

REPAIR INITIATION STRATEGIES IN EVERYDAY INTERACTION BY SPEAKERS OF MALAY LANGUAGE

Jariah Mohd Jan^{*} and Mohammad Azanee Saad

Faculty of Languages and Linguistics, University of Malaya, 50603 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

e-mail: jariah@um.edu.my ; mazanee@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Everyday interaction is not a faultless process. It is possible for the process to experience troubles in speaking, hearing or understanding that can lead to interactional breakdowns between speakers. One available mechanism for speakers to address and resolve trouble is through other-initiated repair (OIR). Majority of OIR studies to date have used English language as data source. This may not entirely describe similar strategies employ by speakers of other languages when they participate in OIR. The present study aims to examine strategies for speakers of Malay language to initiate repair following troubles in everyday interaction. Three parent-child dyads of Malay language speakers were selected as participants. Their interaction over several homely activities (i.e. family meal time) were recorded and later transcribed following Jefferson Transcription System (2004). Analysis on strategies was quantitatively performed following Philip's (2008) Clarification Request coding scheme. Overall result showed that parents and children employ different types of strategies when they are in position to initiate repair. Children largely depend on the use of open-class word that is known to be a weak repair initiator while parents are consistent with a more specific repair initiator. Result from this study provides novel discovery on how Malay speakers initiate repair in the context of parent-child interaction and it can serve as comparative data for future typological studies.

Key words: Other-initiated repair; strategies; parent-child interaction; Malay language

INTRODUCTION

Troubles in speaking, hearing or understanding during the process of everyday interaction can negatively affect speakers' mutual understanding. Therefore, speakers must find their way out from such situation so interaction can progress to its possible end and be successful. To accomplish this, repair practice provides speakers with necessary mechanism to deal with troubles during the on-going process of interaction. Repair is not merely a term but rather a social action that guides them with systematic and organised technique in effort to maintain mutual understanding when troubles occurred (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks, 1977). There are several types of repair but this paper solely focuses on other-initiated repair (OIR) for its ability to showcase speakers' cooperative behaviour (Dingemanse & Enfield, 2015).

OIR describes situation in interaction when one speaker initiates repair from his/her co-speaker on preceding turn that is treated to contain problem. Following this initiation, repair is given by a speaker who produced the trouble source. In doing so, speakers need to be equipped with necessary language, cognitive and social skills (Cho & Larke, 2011). According to Dingemanse and Enfield (2015), OIR connects language, mind and social life. These skills actually help speakers to organise their OIR sequence that can quickly resolve

occurring troubles. Specifically, speaker needs to design initiation turn that can inform the co-speaker on what kinds of trouble that have caused breakdown between them (Hayashi & Kim, 2015). Thus, speakers are expected to employ various resources available in language when they design the initiation turn (Dingemanse et al., 2015).

In their study on repair in American English, Schegloff et al. (1977) found five formats of design that are common to be used when speakers want to initiate repair. The identified formats are open-class word such as *ha* or *what*, question words like *when*, partial repeat of problematic speech with question word, repeat of problematic speech and finally, offering candidate understanding through you mean format. Svennevig (2008) listed these formats according to their strength in specifying troubles in which open-class word is perceived to be weak due to inability to inform the kind of trouble while offering candidate understanding is recognised to have higher strength.

Following Schegloff et al. (1977), studies on OIR have developed to cover many aspects of investigation such as prosodic element in initiation across several format (Dehe, 2015), initiation by language impaired speaker such as autistic children (Wiklund, 2016) or hearing loss individual (Ekberg, Hickson & Grenness, 2017) and the role of non-verbal behaviour like mutual gaze and hand gesture in repair initiation (Mortensen, 2016). These studies have helped to provide deeper understanding on how speakers design their initiation turn during spontaneous interaction, the possible link of initiation format to types of trouble and the role of language in designing initiation format.

This study is motivated due to high attention of OIR studies on English language as primary spoken data (Kendrick, 2015) and also the unavailability of systematic study that looks into the format of initiation in languages around the world (Dingemanse & Enfield, 2015). Even though studies have generally shown that OIR is organised similarly; first being the trouble turn, followed by initiation turn and then, repair turn, it however does not entirely indicate the practice of OIR to be universal.

Despite the similarity in types of repair format, how speakers carry out the initiation or the manner in which initiation is delivered can vary across languages (Sidnell, 2008) and the process may be tied to particular linguistic system (Dingemanse, Blythe & Dirksmeyer, 2014). According to Hayashi and Kim (2015), the design of initiation turn is controlled by the grammatical aspect of the language. Given the fact that languages across the world are built in different and unique linguistic features such as in the aspect of syntactic, phonetic and semantic system, this can significantly influence how OIR is designed (Sidnell, 2008; Svennevig, 2008; Hayashi & Kim, 2015). Similarly, Wierzbicka (1991) confirmed that the ways speakers resolve interactional troubles differ cross-culturally.

Overall, the practice of OIR can be said to be a language-specific interactional action (Dingemanse, Blythe & Dirksmeyer, 2014). Taking this point as departure, the present study looks into how Malay speakers design their OIR turn. Repair to interactional breakdowns in general or more specifically, OIR has not been examined quite extensively and from researchers' own search through available database, study on OIR in Malay language is almost scarce or yet to be available. It is quite significant to look into the aspect of OIR sequence in Malay language for several reasons; first the language is spoken by almost 77 million people around the world and is currently ranked as the 6th language with total number of speakers (Summer Institute of Linguistics, 2017) and secondly, understanding on OIR sequence in Malay language is impossible to be generated from available literatures because

current body of knowledge offers insight into languages that are classified in different language group than Malay language.

As brief overview, Malay is a language that belongs to Austronesian family (Norsimah, Kesumawati, Nor Zakiah & Nor Hashimah, 2007). Structurally, morphological system in Malay is rich with derivational morpheme but inflectional morpheme is not available (Goddard, 2002; Mohd et al., 2016). While morpheme in English can denote changes in its grammatical aspect such as tense (for example present tense *walks* to past tense *walked*), the Malay morpheme can change the syntactic category of the words; for example verb to noun as in “minum” (drink) to “*peminum*” (drinker).

In addition to morphology, Malay language also has certain phonological characteristics that are not similar to English. Generally, Malay like other languages within the group of Austronesian has a simple phonology (Zuraidah, Yong & Knowles, 2008). For example, stress in English has variety of roles where stress patterns are commonly used to infer meanings to certain words or expressions (Thomson, 1996). But in Malay language, stress is identified to have no significant function and usually, stressed syllables are accompanied with stretching of sound or loudness in pitch (Juliah, 1993). In other words, Malay language does not associate itself to the notion of stress despite its speakers can have variety of prosodic changes in speech (Zuraidah et al., 2008).

With this in mind, this study looks into how Malay speakers initiate repair following interactional troubles that occur in the preceding turn during everyday interaction. Specifically, information on strategies that are employed by speakers to initiate repair is discussed. The discussion will draw from the context of parent-child interaction. This allows the study to further develop another objective, which is to compare strategies between parents as adult speakers and children.

Method

This study is conducted within the paradigm of Conversation Analysis (CA). CA is a methodological approach that scientifically examines everyday interaction and has been developed by Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson in the 1960s (Sidnell, 2016). This approach provides systematic ways for researchers to understand how speakers organise their everyday interaction particularly in several key features such as turn-taking organisation and repair organisation. Thus, this study is strictly guided by CA in its data collection procedure and turn-by-turn examination.

Participants

Three families (N=3) were selected to participate in the study. The families consist of parents either both father and mother or one of them only together with their children. Specifically, family 1 is constituted of mother and daughter. The Mother is a housewife while her daughter is aged 7 years old at the time of data collection. Family 2 on the other hand includes parents and their 10-year old son. The father works as technician while his mother is a primary school teacher. Lastly, family 3 includes father, mother and their son. The father is a policeman and the mother is a housewife. Their son on the other hand is at primary school age (12 years old). Table 1 highlights the profiles of participants.

Table 1: Participants' Profile

Participant	Pseudonym	Age (at time of recording)	Number of recording
Family 1	Mother	42 years old	3
	Lisa	7 years old	3
Family 2	Father	44 years old	1
	Mother	44 years old	3
	Aiman	9 years old	3
Family 3	Father	47 years old	5
	Mother	45 years old	5
	Aniq	12 years old	5

Participants for this study are selected through purposive sampling technique, whereby they must meet specific requirements for inclusion. The requirements are Malay to be their first language and have children at primary school age. All participants are able to participate in everyday interaction within home compound. All participants reside in the central west of peninsular Malaysia (i.e. Kuala Lumpur and Selangor) where the accent of Malay language is known to many. Clinical examination on the children's psychosocial functioning to determine children's ability to participate in interaction is not conducted. This instead is obtained through parents' report on their children's ability. Other variables such as socioeconomic background, gender and academic achievement of the children are not within the scope of the present study; thus are not subjected to analysis.

Source of Data

The primary data is largely drawn from a series of recording of everyday interaction between parents and their children within their home compound. To ensure natural quality of interactional data, which is key for CA data, no specific tasks or topics of interaction were given in advance. Rather, participants were made free to interact on any issues or participate in any activities of their choice. Total hour of recordings accumulated almost 7 hours (381.4 minutes) of recording. From these recordings, OIR sequence is identified through the presence of repair initiation and as a result, a total of 219 OIR sequences serve as primary data source.

Data Collection Procedure

Participants were first met with researcher to be explained on the nature of study and how its data are going to be collected. Participants were also briefed on their rights and responsibilities should they agree to participate. Agreement to participate is validated through participants' signature on prepared consent letter.

Next step was recording of interaction. Specifically, this process includes a series of video recordings of interactions between parents and their children with inclusion of secondary participants such as other siblings. Recordings were made over several homely activities such as family's lunch time and leisure time. Recordings were made through suitable recording tool that records both audio and visual. Once recording completes, transcription of data commenced.

Transcription

This study adopts Jefferson's Transcription System (2004), which is a widely used transcription system (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). This system of transcription represents various features of talk in written form that include temporal and sequential aspects such as latching, pauses and overlaps and prosodic features such as pitch, sound lengthening, and pace of talk. The system also integrates features such as aspiration and laughing. Finally, nonverbal activities such as change of eye gaze and hand gesture are transcribed as well.

As the data are in Malay, the transcription employs multi-linear transcription (Hepburn & Bolden, 2012). Through this system, the first line represents the original talk in the video, the second line represents morpheme-by-morpheme English gloss of the original that provides translation to the original word and grammatical information in abbreviated way (e.g. NOUN) and the third line represents English gloss within contextual meaning.

The transcription is presented in three columns. The first column indicates the line number for reference on where the talk occurs in data. The second column indicates the speaker through standardised letter (e.g. AMN for Aiman). Finally, the third column contains the orthographic transcription of the data.

Data Coding

OIR is operationally viewed as request made by speaker following troubles in hearing, speaking or understanding. This follows definition provided by Schegloff et al. (1977). The term OIR is consistently used in this study as it follows CA terminology even though it carries similar meaning as other terms like clarification request. OIR is identified in the data from a sequential perspective following next turn procedure. Then, Philip's Clarification Request (2008) is adopted to code OIR strategies.

Philip's Clarification Request (2008) lists coding categories for repair initiation strategies made by speakers following breakdowns in interaction. The coding categories are developed by Biji Alice Philip (2008) based on categories reported in previous literatures. It lists seven types of clarification request strategies (or OIR) that are used as coding scheme.

Table 2 lists the coding scheme.

Table 2: Philip's Clarification Request (2008)

No.	Clarification Requests	Explanation
1.	Non-specific (NS)	Neutral request such as "huh", "what". This is similar to Drew (1997)'s open-class repair initiator
2.	Specific request for repetition (SRR)	Request in which a <i>wh</i> - question replaces a part of the original utterance of the speaker.
3.	Specific request for specification (SRS)	Listener indicates what specific additional information is required to fix the breakdown
4.	request for confirmation (CONFR)	Repetitions with rising intonation, reductions or elaboration

- | | | |
|----|-------------------------|---|
| 5. | Direct request (DR) | Request for the exact definition of a component in a message |
| 6. | Relevance requests (RR) | Request that questions the relevance of what the speaker says |
| 7. | Cloze requests (CR) | Request that gives two choices to choose from |

(1 to 6 are derived from Gallagher, 1977; Gallagher, 1981, Brinton & Fujuki, 1989; Yont et al., 2000. Category 7 is from Philip & Hewitt, 2006).

Validity and Reliability

Transcription of audio recording, coding of data and analysis technique are the three main aspects of this study that require validation. Two faculty members who have experience in interactional data were appointed to examine the accuracy of transcription, assigned coding for repair sequence and data analysis. The process involved examination of the transcription while listening to the audio recording, examination of the translation and assessment of the assigned coding for repair sequence. In case of dissimilarity with researcher’s own works, discussion was made until agreement is achieved. The validation of transcriptions however did not include participants themselves for the availability of recordings to cross-check.

Data Analysis

Data were first analysed through frequency count of OIR strategies. The frequency count provides information on distribution of strategies that can act as evidence for their occurrence. In the next step, each identified strategy was examined and described in relation to its context of occurrence in term of linguistic resources being used. This follows CA’s approach of analysis which is turn-by-turn examination.

Results

Results for this study are discussed in two parts; first part aims to highlight the frequency of OIR strategies and compare their distribution between parents and children. Description of the most employed strategies by parents and children by highlighting their context of occurrence is given in the second section that follows.

Distribution of OIR strategies

The first aim of this study is to look at the distribution of OIR strategies between parents and children. Table 3 shows the distribution in its frequency of occurrence.

Table 3: Distribution of Repair Initiation Strategies

No.	OIR Strategies	Parents	Children	Total
1.	Specific request for specification	79	5	84
2.	Request for confirmation	42	6	48
3.	Non-specific/Open-class repair initiator	27	19	46
4.	Direct request	15	3	18
5.	Specific request for repetition	13	5	18

6.	Cloze request	15	0	15
7.	Non-verbal	3	3	6
	Total	194	41	235

Table 3 shows the total number of OIR strategies that have been identified in the data set is 235 strategies. From the table, it indicates a clear gap in the frequency of OIR strategies between parents and children i.e. a total of 194 occurrences for parents compared to only 41 occurrences for children. This indicates that parents have to significantly initiate repair from the children that produce more troubles than the children themselves. From the table also, parents are seen to employ OIR strategy's specific request for specification the most as compared to other strategies. Of 194 OIR strategies identified, specific request for specification is seen in 79 repair initiation turns and this is significantly higher than other strategies employed by parents. The second most employed strategy is request for confirmation where the frequency of occurrence is seen in 43 repair initiation turns. This is followed with non-specific/open-class repair initiator strategy (N=27), direct request (N=15), cloze request (N=15) and specific request for repetition (13). In addition, this study has identified the use of non-verbal as repair initiation strategy to be employed by parents in three (N=3) occurrences. The use of non-verbal includes gestures like frowning of eyes or nodding head up.

In contrast, children are recorded to employ the most strategy of non-specific or open-class repair initiator where it is identified in 19 repair initiation turns. The next OIR strategy that is found in children's repair initiation turn is request for confirmation (N=6). Other repair initiation strategies occur at minimal level; specific request for specification (N=5), specific request for repetition (N=5) and direct request (N=3). Similar to parents, the use of non-verbal can be seen in three (N=3) repair initiation turns while cloze request strategy does not occur in children's data set.

Description of Repair Initiation Strategies

The second aim of this study is to describe the OIR strategies employ by parents and children in terms of their context of occurrence in relation to type of breakdowns. This includes the linguistic resources that they use to construct the initiation turns. Randomly selected extracts from data set are used to accompany the discussion.

The most OIR strategy employ by parents is specific request for specification. Extract 1 shows an example of its occurrence.

Extract 1 Running man (Aiman-mother)

1	M	ape die running man tu? what \emptyset TOA the what is the running man?
2	AMN	nak masuk running man want join TOA (I) want to join running man
3	M	ye la yang running <ru:nning> man tu ape die? yes EMP that TOA the what \emptyset yes (but) that running man is what?

4	(.)
5	rancangan die tu? ((Aiman gazes at TV)) show it the the show itself?
6	AMN belari ((Aiman looks at mother)) running running

(TOA=term of address; EMP=emphasis)

Extract 1 shows interaction between mother (M) and Aiman or AMN (family 2) that focuses on one television show that seems to be his favourite TV show (Running Man). Mother begins the interaction by asking Aiman what the show is about. However, Aiman's answer "nak masuk" (to participate in the show) in line 2 is found to be irrelevant to mother's initial question that seeks different type of information. This (Aiman's line 2) becomes the trouble source where the problem is resulted from inaccurate information. Thus, mother initiates repair (OIR) in line 3 to 5 by being specific on the information she is looking for. When using this strategy, mother placed an emphasis to the key word which is the show's name by repeating the first word twice and ended with specific question word "ape die" (what). Mother claims the next turn after a short pause in line 4 by further specifying the kind of information she is looking for by making specific reference to the show through phrase "rancangan die tu" (the show). The determiner "tu" (the) is also used. This particular phrase seems to be continuity from mother's previous turn that ends with question word what. Aiman finally explains about the show in line 6 but rather the response is brief that can create potential trouble in the next turns.

Extract 1 exemplifies specific request for specification strategy that is employed by parents in OIR sequence. This particular strategy is found to be used when there is a trouble concerning information that might be vague or irrelevant to question. The use of this strategy is found to be effective as parents are found to place emphasis on key words within trouble source turn and accompany their initiation turn with specific question word such as "ape die" (what) to obtain the intended response.

The second frequent OIR strategy in parents' speech is request for confirmation. Extract 2 shows the example of this particular strategy

Extract 2 Aloe Vera drink (Lisa-mother)

1	L	slalunye beli:: ya::ng usually buy which usually (I) buy which
2		ade aloe vera °kat dalam die° has NOUN inside it it has aloe vera inside
3		(0.2)
4	M	o::: yang tu Ø that o:: that one
5		(.)
6	L	ta[::k=

no
no

In extract 2, Lisa (L) is telling her mother (M) on drink that she always takes at school. However, she seems to experience difficulty in remembering the exact name of the drink as evident in line 1. Thus, she opts to describe the drink as in this case, the content. Following this, mother seeks confirmation by pointing to one drink that is available during the context of interaction (line 4). This is produced by mother through the use of interjection “o” with sound lengthening to indicate agreement and then, the phrase “*yang tu*” (that one) is specifically used to confirm whether that is the drink Lisa is telling her about.

This particular extract shows an example of request for confirmation strategy employed by mother in trying to resolve the trouble. It is seen here that the OIR strategy is used when the trouble is resulted from information that is not specific or lack of information in order to give immediate complete understanding to the other speaker.

Another frequent OIR strategy found in data set is the use of open-class repair word. Extract 3 shows an example of its occurrence.

Extract 3 Information from friend (Aniq-mother)

1	M	bile cikgu bagitahu? <i>when teacher inform</i> when (does) teacher inform?
2	AQ	ha:? ((Aniq withdraws mutual gaze))
3		tak kawan bagitahu <i>no friend inform</i> no, friend informs
4	M	ha? ((mother gazes at Aniq))
5	AQ	kawan bagitahu <i>friend inform</i> friend informs
6	M	o ye ke:: o::: kelas amal? <i>really class NOUN</i> o really, class amal?

Extract 3 showcases one example of non-specific strategy or the use of open-class repair word by parents in initiating repair from children. The extract is a continuation from previous context of interaction that discusses Aniq (AQ) recently being placed in lower ranked class. The extract begins when mother (M) asks Aniq on when the news is given by teacher (line 1). However, Aniq corrects the mother’s query in line 3 by informing the news is made known to him by his friend and not his teacher (line 3). Even though there is a presence of open-class repair word “*ha*” with rising intonation in line 2, this particular word seems not to function as repair initiator rather it serves as turn construction unit when Aniq claims that particular turn.

In line 4, it can be seen that mother employs similar word “*ha*” with rising intonation at the end. In addition, mother placed her gaze at Aniq while producing the word. This on the other hand functions as repair initiator word where Aniq appropriately repeats his previous

utterance and at the same time, establishes mutual gaze with mother. Even though this type of strategy does not specify the kind of trouble the mother is experiencing, repetition of trouble source seems to work efficiently in this particular context of occurrence. The use of gaze seems to strengthen the open-class repair word by allocating the next turn to speaker that has been initiated.

In the context of children's OIR strategies, non-specific strategy is found to be the most frequent strategy employed by children when they perform repair initiation. The following extract 4 highlights one of the occurring situations.

Extract 4 Class placement (Aniq-father)

1	F	anik dapat nombo berape kelas? <i>TOA get number what class</i> Anik what number did you get in class
2	AQ	ha? ((Aniq establishes mutual gaze with father))
3	F	perikse <i>examination</i> examination
4	M	ala:: tinggal [lam kerete: left in car left in car
5	AQ	[tige belas thirteen thirteen

Extract 4 shows the employment of open-class repair word “*ha?*” by Aniq (AQ) when he initiates repair from his father. In this particular extract, father is trying to get information from Aniq on what number did he get in his class; the overall academic placement. Father is seen to pose Aniq with a question that is specific to his intended response required from Aniq (line 1). The question word “*berape*” clearly requires Aniq to provide number. However, Aniq responds with “*ha?*” with rising intonation in line 2 to indicate his trouble to the father's preceding question. At the same time, he establishes mutual gaze with his father. Father successfully takes the repair initiation and adds information to his previous turn with word that provides contextual background (“*perikse*” examination). There is an interruption from mother (M) in line 4 that seems to be talking about something else, but Aniq is able to respond accurately by informing father on his class placement (line 5) with mother's turn being ignored by both.

Even though the use of such strategy does not specify any kind of troubles, the use of open-class word by Aniq in this context seems to suggest problem in inadequacy of information experienced by him. This is evident in the next turn (repair turn) where father adds information to make his query more specific. Father also seems to be successful in locating the type of trouble source by adding information to his previous utterance instead of repeating as how it is usually performed when open-class is employed as evident in children's repair turns.

Other repair initiation strategies occur at minimal level. One example that can be shown is request for confirmation. Extract 5 exemplifies its employment in interaction between Aiman and his mother.

Extract 5 Nilam book (Aiman-mother)

- 1 M ade beli tak?
did buy EMP
did (I) buy (the book)?
- 2 AMN bm dengan bi? ((Aiman gazes at mother))
NOUN and NOUN
Malay and English?
- 3 M ha ade beli tak?
∅ have bought EMP
ha have (I) bought
- 4 AMN ((Aiman moves his head signalling no))

Extract 5 is a continuation from previous turns on mother's confirmation request from her son, Aiman (AMN) on buying one of his school's books (Nilam book). In line 1, mother (M) asks Aiman in a slightly general request where the main point of discussion which is the book is excluded from her utterance. This general approach of asking by mother is understandable given the specific information has been given in preceding turns. However, this becomes a trouble source and invites Aiman to initiate repair. In line 2, Aiman seeks confirmation that makes his repair initiation turn to be framed within request for confirmation strategy where he adds specific information to his mother's early query and designs it as interrogative style (rising intonation). He specifies the books that the mother is referring to (Malay and English) and maintains his gaze at mother. In the next turn, mother repairs through the first unit in her utterance that indicates confirmation and continues by repeating her original query; whether the books have been bought. Aiman in line 4 responds through non-verbal behaviour indicating no.

Discussion

This study describes the strategies of OIR in everyday interaction between parents and their children. Specifically, it looks at the distribution of strategies between two groups of speakers (adult and children) and examines the linguistic resources to construct the repair initiation turn.

The first finding of this study has shown differences in the distribution of frequency in OIR strategies to be employed by parents and children. With a total of 235 repair initiation turns, 194 turns across several strategies are produced by parents while the remaining 41 turns are produced by children. This first shows that children's troubles in interaction cause breakdowns to occur more than the parents thus causing parents to initiate repair significantly higher than the children. Given language, cognitive and social competency of children is lower than parents (Forrester, 2013; Elbers, 2004), this finding seems to generate hypothesis that breakdowns in interaction between parents and children are likely to be contributed by the latter group of speaker even though the children have reached the maturation age in language development milestone.

In the aspect of strategies employed by speakers, the notable difference in several strategies use in their frequency of occurrence may be due to ability of parents and children to participate in interaction. Parent-child interaction has been described as asymmetrical interaction where both groups differ in their linguistic competency (Forrester, 2013). This may explain why strategies like specific request for specification that is known for being specific in locating trouble source is found to be employed by parents more as contrast to children who employ non-specific strategy or open-class repair initiator (Drew, 1997) which is a poor repair initiator strategy due to inability locate type of trouble source in the preceding turn.

It is worth to highlight on the high frequency of open-class repair word in the data set of this study. However, the use of these words by both speakers can be differentiate through their connection to trouble source in preceding turns. Children are found to have the tendency of employing such words when they are confronted with problem in understanding (as seen in extract 4) while parents can be seen to carefully use these words when there is problem in hearing. The use of open-class repair words is known to be high when speakers have problem to what is being said (Svennevig, 2008) which justifies the parents' strategy but using these words can also lead to successful repair turn when there is understanding problem as evident in children's data (Svennevig, 2008). But it can be expected for the OIR sequence to be extended as stronger repair initiation is required should open-class words fails to trigger intended repair.

The use of non-specific strategy or open-class word like “*ha*” that is commonly observed in the data further highlights its pragmatic function in interaction. Garvey (1977) has asserted that the primary function of such words is to indicate and signal breakdowns in preceding turn. This can primarily be identified when gaze is mutual between speaker of trouble source and the one who produces OIR. However, the function of such word may be different when the gaze is not mutual despite having similar format (with rising intonation). This is particularly evident in extract 3 when Aniq claims the next turn with open-class word “*ha*” but the gaze is not placed at his mother. This may direct the function of such word to be a mechanism to construct turn before actual response is given (Hua, Seedhouse, Wei & Cook, 2007).

Even though data for this study is in Malay language, the types of OIR strategies that frequently occur in everyday interaction such as specific request for specification and non-specific (i.e. open-class word) are found to be similar to types of OIR strategies in other languages (Dingemanse et al., 2014). The employment of such strategies is usually accompanied with rising intonation or within interrogative style and additionally, gaze between speakers is mutual. In addition, the use of Malay interjection and particles seem to play a role in repair initiation turns. For example, the interjection “*o*” with lengthening of sound is used to accompany request for confirmation in addition to provide other speaker on the state of understanding.

Conclusion

The present study has attempted to look at the strategies in constructing repair initiation turns in everyday interaction between parents and their children. Guided by CA in its methodological approach, this study has shown that not all OIR strategies are employed by both parents and children. However, parents' OIR strategies are found to be slightly varied

than the children's. In addition, this study has added one new strategy which is non-verbal to the existing Philip's Clarification Request (2008).

This study is found to be significant because it reports information that is derived from interaction in Malay language that has yet to be studied within the context of OIR. Most studies have consistently reported data originated from English (Kendrick, 2015). Future intended study is recommended to identify role of cultural background in the strategy to initiate repair. In addition, future study can also look at the interconnection with variables that are disregarded in this study such as gender and socioeconomic background of the speakers.

REFERENCES

- Cho, E. H. & Larke, P. J. (2010). Repair strategies usage of primary elementary ESL students: Implications for ESL teachers. *The Electronic Journal for English as Second Language*, 14(3), 1-18
- Dehe, N. (2015). The intonation of the Icelandic other-initiated repair expressions Ha "huh" and "what do/did you say". *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*, 38(2), 189-219
- Dingemanse, M., Roberts, S. G., Baranova, J., Blythe, J., Drew, P., Floyd, S., Gisladottir, R. S., Kendrick, K. H., Levinson, S. C., Manrique, E., Rossi, G. & Enfield, N. J. (2015). Universal principle in the repair of communication problems. *PLoS ONE*, 10(9), 1-15
- Dingemanse, M. & Enfield, N. J. (2015). Other-initiated repair across languages: towards a typology of conversational structures. *Open Linguistics*, 1, 96-118
- Dingemanse, M., Blythe, J. & Dirksmeyer, T. (2014). Formats for other-initiation of repair across languages: An exercise in pragmatic typology. *Studies in Linguistics*, 38(1), 5-43
- Drew, P. (1997). 'Open' class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of trouble in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 28(1), 69-101
- Ekberg, K., Hickson, L. & Grenness, C. (2017). Conversation breakdowns in the audiology clinic: the importance of mutual gaze. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 52(3), 346-355
- Elbers, E. (2004). Conversational asymmetry and the child's perspective in developmental and educational research. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 51(2), 201-215
- Forrester, M. A. (2013). Mutual adaptation in parent-child interaction: learning how to produce questions and answers. *Interaction Studies*, 14(2), 191-211
- Garvey, C. (1977). The contingent Query: A dependant act in conversation. In M. Lewis and L. A. Rosenblum (Eds.), *Interaction, Conversation and the Development of Language* (pp. 63-94). New York: Wiley
- Goddard, C. (2002). Semantic primes and universal grammar in Malay. In C. Goddard & A. Wierzbicka (Eds.), *Meaning and Universal Grammar: Theory and Empirical Findings* (pp. 87-172). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins
- Hayashi, M. & Kim, S. H. (2015). Turn formats for other-initiated repair and their relation to trouble sources: Some observations from Japanese and Korean conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 87, 198-217
- Hepburn, A. & Bolden, G. B. (2012). The Conversation Analytic Approach to Transcription. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

- Hua, Z., Seedhouse, P., Wei, L. & Cook, V. (2007). *Language Learning and Teaching as Social Inter-action*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Hutchby, I. & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press
- Juliah, M. B. (1993). *Stress and meaning: Malay UKM students' ability to apply English word stress*. Academic exercise. Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
- Kendrick, K. H. (2015). Other-initiated repair in English. *Open Linguistics, 1*, 164-190
- Mohd, N. L. A., Lidwina, T. P. C., Norbahyah, B. J., Muhammad, N. H. R., Muhammad, H. B. R., Muhammad, A. Y. B. A. & Kauselya, J. (2016). The comparison and contrasts between English and Malay languages. *English Review, 4(2)*, 209-218
- Mortensen, K. (2016). The body as a resource for other-initiation of repair: cupping the hand behind the ear. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 49(1)*, 34-57
- Norsimah, M. A., Kesumawati, A. B., Nor Zakiah, A. H. & Nor Hashimah, J. (2007). Morphological differences between Bahasa Melayu and English: Constraints in students' understanding. Faculty of Communication and Modern Languages, Universiti Utara Malaysia, 1-11
- Philip, B. A. (2008). *Conversational Repair Strategies in Adolescents with Autism Spectrum Disorders* (Doctoral Dissertation). Bowling Green State University, Ohio, United States
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G. & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction is the organization of repair in conversation. *Language, 53(2)*, 361-382
- Sidnell, J. (2008). Alternate and complementary perspectives on language and social life: the organisation of repair in two Caribbean communities. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 12*, 477-503
- Sidnell, J. (2016). Conversation Analysis. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics. Retrieved 10 Jan. 2018 from <http://linguistics.oxfordre.com/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.000.0001/acrefore-9780199384655-e-40>
- Svennevig, J. (2008). Trying the easiest solution first in other-initiation of repair. *Journal of Pragmatics, 40(2)*, 333-348
- Thomson, D. (1996). Second Language Acquisition. PPP-ITM: Mass Lecture
- Wierzbicka, A. (1991). *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Wiklund, M. (2016). Interactional challenges in conversations with autistic preadolescents: The role of prosody and non-verbal communication in other-initiated repairs. *Journal of Pragmatics, 94*, 76-97
- Zuraidah, M. D., Yong, J. & Knowles, G. (2008). How words can be misleading: A study of syllable timing and "stress" in Malay. *The Linguistic Journal, 3(2)*, 66-81.