

Repair Strategies in Online Chat: A Conversation Analysis

Ari Tiara
English Language and Literature
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
aritiara12@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The study aims to: (1) investigate the types of repair strategies, (2) identify the techniques of repair initiation, and (3) discover the possible purposes of particular types of repair that are employed by the participants in a group chat namely *Calterone 33*. A group's chat room which consists of 32 participants was chosen to explore the repair strategies. The dialogues contain repair were analysed by using Schegloff, Sacks, and Jefferson's theory (1977) and Finegan's theory (2008). The results of the present study reveal that the participants in *Calterone 33* used all types of repair strategies in which other-initiated self-repair appears as the most frequently occurs (52.5%). It was affected by the topic selection from the participants with different knowledge which triggered the recipient to initiate a repair. Three techniques of repair from Finegan (2008) were found in group's chat room, with an asking question technique as the most applied. It was used as the participants urge the explanation of the trouble source from the current speaker. Another technique was discovered in the chat, namely giving possible understanding. Repair strategies were used in online chat for some functions such as to get a further explanation, to clarify a thing, and to rectify the mistyping in the utterance. This study contradicts Zaferanieh (2004) and Meredith and Stokoe (2013) for its claim that SISR appears as the most applied in online chat; nevertheless, it supports Schonfeldt and Golato (2003), Sato (2012), Kendrick's (2015) study about the use of SISR and other-initiation in conversation. Those findings indicate that the participants in *Calterone 33* tend to initiate repair from others' mistakes which affected by different understanding of the topic. They use other-initiation in order to get an explanation of the trouble source.

Keywords: *conversation analysis, repair strategy, online chat*

INTRODUCTION

Conversation is a basic activity that every human needs to support their lives and to maintain social relations between people. Nowadays, with the advance of technology and the existence of the Internet network, people can communicate not only through face-to-face interaction, but also via online chat platform. It is possible for such interlocutors to have a conversation with the support of IT, while still maintains the basic characteristic of conversation for instance turn-taking, feedback, interruption, and repair (Condon & Cech, 1996 as cited in Zaferanieh 2004).

Generally, in a conversation, its participants interact and exchange information to convey their intention, whether in spoken or written language. In making a conversation, it is possible for speakers to make a mistake in delivering their message. Furthermore, misunderstanding can also happen between the participants of conversation. Hence, the speaker or the hearer has to restate or rectify the error to make the information

understandable. This phenomenon is known as repair.

The term 'repair' is defined as a tool used in conversation to correct an error made by the speaker, and to check whether the participant of conversation understand the intention of the conversation or not (Schegloff, Sacks & Jefferson, 1977). It is used when participants feel the need to adjust something in interlocutors' statement in order to maintain the conversation. To analyse repair phenomenon in conversation, conversation analysis can be carried out. Paltridge (2006) considers conversation analysis as an approach to see the way people manage their everyday conversational interaction hence the main purpose of the utterance can be understood by its participants.

According to Schegloff et al. (1977), there are two main types of repair strategies: self-repair and other-repair. However, they add that repair can be initiated and resolved by different person; it can be done by the speaker or the recipient. The one who initiates repair is not necessarily the one who complete the repair. Thus,

there are four types of repair strategies, namely self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, other-initiated other-repair, and other-initiated other-repair. Sometimes, the speakers do not realize that they have made a mistake. As a result, the recipient should give a signal to inform as well to initiate the repair of the previous statement. There are some techniques can be used to initiate repair (Schegloff et al., 1977), for instance asking questions and repeat the trouble source.

The troubles that appear in conversation can disrupt the flow of conversation. Therefore, it is important for interlocutors to master the strategies and techniques of repair to maintain the conversation. The ability to keep the conversation in a good term is not only needed in spoken interaction, but also in written interaction, such as in text-based communication.

Text-based communication is referred to as computer-mediated communication such as online based instant messaging (IM) or 'chatting' and email (Perry, 2010). These forms of interaction are considered to be

ordinary conversation because there is an exchange of thought and word while not necessarily in talk (Zaferanieh, 2004). Condon and Cech (1996) as cited in Zaferanieh (2004) also assert that in that kind of interaction, the crucial features in conversation analysis such as turn-taking and repair can be found too. Regardless the similar basic characteristic of online chat with mundane conversation, it still has some differences. Hence, by using theory of repair strategies from Schegloff et al. (1977) and technique of repair initiation from Finegan (2008), this study was conducted to investigate the repair in written conversation. In addition, this study also investigated the possible purpose of particular types of repair strategies.

Majority of the previous studies analyse repair strategies in different fields of conversation. For example, Seong (2006) and Tang (2011) who examine the classroom interaction; Ohtake, Yanagihara, Nakaya, Takahashi, Sato and Tanaka (2005) and Ohtake, Wehmeyer, Nakaya, Takahashi, and Yanagihara (2011) with the study of repair

strategies used by students with autism; Wongkhat (2012) who analysed repair in radio hosting; Rheisa (2014) and Rahayu (2014) who analysed talk show as the object of analysis; Dincer and Erbas (2010) who investigated repair behaviour used by nonverbal student with developmental disabilities; and Sato (2012) and Al-Harashah (2015) with their study of repair to language learners.

Analysing the use of repair strategies in those fields of conversation is important to be done as the way to understand how people manage their interaction. Nevertheless, investigating repair in written conversation is equally important to explore whether or not repair strategies can be applied properly in written conversation. But, most of the previous studies in repair strategies focus on spoken interaction; meanwhile studies of repair strategies on written interaction field have rarely been conducted (Schonfeldt & Golato, 2003; Zaferanieh, 2004; and Meredith & Stokoe 2014).

Additionally, the study of repair in written conversation has not

extensively been conducted in Indonesia. Therefore, to fill this gap, the presents study aims to analyse the types of repair strategies and repair techniques used by the participants of conversation in online. It also examines the possible purposes that trigger the use of each type of repair. Specifically, the study is conducted to answer the following research question:

1. What types of repair strategies are used in group's chat rooms?
2. What techniques are used by the participants to initiate repair?
3. What are the possible purposes of particular types of repair strategies?

METHODOLOGY

Participants

In doing this study, one group of conversation on WhatsApp application was selected to be observed in terms of the types of repair strategies and the techniques of repair initiation. This group was selected because I am actually one of

the group administrators, so it eases the process of the data selection.

The group's name is *Calterone 33*; it is a group of former students of computer network engineering (TKJ) in a vocational high school in Ciamis period 2013/2014. The group consisted of nine female students and 22 male students along with one teacher. It was created on 2016 in order to assist the graduates to communicate each other. In this group, the graduates are able to talk and discuss any kind of things from the daily activities, occupation, lecture, vacation, until marriage.

The age range of the participants of the group was 21 until 23 years old with one older participant in her thirties. The group is usually active once there are some occasions to be done.

Regardless of the number of the participants in that group, when the group is making a conversation, only some of them participate in every talk. During the conversation, the flow of the talk is not continuously well arranged. There are some moments when the participants

have to repeat the statement in order to make it understandable. In addition, the participants ask for clarification when they found it questionable. Thus, from this group, the 41 occurrences of repair were found to be investigated.

Procedures

The conversation in the group's chat room was observed to explore the repair occurrence. The screenshot of the dialogues were also taken to ease the analysis process. After all the data were collected, the dialogues that contain repair process from the group chats were transcribed before it moves forward to the analysis.

There were four steps involved in this study. First, the data were identified and classified based on the types of repair strategies from Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks. (1977). There are four types of repair strategies proposed by Schegloff et al. (1977): self-initiated self-repair (SISR), self-initiated other-repair (SIOR), other-initiated self-repair (OISR), and other-initiated other-repair (OIOR).

Second, in terms of the techniques of repair initiation, the data were examined by using Finegan’s (2008) techniques of repairs. There are four types of technique of repair initiation, for example asking question and repeat the part of the utterance. Through this step, the researcher can point out which technique that was used by the participant in initiating repair.

Following this, the types of repair strategies and the techniques of initiation used in the group were categorized. The next step was considering the possible purposes of each type by observing the topic and the techniques of repair initiation, and discussing them according to Finegan’s (2008) theory of repair initiation. Finally, after the types of repair strategies, the techniques of repair initiation, and the possible purposes were found, the researcher drew a conclusion with regard to the result of the analysis.

FINDINGS

Question 1

Among the 38 occurrences of repair in Calterone 33, there are 20

occurrences of other-initiated and self-repair, followed by self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair and the last is other-initiated other-repair. The overall findings are presented below. The overall findings of types of repair strategies in Calterone 33 are presented below.

Table 1

The Types of Repair Strategies in Calterone 33

Types of Repair Strategies in Calterone 33			
N	Repair Strategies	Frequency	Percentage
1	OISR	20	52.6%
2	OIOR	2	5.3%
3	SISR	9	23.7%
4	SIOR	7	18.4%
Total		38	100%

The Table 1 shows the types of repair strategies that are used by the participant in *Calterone 33* during the conversation. Through the table above, it can be seen that the participants use all the types of repair strategies. It shows that other-initiated

self-repair appears as the type which most frequently occurs with 20 occurrences (52.6%). It is followed by self-initiated self-repair (23.7%), self-initiated other-repair (18.4%), and other-initiated other-repair (5.3%) respectively. The explanations of each type of repair strategies in *Calterone 33* are presented as follow.

Other-Initiated Other-Repair

Schegloff et al. (1977) explain that other-initiated and self-repair refers to the situation in which the initiation of repair is given by the recipient, while the repair is completed by the speaker. It occurs as the recipient does not get the point of the conversation that is delivered by the speaker and need some explanations. In this study, there are 20 occurrences of this type of repair strategies. The example can be seen as follow:

Excerpt 1

Jun : Din dimana? dieu ulin ka
kosan urg

*Where are you, Din? Come to my
boarding house*

Udin : (share location)

Jun : Jauh di Cinunuk mah. Urg
kost di **tegalega**

*Cinunuk is far from here. I rent a
room in Tegalega*

Udin : → gawe naon di
tegalega?

What are you doing there?

Jun : **urg keur KP din**

I am doing my KP

In this excerpt, Jun wants to know where Udin is and asks him to visit his place. But, after getting a response and knowing that Udin is far from his place, Jun tells Udin that he is in Tegalega. However, since Udin knows that Jun is supposed to be in another place instead of Tegalega, Udin asks for clarification about what he is doing there.

The clause with the sign (→) is Udin's initiation because he considers Jun's statement as problem. In the excerpt above, Udin wants to make himself clear towards Jun statement about *Tegalega* by asking question "gawe naon di tegalega?". From this initiation, Jun completes the repair and makes himself clear by answering "urang keur KP din".

In conversation which involves more than two interlocutors, it is possible for the trouble source is initiated by more than one recipient.

Self-initiation self-repair

There are nine occurrences of self-initiated self-repair as identified in this study. The use of this type in conversation indicates the interlocutors' awareness of their own mistake during conversation. As a result, they act as the repair initiator of their own trouble source and complete it themselves. The following is example of SISR in *Calterone 33*.

Excerpt 2

Panji : Desember kumpul
daks

Let's meet up on December guys

Ili : Desember libur natal tapi
hehe

*But let's meet up in December on
Christmas vacation hehe*

→ Libur natal tapi nya, libur tahun baru na teu balik euy

*During Christmas vacation right, I
won't come home on New Year
time*

In excerpt 3, the participants talk about the plan to meet in December. Panji starts by saying “*Desember kumpul daks*” to open the talk. As a response, Ili gives his opinion about the plan by saying

“*Desember libur natal tapi hehe*”.

However, he is not satisfied with his statement and restates it immediately by saying “*Libur natal tapi nya, libur tahun baru na teu balik euy*”. This statement is given as the excuse or explanation about his opinion.

In this study, SISR is not only found as the interlocutors make themselves clear by giving an extra explanation, but also as the interlocutors rectify a mistyping word as in excerpt 4. In SISR, the initiation of the repair is invisible because the recipient often makes it simultaneously.

Excerpt 3

Udin : Muhun atuh bu mugia
mamah ibu enggal di
sehatkeun seui

→ deui

*It is okay Ma'am, hope your
mother recover soon.*

Self-initiated other-repair

Self-initiated other-repair becomes the third type of repair strategies that is used in *Calterone 33* with seven occurrences. In this type of repair strategies, the speaker or the trouble maker will be the one who initiate the

repair. Meanwhile, the one who completes the repair is the other interlocutors or the recipients.

Excerpt 4

Ambu : mugia arenggal damang deui. Diangkat panyawatna, Ili, Lana, nuju diangken ku Alloh SWT. Mugia aya dina kasabaran sareng kaikhlasan. Dipaparin sehat sabihara bihari deui

Hope you guys get well soon from all the disease you are suffering. Ili and Lana are being tried by God. Be patient and sincere. Hope Allah reward you a healthy body as before.

→ Anin oge pami teu lepat mah di rawat di pb nya

If I am not mistaken, Anin is also hospitalised in PB, right?

Rosma : **neng anin di rawat tipes saur na teh**

Neng Anin is hospitalized as she is suffering from typhus

In excerpt 4 shows the situation in which the participants of the group talk about their health issue. Suddenly, Ambu remember that Anin is being hospitalized too. However,

Ambu seems unsure whether she is correct or not. Therefore, she writes “*Anin oge pami teu lepat mah di rawat di pb nya*” as an initiation to get a confirmation from others, in which is echoing and repairing by Rosma with “*neng anin di rawat tipes saur na teh*”.

Other-initiated other-repair

Other-initiated and other repair is the type of repair strategies that becomes the type with least occurrences in this study with only 5.3%. There are two occurrences which identified as other-initiated other-repair in this study. According to Schegloff et al. (1977), OIOR occurs when the initiation and the repair are completed by the recipient.

Excerpt 5

Ili : cepe acara di uin, jaba leuheung presale 1. Nu di unpad presale 3 mun teu beakeun teuing **ost** mreun *One hundred thousand for UIN event and it is presale 1. Meanwhile in UNPAD, if it is still available I will buy presale 3, or maybe ost.*

Udin : → **ots mreun**

Maybe what you mean is OTS

Ili : tah eta lah

Yes, that is what I mean

In excerpt 5, Udin does the initiation and repair of the trouble source by himself. Ili, who produces the trouble source, is unaware of the mistake. Therefore, Udin, who knows and recognizes the trouble source, feels the need to initiate along with complete the repair by himself by saying “*ots meureun*”.

Question 2

Besides the types of repair strategies, the techniques of repair initiation are investigated too. From four techniques of repair initiation by Finegan (2008), only three techniques appear in chat room. Through the whole conversation, the participants mostly use an asking question and repeating the part of the utterance technique to initiate repair. The findings are presented in Table 2 as follow:

Table 2

The Techniques of Repair Initiation in Calterone 33

N o.	Techniqu es of	Freque ncy	Percent age
---------	-------------------	---------------	----------------

	Repair Initiation in <i>Calterone 33</i>		
1	Asking question toward the problem	23	60.5%
2	Repeat part of the utterance to be repaired	11	29.0%
3	Use particle and expression ‘I mean’	1	2.6%
4	Abruptly stop speaking	-	-
5	Other (Giving possible understanding toward the trouble source)	3	7.9%

Total	38	100%
-------	----	------

As can be seen in the table, the participants of conversation only used three techniques by Finegan (2008), in which asking question technique appears as the most-frequently occurs in the group. It is followed by the repetition of the trouble source and the use of particle and expression ‘I mean’ technique sequentially. Furthermore, another technique is found in the conversation in Calterone 33 namely giving possible understanding toward the trouble source.

Asking question

Asking question appears as the most frequently occurs in *Calterone 33*. In this group, the participant are actively offering question whenever they found the trouble source as in example below.

Excerpt 7

Jisung : hayu atuh ah

Let's go guys

Boz : → hayu kamana?

Let's go where?

Jisung : **bersilaturahmi**

Silaturahmi

In Excerpt 7, Jisung asks the participant in the group chat room to go somewhere. However, as the participants do not have any idea about what Jisung meant, Boz initiates a repair from Jisung by asking question “*hayu kamana?*” to get an explanation.

In some cases, while asking question over the trouble source, the recipients also answer the initiation of repair by themselves as in example of OIOR strategy below. It is affected by the recipients’ prior knowledge about the trouble source.

Excerpt 8

Boz : oh uhun hayu atuh abi teu acan pendaknya sreng suami daymon..basa eta teu dongkap..hayu atuh di **daymon** lah

Ah let's go then, I haven't met your husband. I didn't come back then. Lets's go meet up in your home.

Panji : → naha daymon boz?

Why do you call him Daymon?

Jisung

It is Jisung.

Boz : itu maksud saya.

That's what I mean.

In this excerpt, Tatang's utterance that mentions Daymon is considered as trouble source by Panji because it should be Jisung. Consequently, as Panji realizes that it is wrong, he tries to initiate a repair by asking question while giving the correct answer.

Repeat the part of the utterance

This technique uses when the participants recognize the trouble source in the conversation and try to repair it. In written conversation, the repetition of the trouble source is done immediately after the speaker's first turn completed. It occurs because the speakers unaware of their mistake, and only recognizes it once they send and re-read the message. The illustration can be seen below.

Excerpt 9

Udin : Muhun atuh bu mugia
mamah ibu enggal di
sehatkeun seui
→ deui
*I wish your mother recover
soon Ma'am*

Furthermore, the initiators often use this technique along with the question that is given in order to get the answer

or confirmation from the trouble maker as can be seen in the excerpt 10.

Excerpt 10

Dewa : mun **2 tahun** deui aya
lowongan kabaran nya san
wkwk tertarik di bidang
jaringan urg euy wkwk
*if there is a job vacation two
years later please let me know
wkwk I interested in network
field wkwk*

Lana : → 2 tahun? Ente semester
sbaraha ayna?
*Two years? what semester are
you now?*

Dewa : **urg nambah semester
wkwk**
*I take an additional semester
hhh*

The "2 tahun" in the example is considered by Lana as the repairable that need to be repaired. In order to get a repair from the trouble maker, Lana repeats the trouble source while asking question to get further explanation over Dewa's statement.

Using particle and expression 'I mean'

In this investigation, there is only one case of repair initiation that used particle and expression ‘I mean’ in *Calterone 33*. It is applied when the speaker realize the mistake after getting a hint of the correct word from other participants.

Excerpt 11

Boz : warung depan masjid agung

It is a stand in front of masjid agung

Lana : SMP 5?

SMP 5?

Ili : SMP 5 tonjong, ti iraha masjid agung ka tonjong

SMP 5 is located in Tonjong, since when grand mosque moves to

Tonjong

Lana : → **smp 4 maksud the wa haha**

I mean SMP 4 hhh

panji : Lana mah pohoan

Lana, you are such a forgetful person

Lana clarifies the name of the school that he meant in the previous turn after reading Ili’s explanation about the school. He realizes that he names the wrong school and immediately restates it by saying “*smp 4 maksud teh wa*”.

Giving possible understanding

Besides the previous techniques that are proposed by Finegan (2008), another technique is found in *Calterone 33*. It is giving possible understanding technique. The example can be seen below.

Excerpt 12

Dudung : salamna we nya ka

Lilis abi teu tiasa dongkap nju **dipiwarang ku dosen**. Hapuntena *Please give my regards to Lilis, I can’t come because of the task from the lecturer. I’m sorry.*

Udin : **cie cie jadi asdos sigana**

It must become lecturer assistant

Dudung : → **Cuma mantuan unukul nyusun berkas jeung ngetik**

I’m just helping him to arrange the document and type.

In Excerpt 12, the current speaker, Dudung, makes an excuse that he cannot attend Lilis’s event because he gets an order from the lecture. Udin, who misinterprets Dudung as an assistant lecturer says “*cie cie jadi*

asdos sigana". As a result, Dudung who knows that it is false, repair the trouble by giving his possible understanding by saying "Cuma mantuan ungun nyusun berkas jeung ngetik".

Question 3

In *Calterone 33*, as mentioned previously, the participants of the group use all types of repair strategies when there are misunderstandings in talk. By using the technique of repair initiation by Finegan (2008) and observing the topic to investigate the purposes, it can be found that each type of repair strategies is triggered by different purposes. The purposes are discovered when the same pattern arises more than one while the participants use a specific technique as can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3

Possible Purposes of Particular Type in Calterone 33

No	Types of Repair Strategies in <i>Calterone 33</i>	Possible Purposes
1	OISR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To get a further

		explanation toward the incomplete utterance or information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To get clarification about the trouble source
2	OIOR	1. To rectify or resolve the problem that is produced by the current speaker as well as give the correct answer
3	SISR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To add information of the previous utterance To restate the previous utterance or information To rectify mistyping or error in the messages
4	SIOR	1. To confirm something that the current speaker has known but unsure.

DISCUSSION

Question 1

The findings of the study in which OISR that appears as the most-frequently occurs in online chat is in contradiction with Zaferanieh (2004) and Meredith and Stokoe (2013) who claim that SISR appears as the most

applied strategy in the chat room due to mistyping. There are 20 occurrences identified as OISR, meanwhile SISR appears with only 9 occurrences. In this present study, other-initiated self-repair strategy is mostly used by the participants to clarify other speaker's utterances. In addition, this repair strategy is applied as the recipient asking for further explanation of limited information that is given by the current speaker. The other-initiation is applied by the participants in the conversation because of the different understanding or knowledge towards the topic.

The initiation in the OISR strategy in group chat room can be offered by more than one participant. Despite the number of the initiation for one trouble source, the repairing segment can occur only once for all the initiation. The number of the initiation that appears for one trouble source can be affected by the signal of the Internet network that cause the others' initiation do not emerge in others' phone screen at that time. It is possible since the online chat depends on the Internet. Another reason that affects this phenomenon is the

presence of the interlocutors that invisible for other, because each of them stays in different location.

Besides the initiation that is completely repaired, there are some occurrences in which the initiation is not repaired by the interlocutors. Sometimes, the participants decide not to respond to the initiation without have to be forced and feel bashful. It is in agreement with Schonfeldt and Golato (2003) who stated that it is possible for participants to choose not to respond in chats because the participants are not physically in one location. Additionally, it can also be affected by the messages from that come simultaneously, so the chat room move faster. Consequently, the particular initiation will not be noticed if the speaker does not scroll the screen.

Question 2

By using Finegan's theory (2008), the study found that the participants used three out of four techniques of repair initiation with an asking question technique as the most applied technique.

Asking question technique is used when the interlocutors find something odd in the speaker's utterance and want to confirm or ask for explanation. This technique mostly used in OISR and OIOR because it is often offered by other interlocutors. However, in *Calterone 33*, asking question can be done in SIOR because the current speaker uses it to ask for confirmation about something that is known but still unsure.

Following this technique, there are repeating the part of the utterance or trouble source, and using particle and expression 'I mean' technique. Meanwhile, for the abruptly stop speaking is not used in written conversation because the cuts off cannot be seen by other participants. The interlocutors only see the result of the speaker's thought without can interrupt the process of message construction.

As explained earlier, in written conversation, the current speakers have time to consider what they are going to say. Further, they are able to correct the mistake during message construction that is only visible for

them. In contrast, the recipient can only see the message that is sent to chat room. It is in agreement with the study by Meredith and Stokoe (2014) which reveals that in Facebook chat, a variety of trouble-sources, including word selection, person reference and action formation, are repaired during message construction and not visible to the recipients.

Besides the techniques that is proposed by Finegan (2018), there is another technique that if found in *Calterone 33* namely giving possible understanding towards the problem. It occurs because the recipient has undergo or familiar with the trouble source that arises. Hence, instead of only initiate repair, the participants give possible understanding based on their prior knowledge.

Question 3

Each type of repair strategies has specific reason to be applied in conversation by the interlocutors. In *Calterone 33*, OISR and OIOR mostly used when the recipients need further explanation of the information that is given the current speaker. Usually, the information is limited or

opposed the recipient's knowledge. In group interaction, OIOR sometimes is completed by the third participant. It is possible to occur because in group conversation, not only the current speaker and the second speaker or the recipient who involve but many other participants too. Hence, when the recipient asks for confirmation about trouble source, the third participant who knows the correct answer as good as the current speaker is willingly helping to clear the problem.

Other-initiation become the most frequently occurs in *Calterone 33*. It can be affected by the topic that is selected by the participants. As the participants live in different places with different occupations, it is possible for some participants not to understand all the topics that are discussed by the current speaker. It causes the recipients to always initiate a repair and display some responses like surprise and disbelief which leads them to ask for explanation. It is identical to Kendrick (2015) who stated that other-initiation uses to perform actions, including jokes and teases, preliminaries to dispreferred

response and displays of surprise and disbelief.

The interlocutors use SISR strategy to restate or add something to their previous statement. It occurs as they do not content with the statement and feel the need to extend the explanation to make it clearer for the recipient. In some cases, it is applied to correct the mistyping of the word in the statement. Meanwhile, for SIOR, in *Calterone 33*, it used when the interlocutors need to clarify something.

REFERENCES

- Al-Harashseh, A. M. A. (2015). A conversation analysis of self-initiated repair structures in jordanian spoken arabic. *Discourse Studies*, 1-18. doi: 10.1177/1461445615578898
- Dincer, B. & Erbas, D. (2010). Description of communication breakdown repair strategies produced by nonverbal students with developmental disabilities. *Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities*, 45(3), 400-409. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23880113>
- Finegan, E. (2008). *Language: Its structure and use* (5th ed.). USA: Thomson Wadsworth.

- Kendrick, K.H. (2015). Other-initiated repair in English. *Open Linguistics, 1*, 164-190. doi: 10.2478/opli-2014-0009
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2007). *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis*. London: Atheneum Press Ltd.
- Meredith, J. & Stokoe, E. (2014). Repair: Comparing facebook 'chat' with spoken interaction. *Discourse & Communication, 8*(2), 181-207. doi: 10.1177/1750481313510815
- Ohtake, Y., Yanagihara, M., Nakaya, A., Takahashi, S., Sato, E., & Tanaka, M. (2005). Repair strategies used by elementary-age beginning communicators with autism: A preliminary descriptive study. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities, 20*(3), 158-168. doi: 10.1177/10883576050200030401
- Ohtake, Y., Wehmeyer, L. M., Nakaya, A., Takahashi, S., & Yanagihara, M. (2011). Repair strategies used by verbal students with autism during free play. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities, 26*(1), 3-14. doi: 10.1177/1088357610396079
- Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse analysis: An introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Perry, M. (2010). *Face to face versus computer-mediated communication: Couples satisfaction and experience across conditions*. Undergraduate Thesis. University of Kentucky.
- Rahayu, G. (2016). *Repair strategies in television talk show: A conversation analysis*. Undergraduate Thesis. Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.
- Rheisa, N. S. (2014). *A conversation analysis of repair in The Oprah Winfrey Show: A special episode with Michael Jackson*. Undergraduate Thesis. Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
- Sato, R. (2012). Self-initiated self-repair attempts by Japanese high school learners while speaking English. *Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience, 3*(2), 17-28. Retrieved from <http://edusoft.ro/brain/index.php/brain/article/download/359/403>
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preferences for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language, 53*(2), 361-382. doi: 10.2307/413107
- Schonfeldt, J & Golato, A. (2003). Repair in chats: A conversation analytic approach. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 36*(3), 241-284. doi: 10.1207/S15327973RLSI360302
- Seong, G. (2006). Choices they make: How ESL teachers initiate repair in the classroom. *English Teaching, 61*(1), 227-255. Retrieved from <http://journal.kate.or.kr/wp->

- content/uploads/2015/02/kate_61_1_11.pdf
- Tang, C. (2011). Self-repair devices in classroom monologue discourse. *Concentric: Studies in Linguistic*, 37(1) , 93-120. Retrieved from <http://www.concentric-linguistics.url.tw/upload/articles/26140211073738172>
- Wongkhat, P. (2012). Repair in Thai conversation: A case study of the 94.0 EFM Radio Hosts. *Journal of Language and Culture*, 31(2), 68-92. <https://www.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/JLC/article/view/20287>
- Zaferanieh, E. (2004). *Conversation analysis of online chat*. Undergraduate Thesis. Islamic Azad University.