

Self-Initiated Repair Strategies of Learners of English as a Second Language

Meryl Patrice D. Agustin, Juanito P. Tandoc Jr., Ma. Theresa L. Eustaquio

Isabela State University, Echague, Isabela

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.8120159>

Received: 28 November 2024; Accepted: 06 December 2024; Published: 08 January 2025

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the self-initiated repair strategies employed by learners of English as a Second Language (ESL) in oral communication. Recognizing that no speech is error-free, especially among individuals learning English as a second language, this research aims to understand how ESL learners identify and rectify their own speech errors to facilitate effective communication. Utilizing a descriptive-qualitative methodology, thematic analysis was performed on data collected through audio-recorded interviews with twenty (20) purposively sampled ESL learners. The participants, enrolled in the Bachelor of Science in Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering program and having completed a course in Speech and Oral Communication, provided insights into their common trouble sources and the types of repair strategies they use. The findings reveal that ESL learners frequently employ various strategies to correct errors in their speech, enhancing their communication efficacy. The study underscores the importance of self-repair mechanisms in the language learning process and provides implications for teaching practices aimed at improving oral proficiency among ESL learners.

Keywords: Speech Error, Self-initiated repair strategies, Trouble Sources, English as a Second Language (ESL), ESL learners

INTRODUCTION

Nobody's way of speaking is free from errors. Particularly if you are in the process of acquiring a certain language. Given that English in our country is learned as a second language, learners are more likely to make mistakes in their speech production. The lack of complete proficiency is an unavoidable phenomenon among these individuals. Speaking is one of the four basic language skills that learners strive to acquire. It is a way for students to interact with others and express themselves, as well as their thoughts, objectives, hopes, and viewpoints. Furthermore, those who are literate in a language are referred to as "speakers" of that language. Speaking is also the most often utilized language skill in virtually all contexts (Torky, 2006).

According to Levelt (1989), there are four phases of production: conceptualization, formulation, articulation, and self-monitoring. First, we must conceptualize the message we intend to convey. Second, we translate this idea into a linguistic strategy. Thirdly, the plan is carried out by the speech system's musculature. Finally, we evaluate our speech to determine whether or not we said what we intended and how we intended to say it. In English as a Second Language (ESL) classes, speaking skills development is essential (Nunan, 1999). Therefore, speaking is undoubtedly a top objective for most English language learners (Florez, 1999). However, it may be seen as the most challenging skill to master since it calls for a complete competency of speech production sub-skills such as vocabulary retrieval, choice of grammatical patterns, and sociocultural aptitude. According to Nooteboom and Quené (2020), individuals who engage in speech frequently not only produce a constant speech error, but also consistently identify and rectify their own speech errors that they possess indirect awareness of. This happens when an ESL speaker recognizes his own utterances that has an error and will immediately try to correct by using of repairing strategies. As Dell (1986) state, these unintentional, unexpected and infrequent deviations from their preconceived speech plan are being detected and corrected by means of repair. Repair refers to the actions taken by a speaker to facilitate the smooth flow

of utterances or conversations, with the aim of maintaining the ongoing progressivity of the turn. It has been observed that individuals who are learning a second or foreign language have the ability to utilize and apply various strategies for repairing language during interactions (Schegloff, 2000). According to Schegloff, Sacks, and Jefferson (1977), the concept of "repair" refers to a conversational mechanism employed to fix errors committed by the speaker and to determine whether the interlocutors have comprehended the intended meaning of the discourse. Moreover, the term "repairs" encompasses more than just repairing errors or making basic changes. As an example, repairs are frequently employed by a speaker to determine the appropriateness of a discourse rather than a mistake. And they suggested that the term "repair" refers to a wider variety of occurrences. Instead of referencing errors, the terminology of "trouble source" or "repairable" is utilized.

Furthermore, this study aims to investigate and examine the usage of self-initiated repair as a strategy for rectifying speech errors among the English as Second Language (ESL) learners. The research seeks to shed light on the effectiveness, and factors influencing the utilization of self-initiated repair strategies in the context of ESL communication. Through the analysis on how ESL learners employ this strategy, and the outcomes it produces, this research will contribute to a deeper understanding of language learning processes. The present study methodology used an unstructured interview to collect the data based on ESL students' experiences to examine the influence and efficacy of self-repair strategies procedures. Through this method, it allows for an exploration of self-repair strategies from the perspective of the learners themselves, by uncovering their insights, experiences, and perceptions. Previous studies about self-repair strategy among the English as a second language (ESL) learners frequently rely on the observations of the on-going conversations of student-student or teacher-student interactions in classroom environments. Self-repair is a language learning strategy that the second language learners used to, and learners who employs repair action exhibits distinct variations among individuals. (Haniah, et al., 2020). The learners are expected to engage in the process of the task of repairing their utterances to what they perceive as a speech error. The most direct insights into linguistic and psychological processes, as well as the development and transmission of the primary and secondary languages, can be obtained through conducting research on self-repair mechanisms (Kormos, 2000).

Statement of the Problem

The present study is established to examine the utilization of self-initiated repair strategies employed by English as a Second Language (ESL) learners of Isabela State University - Echague Campus. The aim of this study is to provide an answer to the following questions:

1. What are the common trouble sources that prompt ESL learners to engage in self-repair?
2. What are the frequent types of self-initiated repair strategies applied in dealing with the trouble sources?
3. How effective is utilizing the self-initiated repair strategies of ESL learners in communication?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study used the descriptive-qualitative method. Thematic analysis was employed as an approach in analyzing the data to attain an in-depth understanding of the self-initiated repair strategies of ESL learners in oral communication.

Participants of the Study

The participants of the study were selected through purposive sampling and the data collection was done once the researcher obtained data saturation. The criteria for selection of study participants include the following (a) identified as an ESL learner, (b) currently enrolled in the course of Bachelor of Science in Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering program, (c) students who are done taking the course subject of Speech and Oral communication in the academic year 2022-2023. The study involved a sample of 20 participants who serve as

the subjects of the study.

Research Instrument

In order to obtain the data needed for the research, an unstructured interview question guide was utilized. The interview guide was developed using a “a priori code” to ensure alignment with the objectives of the study and was supported by some studies. A video recorder and audio recorder were used to record and capture the responses of the participants during the interview which were transcribed verbatim.

Data Gathering Procedure

A formal letter of request was written and addressed to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, with a copy provided to the department chair of the Languages and Literature Department. The purpose of the letter is to seek permission for the conduct of the study. After the approval, the researcher coordinated and gathered the study participants. In the course of the interview, it is necessary that each participant in the study is personally interviewed by the researcher in a secure and comfortable location.

Before the said interview, the researcher/interviewer introduced herself and state the purpose and objectives of the study to the study participants for them to be comfortable and aware. An orientation was then be given for the participants on how to answer the interview guide. Before beginning the actual interview, the researcher asked the study participants to sign the consent form. This confirmed that they are aware of the objectives of the study, that they voluntarily agreed to participate in it, that the information they provided is true and accurate for the study's benefit, and that the researcher may use their data in accordance with this consent and protect it. The researcher took an audio and video recording of what the participants say on the entire interview process.

Treatment of Data

After collecting the data, the researcher transcribed verbatim the audio-recording data. As a result, the present transcription undergoes a thematic analysis utilizing the approach of identifying recurring themes to determine the various sources of trouble that prompt ESL learners to engage in self-repair, as well as to identify the frequent types of self-repair strategies employed by ESL learners in the process of correcting speech errors and to find out how effective is utilizing self-initiated repair strategies in communicating.

Moreover, in terms of determining the frequent types of self-initiated repair strategies, themes were given corresponding acronyms: Replacing: RP, Inserting: I, Searching: S, Deleting: D, Parenthetical: P, Sequence Jumping: SJ, Aborting: A, Reformatting: R, Recycling: RC, and Reordering: RO. Prior to the transcription of the recorded data, they were then subsequently categorize into ten types of self-repair strategies proposed by Schegloff (2013).

Furthermore, conducting a thematic analysis on interviews with a purposive sample of participants would yield valuable insights into their common sources of difficulties and self-initiated repair strategies for correcting errors. In the end, the gathered data undergo to a process of validation through its return to the study participants. The researcher incorporated any necessary modifications based on the participants' feedback to refine the final transcription.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Common Trouble Sources of ESL learners

The result of the interviews from twenty (20) participants is that all participants are having factors of difficulty in speaking that hindered the successful flow of conversation in the context of communication. There is a total of thirty-one (31) relevant statements that had appeared during the coding process which were then categorized based on the common characteristic of the trouble sources.

Table 1. The Common Trouble Sources of ESL learners

| Common trouble Sources | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1. Discourse | 16 | 51.61% |
| 2. Channel | 15 | 48.38% |

It was identified that there are two (2) kinds of trouble sources namely Discourse and Channel. These two themes would be introduced, including their subthemes that were generated from the collected interview data. The detailed participants' common trouble sources in communication are presented in the following contexts:

Discourse

Discourse errors are trouble sources that are considered to be disruptions and difficulties that can delay and affect the progressivity of maintaining smooth conversation flow. Among Twenty (20) participants, it was identified that there are sixteen (16) participants who faced discourse errors during their communication. Some of the challenges that make the participants commit this error during a conversation are being identified through the process of coding. The sub themes that are related to the Discourse trouble sources namely: difficulties in delivering the message and sudden topic shifts.

Difficulties in delivering the message

Participant 1 stated that the problem he experienced during the discussion is that he had difficulties in conveying his idea to others which impedes the cohesiveness of the turn-taking. He also mentioned that his low self-confidence and some distractions affect the delivery of his message. When an unexpected event influences the focus of the speaker while communicating, this results in an interruption of their cognition process. This indicates that ESL learners find that it is challenging to express thought when there is a disturbance in their mental processes. This agrees with the study of Pauliková (2017) which revealed that a problem in confidence causes a difficulty in conveying an actual relevant and well-formed intended message. Another related study was made by Aprilawasti et. al (2015) and Samanhudi et. al (2022), they found out that learners of English as a second language face the same problems in their performance wherein the dominant challenge, they encountered in speaking is through their lack of confidence. In the situation of having a sudden conversation, producing utterances needs preparation especially if the language that is being used is not the first language of the speaker for the reason that this may cause a less organized and accurate production of speech. In the case of Participant 20, in an actual conversation, preparation time of her planning is limited. She produced unprepared utterances where she mentioned that she stumbled over her words and makes a lot of pauses before she completes her utterances. According to the study of Patanasorn (2010) and Tilsen (2012), a lack of preparation time can lead to a less structured and accurate performance compared to a well-planned utterance, and it is suggested that giving learners time to prepare can support them to produce a well-formed utterance.

Sudden topic shifts

In terms of communication, a topic is the most important part of a discussion which makes the main point of a conversation and wherein, the speaker and listeners pay attention to it to fully comprehend, absorb and maintain the turn-in-interaction with the same objectives. One of the other causes of discourse error is the unwarranted shifting of topics in conversation. This change in focus of the topic impedes the flow of a conversation. Participant 3 mentioned that she experiences discourse error when a sudden change of topics happens in their communication which results in misunderstanding. A speaker is expected to be the one who carries out the topic of a conversation and the listener is the one trying to absorb and apprehend the given utterances but due to shifting topics that is unrelated to the previous one, this may cause a disturbance and confusion in the understanding of the receiver which may result in struggling on making an appropriate response. According to Puffer (2007), he defined discourse errors as instances in turn-in-interaction where the

delivered utterances of the speaker are not explicitly or clearly established. It means that they were unable to explain or elaborate their ideas coherently which causes misunderstandings. In this situation, another participant stated that she also faces the same trouble where she mentioned that while explaining her ideas, one of her classmates asked a question based on her previous utterances. This interruption disrupted her current utterances, and because of that, she wasn't able to clarify her message.

Meanwhile, Participants 20 mentioned that due to feeling nervous a discourse error occurs where she unintentionally shifts the topics of her utterances making it challenging for her to give a clear and intended point of message. This abrupt transition of the topics indicates a disorganized message and lack of coherence. In the study of Qian and Jaeger (2011), it is discussed that a production of topic shift could arise or appear to be misleading. In such a manner of discourse error, a sudden topic shift could also be linked to the feelings of the learners. This is correlated by Carrol (1986) statement that a speaker tends to make speech errors that can occur when they feel nervous or stressed.

Channel

Channel trouble are issues related to hearing or speaking of both parties that influence effective communication. It was found out that among the twenty (20) participants of the study there are fifteen (15) participants that have faced channel as their trouble sources in communication. Based on the gathered data of the interview, two sub themes emerged namely: clarity of speech and background noise. These findings were carefully reviewed and classified based on the participants' recurring issues related to channel of trouble sources.

Clarity of speech

One of the most challenging situations in communication can be found when the receiver cannot understand the speaker's utterances. Producing clear speech should be the primary goal of the speaker to ensure that the message is being understood by the listener. In some cases, ESL learners tend to produce utterances that affect the listeners comprehension. Participant 1 recognized the clarity and volume of his voice in delivering his utterances. He mentioned that, when he notices that his voice is not loud enough, he will be going to increase this to emphasize his point and make his utterances clearer. This is similar to Participant 2 where he also mentioned that the clarity and proper pitch of the voice is needed to facilitate a better understanding for the listener. In Scarborough and Zellou (2013) study, it was found that speakers adjust their voice to be clearer in various communicative context, such as speaking to someone who has trouble hearing or in an intentional "clear" manner. This suggest that the clarity of speech has a direct impact on listener comprehension and thus, recognizing the clarity and volume of a speaker's voice can facilitate better understanding of the speech.

Background noise

During a conversation, the trouble source channel could also be influenced by the noise depending on the particular surroundings of the participants. Participants 8 and 9 mentioned that they face a noise problem during the interaction that precipitates misunderstanding in their communication process. The noise is a disturbance that makes their communication disrupted. Several studies have suggested that a background noise makes the speech less being heard and received by listeners. (Harmon et al, 2021). Additionally, according to the study of Le Prell and Clavier (2016), it is found that background noise significantly influences a conversation by affecting the ability of the listeners to recognize and understand speech. The effects of background noise on speech recognition vary depending on several factors. This imply that a background noise poses significant challenges for having an effective communication.

A trouble sources are a communication breakdown emerged taking place during the situation of interaction. This could be categorized into two sources, the discourse error and the channel trouble. Among these trouble sources, the dominant problem that the participants face is the discourse error, following with the channel trouble sources. These findings indicate that ESL learners are most likely to engage in difficulties in maintaining a cohesiveness of conversation and least to the issue of mishearing. These findings opposed the study of Betti & Mahdi (2020), which indicated that the most frequent trouble source on his data is

pronunciation and the least trouble source is factual information and it suggests that speaking competence in pronunciation is identified as a weakness of the learners.

The Frequent Self-Initiated Repair Strategies applied in dealing with Trouble Sources

Schegloff (2013) outlines ten distinct operations utilized by speakers to manage or modify potential language difficulties during a conversation. Table 2 below presents a breakdown of the frequency of occurrences for each provided ten (10) self-initiated repair strategies based on the interview responses of 20 participants.

Table 2. The frequent Self-initiated repair strategies used by the ESL participants

| Participants | Self-Initiated Repair Strategies | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|----|---|---|-----|----|----|----|-----------|
| | RP | I | D | S | P | A | S J | RC | RF | RO | |
| P1 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | 8 |
| P2 | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | | | ✓ | ✓ | | 5 |
| P3 | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | | 4 |
| P4 | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | 4 |
| P5 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | ✓ | 5 |
| P6 | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| P7 | | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | | 2 |
| P8 | ✓ | | ✓ | | | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| P9 | | ✓ | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| P10 | | | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | 2 |
| P11 | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | | | 2 |
| P12 | | | | ✓ | | | | | | ✓ | 2 |
| P13 | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | 5 |
| P14 | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| P15 | ✓ | | | | | | ✓ | | | | 3 |
| P16 | ✓ | | | | | ✓ | | | | | 2 |
| P17 | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | | ✓ | 5 |
| P18 | ✓ | | | | | ✓ | | ✓ | | ✓ | 2 |
| P19 | ✓ | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | 2 |
| P20 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | 6 |
| Frequency | 14 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 6 | 68 |

The above table elucidates that **Replacing** as Self-initiated repair strategies of ESL learners was the most frequently occurring theme, with 14 instances of the strategies in the collected study data. This strategy resulted in the highest occurrences in the gathered data of the study. **Searching, Inserting, Recycling and Deleting** self-initiated repair strategies were the next most frequent themes, together with 33 occurrences of

the strategies in the data. The least occurring themes in the data namely: **Reformatting, Aborting, Sequence jumping and Reordering.**

Table 3. The Frequency and Percentage of the Self-initiated Repair strategies of ESL learners

| Self-initiated Repair Strategies | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|----------------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| 1. Replacing | 14 | 20.59 |
| 2. Inserting | 8 | 11.76 |
| 3. Deleting | 7 | 10.294 |
| 4. Searching | 10 | 14.71 |
| 5. Parenthetical | 6 | 8.82 |
| 6. Aborting | 3 | 4.412 |
| 7. Sequence Jumping | 5 | 7.352 |
| 8. Recycling | 8 | 11.76 |
| 9. Reformatting | 1 | 1.47 |
| 10. Reordering | 6 | 8.82 |
| TOTAL | 68 | 100 |

In self-correcting trouble sources in communication, there are ten (10) possible self - initiated repair strategies that can be utilized to repair the sources of disruptions of one’s utterances during a turn-taking interaction. Among this given ten strategies, these were being used as a theme in this study to determine the frequent strategies of English as a Second Language learners used when having trouble in communicating. There are a total of 68 instances found in the data.

In this section, the researcher will operationally discuss each theme individually, using the collected data of study from the participants. It was singly discussed based on the most frequent to least frequent occurrence of the theme in table 3. above.

Replacing. Among the ten self-initiated repair strategies, replacing is the most frequent strategy used by the learners to deal with the trouble sources when they notice a problem with their utterances. This is the process of replacing one element, either entirely or partially of the speech while maintaining the same meaning of utterance. Most of the answers of the participants are that they use replacing as their strategies to refine their message when dealing with the trouble sources. The collected data about using replacing strategy of the participants can be seen as follows:

P2: “If it is a sudden mistake I yeah I do, I replace I yeah I replace words ...”

P6: “When it's like.., I replace the difficult word with a simpler word. I replace simple words so that we can understand easily”

Replacing as strategies of the participants indicates that they used these to substitute their first utterances that makes it difficult to understand by whom they were speaking to into more simplified terms that can easily be understood so that the delay and disruption of the conversation will be lessened. Another participant also stated that she replaced the word into more detailed information where she deliberately explained what her utterances do exactly mean. See the data below:

P20: “there are times when I'm talking to my groupmates and then I use a word that was a little deep in what I wanted to share and I just end up explaining the word so they'll get my point.”

With the collected data from the interview, notice that the intention of the participants to use replacing as their strategy for communicating is that to make their ideas and utterances better understood and well-received by their listener. This outcome indicates that replacing is a helpful way for the learners to overcome the problem during their communication. According to Fox et al. (2009), it is possible that replacing as repair strategies can take place when there is an inappropriate word or mispronounced words that is being produced by the speaker. Additionally, Nemeth (2012) found out in his study that replacement repair implies that the first given utterance of a word is not satisfactory that is why speakers do replace words.

Searching. It was found in the data of the study that searching is the second most frequent strategy used in dealing with the trouble sources. Searching can also be called “word search” wherein it is a strategy used to assist the speaker by extending the duration of their time to find appropriate words in delivering their speech (Laakso, 2014 & Betti 2020). There are 10 participants who stated that they use searching to self-repair their utterances in their ongoing conversation. Their responses are as follows:

P3: “maybe it's for giving me time to think and then find the right words...through searching I'm giving time to myself to think and find the right words for my listener to understand”

P9: “ uhm..I will take such time to find the right word that can fit to my speech so that-thar it will be good to listen to and to make the flow of the speech will be good in conversation”

From the extracted responses of the participants above, it can be seen that these ESL learners refer to searching strategies in communication when they are trying to recall and find words when they are speaking. According to Schegloff et al.(1977) and Suryadi and Fatmawati (2020) a speaker engages in searching repair strategies to find the right words to convey their ideas during a conversation and they often take time to search for appropriate and more suitable terms containing a meaning.

Inserting. The third most frequent strategy used by the participants when they face trouble sources is called “Inserting”. This is a self-repair strategy used by the speaker whereby they will add new elements in their previous utterances. Among the 20 participants there are 8 participants stating that they are adding elements in their utterances to repair and generate complete statements. Some of the participants that used inserting as their strategy for their utterances are as follows:

P1: “Yes, just like in inserting, some in inserting makes the conversation flow smoothly because of the detailed facts that you are stating. Some just like what's your name and then you insert your family name and it makes the flow go smoothly and they will answer it more accurately.”

P13: “By adding or inserting a word that relates to that word I say so everybody will understand it”

The participant 1 above states that by utilizing inserting strategy the conversation can flow smoothly by the reason of adding and making a detailed statement so that the listener can understand and respond more accurately and appropriately on what is being uttered. Participant 13 also mentioned that he uses inserting strategy by adding words to what he has been uttered so that his listener will understand it. This indicates that ESL learners are using inserting as their repair strategy to supplement their utterances with the objective of being understood by their listener. This finding is supported by Wilkinson and Weatherall (2011) study, which discusses that the main objective of inserting elements in utterances is to make the listener understand what is being stated and insertions are usually used to supply the context of the discussion in order to help them to better comprehend the main point of the conversation.

Recycling. The third most frequent strategy along with **inserting** is recycling with the same findings of eighth (8) occurrence from the participants interview data. According to Fox et al. (1996), recycling is a self-initiation repair strategy that could also mean “repeating”. This happens when the speaker says the same words again from her previous utterances. Some of the extracted responses to show that participants engage in recycling strategy are as follows:

P2: “the recycling because I get misunderstood a lot, so I often like to repeat what I said a while back so that I can... I will deliver it in another way so that thought of what I wanted to get from the other party is will be delivered the way I wanted to”

P13: “Yeah when I'm, when someone I talk to is he or she doesn't understand what I'm saying I use to repeat some words.”

Participants 1 and 13 both stated that they often used to repeat their utterances from the previous one to ensure that they are being understood well by the listener. This repetition allows them to deliver the message more clearly to make their point be easily comprehended. Schegloff (2012) stated that recycling as a repair strategy could also be used by the speaker when the turn-in-interaction is influenced by the channel trouble sources wherein the receiver cannot hear and comprehend the stated information. By repeating the previous utterances, the speaker provides an opportunity for the listener to catch up on the missed or misunderstood message.

Deleting. Deleting is the fourth most frequent strategy found in the interview data. This is the process of repairing strategy wherein some elements from what have been uttered are being removed by the speaker which is not appropriate on the ongoing utterances. Here are some of responses from the collected interview data:

P1: “Yes, when I find some words that are unethical or somehow offensive, I remove those words from my speech.”

P2: “I find deleting words effectively making my speech more impactful.”

In this strategy, participants mentioned that they are removing some elements on their utterances that are not necessary to say. By dropping some unwanted words, they produce mid-sentence it helps them to clarify their intended meaning of their speech. Participants 2 also mentioned that he finds this strategy as effective when using deleting strategy in his utterances. Deleting elements from utterances can significantly impact the meaning and structure of the speech. According to Betti and AlFartoosy (2019), the speakers may delete what cannot be understood by the listener depending on a situational or psychological circumstances. This strategy not only helps reducing confusion but also simplifies communication for listeners to understand the intended message.

Parenthesizing. In conversation, speakers may encounter situations wherein they utilize repair strategies in the way of inserting additional information about what they have been uttered. This additional information that the speakers apply usually takes the form of a clause in which differs from the way **inserting** repair strategies do and the purpose of this is to give an elaboration on a certain topic of the conversation and to make it more informative. However, it is important to recognize that not all parentheticals are not always used in addressing an issue of trouble sources (Kusey, 2016). The following are the gathered responses from the data of interview:

P1: “I use them more often to give emphasis to a certain point especially in delivering my speech.”

P4: “I always repeat my words and adding some keys to give emphasize on the word I'm talking about or the topic I'm talking about”

P13: “I'm really, parenthesizing cause when there are mistakes or issues in conversation with someone, we need to make sure that both of us understand, what I say, so parenthesizing may have that.”

Participant 1 stated that he uses the strategy of parenthesizing in his speech to give emphasis on what he is making a point in delivering his message. In this situation, the speaker makes sure that the listener understands his speech. Along with Participant 4, he also mentioned that he does repeating words and adding some key points to give emphasis about the topic he is talking to. According to Kusey (2016), parenthesizing repair helps the speaker to minimize the potential misunderstanding that may be due to incomplete information and to provide more details throughout the discussion. This aligns with the participants' experiences, indicating that this helps learners to convey their message and to ensure that listeners do not miss the important information, thereby enhancing comprehension and retention. The responses from participants in the study shows that this strategy can be employed to improve clarity and reduce misunderstanding.

Reordering. Reordering is a self-repair strategy that is used to change the order or the sequence of the utterances. In this process, the speaker has the opportunity to arrange and organize what had been uttered to

make sure that idea comes together correctly. It is found that there are a total of six (6) occurrences of reordering from the data of the interview. Below are some of the collected responses from the participants.

P1: “It's like I'm paraphrasing it to better understand in simpler form or passage”.

P12: “Yes because sometimes I think that my grammatical structure is wrong, so I will just arrange it.”

P18: “I use to change my own grammar, my own structure of the sentence or the idea.”

Participants' responses reveal that reordering as self-repair strategy is a useful tool for managing communication difficulties. The first participant stated that he does like paraphrasing his own words which is like he means to make a restatement of his own utterance by stating differently and especially more clearly. This is similar to participant 12, as well mentioned that if she thinks that her grammar structure is incorrect, she does rearrange the order of her words. As stated by Schegloff (2013), the operation of reordering allows the speaker to re-arrange the order of elements of utterance to produce less organized speech. Same with participant 18, which further supports the effectiveness of reordering in communication, that she used to change the structure of her grammar. This indicates that the ESL learners are aware about their utterances in which they tried to perform the strategy of reordering when having a conversation in which enables them to restructure their utterances in real-time, facilitating communication that is more coherent and clear.

Sequence Jumping. The strategy of sequence-jumping is nearly similar to the approach of **aborting** in which involves abandoning one's utterances. Both strategies are being used when the speaker tends to have difficulty in expressing or completing its utterances. The only difference is that in sequence jumping, the speaker will abandon his utterances and abruptly change it into something different and unrelated to the prior statement of the speaker. By performing this kind of strategy, it allows the speaker to continue its utterances by immediately shifting the subject to a new sequence. This operation is apparent in the following statement:

P1: “I'm going to change the topic when it's not related to avoid some mistakes”

P7: “There are times when I'm saying something and when I suddenly remember something I was saying, I suddenly change the topic.

From the abovementioned statement, the operation of sequence-jumping allows the speaker to continue the progress of their conversation by changing or jumping from another topic. In the statement of participant 1, he seeks out on changing the topic of his utterance specifically when this becomes unrelated to thwart the mistakes that could lead to misunderstanding. It was mentioned by participant 7 that he suddenly changed the topic of his utterances when he remembered something in which jumps into another discussion. According to Betti & Mahdi (2021), he considers sequence-jumping as a powerful maneuvering technique in dealing with eliminating difficult situations in which the speaker is not fully capable of describing the current interactional determinations. This indicates that the speaker can avoid communication breakdown and keep the conversation going by switching topics in the situations where there is an immense amount of pressure or complexity involved in the conversation.

Abortng. Among the ten different operations of self-initiated repair strategies, it is found that aborting is the penultimate strategy used by the ESL learners. According to Schegloff (2013), reordering can fall into two ways depending on how the speaker executes this operation. Firstly, the speaker can be involved in abandoning or much like pausing on the ongoing utterances followed by another attempt to form to achieve the completion of the utterances. The second way is that the speaker performs a complete abandonment on the current utterances without the intention to complete the utterances. There are four (4) participants that consider aborting as one of their strategies they employ as self-repair. One of their responses can be seen below.

P1: “...when I realized that some of our topics are not... It shouldn't be being talked about, I change the conversation”

Participant 1 emphasized that when he recognizes that something shouldn't be talked about, he will abandon his utterances to change the topic. Schegloff (2013) appraises aborting as an operation where the speaker stops

the production of utterances and leaves it incomplete to start a new sequence. This ability to pause and redirect speech can be immensely valuable in keeping the conversation be relevant and acceptable, and helping to prevent misunderstandings and conflicts. This strategy indicates that by abandoning utterances and starting a new sequence can steer the conversation of the speaker and listener in to more manageable direction and maintain coherence of interaction.

Reformatting. The most least used self-initiated repair strategy among ESL learners is reformatting. Based on the findings of analysis, only one participant uses this type of self-repair operation. Reformatting is related to the grammatical. This self-initiated repair strategy allows the speaker of the trouble source to reverse the reformed utterance. This means that the speaker once reforms the speech, then reverses it and reforms it again into the previous form.

P2: “I will re-do or recreate my question to him in a way that it will be answered the way I wanted to be answered.”

By changing the format of a question can be considered as a reformatting strategy, this much like the statement of the participants 2 where he re-do or recreate his own question in manner of getting the intended answer. In reformatting, speakers may use WH-question and turn it into a YES/NO question and vice versa (Schegloff, 2013).

Overall, the study reveals that the most frequent self-initiated repair strategies employed by the learners of English as a Second Language is **replacing** which results in a total of fourteen (14) occurrences in the analysis of the interview data. Replacing involves substituting a word or phrase that is considered to be incorrect or inappropriate with a more suitable one, allowing for immediate correction of errors. This strategy is particularly helpful for ESL learners who may realize mid-sentence that a particular word or structure they have uttered does not accurately convey their intended meaning. By replacing it with a better word that is clear, learners can possibly rectify this immediately through refining their language elements choices on the spot and leading to clearer and more precise communication. This is an important operation in ensuring that the listener understands the intended message of the speaker without creating confusion. The findings of this study agree with the studies conducted by Emrani & Hooshmand (2019) and Betti (2021) which revealed that the learners mostly employed the operation of replacing in their communication in order to avoid possible grammatical error. These findings also correlate with the previous study of Awang et al. (2023), in which they found that replacing was the most common self-repair strategy, followed by inserting, aborting and deleting. The strategies that are least frequently used by the learners are parenthesizing, reordering, sequence-jumping, aborting and lastly, reformatting. These findings conform to the study of Nemeth (2012) and Sato (2016), whereas the mentioned least frequently used strategies are also the students least occurring strategies resulting in their study.

The Effectiveness of using Self-initiated Repair Strategies in Communication

Based on the participants' responses during the interview, learners show a positive perspective about the effectiveness of utilizing self-repair strategies in their communication. The collected interview data were being analyzed through the process of coding. According to participant 1, he emphasized that self-repair strategies help to maintain the flow of communication and support the audience's understanding. This reflects the idea that self-repair is more than just about correcting speech for accuracy but also about refining it to ensure the message is comprehended as intended. Along with the responses of participant 2, he points out the importance of self-repair in situations where nervousness or anxiety might lead to unclear or incomplete communication. The ability to recognize and correct these lapses mid-conversation helps speakers to ensure that their intended messages are conveyed correctly. Additionally, participant 17 states that by using self-repair strategies the learners are considered to overcome and can handle interactional situations by being aware with their speech production. Through identifying and correcting their errors, speakers become more mindful about their speaking habits, which can lead to improvement overtime. Moreover, other participants gave significant stress on utilizing repair strategies in which this helps prevent confusion by making an immediate correction of the speaker's utterances.

Furthermore, this shows that utilizing different self-initiated repair strategies in the communication process

serves as the evidence to consider that this produces effective communication. This assertion is supported by the result of the analysis from the conducted interviews that shows how the participants perceived their engagement with this operation. The study agrees with Shehadeh (2001) which examined the effects of self-repair with the adult L2 learners which showed that learners produce improvement and success rate on speech production after utilizing self-initiation.

CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATION

The concept of repair mechanism serves as an important learning opportunity for the learners. The irregularities that tend to occur are natural and expected in spontaneous conversation as this is part of the language-learning process. Based on the observations of the interviews, participants exhibited varied behaviors and levels of success when utilizing the self-initiated repair strategies. Some of the participants were able to use self-initiated repair strategies effectively and seamlessly. They corrected their speech without significant pauses, maintaining the flow of conversation. These participants appeared to be confident and showing a clear understanding of how to rectify their utterances. Participants who used repair strategies successfully during the interview often maintained good eye contact and spoke clearly. Their ability to self-correct seemed to enhance their overall communication and that shows an effective communication by making their speech more coherent and comprehensible.

On the other hand, some participants showed indications of anxiety and signs of nervousness while attempting to self-repair. This was evident through their lack of eye contact, fidgeting, and hesitation while speaking. Additionally, some participants experienced stuttering or long pauses when trying to correct themselves.

Despite the produced errors in speaking, learners' effective communication can still be achievable. Self-initiated repair strategies serve as an important approach in dealing with these challenges. By employing these strategies, speakers can correct their speech immediately to clarify their intentions and to maintain the coherence of the conversation. These repairs not only enhance the speaker's ability to communicate effectively but also help in managing the listener's understanding and engagement. The participants who consider employing these strategies as effective procedures display a greater positive change and success in interactional skill outcomes. Across the entire interview data, the researcher has seen significant positive responses from participants about effectiveness of utilizing self-initiated repair strategies on refinement of their speech production and it is an evident that learners have a positive perspective about the effectiveness of self-repair strategies in communication.

Based on the research findings, there are three recommendations that the researcher made for the study. The recommendation are as follows: The researcher suggests that students become more aware of their own speech and to the moment when errors occur. This awareness can help ESL learners to immediately recognize and identify their mistakes and instantly rectify it to reduce ambiguity and misunderstanding; by establishing an interest in communication repair, this can create an opportunity for ESL learners to practice language speaking skills and to actively identify areas that need improvement; and since the findings are only focused on analyzing the context of the responses from the learners' interview and due to limitations of the study, the researcher encourages future researchers to investigate the live performance of ESL learners in actual conversations to find an in-depth view and understanding about self-repair.

REFERENCES

1. Awang, S., Abdullah, N., Razak, SS., Wan Zakaria, W. N. F., Wan Hassan, W. N. F. (2023). Use of self-repair strategies in job interviews: role of CLT approach in L2 learning. *International Journal of Social Science Research* 5 (1), 185-196. <https://myjms.mohe.gov.my/index.php/ijssr/article/view/21717/11760>
2. Betti, M. J., & AlFartoosy, M. H. H. (2019). Ellipsis and reiteration in English and Arabic: A contrastive study. *English Language and Literature Studies*, 9(1), 93-105. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ells.v9n1p93>
3. Betti, M. J., & Mahdi, M. A. (2020). A conversation analysis of repair trouble sources, inadequacy and

- positions in the Iraqi University Viva discussions in English. *International Linguistics Research*, 3(4), 69-93. <https://doi.org/10.30560/ilr.v3n4p69>
4. Betti, M. J., & Mahdi, M. A. (2021). A conversation analysis of staff members' and researchers' repair strategies in the Iraqi University Viva discussions in English. *Education Language and Sociology Research*, 2(1), 14-56. <https://doi.org/10.22158/elsr.v2n1p14>
 5. Carroll, D. W. (2008). *Psychology of Language* (5th ed.). Wadsworth Publishing Company.
 6. Cho, E. H., & Larke, P. J. (2010). Repair Strategies Usage of Primary Elementary ESL students: Implications for ESL teachers. *TESL-EJ*, 14(3). <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ912070.pdf>
 7. Clark, H. H., & Clark, E. V. (1977). *Psychology and language: An introduction to Psycholinguistics*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt P. <https://doi.org/10.2307/412600>
 8. Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007). Discourse in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) classrooms. In *Language learning and language teaching*. <https://doi.org/10.1075/llt.20>
 9. Dayat, D. (2017). Analysis on English speaking performance: Exploring students' errors and the causes. *JETL (Journal of Education, Teaching, and Learning)*, 2(1), 71-74. <https://doi.org/10.26737/jetl.v2i1.149>
 10. Dell, G. S. (1986). A spreading-activation theory of retrieval in sentence production. *Psychological Review*, 93(3), 283-321. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.93.3.283>
 11. Emrani, F., & Hooshmand, M. (2019). A conversation analysis of Self-Initiated Self-Repair structures in advanced Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 13(1), 57-76. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED591531.pdf>
 12. Ester Maji, E., Samanhudi, U., & Mokoagouw, M. (2022). Students' difficulties in speaking English: (A case study in SMKN 3 Sorong). *SOSCIED*, 5(1), 95-109. <https://doi.org/10.32531/jsosced.v5i1.416>
 13. Fitriani, D. A., Apriliawati, R., & Wardah. (2015). A study on student's English speaking problems in speaking performance. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pembelajaran Untan*, 4(9), 215-252. <https://tinyurl.com/45d7z6ck>
 14. Florez, M. C. (1999). Improving adult English language learners' speaking skills. *National Clearinghouse for ESL Literacy Education* Washington DC. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED435204.pdf>
 15. Fox, B., Wouk, F., Hayashi, M., Fincke, S., Tao, L., Sorjonen, M., Laakso, M., & Hernandez, W. F. (2009). *A cross-linguistic investigation of the site of initiation in same-turn self-repair*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511635670.004>
 16. Fromkin, V. A. (1971). The non-anomalous nature of anomalous utterances. *Language*, 47(1), 27-52. <https://doi.org/10.2307/412187>
 17. Haniah, A. U., Sasongko, F. K., & Leve Fauziati, E. (2020). The use of repetition as self-repair of an EFL learner. *Language Circle*, 15(1), 104-111. <https://doi.org/10.15294/lc.v15i1.24469>
 18. Harmon, T. G., Dromey, C., Nelson, B., & Chapman, K. (2021). Effects of background noise on speech and language in young adults. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 64(4), 1104-1116. https://doi.org/10.1044/2020_jslhr-20-00376
 19. Kormos, J. (2000). The role of attention in monitoring second language speech production. *Language Learning*, 50(2), 343-384. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00120>
 20. Kusey, C. L. (2016). *Same-turn self-repair practices in peer-peer L2 conversational dyads*. The University of Texas Press. <https://doi.org/10.15781/t2cn6z28n>
 21. Laakso, M. (2014). Collaborative participation in aphasic word searching: comparison between significant others and speech and language therapists. *Aphasiology*, 29(3), 269-290. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02687038.2013.878450>
 22. Németh, Z. (2012). Recycling and replacement repairs as self-initiated same-turn self-repair strategies in Hungarian. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(14), 2022-2034. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.09.015>
 23. Németh, Z. (2017). 14. The interactional functions of four repair operations in Hungarian. *De Gruyter Mouton*, 279-310. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501505089-014>
 24. Nooteboom, S. G., & Quené, H. (2020). Repairing speech errors: Competition as a source of repairs. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 111, 104069. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2019.104069>
 25. Okoye, A. (2019). Other-Initiated Other-Repair: Repair organization while playing a Place-Based Augmented-Reality game. *PSU McNair Scholars Online Journal*, 13(1).

<https://doi.org/10.15760/mcnair.2019.13.1.6>

26. Patanasorn, C. (2010). Effects of procedural content and task repetition on accuracy and fluency in an EFL context. In ProQuest LLC eBooks. <https://eric.ed.gov/?q=https%3a&pg=2369&id=ED519953>
27. Pavlikova, K. (2019). Use of monologues, games and problem-solving activities for development of speaking skills. *Educational Role of Language Journal*, 2019–1(1), 83–92. <https://doi.org/10.36534/erlj.2019.01.08>
28. Prell, C. G. L., & Clavier, O. H. (2017). Effects of noise on speech recognition: Challenges for communication by service members. *Hearing Research*, 349, 76–89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2016.10.004>
29. Qian, T., & Jaeger, T. F. (2011). Topic Shift in efficient discourse production. *Cognitive Science*, 33(33). Retrieved from <https://escholarship.org/content/qt6b0712jg/qt6b0712jg.pdf?t=op2la6>
30. Rabab'ah, G. (2013). Strategies of repair in EFL learners' oral discourse. *English Language Teaching*, 6(6), 123-131. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n6p123>
31. Salonen, T., & Laakso, M. (2008). Self-repair of speech by four-year-old Finnish children. *Journal of Child Language*, 36(4), 855–882. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0305000908009240>
32. Sato, R. (2012). Self-initiated self-repair attempts by Japanese high school learners while speaking English. *Directory of Open Access Journals*. <https://doaj.org/article/81f05b78cd574b2f8c6b4664eb14eeb6>
33. Scarborough, R., & Zellou, G. (2013). Clarity in communication: “clear” speech authenticity and lexical neighborhood density effects in speech production and perception. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 134(5), 3793–3807. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.4824120>
34. Schegloff, E. (2000). When “others” initiate repair. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(2), 205–243. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/21.2.205>
35. Schegloff, E. A. (2013). Ten operations in self-initiated, same-turn repair. Cambridge University Press, 41–70. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511757464.002>
36. 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. <https://doi.org/10.2307/413107>
37. Shehadeh, A. (2001). Self- and other-initiated modified output during task-based interaction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(3), 433-457. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588030>
38. Siskin, H. J., & Nunan, D. (1990). Designing tasks for the communicative classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 74(1), 89-90. <https://doi.org/10.2307/327949>
39. Suryadi, A. I., & Fatmawati, L. (2020). Self-repair strategies in English conversations to teach English interaction skill. *EduLangue*, 3(2), 205–231. <https://doi.org/10.20414/edulangue.v3i2.2349>
40. Tilsen, Sam. (2012). Utterance preparation and stress clash: planning prosodic alternations. *Planning and Dynamics*, 119–156. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/284948185_Utterance_preparation_and_stress_clash_Planning_prosodic_alternations
41. Torkey, S. a. E. F. (2006). The effectiveness of a task-based instruction program in developing the English language speaking skills of secondary stage students. Ain Shams University. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED523922.pdf>
42. Wilkinson, S., & Weatherall, A. (2011). Insertion repair. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 44(1), 65–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2011.544136>
43. Wisrance, M. W. (2020). An analysis on the self-initiation self-repair strategies of the third semester students of English study program in the oral interaction with their lecturer at Widya Mandira Catholic University Kupang in academic. *International Journal of Research Granthaalayah*, 5(12), 311–317. <https://doi.org/10.29121/granthaalayah.v5.i12.2017.463>