

## **Repair Strategies in English Literature Lectures in a University in Indonesia**

**Akhyar Rido<sup>1</sup>, Heri Kusyowo<sup>2</sup>,  
Ayu S. Suryaningsih<sup>3</sup>, Sandi Nuansa<sup>4</sup>, Ramelia Ayu<sup>5</sup>, Rama Putra Arivia<sup>6</sup>**  
akhyar\_rido@teknokrat.ac.id<sup>1</sup>, heri@teknokrat.ac.id<sup>2</sup>, ayusurya1999@gmail.com<sup>3</sup>,  
sandy.nuansa41@gmail.com<sup>4</sup>, arameliayy@gmail.com<sup>5</sup>, putraariviarama@gmail.com<sup>6</sup>

Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia

### **Abstract**

This study was an attempt to investigate types and functions of repair strategies used by lecturers in English literature lectures in a university in Indonesia. Rido's conceptual framework of repair strategies (2018) was used. Qualitative method was applied while the data were collected through video recording of three English literature lectures, comprising prose, drama, and literary criticism. The findings showed that the lecturers repaired both the linguistic (grammatical and pronunciation errors) and content-related aspects of the students while they were giving oral responses and making presentations. Therefore, the lecturers employed four types of repair strategies such as indicating an error has been made and correcting it, asking students to make self-repairs, indicating an error has been made and getting other students to correct it, and repeating students' responses with changes. The functions of those repair strategies were to show the lecturers as role model and reliable source of knowledge, to give good examples, to make students think critically, to give opportunity for students to share ideas, and make students not aware they were being corrected so that they kept learning. The findings offer some implications for pedagogical considerations within university lecture, especially in English as a foreign language (EFL) setting.

**Keywords:** English literature, Indonesian university, literature lectures, repair strategies

### **Introduction**

Interaction plays an important role in a university lecture, especially in English department in Indonesia where literature is taught using English (Fadilah et al., 2017). In literature university lecture, interaction normally takes place between lecturer and students. During interaction, students may produce many linguistic errors, including grammar, vocabularies, and pronunciation (Wisrance, 2020; Kuswoyo et.al., 2020a, 2020b; Rido, 2020a). In other words, students find that literature lectures are challenging for non-native speakers (NNS) of English as they have to successfully complete tasks given and to communicate with each other, besides receiving and sending comprehensible literature content knowledge from and to their lecturers (Rido & Sari, 2018; Rido et al., 2017; Shi, 2013). As these students are prepared to be a competent English communicator; therefore, lecturers must be aware of students' language competence and performance as well as enable them improving their literary knowledge (Fadilah et al., 2017; Lacia et al., 2019). Thus, repair strategies are needed to identify all aspects of the possible problems and to correct the wrong linguistic and content aspects produced since they cover a wide range of actions such as problems of hearing and understanding talk, prompting, cluing and helping, understanding, explaining, and correcting errors (Rido & Wahyudin, 2020; Rido, 2019; Li & Wang, 2018; Seong, 2006).

Studies have been conducted focusing on repair strategies in classroom and lecture settings. Aleksius and Saukah (2018) investigated the employment of Other-Initiated Repair (OIR) strategies in solving understanding problem of learners' conversation and examined the kinds of trouble sources that prompted the employment of OIR strategies. The results showed that the learners successfully employed eight types of repair strategies such as unspecified repair, interrogative repair, partial repeat plus a question word repair, partial repeat repair, understanding check repair, request for repetition, request for definition and correction repair. In addition, the study found that there were three trouble-sources which caused errors such as linguistic, conversational, and meaning-related problems that comprised of poor grammar, wrong pronunciation and choice of word, delivery problem, filler and long pause, and unclarity of meaning.

Rabab'ah (2013) examined how EFL German and Jordanian students handle communication in story-retelling. This research revealed that Jordanian students utilized more repetitions and self-initiated strategies where they produced double number of words than German students. It implied that mother language affected the students' error in speaking. The findings also found that repetition strategy was used as a strategy to plan and arrange new utterance and also to gain more time to recall the next lexical items. Meanwhile, self-initiated repair was used to monitor and modify the utterance which was considered as an error.

Canonio, Nonato, and Manuel (2017) analyzed the repair strategies used in spoken discourse in both ordinary and institutional conversations. The results showed that self-initiated self-repair was frequently used in both ordinary and institutional conversation. The study also revealed that most of students preferred to correct and convey their own statement so that it was easier to be understood by their interlocutors. Moreover, the findings also revealed that the error done by student was because of lack of communication skills.

Trisanti (2017) explored the impact of self-repair applied in oral performance. Using qualitative analysis and group discussion, the finding revealed that the conversation was dominated by Self-Repair Other-Repair (SROR) where students offered help one to another to correct the errors produced by students. In Self-Initiated Self-Repair (SISR), students corrected their own mistakes directly while speaking, while in Self-Initiated Other Repair (SIOR), the interlocutor would wait in offering help after it was requested. The findings also identified that the biggest difficulty faced by students was lexical item such vocabulary problems and non-lexical item such as long pause and fillers.

However, research about repair strategies in English literature lectures especially in the Indonesian university context is still limited. Thus, it is necessary to investigate the repair strategies to fill gap in knowledge of this topic and to be used as an alternative guideline for lecturers to improve their teaching practice. Related to the problem, this research will examine types and functions of repair strategies used by lecturers in English literature lectures in a university in Indonesia. Thus, the research question is what are the types and functions of repair strategies used by lecturers in English literature university lectures in Indonesia?

### **Theory and Method**

The objective of this current research is to investigate the types and functions of repair strategies used by lecturers in literature lectures in Indonesian university setting where English is used as the medium of instruction. According to Rido (2018), repair strategies are classified into seven types; they are ignoring the error completely, indicating that an error has been made and correcting it, asking students to make self-repairs, indicating that an error has been made and getting other students to correct it, repeating students responses with

changes, pointing out the mistakes and criticizing student, and frequently interrupting to correct error (Rido, 2018). They are utilized to identify, criticize, correct, and replace the error in order to improve language skills and content knowledge of students (Wisrance, 2020)

This research employed a qualitative method as this study concerned with understanding social phenomenon in a natural setting (Canonio et al., 2017; Creswell, 2014), looking at repair strategies used in English literature lecture in a university in Indonesia. This study mainly focused on the types and functions of repair strategies applied in three literature lectures, consisting of prose, drama, and literary criticism.

The participants of this study were three lecturers from English Literature department, Mr. Donald (LE1–Prose), Mr. Syd (LE2–Drama), and Mr. Samuel (LE3–Literary Criticism)-pseudonyms. They were purposively selected based on four criteria such as education, experience, recommendation, and personal agreement. All lecturers had to possess master's degree in English literature, teach literature courses in university for more than five years, obtain recommendation by the head of English Department at the university, and agree to be the participant in this study. After selecting and getting access to the participants, the next step was collecting data.

Data were collected through video recording. Video-recording was considered the most suitable instrument since it recorded all aspects of interaction, including lecturers and students' utterances, facial expression, and body movements. In addition, it also provided opportunity for the researchers to replay the lecture activities so the researchers were able to minimize the missing points and avoid the misinterpretation of the data (Rido, 2019; DuFon, 2002)

The lectures were recorded by using video camera that was placed at the back of the lecture rooms. The recording was conducted in three different lectures and each duration was approximately 100 minutes. So, the total duration of video was 300 minutes. The video recordings were, then, transcribed orthographically using transcription conventions adopted from Hauser (2004) & Simpson, Lee, & Leicher (2002). Line numbering which indicated turn-taking was given on the left of the column to ease reference and facilitate analysis. After that, peer debriefing was used to ensure the validity of the gathered data. A linguistic expert helped the researchers checking the accuracy of transcription results. Member checking was also carried out as an identification process to get confirmation from the participants. After the transcriptions were written, all participants verified the result of transcriptions in order to establish and increase the credibility of the data obtained.

Next, the data were analyzed using four steps. The first step was building a data base. The data obtained from video recordings were organized neatly and labelled in separate files in one folder. Second was open-coding. Here, the data were identified carefully and the researchers were open to any possible categories based on the conceptual framework. Third, focused-coding was conducted to classify the data into sub-categories. Fourth, the final emerging themes were presented.

### **Findings and Discussion**

The findings indicated that all lecturers used four repair strategies during the lectures. They indicated an error had been made and corrected it, asked students to make self-repairs, indicated an error had been made and got other students to correct it, and repeated students responses with changes. These repair strategies were used after the students made errors such as linguistic (pronunciation and grammar) and literary content-related aspects.

### 1. Indicate that an error has been made and correct it

The results revealed that during the lectures, the lecturers indicated that an error had been made and corrected it. The functions were to show the lecturers as role model and reliable source of knowledge as well as gave good examples. The following extract indicated that Mr. Donald used the strategy in prose lecture.

#### Extract 1: (LE 1)

932		Ok, the first video, this is for us to see the character only one. Try to
933	L	analyze characterization. (0.11) ((play a short video of Bernard Bear.))
934	S	<b>Bernard bir</b>
935	L	<b>Bernard Bear not bir. Bear, Teddy Bear</b>
936	S	Teddy Bear

The extract above showed Mr. Donald displayed a short video so that the students could analyze the characterization in Bernard Bear series (lines 932-933). In line 934, a student said 'Bernard bir' (mispronunciation). Due to mispronouncing, Mr. Donald indicated it was an error and corrected the pronunciation by saying 'Bernard Bear not bir. Bear, Teddy Bear.' (line 935). In line 936, the student repeated his response correctly.

Meanwhile, in drama lecture, Mr. Syd also indicated that an error had been made and corrected it. It can be seen in the extract below.

#### Extract 2: (LE 2)

114		What about the additional one or the main character in which it is character
115	L	who is maybe being presented in the fiction? ((walk to the front)) Even if
116		it is presented- it's only the short time. (4.8) Who (.) in Clara?
117	S	<b>(inaudible)</b>
118	L	<b>Excuse me?</b>
119	S	<b>Police</b>
120	L	<b>Police</b>
121	S	<b>Family</b>
122	L	<b>Family</b>
123	Ss	<b>(mumble)</b>
124	L	<b>No- no- you can't say the writer</b>

In the above extract, Mr. Syd was discussing additional characters in a story with the students. Mr. Syd continued the discussion by asking the additional characters around Clara (lines 114-116). In line 117, a student tried to answer, but the voice was unclear; therefore Mr. Syd said 'excuse me?', indicating that he wanted the student to repeat the response with louder voice (line 118). In lines 119-122, the student answered 'police' and 'family' and Mr. Syd repeated the student's answer, showing his agreement. The students continued to discuss together (line 123) in order to give more answer, but Mr. Syd heard a student said 'writer'. Then, Mr. Syd said 'no' and continued 'you can't say the writer' to correct the wrong statement (line 124).

In the same vein, Mr. Samuel, in his literary criticism lecture, indicated that an error had been made by a student and corrected it. It can be seen in extract below.

#### Extract 3 : (LE 3)

39	S	Ok guys eee in this nice occasion ee I would like to share you about ee the
40		example of the literature criticism ee... I found it the first e... examples,
41		

42		in the guardian critics Philip Hook (...) It has portrayed Beckett's play ee it is waiting for Godot
43	L	<b>Waiting for godogh</b>
44	S	Yes
45	L	<b>((write on whiteboard)) we say (.) we pronounce it as waiting for</b>
46		<b>godogh</b>

In Mr. Samuel's lecture, a student presented an example of literary criticism work and he brought a work by Philip Hook in the Guardian which portrayed Beckett's play, *Waiting for Godot*. However, while mentioning 'Waiting for Godot', she mispronounced it (lines 39-42). In line 43, Mr. Samuel corrected her pronunciation 'waiting for godogh' and the student only said 'yes' (line 44). In line 45-46, Mr. Samuel explained how to write 'Waiting for Godot' and how to pronounce it.

## 2. Ask the students to make self repairs

The study indicated that the lecturers frequently asked the students to make self-repairs. This was done as the lecturers expected the students to be more critical with their own language production and mistake. The following extract showed Mr. Donald asked the students to make self-repair in his prose lecture.

### Extract 4: (LE 1)

171	L	Another phsical? Come on. This easy, right.
172	S	<b>Beard ((inaccurate pronunciation))</b>
173	L	What?
174	S	<b>Beard</b>
175	L	<b>Beard. Beard.</b> Like me has a beard

In extract 4, Mr. Donald asked a student about physical appearance of a character in a short story being discussed (line 171). In line 172, the student gave his response 'beard' with inaccurate pronunciation so it sounded 'berd'. In line 173, Mr. Donald asked a confirmation check question 'what?', indicating that he wanted the student to repair his response. After that, the student responded by saying 'beard' (line 174) with an accurate pronunciation, showing that he was aware of the mistake. In line 175, Mr. Donald repeated the student's response twice to indicate the accurate pronunciation while referring to his own beard.

In his literary criticism lecture, Mr. Samuel employed the same strategy and it can be seen below.

### Extract 5: (LE 3)

46	S	Waiting for goddogh, have you ever ee heard this literature critics of
47		<b>this plays</b>
48	L	<b>Plays (/)</b>
49	S	<b>Oh iya, a play ya, play</b>
50	Ss	Yes

In the lecture, Mr. Samuel was discussing a play, 'Waiting for Godot' and he asked a student to present his thought about it. In lines 46-47, the student mentioned 'this plays'. Then, Mr. Samuel indicated an error occurred by posing confirmation check 'plays (/)' (line 48). In line 49, the student realized and corrected the error by saying 'oh iya, a play ya, play'. In line 50, all students said 'yes', showing their agreement toward their friend's response.

### 3. Indicate that an error has been made and get other students to correct it

Getting other students to correct the error becomes repair strategies that was also employed by all lecturers in literature lectures. Here, besides repairing students' errors, the lecturers also tried to give opportunity for other students to share their thought and help their friends. The following extract showed how Mr. Donald used the strategy.

#### Extract 6: (LE 1)

483	L	Antagonist and protagonist. Based on character's characterization,
484		Billy? ((approach the student))
485	S	<b>Aa... ((make a shocking face))</b>
486	L	<b>Character's characterization?</b>
487	S	<b>Aa flat sometimes</b>
488	L	((look at the entire class)) <b>Flat and (/)</b>
489	Ss	<b>Round</b>
490	S	Round

Mr. Donald was discussing characters and characterization with the students and he asked a student named Billy about the material at hand (lines 483-484). In line 485, the student expressed a shocking face as Mr. Donald nominated him. Mr. Donald repeated his question by saying 'character's characterization?' to the student (line 486). He, then, answered 'aa flat sometimes'. After that, Mr. Donald looked at the entire class and repeated the student's response with raising intonation 'flat and (/),' indicating that he asked the floor to complete it (line 488). The entire class responded and completed it by saying 'round' (lines 489). In line 490, Billy repeated the answer 'round', completing his answer earlier.

Similarly, in his drama lecture, Mr. Syd indicated that an error had been made and got other students to correct it. It can be seen in the following extract.

#### Extract 7: (LE 2)

393	L	Ok <i>ya</i> . Nah, later on, you should analyze that. For example, like ee (.)
394		Clara character previously, <i>ya</i> . <b>Is she flat or round ?</b>
395	S	<b>Round.</b>
396	L	<b>Flat or round (/)</b>
397	S	<b>Round</b>
398	L	<b>Flat or round (/)</b>
399	Ss	<b>Flat</b>
400	L	<b>Flat.</b> Because the characterization like just same from the beginning.

In the above extract, Mr. Syd was discussing character and characterization with his students and asked them about characterization of a character in a story named Clara 'Is she flat or round?' (lines 393-394). In line 395, a student responded 'round'. After that, he tried to confirm by posing the question again 'flat or round (/)' (line 396). The student still answered 'round' (line 397). Then, he repeated his question for the third time to the entire class and the students gave a choir response by saying 'flat' (line 399). Mr. Syd repeated the answer 'flat' followed by a brief explanation why the character was flat (line 400).

Next, Mr. Samuel utilized the strategy in his lecture as well. It can be found in the extract below.

#### Extract 8: (LE 3)

527	L	Beaty , ok
528	S	Sir, can we ee can we use more than one theory in analyzing literary
529		work?

530		Ok, thank you, <b>anybody can respond? Can we use more than one</b>
531	L	<b>theory to analyze literary work?</b>
532	S	<b>No</b>
533	L	<b>More than one theory? Yes? Yes? No?</b>
534	Ss	<b>Yes</b>

During the lecture, Mr. Samuel gave an opportunity for his students to ask questions related to method, theory, and approach used to analyze literary works (line 527). In line 528-529, a student initiated to ask the possibility to use more than one theories in analyzing literary work. After receiving the question, Mr. Samuel offered the entire class to respond 'Anybody can respond? Can we use more than one theory to analyze literary work?' (lines 530-531). One student responded by saying 'no' (line 532). After getting such response, again, Mr. Samuel repeated the question, indicating that he expected more and better response (line 533). Later, the entire class gave different response 'yes', indicating that they thought more than one theories could be applied to analyze a literary work (line 534).

#### 4. Repeat students' response with changes

Repeating students responses with changes was the next repair strategy used by all lecturers. The lecturers used this strategy to make the students not aware they were being corrected so that they kept learning. It can be seen in the following extract.

##### Extract 9: (LE 1)

186	L	What about you?
187	S	<b>Shine. Shine. Shine hair.</b>
188	L	What?
189	S	Hair.
190	L	<b>Oh, shiny hair.</b> Like your hair shinny.

The extract above showed that Mr. Donald was discussing physical appearance of character in a story and he wanted to hear the students' opinion so he posed a question to a particular student 'What about you?' (line 186). In line 187, the student gave his response by saying 'Shine. Shine. Shine hair'. Trying to ensure the student's answer, Mr. Donald asked a confirmation question 'What?' (line 188). Next, the student answered by saying 'hair' (line 189). In line 190, Mr. Donald repeated the student's response with changes by saying 'Oh, shiny hair'.

Similarly, in drama lecture, Mr. Syd also repeated students' responses with changes. It can be seen in the extract below.

##### Extract 10: (LE 2)

70	L	Who is Agus? this one? ((point his hand to Agus)) °alright° ee (.)
71		According to you, <b>what kind of person Agus is?</b>
72	S	Ee (.) <b>humorist person</b>
73	L	<b>Ok! And then- so ee(.) he has sense of humor ya.</b>

Mr. Syd was discussing character and characterization with the students and he asked the entire class characterization of one of their classmates named Agus 'Who is Agus? This one?' (lines 70-71). In line 72, a student gave his response by saying that Agus was humorist person. After that, Mr. Syd repeated the student's answer with modification '...he has like sense of humor ya' (line 73).

In literary criticism lecture, Mr. Samuel repeated students' responses with changes as well. The way Mr. Samuel used the strategy can be seen in the extract below.

**Extract 11: (LE 3)**

51		Waiting for godot ee is an explicit and deliberately <b>features</b>
52	S	((mispronounce the word))
53	L	<b>Ok features</b> ((pronounce the word correctly)).

In the beginning of the lecture, Mr. Samuel was reviewing the previous material, a script of literary work 'Waiting for Godot' with his students and he wanted one of the students to share his thought. In line 51-51, the student gave his idea, but mispronounced the word 'features'. Mr. Samuel repeated the wrong pronunciation with changes (line 53).

Based on the findings, the lecturers used four types of repair strategies such as indicating an error has been made and correcting it, asking students to make self-repairs, indicating an error has been made and getting other students to correct it, and repeating students' responses with changes. The strategies were employed to show the function of lecturers as role models and reliable sources of knowledge whom the students could refer to. It was to show the students that telling their mistakes and making them understand were the lecturer's responsibility. This strategy was efficient since it did not take much time. In addition, this strategies reduced students' psychological burden so that they were not afraid of making mistake and made the students not aware of being corrected. As a result, they kept responding question and sharing ideas by using English.

According to Rido, Ibrahim, and Nambiar (2014), it is a common scenario in a university lecture conducted in English and attended by NNS of English students that they make linguistic and content-related errors. Therefore, such repair strategies are employed. The use of repair strategies by the lecturers shows their great awareness of the emphasis of literature lecture which is content and oral fluency. The strategies used by the lecturers are principally scaffolding-type repairs which assist the students with their responses. Here, the lecturers only intervene as and when necessary by giving language support and adding personal comment (Rido, Ibrahim, Nambiar, 2015). This allows the students to produce more complete and natural responses (Simpson, Eisenclas, Haugh, 2013). The strategies do not demotivate the students and develop better learning skill (Noor et al., 2010). In addition, this helps develop critical thinking and communicative skills of the students which is useful for their future career (Rido, 2020b).

### Conclusion

In conclusion, this study investigated the use of repair strategies in English literature lectures. The findings showed that the lecturers used four types of repair strategies namely indicating an error has been made and correcting it, asking students to make self-repairs, indicating an error has been made and getting other students to correct it, and repeating students' responses with changes. The strategies were utilized by the lecturers in order to show the function of lecturers as role models and reliable sources of knowledge whom the students could refer to. In addition, it was to show the students that telling their mistakes and making them understand were the lecturer's responsibility. The findings, in some extent, were similar to Aleksius and Saukah (2018), Rabab'ah (2013), Canonio, Nanato, and Manuel (2017), and Trisanti (2017).

In the Indonesian context where the students are relatively passive due to cultural influence and limited proficiency, the strategies employed by the lecturers successfully create learning opportunities and promote interactive learning. In addition, it gives the



students sufficient opportunities to negotiate meaning and produce more output in forms of the target language.

The findings offer some implications for pedagogical considerations within university lecture, especially in English as a foreign language (EFL) setting. The utilization of repair strategies by the lecturers promoted opportunities for learning. Frequent pronunciation and grammatical repair done by the lecturers, in fact, did not significantly affect the flow of lecture interaction because they still focused on improving students' oral fluency. Thereby, lecturers should plan their repair strategies as frequent interruptions and inappropriate error corrections might be ineffective and do not facilitate learning.

### References

- Aleksius, M., & Saukah, A. 2018. Other-Initiated Repair Strategies in Solving Understanding Problems in EFL Learners Conversations. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, 12(1), 105.
- Canonio, J., Nonato, R., & Manuel, J. B. 2017. Repair strategies on spoken discourse. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 7(11), 662-671.
- Creswell, J. W. 2014. *Research design : qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). London: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- DuFon, M. A. 2002. Video recording in ethnographic SLA research: Some issues of validity in data collection. *Language Learning and Technology*, 6(1), 40-59.
- Fadilah, A. E., Anugerahwati, M., & Prayogo, J. A. 2017. EFL students' preferences for corrective feedback in speaking instruction across speaking course levels. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora*, 5(2), 76-87.
- Hauser, E. 2004. *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kuswoyo, Heri., Sujatna, Eva Tuckyta Sari., Indrayani, Lia Maulia., & Rido, Akhyar. 2020a. Cohesive Conjunctions and and so as Discourse Strategies in English Native and Non-Native Engineering Lecturers: A Corpus-Based Study. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(7), 2322-2335.
- Kuswoyo, Heri., Sujatna, Eva Tuckyta Sari., Indrayani, Lia Maulia., & Rido, Akhyar. 2020b. Schematic Structure and Lexico-grammatical Features of Aerospace Engineering English Lectures: A Systemic Functional Linguistic Approach. *Asian EFL Journal*, 27(4.6), 171-203.
- Lacia, K., Gingo, J. N., & Maxilom, R. M. R. 2019. Interactional Strategies and Anaphoric Repairs of BS Information and Communications (BSIT) Technology Students. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, 4(1), 89.
- Li, A., & Wang, T. 2018. *Research on the Use of Teachersr Body Language in Oral Classroom Teaching for Learners of Chinese as a Second Language*. 250(Emim), 677-682.
- Noor, N. M., Aman, I., Mustaffa, R., & Seong, T. K. 2010. Teacher's verbal feedback on students' response: A Malaysian ESL classroom discourse analysis. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 7(C), 398-405.
- Rabab'ah, G. 2013. Strategies of repair in EFL learners' oral discourse. *English Language Teaching*, 6(6), 123-131.

- Rido, A. 2020a. English for University Graduate Employability: Students and Employers' Voices. *Proceedings of the Twelfth Conference on Applied Linguistics (CONAPLIN 2019)*, 6-10.
- Rido, A. 2020b. Why They Act the Way They Do?: Pedagogical Practices of Experienced Vocational English Language Teachers in Indonesia. *International Journal of Language Education*, 4(1), 24-37.
- Rido, A. 2019. What is Newton's law of inertia?: The use of questions in science lectures. *LITERA, the International Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Their Teaching* 18(2), 312-325.
- Rido, A. 2018. Focus on Teacher : Classroom Interaction from Different Perspectives. In A. Rido, A. Y. Wahyudin, & I. Gulö (Eds.), *An Overview of Current Issues in Literature, Linguistics, and Language Teaching*, 1-12). Bandar Lampung: Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia.
- Rido, A., Afrianto, Sari, F. M., Mayangsuri, R. A., & Duantoro, H. 2017. Discourse Structure of Lecture in L2 in the Indonesian Tertiary Context. *Proceedings of the Fifth International Seminar on English Language and Teaching (ISELT)*, May, 11-20.
- Rido, A., Ibrahim, N., & Nambiar, R. M. K. 2014. Investigating EFL Master Teacher's Classroom Interaction Strategies: A Case Study in Indonesian Secondary Vocational School. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 118, 420-424.
- Rido, A., Ibrahim, N., & Nambiar, R. M. K. 2015. Interaction Strategies of Master Teachers in Indonesian Vocational Classroom : A Case Study. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 21(3), 85-98.
- Rido, A., & Sari, Fatimah Mulya. 2018. Characteristics of Classroom Interaction of English Language Teachers in Indonesia and Malaysia. *International Journal of Language Education*, 2(1), 40-50.
- Rido, A., & Wahyudi, Achmad Yudi. 2020. Perceptuals Learning Styles Preferences Of International Master's Students in Malaysia. *BAHTERA: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 19(1), 169-183.
- Seong, G. 2006. Choices They Make : How ESL Teachers Initiate Repair in the Classroom. *English Teaching*, 61(1), 227-255.
- Shi, D. 2013. Teacher-student interaction in novel and poetry classrooms in the Hong Kong tertiary setting. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(11), 1975-1982.
- Simpson, R, Lee, D., & Leicher, S. 2002. MICASE Manual. In *MI: English Language Institute*. Michigan: The University of Michigan.
- Simpson, Rebecca, Eisenclas, S., & Haugh, M. 2013. The functions of self-initiated self-repair in the second language Chinese classroom. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 23(2), 144-165.
- Trisanti, N. 2017. Self-Repair as Students Development-Oriented Self Assessment in Oral Performance. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*, 12(1), 65-74.
- Wisrance, M. W. 2020. An Analysis on the Self-Initiation Self Repair Strategies of the Third Semester Students of English Study Program in the Oral Interaction With Their Lecturer At Widya Mandira Catholic University Kupang in Academic. *International Journal of Research -Granthaalayah*, 5(12), 311-17.