English Language & Literature Teaching, Vol. 22, No. 1 Spring 2016

L2 Learners' Self-Repair Techniques in the Same Turn

Sukwon Noh
(ChungNam National University)

Noh, Sukwon (2016). L2 Learners' self-repair techniques in the same turn. *English Language and Literature Teaching, 22*(1), 157-179.

This paper examines self-repair techniques practiced by Korean L2 learners in talk-in interactions. It is generally known that L2 learners tend to repair what is produced in the same turn due to their insufficient linguistic ability in SLA. However, the turn in which self-repair is practiced by L2 learners is embedded in an interactional sequence and the procedure of practicing self-repair has not yet been fully understood. In order to investigate how self-repair is conducted by L2 speakers, the talk-in interaction produced by Korean learners of English have been analyzed by employing Schegloff's ten techniques of self-repair (2013). Korean L2 learners have been analyzed to produce their turns in 'stop-and-go' pattern, tend to use two techniques most among ten, and practice self-repair to fix and complete the turn. In addition, specific practices of self-repair techniques, such as mixture of technique uses, code-switching, and overlooking troubles at the turn, have been revealed to be working with both linguistic and interactional resources within the conversation using target language. These findings indicate that self-repair practices can be employed as a useful resource in interaction to enhance L2 use.

[self-repair/repair technique/interactions between NNSs/intersubjectivity]

I. INTRODUCTION

Repair (Example, p. 8) is a behavior dealing with trouble sources employed by speakers participating in conversation while self-repair in the same turn refers to a repair work in which trouble sources are found and fixed by a speaker in the turn of the trouble. Troubles may arise in a speaker's production mainly with regard to linguistic structure, word search, pronunciation, and other issues including simple mistakes. Whatever causes of the speech production troubles are, speakers try hard to deal with potential or current problems in their speaking turns. Self-repair is an evidence that a speaker has assessed what was produced in

the turn and that the trouble shooting was successful. Self-repair, as a contributing factor to the success of a conversation, is a participants' effort to improve their turn.

A speaker's self-repair practices in the first language are similar to a second language speaker's. In general, self-repair is favored over other repair in which repair is initiated and performed by another speaker rather than the speaker of the trouble (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977). This has been revealed the same with the research findings of nonnative speakers (NNSs)' self-repair (Cho, 2007; Hellerman, 2009; Lee, 2005; Noh, 2015a). Also, speakers perform repair displaying their linguistic and interactional competence (Firth & Wagner, 1997; Jefferson, 1974; Wong, 2000). Speakers actively participate in the interaction by not only correcting problems but also elaborating their own turns in order to maintain the interaction. Finally, the format of the repair sequence is found to be consistent in different contexts (Schegloff, Sacks, & Jefferson, 1974; Hellerman, 2009).

How L2 learners deal with the trouble sources in the same turn hasn't yet been studied enough, though. In SLA, self-repairing has mainly been concerned about linguistic error detection and their correction in a single production produced by L2 learners under the monitoring concept (Korsmos, 1999). Because it is embedded within sequential structures, however, self-repair is a strategy used by speakers participating in any interaction. Among the substantial amount of research on repair are a few that have focused on self-repair, mainly in conversations between native speakers (NSs) (Forrester, in press; Schegloff, et al., 1977; Schegloff, 2013; Wooton, 1994). Self-repair markers and the organization of self-repair have been looked for in the conversation between NS-NNS or NNS-NNS (Cho, 2007; Kasper, 2004; Kim, 2009; Markee, 2000). The way for NNSs to practice self-repair is still largely unexamined. Only recently has it been specified how self-repair operates in terms of the ten techniques (Schegloff, 2013). L2 learners' self-repair is important as it reflects the learner's ability to participate in interaction as a competent language user. In this regard, it is worth paying attention to Korean L2 learners' self-repair by demonstrating how the process is going with the use of techniques in the dynamics of interaction.

This study attempts to investigate how Korean learners of English practice the self-repair in the same turn and to provide procedural explanation of the patterns and characteristics of utilizing self-repair techniques. After that, it will be discussed if the findings from the study have any implications on English education. With this aim, the investigation will be conducted through analyzing recorded conversational data with the speaker's turn related analysis. In order to do this, self-repair techniques will be analyzed for the use of each category according to the Schegloff's ten techniques (2013), as is restricted to the same turn self-repair. Finally, implications on English language learning will be searched for, which may add to the theoretical framework and implementation of the theory into practice. Korean learners of English will be referred to as L2 learners and NNSs interchangeably in this study.

II. BACKGROUND OF STUDY

1. L2 Learners' Self-Repair in the Same Turn of an Interaction

Anything that hinders the communication between the speakers in the interaction needs to be treated once noticed by them (Seedhouse, 2004). When the speaker feels the need to fix his or her ongoing turn, self-repair begins after cutoffs, pause, sound stretches, or any delay markers such as *uh* that signal the speaker's perception of the trouble preceding or following production. Unlike other repair, according to Ktzinger (2013), self-repair in the same turn interrupts the progressivity of the turn. Once self-repair begins, current speaker stops what he or she is producing in order to deal with obvious errors or to elaborate the turn by employing some technique, such as framing, delay markers, repeats, etc. The repair procedure ends when the repaired element of the turn is produced in the same turn as the problem.

A repair system motivates many of the linguistic or structural matters, which mainly concerns the ordering of elements (Schegloff, 1979). The troubles include anything repairable concerned with linguistic components such as grammar, word meaning, pronunciation, etc. during the talk-in interaction (Schegloff, 2010). In Hellerman's study (2009), an L2 learner has increasingly more performed self-repairs as the language learning progressed. In another study of NNSs' self-repair, the repairable were discovered to be grammatical components of using pronouns, numbers, noun phrases, pronunciation, ~ing forms, and articles (Lee, 2005). These errors are expected to be fixed and settled by the speaker so the conversation can move on along the ongoing sequence development. Unless the trouble sources are addressed, the conversation may become problematic and result in miscommunication (Schegloff, 1992).

In addition to linguistic matters, self-repair is concerned about interactional aspects in making the conversation a success. In Lee's (2005) study, it was discovered that L2 speakers sometimes did not practice self-repair on the trouble sources that took place in interaction. Nor were they requested to do it by the interactants. The interaction ended up with being successful despite the trouble sources. It was explained in the study that this was because, first, the interactants as NNSs were used to mislocation of an accent in a participant's utterance, second, contextual clues helped the other participants understand the problematic turn, and finally they were receptive and tolerant toward the trouble sources triggered by one another. Because NNSs participating in interactions were sharing nonnative norms of English language use and were used to each other's problems occurring at the speaking turn, their conversation could continue while skipping some of the possible repairing acts. A speaker's self-repairing had already been approved to be

interacting with the court as an environment in Jefferson (1974)'s study. It can be readily suggested that self-repair is interrelated with the specifics of the interaction.

In this regard, traditional SLA research that has been overly concerned about L2 speakers' grammatical errors in production has not been good enough to explain L2 learners' self-repair practice. Self-repair has been regarded as something that can be practiced by a competent L2 learners (Jung, 2005; Kim, 2005). Since language acquisition and production are understood as a psychological process, L2 knowledge is required for language learners to notice and to act out repair on the problem. The ability to practice self-repair reflects the language learner's status of L2 development by adopting a psycholinguistic approach (Korsmos, 1999). Comparison of L1 and L2 self-repair is seen to function as an impetus to L2 learning and the development of automaticity from the psycholinguistic viewpoint (Poulisse, 1997).

Many of the grammatical aspects of an L2 learner's production which are the subjects to be repaired indicate that the speaker's linguistic competence is intrinsically related with self-repair in the same turn. It is generally agreed that intermediate or above level of speakers are more capable of success in self-repairing than the beginners. However, trouble sources involve not only linguistic problems but also interactional considerations. Notably, L2 learners participating in conversation find the trouble sources while they interact with their settings and with their interactants. The speaker's turn at the moment entails the next turn conditionally relevant to what is preceded. Whether the repair ends in success or not, the ability to repair the current turn can be referred to as L2 learners' linguistic and interactional competence. "The organization of repair is the self-righting mechanism for the organization of language use in social interaction" (Schegloff, et al., 1977, p. 381).

2. Techniques of Self-Repair in the Same Turn

The subject of this study is the operational techniques of self-repair that take place within the speaker's turn before the end of the turn constructional unit (TCU) and exclude those of the third turn or turn transitional place. Before Schegloff (2013), there have been several attempts to organize the self-repair mechanisms into repair prefaces, beginning of repair, techniques of repair, and analytical tries. During the process, speakers practice self-repair with a variety of techniques such as replacing, repeating, deleting, searching, etc. after cutoffs, pause, delay markers of 'um', 'uh', or repair prefaces of 'I mean' or 'you know'. (Cho, 2007; Kim, 2009; Kitzinger, 2013).

According to Schegloff (2013), as the conversation progresses, the speaker and recipient are oriented to the overall conversational structure and local organization of the subunit construct by interrupting the progressivity of the talk. Schegloff organized self-repair techniques into ten types. These techniques should be applicable to analyzing the Korean

L2 learners' self-repair of talk in interactions as repair systems have a general basis and are locally manageable (Levinson, 1984). The analysis of the recorded data in this study is grounded on the techniques as such according to the researcher's interpretation. The details of the techniques are outlined in Table 1.

TABLE 1

The Ten Self-Repair Techniques (based on Schegloff, 2013)

Techniques	Details
Replacing	Speaker stops talking and substitutes the whole or part of the TCU
Inserting	After cutoffs, speaker inserts adverbial modifier, such as 'exactly'
Deleting	When repeating what is just uttered, part of the articulated is removed
Searching	Not only word searching, precise and delicate naming is pursued
Parenthesizing	Clausal TCU is added to the turn in progress to invite quick responses
Aborting	Speaker abandons what was just said in favor of another try, 'in other words'
Sequence Jumping	Abandoning the TCU so far by turning sharply to something unrelated
Recycling	Saying again some stretch of talk, containing less than a full TCU
Reformatting	Whether or not grammatical, type of utterance changes by perspectival transition, like paraphrasing
Reordering	To work out the order in which elements of a talk in progress needs arrayed

Once cutoff or sound stretches occur, the repairing techniques will appear. The details are as follows. *Replacing* is an act that comes with partial repetition of the ongoing turn and grammatically different elements may take the place of the repaired turn. *Inserting* brings a complementary modifier during the utterance in the turn of, for example, 'exactly', or 'in the world'. In *Deleting*, just uttered components disappear in the repaired production, as in 'I can even run... I can run...'. *Searching* is used as a way of fine tuning what the speaker of the turn want to deliver especially with the names of people, places, or business, not limited only to looking for words. *Parenthesizing* is an unnecessarily added part before continuing the turn of the speaker with clauses, such as 'I don't know if I told you this…', or 'You know, he's gotta temper'. This is done to further the meaning or intention of the speaker and invite others to respond with insight.

Aborting works for explaining something by abandoning the way the turn was being produced and launching another try. *Sequence Jumping* comes with no break shifting from one to a wholly different sequence. *Recycling* is just the same as repetition by saying again part of the turn. *Reformatting* is a phenomenon caused by the speaker's alternating perspectives of uttering clausal or sentential turn as in 'I would… (like it)' to 'That would be great'. Thus, *Reformatting* include such grammatical changes when using positive and

negative sentence alternatively, wh-questions to yes/no question, or shifts from pseudo cleft to simple declarative. Lastly, *Reordering* is related with speaker's speech mistakenly ordered within a clause or sentence and relocating the array of structural units.

These techniques look somewhat similar to communicative strategies which are primarily managed surrounding repair work. It is stated that the efforts to deal with problems in speaking and understanding each other in the talk, such as confirmation checks, clarification requests, restatements, repetitions, understanding checks, etc., all fall within the domain of repair (Wong, 2000). These efforts are also categorized as deeds of meaning negotiation, named communicative strategies (Dornyei & Scott, 1997; Nakatani, 2010). Among these, the acts of using communicative strategies, such as restatements, repetitions, and confirmation appear as if they are operated the same as self-repair techniques of *Recycling*, *Inserting*, *Searching*, *Aborting*, *Reformatting*, and so on.

Self-repair applies to conversational turns locally and sequentially from a sequence analytic view while intersubjectivity is established between interactants. Examination of language learners' self-repair practiced during a talk-in interaction may uncover their linguistic and interactional competences as language users. It is, therefore, sensible that the self-repair of L2 learners needs to be analyzed in relation to speaking turns in interaction with a view to understanding how the speaker's current turn is repaired along the interactive sequence through the ten categories of self-repairing techniques.

III. METHOD

1. Participants

The data in this study was collected from a recording project conducted in 2014. Eight Korean university students volunteered and were paired for the micro-analytic purpose of this project. They all have English proficiency test scores of TOEFL or TOEIC (Table 2) and are capable of English conversation at around intermediate level. Members in Pair A and B were classmates of each other, those of Pair C were friends, and the two in Pair D had never met before this project. Pair A consisted of two males who had never studied abroad. Pair B consisted of a male student who studied in the U.S. for a year and a female with no experience of studying abroad. Pair C was formed of two female students, one of whom had studied in the U.S. for six months and the other who studied in the U.S. for one year. Members of Pair D were a male who had studied for a year in U.S. and a female who had never been abroad. More details of participants are listed in the Table 2 below.

TABLE 2

Participants of Korean L2 Learners

Pair	Name	Major	Proficiency Test Score		Studying abroad	
A	W (M)	Economics	TOEFL IBT	73	Never	
	S (M)	Management	TOEIC	820	Never	
B	J (M)	Chemical Eng.	TOEFL IBT	79	Yes	(US 1yr)
	C (F)	Business Admin.	TOEFL IBT	85	Never	
C	B (F)	Intnl. Trade	TOEIC	905	Yes	(US 0.5 yr)
	J (F)	Agri. Economics	TOEIC	800	Yes	(US 1yr)
D	J (F)	Phys. Chemistry	TOEFL IBT	86	Never	
	I (M)	Sports Science	TOEFL IBT	62	Yes	(US 1yr)

2. Data Collection

The conversations were audio-recorded by the researcher in a quiet university classroom. Participants were given the explanation of the aim of the recording and were introduced with the topics that they may choose from and talk about by the researcher before recording begins. A total of one hundred and forty five minutes of conversations were recorded, which all were the subject of analysis. When recording began, they started the conversation themselves.

Pair A had conversations of 'preference, asking direction, exchanging opinions, inviting, thanking, asking favors, and apologizing'. Pair B talked about 'preference, free talking, exchanging opinions, inviting people, giving congratulations, apologizing, complaining, and forgiving'. Pair C talked about 'preference, asking for directions, exchanging opinions, thanking, giving excuses, and apologizing', and Pair D talked about 'preference, asking for directions, exchanging opinions, thanking, inviting, asking favors, and apologizing'.

Once recorded data was collected, it was transcribed using two transcribing software programs, *Transana 2.60* and *Sound Forge pro 11.0*, following the Jefferson's tradition of transcribing (Appendix 1). Transcription was completed through a series of steps that built on previous transcription. Each line of speech was simply transcribed first with the signs of sound stretches and cutoffs surrounding the dialogues. Then, symbolic details were added of overlapping, decreasing volume of a sound, and signs of rising or falling intonation to the first draft of transcription. Listening to the audio-recorded files repetitively after the detailed transcription enriched the understanding the conversation from both audio file and written data.

Example is below. There is no gap between the speakers' speaking turns in line 1 and 2. Speaker J is asking a question to B in line 2 with rising intonation and both speaker are

speaking at the same time in line 2 and 3 which makes their utterances overlapped. In line 3, speaker B's utterance saying "why" is getting stretched and her intonation is rising.

Example: Pair C

1 B: I didn't like, I didn't like=
2 J: =You want to [eat Mexican food?
3 B: [Yeah, okay. I don't know why: ↑ but I really wanna eat salsa,

3. Data Analysis

Self-repairs occurring in the same turn were first identified for a qualitative data analysis to describe how the self-repair techniques were used. Local management of self-repair was cued with cutoffs represented by commas, sometimes followed by sound stretches such as 'uh', 'um', or 'ah'. Then, the techniques used by speakers were analyzed and classified according to the ten techniques presented by Schegloff (2013). Some techniques were easy to classify as they are usually noticed within the turn of a speaker. *Recycling* is typified with repetition of parts of a word, phrase, or clause. In the case of *Inserting* and *Deleting*, parts of their speech are added or removed. *Replacing* was applied to parts of each word. A word was replaced with a word, or a phrase. Also, a phrase was replaced with a phrase.

Sentential replacing was classified as *Reformatting* as in the case of "I: would-(.) *t*hat *would be* great?". It looks like only a subject is changed, but in fact, the speaker was about to say "I would LOVE THAT!" (Schegloff, 2013). Replacing the subject 'I', 'that' indicating something uttered in the previous turn took the place of the subject recycling 'would'. This applies to be *Reformatting* because it reflects the speaker's perception or mind. This is not simply a *Replacing* whose procedure begins with sudden stop of producing an incipient part of a word and ends with a new word. In this way, the switch of a sentence starting off with a subject and a verb into a new sentence form was classified into a *Reformatting*.

The results will be presented in the order of three categories of 1) *Recycling*/ *Replacing*/ *Inserting*/ *Deleting*, 2) *Searching*/ *Aborting*/ *Parenthesizing*/ *Sequence Jumping*, 3) *Reordering*/ *Reformatting*, and 4) Others: *Code-switching*/ *Overlooking of self-repair* for convenience. Troubles occurring in interaction may just be passed by without a repairing try. When repair is tried and not successful as intended by the speaker, it is a failure. The qualitative data analysis is presented by describing the procedures of technique uses from the excerpts of transcription. All of the excerpts are labeled with numbers next to which the names of the speaker pairs are indicated. For example, Excerpt 1: Pair C represents Excerpt 1 is an extracted part of transcription of Pair C's conversation.

For quantitative data description, the number of occurrences of individually identified techniques were added to account for how many times each technique was practiced by each pair of speakers. The importance of quantification of conversation analytic data is already approved (Schegloff, et al., 1977; Schegloff, 1993). After that, the ratio of the total number of self-repair technique uses to the total number of turns generated in each group was presented respectively. Next, the ratio of *Recycling* and *Replacing*, the two most used techniques to the total number of the turns in each group, were also presented. In cases when two or more of the techniques appear in the same turn, each technique was counted separately. The added numeric description is presented in Table 3 (p. 16). The results of quantitative analysis were used to compare the differences of each speaker pairs' techniques and helped picture the Korean L2 learners' self-repair technique usage.

Over ten percent of the total data set (Pair D's conversation) was analyzed by the researcher and an evaluator separately for self-repair and its techniques according to the analytical procedures above. Interrater reliability using Cohen's Kappa statistic was measured and the Cohen's Kappa value was 0.871, which indicates the strength of agreement is very good. This helped ensure the validity of the analysis.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

According to the analysis, Korean L2 speakers practiced self-repair locally at the turn of their speaking and sequentially displaying interactional characteristics. Additional self-repair technique was discovered to be used and sometimes repair is not practiced for troubleshooting.

Basically, the purpose of practicing self-repair was to correct and finish the turn or some parts of the turn being produced. The participants, even if not all, as L2 learners were completing their turns with their efforts to make the turn correct structure, vocabulary, pronunciation and accent with sound stretches and cutoffs, while they try to present their thoughts as in Excerpt 1. Some repair prefaces such as 'I mean', 'I think', 'you know', or 'like' were employed as seen in line 3 in Excerpt 1 while the speaker J is completing her turn in line 1, 3, and 6 with pauses and sound stretches. The prefaces served as a device that signals self-repair is about to occur.

Excerpt 1: Pair C

1 J: Uhm, actually I prefer:::(.) eating ou:t,
2 B: Um.
3→ J: to cooking dinner, because:, **you↑ know**, I'm not good at cooking,

4 something?
5 B: Um-hmm.
6 J: Uh, when: we: were (.) in USA, (1.4) I was not good at cooking.

Moreover, in practicing self-repair with some self-repair techniques against the repairable, Korean L2 learners' self-repair was characterized by having 'stop-and-go' pattern in production, with using frequent cutoffs, delay markers, and attempts to repair. In many of the turns, a sentential production was not completed at a time with fluency. Often sentences were paused for repair right after its beginning and then continued, which was repeated until the turn is completed as in every line in Excerpt 2.

Excerpt 2: Pair B

1 → I: So, and they, uh, always follow me, so, and, when I come to my house, they
2 always hollow to me, it's like a, uh, (like a) **bow-wow, bow-wow?** and, (hh) so
3 it's very cute **so,uh so I, wanna, (.) I wanna get, uh, one dog**. Do you have a
4 dog?
5 J: No, but I: used to: **rais, raised** uh it? **one, uh one time**? (1.0) uh, and (.) uh, h.
6 it was a cocker spaniel?

In Excerpt 2, one or two techniques were repetitively used in the same turn, mainly in combination of *Recycling* and *Replacing*. Speaker I stopped at the beginning of his turn, changed, repeated, and continued parts of the turn in line 1 and 2 with the use of cutoffs and pauses. This procedure was repeated in lines 3 and 4. Interactive characteristics also appeared in line 2 when the speaker I recycled the dog barking sound 'bow-wow' with rising intonation both to detail the meaning of 'hollow' and to confirm that the other participant understood what he meant. The speaker J also practiced *Recycling* for the word 'raise' in line 4. With rising intonation after 'it', 'one time', and 'it was a cocker spaniel' in lines 5 and 6, speaker J tried to confirm the recipient's comprehension of what was uttered. This procedure displayed that the participants practice self-repair in the same turn for interactional purpose of confirmation and for completing their turns while employing more than one technique at a turn.

As observed just above, self-repair was practiced with one or more than two techniques at the same time. The mixture of techniques was often seen in the process of completing a speaker's turn in line 2 and 3 from Excerpt 3 to fix and continue the turn employing *Replacing* and *Recycling* alternately after each cutoff. Also, 'because, actually' in line 2 indicates *Parenthesizing* and *Reformatting* are being used together in providing her excuse to the interactant B.

Excerpt 3: Pair C

1 B: What- happened?
2→ J: But, **I have**, °because, actually **I got an accident? in, on the road**, (.)
3 so **I was, I was** almost DI:E.
4 B: DID YOU HURT? (.) >You're here, you're not < (.) in the hospital.

Full description and explanation of using self-repair techniques performed by Korean L2 leaners are as follows.

1. How the Ten Self-Repair Techniques are Used in the Same Turn

1) *Recycling/ Replacing/ Inserting/ Deleting*

The speaker J is repairing and continuing her turn using *Recycling*. She is producing her turn by restating what is already uttered and extending the part as in line 1, 3 and 5 of Excerpt 4. Also, she is doing *Replacing* in line 1 to change the subject from 'It' to 'he' in line 1. During her 3 turns in the conversation, speaker J kept practicing self-repair in each turn after cutoffs or delay marker 'uh'.

Excerpt 4: Pair D

1→ J: **It has, he has, uh, he has** a long ears
2 I: AH::=
3 → J: =and **a lot of, a lot of smooth hairs** on the body?
4 I: Um-hmm.
5 → J: .hh But **he was so**, (3.2) **he was so NOise**.

Recycling is also used in line 1 of Excerpt 5. Speaker J used *Recycling* in line 1 by repeating 'I' to continue her turn. In the next turn, she abandoned the part of the word 'a cre' and uttered 'the debit card' in line 3. She is employing *Replacing* when the incipient of a word is stopped in the middle of a speaker's articulation and a new word substitutes what the speaker is just about to produce.

Excerpt 5: Pair C

1 J: U-hm. But **I, I** ↑heard couple has (.) a (.)one: (1.2) bank account?
2 B: OH, YEah.
3 → J: So: they use **a: cre. the debit card**
4 B: yeah.

When an intensifier such as ‘exactly’ or ‘in the world’, or specifying expression like in ‘vi-, fat ol Vivian’ (Schegloff, 2013) is used after cutoff, it is *Inserting*. This was not discovered to be used in this study. Instead, a clause as a part of the talk has been inserted by the speaker in the same turn as *Inserting* in line 2 of Excerpt 6.

Excerpt 6: Pair D

1 I: (4 lines continued) So, that is very fun things, but actually I have a very
2 → special experience in USA. They always a, uh (.) they, **when they make a**
3 **pizza,** they always ask me what do you wanna put in the pizza, so (1.0) I
4 always said that it's very hard time to me=

A part of a speech was removed intentionally by the speaker J in line 1 in Excerpt 7, which is *Deleting*. Speaker J is trying to complete the turn by removing a part of the unit.

Excerpt 7: Pair B

1 → J: And, so >how do you think about that?< **It is really, it is wrong?** for
3 people, or- do you- agree with that (.) experiment?

2) *Searching/ Aborting/ Parenthesizing/ Sequence Jumping*

According to Schegloff (2013), *Searching* is not restricted to word only and is sometimes used to look for the precise names of people, places, businesses, etc. or a delicate meaning to be delivered. *Searching* for preciseness and delicateness in a broad sense could not be found from the transcribed data in this study. Instead, speakers as L2 learners were using *Searching* for words. *Searching* is used when the speaker J is trying to find an appropriate word in line 1 and 2, Excerpt 8. Besides, *Searching* for pronunciation of words also appeared in other turns.

Excerpt 8: Pair B

1→ J: Well, (.. skipped..) I have to wash the dishes or, (gesture showing bla, bla) so
2 **cleanup thing?** So, I usually want, I usually, go eating out the dinner.

The study found that *Aborting* is used as an interactional technique. In Excerpt 9, in line 3, speaker B just said ‘bean meat’ and she presented additional explanation stating ‘meat, made of bean’. This technique was used as the speaker of the turn wanted to make herself better understood in the conversation. With rising intonation, she successfully elicited the

recipient's response that speaker J understood speaker B. In this sense, *Aborting* is an interactional technique for self-repair.

Excerpt 9: Pair C

1 B: Actually there is a=
2 J: =Yes, [I know.
3→ B: [**bean: meat, meat made of (.) bean**?
4 J: Yeas yes.

Parenthesizing is inserting some part of a talk for the recipient of the conversation to grasp what is just said under intersubjectivity. It is inserted in the ongoing talk like a short deviation. So, it occurs after cutoff or just stand on its own sentence, after which the talk of the topic goes on. The speaker J tried to add an alternative meaning of the word 'creature' in line 3 when he was talking about UFOs and extraterrestrial beings in Excerpt 10. *Parenthesizing* was tried when he continued his turn after talking about the 'creatures' in line 3 by saying, 'can be survive..' in line 4. More techniques are also involved in this conversation. While the speaker J tried to complete his second turn, the word 'like' was used repeatedly in line 3 and 4 as *Recycling*, the word 'pros' was replaced with 'human' in line 4 as *Replacing* and *Searching*. *Aborting* was tried in line 3 when the speaker J tried to change the word 'some' to 'the intelligent creature' after the repair preface 'you know'. A total of five techniques appeared to have been used in a complicated manner to conduct self-repair in J's turn.

Excerpt 10: Pair B

1 J: Yeah, photos can be artificial, but (1.4)
2 C: Umm=
3→ J: =yeah, maybe::: some other **creatures like, some, you know, the**
4 **intelligent (0.7) creature? like pros, like human?** can be survi::ve at
5 space. It's really (1.2) possible

Sequence Jumping was used once in the data when the speaker wanted to end the conversation abruptly. It was a sudden change of a topic to something new. In Excerpt 11, interactants I and J were having a conversation with the use of *Searching* in line 1. In line 6, speaker J's turn was suddenly paused with a cutoff and repair began with 'oh'. Then, a new sequence was initiated of her getting ready to leave the scene by saying 'I gotta go'. Obviously J wanted to stop the talk and leave for some reason. This unexpected switch of the turn into a new topic is also interactional in that the interaction cannot help being cut

out due to speaker J's practicing *Sequence Jumping*. The interactant I is laughing in line 7 as a response.

Excerpt 11: Pair D

1 J: We need, we don't need, uh, any (.) wear, uh::, cloths? to (.) wear in (1.1)
2 autumm, hh.
3 I: (hh)
4 J: autumm, uh, and hh. and for spring?
5 I: Yeah.
6→ J: and, **oh, I gotta(hhh) go**.
7 I: (burst into laughter)

3) *Reordering/ Reformatting*

Reordering did not appear in any slow paced utterances during which a speaker took enough time to produce her or his appropriately structured turn; instead, it turned up after cutoffs when speaker S restarted his turn by completing a correctly ordered sentence in the following excerpt. After replacing 'which I give' with 'which I gave', the speaker S in line 3 in Excerpt 12 stopped and reordered his turn as he discovered that 'I for' was not right.

Excerpt 12: Pair A

1 S: Uh, the, the car?
2 W: Um.
3→ S: which:: I: give, >which I gave you<, **I for: I need the car for ONE day**.

Reformatting appeared when speaker I's turn that begins with 'I.. get' in line 2 of Excerpt 13. The part of the sentence changed into 'my computer is broken down..'. The speaker I's effort to explain the reason why he needs an extension of deadline did not prove to be successful even after repeating the subject. thereafter, the speaker decided to give it another try with a different sentence structure and grammar. This *Reformatting* was used by an NNS because the speaker opted for an better sentence structure to be produced. This is different from NSs' whose perspectival change lead to *Reformatting*.

Excerpt 13: Pair D

1 J: (hh) .hh [Why you want to me] uh, extend your deadline?
2→ I: [But, because **I.. get,**] **I, my computer is broke down**, so, and my
8 file's gone.

4) Others: *Code-Switching* and O*verlooking of Self-Repair*

Besides the techniques classified earlier, other features of self-repairing mechanisms in the same turn were discovered to be systematically exercised by the participants. These features are *Code-switching* interjected and *Overlooking* of repair tries.

First, *Code-switching* can be used as a self-repairing technique. In line 3 of Excerpt 14, J uses *Code-switching* by saying '줄기세포' as a technique *Aborting* to support the meaning of 'stem cells' in the same line. This is not to fix a trouble source, but to invite the recipient's comprehension of the word, which is acceptable as an interactional characteristics of practicing self-repair. *Code-switching* of NNSs as an interactive resource was already demonstrated in the previous study (Noh, 2015b).

Excerpt 14: Pair B

1 J: But:::↓(0.1) studying cloning: of animals can (0.3) give some help for, uh,
2 our (.) health (0.2), it's, (0.2) healthcare (.) program? like, you know the (0.2)
3→ stem cells↑, 줄기세포(*Jul-gi se-po*)?
4 C: Umm↑
5 J: 줄기세포(*Jul-gi se-po*)?
6 C: yes.

Second, O*verlooking of Self-Repair* typically did not end in a breakdown of interactional conversation. In line 1 of Excerpt 15, the participant I did not correct his utterance 'for fix my computer' and this did not hinder the communication between the participants.

Excerpt 15: Pair D

1→ I: Excuse me, I wanna go: to: a computer store **for fix my computer**?
2 How can, how can I get to there?
3 J: Um:: (.) we're here? (.) in, on the Hardy street,

The findings of the analysis suggest that self-repair is practiced linguistically and interactionally for the recipient's understanding and for continuing the sequence development. *Recycling*, *Replacing*, *Deleting*, *Searching*, *Reordering*, and *Reformatting* were used to fix and complete the speaking turn with regard to structures and vocabulary. *Parenthesizing*, *Aborting*, *Inserting*, and *Sequence Jumping* have been shown to be used in consideration of the recipient's understanding of the speaker's talk. *Code-switching* as a self-repairing technique and overlooking of self-repair also displayed the interactive characteristics. Besides, more than two techniques were entangled in a turn. Lastly, parts of

a turn ending with rising intonation displayed the confirmational characteristics of the turn. Based on these findings, self-repair techniques are useful for L2 learners to enhance their turns in interaction, which could be focused on in language learning for both linguistic and interactional purposes.

The ten techniques of self-repair has been suggested by Schegloff (2013) from native speakers' talk-in interaction have proven to be applicable to nonnative speakers' talk-in interaction as a tool of defining the way to deal with problems of their talk at the ongoing turn in conversation.

2. Distribution of Self-Repair Techniques Use

The ten self-repair techniques have been analyzed for the number of each technique's occurrences. Self-repair techniques were used in total, 358 times, which accounts for 28% of the total turns generated in all of the dialogues (Table 3). Code-switching as a self-repair strategy has been found to be used two times. Despite the low frequency of use, code-switching can be clearly classified another self-repairing technique based on the results of this study.

Among the ten techniques, the total numbers of using *Recycling* and *Replacing* in each group were converted to a ratio against 100 percent of the total number of the speaking turns generated by each pair as in Table 3. This frequency of using repair techniques in Pair A, B, C, and D can be used to compare with each other according to the participants' background. It may reveal potential factors related to the different numbers of technique uses employed by each pair respectively.

TABLE 3

Distribution of the Ten Self-Repair Techniques Used by Korean Speakers of English

	Pair A	Pair B	Pair C	Pair D	Total
Replacing (to total turns)*	32 (7%)	13 (8%)	10 (2%)	24 (9%)	79 (6%)
Inserting	3	0	0	10	13
Deleting	0	1	0	7	8
Searching	0	3	4	7	14
Parenthesizing	1	2	0	0	3
Aborting	1	0	2	0	3
Sequence Jumping	0	0	0	1	1
Recycling (to total turns)**	96 (22%)	14 (8%)	19 (5%)	89 (34%)	218 (17%)
Reformatting	4	3	3	6	16

Reordering	1	0	0	2	3
Total (SR/Total turns)***	138 (31%)	36 (21%)	38 (9%)	146 (55%)	358 (28%)
Total turns	443	168	411	263	1285

* the ratio of *Replacing* against total turns of each group

** the ratio of *Recycling* against total turns of each group

*** the ratio of the total self-repair techniques used against the total turns of each group

In general, the use of self-repair techniques was weighted towards only a few of them. As seen in the Table 3, *Recycling* (17%) is by far the most used of them all and *Replacing* (6%) is the next. This means that participants construct their turn by using cutoffs, repeating parts of their utterances and extending their productions next, which is a 'stop-and-go' action to complete the turn. *Recycling* works for the establishment of a turn. *Replacing* is related to the speaker's linguistic competence and contextual understanding. It has been observed that the participants of this project replaced mainly the function words (for example, "in, on the street" uttered by J in Pair B), appropriate vocabulary (excerpt 4 and 5), and correction of pronunciation (for example, "dra-u-t? draut?" uttered by J in Pair D) rather than to elaborate vocabulary choices.

The next techniques in terms of frequency are *Reformatting*, *Searching*, and *Inserting*. Among them, *Reformatting* represents the grammatical change of a turn as well as the cognitive power of the speaker for the context of the turn. Language learners searched for a correct sentence by focusing on linguistic forms rather than perspectival changes of state of mind in a more sophisticated way. *Searching* and *Inserting* were used to compliment and finish the ongoing turn linguistically and interactionally each.

The rest of the techniques were exercised in the order of *Deleting*, *Parenthesizing*, *Aborting*, *Reordering*, and *Sequence Jumping*. *Sequence Jumping* has been identified as being used only once in Pair D when the speaker at the turn abandoned the ongoing topic at one point. To stop the sequence so far and start a new sequence of closing the conversation they were having, the speaker of Pair D jumped to another sequence of the talk. This is very similar to 'avoidance' of communicative strategy, which comes up when the speaker abandons what is to be uttered because it is difficult for her or him to produce.

Overall, based on Table 3, the ratio of using self-repair techniques (RSRT) use at the same turn indicates almost 30% of the total turns-in interaction took place in all groups. According to RSRT to total turns generated by each pair, Pair D used the self-repair techniques the most with 55 %, the next is Pair A (31%), B (21%), and C the least with 9 % in the frequency order. Meanwhile, according to Table 3, *Recycling* appears the most in Pair D with 34 % than any other groups while Pair C shows the least proportion of 5 %.

Replacing, the second most used technique, was used most in pair D again with 9 % of use compared with the total turns-in interaction.

Based on this result, Pair D was discovered to employ the whole self-repair techniques the most among the four pairs, especially with using *Recycling* and *Replacing* while Pair C used self-repair techniques least. Apparently the Pair D, one of whom has relatively low English proficiency test score of 62 in TOEFL IBT (Table 2), is far less fluent compared with Pair C considering the high rate of both speakers' using self-repair techniques. There can be some components to trace the self-repair technique use to the affecting factors. The participants' background can be an influential factor to the frequency of using self-repair techniques because both members of the Pair C who studied abroad are more fluent speakers of English as learners (Table 2). However, seeing that one member of the Pair D has studied abroad, this may not be a good example of the affecting factor for using self-repair techniques.

Meanwhile, linguistic competence may support the possibility of the participants' use of self-repair techniques from Pair D, though not decisive. According to Table 2, individual differences of the test scores in Pair D, however, is notable among others, which means that linguistic competence also may not be critical in affecting the frequency of employing the self-repair techniques. That Pair D used self-repair techniques most means that the frequency of self-repair technique use cannot be determined only by the speaker's linguistic competence or by the individual's experience of studying abroad.

There can be other possibilities such as interactive circumstances or intersubjectivity created by the interactants in the conversation for their self-repair technique employment. Considering that the members of Pair C who practiced self-repair least were friends with each other while Pair D had never met and used self-repair technique most, intersubjectivity may have been integral in participants' flowing production in interaction. This implies that it is important for language learners to practice building intersubjectivity in dyadic structures through participating in L2 interactions as much as possible.

V. CONCLUSION

This study was aimed to look for and describe the procedural characteristics of self-initiated self-repair performed by Korean learners of English in order to examine how language learners practice self-repair in the same turn in reference to the ten self-repair techniques presented by Schegloff (2013). The ten techniques were discovered to be useful in investigating self-repair practices in NNSs' interactions using English although they were based on the conversation among NSs. The ten techniques were adopted to

accomplishing Korean L2 learners' linguistic and interactional goals of the same turn repair. General characteristics of self-repair in the same turn also appeared in Korean L2 learners' interactions, such as using cutoffs and prefaces, carrying both linguistic and interactional purposes of correction and elaboration of the ongoing turn, and the formats of repair practices.

In detail, first, self-repair was practiced by the Korean L2 learners to fix and complete the speaker's current turn. Second, self-repair in the same turn in this project can be typified by 'stop-and-go' production locally distributed in their talk-in interaction. Third, mixture of the self-repair techniques using more than two techniques was seen to be exercised, which was also stated by Schegloff (2013). Fourth, troubles of the speaker's turn that are clearly defective linguistically, such as in the forms of vocabulary or sentential structures, have sometimes been overlooked and unrepaired by the speaker at the turn. This was not a hindrance for their interaction as in Lee's (2005) study.

It has also been observed that self-repair in the same turn practiced by language learners is a socially achieved behavior. The interactive traits of self-repair demonstrate that the errors and the repairable in production should not be limited to be attributable to language learners' insufficient linguistic competence. Rising intonation indicates the speaker's confirmation of the utterance with the interactants and *Code-switching* was employed by the participants to help the recipient understand the speaker better. These two are the language learners' efforts to elaborate their turns under the interactional circumstances created by them. Among the ten techniques, *Aborting*, *Parenthesizing*, *Inserting*, and *Sequence Jumping* were revealed to be interactive resources in addition to the use of rising intonation and C*ode-switching*. The others, *Recycling*, *Replacing*, *Deleting*, *Searching*, *Reordering*, and *Reformatting*, were used to repair or complete the turn of the speaker.

According to the result of the quantitative analysis, almost thirty percent of self-repair was practiced in the participants' total turns at talk. *Recycling* and *Replacing* were the most frequently used techniques to complete the turn by the participants, much more concentrated on *Recycling* (Table 3). Next, *Reformatting*, *Searching*, and *Inserting* were used in order after *Recycling* and *Repairing*. *Deleting* was used next often after *Inserting*, followed by *Parenthesizing*, *Aborting*, and *Reordering* in order. *Sequence Jumping* was used only once in Pair D, which stopped the sequence and brought about the beginning of a closing sequence. The remainder of the self-repair techniques tended to be used distinctively in each pair.

The differences in using self-repair techniques by each pair were remarkable in that the technique uses were found to occur in Pair D's conversation, which made up 55 percent against their total speaking turns generated, in contrast with Pair C who exercised self-repair techniques 9 percent of their total turns. This result is not necessarily a reflection of the participants' background such as studying abroad experience or linguistic competence

because individual differences did exist in each pair. It is not clearly defined what made the differences in using the self-repair techniques in each pair. It is just that various elements of the participants and interactions have been compiled for the self-repair techniques to be used. Each participant's linguistic background of studying abroad or language proficiency, or personal background of gender, age, and personal characters may all be complicated working for their talk-in interaction. The fact that members of Pair D had never met and those of Pair C are friends with each other can only support that intersubjectivity between the participants is linked to their practicing self-repair to a certain degree.

In sum, the results of this study helped to understand L2 learners' self-repairing behaviors as L2 users. It was observed that *Recycling* and *Replacing* were used most among the ten techniques and that one or more self-repair techniques in a speaking turn as well as *Code-switching* were used by Korean L2 learners to fix and complete their speaking turns. Their interactions were successful whether or not self-repair is practiced. It was found that intersubjectivity is an important factor in conversational interactions between Korean L2 learners seeing that Pair D whose participants practiced self-repair most. Self-repair may be an obstacle for fluency. However, self-repair can be a useful resource for an L2 speaker's elaboration of the ongoing turn if the goal of L2 education is set to help the learners become capable L2 users in any interactions. Even though a 'stop-and-go' pattern of production is prevalent at the beginning stage of learning with the use of structure-related self-repair techniques, more advanced L2 learners who practice a variety of self-repair techniques such as *Aborting*, *Parenthesizing*, *Inserting*, and *Sequence Jumping* may find these techniques helpful for their interactions in the target language. *Reformatting*, used to complete the ongoing turn by Korean L2 learners, may serve interactional purposes reflecting the speaker's perspectival change as noted in Schegloff (2013). Generalization of relationship between components of L2 learners' background and self-repair technique used in L2 interactions is to be cautiously made. It requires a further research to decide which factors of participants' language proficiency, age, etc. affect how L2 speakers' self-repair techniques are practiced. Nonetheless, L2 learners' practicing appropriate self-repair techniques in a timely manner in their interaction would help them become competent language users while they study a language.

REFERENCES

Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (1984). Transcription notation. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structure of social action* (pp. 4-16). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cho, E. A. (2007). A conversation analytic approach to repair organization in talk-in interaction between Korean speakers of English. *The Jungang Journal of English*

Literature and Linguistics, 49(2). 283-302.

Dörnyei, Z., & Scott, M. L. (1997). Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies. *Language learning, 47*(1). 173-210.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and some fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal, 81*(3), 285-300.

Forrester, M. (in press). *The emergence of self-repair: A case study of one child during the early pre-school years*. Research on Language and Social Interaction.

Hellerman, J. (2009). Looking for Evidence of Language Learning in Practices for Repair: A Case Study of Self-Initiated Self-Repair by an Adult Learner of English. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research. 53*(2), 113–132.

Jefferson, G. (1974). Error correction as an interactional resource. *Language in Society, 3*(2), 181-199.

Jung, E. H. (2005). Second language classroom discourse: The roles of teacher and learners. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 11*(4), 121-137.

Kasper, G. (2004). Participant Orientations in German Conversation-for-Learning. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(4), 551-567.

Kim, Y. E. (2006). Teacher's corrective feedback: Focus on initiation to self-repair. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 13* (1), 111-131.

Kim, Y. K. (2009). The organization and decisions of L2 learners' self-repair in conversation. Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics, *25*(3), 215-239.

Kitzinger, C. (2013). Repair. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Conversation analysis*(pp. 229-256). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd

Kormos, J. (1999). Monitoring and self-repair in L2. *Language Learning, 49*(2), 303-342.

Lee, J. S. (2005). A conversation analysis of self-repair in Asian Englishes. *Asian Englishes, 8*(1). 4-25.

Levinson, S. C. (1984). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.

Markee, N. P. P. (2000). *Conversation analysis.* Mahwah, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum.

Nakatani, Y. (2010). Identifying strategies that facilitate EFL learners' oral communication: A classroom study using multiple data collection procedures. *The Modern Language Journal, 94*, 116-136.

Noh, S.W. (2015a). *A Study of Conversation Analysis on Interactional Strategies of Korean Learners of English*. Unpublished Ph.D thesis, Dae-Jeon: ChungNam National University.

Noh, S.W. (2015b). A study on the Korean University Students' use of Code Switching in Interactional Conversation. *Modern Studies in English Language & Literature, 59*(2), 73-96.

Poulisse, N. (1997). Some Words in Defense of the Psycholinguistic Approach: A Response to Firth and Wagner. *The Modern Language Journal, 81*(3), 324-328.

Schegloff, E. A. (1979). The Relevance of Repair to Syntax-for-Conversation in Discourse and Syntax. *Syntax and Semantics Ann Arbor, Mich. 12*, 261-286.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sciology, 97*(5). 1295-1345.

Schegloff, E. A. (1993). Reflections on quantification in the study of conversation. *Research on language and social interaction 26* (1), 99-128

Schegloff, E. A. (2010). *Sequence organization in interaction* (5th ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. (2013). Ten operations in self-initiated, same-turn repair. In M. Hayashi, G. Raymond, & J. Sidnell. (Eds). *Conversational repair and human understanding* (pp. 1-40). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A., Sacks, H. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematic for the organization of turn taking for conversation. *Language*, *50*(4), 696-735.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G. & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organisation of repair in conversation. *Language*, *53*, 361-382.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). Conversation analysis methodology. *Language Learning, 54*(1), 1–54.

Wong, J. (2000). Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/ nonnative speaker English conversation. *Applied Linguistics*, *21*, 274-297.

APPENDIX

Transcribing Notation (adapted from Jefferson, in Atkinson & Heritage, 1984)

1. Utterances		**3. Characteristics of speech delivery**	
[ ]	Beginning and end of overlapping	WORD	Loud sounds
=	No 'gap' between the two lines	::	Extended sound
( )	Untranscribed talk	.	A stopping fall in tone
		,	A continuing intonation
2. Timed intervals		?	A rising intonation.
(0.0)	Pause, (7.1) = a pause of 7.1 seconds	↑↓	Rising and falling intonation
(.)	A tiny 'gap' within or between utterances	°	Relatively quieter talk
—	A short pause	><	A quicker utterance
		·hhh	An inhalation
		hhh	An exhalaration.

Examples in: English
Applicable Language: English
Applicable Levels: University

Suk-Won Noh
Dept. of English Literature and Linguistics
College of Humanity, ChungNam National University
220, Gung-dong, Yu-Seong Gu
DaeJeon, Korea
Tel: (042) 821-5331
Email: snoopynoh@gmail.com

Received in January 15th, 2016
Reviewed in February 26th, 2016
Revised version received in March 5th, 2016