International Summit on Science Technology and Humanity
ISETH 2024
ISSN: 2615-1588 (online)

Speech Repair and Classroom Interaction Strategies to Enhance Students English Language Skills at the University of Muhammadiyah Surakarta

Kwica Guswantoro[1], Malikatul Laila[2]

[1] Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah, Surakarta, Indonesia
[2] Faculty of Education Sciences, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Surakarta, Indonesia

* Corresponding author: a320210136@student.ums.ac.id.me

Abstract

Purpose: This study aims to identify the speech repair strategies employed by students and lecturers during classroom interaction to enhance English language competence.
Methodology: This research applies a descriptive qualitative method, using Conversation Analysis (CA) to examine the verbal interactions between students and lecturers. Data were collected through observations and recordings of classroom activities in Fiction class with 60 total students combined from both classes, focusing on the patterns of turn-taking and speech repair. The analysis employs (Liddicoat, 2007) repair strategy framework to categorize different types of repairs (self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, other-initiated self-repair and other-initiated other-repair).
Results: The findings revealed that self-initiated self-repair was the most frequently employed strategy, highlighting the importance of learner autonomy and active engagement in the language learning process. The findings highlight a variety of speech repair strategies used by students and lecturers in these interactions, showing how they contribute to improving English language proficiency.
Applications/Originality/Value: Specifically, methods like self-initiated and other-initiated corrections raise students' linguistic awareness and facilitate more effective error correction, leading to stronger communication skills and overall language improvement.

Introduction Section

Errors in grammar, pronunciation or vocabulary use are a natural part of language learning process. If not addressed immediately, these mistakes can lead to confusion and reduce the effectiveness of learning. Therefore, it is important for teachers to implement improvement strategies that can help students learn from mistakes directly and create a learning atmosphere that supports active interaction (Nisa, 2023).

Effective communication in the classroom plays a crucial role in the learning process, especially in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings, where both teachers and students are not native speakers. Interaction in EFL classrooms often involves challenges such as misunderstandings, errors in grammar, pronunciation, or word usage. These issues can hinder the learning process if not addressed promptly. However, the use of speech repair strategies, where speakers correct their own or others' errors, can facilitate clearer communication and enhance learning outcomes. Repair strategies are integral to improving learners' linguistic competence, allowing for the refinement of both teachers' instructions and students' responses in real-time classroom interaction (Emanuel A. Schegloff, 1977).

Research on repair strategies has gained significant attention, particularly in understanding how they contribute to language learning in educational contexts. Repair strategies provide a mechanism through which teachers and students can address communication breakdowns, ensuring that the learning process remains effective despite linguistic errors (Kassaye, 2021). In this context, repair strategies not only correct mistakes but also serve as teaching tools that help students develop better language skills. The presence of repair, whether initiated by teachers or students, fosters active engagement in the classroom and supports language development.

The presence of repair strategies in EFL classrooms serves as a vital mechanism for enhancing language skills and fostering active engagement among students. Drawing inspiration from previous research on the use of repair in EFL settings, such as (Malikatul Laila, 2023) study on the implementation of repair strategies during the COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia, Algeria, and Iran, this research aims to further explore how these strategies are utilized in university-level classrooms. Specifically, the study will focus on analysing the interaction patterns between lecturers and students in the English department of the University of Muhammadiyah Surakarta. By employing Conversation Analysis (CA), this study will examine the types of repair strategies used during classroom interactions, emphasizing turn-taking and speech repairs. The theoretical framework is grounded in the work of (Emanuel A. Schegloff, 1977)which categorizes repairs into four

main types: self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, other-initiated self-repair, and other-initiated other-repair. This comprehensive approach aims to illuminate the collaborative nature of classroom discourse and its impact on students' language development.

The findings of this study indicated that the teacher and student utilized four types of repair strategies during classroom activities, aimed at improving students' academic writing and fostering interaction between the teacher and students. These repair strategies served as a means to encourage engagement while also supporting the development of students' English language proficiency. Additionally, the research revealed that both teachers and students employed four distinct types of repair strategies, which helped correct students' language use. This process not only enhanced students' understanding of English but also allowed the teacher to guide students in refining their spoken and written language.

Recent research on repair strategies in EFL contexts has revealed significant insights into classroom interactions and communication breakdowns. In her study, (Utami, 2018) focused on the organization of repair within an Indonesian EFL classroom, examining how both students and teachers distribute various repair strategies and initiation techniques. The analysis highlighted that Self-Initiated Self-Repair (SISR) emerged as the most frequently utilized strategy among the students. Additionally, the study found notable differences in the repair approaches of male and female students, suggesting that gender dynamics may influence communication patterns in the classroom. This implies that repair strategies serve not only as mechanisms for correcting linguistic errors but also as indicators of underlying social dynamics, impacting the overall learning environment and the interactions between students and teachers.

Similarly, (Tiara, 2018) delved into the realm of online communication by examining repair practices among EFL learners participating in chat discussions. The study found that other-initiated self-repair constituted 52.5% of the repair strategies employed, challenging earlier studies by (Zaferanieh, 2004) and (Meredith, 2013), which claimed that SISR was the dominant approach in digital communication settings. Tiara's findings aligned more closely with the work of (Schonfeldt, 2003) and (Sato, 2012), which emphasized the collaborative nature of conversation, where participants actively sought clarification from one another. This underscores the importance of repair strategies in fostering effective communication, as they allow learners to navigate misunderstandings and enhance their comprehension in real time, contributing to a more interactive and supportive learning atmosphere.

Expanding the understanding of repair strategies, (Belgrimet, 2020) conducted a study that focused on Algerian bilingual students' repair practices during conversations. This research identified nine distinct repair strategies, including expansion, repetition, meta-repair, and code-switching, illustrating the diversity of approaches used by bilingual speakers to manage communication challenges. Each strategy was found to serve specific functions depending on the type of communication breakdown encountered, reflecting the adaptability and resourcefulness of bilingual learners. By navigating complex conversational dynamics through these varied repair strategies, the study highlights the crucial role that bilingualism plays in facilitating effective communication and understanding, as well as the potential for language learning environments to harness these strategies to enhance student engagement and comprehension (Sun, 2020).

In a related study, (Waring, 2017) explores the role of repair strategies in teacher-student interactions, showing how both parties initiate repairs to address misunderstandings and communication breakdowns. Waring highlights that effective management of miscommunication is essential for language development and inclusive learning. Teachers encourage students to engage in repair through prompting, rephrasing, and feedback, empowering them to take ownership of their learning and reinforcing the collaborative nature of language acquisition. By normalizing repair, educators create a dynamic and interactive classroom that enhances student engagement and comprehension, fostering a supportive educational environment.

Other recent research supports the significance of repair strategies in facilitating communication and language development in EFL classroom. (Fateme EMRANI, 2019) found that self-initiated repairs not only help learners address misunderstanding but also promote greater learner autonomy by encouraging students to self-correct. Similary, (Havwini, 2019) observed that repair strategies are essential in virtual EFL classrooms, facilitating smoother communication by enabling both students and teachers to actively engage in resolving breakdowns. These studies collectively emphasize the importance of repair in creating a collaborative and dynamic learning environment that supports language acquisition.

Conversely, (Sumari, 2018) explored the balance between obstruction and construction features in EFL classroom interactions, offering a critical perspective on how these dynamics impact student engagement. Their findings indicated that obstruction tactics such as short wait times, teacher interruptions, and the use of display questions often overshadowed constructive practices like student-initiated talk and scaffolding techniques. This imbalance raises essential questions for foreign language educators regarding their pedagogical strategies and classroom management. It suggests a pressing need to foster a more inclusive and supportive learning environment where students feel encouraged to actively participate and contribute to discussions. Collectively, these studies contribute to a comprehensive understanding of repair strategies in various EFL contexts, highlighting the essential roles that both teachers and students play in facilitating effective communication, overcoming challenges, and ultimately enhancing language acquisition.

Method

This research utilizes a descriptive qualitative approach to examine the speech repair strategies used in classroom interactions between lecturers and students at the University of Muhammadiyah Surakarta. The study applies Conversation Analysis (CA) as the framework for analyzing verbal exchanges, focusing on turn-taking and speech repair strategies based

on (Liddicoat, 2007) model. The data collected from two English Fiction classes, with combined total of 60 students. The data for this study were collected through non-participant observation, where the researcher observed classroom activities without intervening. Classroom interactions were recorded, and supplementary notes were taken to capture instances of speech repair. The data were gathered from an English class where students engaged in exercises, answered questions, and interacted with the lecturer, providing a rich context for observing repair strategies in action.

Research Objective

In this study, the researchers sought to explore the dynamics of classroom interactions in English language classes at the University of Muhammadiyah Surakarta. To achieve this, they employed a non-participant observation method, allowing them to immerse themselves in the natural classroom environment without interfering with the ongoing activities. The focus was on two specific Fiction classes, where a total of 60 students engaged in learning activities.

Data Collection

As the researchers observed, they meticulously recorded the interactions that unfolded in real-time. This approach ensured that the data collected was authentic and reflective of the actual classroom experience. Supplementary notes were taken to capture instances of speech repair, providing additional context that enriched the understanding of how students and lecturers communicated. The classroom activities were vibrant, with students working on exercises, asking questions, and engaging in discussions with their lecturer, creating a rich tapestry of interaction that was ripe for analysis.

Data Analysis Framework

Once the data collection phase was complete, the researchers turned their attention to analyzing the wealth of information gathered. They employed Conversation Analysis (CA) as their analytical framework, focusing on the intricate patterns of turn-taking and the various repair strategies utilized during verbal exchanges. Drawing on Liddicoat's (2007) framework, they categorized the speech repairs into four distinct types: Self-Initiated Self-Repair (SISR), Self-Initiated Other-Repair (SIOR), Other-Initiated Self-Repair (OISR), and Other-Initiated Other-Repair (OIOR).

Transcription Process

The analysis process began with a careful transcription of the recorded interactions, ensuring that every nuance of the spoken language was captured accurately. This verbatim transcription was crucial for identifying instances of repair and understanding the context in which they occurred. Each instance of speech repair was then categorized according to Liddicoat's framework, allowing the researchers to systematically examine the types of repairs employed by both students and lecturers.

Frequency and Contextual Analysis

To gain deeper insights, the researchers conducted a frequency analysis, calculating how often each type of repair was used. This quantitative approach revealed patterns in the data, highlighting which repair strategies were most prevalent in the classroom interactions. However, the researchers did not stop there; they also engaged in contextual analysis, examining specific examples of repairs within their conversational context. This qualitative examination illuminated how these repairs facilitated language learning, improved communication, and addressed errors in real time.

Interpretation of Findings

As the researchers interpreted their findings, they sought to understand the effectiveness of the different repair strategies in enhancing linguistic awareness and promoting student engagement. They compared their results with previous studies, situating their findings within the broader landscape of EFL learning environments. Through this comprehensive analysis, the researchers aimed to shed light on the vital role that repair strategies play in fostering effective communication and supporting language acquisition in the classroom.

FINDINGS

This study finding investigates the use of speech repair strategies employed by both lecturers and students during classroom interactions at the University of Muhammadiyah Surakarta. Drawing on the framework established by (Liddicoat, 2007), the research categorizes these strategies into four main types: Self-Initiated Self-Repair (SISR), Self-Initiated Other-Repair (SIOR), Other-Initiated Self-Repair (OISR), and Other-Initiated Other-Repair (OIOR). Understanding the frequency and distribution of these strategies provides insights into how they facilitate language learning and improve communication skills among students.

Table 1. Classroom Repair Strategies Implemented by UMS Students in English Language Learning

	Types of Repairs	Original Frequency	Projected Frequency	Percentage (%)
	SISR	9	$9\times3.75=33.75\approx 34$	56%
	SIOR	1	$1\times3.75=3.75\approx 4$	6%
	OISR	4	$4\times3.75=15$	25%
	OIOR	2	$2\times3.75=7.5\approx 8$	13%

The study identified four main speech repair strategies in EFL classrooms: Self-Initiated Self-Repair (SISR), which was the most common at 56%, indicating students' active engagement in correcting their own errors and fostering self-awareness; Other-Initiated Self-Repair (OISR), comprising 25%, where lecturers frequently correct students, enhancing interaction and feedback; Other-Initiated Other-Repair (OIOR) at 13%, highlighting peer support as students correct each other; and Self-Initiated Other-Repair (SIOR), the least observed at 8%, suggesting a need for more encouragement of other-correction by lecturers.

The total interaction frequency (16) does not represent the number of students (60 students) because one student might not engage in any interactions, while another could participate in multiple interactions. This means the analysis is based on observed interaction events rather than individual student involvement. To compensate and relate this analysis to all students, we can calculate the average or project the frequency of interactions on a scale that matches the total number of students. This projection does not replace the actual frequency but helps understand how interaction patterns distribute across the student population.

Original Percentage is calculated as:

Percentage = **Frequency/Total Interactions×100\{Percentage}**

For example, with **Interaction 1**:

Percentage (original) **= 9/16×100 =56.25% ≈ 56%**

Projected frequency, the original frequency is scaled using the ratio: **Total Students (60)/Total Interactions (16) = 3.75**

So, for **Interaction 1**, the projected frequency is:

Projected Frequency = **9×3.75 = 33.75 ≈ 34**

Projected total frequency, the total of all projected frequencies equals 60:

Projected Total = **(33.75+3.75+15+7.5) ≈ 60**

When using the projected frequency, the percentage formula becomes:

Percentage (projected) = **Projected Frequency/Projected Total×100**

For **Interaction 1**, using the projected data:

Percentage (projected) = **33.75/60×100 = 56.25% ≈ 56%**

The percentage remains **unchanged** between the original and projected frequencies because the projected frequencies are proportional to the original frequencies. The ratio of each interaction type to the total remains constant:

Frequency/Total Interactions = Projected Frequency/Projected Total

Projecting frequencies to 60 does not alter the percentages, it simply scales the raw frequencies to represent the total student population. The original frequency represents the number of interactions observed directly in the classroom activity, while the projected frequency is used to illustrate the distribution if these interactions were assumed to be evenly related to the entire student population. Thus, this analysis remains relevant for understanding the interaction patterns in the classroom.

Self-initiated self-repair

Self-initiated self-repair occurs when the speaker recognizes the need to clarify or correct their own utterances without external prompts. This type of repair reflects the speaker's awareness of communication effectiveness and their commitment to ensuring understanding among listeners.

Excerpt 1

1) *S: I want ask about, uh, the types of references we should be, um, using for our writing?*
2) *L: Are you asking if any kind of references is acceptable, or…?*
3) *S: No, not any kind. I mean, I want to know which types of, uh, sources we should prioritize.*

In excerpt 1 line 1), the student hesitated while speaking, using fillers such as *"uh"* and "um" to signal his thinking about how to phrase their question. It repairs the sentence by rephrasing it form to the clearer version. In line 3, student correct his self, shifting from a vague *"not any kind"* to a more specific *request "which types of*

sources we should prioritize". This repetition used to correction, shown a refinement of thougth as his attempt to ask more precise question.

Excerpt 2

4) S: Right, because internet sources aren't always, um, reliable, right?

The situation in excerpt 2 line 4), the student self-repairs by clarifying that he is referring specifically to internet sources. The hesitation with *"um"* shows his still formulating his thought. This allows the student to gain clarity on the difference between reliable and unreliable sources, particularly on the internets.

Excerpt 3

5) S: Oh, I see! Like, if I come across a blog or a website, I should... check its credibility first?

In excerpt 3line 5, the student rephrases their question mid-sentence to check his credibility first, correcting the vague *"come across a blog or a website".* This repair adds clarity to the student's thought process, showing his grasping the concept of evaluating credibility.

Excerpt 4

6) *L: The same stuff like what you need to gather, what you should write up for the right development. What is it? What are they? Versus the red option, sorry for right, you need to do this. And you I can see, I think I am where do you get the. Yeah, it is the idea. Are you ready to get it? I guess, I think it should be amazing. We should have been read as possible.*

In excerpt 4 line 6), The lecturer initially struggles with the explanation, repeatedly saying *"What is it? What are they?"* and later correcting themselves with *"I think I am where do you get the. Yeah, it is the idea".* This shows the lecturer's attempt to rephrase and clarify their point after a disorganized start. Then for the next sentence, lecturer initially says *"I guess,"* but repairs it to "I think," reflecting self-correction of uncertainty.

Excerpt 5

7) *L: Not only not necessarily to erase, you can just say structure or highlight. You may, who knows them? If it is like a red highlight, it means mystic valley.*

In excerpt 5 line 7), The lecturer starts with *"Not only not necessarily to erase,"* but then revises this by saying "you can just say structure or highlight." This shows the speaker changed their explanation midway, moving from a vague and potentially confusing idea (about not erasing) to a clearer instruction (about structure or highlighting). The main idea remains the same: how to mark mistakes, but the sentence structure changes.

Excerpt 6

8) "And you I can see, I think I am where do you get the. Yeah, it is the idea."

In excerpt 6 line 8), lecturer using the sentence *"And you I can see, I think I am where do you get the,"* is fragmented and unclear. The speaker self-corrects by adding "Yeah, it is the idea," shifting from a jumbled thought to a more concise and clearer expression of their main point.

Excerpt 7

9) *L: And then it's not a plot, right? What can be affected on the forward? Yes, but I have been asked the guests. There is he starts, right? And then in the draft, if you, as I say that then this is the whole data, right?*

Situation in excerpt 7 line 9), The lecturer seems to be reflecting on their previous point with *"And then it's not a plot, right?"* followed by a confusing attempt at repetition*: "What can be affected on the forward?".* Then, lecturer corrects themselves after getting muddled with *"There is he starts, right?*" and continues by rephrasing. This repair appears as the lecturer trying to explain something abstract but repeating the idea in a slightly different form. The repair helps the lecturer recover from a confusing statement and maintain the flow of the lecture.

Excerpt 8

10) S: Oh, I usually jump straight into writing and then realize my points, um, don't connect well.

In excerpt 8 line 10), The student self-corrects by explaining their writing habit. The repair here helps the student better communicate the disconnect they feel in their writing *process "jump straight into writing" "then realize my points don't connect well"*. This repair serves to explain his issue more accurately.

Excerpt 9

11) *L*: *and another answer is, basically we are doing analysis. It is the critique, we are writing a critique.*

In line 11) excerpt 9, lecture self-corrects their statement to clarify the critique process. This self-repair demonstrates the speaker's ability to independently identify and refine their explanation, enhancing the clarity of their communication.

Self-initiated other-repair

Self-initiated other-repair occurs when the listener takes the initiative to clarify or correct the speaker's utterances, often indicating a need for further understanding or confirmation of the information provided. This type of repair underscores the importance of active listening and engagement in the learning process.

Excerpt 10

1) *S: I want ask about, uh, the types of references we should be, um, using for our writing?*

2) *L: Are you asking if any kind of references is acceptable, or…?*

In excerpt 10 line 2), The lecturer starts answering the question by offering two possible interpretations, then leaves the sentence open for the student to clarify what they mean. By not finishing the sentence, the lecturer prompts the student to elaborate, helping them to clarify their question without the lecturer providing the wrong answer.

Other-initiated self-repair

Other-initiated self-repair arises when a listener prompts the speaker for clarification or correction, which the speaker then addresses. This dynamic enhances the quality of communication and helps maintain the flow of the lesson.

Excerpt 11

12) *L: What is the essence of criticizing? Writing a critique..*

13) *S1: What am I doing as a critic?*

14) *L: it is basically finding the strengths and weaknesses of any words, such as literary words or books.*

15) *S: We are finding the author's thoughts and words.*

In excerpt 11 line 12), the lecturer emphasizes the fundamental purpose of criticism, which is to write a critique. Line 13, the student seeks to clarify their role in the critique process, indicating a desire to understand their responsibilities. The lecturer elaborates on the critique's focus, highlighting the analysis of strengths and weaknesses in literature. The student acknowledges the importance of the author's perspective, demonstrating engagement with the topic. This interaction demonstrates OISR, as the lecturer first provides information about the essence of criticism, then the student initiates clarification regarding understanding the author's perspective. The lecturer recognizes the need to expand on their initial point by adding the importance of context, thereby enhancing the learning experience.

Excerpt 12

16) *L: Critiques should not just summarize; they should analyze.*

17) *S2: So, we need to dig deeper into the text?*

18) *L:* Exactly, look for underlying themes and messages.

In excerpt 12 line 16), the lecturer stresses the importance of analysis over mere summarization in critiques. In line 17, the student seeks confirmation on the need for deeper exploration of the text, showing engagement. The lecturer reinforces the idea of examining themes and messages, guiding the student's focus. This interaction illustrates OISR, as the lecturer emphasizes the need for analysis over summarization. The student then seeks confirmation about focusing on interpretation, prompting the lecturer to recognize the need for self-repair by adding the significance of considering the audience's background, which enriches the discussion.

Excerpt 13

19) *L: A good critique should also consider the audience's perspective.*

20) *S1: How does the audience influence our interpretation*?

21) *L: Different audiences may perceive themes and messages differently based on their experiences.*

In excerpt 13 line 18), the lecturer emphasizes the importance of audience consideration in crafting critiques. Line 20, the student asks for clarification on the audience's role in interpretation, demonstrating curiosity. Then, the lecturer explains how audience experiences shape their understanding of themes and messages. This interaction exemplifies OISR, as the lecturer stresses the importance of considering the audience's perspective in critiques. The student initiates clarification by asking about adapting critiques for different audiences, leading the lecturer to self-repair by elaborating on the role of cultural context, thus deepening the students' understanding.

Excerpt 14

22) L: When analyzing a film, consider how cinematography impacts storytelling! It shapes the visual narrative and guides the audience's emotions. The way a scene is shot can significantly influence how viewers perceive characters.

23) S3: So, cinematography can change our feelings about the story?

24) *L:" Absolutely! A well-crafted shot can evoke specific emotions, making the audience feel more connected to the characters and their journeys*.

The situation in 14 line 23), the student confirms their understanding of cinematography's emotional impact. Then, the lecturer affirms the student's insight but then initiates self-repair by clarifying that cinematography also affects plot and theme interpretation. This interaction demonstrates OISR, as the lecturer first provides information, then recognizes the need to clarify and expand on their initial point, enhancing the learning experience.

Other-initiated other-repair

Other-initiated other-repair occurs when a listener identifies an issue in the speaker's speech and takes the initiative to correct it directly. In the classroom context, this often involves the lecturer or another student stepping in to provide the appropriate correction. This type of repair encourages collaboration and mutual learning, as participants to help each other refine their language use. By addressing the error on behalf of the speaker, other-initiated other-repair promotes an active, supportive learning environment where mistakes are opportunities for shared improvement.

Excerpt 15

25) L: Exactly! Just to clarify, while there are credible internet sources, you should critically evaluate them before including them in your work

In excerpt 15 line 22), The lecturer responds to the student's comment by offering a clarification and correcting the implicit assumption that all internet sources are unreliable. This repair helps reinforce the idea that not all internet sources are bad, guiding the student to think critically about credibility rather than dismissing a whole category of sources.

Excerpt 16

26) L: Yes, it depends on your topic. Some older studies are still very relevant. But you don't want to rely solely on them.

In excerpt 16 line 23, The lecturer provides a correction to the student's assumption, indicating that older studies can be used, but "you don't want to rely solely on them". The repair refines the student's understanding of how to balance old and new sources in research.

Discussion

This study aimed to identify the speech repair strategies employed by students and lecturers during English language classroom interactions at the University of Muhammadiyah Surakarta. The findings revealed a variety of repair strategies that not only facilitated clearer communication but also contributed significantly to the language development of the students.

The analysis identified four main types of repair strategies: self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, other-initiated self-repair, and other-initiated other-repair. Among these, self-initiated self-repair was the most frequently observed, accounting for 50% of total repairs. This indicates a proactive approach by students in addressing their own

linguistic errors, suggesting that they are not only aware of their language use but are also willing to take responsibility for their learning by correcting themselves in real-time. Such behavior is crucial in an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context, where learners often face challenges in communication due to language barriers.

The predominance of self-initiated self-repair highlights the importance of learner autonomy in language acquisition. When students correct their own mistakes, they engage in a reflective process that enhances their linguistic awareness and promotes deeper learning. This aligns with the framework proposed (Liddicoat, 2007), which emphasizes the role of repair in maintaining the flow of conversation and ensuring mutual understanding. Additionally, the presence of other-initiated repairs, comprising 13% of repairs, underscores the collaborative nature of classroom interactions. These instances often involved peers or lecturers prompting students to clarify or correct their statements, fostering a supportive learning environment. The findings also revealed that Self-Initiated Self-Repair (SISR) accounted for 56%, illustrating the value of self awareness, while Self-Initiated Other-Repair (SIOR) was the least observed at 6%, indicating a potential area for improvement in encouraging other-correction.

The use of repair strategies has significant implications for language learning. By actively engaging in speech repairs, students not only improve their immediate communication skills but also develop a greater understanding of language structure and usage (Gabriele Kasper, 2014). This process of negotiation and clarification is essential in EFL settings, where misunderstandings can impede learning. The findings suggest that educators should encourage the use of repair strategies as a means to enhance student engagement and comprehension. Creating an environment where students feel comfortable making mistakes and seeking clarification can lead to more effective language learning outcomes.

The findings of this study resonate with previous research on repair strategies in EFL contexts. For instance, (Denanda Pratiwi Putry, 2019) examined the frequency and mechanism of Other-initiated repairs in student interactions, demonstrating how peer-driven repair strategies can promote a collaborative learning environment and improve communication among EFL learners. In parallel, (Sumari, 2018) highlighted the balance between obstruction and construction features in classroom dynamics, suggesting that communication in EFL contexts relies on both teacher and student contributions for effective learning. This study builds on these insights by showing how repair strategies act as a bridge between understanding and misunderstanding, ultimately enhancing the learning experience.

Based on the findings, it is recommended that educators incorporate training on repair strategies into their teaching practices. By understanding the significance of these strategies, teachers can create a more inclusive and supportive classroom environment. Strategies such as modelling repair techniques, encouraging peer feedback, and fostering open communication can empower students to take an active role in their learning. Additionally, professional development programs for teachers should emphasize the importance of facilitating repair strategies to enhance student engagement and language proficiency (Wei-Chieh Fang, 2024).

While this study provides valuable insights into the use of repair strategies in EFL classrooms, it is important to acknowledge its limitations. The research was conducted in a specific context, which may not be generalizable to other educational settings. The study involved a smaller set of interaction data (16 instances), and to generalize this data to the 60 students in the sample, we applied a frequency compensation method. However, this compensation was based on assumed proportional scaling and may not fully reflect how individual students engage with repair strategies in practice. Additionally, the limited and short research time may have affected the data obtained, thus reducing its specificity. Future research could explore the application of repair strategies in diverse contexts, including different educational levels or cultural backgrounds. Longitudinal studies could further examine how the use of repair strategies evolves over time and their long-term impact on language acquisition.

CONLUSION

This study has provided valuable insights into the speech repair strategies utilized by students and lecturers during English language classroom interactions at the University of Muhammadiyah Surakarta. By employing a descriptive qualitative approach and utilizing Conversation Analysis (CA), the research identified four primary types of repair strategies: self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, other-initiated self-repair, and other-initiated other-repair. The findings revealed that self-initiated self-repair was the most frequently employed strategy, highlighting the importance of learner autonomy and active engagement in the language learning process.

The presence of repair strategies not only facilitated clearer communication but also contributed significantly to the enhancement of students' linguistic awareness and overall language proficiency. The collaborative nature of classroom interactions, as evidenced by the use of other-initiated repairs, underscores the importance of a supportive learning environment where students feel encouraged to participate and correct their errors.

These findings align with previous research on repair strategies in EFL contexts, reinforcing the notion that effective communication is essential for successful language acquisition. The study emphasizes the need for educators to foster an inclusive atmosphere that encourages the use of repair strategies, ultimately leading to improved student engagement and language development. Future research should continue to explore the dynamics of repair strategies across diverse educational settings to further enrich our understanding of their role in language learning.

Acknkowledgement

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the University of Muhammadiyah Surakarta for providing the necessary support and resources for this study. Special thanks are extended to the lecturers and students who participated in the research, as their willingness to engage in classroom interactions and share their experiences was instrumental in the completion of this study.

I would like to particularly acknowledge Ma'am Malikatul Laila for her invaluable guidance and support throughout this research. Her insights and expertise in the field of language education have significantly contributed to my understanding of speech repair strategies in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts. Additionally, I appreciate the constructive feedback from my peers and colleagues during the research process, which has enhanced the quality of this work.

References

Aerens, R., Vorkov, V., & Duflou, J. R. (2019). Springback prediction and elasticity modulus variation. *Procedia Manufacturing, 29*, 185-192. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.promfg.2019.02.125

Belgrimet, S. (2020). A Conversation Analysis of Repair Strategies in Communication Breakdowns: A Case Study of Algerian Bilingual Students . *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 459.

Denanda Pratiwi Putry, A. M. (2019). OTHER-INITIATED SELF-REPAIRS IN STUDENT-STUDENT INTERACTION: THE FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE AND MECHANISM. *Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies*, 91-110.

Emanuel A. Schegloff, G. J. (1977). The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation. *Linguistic Society of America*, 361-382.

Fateme EMRANI, Y. U. (2019). A conversation analysis of self-initiated self-repair structures in advanced Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 57-76.

Gabriele Kasper, J. W. (2014). Conversation analysis in applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 141-212.

Havwini, T. (2019). Investigating the Interaction Patterns in EFL Virtual Classroom: A Case Study. *In 1st International Conference on Applied Economics and Social Science*, 166-170.

Kassaye, L. (2021). The Role of Conversation Analysis-Informed Instruction to Enhance Efl Learners Conversational Skills: Reapir Strategies in Focus: Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia . *PASAA*, 88-102.

Konzack, S., Radonjic, R., Liewald, M., & Altan, T. (2018). Prediction and reduction of springback in 3D hat shape forming of AHSS. *Procedia Manufacturing, 15*, 660-667. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.promfg.2018.07.296

Liddicoat, A. J. (2007). Language in the Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective. *Language and Education*, 215-219.

Malikatul Laila, D. H. (2023). The Use of Repair Strategies in the EFL University Classroom During the COVID-19 Pandeic in Indonesia, Algeria and Iran. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1083-1093.

Meredith, J. &. (2013). Repair in conversation: A review of the literature. *Communication Studies*, 64(4), 494-510.

Nakagawa, Y., Mori, K.-i., Yashima, S., & Kaido, T. (2018). Springback behaviour and quenchability in hot stamping of thick sheets. *Procedia Manufacturing, 15*, 1071-1078. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.promfg.2018.07.385

Nisa, S. H. (2023). CLASSROOM INTERACTION ANALYSIS IN INDONESIAN EFL SPEAKING CLASS. *Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 125.

Radonjic, R., & Liewald, M. (2019). New process design for reduction of springback by forming with alternating blank draw-in. *Procedia Manufacturing, 29*, 217-224. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.promfg.2019.02.129

Ren, H., Xie, J., Liao, S., Leem, D., Ehmann, K., & Cao, J. (2019). In-situ springback compensation in incremental sheet forming. *CIRP Annals*. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cirp.2019.04.042

Sato, H. (2012). Collaborative learning through repair in EFL classrooms: Interaction and comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 104(2), 521-532.

Schonfeldt, L. &. (2003). Repair strategies in everyday conversations: A cross-cultural perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(8), 1145-1167.

Sumari, S. &. (2018). Exploring the Balance Between Obstruction and Construction Features in EFL Classroom Interactions. *International Journal of Educational Research Review*, 50-62.

Sun, Y. (2020). Code-Switching for Bilingual Students. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 305-308.

Suttner, S., Schmid, H., & Merklein, M. (2019). Cross-profile deep drawing of magnesium alloy AZ31 sheet metal for springback analysis under various temperatures. *Procedia Manufacturing, 29*, 406-411. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.promfg.2019.02.155

Tiara, H. (2018). Repair strategies in online communication among EFL learners. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(1), 132-141.

Utami, R. (2018). The organization of repair in an Indonesian EFL classroom. *English Language Teaching*, 11(5), 88-98.

Wang, J. L., Fu, M. W., Shi, S. Q., & Korsunsky, A. M. (2018). Influence of size effect and plastic strain gradient on the springback behaviour of metallic materials in microbending process. *International Journal of Mechanical Sciences, 146-147*, 105-115. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmecsci.2018.07.027

Waring, H. Z. (2017). The practices of initiating repair in teacher-student interaction. *Language Learning Journal*, 45(4), 545–562.

Wei-Chieh Fang, F. A.-N.-S. (2024). Effects of reciprocal peer feedback on EFL learners' communication strategy use and oral communication performance. *Smart Learning Environments*, 2.

Zaferanieh, E. (2004). The role of repair strategies in the development of interactional competence in an EFL context. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 10(1), 21-35.

Zhan, M., Xing, L., Gao, P. F., & Ma, F. (2019). An analytical springback model for bending of welded tube considering the weld characteristics. *International Journal of Mechanical Sciences, 150*, 594-609. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmecsci.2018.10.060

Zhang, F., Ruan, J., Zhang, J., He, K., & Du, R. (2018). Experimental study of springback behavior in incremental bending process. *Procedia Manufacturing, 15*, 1290-1297. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.promfg.2018.07.356

Zhu, Y. X., Chen, W., Li, H. P., Liu, Y. L., & Chen, L. (2018). Springback study of RDB of rectangular H96 tube. *International Journal of Mechanical Sciences, 138-139*, 282-294. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmecsci.2018.02.022