



**Same-Turn Self-Repair in Decision-Making Tasks:
A Conversation Analysis of Thai EFL Group
Discussions**

Sumita Supakorn

sumitasu@tu.ac.th, College of Interdisciplinary Studies, Thammasat
University, Thailand

APA Citation: Supakorn, S. (2026). Same-turn self-repair in decision-making tasks: A conversation analysis of Thai EFL group discussions. <i>LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network</i>, 19(1), 427-463. https://doi.org/10.70730/FZSV6715	
Received 07/09/2025 Received in revised form 05/12/2025 Accepted 18/12/2025	ABSTRACT Self-repair is regarded as evidence of the development of spoken language, and this forms an important component of an individual’s interactional competence (Gass & Selinker, 2008; Wong & Waring, 2020). However, most previous research in the Thai context has focused on students’ use of form-focused correction and corrective feedback from teachers, leading to insufficient insights into student self-repair in meaningful interactions. The present study thus investigates same-turn self-initiated self-repair (SISR) in a group decision-making task undertaken in an English language lesson involving 15 Thai undergraduate students. This employs Schegloff’s (2013) ten repair operations framework within a sequential microanalysis of conversation analysis (CA) methodology suggested by Wong and Waring (2020). The dataset comprises three hours of video of a classroom discussion task carried out by five groups of students. Overall, 129 instances of same-turn SISR were seen. These were used as an interactional resource to maintain progressivity, reasoning and task alignment. Additionally, the study shows how replacing is used to improve lexical accuracy and conceptual clarity, searching is used as a marker of lexical awareness and

	turn-holding, and recycling is a strategy for emphasis and fluency. Sparingly but strategically adopted, inserting is used to add precision and expand arguments, while aborting is deployed as a strategy for reformulation and group alignment. The findings offer insights into the relationship between linguistic and social dynamics within a specific decision-making discussion task, and this has implications for English as a foreign language (EFL) instruction in Thailand. Pedagogically, this study underscores the importance of teaching same-turn self-repair strategies to students for use in self-monitoring in high-stakes conversations. The research also compliments prior CA literature on same-turn SISR in a specific task, as well as literature applying Schegloff's framework to Thai students' use of repair strategies. Keywords: conversation analysis, EFL classroom interaction, interactional functions, repair operations, same-turn self-initiated self-repair
--	--

Introduction

In second language (L2) learning, such as in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom settings, communication breakdowns are common due to learners' limited proficiency, lexical gaps, and pronunciation difficulties. To address problems with linguistic accuracy and to resolve breakdowns in interaction, speakers employ repair practices that maintain mutual intelligibility and promote collaborative meaning-making. Following the foundational work of Schegloff et al. (1977), much Conversation Analysis (CA) work on repair has examined interactions between native speakers, and a share of this research has focused on repair practices in learning contexts (Hall, 2007; Hellermann, 2009; Kasper, 1985; Macbeth, 2004; McHoul, 1990; Seedhouse, 2004). In L2 classrooms, repair works not only as a conversational device but also as a pedagogical tool, with teachers and learners engaging collaboratively in repair sequences to scaffold understanding, negotiate meaning, and enhance language development. Research in this area has shown that repair practices vary based on the pedagogical focus (Seedhouse, 2004), and while self-repair predominates in fluency-oriented activities, other-repair is more frequent in accuracy-focused tasks. Other-initiated repairs are often used in pedagogical contexts, where teachers provide corrective feedback (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Waring, 2008). Learner repair not only provides a diagnostic tool for teachers to identify areas for improvement, but also offers valuable insights into learners'

linguistic strategies, and recently, research (Kaur, 2011; Kim, 2020) has demonstrated that L2 speakers employ SISR to preempt potential ambiguities and through this, enhance clarity and avoid misunderstandings.

CA-based studies of repair in EFL contexts, particularly those examining repair strategies used by learners in classroom interactions (Beshir & Yigzaw, 2022), have shown that these exhibit a strong tendency to self-initiate and to complete repairs by means of both word or lexical searches and, if this is possible, to do this in the middle of their turn. This mirrors the general conversational preferences demonstrated by Schegloff et al. (1977). However, in the classroom setting, IRF/IRE sequences, which start with a teacher-led question and are followed by a learner's answer and then a follow-up move or evaluation by the teacher, often limit learner self-repair because teachers are quicker to provide other-repairs and corrections, or to move the sequence forward. Thus, while learners can engage in self-repair, the institutional environment frequently privileges teacher-initiated repair or repair-as-correction. CA studies in EFL tertiary contexts (Chen & Ye, 2022) reinforce the contrast between peer and teacher interactions, with the former, for example group role-play tasks, affording more extended opportunities for learner-initiated repair as they engage in extended sequences that create subsequent reformulations. On the other hand, teacher-led repair is often shorter and correction-oriented, and this may close down the interaction. In Thailand, despite the growing body of research on the challenges faced by learners and the strategies they use to manage natural conversation (Kampittayakul, 2018; Kongsom, 2016; Tantiwich & Sinwongsuwat, 2021; Ulla et al., 2022), institutional classroom features heighten the reliance on IRF/IRE patterns, and teachers' tendency to quickly provide other-initiated repairs or direct corrections dominates. In these cases, when teachers immediately supply the correct form, learners lose the interactional space needed to treat difficulties as a learning moment, and this typically reduces opportunities for self-repair.

The role of SISR in task-oriented Thai EFL group discussions and the extent of its interactional (in addition to its corrective) functions has been underexplored. The present study therefore addresses this gap by presenting empirical evidence of Thai students' use of same-turn SISR within a group decision-making task. The study's objectives are:

1. To analyze same-turn SISR as an interactional practice deployed among Thai EFL students engaged in group decision-making tasks, and to use Schegloff's (2013) ten operations framework to do this.
2. To examine the interactional functions of same-turn SISR in collaborative decision-making.

Literature Review

Conversation Analysis of Repair Practice

The conversation analysts Schegloff et al. (1977) addressed issues connected to recurrent problems with speech, hearing and understanding, introducing the term 'repair' to describe the replacement of errors, anticipated mistakes, misunderstanding, mishearing, non-hearing, and self-editing that was needed to make communication more precise and accurate. This self-righting mechanism then allows talk-in-interaction to keep going when problems are encountered. The object of repair, referred to as a trouble-source or trouble spot, is a repairable item within a word, phrase, or utterance that is considered troublesome or problematic by the participants, with the core concept of repair divided into the two dichotomies of: (1) repair initiation and repair outcome, and (2) self-repair and other-repair (Schegloff et al., 1977).

Repair is an interactional process with stages referred to as repair segments (Schegloff, 1979) that extend from points of initiation and points of outcome or completion. Repair initiation is the practice of signaling or targeting a trouble-source, and this may occur in a repair itself, while repair outcome refers to the solution to or abandonment of the problem. A repair may be initiated and completed in the same turn, or this may occur across turns, and this may be initiated and completed either by the speaker of the trouble-source (self) or by another participant (other). This then generates the four repair types: (i) Self-initiated self-repair (SISR) occurs when the current speaker stops what s/he is saying or about to say and turns to address the issue being treated as a problem; (ii) self-initiated other-repair (SIOR) happens when the current speaker indicates that there is an error in their own talk, but this is resolved by the interlocutor; (iii) other-initiated self-repair (OISR) refers to a situation whereby an interlocutor signals the trouble source, but the trouble is resolved by the trouble maker; and (iv) other-initiated other-repair (OIOR) is seen when repair is initiated and completed by someone other than the speaker of the trouble source. All four repairs can occur at any time during an interaction, although studies have shown that self-initiated self-repair is preferred in native speaker interactions (Schegloff et al., 1977).

Same-turn Self-initiated Self-repair

Of the four types, SISR is particularly prevalent in natural conversation and its use is essential for maintaining the speaker's conversational autonomy (Schegloff, 1979). SISR occurs when speakers who are the producers of the trouble source self-initiate the provision of a repair solution at one of the four sequential positions of same-turn, transition-space, third-turn, and third-position (Schegloff et al., 1977). In a same-turn repair, speakers interrupt their own emerging 'turn constructional unit' (TCU) in order to deal with a problem related to the current turn. In a transition space repair, the speaker provides a repair on the last item of an already completed TCU at the next possible sequential position, namely at the transition-relevance point. In a third turn repair, the speaker produces a trouble source, which mostly occurs in the turn-final position of the trouble-source turn, but deals with it only after the next turn (Schegloff 1992, 1997; Liddicoat, 2007); Schegloff (1997) thus refers to these as 'repairs after next turn'. Third position repairs usually occur in the same position as third turn repairs, but the former are initiated by the producer of the trouble source after the recipient's talk reveals that the producer of the trouble source has been misunderstood (Schegloff, 1992; Liddicoat, 2007). Third position repairs therefore deal with misunderstandings (Schegloff, 1987).

Jefferson (1974) refers to same-turn SISR as "self-correction" given how speakers revise their utterances within a single conversational turn and so address inaccuracies or ambiguities before yielding the floor to another participant. This type of repair thus allows speakers to address grammatical, lexical, or semantic issues by refining their utterances in real-time. Schegloff (2013) elaborates on the structure of same-turn SISR by identifying ten possible operations, and this provides a more nuanced framework for analyzing this phenomenon. Previous studies focusing on same-turn SISR (Agustin et al., 2024; Alharbi, 2023; Beshir & Yigzaw, 2022; Emrani & Hooshmand, 2019; Rad & Rabani, 2023; Zeng, 2019; Zhang, 2022) have also demonstrated the use of these repairs and added to the understanding of how EFL students use these to enhance communicative effectiveness. Through monitoring and rectifying their speech in real-time, students are able to address breakdowns and so facilitate the overall conversational flow, thus ensuring the comprehensibility of their interactions. To illustrate each of the repair practices identified in Schegloff's typology, the following examples are given. These should help to clarify how each operation manifests within a real interaction.

Ten types of operation that may be carried out within same-turn self-repair

(1) Replacing

The term “replacing” refers to the replacement by a speaker of an articulated element in whole or in part within the speech segment containing the problem. The replacement remains within the same utterance. This can be seen in the example below, where “said” is replaced with “told” (Kitzinger, 2013, p. 235).

- 1 Erm: Did he- did you hear what he **said told** Lisa .hhh that they
2 were considered the cutest couple in the cla:ss.

(2) Inserting

Inserting operations occur when the speaker inserts one or more new elements into the turn, as in the example conversation between Joyce and Stan cited below (Schegloff, 2013, p. 46).

- 1 Stan: And for the hat, I’m looking for something uh a little
2 different. Na- uh:f: not f:: **exactly** funky but not
3 (.) a r-regular type’a .hhh >well you know I I< have
4 that other hat I wear. You know?
5 Joy: Yeah.

In line 2, Stan has initiated repair by articulating the first sound of the element “f:” before inserting the word “exactly”, and he then completes this with the word “funky” (Wilkinson & Weatherall, 2011).

(3) Deleting

The “deleting” operation occurs when the speaker removes/deletes one or more elements that are already partially or completely articulated on the turn (Kitzinger, 2013, p. 233).

- 1 Bee: .hhhh So she told me of a place on Madison Avenue ‘n
2 Sevendy Ninth Street.=
3 Ava: =M[mm
4 Bee: [tuh go and try there. Because I **als**.-I tried Barnes ‘n
5 Nobles ‘n, (0.6) they didn’t have anything

In line 4, the speaker deletes the word “also” by cutting this off in the course of its production and then repairs it with the word “tried” before the word “I”. Deleting is much rarer than the other speaker-based repair strategies.

(4) Searching

As Schegloff defines it, “searching” refers to “word searches” that aim to help the speaker extend the time available to look for the correct word(s). Sacks notes that “searching” falls into two kinds. “Delicates” refers to searching for a word and “précises” to searching for names of people, places, businesses, and the like. This can be seen in the example below, where Stan is searching for the name of the Plaza Theater in lines 4 and 5 (Schegloff, 2013, p. 49).

- 1 Joy: Why don'tchoo: go into Westwoo:d, (0.4) and go to
 2 Bullocks.
 3 (1.2)
 4 Stan: Bullocks? ya mean that one **right u:m (1.1) tch! (.)**
 5 **right by thee: u:m (.) whazit the Plaza? theatre::=**
 6 Joy: =Uh huh,
 7 (0.4)
 8 Stan: °(memf::)°
 9 Joy: °Yeah,

(5) Parenthesizing

Parenthesizing is similar to inserting in that it adds an element to the turn-in-progress, but this usually consists of a clause turn. Not all parentheticals entail dealing with possible problems in conversation, but they can be used for this, as in the example below of a conversation between Debbie and Shelley (Schegloff, 2013, p. 51).

- 1 Debbie: <It's not cause uh:m (0.5) Mark's not going.
 2 Shelly: No- well that wuz initially and then I'm like
 3 no: I'll just go and then hm yaknow this- this
 4 tow bandit (.) thing that I have , that we're
 5 doing, [he w]a:nts me: **>I don't know if I=**
 6 Debbie: [mm hm]
 7 Sheely: **=tol' you this,<** he wants us to come out to
 8 his house and do:, .hh like spend a whole day
 9 o:n putting everything together cause we don't
 10 get the shit done while we are at work

Shelly interpolates a parenthetical clausal TCU “I don't know if I tol' you this” in line 5 before returning to her pre-parenthetical talk in line 7.

(6) Aborting

The term ‘aborting’ refers to a speaker carrying out an existing plan and completing a task but doing so in a different way to that initially begun. An aborted event is followed by a new attempt to achieve the same result, and this may involve a pause before the speech is continued. Alternatively, the production of the turn may be stopped without further ado, as in this example of a conversation between Sherrie and Mark (Schegloff, 2013, p. 53).

- | | | |
|---|----------|--|
| 1 | Sherrie: | Who was the girl that was outside (0.8) |
| 2 | Mark: | Debbie. (0.8) |
| 3 | Sherrie: | Who is Debbie? |
| 4 | Mark: | (Katz.) (0.7) She’s just that girl thet: uh:, (0.2) |
| 5 | | ’hh I met her through uh:m:., (1.0) I met her in |
| 6 | | Westwood.= |

In lines 4-5, Mark aborts the speech turn twice, in both cases giving up and then answering Sherrie's question in a different way. He hesitates for a few seconds before initiating a repair using the correct utterance.

(7) Recycling

This refers to a situation in which a speaker repeats a section of a previous conversation that has usually just been produced. Recycling can entail a repair operation in and of itself, and one location where recycling regularly functions as a repair operation is in the “survival turn”. This can be seen in the example below (Schegloff, 2013, p. 61).

- | | | |
|---|-----------|---|
| 1 | Shelley : | So: I mean it’s not because he’s-he’s -I mean it’s |
| 2 | | not because he:’s not going, it’s because (0.5) his |
| 3 | | money’s not: (0.5) funding me. |
| 4 | Debbie: | okay. |

Here, the phrase “he’s” is a point of reference for the next utterance, “not HE, the money.”

(8) Sequence-jumping

Jumping sequences are repairs initiated and performed by jumping without a pause to a topic unrelated to the turn of speech and the ongoing sequence. An example of this can be seen in the conversation below (Schegloff, 2013, p. 56).

- | | | |
|---|--------|---|
| 1 | Rubin: | They don’t mind honey they are just not going to talk to us |
| 2 | | ever again.= |

- 3 Dave: =(hehem)/(ri:(h)ight)
 4 (0.8)
 5 Kathy: We don't mind <[we just never going to talk to you ever=
 6 Dave: [(No, b't)
 7 Kathy: =(hh heh)
 8 Rubin: heheheheh
 9 Kathy: [No: :] that's awright
 10 Frieda: [So: :]
 11 Dave: [()]
 12 Frieda: [You know what we're gonna-] in fact I'm- she I
 13 have not seen her since I spoke to you **but I'm going to**
 14 **talk to =what a you making;**
 15 (0.2)
 16 Kathy: it's a -bla:nket
 17 Frieda: Did yu weave tha[t yourse:lf]
 18 Kathy: [I w o : :]ve this myself.=

In lines 13-14, it can be seen that Frieda experiences discomfort so she immediately changes the direction of the conversation by escaping the TCU-in-progress with “but I’m going to talk to”. When she notices a woven blanket, she extends this further with “What are you making?”, which turns the exchange to an entirely different sequence.

(9) Reformatting

The starting point for reformatting operations is grammatical and so most of these repairs involve a grammatical category. This strategy can be seen in the conversation below (Schegloff, 2013, p. 62).

- 1 Bee: So, < I got some lousy cou(h)rses th(hh)is term too.
 2 Ava: Kehh huh!
 3 Bee: hhh [h m—]
 4 Ava: **[W—whe]n is your uh , weh—you have one day you only**
 5 **have one course uh?**
 6 Bee: mMo[nday and Wednesday:[s right.] That's my=
 7 Ava: [hh [O h. that's—] =linguistics course [hh

In lines 4-5, Ava's question, which starts out as a WH-question, is reformatted as a yes/no tag question.

(10) Reordering

Reordering involves the speaker working out the order in which the elements in the ongoing process must be arranged (Schegloff, 2013, p. 65).

- 1 Rse: An'it– (0.3) An'it left'er (0.4) quite permanently
- 2 Damaged °I s[uppose°
- 3 Bea: [ˈtk Uh: apparently, Uh—he is still hopeful
- 4 Rse: The husb'n.
- 5 Bea: → Ah hah end you **never just** (•) eh you **just never** saw
- 6 such devotion in your life ...

In line 5, Bea is on her way to say “you just never saw such devotion” when she realizes that she has said “you never just”. After reordering the elements, she engages in a repair by restating these.

Research on Correction and Repair in Thai EFL Contexts

In Thai EFL contexts, speaking is often regarded as the most difficult skill due to limited practice and the existence of pervasive proficiency gaps, and so repair mechanisms are a vital area of study. Both self-initiated and other-initiated repairs have been observed, with teacher-initiated corrections especially common. Previous research on Thai English-language classrooms has emphasized the use by teachers of form-focused repairs and corrective feedback, focusing especially on their types and effectiveness, as well as on relevant student preferences. Thus, a study by Mayi (2014) found that minor grammatical errors produced by Thai students that did not hinder comprehension in natural conversation were often left uncorrected by native speakers. The effectiveness of the different repair strategies used in Thai classrooms has also been a subject of research. Choopool and Sinwongsuwat (2017) investigated form-focused repairs, or corrections that emphasize grammatical accuracy, and found that low-proficiency students who received such interventions showed significant improvement in their speaking. This study also suggested that integrating form-focused repair into teaching would enhance students' pronunciation, grammar, fluency, and word choice. Research by Stephens and Sanderson (2019) suggests that the use of recasts or implicit corrections during conversation is common, but this may not always be the most effective method for providing corrective feedback, and so they recommend combining different techniques, such as repetition and elicitation, to improve student uptake and error correction. Additionally, Duklim (2023) examined Thai university students' attitudes regarding different sources of oral corrective feedback, showing that these had a strong preference for teacher-initiated corrections over peer- or self-corrections. It

can thus be concluded that they value receiving authoritative feedback. However, recasts are categorically other-initiated-other-repair (OIOR) in CA, but the studies of recasts or corrective feedback don't always have their focus on repair as an interactional practice.

In brief, while English remains a significant challenge for Thai students, studies of how self-repair is used when students engage in authentic speaking tasks remain limited. Indeed, most Thailand-based studies of repair practices focus heavily on the grammatical accuracy of student responses to teacher-led prompts at the expense of other possible sources of repairable tokens. Research on Thai students' repair practices in unstructured, peer-to-peer communication is therefore lacking, and little attention has been given to how students initiate and manage self-repairs in natural classroom interactions. This gap is particularly evident in high-stakes discussions, such as group decision-making tasks, where repair plays a crucial role in anticipating and resolving misunderstandings and through this, the reaching of a consensus. More to the point, there remains a need for a comprehensive understanding of how Thai students self-repair and how interactional functions are used in a particular task-oriented context since this is central to effective communication in English; an extension of work in this area will enrich both theoretical perspectives on and practical approaches to CA and to English language education in Thailand. The present study therefore addresses this gap by using CA methodology to inform an investigation of how Schegloff's (2013) ten same-turn SISR operations are used as interactional devices in a real-world English task, in this case a group discussion held between Thai EFL students. It is hoped that this will shed light on how students navigate and resolve communication breakdowns in academic discussions.

Methodology

Data and Methods

The data were collected from group discussions held between 15 undergraduate students enrolled in an academic English listening and speaking course at a university in northern Thailand. At the time of the recordings, the participants, who had a balanced gender representation and mixed English proficiency, were second year non-English majors and thus ranged in age from 18 to 22. Participating students provided informed consent for the video-recording of their naturally-occurring classroom interaction. Anonymity was maintained by assigning pseudonyms to students and ensuring sensitive data remained confidential. The researcher, who was

also the teacher for this class, engaged students in a speaking task that required five groups, each of three students, to engage in a 30-minute simulation of a real-world decision-making discussion. In this, students assumed the role of a scholarship committee tasked with selecting a single candidate from five finalists. They did this using predefined criteria for evaluating the candidates (interview scores, written application quality, grades, and financial need) that were provided in a worksheet. The group discussions generated approximately 150 minutes of spoken data, and to capture the intricate details of spoken interactions needed to analyze repair, these were transcribed using Jeffersonian transcription conventions (Jefferson, 2004).

A sequential microanalysis of the students' interactions used the CA emic procedures suggested by Wong and Waring (2020). This includes unmotivated looking, or examining the data without preconceived notions or hypotheses while remaining open to any potential discoveries. The data were repeatedly listened to and viewed, and the research generated initial observations by answering the question, "Why that now?" (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, p. 299). That is, by asking why a student is producing a particular utterance in a particular way at a particular moment, one can understand how the current turn was constructed and what co-participants made of it. The CA next-turn proof procedure was also used to follow students' responses and to see how their turns were understood by other group participants, and this was thus one source of evidence for the analysis of prior and subsequent turns (Heritage, 1984; Sacks et al., 1974). When a point of interest emerged that could be viewed as a repair practice, segments were examined in order to build an argument on a case-by-case basis. All instances of the four repair types as well as SISR repairs that occurred in the four sequential positions were coded, but only same-turn SISR operations were identified for use in this in-depth analysis.

In line with the CA perspective, identification of same-turn SISR practices was based on a student's recognition that his or her own speech required some form of adjustment or modification. The analysis thus focused on segments of talk that contained a disruption to the progress of an ongoing utterance by the speaker and that were followed by an immediate or fairly immediate move to repair some element(s) in a preceding section. Specifically, the analysis aimed to investigate both the same-turn SISR operations that students employed and the interactional functions that they used to execute these operations. To this end, segments involving same-turn SISR were initially coded using Schegloff's (2013) ten operations. This gave a solid foundation for exclusion/inclusion criteria and from which it was possible to build same-turn SISR practices for further specification in that particular context. In the analysis below, the frequencies and percentages of different

repair types were calculated to identify prevalent patterns, and to minimize subjectivity, coding of repair operations was cross-verified with a second analyst familiar with CA principles. For this paper, patterns and interactional functions are illustrated through selected instances of SISR.

Results

In order to show the overall interactional picture, Tables 1-3 present details of overall repair practices and specific patterns of same-turn SISR, as based on Schegloff's (2013) ten operations. Following this comes the fine-grained CA analysis of repair operations used in relation to interactional functions.

Table 1

Overall Repair Practices

Type of repair	Frequency	Percentage
Self-Initiated Self-Repair (SISR)	133	89%
Self-Initiated Other Repair (SIOR)	0	0%
Other-Initiated Self-Repair (OISR)	6	4%
Other-Initiated Other-Repair (OIOR)	11	7%

Table 1 gives data on the 150 instances of repair. SISR dominates with 89% of cases, followed by 7% for OIOR and 4% for OISR. SIOR was absent in this dataset, suggesting a strong preference for self-correction among students undertaking this task.

Table 2

Self-Initiated Self-Repair (SISR)

Position of repair	Frequency	Percentage
Same-Turn Repair	129	97%
Transition-Space Repair	1	0.75%
Third-Turn Repair	3	2.25%
Third-Position Repair	0	0%

Table 2 shows that out of 133 instances of SISR, 129 or 97% occurred within the same turn. 1 instance of repair was seen at the transition-space and 3 cases of third-turn position repairs were found, but students completely refrained from engaging in third-position repair. These findings align with

Schegloff's et al. (1977) observation that repair tends to be initiated and completed in proximity to the trouble source.

Table 3

Same-turn SISR

Repair operation	Frequency	Percentage
Replacing	40	31%
Searching	27	20.9%
Recycling	26	20.2%
Inserting	17	13.2%
Aborting	12	9.3%
Parenthesizing	3	2.3%
Reformatting	2	1.5%
Deleting	1	0.8%
Reordering	1	0.8%
Sequence-jumping	0	0%

Table 3 shows that nine of Schegloff's ten same-turn SISR operations were employed by the students. The three most frequently occurring were replacing (31%), searching (20.9%), and recycling (20.2%). Less frequently found were parenthesizing (2.3%), reformatting (1.5%), deleting (0.8%), and reordering (0.8%).

Interactional Functions of Same-turn SISR

This section provides fine-grained details of how students use same-turn SISR within their interactions. In this EFL small-group decision-making discussion task, students collaboratively negotiated criteria, proposed justifications, and reached agreement, all while managing lexical and interactional challenges. Replacing repair emerges as the most commonly adopted interactional resource, and this was used to improve lexical accuracy and conceptual clarity. Searching repair served as a marker of lexical/grammatical awareness and an enabler of turn holding, while recycling played a vital role as a strategy used for emphasis and fluency. Additionally, inserting repair emerges as a resource for adding precision and expanding evaluative arguments, while aborting served as a resource for reformulating ill-structured utterances and aligning contributions with the group objectives. Throughout the data analysis, students' names are replaced by three-letter codes, such as CTS, JTM, NTW, etc.

Replacing to improve lexical accuracy and conceptual clarity

Replacing repairs, which accounted for 31% of all episodes of student repair, involve the student substituting a problematic word, phrase, or structure with another, thereby improving accuracy, appropriateness, or conceptual clarity. This is illustrated in the sample extract below.

Extract 1

- 1 CTS: Okay we have to see the requirement from Agon Shu
- 2 foundation for this scholarship this require applicant must be
- 3 Thammasat university
- 4 YNS: Mmm Hmm
- 5 CTS: Study in year one to four
- 6 YNS: So I know that this scholarship for Thammasat university
- 7 **study student** only
- 8 CTS: Yeah only but but not from center campus or rangsit campus
- 9 YNS: Oh
- 10 STM: Some students study well and have more money to study at
- 11 university
- 12 CTS: I think so
- 13 STM: And we can cut off about the scholarship and focus on
- 14 some students that **have ah:: don't don't have** more money
- 15 to study it's better
- 16 CTS: So now we have five candidate who should **get uh::**
- 17 **receive** the scholarship
- 18 YNS: So we choose the only one to receive scholarship
- 19 CTS: We must have a standard for applicant (1) if financial need
- 20 equal Ann, Dan, Joe, Pena, Lee is eight equal (1) what is the
- 21 second priority from we consider?
- 22 YNS: Okay for me it's second priority for me is uh:: interview
- 23 score because I think when you apply to this scholarship you
- 24 must to talk with committee **why you should why you**
- 25 **must** have to scholarship
- 26 CTS: I choose written application score
- 27 STM: Okay
- 28 YNS: And why
- 29 CTS: Okay the reason I think ah:: (1) before you interview right?
- 30 You have to write essay to committee **how you want uh::**
- 31 **what you want why you want** to receive this scholarship.
- 32 YNS: Okay

The discussion begins with CTS taking the initiative and framing the group's task. His turn at lines 1-3 "we have to see the requirement from Agon Shu foundation for this scholarship" serves as both a task/topic initiation and an institutional framing device that situates the upcoming discussion within the official scholarship criteria. In lines 6-7, YNS's utterance, "So I know that this scholarship for Thammasat university study student only," marks her effort to confirm understanding by rephrasing prior talk, but this exhibits a replacement of the trouble spot "study" with "student", correcting a lexical error that could obscure meaning. This is subsequently accepted and expanded by CTS, whose line 8 contribution "Yeah only but but not from center campus or rangsit campus" builds an understanding of the scope of the scholarship.

In line 10, STM introduces student financial status as a criterion for evaluation, which she does with her utterance "Some students study well and have more money to study at university". CTS then provides a minimal alignment, saying "I think so" in line 12, which encourages STM to continue. In line 14, STM repairs the trouble source "have", initiated with the hesitation marker "ah::", the repetition "don't don't", and its replacement with "don't have". This demonstrates STM's ongoing struggle to select an accurate form.

In lines 16-17, CTS moves the discussion toward a decision by saying "So now we have five candidate who should get uh:: receive the scholarship." This illustrates a different dimension of the replacing repair, and the student shifts from correcting lexical errors to a more formal register. The replacing of the repairable "get" with "receive" is initiated with an elongated "uh", and this reflects CTS's preference for a more formal verb, as suggested by the context. YNS's next turn in line 18 "So we choose the only one to receive scholarship" displays her alignment since she adopts CTS's lexical framing "receive scholarship" to confirm the task progression.

CTS then initiates a new decision-making phase in lines 19-21, where the criteria to be used for selection when the financial need is equal are discussed. This is achieved by asking "what is the second priority from we consider?". In lines 22-25, YNS elaborates her evaluation criteria, saying "Okay for me it's second priority for me is uh:: interview score because I think when you apply to this scholarship you must to talk with committee why you should why you must have to scholarship." Here, replacing can be observed at the segment "why you should why you must have to scholarship." YNS's utterance incorporates the repetition of "why you" as a repair initiator, and the repairable "should" is then replaced with "must" while she struggles to articulate the obligation or justification embedded in her reasoning.

CTS introduces a counter-proposal, saying "I choose written application score" in line 26. STM's "Okay" in line 27 shows minimal

acknowledgment, which prompts YNS to elicit a justification by asking “And why” in line 28. In lines 30-31, CTS’s response “You have to write essay to committee how you want uh::: what you want why you want to receive this scholarship” replaces the initial trouble source “how” with “what” and then “why” with an emphatic tone. This replacing repair reflects CTS’s awareness that “why” better conveys the intention of making a reference to the reasons the scholarship candidates give in their statement of purpose, rather than the manner of their writing. This repair segment adds to CTS’s clarity and persuasiveness, which is acknowledged by YNS’s final “Okay” in line 32.

Searching as a marker of lexical/grammatical awareness and turn-holding

The students use of searching repair involves the deployment of pauses, non-lexical speech perturbations and hesitation markers involving elongated sounds (e.g., “ah”, “uh:::”, “um:::”), or repetitions as they attempt to retrieve a lexical item or construct a grammatically coherent phrase (Kurhila, 2006). Searching performs a dual interactional function as a marker of lexical and grammatical awareness and as a tool for controlling turn-taking, in the latter case by helping speakers hold the floor and so avoid premature interruptions while they plan their utterance. The treatment of WRY’s searching repair below exemplifies how students use these, demonstrating their dual role in turn-holding and in lexical and grammatical retrieval.

Extract 2

- 1 TRD: Lee wants money for study I have choose financial Lee
 2 do you agree with me
 3 WRY: In my opinion I disagree with you I think we choose student
 4 more need (1) more financial need because **I think study**
 5 **(3) um::: (5) study is (3) ah:: study university is very**
 6 **expensive (2) also some people no money or normal (3)**
 7 **normal (3) um::: I mean is home money normal** but
 8 some people don’t have money I think we choose student
 9 fi- um::: focus on financial need **like um::: like Joe (5)**
 10 **Joe is ah:: interview score is basic normal ah:: writing**
 11 **application score is writing is very good** grade point I
 12 think is very good or normal grade is okay but financial need
 13 is more than everyone.
 14 TRD: We’re summarize the final name should help from the Agon
 15 Shu I vote Lee who do you vote

- 16 NTW: Lee
 17 TRD: Lee what do you think
 18 WRY: I think Joe because Joe want help more than Lee

TRD begins with the summary statement in lines 1-2 “Lee wants money for study I have choose financial Lee” that both frames the decision criterion as “financial” and proposes the candidate “Lee”. The follow-up question “do you agree with me” in line 2 is a turn-allocation device that invites co-participant alignment and projects the next agreeing or disagreeing sequence. This marks the transition from task framing, which is a hallmark of decision-making talk (Heritage & Clayman, 2010).

WRY’s turn in line 3, “In my opinion I disagree with you,” signals a dispreferred response format (Pomerantz, 1984) but its impact is mitigated by the preface “In my opinion.” Her subsequent justification “I think we choose student more need (1) more financial need” incorporates the specified inserting repair “financial”, initiated by a 1-second pause, and the repetition of the word “more”. From line 4 onwards, WRY’s turn exhibits several search markers including a number of pauses and elongated hesitations “um:::,” “ah::” (lines 5, 7-10), self-interruptions and cut-offs “fi- um:::” (line 9), grammatical reformulations “study is (3) ah:: study university is very expensive” (lines 5-6), and recycling. The use of an elongation “um:::” shows an initiation towards finding, which is incorporated with “I mean” as a self-initiated repair preface (Schegloff et al., 1977) and together these project the forthcoming reformulation “I mean is home money normal but...” (line 7).

In line 9, the trouble source “fi-” is cut-off, with this then followed by an elongated hesitation marker “um:::” and the inserted utterance “focus on” before a reformulation as “financial need”. After resolving this lexical formulation, WRY searches for an example-based elaboration, starting with “like um:::” “like Joe... Joe is ah:: interview score is basic normal ah:: writing application score is very good...” (lines 9-10). Each “ah::” that precedes a lexical or syntactic planning item serves as a turn-holding marker, and these filled pauses allow WRY to sustain a long multi-unit turn without interruption. At the end of line 19, WRY completes her dispreferred disagreement with a reasoned and coherent justification, saying “financial need is more than everyone”, and so lexical and grammatical searching, which has not impeded the interaction, has supported her turn construction and interactional persistence.

TRD reclaims the floor in lines 14-15 with the summarizing directive “We’re summarize the final name... I vote Lee who do you vote.” This turn reformulates the prior discussion into a decision format and re-establishes procedural control. NTW’s short response “Lee” in line 16 provides a

preferred agreement that completes the adjacency pair. TRD's follow-up "Lee what do you think" in line 17 functions as an invitation for a final opinion, thus exemplifying the kind of democratic participation that is typical of decision-making talk. WRY's final turn in line 18 "I think Joe because Joe want help more than Lee" is concise and fluent, and this resolves her prior lexical struggle. The shift from earlier disfluency to smooth production may indicate that successful lexical retrieval has been achieved through prior searching.

Recycling as a strategy for emphasis and fluency

To clarify the definition adopted in this study, the terms recycling and repetition are used somewhat interchangeably, but here this involves the students maintaining fluency and emphasizing a point by repeating words or phrases. By repeating rather than pausing, JTT and PCP sustain the rhythmic flow of the turn and display their continued speakership and engagement (Rieger, 2003) while also reinforcing key points in this discussion. This is illustrated in the sample extract below.

Extract 3

- 1 JTT: Could you please explain people who will receive to decide
- 2 scholarship uh:: what benefit will they receive
- 3 NPT: Tuition and expenses will be paid this year
- 4 PCP: That's good too it opens up opportunity for education
- 5 JTT: **I think the first (1) I think the first step must be (1) I**
- 6 **think the first step must be current student of**
- 7 **Thammasat university.**
- 8 PCP: **I think must be grade point (1) I think must be grade**
- 9 **ah:: good student with grade two point five and oh two**
- 10 **point five or low or higher**
- 11 NPT: I agree with you and I think must be someone it's Ann got
- 12 financial problem
- 13 JTT: I think Ann good interview score and **writing writing better**
- 14 **(6)**
- 15 PCP: Writing better than Pena and Lee
- 16 JTT: Yes
- 17 NPT: Do you think about Joe and Pena for this score?
- 18 **(5)**
- 19 JTT: Um::
- 20 PCP: Mm::
- 21 JTT: **Dan better Dan better than Ann in writing.**

-
- 22 NPT: You just say Dan better than Ann with writing application
 23 score
 24 JTT: Yes

In lines 1-2, JTT opens the sequence by requesting a clarification with “Could you please explain people who will receive...”, which also projects a decision frame of reference. NPT provides the response “Tuition and expenses will be paid” in line 3, which is followed in line 4 by PCP’s expansion “That’s good too it opens up opportunity for education”. Together, these turns collaboratively establish the participants’ task understanding, and this leads the discussion towards the evaluation process.

In lines 5-7, JTT’s multi-word recycling “I think the first step must be”, initiated through 1-second pauses and repetition, serves a dual function. Sequentially, it is an ongoing formulation that momentarily suspends her fluency but that may secure time for syntactic and cognitive planning. Interactionally, the recycling also centers the utterance “the first step must be”, which may emphasize her proposed “current student of Thammasat university” as a specific criterion.

Likewise, PCP’s turn in lines 8-10 shows a comparable pattern with “I think must be grade point (1) I think must be grade ah::: good student with grade two point five...” Here, recycling is initiated by a 1-second pause and the elongated hesitation marker “ah:::”. To maintain fluency, PCP restarts with the same syntactic frame “I think must be grade”, but then reformulates this with the precise lexical items “good student with grade two point five and”. This is followed by another recycling “two point five” initiated by the change of state token (Heritage, 1984) “oh” and another proposal, “or low or higher”. Similar to JTT’s “I think the first step must be...”, PCP’s recycling of “I think must be...” may also serve to emphasize the utterance by highlighting her ideas concerning the evaluative framework.

In lines 11-12, NPT enters with an agreement and extends the criteria by proposing that this should include a consideration of the candidate’s financial need, saying “I agree with you and I think must be someone it’s Ann got financial problem.” NPT’s move may exemplify task/topic chaining in that each student recycling the structural elements “I think must be...” maintains emphasis and fluency. In lines 13-16, JTT’s lexical recycling “writing writing better” may also function as an emphasis highlighting writing ability as a decisive evaluative criterion. The 6-second pause in line 14 following the repetition creates a transition relevant space, opening the way for other students to take up the evaluation. Indeed, PCP immediately aligns with JTT in line 15 by completing the evaluation with “Writing better than Pena and Lee”, which is followed by JTT’s agreement “Yes” in line 16.

NPT's question in line 17 asks JTT to evaluate the candidates in relation to a particular score. A notable five-second pause in line 18 signals JTT's hesitation or difficulty formulating a response, and this can then be seen in her use of the delayed and elongated response marker "Um:::" in line 19. PCP's "Mm:::" in line 20 aligns with JTT's hesitation during the evaluation. In line 21, JTT finally launches her evaluative response "Dan better Dan better than Ann in writing." The first occurrence of "Dan better" constitutes an initial attempt at forming a comparative construction, while the immediate recycling "Dan better Dan better" reflects JTT's attempt to regain fluency and to reinforce Dan's (a candidate) superior writing skills. While this repetition seems to signal her hesitation or her trouble formulating a response, it provides time during which she can emphasize her point at the same time.

NPT's next turn in lines 22–23 takes the form of "You just say Dan better than Ann with writing application score", and this demonstrates his uptake and reformulation of JTT's prior turn. The absence of overlap and the smooth uptake suggests that NPT treats JTT's recycling not as disfluent but as semantically informative and maybe an emphatic reaffirmation of Dan's comparative advantages. JTT's final "Yes" in line 24 confirms this shared understanding, and this closes and aligns the assessment sequence.

Inserting to add precision and expand arguments

Inserting involves adding new material mid-utterance to refine or clarify meaning, to enhance precision, or to strengthen an argument. The analysis of the sample extract below reveals how JTM's insertion of supplementary information adds specificity, which then elicits an expansion of the topic by the other students. NDN's intensified insertion may also reinforce the argument, allowing him to integrate additional evidence and explanations that support his claims in favor of a particular candidate.

Extract 4

- 1 NDN: What should we get to consider Lee
- 2 JTM: Can uh::: you you interview Ann right? And can you tell me
- 3 about uh::: **more detail** about how many fi- financial need
- 4 of Ann.
- 5 SRR: Ann uh::: **home story** Ann difficult than Joe than Pena and
- 6 Lee. I focus Ann
- 7 JTM: Okay we choose Ann and I want I want to know how do
- 8 you feel that we uh::: we discussion about students to choose
- 9 the Agon Shu scholarship

- 10 NDN: For me I feel good about these five students to final round
 11 and everyone should get the scholarship but this scholarship
 12 just one student to get it I think Ann is the most student
 13 to- the most **perfect** student to get because interview score
 14 or written application or grade had a perfect more than
 15 another students.
 16 JTM: Yeah I agree with your point because I think it's difficult to
 17 choose the only one because I think everyone is want to
 18 want this scholarship

This interaction begins with a topic initiation by NDN in line 1, who opens a consideration frame for the candidate “Lee.” However, JTM reorients the discussion by introducing a clarification-seeking question about “Ann” in lines 2-4, asking “Can uh::: you you interview Ann right? And can you tell me about uh::: more detail about how many fi- financial need of Ann.” Here, after several within-turn self-repair items including the initiation “uh:::”, the repetition “you you” and the re-initiation “And can you tell me about”, the inserted element “more detail”, which is initiated by “uh:::”, enables JTM to specify the inquiry’s epistemic domain, i.e., Ann’s financial status, and to make the question more precise. In lines 5-6, SRR’s turn begins with the hesitant restart “Ann uh:::”, followed by the inserted phrase “home story”, which could function as a narrative elaboration. This contextual precision is added to justify her claim that “Ann difficult than Joe than Pena and Lee. I focus Ann”. SRR not only names her preferred candidate, but also adds Ann’s biographical detail, thereby strengthening the justification for her choice.

In lines 7-9, after supplying the group’s final decision with “Okay we choose Ann”, JTM says “and I want I want to know how do you feel that we uh::: we discussion about students to choose the Agon Shu scholarship”, broadening the discussion and inviting the group members to reflect on and to evaluate this process. NDN replies to JTM in a long, multi-turn utterance over lines 10-15 that displays his attitude towards the candidate evaluation. In particular, his utterance “Ann is the most student to- the most perfect student to get” upgrades the evaluation. Here, NDN’s inserted repair “perfect” is initiated with a cut-off “to-” and the repetition of “the most student to”. The insertion marks a reformulation, shifting from the incomplete comparative “the most student” to the evaluative intensification “the most perfect student”. This insertion amplifies NDN’s evaluation of Ann as the most qualified candidate, which is supported by JTM’s turn in lines 16-18.

Aborting as a strategy for reformulation and group alignment

Aborting occurs when a student abandons an incomplete utterance and starts anew, often to restructure a contribution or to better realign with the focus of the group discussion. Students employed this device to demonstrate their awareness of the group requirements and their ability to correct an ill-formed or off-topic utterance. The aborting repairs found in this dataset can be categorized into the two primary types of full and partial aborting. Full aborting is seen when the students completely abandoned their initial utterances to restructure their contributions, whereas partial aborting involves discarding specific phrases while preserving the communicative goal of the utterance. This strategy also helps the students clarify their points without losing the overall message, as illustrated in sample extract 5 below.

Extract 5

- 1 JTM: Okay we have five students right?
- 2 NDN: Yes we (2) now we have five students but before that we
- 3 have many students **to- and apply for this scholarship.**
- 4 JTM: Let me see ah::: criteria to get ah::: scholarship we have ah:::
- 5 interview written application grade and the last one is
- 6 financial need first of all I would like to ask you both what
- 7 important factor then we should consider to get a
- 8 scholarship **and then uhm::: okay** do you agree if we main
- 9 consider about financial need.
- 10 SRR: If we ah::: if we consider that point then Joe should receive
- 11 the scholarship because he has high financial need score
- 12 eight ah:: score is eight point.
- 13 NDN: **Speaking of financial need I speaking with I (1) but we**
- 14 doesn't feel he doesn't need this scholar maybe he focus
- 15 many scholarship.
- 16 JTM: Okay what about grade point do you agree if we choose
- 17 grade consider
- 18 NDN: **I think grade hav- if we consider grade** maybe we should
- 19 consider Pena and Lee two students more than another
- 20 students but if we choose focus on interview score we
- 21 should focus at Ann just one person because she has the
- 22 most
- 23 SRR: I agree about the grade we will not take into it into
- 24 consideration because as you said it is not merit scholarship
- 25 it's scholarship of poor students

In line 3, NDN's aborting involves a cut-off "to-" that initiates the repair of "before that we have many students to-" and this is completed by

the restart “and apply for this scholarship”. The cut-off may indicate that he has difficulties connected to lexical retrieval, and so instead of searching for the correct verb phrase, he abandons the prior grammatical path and constructs a new phrase. Interactionally, NDN’s aborting allows him to reformulate his utterances and to stay aligned with the ongoing task as he lists how many students have applied for the scholarship.

In line 4, JTM uses several “ah:::” as delaying devices, as seen in “Let me see ah::: criteria to get ah::: scholarship we have ah:::”. This allows him to hold the floor while searching for the correct criteria, seen in line 5-8 in “interview written application grade and the last one is financial need first of all I would like to ask you both what important factor then we should consider to get a scholarship”. In lines 8-9, JTM aborts “scholarship and then”, which is initiated by the elongated hesitation marker “uhm:::”, before a new TCU is started with “okay do you agree if we main consider about financial need”. Here, aborting allows JTM to realign her contribution and to gradually reformulate her suggestion that financial need should be the group’s priority.

In lines 10-12, SRR suggests that Joe should be given the scholarship, saying “If we ah::: if we consider that point then Joe should receive...”. This prompts NDN to launch a report of his prior interaction with an initial clause “Speaking of financial need I speaking with I”, but he abandons this mid-turn with the 1-second pause seen in line 13. This is followed by the reformulation “but we doesn’t feel...”. Here, NDN appears to be uncertain about his personal reasoning, and so he shifts to the group position with “but we doesn’t feel he doesn’t need this scholar maybe he focus many scholarship”. This aligns more strongly with the group’s collective assessment.

In lines 16-17, JTM opens the floor and elicits more opinions while also projecting a transition to the next evaluative criterion by asking, “Okay what about grade point do you agree if we choose grade consider”. In line 18, NDN provides a response that starts “I think grade” but this is followed by “hav-”, which is aborted with a cut-off for something like “grade has...”, or “grade have...”, or “grade having...”. The cut-off “hav-” signals that NDN is aborting his explanation of his personal reasons and is reformulating the utterance as a new structure with, “if we consider grade maybe we should consider Pena and Lee...” This aligns directly with the group’s views on identifying the best candidates by using their grades.

Discussion

The analysis of same-turn SISR used in this role-play group discussion task demonstrates that Thai EFL students deploy a broad but selective repertoire of repair operations and that these align closely with Schegloff’s

(2013) ten operation framework. The findings not only reveal which repair types students adopt, but also illuminate how these operations function to support the interactional demands of collaborative decision-making.

Concerning the first research objective, that is, to analyze same-turn SISR as an interactional practice used by Thai EFL students in group decision-making tasks via Schegloff's (2013) ten operations framework, the distribution of repair operations shows that Thai EFL students engage in a robust but asymmetrical selection of repair strategies. This is seen in the high frequency of replacing, searching and recycling operations, the moderate frequency but high interactional value of inserting and aborting, and the lower frequency of parenthesizing, reformatting, deleting and reordering actions. This range reflects an orientation to progressivity, clarity, and turn-holding, which are the three imperatives crucial to group decision-making talk. The students' heavy reliance on replacing, searching and recycling suggests a preference for operations that allow them to fix lexical items and grammatical structures, to maintain their fluency and to hold the floor, all as they formulate their arguments. The occurrence of inserting and aborting repairs also indicates a developing capacity among students to fine-tune their arguments and to better align their contributions to the group's reasoning.

In terms of the second research objective, that is, to examine the interactional functions of same-turn SISR found in collaborative decision-making, the predominant use of same-turn SISR reflects students' focus on preserving interactional autonomy. This is consistent with Schegloff et al. (1977) and the preference for self-correction over other-correction in conversation. These repairs were frequently made to maintain progressivity (Schegloff, 2007) and to ensure alignment among group members or at times to present their arguments for evaluation. Prior research by Agustin et al. (2024) has shown that ESL/EFL learners utilize a range of self-initiated repair strategies, including replacing, searching, recycling, inserting, and aborting to maintain conversational coherence and to address misunderstandings. The present study builds on this by highlighting context-specific patterns that show how replacing, searching and recycling strategies are frequently used by students as opportunities for giving reasons and securing favorable decisions. Inserting and aborting repairs are occasionally made to the same end, and these issues are significant here because given the nature of decision-making discussions, speakers are required to give justifications that others can evaluate. As seen in the sample extracts quoted in the analysis above, same-turn SISR enables students to expand their turns of talk and to display the epistemic grounding for their justifications, which in this case included criteria such as interview scores, grades, or "home story". Demonstration of these then made the evaluation criteria explicit and negotiable. This expansion also

shifts the decision trajectory by prompting follow-up elaborations from other members that then led to sections within which the group collectively sequenced its reasoning. Ultimately, by structuring how evidence and assessments are built sequentially, same-turn SISR contributed to the group's ability to discuss and agree on a successful candidate for the scholarship.

Emrani and Hooshmand (2019) report that replacing is used to help when correcting or enhancing utterances. In the present study, this is the most frequently used repair operation, and is deployed not only to correct lexical errors but also to adjust register and clarify ambiguities. Students use replacing repairs to substitute non-targeted lexical items with more appropriate alternatives, often demonstrating their self-awareness through choice of vocabulary, which is critical in high-stakes discussions where speakers must convey precise meanings. In extract 1, YNS's ability to identify and replace the error "study" with "student" shows her evolving capacity for self-monitoring since here, she attempts to refine both her linguistic accuracy and her conceptual clarity when she indicates that the scholarship is limited to students from Thammasat University. Likewise, STM's replacement of "have" with "don't have" targets a more precise expression of financial disadvantage, thereby clarifying eligibility for the scholarship; this replacing repair improves conceptual precision and explicitly frames financial need as a key selection criterion. In turn, CTS's substitution of "get" with "receive" demonstrates his awareness of register and appropriateness in academic discourse. While this replacing repair operation underlines his lexical accuracy, which Brouwer (2003) and Koshik and Seo (2012) have identified as a common feature of L2 talk, this is also an interactional resource that enables these students to refine their expression of procedural necessity specific to this context. Examples of this include YNS's "why you should why you must have to the scholarship" and CTS's "how you want uh::: what you want why you want". In these cases, when students recognize that their initial formulation does not fully capture their intended meanings, replacing is used to express vague or ambiguous ideas more effectively.

In line with Carroll (2004), the searching repairs used in these discussions demonstrate students' control of turn-taking and sensitivity to meaning and form. In extract 2, WRY's visible searching behavior indicates a heightened lexical and syntactic awareness since she actively monitors her linguistic production for adequacy. WRY's pauses and retries show an awareness of her lexical insufficiency and mark a strategic effort to refine her contribution to the discussion, and as per Kurhila (2006), this illustrates how L2 learners' typically complete word-search repair and simultaneously manage lexical selection and syntax. In this context, searching not only mitigates lexical/syntactic gaps but also serves as a turn-holding device since the talk

can move forward semantically even if it halts momentarily at the lexical level. Thus, rather than yielding the floor, WRY uses pauses and recycling to retain turn-holding rights. This aligns with Brouwer (2003), who found that L2 speakers use vocalizations and fillers to signal ongoing search, and that this discourages others from taking the floor. For example, in line 11 one sees “study is (3) ah:: study university is very expensive”, and the elongated hesitation “ah::” with the immediate self-continuation tell the other students that the speaker is still searching for the most contextually fitting expression to describe the students’ socioeconomic backgrounds. The interactional relevance of these cues lies in her ability to project continuation while preventing premature speaker change. Similarly, the repeated restarts “um::: I mean...” in line 13 may be designed to display WRY’s current struggle and to request that listeners wait. This is in keeping with Koshik and Seo’s (2012) observation that in L2 talk, these types of public search foster recipient cooperation and empathy. Thus, the search markers “um:::,” “fi-,” “I mean” work to display her efforts to make meaning explicit while retaining interactional control, and the accumulation of pauses and repairs demonstrates an incremental formulation (Ford, et al., 1996) that holds the turn piece-by-piece while displaying an evaluative position. As Kurhila (2006) notes, this type of repair sequence allows learners to co-construct meaning collaboratively, often prompting displays of understanding or alignment from others. This can be seen when TRD re-engages the voting phase in the following turn.

In this context, the students’ use of repetition as a form of recycling repair marked by a 1-second pause and elongated “ah:::” displays their ongoing orientation towards fluency. Interactionally motivated repair practice is also seen to be used as a way of reinforcing ideas and clarifying meanings. In line with CA terminology, students’ recycling demonstrates progressivity management by sustaining talk through moments of potential disfluency, and this is in fact a common repair strategy used to manage syntactic complexity (Fox et al., 1996). This is also consistent with studies by Rieger (2003) and Lerner (2002), which found that word-level repetition within the same TCU often serves to foreground key information and project an upcoming evaluation, thereby foregrounding fluency and emphasis through repetition of fragments (Rieger, 2003). The students’ recycling sequences demonstrate their ongoing epistemic vigilance within the decision-making trajectory, and this collaborative completion also shows how recycling facilitates co-construction of assessment, a key interactional feature in decision-making discussions (Heritage & Clayman, 2010).

Despite their limited use, when inserting repairs are found in the present study, Zhang’s (2022) observations are applicable. Insertions are also

employed to sharpen precision and to expand students' reasoning or arguments through the addition of lexical items. Wilkinson and Weatherall (2011) have demonstrated that inserting repairs are most commonly used for specifying and intensifying, and this is in line with the results presented here. As evidenced in lines 3 and 5 of extract 4, the inserting repairs of JTM's "more detail" and SRR's "home story" aid specification in that their inserted utterances modify the original reference formulation "can you tell me about Ann" and so identify a particular type of referent (more detail about Ann's financial need and Ann's home story, respectively). NDN's inserting repair "perfect" in line 13's "the most perfect student to get" works to intensify and strengthen his argument that Ann is the most qualified recipient for the scholarship. This inserting repair not only strengthens his argument but also prompts the alignment of the co-participant's next turn, as seen in the immediate agreement tokens provided in JTM's "Yeah I agree with your point....." in line 16. This then drives the group to a joint decision. These insertions serve to improve arguments, strengthen epistemic claims, and refine assessment terms, and this functions similarly to how native speakers deploy insert expansions to preserve on-track talk while enriching the TCU (Schegloff, 1987). Koshik and Seo (2012) show how L2 speakers often engage in incremental turn construction that allows them to add, modify, or extend elements within an ongoing TCU, thereby refining meaning or displaying understanding. This aligns closely with how inserting is seen to function in the present study, with Thai EFL students inserting lexical, descriptive, or evaluative elements that increase precision and expand the argument in ways that reinforce group reasoning.

However, the relative rarity of insertions in this dataset suggests that students orient more strongly to progressivity than to elaboration. This resonates with Lerner's (2004) discussion of how speakers construct TCUs in such a way that potential points of overlap or dis-alignment are minimized. Inserting repairs requires momentary disruption to the emerging TCU, and this may project uncertainty, reduce fluency, or risk overlap. In a task environment such as this, which is framed as consensus-seeking, students may select simpler repair strategies that avoid complex mid-TCU expansions.

While prior research (Alharbi, 2023; Beshir & Yigzaw, 2022; Rad & Rabani, 2023; Zeng, 2019) has found that aborting repair serves to prevent misunderstanding by halting problematic speech, it is here utilized as a strategy for reformulation and to facilitate group alignment. In lines 13-15 in extract 5, NDN shifts from a personal epistemic stance to a group-stance frame when he says, "Speaking of financial need I speaking with I (1) but we doesn't feel he doesn't need this scholar maybe he focus many scholarship", and again in lines 18-19 with "I think grade hav- if we consider grade maybe

we should consider Pena and Lee two students more than another”. This is in keeping with Lerner and Kitzinger’s (2007) aggregation of the individual self-referential term “I” to a “we” as a self-collectivity. While this aggregation is most often implemented through a replacing repair move, in this case, a personal report is shifted to a group decision via the interactional use of aborting repair. Early work by Schegloff et al. (1977) demonstrates that cut-offs are not only indicators of production difficulty but are also contextually sensitive markers of emerging trouble that project the speaker’s need to structurally reorganize the turn. Here, aborting displays exactly this interactional logic, as students halt the current TCU precisely at the moment they recognize that the trajectory they are constructing no longer aligns with the emerging group consensus, as happens with the assessment of a student’s financial needs. Restarts following cut-offs also introduce more cautious, hedged, or collaboratively aligned formulations. This reflects a phenomenon identified by Lerner (2004), who shows that restarts frequently involve altering the “projectability” of the upcoming material, such that the new TCU becomes more fitted to the participation framework. This suggests that this repair type plays a key role in reformulating and sustaining collective alignment during this particular discourse.

Compared to the aforementioned research on EFL interactional settings, the relatively low frequency of inserting and aborting repair operations seen in this dataset can be explained by the interactional ecology of the decision-making task, Thai cultural norms, and students’ linguistic resources. First, group decision-making involves highly goal-oriented and criteria-driven talk, and in this context, students would naturally consider it more important to give assessments and reasons than to provide detailed insertion-based expansions since the latter requires stopping the progressivity of the turn. Because the task required groups to select a single scholarship candidate, students tended to produce forward-moving turns that maintain the flow of deliberation, rather than pausing to insert additional descriptors unless this was necessary as a justification. As a result, inserting repairs are typically used selectively to add precision that directly strengthens the persuasiveness of a particular claim. Moreover, the uncommon use of aborting can be linked to the highly collaborative and non-confrontational norms typical of Thai peer-group interactions, where maintenance of interpersonal harmony is prized (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Students orient strongly toward interpersonal harmony and task alignment, which allows them to preserve face while still adjusting their position. Consequently, repair operations such as replacing, searching and recycling help task participants restart or adjust their reformulations at mid-turn, instead of aborting and abandoning their turns entirely. This reflects a culturally shaped preference

for smooth interactional relations, and this makes aborting a dispreferred resource. Finally, lower frequencies of both inserting and aborting repair operations may reflect the students' limited linguistic resources and preference for simpler, more accessible repair trajectories. Both inserting and aborting require rapid real-time monitoring of syntactic structure and argument coherence, and students may lack the fluency to systematically deploy these operations. Instead, these speakers seem to favor simpler repair types, such as lexical replacement, searching, or recycling, that allow them to maintain progressivity without complex restructuring. The distribution of repair operations in this dataset is thus likely a result of the intersection of the task demands, Thai cultural-interactional norms, and students' own language competencies, and this caused students to deploy practices in which inserting and aborting remain available but are used only sparingly and strategically.

Conclusion

In this study, evidence of Thai EFL students' same-turn SISR and its connection to context-specific interactional functions, which were amplified by the nature of the high-stakes task/discussion, has significant implications for English language education in Thailand. First, Thai students tend to favor replacing, searching or recycling repairs over riskier operations such as inserting new information or aborting an utterance midway, and so making inserting and aborting repair practices explicit within pedagogy could help to shift students from accuracy-focused monitoring towards more meaningful interactions (Walsh, 2011). For example, task-based activities that require rapid and collaborative problem-solving might encourage students to add precision and expand their arguments in real-time through the use of inserting repairs that add qualifiers, specify details, or modify their position. Second, Thai EFL teachers may benefit from raising awareness of repair strategies by modeling how effective speakers use same-turn self-repair to manage precision, mitigate potential misunderstandings, and project alignment in interaction. Metapragmatic reflection, such as discussing why a speaker aborted a turn to reframe a proposal, could help develop students' sensitivity to interactional repair functions beyond error correction (Seedhouse, 2004). This kind of pedagogical attention would be especially welcome in Thai classrooms, where interaction is often teacher-fronted and students have limited exposure to authentic peer negotiations (Noom-Ura, 2013).

Finally, because same-turn SISR practices are tied to the sequential organization of interaction and decision-making progressivity, collaborative tasks, for example ranking, choosing, or evaluating alternatives, can be used to train students to use same-turn interactions as a resource for managing

interpersonal alignment. This research also implies support for the development of interactional competence (Hall, 2018; Hall et al., 2011; Pekarek Doehler, 2019) since the students' same-turn repairs are not only indicators of their linguistic difficulty, but are also interactional resources through which students manage their reasoning, negotiate meaning, and maintain the progressivity of joint discussion. Each repair operation enables participants to refine their proposals and to more closely align with co-participants, and this then helps them to display competent participation in collaborative decision-making. Moreover, when students make replacing, searching and recycling repairs, this demonstrates their sensitivity to contingencies that are emerging in real time and their orientation to recipients' potential uptake of these. This responsiveness is a key dimension of interactional competence since it shows that individuals are able to shape their turns to fit the evolving trajectory of the talk. By contrast, the low frequency of inserting and aborting repairs suggests that students may not yet fully mobilize more radical turn adjustments, which could be due to their limited linguistic resources or uncertainty over how or when to do this. Pedagogically, this highlights the need to encourage students' use of repair strategies by helping them recognize that abandoning and reformulating a turn is a legitimate and effective approach for maintaining mutual understanding. Activities that promote negotiation of viewpoints, justification of rankings, or on-the-spot evaluation offer particularly strong opportunities for developing these repair-based displays of competence. Indeed, the findings underscore the fact that cultivating interactional competence in Thai EFL contexts also requires supporting students' use of a full range of same-turn SISR practices, not only error-correction but also higher-level turn-modifying operations that contribute to meaning negotiation, reasoning management, and collaborative action.

More broadly, this study contributes to CA research on repair in several key ways. First, by documenting how EFL learners deploy same-turn SISR practices during collaborative decision-making, this research extends existing work on SISR beyond its traditional focus on native-speaker interactions. The present findings demonstrate that replacing, searching and recycling repairs play a central role in shaping the trajectory of proposals, refining criteria, and projecting affiliation, thus revealing their relevance for decision-making. Second, the study provides an explanation for the relative infrequency of inserting and aborting repairs compared to other EFL classroom studies, thereby adding nuance to our understanding of how repair formats may be conditioned by task type. Finally, by connecting the analysis of same-turn SISR with interactional competence, the study has the potential

to advance theoretical discussions on how these repair practices can be conceptualized as both indicators and mechanisms of L2 development.

Building on the present study's findings, future task-based CA studies should analyze same-turn SISR across a more diverse range of interactional activities, such as debates or problem-solving tasks, to clarify which characteristics of these (e.g., level of conflict or knowledge distribution) promote or constrain particular repair operations. Future research could examine whether learners show increased willingness to abandon and relaunch turns, or whether the use of inserting repairs that specify criteria or strengthen claims expands with interactional experience. Longitudinal CA studies would also help to establish whether changes in same-turn SISR reflect broader developmental trajectories in L2 participation. Last but not least, since the present study used a classroom-based decision task, future research should analyze the same phenomena in authentic institutional settings, such as student committee meetings, workplace group discussions, or community decision-making forums. Such environments may reveal how different structures influence the frequency and pattern of same-turn SISR operations.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the College of Interdisciplinary Studies Research Fund, Thammasat University, Contract No.6/2566.

About the Author

Sumita Supakorn: An Assistant Professor in Education and Applied Linguistics at the College of Interdisciplinary Studies, Thammasat University. Her professional interests include L2 classroom discourse, conversation analysis, and task-based language teaching.

References

- Agustin, M. P. D., Tandoc Jr., J. P., & Eustaquio, Ma. T. L. (2024). Self-initiated repair strategies of learners of English as a second language. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS) VIII (XII)*, 1858-1871. <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.8120159>
- Alharbi, J. M. (2023). Linguistic features of self-repair strategies of Arab speakers of English language. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, 46, 342-354. <https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v46i1.9337>

- Beshir, M., & Yigzaw, A. (2022). Students' self-repair in EFL classroom interactions: Implications for classroom dynamics. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 7(26), 1-15.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-022-00153-6>
- Brouwer, C. E. (2003). Word searches in NNS-NS interaction: Opportunities for language learning? *The Modern Language Journal*, 87(4), 534–545. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00206>
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Carroll, D. (2004). Restarts in novice turn beginnings: Disfluencies or interactional achievements? In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 201–221). Continuum.
- Chen, M. H., & Ye, S. X. (2022). Extending repair in peer interaction: A conversation analytic study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1-13.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.926842>
- Choopool, P., & Sinwongsawat, K. (2017). Effectiveness of form-focused repairs in improving low-proficiency learners' speaking performance. *Veridian E-Journal, Silpakorn University (Humanities, Social Sciences and arts)*, 10 (4), 458-472.
- Duklim, B. (2023). Students' preferences regarding the techniques of oral corrective feedback in a tertiary institution. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 22 (1), 39-405.
<https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.22.1.22>
- Emrani, F., & Hooshmand, M. (2019). A conversation analysis of self-initiated self-repair structures in advanced Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 13(1), 57-76.
- Fox, B. A., Hayashi, M., & Jasperson, R. (1996). Resources and repair: A cross-linguistic study of syntax and repair. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and Grammar* (pp. 185–237). Cambridge University Press.
- Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (2008). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Hall, J. K. (2007). Redressing the roles of correction and repair in research on second and foreign language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(4), 511-526.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00619>
- Hall, J. K. (2018). From L2 interactional competence to L2 interactional repertoires: reconceptualising the objects of L2 learning. *Classroom Discourse*, 9(1), 25-39.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2018.1433050>

- Hall, J. K., Hellermann, J., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (eds.) (2011). *L2 Interactional Competence and Development*. Multilingual Matters.
<https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847694072>
- Hellermann, 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.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00313830902757550>
- Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299–345). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511665868.020>
- Heritage, J., & Clayman, S. (2010). *Talk in action: Interactions, identities, and institutions*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Jefferson, G. (1974). Error correction as an interactional resource. *Language in Society*, 3(2), 181–199.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kampittayakul, T. (2018). The Role of translanguaging in improving Thai learners' interactional competence in dyadic English as a Foreign Language tutorial sessions. *PASAA*, 56, 80–111.
<https://digital.car.chula.ac.th/pasaa/vol56/iss1/5>
- Kasper, G. (1985). Repair in foreign language teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 7(2), 200–215.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100005374>
- Kaur, J. (2011). Raising explicitness through self-repair in English as a lingua franca. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(11), 2704–2715.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.04.012>
- Kim, D. R. (2020). Emergence of proactive self-initiated self-repair as an indicator of L2 IC development. *Applied Linguistics*, 41(6), 901–921.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amz047>
- Kitzinger, C. (2013). Repair. In J. Sidnell, & T. Stivers (Eds.) *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 229–256). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Kongsom, T. (2016). The impact of teaching communication strategies on English speaking of engineering undergraduates. *PASAA*, 51, 38–69.
https://digital.car.chula.ac.th/pasaa?utm_source=digital.car.chula.ac.th%2Fpasaa%2Fvol51%2Fiss1%2F3&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages
- Koshik, I., & Seo, M.-S. (2012). Word (and other) search sequences initiated by language learners. *Text & Talk*, 32(2), 167–189.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2012-0009>

- Kurhila, S. (2006). *Second language interaction*. John Benjamins.
- Lerner, G. H. (2002). Turn-sharing: The choral co-production of talk-in-interaction. In Celia E. Ford, Barbara A. Fox, Sandra A. Thompson, (Eds.), *The Language of Turn and Sequence* (pp. 225–257). Oxford University Press.
- Lerner, G. H. (2004). On the place of linguistic resources in the organization of talk-in-interaction: Grammar as action in prompting a speaker to elaborate. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 37(2), 151-184.
https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi3702_3
- Lerner, H., & Kitzinger, C. (2007). Extraction and aggregation in the repair of individual and collective self-reference. *Discourse Studies*, 9(4), 526-557.
https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445607079165?urlappend=%3Futm_source%3Dresearchgate.net%26utm_medium%3Darticle
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2007). *An introduction to Conversation Analysis*. Continuum.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37-66.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- Macbeth, D. (2004). The relevance of repair in classroom correction. *Language in Society*, 33(5), 703-736.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404504045038>
- Mayi, L. (2014). Doing repair in native-non-native talk: A conversation analytic study of Thai-English interaction. *Rangsit Journal of Educational Studies (RJES)*, 1(2), 18-31.
<https://doi.org/10.14456/rjes.2014.9>
- McHoul, A. (1990). The organization of repair in classrooms. *Language in Society*, 19, 349–377. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S004740450001455X>
- Noom-Ura, S. (2013). English-teaching problems in Thailand and Thai teachers' professional development needs. *English Language Teaching*, 6(11), 139-147. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n11p139>
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2019). On the nature and the development of L2 interactional competence: State of the art and implications for praxis. In R. Salaberry & S. Kunitz (Eds.), *Teaching and testing L2 interactional competence: Bridging theory and practice* (pp. 25–59). Routledge.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In M. Atkinson, & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57-101). Cambridge University Press.
- Rad, N. F., & Rabani, K. (2023). Uncovering Iranian EFL learners' repair operations' employment in story-retelling. *Studies in Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis*, 4(2), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.48185/spda.v4i2.811>

- Rieger, C. L. (2003). Repetitions as self-repair strategies in English and German conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(1), 47-69.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(01\)00060-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(01)00060-1)
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696-735.
<https://doi.org/10.17323/1728-192X-2015-1-142-202>
- Schegloff, E. A. (1979). The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation. In T. Givon (Ed.), *Syntax and Semantics 12: Discourse and Syntax* (pp. 261-286). New York: Academic Press.
https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368897_012
- Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Recycled turn beginnings: A precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organization. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organization* (pp. 70-85). Multilingual Matters.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97(5), 1295-1345.
<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1086/229903>
- Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Third turn repair. In G. R. Guy, C. Feagin, D. Schiffrin, & J. Baugh (Eds.), *Toward a social science of language: Papers in honor of William Labov, Vol. 2. Social interaction and discourse structures* (pp. 31-40). John Benjamins.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis 1*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2013). Ten operations in self-initiated, same-turn repair. In M. Hayashi, G. Raymond, & J. Sidnell (Eds.), *Conversational repair and human understanding* (pp. 41-70). Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511757464.002>
- Schegloff, E. A. & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8(4), 289-327.
https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.1973.8.4.289?urlappend=%3Futm_source%3Dresearchgate.net%26utm_medium%3Darticle
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53(2), 361-382. <https://doi.org/10.2307/413107>
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Language Learning Monograph Series. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Stephens, O. S., & Sanderson, I. J. (2019). The recast: Frequency and effectiveness in EFL communicative language schools in Thailand.

- THAITESOL Journal*, 32(2), 1–16. <https://so05.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/thaitesoljournal/article/view/229322>
- Tantiwich, K., & Sinwongsuwat, K. (2021). Thai university students' problems of language use in English conversation. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 14(2), 598–626. retrieved from <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/253282>
- Ulla, M. B., Bucol, J. L., and Dechatiwongse Na Ayuthaya, P. (2022). English language curriculum reform strategies: The impact of EMI on students' language proficiency. *Ampersand*, 9, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amper.2022.100101>
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. Routledge.
- Waring, H. Z. (2008). Using explicit positive assessment in the language classroom: IRF, feedback, and learning opportunities. *Modern Language Journal*, 92(4), 577-594. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2008.00788.x>
- Wilkinson, S., & Weatherall, A. (2011). Insertion repair. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 44(1), 65-91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2011.544136>
- Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2020). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Zeng, S. (2019). A three-dimensional classification system of second language self-repair. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 9(8), 917-928. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0908.04>
- Zhang, Q. (2022). A study on the phenomenon of anaphoric correction in college students' English conversation. *Applied Mathematics and Nonlinear Sciences*, 8(2), 1-11. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2478/amns.2021.2.00289>

Appendix

Jeffersonian Transcription Conventions

(0.2)	The time (in tenths of a second) between utterances
(.)	A micro-pause (one tenth of a second or less)
wo:rd	Sound extension of a word (more colons = longer stretches)
word.	Fall in tone (not necessarily the end of a sentence)
wor-	An abrupt stop in articulation
word?	Rising inflection (not necessarily a question)
word	(underline) Emphasized word, part of word or sound