A conversation analysis of self-initiated self-repair structures in advanced Iranian EFL learners

Fateme EMRANI, Yasouj University, Iran
Mozhgan HOOSHMAND, Yasouj University, Iran[1]

This article reports the results of a study involving the Conversation Analysis (CA) of self-initiated self-repair structures in classroom conversations. The study aimed to cast light on self-initiated repairs practiced by advanced EFL learners. The data were collected in 2018. Forty proficient EFL students participated in the study. 72 hours of videotaped single-sex conversations were collected through classroom observations, and follow-up interviews were conducted, both at three different language institutes in Isfahan, Iran. The CA approach was employed as the theoretical framework for this study. The students' utterances were analyzed qualitatively. It was found that Iranian EFL learners practice 4 self-initiated self-repair structures, namely, replacing, inserting, deleting and aborting. Finally, the collected data were compared to those used by English native speakers. The results showed that the most frequent self-initiated self-repair structure employed by the participants in both cultures is replacing.

1. Introduction

Conversation is a form of oral interaction through which language is used. Salmani Nodoushan (1995; 2013) cited Labov and Fanshel (1977, p. 29) who believe that conversation is a medium of utterances and acts "bound together by a web of understanding and reactions." According to Goodwin and Heritage (1990), "social interaction is the primordial means through which the business of the social world is transacted, the identities of its participants are affirmed or denied, and its cultures are transmitted, renewed and modified" (p. 283) (See also Allan & Salmani Nodoushan, 2014). The benefit of studying spontaneous conversations is to help others to realize the cultural

[1] Corresponding Author (Email: mhooshmand78@gmail.com)

norms of a given society and the way people use express themselves in certain social settings. It also leads to the understanding of intercultural communications between societies. CA also enables teachers to realize forms of communication in order to uphold L2 classroom interactions, and it, subsequently, helps learners to accomplish their interaction (Saniboo & Sinwongsuwat, 2016; Waedaoh & Sinwongsuwat, 2019). Fujii (2012) also argued that "CA-based materials are also helpful for learners, as the exercises unveil mechanisms through which target language speakers actually achieve that order" (Fujii, 2012, p. 113).

Errors naturally appear in spontaneous conversations, particularly in a second or foreign language (Salmani Nodoushan, 2007; 2018). After the identification of an incorrect expression, the speaker or the recipient correct it. This action can be initiated either by the speaker or the recipient. The former is named as self-initiated, while the latter as other-initiated (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977). Moreover, a repair can be made by the speaker of the repairable item *(self-repair)* or it may be made by the recipient of the item *(other-repair).* This study is designed to cast light on self-initiated self-repair structures in Iranian EFL learners' casual conversations.

This study is significant since it attempts to address a gap in the literature by contributing to an understanding of L2 learners' self-initiated self-repair structures in a meaningful context in language classrooms.

2. Background

2.1. Conversation analysis (CA)

Conversation analysis (henceforth CA) is a method to study the organization and structure of social interaction between people. CA was mainly influenced by two theories; the first was suggested by Goffman (1959). As said by McKay and Hornberger (1996), "Goffman viewed interaction in terms of strategy and ritual and emphasized the importance of situation– the encounter as an attentionally focused gathering in which some aspects of the presentation of self are salient and others are downplayed or concealed" (p. 285). The second influence was based on the works of Garfinkel (1967) and ethnomethodology.

Since this article concerns the self-initiated self-repair structures, the most powerful framework is CA. This approach is 'the systematic analysis of the talk produced in daily situations of human interaction: talk-in-interaction' (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 13).

The basis of CA is empirical which helps to improve a partaker's view on what is going on in the talk. As participants interact with each other, the researcher can observe and analyze their talks to find the way they handle their talk to interact. Based on Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005, p. 199):

> Talk is the embodiment of social action for conversation analysts because participants do things and perform actions with talk. Sacks believed that analysts can develop a thorough understanding of these social activities by studying detailed transcripts of tape-recorded conversations. The goal, then, is to explicate from these recordings the ways participants produce and interpret the talk in their interactions from their perspectives; that is, how they orient to what they accomplish together, as opposed to any assumptions of an observing analyst.

Paper after paper, whether single authored or co-authored, Schegloff, with Sacks and Jefferson, identifies major structural axes of interaction: *turn-taking, sequence organization, repair, overall structural organization of conversation, word selection, turn organization*, etc. There have been many authors dealing with the theory of repair but Schegloff is considered the first important figure in this field.

Research on repair has recognized a range of repair strategies, including self-initiation self-repair, other-initiation self-repair, other-initiation other-repair, self-initiation other-repair, repetition, paraphrase, confirmation checks, clarification requests and comprehension checks (Drew, 1997; Nagano, 1997; Schegloff, 2000; Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks., 1977).

Schegloff et al. (1977) represented that self-repair is part of a greater repair mechanism in conversation and it is preferred not because of the vast number of instances of this strategy, but also that the system is planned to attain self-repair in which its positions precede the positions of other repair.

2.2. Self-initiated self-repair (SISR)

Schegloff et al. (1977) asserted that SISR is beginning with a non-lexical initiator such as cut-offs, lengthening of sounds, and quasi-lexical fillers. Afterwards the repairing segment is presented (p. 376). The speakers. In order to repair their errors in problematic talk, repeat words and use fillers in order to accomplish their communicative aim.

According to van Hest (1998b): "*If the speakers' monitoring device meets with a troublesome item, speakers can decide to correct this item on their own initiative, without intervention from their interlocutors*" (Cited in Wang, 2003, p. 37). This type of repair is called self-initiated self-repair*.*

Self-initiated repair has been viewed as self-interruption (Sparks, 1994), as the speaker of the current turn cuts off his or her speech and then he/she turns back to repair what has been said in the prior utterance. The self-initiated repair structures have been classified as expansion of the turn, hesitation, repetition of the previous word(s), replacement of a word or

structure, abort and restart, abort and abandon, insertion, deletion, meta-repair and modify order. Sparks (1994, p. 87) refers to repetition deletion and insertion as 'primitive operations' (cited in Al-Harahsheh, 2015).

Research on the repair of second language learners (e.g., Kranke & Christison, 1983; Schegloff, 2000) shows preference for SISR. According to Krahnke and Christison (1983) ". . . language learners have demonstrated ability to utilize non-language-specific techniques of interaction maintenance which also facilitate their comprehension, and, we can assume, their acquisition of the new language" (p. 234).

The present study investigates the most frequent strategies of SISR used by EFL learners in non-English speaking community, Iran. Lastly, it compares how self-initiated self-repair strategies are similar to those used English native speakers. Accordingly, it strives to address a gap in the literature by contributing to an understanding of L2 learners' repair organizations and practices in a meaningful context in the language classroom

Repair is more than error correction and it is defined as "practices for dealing with problems or troubles in speaking, hearing, and understanding the talk in conversation (and in other forms of talk in interaction)" (Schegloff 2000: 207). Repair is categorized into four classes based on who has initiated the repair and who has taken steps to resolve it: self-initiated self-repair (SISR), other-initiated self-repair (OISR), self-initiated other-repair (SIOR) and other-initiated other-repair (OIOR) (Schegloff, 1997; Schegloff, 2000).

This paper generally concentrates on self-initiated self-repair (SISR), which defines the cases where the learners experience a trouble in their utterances and they initiate repair in their classroom interactions.

Kasper (1985) investigated negotiated information between a NS and an NNS, as well as NNS/NNS exchanges, and concluded that self-initiated self-completed repair is more important than other-initiated other-completed repair for successful language learning.

Hellermann (2009) looked for practice from mundane conversation (self-initiated self-repair) as it is accomplished during the interactions of one adult learner of English. The research described the placement of repair initiations, the production practices used for initiation and repair, the contexts within which the repairs occurred, and how the production of repair might give us an evidence to emerging syntactic organization of language learners.

A number of studies have asserted that SISR can be used as a sign of an L2 learner's proficiency level based on the relationship found between monitoring and proficiency (Bardovi-Harlig & Dornyei, 1998; Chen, 1990; Fincher, 2006; van Hest, 1996). According to the results of Chi-square, the

study revealed that intermediate Chinese students of English make more significant use of the same strategies of repairs than relatively advanced Chinese learners of English do.

More specifically, the aim of the present research is to answer the following questions:

1. What are the most frequent SISR strategies used by both groups (Iranian EFL learners and English native speakers)?

2. Are there any significant differences in the use of self-initiated self-repair strategies between English speakers and Iranian EFL learners?

3. Method

3.1. Participants

The participants of this study were female students studying English in three different language institutes in Isfahan, Iran. In 2018, forty advanced students from each institutes, ranging from age from 15-19 years of age and the average of 17 were selected based on a speaking pre-test provided by the researchers. These participants were tested by the researchers. Persian was the first language of all the participants and they learned English as a foreign language because they neither spoke nor heard it in their everyday conversations in the society.

3.2. Instruments and materials
In this study the researchers are the first data collection instrument and the data collected from subjects were interactions in the context of the research problem. Hence, we carried out interviews from EFL leaners and also observed three advanced EFL classrooms. Additionally, the only instrument to compare the collected data with native speaker's ones is the framework developed by Schegloff et al. (1977). As it is cited in Ussama and Sinwongsuwat (2014), although some of the researchers argued that interview is not an adequate instrument in order to investigate interactional skills as it does not indicate real-life interaction (e.g., Bachman, 1990; Lazaraton, 1992; Salmani Nodoushan, 2002; Van Lier, 1989; Young, 1995), it is too early to assert that interview interaction can measure Iranian EFL learners' self-initiated self-repair strategies.

3.3. Data collection procedure

Prior to collect data, we talked to the managers of the institutes in order to get permission for recording the students' voice. To do this, we sought for courses which have as more discussions as possible in their classrooms.

On the whole, the database includes 10 interviews totaling 150 minutes and

36 classroom observations. In addition to recordings, we also took notes during classroom observations in order not to miss any significant points.

3.4. Data analysis procedure

Regarding the objective of the study, having the written format of recordings which is called the transcription of interactions was necessary. For this, the participants' interactions were transcribed by using Jefferson's transcription system. Gail Jefferson (2004) developed a system of transcribing which uses symbols available on conventional typewriter and computer keyboards which is mainly useful for capturing aspects of speech production and the sequential positioning of utterances relative to each other (e.g., < > trouble source, underlining self-initiated self-repair operation).

Prior to the analysis of data, we transcribed audio-taped recordings. Besides, the data collected through classroom observations o along with interviews were analyzed in order to describe, compare, and explore the types of SISR strategies used by the participants. Accordingly, I analyzed the transcriptions in order to find out which kind of SISR strategies are used more by the participants and also to explore the grammatical categories of the errors repaired by them. After that, I compared findings with the results of the previous work done on English speakers based on the framework of Schegloff et al. (1977) in order to investigate the similarities and differences among Iranian EFL learners and English native speakers in the use of self-repair strategy and grammatical categories of repaired errors.

4. Results

4.1 SISR strategies used by Iranian EFL learners

The first research question asked about the most frequent type of SISR strategies used by Iranian EFL learners and English speakers. Following Schegloff et al. (1977), this study is nearly based on the framework Schegloff et al. (1977) employ in their study for the structure. This study finds 4 SISR strategies, namely, replacing, inserting, deleting, and aborting. The results are presented in Table 1.

Table 1
The Frequency of Types of SISR Operations in Iranian EFL Learners

SISR operations	Frequency	Percentage
1. Replacing	19	59.37%
2. Inserting	7	21.87%
3. Deleting	4	12.50%
4. Aborting	2	6.25%

a. Replacing: Replacing or substituting is possibly the most common operation in same-turn repair in English and also in some other languages. It involves "a speaker' s substituting for a wholly or partially articulated element of a TCU-in-progress another, different element, while retaining the sense that 'this is the same utterance'" (Schegloff, 2008).

Extract 1: Melika, Zahra & teacher

Teacher: What do you like in your hometown?
Melika: It has a lot of delicious food...food<u>s</u>
Teacher: Uhum...What are you doing at present?
Melika: I'm asking to my teacher...no <u>answering</u> to my teacher's question...<u>q</u>uestion<u>s</u>
Teacher: I mean what are you doing this semester?
Melika: I'm studying my lessons.
Zahra: Did you finish cleaning home?
Melika: No, I don't.... <u>didn't</u> begin to do it (laughing)

In Extract (1), Melika is speaking about her hometown and her schedule. Actually, she's answering to her teacher's questions. In line (2), she uses singular noun "*food*" instead of plural one and then she repairs it as "*foods*". In the next turn, she says an incorrect vocabulary "*asking*", then she replaces it with the correct one "*answering*". In the same line, Melika uses singular word "*question*" instead of the plural one. Finally, she makes a use of present tense and immediately she replaces it with a past tense auxiliary.

Extract 2: Teacher, Sahar & Fateme

Teacher: Where do you come from?
Sahar: I am from Japan, eh...Yokohuma, which is a very big city near to Tokyo. I think the population is more than 3 million which is huge...<u>a</u> huge city
Teacher: What do you like about hometown?
Fateme: There are many shops and marks...mark<u>er</u>s.

In this Extract, Sahar speaks about her imaginary hometown. In line (4), she forgets to use "*a*" before "*huge*", but then she repairs it. In the last line, Fateme also says "*marks*" instead of "*markers*", and immediately she corrects it.
The findings of this study show that there were 19 replacing repairs, about 59.37% of all the SISR strategies in the analyzed data.
b. Inserting: Inserting is another strategy of self-initiated repair structure used by the participants in this study; the speaker adds a new word or an utterance.

Extract 3: Ayda, Hosna & Parastesh

Ayda: What are the things are important for you... What are the things important for you <u>when you are watching a movie?</u>
Hosna: As much as I experienced, I know that a movie must be completely understandable.
Parastesh: As my experience, a movie should be attractive...<u>I mean it should be attractive in order to perceive us to follow it.</u>

Extract (3) is a part of classroom discussion among Ayda, Hosna and Parastesh. Ayda asks about the important tips in movies based on her classmates' own opinions. First of all, she asks a general question. After that, in line 2, she makes it more detailed and restricts the question to movies that "*what are the things important for you when you are watching a movie?*". Hosna answers the question in this way that the movies must be comprehensible. Then, Parastesh replies that in her opinion "*a movie should be attractive*". After seconds, she adds something more "*a movie should be attractive in order to perceive us to watch it*" (in line 5).

Extract 4: Leila & Farzane

Farzane: As we talked about this...as we talked about this <u>problem with Mr. Hejazi</u>, after each lesson we should write about the topic.
Leila: Wait...do not focus on the writing more than enough.
Farzane: I study the vocabularies...I study <u>the meaning of</u> the vocabularies and then start practicing the writing.

In Extract (4), the topic of the speaking in classroom is about writing. Farzane and Leila are talking about how to start writing skill. In line (1), Farzane says "*as we talked about this*", then she inserts something to the current sentence that "*this problem with Mr. Hejazi*" in order to be understood by Leila. In line (4), Farzane also speaks about her method of studying for writing. She says that "*I study the vocabularies*", after that she adds "the meaning of" to her previous statement.

This study finds 7 inserting repairs, approximately 21.87% of all the SISR strategies in the analyzed data.

c. Deleting: Deleting is omitting an element as it does not serve the speaker in doing his or her interactional project.

Extract 5: Sara & Narges

Sara: What do you mean by this word in your writing?
Narges: I mean you suffer from your past experience...<u>I mean you may suffer from your experience</u>.
Sara: uh...I got it.

This Extract is a section of interview between Sara and Narges which is about their composition they've prepared for their English class. Sara reads Narges's composition and asks about the meaning of an unfamiliar vocabulary. In line 2, Narges provides an explanation and after hesitations she deletes a word from her previous sentence, "*past*", as it's extra.

The findings of this study indicate that there were 4 deleting—SISR strategies—in the analyzed data, about 12.5% of the total self-initiated repairs in this study.

d. Aborting: Aborting is abandoning followed by another effort in order to obtain the same result with possibly a pause before the production of the turn altogether

Extract 6: Setayesh & Nadia

Setayesh: Animated movie is a good genre of movie that can be watched by any one. Something that can be very… <u>something that make these movies so common</u> is that they do not need a lot of project to be made.

Nadia: Uh, but I think the majority of people prefer romantic ones.

In Extract (6), Setayesh and Nadia are talking about different genres of movies. Setayesh prefers animated movies as they're suitable. Initially, she says "*something can be very…*" she hesitates for a few seconds, and then initiates a self-repair which is an abort and abandon repair by saying "*something that make these movies so common is that they do not need a lot of project to be made*" (in line 2).

Extract 7: Raha & Iynaz

Raha: I prefer to watch science fiction movies. These are kind of …<u>uh I think they can be transformed to other genres of movies as it depends on your vision.</u>

Iynaz: I disagree…science fiction movies are…um, <u>I cannot accept them as an exciting genre.</u> I think they're really dissatisfied.

In this Extract, as the previous one, Raha and Iynaz start a free discussion about genres of movies, too. In the first and second lines, Raha expresses her opinion regarding science fiction movies as they can be transformed to other genres. She says "*these are kind of…*", but suddenly she interrupts it, and jumps to the other statement that "*uh I think they can be transformed to other genres of movies as it depends on your vision".* In line 3, Iynaz states her disagreement in this way that *"science fiction movies are…".* Immediately after, she aborts the turn and restart a new statement as *"um, I cannot accept them*

as an exciting genre".

The findings of this study indicate that there were 2 aborting SISR strategies, about 6.25% of all the repairs.

4.2. SISR strategies used by English speakers

Repair operations identified by Schegloff are: replacing, inserting, deleting, searching, parenthesizing, aborting, sequence jumping, recycling, reformatting and reordering. Below, the examples of these operations practiced by English native speakers are provided:

A. Replacing

(8) Bee & Ava (Schegloff, 2013, p. 44)

```
01   Bee:    .hh Yihknow buh when we walk utta the cla:ss.=
02   Ava:    =nobuddy knows wh't [wen' on,]
03   Bee:                         [Wid_.hh] h=
04   Bee:    =Li(hh)ke wu_ .hhDidju n_ Didju know what he wz=
05           talking about didju know wh't [structural paralysis=
06   Ava:                                  [dahhhhhh!
07   Bee:    =was I sid no I sid but we're supposetuh know what it
08           is (fuh Weh_) .hh yihknow fuh tihday's [class. 'n,
09   Ava:                                           [.hhh Mmm.
10   Bee:    He nevuh wen' o:ver it' n,t!  .hhh
```

In this extract, in line 8, the partially produced element *"We[dnesday's class]"* is replaced with another one (i.e., *"today's class"*) whereas maintaining the same sense of the utterance.

B. Inserting

(9) Bee & Ava (Schegloff, 2013, p.47)

```
01           (0.5)
02   Bee:    °(I 'unno   ) I° (So anyway) .hh Hey do you see v_(0.3)
03           fat ol' Vivian anymouh?
04   Ava:    No, hardly, en if we do: , y'know , I jus say hello
05           quick'n,
```

Inserting is the speaker's addition of one or more new element to the turn to be recognized better. Schegloff (2013) offers an instance of inserting when Bee inserts *"fat ol'"* before *"Vivian"* in the second and the third lines.

C. Deleting

(10) Bee & Ava (Schegloff, 2013, p. 48)

```
01    Bee:    .hhhh So she tol' me of a place on
02            Madison Avenue 'n Sevendy Ninth Street.=
03    Ava:    =M[mm
04    Bee:    [tuh go en try the:re. Because I
05            als- I tried Barnes 'n Nobles 'n,
06            (0.6) they didn' have any'ing
```

Deleting refers to the deletion of an element as it does not serve the speaker in doing his or her interactional project. Initially, the speaker deletes the word "also", and recycles the word that preceded it (*"I"*, line 4) and then continues with the word that would have followed the current - deleted word *("tried"*, line 5).

D. Searching

(11) Joyce & Stan (Schegloff, 2013, p.49)

```
01    Joy:    Why don'tchoo: go into Westwood,
02            (0.4) and go to Bullocks.
03            (1.2)
04    Stn:    Bullocks? ya mean that one right
05            u:m (1.1) tch! (.) right by thee:
06            u:m (.) whazit the Plaza? theatre::=
07    Joy:    Uh huh,
08    (0.4)
09    Stn:    °(memf::)°
10    Joy:    °Yeah,
```

Searching is defined as the speaker's recognizable searching for a word. Drawing on the work of Sacks, Schegloff maintains that there are "précis" searches for proper names of people and places, "delicate" searches for a word, and resumptive searches which follow interruptions or side tracking. Extract 11 is an example of précis searching where Stan is searching for the name of the Plaza Theater in the forth and the fifth lines.

E. Parenthesizing

Parenthesizing adds something to the turn-in-progress and usually consists of a clausal turn. In the following extract, Shelly inserts *"I don't know if I tol' you this"* in line 6 when she registers her awareness that she may be telling Debbie

something she has already told her before returning to her pre-parenthetical talk in the eighth line.

(12) Debbie & Shelley (Schegloff, 2013, p.51)

```
01    Deb:    <It's not cause uh:m (0.5) Mark's not going.
02    She:    No- well that wuz initially and then I'm like
03            no: I'll just go and then hm yaknow this- this
04            tow bandit (.) thing that I have, that we're
05            doing, [he w]a:nts me: >I don't know if I=
06    Deb:    [mm hm]
07    She:    =tol' you this,< he wants us to come out to
08            his house and do:, .hh like spend a whole day
09            o:n putting everything together cause we don't
10            get the shit done while we're at work
```

F. Aborting: Aborting refers to a way in which the speaker carries out the existing project in another way of getting the same undertaking done.

(13) Sherrie & Mark (Shegloff, 2013, p.55)

```
01    Sher:   Who's Debbie.
02    Mark:   °(Katz.)
03            (0.7)
04    Mark:   She's jus' that girl thet: uh:, (0.2)
05            .hh I met her through uh:m::, (1.0)
06            I met 'er in Westwood.
```

In Extract (13), the speaker aborts a turn twice, giving up on each of these two different ways of answering Sherrie's question, and lastly addresses the same undertaking in a different way (at line 6).

G. Sequence Jumping

(14) Rubbin & Frieda (Schegloff, 2013, p.56)

```
01    Rub:    They don mind honey they're jus not gonna talk to us
02            ever again.=
03    Dav:    =(hehem)/ri: (h)igt.
04            (0.8)
05    Kat:    We don mind <[we jus never gonna talk to you e:ver=
06    Dav:                 [(No, b't)
07    Kat:    =(hh heh)
08    Rub:    heheheheh
```

```
09    Kat:    [No: :] that's awright
10    Fre:    [So: :]
11.   Dav:    [(                                        )].
12.   Fre:    [You know what were gonna—] in fact I'm— she I
13.            haven't seen her since I spoke to you but im going to
14.            talk to = what a you making¿
15.            (0.2)
16.   Kat:    it's a —bla:nket
17.   Fre:    did yu weave tha[t yourse:lf]
18.   Kat:                    [I w o  : :]ve this myself.=
```

Sequence jumping is jumping to something unrelated to the turn and sequence in progress with no break. As following extract reveals, Frieda was just explaining how they had also met other friends. Rubin interrupts the silence in line 1. Kathy in turn replies Ruben's ironic intent by saying *"not…ever"* to *"never… ever,"* and utters a joke-to-serious *"no"* followed by *"that's all right"* in the ninth line. Frieda interrupts the turn-in-progress, *"I'm going to talk to-"*, directly into *"What are you making?"* hence turning abruptly to a different sequence.

H. Recycling

(15) Shl & Debbie (Schegloff, 2013, p.61)

```
01   Shl:   rcl:   So: I mean it's not becuz he's— he's— I mean it's
02           Rpl:   not becuz he:'s not going, it's becuz (0.5) his
03                  money's not: (0.5) funding me.
04   Deb:          okay.
```

Recycling refers to those situations where the speaker repeats some bit of the previous talk. In the next Extract, *"he's"* is to make it a point of reference for a subsequent contrast—that is, "not HIM, his money". According to Schegloff, this is an example of lexical recycling.

I. Reformatting

(16) Bee & Ava (Schegloff, 2013, p.62-63)

```
01    Bee:   So, < I got some lousy cou(h)rses th(hh)is term
02            too.
03    Ava:   Kehh huh!
04    Bee:   'hhh [h m—    ]
05    Ava:   [W—whe]n's yer uh , weh— you have one day y'only
06            have one course uh?
```

```
07    Bee:    mMo[nday en Wednesday:[s right.] That's my=
08    Ava:    ['hhh                   [O h. that's—]
09    Ava:    =linguistics course [hh
```

Schegloff's (2013) reformatting operation is, largely, grammatical. For example, in Extract (16), what begins as a declarative may be reformatted as a negative question (see line 12).

J. Reordering

(**17)** Rse & Bea (Schegloff, 2013, p. 65)

```
01    Rse:    An'it—(0.3)  An'it left' er (0.4) quite permanently
02            damaged °I s[uppose°
03    Bea:            ['tk
04    Bea:            Uh;pparently,
05            (•)
06    Bea:    Uh— he is still hopeful
07    Rse:    The husb'n
08    Bea:    Ah hah end yih **never jus'** (•) eh yih **js' never** saw
09            such devotion in your li:fe …
```

Reordering is a case where a speaker effort to work out the direction in which elements of a turn-in-progress should be arranged. On the other hand, it is re-ordering the elements of a turn-in-progress. In Extract 21, Bea is well on her way to saying "you just never saw such devotion" when she hears "you never just" in line 8. She then restates her utterance with reordered elements.

4.3. SISR operations: Iranian EFL learners vs. English native speakers

Based on Schegloff's (2013) view, recycling repairs are enormous and seems to be expressively more numerous than all the other repair types. He argues that "the recycled element(s) *figure* in the repair segment but *not* as the repair *itself;* they are resources, but not the product" (Schegloff, 2013 p. 59).

In Schegloff's framework, replacing is the second common repair operation used by English native speakers followed by inserting. The Searching, parenthesizing and aborting repair operations as a whole appeared to occur quite frequently in English. In Schegloff's point of view, there is a skewed relative distribution within these types. Sequence-jumping, deleting, reformatting and reordering are very rare in English native speakers' conversations in Schegloff's way of thinking. To date, studies investigating deleting, aborting, sequence-jumping, reformatting, and reordering are extremely scarce. Though, deleting is infrequent when compared to other self-

repair operations, they seemed to act the important function which modifies the action.

Table 1 demonstrates four types of SISR operations employed by the participants of this study, which are (i) replacing, (ii) inserting, (iii) deleting, and (iv) aborting. The percentage of each operation is also illustrated in table 1. The most frequent operation of SISR was replacing with 59.37 percent. The next one was inserting with 21.87 percent. Deleting came next with 12.5 percent. The least frequent SISR operation was aborting with 6.25 percent. Accordingly, the most frequent type of SISR operation was replacing and the least frequent one was aborting. The other operations such as searching, parenthesizing, sequence jumping, recycling, reordering and reformatting were not observed in the study.

As the transcription of data represents, the majority of participants in the present study prefer to substitute a wholly or partially element for another or different one while the sense of the utterance remains. Instances of replacing are provided in section 4.2 (extracts 1 to 5). Schegloff (2013) states that replacing "need not be the same sort of linguistic or grammatical object of the trouble source" (p. 45). More than the half of replacing articulated by EFL learners are grammatical error corrections which precede the lexical one.

The second common strategy used by the leaners is inserting in which the students insert on or more new element. This kind of strategy may be looked as if it is not exclusively used to alter the erroneous utterance in order to be fixed, but this utterance will be better understood through modification.

The most unusual types of self-repair strategies produced by the students in the current study are deleting and aborting, respectively. Deleting refers to those utterances in which the leaner deletes one or more element. Although, they're not extremely common in this study, they outnumber aborting as they rarely left a turn incomplete and jumped to another one.

5. Discussion and conclusion

The results of this study show that there is a similarity between SISR structures in Iranian EFL learners and in English conversations.

In respect to the operations of SISR, it is concluded that the most common operation used by Iranian EFL learners participated in this study was replacing with 19 occurrences. The next frequent one was inserting with 7 occurrences. These findings are in line with Schegloff's framework in which replacing is a common operation followed by inserting and a study conducted by Wang Yun (2005) in which replacement was the most prominent operation. Deleting was also used rarely by both English native speakers and Iranian EFL learners in the present study. Although there were similarities

between these two cultures in the use of some SISR operations, there were dissimilarities as well. Searching and parenthesizing repair operations as a whole appeared to occur quite frequently in English while they were not observed in this study.

With regard to the most frequent SISR operation, it was found that Iranian EFL learners concentrated on replacing and inserting repairs more. These results are supported by Alharahsheh (2015) who claimed that there is a similarity between self-repair structures in JSA and in English conversations. Additionally, the findings are consistent with earlier findings shown on simple recycling and replacement self-repairs in English, Hebrew and German (Fox Maschler, & Uhmann, 2010) which presented that languages with the same typological features use same self-repair practices.

Moreover, a CA analysis that takes the positions of self-repair into accounts, not only suggests an outline of various repair practices that students engage in, but also is helpful in drawing comparisons across studies.

Through the investigation of the data collected from the participants in this study, we found that OISR is more common than SISR. Similarly, Kusey, (2016) made a use of Schegloff's (2013) ten operations of self-repair in English. He concluded that SISR has a high frequency while it is in opposition to the findings of the present data.

As a conclusion, analysis of self-repair can provide some insight into learners' general perceptions and conceptualization of the target language, their areas of difficulty, and their language acquisition strategies and attitudes. Though, in our study, examination of the self-repair data discovered only insignificant information about what each participant can and cannot say appropriately and correctly in English as a foreign/second language and did not indicate their proficiency The most common example in this study involved participants using self-repair for "addition" when they were uncertain about the grammaticality or appropriateness of what they had said.

The Authors

Fateme Emrani (Email: fateme.emrani72@yahoo.com) is an M.A student in TEFL at English language department of Yasouj University. She has received her BA degree in English Language Translation.

Mozhgan Hooshmand (Email: mhooshmand78@gmail.com) has received her PhD in linguistics from the University of Isfahan, her MA in linguistics and BA in English literature from Shiraz University. She has about seven years of teaching experience and has taught different linguistics courses. She is currently Assistant Professor at Yasouj University, Iran.

References

Al-Harahsheh, A. M. A. (2015). A conversation analysis of self-initiated repair structures in Jordanian spoken Arabic. *Discourse Studies, 17*(4), 397-414.

Allan, K., & Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2015). Pragmatics: The state of the art (An online interview with Keith Allan). *International Journal of Language Studies, 9*(3), 147-154.

Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental consideration in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. & Dornyei, Z. (1998). Do language learners recognize pragmatic violations? Pragmatic vs. Grammatical awareness in instructed L2 learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*, 233-259.

Chen, S.-Q. (1990). A study of communication strategies in interlanguage production by Chinese EFL learners. *Language Learning, 40*(2), 155-187.

Drew, P. (1997). Open class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation. *Journal of pragmatics, 28*(1), 69-101.

Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. P. (2005). *Analysing learner language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fincher, A. (2006). *Functions of self-initiated self-repair in an advanced Japanese language classroom* (Unpublished PhD Dissertation). Griffith University, Australia.

Fox, B. A., Maschler, Y., & Uhmann, S. (2010). A cross-linguistic study of self-repair: Evidence from English, German, and Hebrew. *Journal of Pragmatics, 42*(9), 2487-2505.

Fujii, Y. (2012). Raising awareness of interactional practices in L2 conversations: Insights from conversation analysis. *International Journal of Language Studies, 6*(3), 99-126.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Doubleday.

Goodwin, C., & Heritage, J. (1990). Conversation analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 19*, 283-307.

Hellermann, J. (2009). Looking for evidence of language learning in practices for repair: A case study of self-initiated self-repair by an adult learner of English. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 53*(2), 113-132.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis: Principles, practice and applications*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13-31). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kasper, G. (1985). Repair in foreign language teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7*, 200-215.

Krahnke, K., & Christison, M. (1983). Recent language research and language teaching principles. *TESOL Quarterly, 17*(4), 625-649.

Kusey, L. (2016). *Same-turn self-repair practices in peer-peer L2 conversational dyads* (Unpublished PhD Dissertation). University of Texas, Austin.

Labov, W., & Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic discourse: Psychotherapy as conversation*. New York: Academic Press.

Lazaraton, A. (1992). The structural organization of a language interview: A conversation analytic perspective. *System, 20*, 373-86.

McKay, S. L., & Hornberger, N. H. (1996). *Sociolinguistics and language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nagano, R. (1997). Self-repair of Japanese speakers of English: A preliminary comparison with a study by W. J. M. Levelt. *Bulletin of Language Science and Humanities, 11*, 65-90.

Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (1995). *A sociopragmatic comparative study of ostensible invitations in English and Farsi* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran.

Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2002). *Text-familiarity, reading tasks and ESP test performance: A study on Iranian LEP and Non-LEP university students* (PhD Dissertation). University of Tehran, Iran.

Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2007). Error treatment in the EFL writing class: Red pen method versus remedial instruction. *Journal of Educational Technology, 4*(3), 53-58.

Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2013). The social semiotics of funerary rites in Iran. *International Journal of Language Studies, 7*(1), 79-102.

Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2018). Toward a taxonomy of errors in Iranian EFL learners' basic-level writing. *International Journal of Language Studies, 12*(1), 101-116.

Saniboo, H., & Sinwongsuwat, K. (2016). Improving English conversation skills through online conversation lessons and classroom interactions with English speakers. *International Journal of Language Studies, 10*(1), 111-124.

Schegloff, E. A. (2000). When 'others' initiate repair. *Applied Linguistics, 21*(2), 205-243.

Schegloff, E. A. (2008). *A primer in conversation analysis: Sequence organization in interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (2013). Ten operations in self-initiated, same-turn repair. In M. Hayashi, G. Raymond & J. Sidnell (Eds.), *Conversational repair and human understanding* (pp. 41-70). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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.

Ussama, R., & Sinwongsuwat, K. (2014). Conversation proficiency assessment: A comparative study of two-party peer interaction and interview interaction implemented with Thai EFL learners. *International Journal of Language Studies, 8*(4), 95-106.

Van Hest, E. (1996). *Self-repair in L1 and L2 production*. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.

Van Lier, L. (1989). Reeling, writhing, drawling, stretching and fainting in coils: Oral proficiency interviews as conversation. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*, 489-508.

Waedaoh, A., & Sinwongsuwat, K. (2019). Enhancing English language learners' conversation abilities via CA-informed sitcom lessons: A case study of Thai high school students. *International Journal of Language Studies, 13*(1), 41-56.

Wang, Z. (2003). *A Study on self-repair behaviors and EFL learners' oral fluency* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). School of Foreign Studies, South China Normal University.

Young, R. (1995). Conversational styles in language proficiency interviews. *Language Learning, 45*, 3-42.

Yun, W. (2005). *A study on the organization of repair in Mandarin Chinese conversation* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). University of Hong Kong, China.