A Model of Incorporating Other-Initiated Repair Strategies in Teaching Speaking to EFL Learners

Madar Aleksius

UNIKA Widya Mandira & Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia
Email: alex_madar2000@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

This paper aims at sharing ideas on how other-initiated repair strategies can be used in teaching speaking to EFL learners. Other-Initiated Repair (henceforth OIR) is a concept in Conversation Analysis (CA) theory which is defined as the treatment of trouble occurring in interactive talk such as in speaking, hearing, or understanding. To set the context this paper will give a brief overview of the application of Conversation Analysis, and OIR Strategies as an aspect of CA, in second/foreign language learning and teaching. Different OIR strategies which are synthesized from different studies and literature review will be presented. The final and major part of the paper contains a suggested teaching model of how OIR strategies can be incorporated in speaking class in order to enhance the EFL students' fluency in speaking. The model, which is based on Wong and Waring (2010) consists of three major steps, such as (a) awareness raising activity; (b) practicing activities; and (c) variation activity, where each step comprises several activities.

Key words: Speaking; Other-Initiated Repair; EFL Learners

Introduction

As one of the four language skills, speaking is considered very important by many people to master because the ability to speak a language indicates one's overall mastery of a language. Given the important role of speaking, many (if not all) ELT programs set up the goal of their programs as to impart learners the ability to use English effectively and accurately in communication. However, to be able to speak English fluently and accurately is not an easy thing to do because speaking requires learners to master certain set of sub-skills. Richard and Renandya (2002: 202) mention that speaking proficiency in second or foreign language is a very thorny task for the learners as it involves different related aspects. For instance, speaking can have different purposes and each purpose involves different skills. The purposes of speaking vary depending on the setting or situation of speaking. In casual conversation, the purposes can be to make social contact, to establish rapport, or to engage in small talks with friends. On the other hand, when speaking in a more formal setting, the purposes may include seeking or expressing opinion, persuading people, or clarifying information. Speaking may also be intended at giving instructions or getting things done, describing things, complaining, making request, or just to entertain people with jokes and anecdotes (Richard & Renandya, 2002).

Whatever the purposes of speaking are, every learner needs to possess the knowledge of the language and the rules of how to display the knowledge in real communication. Linguists called this knowledge and ability as communicative competence (Hymes, 1972; Canale and Swain,

1980; Celce-Murcia, 2007). Canale & Swain (1980) assert that communicative competence is not a single trait but composing of some components, namely of grammatical competence, sociocultural competence, and strategic competence. Canale & Swain's concept of communicative competence is built on Hymes' theory (Hymes, 1972) that in addition to linguistic knowledge, L2 learners need to know the ways of interacting with others in various circumstances and relationships in a culturally acceptable ways. Celce-Murcia (2007) extended this notion of communicative competence by including interactional competence as vital component in conjunction with other components of communicative competence.

For EFL learners, communicative competence would be hard to achieve without explicit instruction because it is not something that can be mastered automatically but needs to be learned and practiced, like any other language skills. Therefore, it is necessary that in the design of speaking instruction, teachers should also incorporate the teaching of interaction strategies where students may be able to use language for communication, and not just asking the students to discuss about certain topics or to talk about certain subject that has been previously prepared by the teachers (Shumin, 1987: 204). These strategies are particularly important when students engage in real-life interaction where the possibility of communication breakdown is inevitable due misunderstanding problems between the interlocutors.

It is commonly happened in a conversation that the participants would find unknown words or structures, or what the speaker is saying is not clear. The presence of such problems will result in misunderstanding between the interlocutors. To solve the understanding problem, the interlocutors should find ways or strategies so that conversation will not cease. Nation & Newton (2009:158) suggest that interlocutors may use the phrases like "pardon?", "What?" or a more colloquial one like "Eh?" Another possible way to do is by repeating the unclear part and adding question words "what", such as in "He what"? or "He agreed what?". These strategies are call negotiation of meaning devices or in CA theory they are called other-initiated repair strategies (Wong & Waring, 2010). This strategy must be learned for the sake of fluency in interaction. Regarding the necessity to incorporate the teaching of repair strategies for Indonesian EFL learners, Mukminatien (2012: 229) says that repair strategies is very important because they will help students to achieve success in cross-cultural communication. Mukminatien mentions code mixing and code switching as an example of repair strategy that EFL learners often use in order to cope with breakdown communication breakdowns. This is usually done because the students come from the same L1 background.

The objectives of this paper, then, are to show that other types of repair strategies, especially other-initiated repair strategies can be used by EFL learners in overcoming communication breakdown, and how they can be used to teach speaking to EFL learners in order to improve their speaking proficiency. The use of OIR strategies in speaking class to improve the learners' fluency have not been commonly practiced in EFL classes. Therefore, this paper would contribute as a reference for EFL teachers to have an alternative method in teaching speaking to EFL learners in order to improve their fluency.

Conceptualization of OIR Strategies and their Relevance in ELT

Other-Initiated Repair (OIR) is actually one of the aspects of analysis in the Conversation Analysis (CA) study. By definition CA is "the study of social organization of natural conversation that concerned with how meaning and pragmatic functions are communicated in both mundane and institutional talk" (Richard & Schmidt, 2002: 122). This definition shows that CA studies not only mundane talk but also interactions in formal and institutional setting such, in the courtroom, in classroom, or interactions between the doctors and the patients. The conversation aspects studied under CA are (a) the sequential organization of talk; (b) turn-taking; and (c) the ways how people identify and repair communicative problems (Richard & Schmidt, 2002), and (d) overall structuring practices, i.e. the ways of organizing a conversation as a whole as in openings and closings (Wong & Waring, 2010: 8).

The relevance of CA in the fields of SLA and ELT has been articulated by several authors (e.g. He & Young, 1998; Macbeth, 2004; Seedhouse, 2004, 2005; Markee, 2000; Wong & Waring, 2010; Huth, 2011; Kasper & Wagner, 2014). Wong & Waring (2010), Markee (2010), and Seedhouse (2004) wrote a book-length account on the application of CA's theoretical and methodological principles in studying the interactions that occur in ESL/EFL classroom settings. Meanwhile, Huth (2011) asserts the application of CA in language classroom could help the teachers explicate the interaction pattern of language learning tasks produced by the learners. One particular aspect of CA that has strong relevance in language teaching and learning is the repair organization because it specifically addresses the description and analysis of understanding problems which commonly happen in ESL/EFL learners' interactions (He & Young (1998: 14). In addition, Seedhouse (2005) maintains that "repair is particularly important for L2 learners and teachers to understand how breakdowns in communication and misunderstandings are repaired, as repair in the L2 classroom tends to carry a heavier load than in other settings" (p.168). Therefore, teachers should consider incorporating repair as part of speaking class in order to enhance the students speaking proficiency.

In CA, repair is defined as the treatment of trouble occurring in interactive language use (Seedhouse, 2005: 168) such as in speaking, hearing, or understanding of talk (Wong & Waring, 2010: 212). The mechanism of repair in conversation can be distinguished based on who performs the repair acts. Liddicoat (2007: 173) divided repair into two types: (a) self-initiated repair, i.e the repair act performed by the speaker of the trouble source himself/herself, and (b) other-initiated repair, i.e. the repair act done by other participant(s) in the conversation. This paper focuses on other-initiated repair, the teaching of which would benefit the improvement of EFL learners speaking proficiency.

The sequence of other-initiated repair starts from the presence of *trouble source* in a speaker turn which will prompt the employment of *repair initiation* by the other speaker, followed by *repair outcome* produced by the trouble source speaker (Gardner & Wagner (2004: 11). Wong & Waring (2010: 213-214) define trouble source as word, phrase, or utterance treated as problematic by the participants; repair initiation as the practice of signaling or targeting a trouble source; and repair outcome as the solution of the trouble source or abandonment of the problem. The sources of trouble in interaction take different kinds of forms, such as grammatical errors, imperfection of speech delivery, clarifications, or mishearing that may impede mutual

understanding between parties in the interaction.   In order to overcome the understanding problems due to the presence such trouble sources, the conversational participants need to use certain strategies, called *other-initiated repair strategies*, so that the conversation will not breakdown or cease.

The previous description shows conceptual/theoretical foundations for the development of teaching model proposed in this paper.   However, the model should also be empirically supported by studies that may provide the merits on the use of OIR strategies in ESL/EFL learning context.   Therefore, several studies on this topic are reviewed, especially those conducted with ESL/EFL learners.

The first group of studies (Abdullah, 2011 and Yasui, 2010) are conducted in in ESL setting. Abdullah (2011) conducted a study on the negotiation of meaning of the international postgraduate students learning English as a second language in USA. The study investigates the strategies used by the participants to negotiate meaning in the interaction and whether the strategies are influenced by the interaction task, in terms of the strategy types and frequency. It was found that the students used various types of strategies to negotiate meaning in their interaction, such as clarification requests, confirmation, checks, comprehension checks, word-coinage, and use of approximation, self-repetition, other repetition, self-correction, and non-verbal expression of non-understanding. It was also found that the frequency of strategies is influenced by the interaction tasks. The second study is conducted by Yasui (2010) with the Japanese speaker participants studying in an American university in USA. The aim is to explor the repair patterns of advanced and beginner language learners. It is found that the participants orient toward their different levels of proficiency through the use of repair process, where advanced learners prefer to use self-repair while beginner learners are more inclined to use other-initiated repair. It is also revealed that the repair strategies used by the learners are mostly to address understanding problems because of lexical and grammatical errors.

The next group of studies are done in the setting where English is a foreign language (EFL). Kaur (2012) specifically studies the use of repetition as repair strategies in the spoken interaction used by EFL graduate students in Malaysia. The participants come mostly from Asian countries with different L1 backgrounds and they use English as the main medium of communication. The result of the study shows that the participants use repetition in their speech to clarify their expression in order to increase the interlocutors' understanding. The types of repetition strategy employed by the speaker include parallel phrasing and combined repetition and repaired repetition.

Studies by Fotonania & Dorri (2013) and Khodadady & Alifathabady (2014) are done with participants whose L1 is Persian. Fotonania & Dorri's (2013) study aimed at investigating whether the use of other-repair strategies is influenced by students' genders and teacher's gender. More strategies were found in single gender class than mixed-gender class and teacher's gender has no significant influence of the use of the strategies. In the study, the authors include nine different types of other-initiated repair strategies. They are unspecified repair, interrogative repair, partial repeat plus a question word repair, partial repeat repair, understanding check repair, request for repetition, request for definition, nonverbal resources repair, and correction repair. Khodadady & Alifathabady's (2014) study focuses on the difference in the frequency of

other- repair used by the high group and low group.   It was found that the high group used more repair strategies in their conversation than the low group.   The other-initiated repair strategies included in the study were partial repeat, understanding check, and correction.

Taking into account the conceptual basis and empirical support provided in the preceding sections, this section presents different types of OIR Strategies that will be included in the proposed teaching model. These types of OIR strategies are mainly summarized from Wong & Waring (2010: 230 – 234) that they adapted from Schegloff, at.al (1977).

1. Open class OIR strategy or unspecified repair strategy, is usually used with no specification of trouble source in the turn prior to the OIR strategy, whether the problem is related to hearing, misunderstanding of talk, or both. The repair initiation is indicated by the use of *Huh?, What? Pardon? I'm sorry?*

    Example:

    (Schegloff et al., 1977 in Wong and Waring, 2020: 230)

    01   D: Well did he ever get married or anything?

    02   C:→   **Hu:h?**

    03   D: Did he ever get married?

    04   C: I have no idea.

    OIR takes place at line 02 of C's turn with the use of Hu:h?. The repair initiator does not specify which part of D's utterance at line o1 contains the problem.

2. *WH*-Interrogative OIR. This strategy involves the use of a single question word such as *who, where, when* as repair initiation that specifies trouble source of prior turn.

    Example:

    (Schegloff, 1997 in Wong and Waring, 2010: 232)

    01   Freda: This is nice did you make this?

    02   Kathy: No Samu made that.

    03   Freda: →**Who?**

    04   Kathy: Samu.

    The repair initiation takes place at line 03 of Freda's turn, using question word *Who?*. Another form of interrogative OIR includes expressions such as *What do you mean*, *What do you mean by that*, or *what do you mean* + [element of prior turn] (Wong & Waring, 2010: 232).

    Example:

    (Schegloff, 199, in Wong & Waring, 2010: 232)

    01   Curt: He- he's about the only regular <he's about the only

    02   good regular out there is Keegan still go out?

    03   Mike: Keegan's, out there he's, he run,

    04   (0.5)

    05   Mike: E:[r he's uh::

    06   Gary:→   [**What do you <u>mean</u> my:, my [brother in law's**

    07   **out there,**

    08   Mike: [doing real good

    09   this year and Gilton's doing real good this year.

    At line 06, Gary uses the format of *What do you mean* + [element of prior turn] as a repair initiator to challenge Curt's assertion that "Keegan is one of the only good regulars".

3. Partial repetition of trouble- source + *WH*-interrogative where a question word is used together with the repetition of the trouble source turn.
   Example:
   (Schegloff, 2007, in Wong & Waring, 2010: 233)
01	Bet:	Was last time the first time you met Mrs.
02		Kelly?
03		(0.2)
04	Mar:→	**Met whom?**
05	Bet:	Mrs. Kelly.
06	Mar:	Yes.

   The OIR Strategy takes place at line 04 of Mar's turn. He repeats the word 'met' in Bet's utterance followed by question word *whom*?.

4. Partial repetition of the trouble-source, where some parts of the trouble source turn are used again in repair initiation, usually delivered in rising intonation to convey uncertainty which serves to invite the speaker of the trouble-source to complete the repair (Wong & Waring, 2010: 232).

   Example:
   (Wong phone data in Wong & Waring 2010: 232)
01	Irene:	I'm um .h thinking (.) about (.) moving (.) to
02		Boston.
03	Han:→	**Boston?**
04	Irene:	(h)u(h) .h Yeah::: I'm at- I'm thinking about that

   Han initiates a repair at line 03 by repeating the word 'Boston' from Irene's utterance, producing it in rising intonation. By using this type of OIR, the part of the prior turn to be repaired is precisely known.

5. *You mean* + understanding check. In this strategy, the repair initiation involves an understanding check often preceded by *You mean*. It is done by targeting more specifically the trouble in the previous speaker's turn.
   Example:
   (Schegloff et al., 1977, in Wong & Waring, 2010: 234)
01	B:	How long you gonna be here?
02	A:	Uh- not too long. Uh just till uh Monday.
03	B:→	**Till- oh you mean like a week from tomorrow.**
04	A:	Yah.

6. Exposed Correction Repair Strategy
   It refers to stopping the trajectory of talk to overtly address a trouble-source (Wong & Waring, 2010: 238).
   Example:
   (Jefferson, 1987, in Wong & Waring, 2010: 238)
01	Jan:	I guess they paid two-twenty thousand for the house
02		and two thousand for the **ki:l**.
03	Beth:	Mm::,
04	Jan:	Technically,
05	Ron:→	**(It's a) kil:n.**
06	Jan:	Kil:n, I don't know how to say it,

| 07 | Ron: | You always say kil. |

At line 02, Jan's pronunciation of the "ki:l" ("kiln") is treated as the trouble-source by Jon, who does an overt correction at line 05 by providing the correct pronunciation of the word.

7. Request for Repetition. In this strategy, the interlocutor who initiates the repair explicitly asks the previous speaker to repeat his/her utterance that might cause problem in understanding (Fotovatnia, & Dorri, 2013:951-952).
   Example:

01	T:	Ok. Today I sneeze wobbly. Yesterday I, what verb form?
02	S 1:→	*Uhm? One more time*
03	T:	Today I sneeze wobbly
04	S 2:	Sneezed
05	T:	Yeah sneezed.

   At line 02, student 1 explicitly asks the teacher to repeat his/her utterance at line 01 because the student is having a problem to understand it.

8. Non Verbal Repair Strategy. This strategy includes the use of gesture, bodily movement, gaze, facial expression and silence to indicate that one is having a problem in understanding the utterance of the previous speaker (Fotovatnia, & Dorri, 2013:952).
   Example:

01	T:	What day of the week tomorrow?
02	S:→	*(patting his hand with making squint eyes)*
03	T:	What's tomorrow? It starts with f
04	S:	Friday

   At line 02, the student is having an understanding problem of the teacher's question at line 01. He shows it by patting his hand and squinting his eyes.

Teaching Model of Using OIR Strategies in Speaking Class

The following model of teaching Other-Initiated Repair Strategies is adapted from Wong & Waring (2010). This model is meant to be used as guidance for the English teachers when he/she intends to incorporate the teaching of OIR strategies in his/her speaking class to improve students' proficiency in conversation. Therefore, the teachers may use it as a variation of their current practice of teaching speaking.

Wong & Waring stresses the importance of raising the students' awareness of repair to enhance their ability to incorporate repair in their everyday conversation.
The procedures are described as follows:
1. Awareness-raising Activity.
   a. Step 1: Begin the class by finding out what learners know about other-initiated repair in English and/or in the learners' native language.
      The teacher can start by asking questions:
      1) When you do not hear or understand what someone has said, what do you usually say? The purpose of asking this question is to activate the students' previous

conversational experiences, especially when they are having problems in understanding of what people say to them.

- In this activity, the teacher should give ample opportunity for the student to give their answer, either in English or in their L1, so that their background knowledge on how they address misunderstanding in conversation is really explored.
- All the students' answers should be written on board and recorded by both the teachers and the students to be used later as comparison with OIR strategies in English.

2) Have you ever heard someone says *What? Huh* or *Sorry?* when you are having a conversation? Is it always clear to you what the problem is? The purpose of asking this question is to explore the students' knowledge about different kinds of trouble-sources in the conversation that may trigger the employment of the OIR strategies of *What? Huh* or *Sorry.*

- The students should be given ample opportunity to give their answers, either in English or in their L1, so that they are aware of different kinds of problems that they might produce when having daily conversation.
- All the students' answers should be written on board and recorded by both the teachers and the students to be used later as comparison with trouble-sources in English conversation.

3) Do you know of any ways of asking someone to repeat if you did not hear or understand it? If so, what are they? Similar to number 1, the purpose of asking these questions is to activate students' previous experience in using Repetition as a type of OIR strategy to overcome understanding problem in conversation.

- The students should be given ample opportunity to give their answers, either in English or in their L.
- All the students' answers should be written on board and recorded by both the teachers and the students to be used later as comparison with Repetition OIR strategy in English conversation

4) What questions or problems do you have about how to ask others to repeat, clarify, confirm, or correct an utterance? These questions are given to explore more on students' knowledge and experiences in dealing with understanding problems in conversation.

- The students should be given ample opportunity to give their answers, either in English or in their L1.
- All the students' answers should be written on board and recorded by both the teachers and the students to be used later as comparison with OIR strategies in English conversation

b. Step 2: Provide learners with the following list of OIR strategies in context and ask them to consider:

What differences exist among the various initiators?

When is each used in what context?

Are these techniques mutually interchangeable?

The purpose of this activity is to introduce the students with OIR strategies in English conversation.

1) *Huh? Pardon? Sorry? What? Excuse me?*
(Schegloff, 1997 in Wong & Waring, 2010: 245)

01	A:	And okay do you think you could come?
02		Pretty much for sure?
03	B:	What?
04	A:	Do you think you could come pretty much for sure?
05	B:	Sure.

2) *Wh*-questions: *who, when, where*

(Schegloff, Sacks, and Jefferson, 1977 in Wong & Waring, 2010: 245)

01	B:	By the way, I have to go to Lila's.
02	A:	Where?
03	B:	Lila's to get my books.

3) Partial repetition + *wh*-question

(Sacks, 1992 in Wong & Waring, 2010:245)

01	A:	Okay, uh I was saying my name is Smith and I'm
02		with the Emergency Psychiatric Center.
03	B:	Your name is what?
04	A:	Smith.
05	B:	Smith?
06	A:	Yes.

4) Partial repetition

(Wong phone data, in Wong & Waring, 2010: 246)

01	B:	Wa- I was wondering if you were gonna be home
02		tomorrow afternoon I could maybe come over after
03		summer school.
04		(0.4)
05	A:	Um:: I'll be at my mother's tomorrow afternoon.
06	B:	Oh::=
07	A:	No I'm just sitting there waiting for an oil burner
08		man=you can come over then.
09	B:	You're sitting there waiting for an oil burner?
10	A:	Yeah(h)(h) .h heh:: No:: you know you have to
11		(h)(h)huh-hih I
12		think I am=I'm not sure (0.2) um:: you know you
13		have to get the burner cleaned or something for the
14		summer?

5) *You mean* + understanding check

(Schegloff et al., 1977, in Wong & Waring, 2010)

01 B: How long are you going to be here?
02 A: Uh not too long uh just till uh Monday.
03 B: Oh you mean like a week from tomorrow.
04 : Yeah.

c. Step 3: Have learners share their answers in class discussion and introduce about the use of those OIR Strategies.
- The teacher should listen very carefully to the students' talk.
- The teacher should praise the students when they use any of the above OIR strategies.

d. Step 4: Discuss possible cross-cultural variations.
- Teacher can use the notes previously recorded for this activity.

2. **Practicing Activity:** *The Power to Repair*
  a. Step 1: Makes sets of six cards.
      - Card one is written with the statement:
          Zoe will drop by to pick up the toy after school at 3 o'clock.
      - Cards two is written with Open class or unspecified OIR strategy: *What? Huh? Pardon? Sorry?*
      - Card three is written with *Wh*-Interrogative OIR Strategy*: Who, Where, When*, etc.
      - Card four is written with Partial repetition + *who, where, when*, etc. OIR Stretegy
      - Card five is written with partial repletion OIR Strategy
      - Card six is written with *You mean* + understanding check OIR Strategy.
  b. Step 2: Place learners into groups consisting of six members in each group.
      - One student is asked to read the statement in card one.
      - Other students take turn to pick up one of the other cards (card 2 to 6), and give their response to the statement based on OIR strategy written in their card.
      - When one student is giving his/her response, other students in the group should try to guess the OIR strategy is being used.
      In order to help the students understand how to perform the task, the teacher models the activity first by reading the statement and showing the possible responses for each OIR Strategy on cards 2 to six.
      - Step 3: Place students in pair. Give a topic of conversation (any topic). Ask them to make a conversation. Ask them to practice the OIR Strategies above.

3. Variation Activity
      To strengthen the students' ability in using different kind of OIR Strategies, the teacher can ask the students to make their own conversation out of the class.
  a. Step 1: Put student in pair. If it is possible, the partners in the group are based on students' own choice to guarantee good rapport between the partners.
  b. Step 2: Ask each pair to decide on the topic that they want to talk about. However the conversation should not be rehearsed in order to make it as natural as possible.
  c. Step 3: Ask the students to record their conversation
  d. Step 4: The recorded conversation is played in the classroom.
  e. Step 5: When the recording is being played, the teacher and the class try to identify the OIR strategy occurring in the conversation.
  f. Step 6: The teacher explains about the types of OIR strategies used by the students and shows how those strategies might have helped overcome understanding problems in the conversation.

Assessing the EFL Students Speaking Ability in Using OIR Strategies

Ability to employ OIR strategies in conversation is a part of the students' interactional competence. To assess this ability, teachers cannot rely on traditional assessment approach using test. This ability can only be assessed by asking students to perform certain task where they can use language in real communication setting. Therefore, communicative – based assessment approach (Sulistyo, 2016) is considered most appropriate to use. According to Sulistyo (2016: 126) communicative assessment is characterized by the use of authentic materials, authentic task

and intergratedness of language skills. Language components, such as grammar and vocabulary are explicitly measured in this approach.

The classroom procedure of communicative-based assessment to assess the students ability in using OIR strategies can be outlined as follows.

1. Choose one of communicative tasks, for example *Desert Island* task, which is very popular now in ELT field. Desert Island task is classified as decision making task where students should make a decision and agreement on the items that they have to choose for their survival in a desert island. Detail instruction of how to perform the task can be seen in (Klippel, 1984).

2. Ask the student to perform the task in pair. Students' interaction in performing the tasks should be recorded so that teacher can replay it later to identify the OIR strategies in students' interaction.

3. Prepare the instrument to record the students' performance of using OIR strategy in their conversation. Since the assessment does not involve the use of scoring, the teacher can use tally sheet (Fraenkel & Wallen. 1990: 120-121) to record the frequency of the OIR strategies. Example of tally sheet to assess the students' ability to use OIR strategies can be seen below.

Student	Type of OIR strategy	Tally	Frequency
A	1. Open class OIR strategy or unspecified repair strategy: *Huh?, What? Pardon? I'm sorry?*	///// /	6
	2. *WH*-Interrogative OIR	//	2
	3. Partial repetition of trouble- source + *WH*-interrogative		0
	4. Partial repetition of the trouble-source	///	3
	5. *You mean* + understanding check	/	1
	6. Exposed Correction Repair Strategy		0
	7. Request for Repetition	///// //	7
	8. Non Verbal Repair Strategy	/	1
B	1 to 9		
C	1 to 9		
Etc.			

Conclusion

Using OIR strategies in teaching speaking to EFL learners is believed to be useful in improving their speaking proficiency as they can use them when they are having understanding problems in interaction. By teaching these strategies explicitly the students will be aware of the presence of

problems in communication and they know how to address those problems so that communication breakdown will be avoided. Therefore, the English teachers should incorporate these strategies in lesson using task-based language teaching approach where learning is centered on learner-learner interaction. Shahedah (1999) suggests that teachers should introduce such activities as problem solving, decision making, opinion exchange, picture dictation, and jigsaw tasks because these activities are usually rich of interactive atmosphere where students can practice using those strategies in a more real communication.

References

Abdullah, U. 2011. EIL in practice: Indonesian and Chinese International postgraduate students negotiate meaning. TEFLIN Journal, 22(2): 103-123

Canale, M. and M. Swain. (1980). 'Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing.' Applied Linguistics 11, 1-47

Celce-Murcia, M. 2007. Rethinking the role of communicative competence in language teaching. In E. Alcon Soler & M. P. Safont Jorda (Eds.), The intercultural language use and language learning (pp. 41–58). Dordrecht: Springer

Fotovatnia, Z. & Dorri, A. (2013). Repair in EFL Classroom Talk. *Theory and Research in Language Studies*. 3(6): 950-956. Doi: 10.4304/tpls.3.6.950-956

Fraenkel, J R. & Wallen, N. E. 1990. *How to design and evaluate research in education* (Seventh edition). Boston: Mc-Graw Hill

Hymes, D.H. 1972. On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (eds.). *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth: Penguain, 269-293

Huth, T. 2011. Conversation Analysis and Language Classroom Discourse. *Language and Linguistics Compas.* 5(5): 297–309, 10.1111/j.1749-818x.2011.00277.x

He, A.W., & Young, R. (1998). Language proficiency interviews: a discourse approach. In A.W. He & R.Young (Editors). *Talking and testing: discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company: 1-25

Kasper, G. & Wagner, J. 2014. Conversation and Applied Linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 34: 171–212.

Kaur, J. 2012. Saying it again: enhancing clarity in English as a lingua franca (ELF) talk through self-repetition. *Text & Talk*, 32(5): 593 – 613

Khodadady, E. & Alifathabady, J. (2014). Repair in EFL talk: a case of Iranian intermediate and advanced EFL learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Teaching*, 4 (10): 2129-2137. Doi: 10.4304/tpls.4.10.2129-2137

Klippel, F. (1984). *Keep Talking: Communicative Fluency Activities for Language Teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Liddicoat, A.J. 2007. *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis.* London: Continuum

Macbeth, D. 2004. The Relevance of Repair for Classroom Correction. *Language in Society*, 33(5): 703-736

Markee, N. 2000. *Conversation Analysis.* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Mukminatien, N. 2012. Accommodating World Englishes in Developing EFL Learners' Oral Communication. *TEFLIN Journal*, 23(2): 222-232.

Nation, S.P & Newton, J. 2009. *Teaching ESL/EFL Listening and Speaking*. London & New York: Routledge

Richards, J.C. & Schmidt, R. 2002. *Longman dictionary of Language teaching and Applied linguistics* (Third Edition). London: Longman.

Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. 1977. The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. Language, 53(2), 361–382.

Seedhouse, P. (2005). Conversation Analysis and language learning. *Language Teaching*. 38, 165–187. doi:10.1017/S0261444805003010

Shahedah, A. 1999. Insights into learner output. *ELT Forum*, 37/4

Shumin, K. 1997. Factors to consider: Developing EFL learners' speaking ability. Forum, 35(3),

Sulistyo, G.H. 2016. *EFL learning assessment at schools*: *An introduction to its basic concepts and principles.* Malang: Bintang Sejahtera

Wong, J. & Waring, H.Z. 2010. *Conversation Analysis and Second Language Pedagogy*. New York: Routledge

Yasui, E. 2010. Repair and language proficiency: differences of advanced and beginning language learners in an English-Japanese conversation group. *TPFLE*, 14 (1): 41-57