

---

## Self-Repair as Students Development-Oriented Self Assessment in Oral Performance

Novia Trisanti  
Faculty of Languages and Arts  
Universitas Negeri Semarang  
E-mail: [novia.santi76@gmail.com](mailto:novia.santi76@gmail.com)

**Received:** 12 August 2017. **Revised:** 30 August 2017. **Accepted:** 20 September 2017

---

### Abstract

There are certain concerns that a teacher needs to observe in assessing students oral performance, such as the amount of words, the grammatical errors, the hesitation and certain expression. This paper attempts to give overview of research results using qualitative method which show the impacts of self repair type analysis as development-oriented self-assessment in oral performance. The subject was the tertiary level learners of English Department, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia in 2016. They performed the speaking tasks orally in *Speaking For General Purposes* class. They were given the modified rubric of oral performance including the aspects of self-repairs and asked to evaluate their own performance (self-assessment). They were introduced by the term of self-repairs in simple manner and they were instructed to give self and other repairs whenever they needed in their performances. All the spoken data were recorded. Concerning the repair types, there are two self-repairs as reviewed by Buckwalter (2001) which occurred in self-assessment, they are Self-Initiated Self Repair (SISR), and Self-Initiated Other Repair (SIOR). The finding showed that SIOR occurred 60% of all the repairs in students' conversation. Then, it could be as development-oriented self-assessment which can be a valuable additional means to improve students speaking since it is one of the motives that drive self-evaluation, along with self-verification and self-enhancement. Also, this development-oriented self-assessment began to receive attention as the result of increasing interest in the learners-centered approach. The results are hoped to give beneficial implication on student's oral performance assessment.

**Keywords:** self-repair, development-oriented self-assessment, oral performance

How to Cite: **Novia Trisanti**. 2017. Self-Repair as Students Development-Oriented Self Assessment in Oral Performance. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*, 12(1), 65—74.

---

### Introduction

In many EFL classes in Indonesia, the instructions are delivered in English. The idea of it is good since it is based on theoretical view that to reach the goals of fluent speaking using the target language means that it has to be used in real situation, including in the

class. Krashen (1987:58) however, states that the classroom is of benefit when it is the major source of comprehensible input. When acquirers have rich sources of input outside the class and when they are proficient enough to take advantage of it, the classroom does not make an important contribution. Thus, the

real advantage of the informal environment is that it supplies comprehensible input. The condition as stated by Krashen above has related to the EFL classroom we have in our country that classroom is of benefit to the learners as a major source to get input of English. Therefore, EFL teachers, in fact, should also try to give activities related to the students productive performance so that they are able to build oriented improvement performance. However, since the students' competence on oral performance is limited, it sometimes creates miscommunication between students and their teacher and the students themselves. So, they usually have solutions by their own using their conversational strategies to anticipate the miscommunication.

Long (1983) as quoted by Glew (1998:84) asserts that interaction modification comprises of two broad groups; (1) conversational strategies to avoid conversational trouble and (2) discourse repair tactics to repair conversation when trouble happens. In learning systems, misunderstandings may occur. They are the bases for teaching and tutoring. There is the need, then, for error repair. The misunderstandings sometimes are caused by the difficulties with the L2 use. Buckwalter (2001:381) has said that repair is usually understood as synonymous with correction. There are several types of repair initiation: self and other initiation. Studies in repair examine how repair sequencing contributes to language acquisition, namely its occurrence in discourse modification (caretaker speech/ foreigner talk, etc). Related to the term of repairs, this study gives overview of repair analysis as the assessment by looking at Self Initiated Self Repair (SISR), Self Initiated Other Repair (SIOR), Other Initiated Self

Repair (OISR) and Other Initiated Other Repair (OIOR). However, this study concerned on the types of self-repair strategies. Self-repair can be initiated from self-initiation and other-initiation. From those initiation, then Self-Repair can be distinguished into two, those were SISR (Self-Initiated Self-Repair) and SIOR (Self-Initiated Other-Repair). Therefore, the problem of the study related to the repair strategies used by EFL learners is "*What types of repair strategy are carried out by students in their oral performance as their development-oriented self assessment?*" The purposes of this study are to investigate and to describe the types of repair strategies used by tertiary learners when they accomplish the speaking tasks orally as their development-oriented self-assessment.

Concerning the types of self-repair which can issue self-initiated and other-initiated, according to Seedhouse (1997) as quoted by Trisanti (2013) self-initiated repair means that "I prompt repair of my mistake", while other-initiated repair means that "somebody else notices my mistake and prompts repair". Then, Self-initiation of repair occurs when the producer of the talk containing the trouble source is also the person who indicates that trouble is being experienced. SISR (Self-Initiated Self-Repair) is the self-initiation of repairs. Example of SISR is:

1. **Pam** : *(and) I put the bag um...on a table...where it was outside...how do you say...um...and some friends...um... "hit" oh "hit?"...Oh...they hit the bag and...um...my bag...fell in.*  
(modified and cited from Buckwalter, 2001:386)

From the example above, the speaker was searching for the word "hit" by

him/herself. It happened in the same turn as the trouble source.

The example of SIOR (Self-Initiated Other-Repair) is:

2. **Leo** : *I had a party...uh this night? No.*

**Paul**: *last night*

**Leo**: *last night yes and um...someone...takes the door.*

(modified and cited from Buckwalter, 2001:389)

From the example above, Leo (as the first speaker), initiated lexical difficulty, then Paul (as the second speaker) provided the repair proper. We can see there were some signals of trouble also which elicit the types of help. This study tries to investigate those two self-repairs strategies, SISR and SIOR which then can be the development-oriented self assessment.

The assessment is needed not only knowing things related to criterion but also focusing on the self- development of students performance. Self- assessment can be used for variety of purposes. It depends on the appropriate placement, feedback to the learners, program evaluation, assessment of attitudes and sociopsychological differences, determination of course grade (Henning, 1987 as cited by Saito 2014). Bachman, 2000; Haughton and Dickinson, 1988; Oscarson, 1989 as cited by Saito (2014) define the term of self-assessment into two, they are (1) performance oriented self assessment and (2) development oriented self assessment. Development oriented self assessment used to measure the process of learning in classroom environment in which self managed activities are incorporated.

Then, Brown (2004) also categorized self and peer assessment into the following:

(1) Assessment of a specific performance.

In this assessment, learner naturally oversees him/herself in either oral or written performance and he/she can decide his/her own some evaluation of performance. The way this assessment done is by filling out a checklist that rates performance on a defined scale.

(2) Indirect assessment of (a) general competence.

This type of self and peer assessment is in contradictive with the assessment of short performance. In self or peer assessment of performance, teacher needs limited time to evaluate performance directly. However, in self and peer assessment of competence, it is needed several days or even one term of course work with using module and this kind of assessment will encompass a lesson and the general ability.

(3) Metacognitive assessment (for setting goals)

Brown (2004) mentions that some kinds of evaluation are more strategic in nature, with the purpose not just viewing past performance or competence but of setting goals and maintaining an eye on the process of their pursuit. Personal goal setting has the advantage of fostering intrinsic motivation and of providing learner with that extra-special impetus from having set and accomplished one's own goal. Strategic planning and self monitoring can take the form of journal entries, choices from a list of possibilities, questionnaires, or cooperative (oral) pair or group planning.

(4) Socioaffective Assessment

Such assessment is quite different from looking at and planning linguistics aspects of acquisition. It requires looking at oneself through a psychological lens and may not differ greatly from self-assessment across

a number of subject matter or for any set of personal skills.

(5) Student generated assessment.

In this assessment, students have to set out the clear terms as wishes to be achieved in longer period or one term. They will evaluate their own progress in specific term. It can be said that they set their own goal in learning.

From the terms and explanation of Brown (2004) above. There are certain self and peer assessments which actually can be used by teacher and applicable for classroom setting assessment, for example assessment of a specific performance, indirect assessment and metacognitive assessment.

Brown (2004) also states that in giving self –or peer assessment there are some guidelines: First, the teacher tells students the purposes of the assessment. Second is defining the tasks clearly; Third is encouraging impartial evaluation of performance or ability; and the last is ensuring beneficial washback using follow – up tasks.

There is kind of follow up activity which can be accomplished through further self- analysis, or written feedback from the teacher, conferencing with the teacher, purposeful goal-setting by the student, or any combination of the above.

This study implemented self-assessment of specific performance of group discussion simulation. By using the assessment of specific performance, the students were asked to use rubric of self-assessment which were modified using self-repair types. Those are Self-Initiated Self Repair (SISR) and Self-Initiated Other-Repair (SIOR). Hence, this study gives overview of using the modified self-assessment by identifying Self-Initiated Self Repair (SISR)

dan Self- Initiated Other- Repair (SIOR) on specific performance, that is “Group Discussion Simulation” speaking task. It is considered that by using self- repair types in students’ self assessment, it can be as student self-development oriented assessment which can improve their oral performance better.

### **Methodology**

The study was conducted using descriptive qualitative design which means the writer used descriptive and explorative techniques in which she observed what presented the focus, and consequently the data and the most important issue was the quality of analysis. The subject was the third semester learners of tertiary level. They were students of *Speaking for General Purposes* class in English Department, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Central Java, Indonesia in 2016. There were 28 students in the class, and they were about 20 years old. The writer wanted to find the phenomena happened in the class for one semester. Here, the writer also employed what was referred to CA (Conversation Analysis). She also counted the frequency of repair types occurrences. The data of repair strategies carried out by learners were gathered from their oral performance tasks. Another data were gathered by using the results of self assessment in which the students described their ability in term of self repair types that they made. The students did group discussion simulation task activity and self-assessment modified using self repair types strategies. Those are Self-Initiated Self- Repair (SISR) and Self-Initiated Other-Repair (SIOR). All data of oral performances were recorded in classroom context by the researcher.

The following is the table of modified self- assessment using self repair types

analysis rubric that the students used to assess their group discussion simulation activity.

**Table 1.** Rubric of Self Assessment used in discussion simulation activity

Quality	Description	Self-Repair	
		SISR	SIOR
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Speaks fluently</li> <li>- Uses variety grammatical structures</li> <li>- Uses extensive vocabulary</li> </ul>		
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Speaks in social and classroom settings with sustained; any errors do not interfere with meaning</li> <li>- Speaks near fluency</li> <li>- Uses variety of structures with occasional grammar errors</li> <li>- Uses varied vocabulary</li> </ul>		
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Initiates and sustains a conversation with descriptors and details</li> <li>- Speaks with occasional hesitation</li> <li>- Uses some complex vocabulary; applies rules of grammar but lacks control of irregular forms</li> <li>- Uses adequate vocabulary: some word usage irregularities</li> </ul>		
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Begins to initiate conversation, asks responds to simple questions</li> <li>- Speaks hesitantly because of rephrasing and searching for words</li> <li>- Uses predominantly present tense verb; demonstrates errors of omission (leaves words out, words ending off)</li> <li>- Uses limited vocabulary</li> </ul>		
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Begins to communicate personal and survival needs</li> <li>- Speaks in single- word utterances and short patterns</li> <li>- Uses functional vocabulary</li> </ul>		
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Begins to name concrete objects</li> <li>- Repeats words and phrases</li> <li>- Understands little or no English</li> </ul>		

The beginning steps that were applied in conducting the study were:

- (1) The lecturer gave students task of oral presentation (group discussion simulation) for several weeks speaking practices.
- (2) The lecturer then noted down all the results of students' reflection which

- comprised some aspects like self confidence, mastery of vocabulary and grammar, feeling of understanding the meaning of sounds and intonation, etc.
- (3) The students, then, got explanation from the lecturer about the rubrics that they would use to evaluate in the self-assessment including the terms of self

repair, they are Self- Initiated Self Repair (SISR) and Self- Initiated Other Repair (SIOR), and asked them to do that in group dealing with communicative activities in class,

- (4) In peer group, the students did discussion simulation and record their dialogues in the class (the recording was done directly in the class using the simple recording from their gadget).
- (5) Next, the students did self assessment by listening to the recording dialogues using the rubrics given including the self repair sequences like SISR (Self Initiated Self Repair) and SIOR (Self Initiated Other Repair).
- (6) The lecturer observed the students attitude toward the process of self assessment in communicative activities of discussion simulation.

(7) All data were collected and analysed.

After all the data were gathered and recorded, then the repair occurrences were analysed using Conversation Analysis (CA) paradigm.

### Results and Discussion

The findings of the study are comprised into two. They are the description of self- repair sequence types analysis which occurred in oral performance (group discussion simulation) of the students based on the self assessment itself and the second is the result of self assessment and interpretation to the development oriented self- assessment which may enhance the students ability in doing oral performance. The following is result of self assessment in percentage of each scoring (1- 6).

**Table 2.** The Results of Self Assessment Analysis using Rubric

Numbers of students Oral Performance	Frequency of Scoring appears in modified rubric of self assessment					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Group Discussion simulation 1	0	20%	60%	10%	10%	0
Group Discussion simulation 2	0	10%	20%	50%	20%	0
Group Discussion simulation 3	0	0	10%	20%	50%	30%

The self assessment can be effective since we can see from the percentage, from score 1 up to 6, the results improve. It seems that the students are accustomed to self assessment to improve their development oriented ability in oral performance. In score 6, it got 30% for the last group discussion simulation. It can be interpreted that finally the students can speak fluently and uses variety grammatical structures, extensive vocabulary and the contents which make sense from their cued simulation. The

development oriented self assessment was applied based on the process and progress of students learning periodically using classroom activities (group discussion simulation).

Meanwhile, the self assessment done by the students is also influenced by their analysis on the types of self-repair strategy. As already explained that this study viewed the self- repairs occurred in students oral performance of group discussion simulation. They were Self-Initiated Self Repair (SISR)

and Self- Initiated Other Repair (SIOR). Therefore, the followings are the results.

The results of the analysis showed a preference for *Self* and *Other* repair, both are in Self-initiated, namely Self-Initiated Self Repair and Self- initiated Other Repair. The data analysis showed that Self- Initiated Self Repair (SISR) was natural here with many lexical difficulties being the most common target of it. While SIOR occurred when learners recognized that their knowledge basis was sufficient. Here, it was found that in

peers, they offered help whether it was needed one another. So, one student here initiated repair when the other student seemed that he/she paused the utterances in a long time, cut off and rise the intonation given to non-lexical items, such as *em* and *uh*. However, there were also some expression tended to elicit help from the peer using the exclamation in English, such as “*what is that..?*”; “*I mean...*”. The following is the result of data analysis.

**Table 2.** Repair sequence of students-student conversation occurrences

Categorized Identified Repair sequence types		Total Identified Repair Sequence Types
SISR	SIOR	
18	27	45

Based on the above table, the total of identified self repair sequence types are 45 occurrences. The highest amount is SIOR (Self initiated Other repair) with 27 occurrences. It occurred most in interaction of group discussion simulation. It was found that lexical items were the most preferred type of linguistics difficulties to students beside grammar. Schegolf (1977) as cited by Buckwalter (2001) stated that Self-Initiated Other Repair (SIOR) occurred when the speakers note breakdowns and request assistance. In this case, most groups experienced SIOR in their simulation. Since each group consisted of 4 to 5 learners with different assigned roles, SIOR occurred whenever the spoke person in the group had to present their discussion results, and other learners in the group gave helps when he needed or requested assistance by giving pauses signals. From the recordings data, there were found that some occurrences of SISR and SIOR were done unconsciously.

**SISR (Self Initiated Self Repair)**

The percentage of SISR occurrence frequency is 18. The example below is a view of self-initiated self repair (SISR)

- S1: “ Would you give idea about full day school in our country?
- S2: “ ((smile)) I like...I mean...em...I would like to give opinion on....?”

The extract above shows that the student (S2) experienced the mistake and then he initiated the repair by himself. The non-lexical term, *em* and some pauses indicate if he was in trouble, but then he uttered the phrase “*I would like to...*” to repair his sentence to be understandable by the interlocutor. That is an example of lexical SISR sequence. So, he became self-regulated.

Another example taken from the data of SISR is the following:

S3: “...So...that’s why the children do  
as...as himlike...em...em...and he  
didn’t know  
about the....about....about the position  
of him,...like that”

It can be seen from the data above that S3 tried to speak fluently but it seemed that she got failure in delivering the comprehensive meaning. S3 tried to make herself was able to express her ideas. The signals are longpauses and the filler of non lexical term, *em*. From the extract data, S3 tried to repair her ideas about students who act without any tied rules in school, but it seemed S3 expressed the wrong diction. The word was “the children”, while it should be “the students”. Another self repair was pause occurrence by using miming and preposition of “about”. S3 sought the correct word by pausing in longer time but finally she could find the word “position”. So, it is based on the framework that SISR occurs when the speakers notices and correct the mistakes he/she has made.

### SIOR (Self Initiated Other Repair)

The frequency of SIOR sequence is 27. SIOR was the most common type of repair sequence found in the data of group discussion simulation task. It was found that the students did not immediately offer help but rather waited until help had been requested. SIOR occurred when learners recognized that their knowledge base was insufficient to carry out an action and sought other regulation. The sample below represents example of SIOR:

S3: “ Talking of ... *em* ... cigarette ...  
especially ... because the government  
try to increase the cost of cigarette

become...*ehm*...what’s it....((mime  
using hands))

S4: “regulation?”

S3: “Yes...kind of that, for example”

The extract above shows the pauses are many in the data and in long duration. In line, S4 (the student) initiated repair by indicating the failure mark of non-lexical term, such as *em...* and also gestures, such as miming by hands. It seemed after he lapsed the first self-repair, then he added additional information to request or elicit help from S4. The SIOR example above was lexical one.

Another example taken from the data is the following:

S5: “.....if the price of cigarette is  
surpressed, the government will  
get...*em....em*”

S6: “more income?”

S5: “Yes...I mean the government will get  
more income for this country...”

The same as the previous example, S5 got difficulty in lexical term. She paused few minutes to seek the appropriate word by using the non lexical term of *em....* Then, one of the learners in the group delivered help by giving appropriate lexical term that was needed by S5, that was “more income”. Finally, S5 and S6 achieved comprehensive interaction about the impacts of cigarette in their country.

All in all, the results show that although the self assessment modified by self-repair aspect gives benefit to the learning since the students have learnt from their own mistakes but there is also weakness of implementing the self assessment. However, by looking at the students self - repair sequence occurrences in their group discussion simulation activity, the students

can get overview and realize that in their oral performance, some elements like pronunciation, grammar, lexical range to get good fluency are important to improve their speaking ability. Also, the oral performance of the learners can be improved if the learners can make use the rubric of modified self assessment using self- repair occurrences aspects as the self- development oriented learning goal for them.

### Conclusion and Suggestion

The conclusion can be drawn from the two perspectives, the first is from the results of self assessment as their development oriented in oral performance, and the second is from the self repair sequences types analysed. The first is self assessment results. From the first group discussion simulation, it was only ranging from 2 to 4 scores. Then, in third simulation, range 5 to 6 scores are achieved. In first and second simulation, the students speak hesitantly because of rephrasing and searching for words, use predominantly present tense verb, demonstrate errors of omission (leaves words out, words ending off), use limited vocabulary, and understand

simple sentences in sustained simulation. Then, in third discussion simulation, they have spoken in classroom setting with sustained; any errors do not interfere with meaning, spoken near fluency, used variety of structures with occasional grammar errors, and used varied vocabulary. Finally, after getting and knowing the students strength and weaknesses , the students can speak fluently when they are given activity of group discussion simulation in their oral performance task.

The results of analysing the self repair sequence types showed that SISR (Self Initiated Self Repair) and SIOR (Self Initiated Other Repair) occur many times, they were 45 occurrences, with SISR was 18 occurrences and SIOR was 27 occurrences of 60%. It can be said that they need opportunities allowing them first to compare their utterances to models formed in their minds based on learning or experience and then to reformulate the utterances as necessary. There is suggestion then, that making the classroom ‘cost-effective’ is a particularly appropriate metaphor for the foreign language context.

### References

- Allwright, D and K.M Bailey. (1991). *Focus on the Language Classroom: An Introduction to Classroom Research for Language Teachers*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Buckwalter, P. (2001). The Repair Sequences in Spanish L2 Dyadic Discourse: A Descriptive Study. *The Modern Language Journal*. 85(3), 380—397.
- Brown, H.D. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practice*. Virginia: Pearson Education Limited
- Fulcher, G. (2003). *Testing Second Language Speaking*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited
- Fotovatnia, Z and A. Dorri.(2013). Repair Strategies in EFL Classroom Talk. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(6), 950 – 956. <http://www.academypublication.com/issues/past/tpls/vol03/06/12.pdf>
- Glew, P.J. (1998). Verbal Interaction and English Second Language Acquisition in Classroom Context. *Issues in Educational Research*, 8(2), 83-94. Retrieved from <http://pandora.nla.gov.au/pan/12285/20100430-0006/www.iier.org.au/iier8/glew.html>

Krashen, S. (1987). *Principles and Practices in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Prentice Hall

The Foundation of Coalition. *Peer Assessment and Peer Evaluation*.  
<http://www.foundationcoalition.org>

Trisanti, N. (2013). EFL Learners Repairs Sequence Types Analysis as Peer Assesment in Oral Performance. *Unnes International Conference on ELTLT Proceeding*, pp. 341–355.

Saito, Y. (2014). *The Use of Self- Assessment in Second Language Assessment*.

[http://www.tc.columbia.edu/academic/tesol/WJFiles/pdf/Saito\\_Forum.pdf](http://www.tc.columbia.edu/academic/tesol/WJFiles/pdf/Saito_Forum.pdf)

**Websites:**

<http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/cogarch0/common/capa/selfreflect.html><http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/rfl/PastIssues/rfl52robb.pdf>

<http://www.aft.org/sites/default/files/periodicals/goldenberg.pdf>

<http://ro.uow.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1204&context=buspapers>

[http://www.tc.columbia.edu/academic/tesol/WJFiles/pdf/Saito\\_Forum.pdf](http://www.tc.columbia.edu/academic/tesol/WJFiles/pdf/Saito_Forum.pdf)