or... (...) what is that, can adopt the questions.</i>
Hearing repair initiation (hearing check)	S2: <i>You mean the questionnaires?</i>
Hearing repair (confirmation)	S1: <i>Yes, the questionnaire I mean.</i>
Understanding repair initiation	S2: <i>So, we can adopt the questionnaire?</i>
Understanding repair	S1: <i>Mm (.), yeah.</i>

Excerpt (1) shows that during interaction, a student as an interlocutor detected there was an inappropriate word that was uttered by the speaker while the interlocutor believed that what the speaker intended to say was different from what the speaker was actually saying. The trouble of acceptability then occurred so that the interlocutor initiated another party (the speaker) to repair by saying '*you mean the questionnaire?*'. The way the interlocutor initiated the speaker to repair the speaking is word replacement. As stated previously, word replacement displays changes of inappropriate words into the appropriate words to elude misleading mainly to the interlocutors' interpretation. The interlocutor initiated other to repair by changing the word 'question' became 'questionnaire', the more appropriate word to use based on the topic they were discussing. The case is the interlocutor initiated to keep the content matter which is

'questionnaire' to be clearly understood. Björkman (2014) mentioned that word replacement in his seminar work is frequent related to language use even though in particular case, she found lexicogrammatical word replacement, and content matter also occurred. Thus, the instances provided in this study clearly depict how word replacement used in content matter. Excerpt (1) also depicts the response of the other to repair the trouble sources. In the excerpt (1), it can be seen that the speaker provided the confirmation by saying 'Yes, the questionnaire I mean' as the acceptance that both the speaker and the interlocutor agreed and understood the topic they were discussing.

Excerpt (2) also depicts how other-initiated self-repair occurred in the form of full two-cycle repair sequence.

Excerpt (2)

Trouble source turn	S1: <i>Oh, yes. (8 sec). oh. Yes in, in page 78, in (2.0)</i>
Hearing repair initiation (hearing check)	S2: <i>Sorry, what did you say? 78?</i>
Hearing repair (confirmation)	S1: <i>Yes. Page 78.</i>
Understanding repair initiation	S2: <i>Oh, on page 78.</i>
Understanding repair	S1: <i>Yeah.</i>

The sequence was started when the speaker symbolized S1 uttered 'Oh, yes. (8 sec). oh. Yes in, in page 78, in..'. The trouble was detected by the S2 as the interlocutor when she failed to catch what the speaker mentioned which is number 78. The trouble detected in excerpt (2) was clearly about trouble of hearing. When the speaker said the number 78, the interlocutor may have difficulties in gaining the idea so that the interlocutor initiated the speaker to repair or restate what has been mentioned by uttering 'Sorry, what did you say?'. However, the trouble of hearing that appeared may not fully occurred since the interlocutor actually succeeded in identifying the number 78

with doubt in mentioning it. The sequence of turn-taking after the interlocutor initiated the speaker to repair and clarify what the interlocutor said, the speaker in excerpt (2) showed that he succeeds in receiving signal from the interlocutor by confirming 'yes'. The turn-taking was continued by the interlocutor by signalling that he understood the repair initiation by uttering 'yes, it is on page 78?' and finally the sequence of turn was ended by S1's utterance.

Similar to those previous two excerpts, excerpt (3) also depicts how full two-cycle repair sequence occurred.

Excerpt (3)

Trouble source turn	S1: <i>Uh.. (2.0) uh.. be honest I don't totally understand about uh (...).. what is that.. um, (...). learning strategy cla (2.0)</i>
Hearing repair initiation (hearing check)	S2: <i>Classification?</i>
Hearing repair (confirmation)	S1: <i>Yeah. Classification, especially what is (2.0) what is memory, what is metacognitive and others. Uh.. would you please eh.. (...) what is that.. uh like define about (.) about the learning strategies that is ment.. (.) that are mentioned in .. in the journal?</i>
Understanding repair initiation	S2: <i>You mean the classification of the learning strategy?</i>
Understanding repair initiation	S1: <i>Yeah, the learning strategy.</i>

Other-initiated self-repair may occur when an interlocutor initiate to fill what the speaker failed to say. The strategy is popularly known as co-creation of the message or anticipation. As mentioned previously, Kirkpatrick (2007) stated that co-creation of the message or anticipation deals with how another participant of communication fill in gaps in each other's utterances in an effort to produce a comprehensive utterance. Excerpt (3) factually depicts how co-creation of the message or anticipation of other-initiated self-repair occurred. The trouble occurred when S1 failed to deliver a lexis 'clarification'. Excerpt (3) shows that the speaker may get a trouble to utter the word intended to mention so that the interlocutor initiated

to complete or fill what the speaker was actually intend to say. The interlocutor initiated the speaker by uttering a word 'classification'. Then, the speaker confirmed it by saying '*Yeah, classification...*' and elaborated his idea. In stating the further explanation, the speaker had a trouble to select a proper word which made the interlocutor had a question in her mind. However, the interlocutor seemed to understand what the speaker intended to say. Then, she ensured what the speaker's intention is and the interlocutor understood were in line so that the interlocutor decided to initiate by using clarification request with the utterance '*you mean the classification of the learning strategy?*'. When both the speaker and the interlocutor got similar understanding of ideas or topics they were discussed, the speaker then ended the sequence by saying '*yeah, the learning strategy.*'

Background Check

Background check as the sequence of other-initiated self-repair also happened in the classroom interaction. The researcher of this study found the mechanisms of other-initiated self-repair using background check pattern. The excerpts are presented as follows.

Excerpt (4)

Trouble source turn	S1: 78. <i>Yes: there are mentioned formula of statistics what is M stands for?</i>
Hearing repair initiation (hearing check)	S2: <i>(...) M?</i>
Hearing repair (confirmation)	S1: <i>The letter M, Mean?</i>
Background check	S2: <i>Mean. Did you find on the page 78?</i>

Background check as the mechanism of other-initiated self-repair occurred not so long as the full two-cycle sequence occurred. The background check mechanism occurred also due to a trouble. When an interlocutor detected a trouble such as he or she did not know the meaning of particular word or phrase, he or she may ask directly about the meaning of the word or the phrase by repeating what the speaker has already stated. Excerpt (4) shows how an

interlocutor initiated the speaker to repair or give an additional clue of the meaning of *M* mentioned by the speaker. In initiating the speaker, the interlocutor afforded to request a clarification from the speaker. When the speaker succeeded to catch the initiation of the interlocutor, the speaker then afforded to explain the letter *M* which stands for *Mean*. In excerpt (4), it seemed that the interlocutor needed an extra explanation of what the speaker explained by checking the background by saying '*Mean. Did you find on the page 78?*'.

Excerpt (5) also presents how background check mechanism of other-initiated self-repair.

Excerpt (5)

Trouble source turn	S1: <i>Um (...) for this paper it is not mentioned, but I think (2.0) um (.) to avoid the (...) what is it?</i>
Hearing repair initiation (hearing check)	S2: <i>Um (...) avoid the neutral position.</i>
Hearing repair (confirmation)	S1: <i>(.) avoid the neutral position so the researcher decided to (2 sec) focus on two options. Uhm (2.0)</i>
Background check	S2: <i>Do you intend to say much and little?</i>

In excerpt 5, S2 firstly completed the S1's utterance in the second line. To add, the communicative behaviour is well-known as 'anticipation' in this monograph (adapted from Kirkpatrick, 2007). Later on, S1 repeated S2's recommended phrase. Following that, S1 checked his understanding by continuing his ideas. To avoid misleading of understanding between two people speaking, the S2's utterance in the last line shows how filler such as '*Uhm...*' seemed to be a method to avoid potential trouble in understanding. Then, the S2 anticipated it by flooring ideas by uttering a yes-no question that can be identified in line 4.

Short-cut Repair Sequence

Excerpt (6) comes from the same setting of collecting data of the prior excerpts. It presents how short-cut repair sequence occurred in other-initiated self-repair.

Excerpt (6)

Trouble source turn	S1: <i>...then the compensation strategies... um... (2.0) this is dealing with the (...) learners' weaknesses uh (.) uhm (...) for example (2.0)</i>
Hearing repair initiation (hearing check)	S2: <i>Learners'? What did you say?</i>
Understanding repair	S1: <i>Weaknesses.</i>

In the above excerpt, first we see S1 uttered sentences to explain learning strategies used by students. In the explanation, she mentioned '*learners' weaknesses*', however, S2 failed to identify the phrase since S2 as the interlocutor did not hear the phrase clearly. Because of the failure to catch what phrase has been mentioned, the interlocutor in line 2 uttered '*Learners'? What did you say?*' with intention to initiate S1 as a speaker to repair or to restate what she has said. The strategy of the interlocutor's initiation is overt question, by raising a question about the unclear preceding utterance (Jamshidnejad, 2011).

The excerpt also depicts how short-cut repair sequence occurs. In excerpt (7), the speaker in the data uttered an inappropriate word to describe a data collection technique of a seminar work.

Excerpt (7)

Trouble source turn	S1: <i>...the researcher decided to (2.0) focus on much and little so the students (.) uhm (2.0) the have to respond only to much as little.</i>
Hearing repair initiation (hearing check)	S2: <i>Respondents</i>
Understanding repair	S1: <i>Uhm, respondents... respondents...</i>

Excerpt (7) portrays a case of other-initiated word replacement. What happens in excerpt (7) seems to be a factual excerpt of how word replacement to initiate other to repair occurs. In line 2, the S2 mentioned '*respondents*' instead of the word '*students*' since S2 believed that what S1 actually intended to say is respondents

since the context and the topic of their discussion is about how a researcher of a seminar work collected data in a questionnaire. In line 3, the speaker succeeded to catch the signal of the interlocutor's initiation so S1 directly repaired by repeating the word '*respondents*.'

The data of excerpt (8) below includes the instance of co-creating the message of anticipation.

Excerpt (8)

Trouble source turn	S1: <i>In the result here said that multi (2.0) uhm (2.0).</i>
Hearing repair initiation (hearing check)	S2: <i>Multilingual students?</i>
Understanding repair	S1: <i>Multilingual students!</i>

In excerpt (8), in line 2, it can be seen that S2 filled in the blanks of S1's utterance in an effort to assist the S1 to produce the complete utterance. Kirkpatrick's term of this type of anticipation is 'lexical anticipation' (Kirkpatrick, 2007). In line 2, the S2 completed the phrase the S1's utterance. The line 3 then shows that the S1 succeeded to understand the repair's initiation of S2 so that S1 accepted the initiation by saying '*multilingual students*'.

CONCLUSION

In summary, it is found that of all typologies of other-initiated self-repair strategy, *confirming checks*, which cover paraphrasing, repetition, and overt questions were dominantly used among other typologies. Of all the three types of confirming checks, repetition was the most frequently used, followed by overt question, and paraphrasing. *Clarification request* as the other type of other-initiated self-repair strategy was also used as frequent as repetition. Meanwhile, *co-creating of messages or anticipation* was the third typology frequently used and *word replacement* was the less frequently used typology. In relation to other-initiated self-repair mechanism, three sequences: full two-cycle sequence, background check, and short-cut repair sequence, are administered.

Putry, D.P., Munir, A. & Purwati, O. (2019). Other-Initiated Self-Repairs in Student-Student Interaction: The Frequency of Occurrence and Mechanism.

REFERENCES

- Björkman, B. (2014). An analysis of polyadic English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) Speech: A communicative strategies frameworks. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 66, 122-138.
- Dingemanse, M., Blythe, J., & Dirksmeyer, T. (2014). Formats for other-initiation of repair across languages: An exercise in pragmatic typology. *Studies in Language*, 38(1), 5-43.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Scott, M. L. (1997). Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies. *Language learning*, 47(1), 173-210.
- Gillies, R. M. (2006). teacher's and students' verbal behaviour during cooperative and small-group learning. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 271-287.
- Heritage, J. (1984). A change of state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Heritage, *Structures of social action: Studies in conversational analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversational analysis: Principles, practices and applications*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Jamshidnejad, A. (2011). Functional approach to communication strategies: An analysis of language learners' performance in interactional discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(15), 3757-3769.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). The communicative strategies of ASEAN speakers of English as a lingua franca. *English in Southeast Asia: Varieties, literacies, and literatures*, 118-135.
- Levert, W. J. (1989). *Speaking: From intention to articulation*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: MIT Press.

- Lever, W. J. (1999). Language production: A blueprint of the speaker. In C. Brown, & P. Hagoort, *Neurocognition of language* (pp. 83-122). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37-66.
- Mauranen, A. (2010). Features of English as a lingua franca in academia. *Helsinki English Studies*, 6, 6-28.
- Nunan, D. (Ed.). (1992). *Collaborative language learning and teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pillai, S. (2006). Self-monitoring and self-repair in spontaneous speech. *k@ta*, 8(2), 114-126.
- Rieger, C.L. (2003). Repetition as Self-Repair Strategies in English and German Conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35: 47-69.
- Robinson, P. (1997). Generalizability and automaticity of second language learning under implicit, incidental, enhanced, and instructed conditions. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 19(2), 223-247.
- Robson, C. (2011). *Real world research: A resource for users of social research methods in applied settings*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Sato, R., & Takatsuka, S. (2016). The occurrence and the success rate of self-initiated self-repair. *TESL-EJ*, 20(1), 1-15.
- 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.
- Svennevig, J. (2008). Trying the easiest solution first in other-initiation of repair. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(2), 333-348.

Putry, D.P., Munir, A. & Purwati, O. (2019). Other-Initiated Self-Repairs in Student-Student Interaction: The Frequency of Occurrence and Mechanism.

Trisanti, N. (2017). Self-repair as students development-oriented self-assessment in oral performnace. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 12 (1), 65-74.

Williams, J., Inscoc, R., & Tasker, T. (1997). Communication strategies in an interactional context: The mutual achievement of comprehension. *Communication Strategies: Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives*, 304-322.

Wisrance, M. W. (2017). An analysis on the self-initiation self-repair strategies of the third semenster students of English study program in the oral interaction with their lectures at Widya Mandira Catholic University Kupang in academic. *International Journal of Reserach - Granthaalayah*, 5, 311-317.