

Conversation Analysis of Repair in EFL Classroom

Rifhani Handayani L

rifhanihandayani196@gmail.com

Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

Syarifuddin Dollah

syarifuddindollah@unm.ac.id

Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

Baso Jabu

basojabu@unm.ac.id

Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

Abstract

This research aims to: (1) describe the types of repair occurred during the conversation of the participants in the EFL classroom, (2) disclose the didactic repair occurred during the conversation in EFL classroom, and (3) examine the trouble source in the EFL classroom. This study applied descriptive qualitative method. The participants were the teacher and students at the XII Grade MIPA 1 of SMAN 1 Jeneponto. The research instruments employed in this research were observation and interview. Techniques of data collection were observation (e.g. recording and observational checklist), note-taking technique, and interview. The research findings showed three things. Initially, there were 41 repairs uttered by the participants in the EFL classroom which belonged to four types of repairs, i.e. self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other repair, other-initiated self-repair, and other initiated other repair. Other-initiated other repair was the most often appearing types of repair, i.e. 22 times. Besides, the didactic repairs were also discovered, including form-and-accuracy (13 times of occurrence), and meaning-and-fluency (16 times of occurrence). However, there were several repairs which were not categorized into any of context of the didactic repair. Therefore, the researcher put them into other items in order to make them well arranged. Next, the common problems appeared within the conversation between teacher and students (or student and student) were mostly about the problem of understanding, then, followed by the linguistics problem of the student, and the technical problem i.e. mishearing and non-hearing.

Keywords: *Conversation Analysis, Repair, EFL Classroom*

INTRODUCTION

As far as the human relationship is concerned, a conversation is the most basic things existed in all human social groups. This covers the many intentions of the participants who get involved in the process. The conversation arises when there is a mutual interaction between two or more participants either an interactional or a transactional conversation. The occurrence of conversation is such an unavoidable thing. This is an autonomous speech resulting in an unexpected 'broken' language since the language naturally comes out without any preparation in advance. In this case, during the conversation, it will bring out various kinds of unintentional

problems, including unclear diction, problems of hearing, problems of speaking, and problems of understanding.

In terms of examining one of the phenomena which arises in conversation, the researcher uses the conversation analysis approach, adopted from Schegloff, et al., (1987). It is a scientific theory that concerns the basis of social interaction between human focusing on spoken interaction. This term is firstly coined by Ervin Goffman, and then developed by the scholars Sack, Schegloff, and Jefferson. As stated by Have (2007) that this study enables to examine the phenomenon in depth existed in the conversation. This ordinary conversation potentially raises a chaotic and disorderly during the emergence of conversation.

Repair is defined as an act of dealing with problems during the occurrence of conversation among the participants. It describes how the participants overcome the problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding. The term of repair claimed by Yun (2005)'s point of view suggests that repair consists of two aspects; repaired segment and repairing segment. A repaired segment refers to the "trouble-source" i.e. the segment of emerging utterance that is repaired. Meanwhile, a repairing segment is a segment of utterance that repairs the "trouble source". Schegloff et al. classified repair into 2 types; self-initiated repair and other initiated repair. Each of these two types consists of three components, such as trouble source, repair initiator and repair completion.

Schegloff cited in Liddicoat (2007) have proposed a model of the mechanism for repair in conversation which establishes a distinction between whom initiates repair and who makes the repair. In combination, it allows four possibilities; first, self-initiated self-repair (SISR). It occurs when the speaker indicates a problem in the talk and resolves the problem. Second is self-initiated other-repair (SIOR). It occurs when the repairable item arises in the talk, but the recipient resolves the problem. Third, other-initiated self-repair (OISR). It occurs the recipient indicates a problem in the talk and the speaker resolves the problem. Fourth is other-initiated other-repair (OIOR). It occurs when the recipient indicates a repairable item in the talk and resolves the problem by himself.

The notion of repair underlying the pedagogical of repair refers to repair practices that address problems of comprehension and production in learning contexts. According to Nassaji (2015) cited in Betti (2020), the mechanism of repair has two substantial forms, i.e. the first form, conversation commonly aims to as a form of interaction. While, the second form, it is a didactic which purposes not simply as a form of interaction, but also as a form of a pedagogical nature. Therefore, didactic repair is a term used in examining a repair in classroom interaction. Seedhouse cited in Ellis (2011) distinguished repair into two main aspects. First, Form-and-accuracy context, refers to one in which the teachers focus on a students' production of a specific aspect of the target language being taught within the activity. In this context, it commonly concerns the formal correctness which is strongly related to linguistic forms, namely vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, etc. Second, Meaning and fluency, is defined when the teachers encourage students to produce talk in which the purposeful use of any specific item to convey meaningful content. This context focuses on the content of what is being communicated rather than the linguistic forms of language.

As quoted by Drew (1996), when a participant in the conversation is difficult to understand of the other party has said, difficult to hear what has been said, or figures that other party might have uttered inaccurate information, then it categorized as a trouble source in which an initiation should be carried out. Therefore, Svennevig (2008) elaborates the types of trouble sources in the

following section; First, problems of hearing, refers to the trouble of “hearing an utterance” clearly. This term indicates a problem of hearing when some signals are offered by the interlocutor either in the explicit way, such as (“what did you say?”), or implicitly, (e.g. “huh?”, “pardon?”, etc.) Second, problems of understanding, refers to the failure of comprehending the things being a talk in conversation. Third, Shen & Chiu (2019) have studied that the most linguistic problems in speaking are insufficient vocabulary, insufficient grammar, and inaccurate pronunciation. Therefore, the three problems affected in speaking are drawn as follows; first, vocabulary problem, refers to the speaker who is lack of vocabulary caused the intention of the idea to be conveyed is not well expressed. Second, is grammar problem. This becomes a problem when the speakers are inadequacy of grammar knowledge. EFL students, for instance, they difficult to arrange the correct sentences due to their deficiency. Third, pronunciation problem. A problem might appear when the speaker is difficult to pronounce word accurately affected the interlocutor who is hard to recognize the word being pronounced.

METHOD

A descriptive qualitative method was utilized to conduct this research. According to Cresswell in Williams’ point of view (2007), a descriptive qualitative research method aimed at describing, explaining, and interpreting the collected data. Besides, Bogdan and Biklen (1982) in Sugiyono (2017), the characteristics of this method were based on the collected data which were in the form of words, phrases, sentences, rather than in the form of a number. This research method was adequately suitable to be applied due to the purpose of this research is to identify, to classify, and to describe the content repair collected from selecting and transcribing the conversation between teachers and students, (or students and students).

The data of this research were in the form of utterances which contained repair phenomena uttered by participants in the EFL classroom at The XII Grade MIPA 1 of SMAN 1 Jeneponto. There were 35 participants who consisted of 34 students and 1 teacher. There were three meetings of conversation which were obtained as the collected data.

The instruments applied in this research were observation and interview. In Wilkinson & Birmingham’s point of view (2003), an observation instrument was used to seek accurate information occurred in the EFL classroom. It allowed the researcher to understand much more about the exact situation happened when a conversation took place. This research conducted observational checklists when teaching and learning process through virtual meeting of google meet was carried out. The purpose of applying an observational checklist was to acquire the data related to some aspects of repair, such as the person who initiated and repaired the trouble source, the kind of context that was repaired. Also, an interview instrument was applied to deepen the knowledge concerning to the trouble source in speaking faced by teachers and students. As stated by Cohen, et al (2007), this instrument was functioned as a means of gathering information directly related to research objectives.

In Johnson and Christensen (2014)’ points of view, there were several major methods of data collection. The methods applied in this research, as follows: First, observation. By screen recording teaching and learning process in EFL classroom, it allowed the researcher to gain the visual data. The researcher recorded the interaction between students and teacher (or student and student) in the EFL classroom at The XII Grade of SMAN 1 Jeneponto through virtual meeting of google meet. An observational checklist was also employed in collecting data. The purpose of

performing this segment was to be additional data information regarding the repair action accomplished by both teacher and students. Second, note-taking technique. After obtaining the screen video recording of the interaction between teacher and students (or students and students), the researcher transcribed all the utterances uttered by the participants in the EFL classroom. It was carried out to facilitate the researcher in understanding the conversation among teacher and students (or students and students). Third, interview. According to Johnson and Christensen (2014), this was used to obtain in-depth information about the participant's thoughts, reasoning, and feelings about the topic. Hence, there were 10 students which were selected randomly. This interview was carried out by utilizing what's up app platform.

As stated by Miles and Huberman (1994), in analyzing a qualitative data, there were three majors of stages, including data reduction, data display, and conclusion. Data reduction referred to the process of selecting the important items, in this case, choosing the utterances which contained a repair. Next, data display was the part in analyzing, explaining the chosen items. Then, conclusion was the last step of data analysis which showed the result of analysis. The analysis was accomplished in several following steps: (1) Transcribing; (2) Identifying; (3) Classifying; (4) analyzing.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The study showed that there were 41 occurrences of repair performed by the participants in the EFL classroom. The extracts were provided in the following passage:

1. Types of Repair

In relation to the findings, it was evidently stated that all types of repair proposed by Sack, Scheglof, and Jefferson were found in this research.

a. Self- Initiated Self- Repair (SISR)

The analysis of the utterances uttered by the teacher and student (or student and student) in regard to self-initiated self-repair type simply appeared a few times. It was highly considered since the emersion was simply 3 times during the three meetings of conversation.

Extract 3.

T : Two weeks ago.. or maybe some weeks ago.. we hear the news about this.

In the extract 3, the teacher (T) explained about the earthquake that happened in West Sulawesi. During her explanation, the teacher (T) found a difficult in determining the specific time when the earthquake occurred. When uttering "two weeks ago" the teacher had a pause. After that, the teacher then repeated the information by changing the specific time to "some weeks ago." The teacher repaired her previous utterance since she was not sure about her information.

The repair was classified as SISR. This was due to the teacher realized the problem in her talk and repaired the problem by herself.

b. Self- Initiated Other Repair (SIOR)

In line with self-initiated self-repair, the type of self-initiated other-repair also had a less frequency of occurrence. This type occurred 5 times during the conversation in the EFL classroom.

Extract 21.

T :Itu juga step nya tahapan specially in the.. what is.. yang di explanation text. Yang menceritakan proses itu biasanya kita menggunakan connector apa? Yang lalu..

[That is the step especially in the.. what is.. within the explanation text. It tells the process that we used as a connector. In the meeting before..]

S15 : sequence ma'am

T :ya.. urutan. Yang lalu sudah kita pelajari ya, ada connector of cause or reason.. yaa connector of sequence.

[Yeah, a sequence. We have studied that in the previous meeting. There is a connector of cause or reason.. connector of sequence.]

In the extract 21, the teacher explained about the characteristics of explanation text. When uttering “That is the step especially in the..” the teacher took a pause to think the next word that she would convey. However, the teacher found it difficult to continue the next word. The signal given by the teacher “what is..” was the indication that the teacher initiated the students to complete the next utterance. Another signal was given by saying some clues like “within the explanation text,” “It tells the process that we used as a connector,” “in the meeting before.” These signals were the indication that teacher asked the other participant to remind her the connector that was used in explanation text. After an initiation, the student (S15) then provided the answer of the things that the teacher forgot by stating “sequence ma’am.”

In relation to the situation happened within the conversation, this repair was determined as SIOR. The evidence was obviously found when the teacher as the speaker who produced the trouble source and initiated a repair for the other participants, then, the student (S15) was the one who accomplished the repair produce by the teacher.

c. Other- Initiated Self Repair (OISR)

In contrast with the prior two types of repair, other-initiated self-repair occurred quite often in this conversation. This type appeared 11 times in the conversation.

Extract 1.

S2: maybe it is about --tentang pengaruh sekitarnya bu.

[Maybe it is about –about the effect of his surroundings.]

T : Pengaruhnya kenapa?

[What is the effect?]

S2 : dipengaruhi oleh banyak hal bu, bisa karena teman-temannya, mungkin karena keluarganya, begitu bu.

[It is affected by many things ma’am, such as his friends or his family]

In the extract 1, as seen in the situation above, the student (S2) expressed his opinion about the cause of juvenile delinquency. However, the student (S2) did not explain more when he said “the effect of his surroundings”. Therefore, the teacher (T) asked him about what he meant by saying “What is the effect?”. After the teacher (T) provided an initiation for the student (S2) to repair the trouble source by giving more explanation about his first utterance. The student (S2) then repaired his first intention by conveying “It is affected by many things ma’am, such as his friends or his family.”

At this moment, it was categorized as OISR since the recipient (T) indicated a problem in the talk, and the speaker (S2) resolved the problem.

d. Other- Initiated Other Repair (OIOR)

As it was attached in the findings of this research, there were 22 times of occurrence used other-initiated other-repair. This was the highest frequency of occurrence during the conversation took place.

Extract 24.

S4 : tema.

[Theme]

T : ini adalah topik ya.

[this is a topic]

In the extract 24, the student (S4) answered the question of the particular example of topic by saying “Theme”. Unfortunately, the answer given was incorrect. Therefore, the teacher initiated and repaired the incorrect answer by providing the correct one “this is a topic”

By this repair action, this belonged to other-initiated other-repair. The teacher was the interlocutor who realized the problem and repaired the problem by herself at a time.

As a conclusion, it was highly stated that the implementation of the types of repair theory developed by Schegloff, Sack, and Jeffereson in different situation and context would lead a different kinds of the person who carried out initiation and completion of the trouble source. Some previous researches revealed that the type of self-initiated self-repair was the highest types during the occurrence of conversation. However, in this research findings, the type of other-initiated other repair was evidently the highest type. Since it was in the EFL classroom interaction, the teacher was imaged as the one who shared the knowledge to the students. While, the students were the one who obtained the knowledge from the teacher. As the results, this context demonstrated that the production of the trouble was highly possible produced by the students, while the teacher acted as the participant who indicated, initiated, and repaired the trouble source.

Further, it was claimed that by applying this theory in a different setting with a different level of participants, it showed a various kinds of results existed in the conversation. As some extracts of Liddicoat (2007) revealed the same level of the participants since the speaker and the interlocutor exchanged thoughts freely without any hesitance. The previous researches also represented the same level of participants which truly talked about the point of view of both speaker and interlocutor without displaying superior and inferior positions of the participants. As the opposite, this research showed a different level of participants. The teacher as in the

superior position that the students should listen to her carefully and insecurely. Meanwhile, the students were in the inferior position which understood that their knowledge, insight, experience about the topic being discussed were less than the teacher. Consequently, the students felt hesitant to convey their opinion clearly. Therefore, this condition was the reason of why the finding showed that other-initiated other-repair type appeared quite often than any other repair types.

2. Didactic Repair

In Seedhouse's theory, related to the repair initiation and completion in the conversation, the context taken place was divided into two contexts, including form-and-accuracy and meaning-and-fluency context. However, based on the findings, there were several situations of repair where the focus was not merely about in these two contexts. There was a situation when one of this contexts formed by the participants was distracted by other kinds of situation which did not belong to those two contexts. The interpretation was drawn as follows:

a. Form-and-Accuracy

In this context, it refers to the teacher in enriching students' formal correctness of the linguistics forms. There were some extracts which belonged to different kinds of linguistics form.

1). Vocabulary

The highest frequency of the occurrence of this context was in the vocabulary aspect.

Extract 35.

S15: untuk melihat.

T : jadi artinya look for itu mencari ya.

[The meaning of look for is "mencari."]

In the extract 35, the teacher asked the students about the meaning of "look for" in Bahasa. The student (S15) then answered by translating the literal meaning word by word "*untuk melihat.*" Since the answer was incorrect, the teacher then provided the correct answer by saying "the meaning of look for is "*mencari.*"

The context build in this situation was form-and-accuracy because the teacher focused in enriching the students' vocabulary especially in some phrases that could not be translated word by word.

2). Grammar

In the grammar aspect, it simply occurred 2 times during the three meetings of conversation.

Extract 17.

S28: contohnya. I feed two cat in my house.

[The example is I feed two cat in my house.]

T : berapa cat nya?

[How many cats?]

S28: dua bu.

- [Two ma'am.]
T : *Kalau bendanya lebih dari satu seharusnya pakai?*
[If the things are more than one, then it should be?]
S28: *oh iya bu. I feed two cats in my house.*
[Oh yeah ma'am. I feed two cats in my house.]
T : *Yeah, that's right*

In the extract 17, the student (S28) provided the example of simple present tense by saying “The example is I feed two cat in my house.” However, the example delivered by the student (S28) contained a grammar problem. Therefore, the teacher asked an initiation for the student (S28) to repair her utterance by asking “how many cats?” the student (S28) answered confidently by stating “two ma'am.” Another initiation provided by the teacher was carried out “if the things are more than one, then it should be?” After the teacher asked for the second, the student (S28) finally realized that there was an incorrect form in her sentence. The student (28) directly repaired her sentence by repeating the prior sentence in a correct form “I feed two cats in my house.”

The context was a form-and-accuracy context since the teacher, because the teacher focused the student's formal correctness, to be specific, grammatical problem.

3). Pronunciation

The last was the pronunciation aspect which existed in the extract 16, extract 19, extract 20, and extract 28.

Extract 20.

- S4* : *finally bu. Akhirnya.*
[Finally ma'am.]
T : *Finally* [ʼfɪn(ə)lɛ̃]. *bukan finally* [ʼfɪnɪli] *yah, tapi finally* [ʼfɪn(ə)lɛ̃].
Yeah, That's right. Anymore? Ada lagi?
[Finally [ʼfɪn(ə)lɛ̃]. It's not finally [ʼfɪnɪli], but finally [ʼfɪn(ə)lɛ̃]. Yeah, that's right. Anymore?]

In the extract 20, the teacher and students discussed about the sequence of words that functioned to connect the prior sentences to the next sentences. However, the problem appeared when the student (S4) pronounced the particular word incorrectly “Finally ma'am”. The student (S25) literally pronounced the word “finally” according to the written form. The teacher then fixed the way student (S4) pronounced by repeating and by emphasizing the word “finally.” Also, the teacher reconfirmed by saying “It's not finally [ʼfɪnɪli], but finally [ʼfɪn(ə)lɛ̃].” , the context build was a form-and-accuracy because the teacher concerned on the students' production of words.

b. Meaning-and-Fluency

In this context, it was defined as the teacher who focused on the students' in producing the meaningful content to what was being discussed. This context was the most often appearing context formed by the participants.

Extract 5.

S4 : *apa itu kerak bu?*

[What is crust ma'am?]

T : *apa katanya kerak who knows kerak?*

[She asked "what is crust"? who knows crust?]

S10: *lempengan.*

[Plaque.]

S15: *lapisan bumi.*

[The earth's layer.]

T : *bumi kita ini terdiri dari many layers. Lapisan-lapisan atau layer-layer ya.. have you studied geografi? belajar geografi ya?*

[Our earth consists of many layers. Have you studied geography?]

In the extract 5, the student (S4) gave a question to the teacher, she said "What is crust ma'am?" Instead of answering the student (S4)'s question directly, the teacher chose to repeat the same question and then asked the other students back by saying "She asked "what is crust"? who knows crust?". This action encouraged other students to get involved during the teaching and learning process. This question pushes other students to answer it. Yet, the student (S10) provide an incorrect answer "Plaque." The other student, i.e. student (S15), answered by uttering "The earth's layer." The student (S15) had repaired the student (10)'s answer. The indication that the answer was correct when the teacher confirmed by saying "Our earth consists of many layers." On the other hand, the context formed in this problem was a meaning-and-fluency context. It was obviously known when the teacher emboldened students to speak based on the topic being discussed.

3. Types of Trouble Source

According to Schegloff (1987), in the organization of talk-in-interaction, the participants might have to deal with the problem or trouble arisen in the talk, such as trouble in speaking, hearing, or understanding the talk. Therefore, Svennevig (2008) elaborates the types of trouble source in the following section:

a. Problem of Hearing

In the problem of hearing, the participants commonly provide a signals to the speaker in order to repeat the speaker previous utterance. Several extracts showed the troubles that was caused by the participants who were difficult to hear what has been said in the conversation. It happened 4 times during the occurrence of conversation

Extract 8.

S4 : *Perpindahan air bu.*

[The water movement ma'am.]

T : *what is Alfahira? Again? Bisa tambahkan?*

[What is Alfahira? Again? Can you add it?]

S4 : *kalau saya menurutku itu Bu. Tsunami itu terjadi karena kayak gangguan dari laut toh bu yang menyebabkan perpindahan air besar Bu.*

[In my opinion, Tsunami occurred because of the disturbance from the sea which caused a large water displacement.]

In the extract 8, the teacher gave a question to the students why tsunami could occur. After asking a question, some students expressed their thought. The student (S4) responded the question by “the water movement ma’am.” However, the teacher could not hear clearly the student utterance. It might be caused by the unstable network of the teacher computer that affected the emergence of conversation. The teacher then asked an initiation to the previous speaker for repeating her utterance by conveying “What is Alfahira? Again? Can you add it?” After an initiation carried out by the teacher, the student (S4) repeated the explanation in a different way by uttering “In my opinion, tsunami occurred because of the disturbance from the sea which caused a large water displacement” as a repair action.

The trouble source existed within this conversation was caused by the problem of hearing. The signal given by the teacher were such as “what” “again”. These were the indication of problem of hearing. It was also supported by the gestured of the teacher who put her ears to the source sound.

b. Problem of Understanding

This type of trouble was the highest problem that appeared within the conversation. The illustration of this trouble was demonstrated 16 times within the extract. The extracts covered the students’ obscurity in expressing their opinions, ideas, thought, etc. As a consequence, the teacher was the one who asked an initiation for the students to clarify and to explain much more about their previous particular statements.

Extract 27.

S15: kalau simile itu ma'am, kalau memperbandingkan.

[For simile types, it is comparison]

T : apa yang dibandingkan dalam simile?

[What is compared in simile?]

S15: kayak meja sama kursi..

[Like the table and the chair.]

T : can you give the example? Using English. How about others? Siapa yang mau tambahkan jawaban dari Putri tadi? Apa itu simile?

[Can you give the example? Using English. How about others? Who wants to add the answer of Putri? What is simile?]

S12: saya miss. Membandingkan dua objek yang tidak sama miss. Seperti kata like atau as (as)

[Me Miss. Comparing two contradictive objects. Such as like or as.]

In the extract 27, the teacher discussed about one of the types of figurative language. When the teacher asked “what is simile”, the student (S15) answered by saying “For simile types, it is comparison.” The student (S15)’ statement attracted the teacher to asked deeper about simile. This was due to the student (S15) who did not elaborate in detail the meaning of simile. Therefore, the teacher then initiated the student (S15) for repairing her utterance by conveying

“What is compared in simile?” however, the example provided by the student (S15) was incorrect. Therefore, in the next turn, the teacher once again asked an initiation for the student (S15) or other participant to fix the explanation. The student (S12) finally presented a clear explanation by saying “Comparing two contradictive object. Such as like or as.” A trouble source happened when the student (S15) was lack of comprehension related to the topic.

c. Problem of Speaking

In line with the problem of understanding, this trouble source occurred quite often during the conversation, i.e. 14 times. The reasons of the emergence of trouble existed were caused by some aspect of speaking. In this problem, the students dominantly resulted a trouble source. The problem was mostly by the students’ lack of lexical, and also followed by the students’ lack in grammatical, and their pronunciation knowledge. Therefore, this problem referred to the form-and accuracy issues.

Also, based on the statements opined by the students, there were 10 ten students who were asked randomly about their opinion towards speaking in EFL classroom. It was found that there were some kinds of difficulties faced by the students. The most problems were such as the lack of vocabulary, inability to distinguish in pronouncing the different word but the same pronunciation, not confident to speak, difficult to arrange the word grammatically. In relation to these problems especially related to the linguistics problem, most students were lack of vocabulary, lack of grammar, and inaccurate pronunciation. Similarly, there were several causes of the problems, including seldom using the words practically after memorizing that words, seldom learning grammar book, and seldom pronouncing the word regularly.

According to the students’ opinion about their speaking problem in the EFL classroom interaction, it was obviously related to the findings during the occurrence of conversation within the teaching and learning process. as seen in the extract, there were several extracts which contained the linguistics problem. they were included to the form-and-accuracy context, such vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation.

Extract 2

T : ya gempa bumi ya. Apa bahasa Inggrisnya gempa bumi? Who knows the English of gempa bumi?

[Yeah, earthquake. what is the English of “gempa bumi”? who knows the English of “Gempa Bumi”?]

S15 : Earth...

S2 : earthquake ma'am..

The illustration above showed that the student (S15) was unable in remembering the English of “gempa bumi.” It was indicated that the student (S15) was difficult to remember the particular word in English.

Next, the grammar problems were merely about the use of appropriate singular or plural verb. The illustration of grammar was presented as follows;

Extract 15

S31 : My big brother love to play game everyday.

T : love nya harus pakai (s) yah because subjectnya only one. Jadi seharusnya verbnya pakai loves.

[The verb love should use (s) because the subject is only one. So, the verb should be loves.]

The trouble source presented above was simply because of the student (S131) who did not use suitable verb based on the subject. Therefore, the teacher repaired the utterance by correcting the incorrect one.

The pronunciation problems consisted of five extracts, such as extract 16, extract 19, extract 20, extract 28, extract 40. The most problem was because of the inability students in pronouncing the particular word appropriately. The illustration was presented below;

Extract 19

S25: the first bu

T : The first. that's right.

The trouble source illustrated above was caused by the student (S25) who pronounced the word “first” incorrectly. The student (S25) pronounced it as the written form of the word. Therefore, the teacher fixed the student (S25)’s pronunciation by repeating the same words with an emphasis.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the research finding and discussion of the types of repair, didactic repair, and the trouble source in the conversation between teacher and student (or student and student) in the EFL classroom. Three items are drawn as follows;

Firstly, concerning the first objective of the study, that is, to describe the types of repair, all four types of repair exist within the conversation of the participants in the EFL classroom. They are self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other repair, other-initiated self-repair, other-initiated other repair.

During the occurrence of the conversation in the EFL classroom, other-initiated other repair is the most often appearing types of repair i.e. 22 times. The use of this type is quietly normal since the participant, i.e. the teacher commonly finds out incorrect information/ answers uttered by the speaker (students) and make sure that the interpretation of the speaker’s utterance (students) is correct. Also, the teacher is the one who fully realizes the repairable item produced by the students.

In contrast with other initiated other repair, self-initiated other repair and self-initiated self-repair are the most rarely occurring types of repair. They have simply occurred in 5 times and 3 times. In self-initiated self-repair, it is the lowest number of the occurrence within the conversation. It happens when the speaker realizes the trouble that will be produced in the utterance. Meanwhile, self-initiated other repair occurs when the speaker experiences a loss of words and immediately need assistance from the interlocutor.

Unlike those three types of repair that have significant occurrences, the other types, that is, other initiated self-repair also has a small number i.e. 11 times. This type occurs when there is an unclear utterance or the failure of the interlocutor to hear the utterance.

Secondly, the second objective of the study is to disclose the didactic repair presented by the speakers in the EFL classroom interaction. The didactic repairs proposed by Seedhouse emerge in this research. However, several repairable items are not included in any of two prior contexts. As a result, the researcher put them into the “other” category.

In reference to the findings, these two didactic repair and “other” repair have a various number of occurrences. In a meaning-and-fluency, it is the highest number of occurrence, that is, 16 times when the trouble source appears. This means that the teacher mostly focuses on the students’ comprehension of the topic being talk rather than the linguistics forms of the student. Followed by the form-and-accuracy context, this didactic repair occurs 14 times which indicate the teacher also concerns about the formal correctness of the students associated with linguistics forms, such as vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation. Then, the lowest number is inserted into the “other” category because when the context form-and-accuracy or meaning-and-fluency take place, the focus is not merely about them, some situations are mixed up, like the form-and-accuracy with the affection of problem of hearing, etc.

Thirdly, following the third objective of the study which is to examine the common reasons of the emersion of trouble source in the EFL classroom. Several problems existed within the conversation in the EFL classroom, including, the problem of hearing, the problem of speaking, and the problem of understanding.

The occurrence of conversation produces several sources of trouble. The most occurring trouble source is in understanding the topic being talk about. It is highly remarkable because the participants mostly construct the topic to achieve the same comprehension between the participants that are, teacher and students (or student and student). The lowest trouble that occurred within the conversation is the mishearing problem faced by the participants. While, the other problem is caused by the lack of participants to understand, pronounce, and arrange the particular words, phrases, or sentences in a correct form.

According to the result of the research, the researcher puts several suggestions to the following parties; firstly, it is highly suggested that the next researcher focuses on conversation analysis more deeply especially in EFL classroom interaction since there is huge things waited in conversation to be investigated. Comprehending the conversation analysis will assist the researcher to fully understand the phenomena within the conversation in various kind of setting. Secondly, since applying a repair theory in the EFL classroom results in different findings from the previous research, it may become another focus of the next researcher to analyze a conversation in depth especially about the effect of different level of participants in doing a conversation.

Thirdly, related to the research question number three about the problem faced by the participants, it is suggested that the teacher should fully speak English in elaborating a particular topic to familiarize the students with listening and pronouncing words in English. Fourthly, it is proved that the teacher carried out much initiations and completions of repairing the students’ trouble in conversation in order to overcome the obscurity of the students in conveying their thoughts. Bringing on a good chemistry between teacher and students is necessary to create the comfort and courage of the students in expressing their opinions, ideas, answers, freely and unquestionably, so that the teacher no longer need to carry out an initiation for the students to clarify their intention.

Besides, this research has found limitations when conducting this research. In the process of data collection, the researcher did not inform the teacher in advance about teaching the students by using English language dominantly. As a consequence, the data of conversation between teacher and students are dominated by their mother tongue i.e. Bahasa Indonesia rather than English language.

REFERENCES

- Adam, M A A. 2016. *The Role of Vocabulary Learning Strategies in Promoting EFL Learners' Performance*. Sudan: Sudan University of Science & Technology.
- Barbara, B Fox, et al. 2012. *Conversation Analysis and Repair Organization: Overview*. The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Betti, M J., & Mahdy 2020. *A Conversation Analysis of Repair Trouble Sources, Inadequacy and Positions In The Iraqi University Viva Discussions In English*. International Linguistics Research – November 2020.
- Chen, M., & Chiu, T. 2019. *EFL Learners' English Speaking Difficulties and Strategy Use*. Education and Linguistics Research Vol 5, No.2. Macrothink Institute.
- Cohen, L, Manion, L, Morrison, K. 2007. *Research Methods in Education*. (6th ed.) London & New York: Routledge.
- Cook, G. 1989. *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cutting, J. 2002. *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book For Students*. Kentucky: Routledge.
- Drew, P. 1996. 'Open' Class Repair Initiators in Response to Sequential Sources of Troubles in Conversation.
- Dubberly, H, and Pangaro, P. 2009. *What Is Conversation? How Can Wedesign For Effective Conversation? Reprinted from Interactions, "On Modeling Forum," 16(4), July/August*. Al.
- Ellis, R. 2011. *Language Teaching Research and Language Pedagogy*: Wiley Publishers.
- Fitriani, D A, et al. 2015. *A Study on Student's English Speaking Problems in Speaking Performance*. Pontianak: Tanjungpura University
- Have, P t. 2007. *Doing Conversation Analysis: A Practical Guide*. London: Sage Publication Ltd.
- Heriansyah, H. 2012. *Speaking Problems Faced by the English Department Students of Syiah Kuala University*. *Lingua Didactika*, Vol. 6.
- Hidayah, Nur. 2015. *An Analysis of Repair on Utterances in The Conversation of The Magic of Belle Isle Movie Manuscript*. Thesis. Surakarta: Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.
- Hornby, A.S. 1995. *Oxford: Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hutby, I, and Wooffitt, R. 1998. *Conversation Analysis: Principles, Practices, and Implications*. Malden: Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

- Huwari, I F. 2019. Problems Faced by Jordanian Undergraduate Students in Speaking English. Vol. 8. International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change.
- Johnson, R B, and Christensen, L. 2014. Educational Research: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Approaches 5th Edition. USA: Sage Publications.inc.
- Lai, YT. 2018. Repairs in The Interaction Between Teacher and Student of A One-To-One Mandarin Chinese As A Foreign Language Class. Master Thesis. Barcelona: Pompeu Fabra University.
- Levinson, S. C. 1983. Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liddicoat, A. J. 2007. An Introduction to Conversation Analysis. London: Athenaem Press Ltd.
- Lind, C., et al. 2009. Conversation Analysis of Repair in Interaction with Adults who Have Acquired HI. Hearing Care for Adults. XVI. Flinders University
- Merriam, George and Charles M. 2018. Merriam Webster. Springfield: MerriamWebster, Inc. Offline Dictionary.
- Mey, J. L. 2001. Pragmatics: An Introduction. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Miles, M B, and Huberman, A M. 1994. An Expanded Sourcebook: Qualitative Data Analysis Second Edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Nguyen, Ht and Kasper, G. 2009. Talk-in-interaction: Multilingual Perspectives. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Paltridge, B. 2006. Discourse Analysis: An Introduction. London: University of London.
- Psathas, G. 1995. Conversation Analysis: The Study of Talk-in-Interaction. Thousands Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Rahman, H., Sakkir, G., & Khalik, S. (2020). Audio-Lingual Method to Improve Students's Speaking Skill at Smp Negeri 1 Baranti. *La Ogi: English Language Journal*, 6(1), 15-21.
- Rheisa, N S. 2014. Conversation Analysis of Repair in The Oprah Winfrey Show: A special episode with Michael Jackson. Thesis. Yogyakarta: Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
- Rui, K and Su, T. 2014. An Analysis of Conversation Structure in Ellen Show. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 9, II, p. 37-42. CS Canada.
- Saputra, U. R., Maulina, M., Nasrullah, R., & Sakkir, G. (2021). Students' Sentence Errors on WhatsApp Daily Status: A Literature Review. *Celebes Journal of Language Studies*, 23-31.
- Saputri, D. Y. 2015. A Conversational Analysis of Repair in Ellen DeGeneres Show Season 11. Thesis. Yogyakarta: Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
- Schegloff, E. A., 1987. Analyzing Single Episodes of Interaction: An Exercise in Conversation Analysis. In *Social Psychology Quarterly*, Vol 50, No. 2, 101-114.
- Schegloff, E. A., et al.. 1977. The Preference For Self-Correction In The Organization Of Repair In Conversation. *Language*. 53. II. p. 361-382. Los Angeles: University Of California.

- Sugiyono. 2017. *Metode Penelitian: Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Susan E. Brennan 2010. *Conversation and dialogue*. Encyclopedia of the Mind: SAGE Publications.
- Svennevig, J. 2008. *Trying The Easiest Solution First in Other-initiation of Repair*. Journal of Pragmatics. 40. p. 333-348. North Holland.
- Tang, C. 2011. "Self-Repair Devices in Classroom Monologue Discourse" *Concetric: Studies in Linguistics*, 4, XXXVII, p. 93-120. Taipei: National Science Council.
- Van Lier, L. 1998. *The Classroom and The Language Learner: Applied Linguistics and Language study*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman Inc.
- Wilkinson, D, & Birmingham, P. 2003. *Using Research Instruments: A guide for Researchers*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Williams, C. 2007. *Research Methods*. Journal of Business Economics Research, Volume 5, Number 3. Phoenix: Grand Canyon University.
- Yang, W-H. 2005. *Applying Conversation Analysis (Ca) To Uncover The Dynamic Trajectories Of Repairs In The Context Of Primary School Efl Classrooms In China*. Annual Review of Education, Communication and Language Sciences, Volume 2.
- Yun, W. 2005. *A Study on The Organization of Repair in Mandarin Chinese Conversation*. Thesis. Ma Liu Shui: The Chinese University of Hong Kong.