

# **CHAPTER- ONE**

## **INTRODUCTION**

Language is rich in terms of research topics. It is a very complex phenomenon. It is human behavior. Lots of studies have been carried out in the area of language. The present research also aims to add extra knowledge in the existing body of language research. This research is related to conversation analysis.

### **1.1 General Background**

Most people spend an immense amount of their life talking, listening and in advance society reading and writing. The use of language is an integral part of human beings.

Gardiner (1935) says, 'Language in its widest sense means the sum total of such signs of our thoughts and feelings as are capable of external perception and could be produced and repeated at will'(as cited in Varshney,1995, p.2).

Language is complex and essential for a human being, without it human civilization would have remained in a wild era. Language is present everywhere in our thoughts, dreams, communications and it is a store house of knowledge. It is an instrument of thinking as well as source of delight. We use language to laugh and to weep. We share our joys in language and use to expel our agony with it. So, it is in our blood which makes us distinct from other animals.

Simply speaking, language is a means for communication. Though olfactory, gustatory, gestures, tactile, etc. are the means of communication but they differ

from language. These means of communication are mostly used by animals. Human beings also make use of them to have some sort of communication but we mostly use visual and vocal auditory channel to have communication.

Generally, we use spoken form of language to have communication. It can be either one way e.g. news broadcasted through radio, television etc. and speech delivered addressing mass gathering or two way trafficking e.g. face to face interaction or telephone conversation, etc. In one way channel there is less possibility of getting feedback from listeners. But in two way conversation giving and receiving feedback is common.

The direct or face to face interaction is called conversation. According to Levinson (1983, p. 284), 'Conversation is taken to be that familiar predominant kind of talk in which two or more participants freely alternate in speaking, which generally occurs outside specific instructional settings like religious service, law court, classroom and the like'.

Conversation is the product of purpose and setting which goes beyond the area of sentence production. Levinson further says that 'Conversation is not a structural product in the same way that a sentence is. It is neither the outcome of two or more independent, goal directed individuals with often divergent interests' (ibid).

Rai (2003, p. 99) tries to make the concept clear about conversation.

If we observe a piece of conversation we come across different components.

A conversation has to be started (opening). Once it is started it takes turns

and participants usually question and answer or make queries and responses (adjacency pair), at the end conversation stops (closing).

So, anything which analyses the conversation in such a way is conversation analysis. Conversational analysis is an analysis of natural conversation in order to discover what the linguistic characteristics of a conversation are and how conversation is used in ordinary life.

Levinson (1983) points out two approaches which study conversation i.e. *discourse analysis* and *conversation analysis*. Discourse analysis attempts to identify and describe linguistic regularities and irregularities in utterances which cannot be accounted for at a grammatical level whereas, conversation analysis is the approach to the description of conversation mainly in sociolinguistic perspective.

The present research is an analysis of conversation in nature but it also aims to compare the repair organization of Nepali and English conversation.

### **1.1.1 Conversation Analysis**

Conversation analysis is an ethnomethodological approach originated by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) and Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977). The principal goal of conversation analysis is to explicate everyday courses of action by orienting to the underlying structural organization of talk in interaction.

Conversation analysis developed in 1960s and 1970s in writing and research of Harvey Sacks, Emmanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson along with their students and a number of close colleagues. Conversation analysis differs from other

approaches such as discourse analysis and componential analysis by its focus and actions.

Conversation analysis is an approach to the study of natural conversation especially with a view to determining participant's methods of turn talking, constructing sequences of utterances across turns, identifying and repairing problems and employing gaze and movement how conversation works in different conversation settings. Interviews, court hearing, telephone conversation and public discussion are the examples of conversation setting.

A naturally occurred conversation consists of several mechanisms, which Levinson (1983) calls the components of conversation. Rai (2003) also agreed with him. These components, which fall under the subjects of CA, are described as follows:

#### **1.1.1.1 Opening**

Conversation has a basic structure AB AB AB and so on, in which participants A and B speak successively in turns. But the basic question is that how conversation is opened. According to Schegloff (1974), the basic structure of opening is summons – answer sequences. A conversation is opened with summons and followed by answer sequence. The following is an example of it given in Downes (1998):

- Phone rings
- Hello?
- Hello Charlie?

(As cited by Rai, 2003, p.100)

### **1.1.1.2 Turns and Turn-taking**

Turn taking refers to the turn of participants to speak in a piece of conversation, when it is relevant for someone to speak, the machine of turn taking starts. Turns are called the transition relevance points (TRP) which are the boundaries of linguistic items such as sentences, clauses, phrases and even in some cases words. At each transition relevance point or turn a number of things can happen. The current speaker can select the next speaker. If so, the person who is selected starts talking. There are many ways in which a current speaker can select a successor, which can be done by nomination or by signaling someone to speak. Mostly paralinguistic features, such as; eyes, intonation are used to nominate for turn taking. Not in all cases current speaker selects the successor but the hearer can himself take the turn called self-selection turn.

Although it is clear that conversation is made up of turns at talk-in-interaction and that these are arranged one after the other it is not immediately obvious how participants accomplish this organization. Participants use it to find that turns are recognizably now just beginning; now still in progress, now ending. That is, they use it not only to locate but also to project points of possible completion within the talk. A point of possible completion constitutes a transition relevance place (TRP), that is, a discrete place within the talk at which transition to a next speaker is relevant. A turn allocation component allows for a series of possibilities; current speaker can select next speaker (through a question for instance), one other than the current speaker can self-select, current speaker can continue talking.

### 1.1.1.3 Adjacency Pair

In one conversation there may be more than two turns. All the turns should be related to each other to continue the conversation successfully i.e. summons-answer should be related. So, two related turns are called adjacency pair.

It is another local management organization of each conversation in which utterances are paired in summon – answer, greeting – greeting, offer – acceptance, apology- minimization etc. Paired utterances are deeply interrelated with turn taking system. Rai (2003, p.103) gives the following different examples of adjacency pairs:

i. Question- answer adjacency pair

Teacher: Who wrote on the black board?

Students: Mohan did, sir.

ii. Greeting – greeting adjacency pair

Teacher: Good morning!

Class: Good morning Miss.

iii. Offer – acceptance adjacency pair

Sales man: Can I help you madam?

Woman: Oh Yes... I am looking for the birthday present for my daughter something cheap and nice, you know.

iv. Apology – minimization adjacency pair

Mohan: I am sorry. I didn't know it was your seat.

Krish: That's all right!

Adjacency pair is a fundamental unit of conversation, which requires two adjacent pairs produced by different speakers. According to Schegloff and Sacks (1973), these parts are ordered as first part and second part. So, the particular first part

requires particular second part, e.g. offer requires acceptance or rejection; greeting requires greeting and so on.

#### **1.1.1.4 Timing**

Every participant takes some time to speak, which is called timing. So, timing has some role in conversation. Timing has two properties; overlap and pause. Overlap refers to an occasion in which one participant speaks before the current speaker finishes whereas pause refers to the short interruption during the production of utterance in conversation. Mainly two pauses are found; silent pause which contains no sounds and filled pause which is filled by some sorts of noise as hesitation and noise like um..., em... etc.

#### **1.1.1.5 Topic**

Topic refers to the message which is a piece of conversation contains. In other words, it is called the subject matter of conversation because conversation cannot exist without subject matter or purpose.

#### **1.1.1.6 Move**

According to Rai (2003, p.106), 'it is a unit of discourse which may be smaller than an utterance'. So, *Ram, come here, you have to bring umbrella for me.*, is an utterance but it has two moves e.g. *Ram, come here.* and *You have to bring umbrella for me.*

#### **1.1.1.7 Side Sequences**

Generally in the conversation one of the participants breaks the main conversation and inserts his utterance to check up the particular points and other speaker

supplies the answer, which is called side sequence. After this break the main conversation is supposed to take place again.

#### **1.1.1.8 Insertion Sequence**

In conversation one of the participants takes his turn and starts speaking but in between the utterance he inserts another utterance, which is not relevant to the main conversation, Rai (2003, p. 106) calls it insertion sequence.

#### **1.1.1.9 Pre-closing, Closing**

Every conversation is bound to end. If participants are satisfied to their conversation they end the conversation. But they do not close the conversation with out giving some prior clue. So the ending of a conversation is called closing and the clue employed by the speaker is called pre-closing, e.g. 'Well', 'Ok... then' etc.

Conversation analysis often tries to seek what native speakers do in conversation. Conversation is such a natural part of our life that many people are not conscious of what happens within it. According to Arthur (1987), we can point out the following things, which come during conversation;

- i. Usually only one person speaks at a time
- ii. The speakers change;
- iii. The length of any contribution varies;
- iv. There are techniques for allowing the other party or parties to speak  
and
- v. Neither the content nor the amount of what we say is specified in advance.



Conversation analysis is done using some conventional transcriptions, which are primarily developed by Jefferson and others and mostly employed by Schenkein (1978, p. xi-xvi)

|| : Point at which the current utterance is overlapped by that transcribed below:

e.g. Sack, Schegloff and Jeffersons (1978, p.25)

C: Well no I'll drive (I don't mi // nd ).

J: hhh.

\* : indicates the dignment of the points where overlap ceases.

e.g. Atkinson and Drew (1979, p.44)

D: ..... he's got to talk to someone (very sor..)

supportive way towards you (.)

A: // Greg's ( got wha-)\*

G: Think you sh\*- think you should have one to: hold him.

(0.0) : pauses or gaps in what is very approximately tenths of seconds.

e.g. Merit (1976, p.146)

A: Er... I'll just work that out for you =

B: = Thanks.

(0.0)

A: Three pounds nineteen a tube sir.

(.) : Micro pause (0.2) second duration.

e.g. Merit (1976, p.146)

A: Yes // how many tubes would you like sir?

B: An-

B: U: hm (.) what's the price now eh with V.A.T, do you know

eh.

CAPS : relatively high amplitude or in double parentheses, analytical labels.

e.g. Schegloff and Sacks (1973, p.320)

C: Okey, thank you.

R: Okey dear.

C: OH BY THE WAY I just like to say...

*italics* : syllables stressed by amplitude, pitch and duration

e.g. Schegloff (1979a, p.39)

A: C'o m on down *he:re*, = it's oka: y

(0.2)

A: I got lotta stuff, = I got *be: er* en stuff.

:: : lengthened syllables

e.g. Levinson (1983, p.311)

C: (( causes telephone to ring at R's location))

R: Heloo

C: Hi

R: Oh hi! ::

— : glottal-stop, self editing marker

e.g. Schegloff (1976, p.9 )

B: An's – an' (.) we were discussing it – tur –, it comes down, he

((T)) s – he says, I –I – you've talked with thi – si – i about

this many times.

A: Mmhmm

= = : 'latched' utterances with no gap

e.g. Schegloff (1979a, p.39)

A: C' mon down *he:re* = = it's okey.

(0.2)

A: I got lotta stuff, = = I got be: er en stuff.

? : Raising intonation contour /falling intonation contour

e.g. Schegloff (1979a, p.59)

C: ((Rings))

R: Hello

C: Hi! Susan?

R: Ye:s

, : used to indicate maintained intonation contour

e.g. Schegloff (1976, p.9 )

B: An's – an' (.) we were discussing it – tur –, it comes down, he

((T)) s – he says, I – I – you've talked with thi – si – i about  
this many times.

A: Mmhmm

(( )) : used to specify “some phenomenon” that the transcriber does not  
want to wrestle with or non vocal action.

e.g. Schegloff (1979a, p.59)

C: ((Rings))

R: Hello

C: Hi! Susan?

R: Ye:s

() : uncertain passage of transcript

e.g. Atkinson and Drew (1979, p.44)

D: ..... he's got to talk to someone (very sor..)

supportive way towards you (.)

A: // Greg's ( got wha-)\*

G: Think you sh\*- think you should have one to: hold him.

: draws the attention to location of phenomenon of direct interest to discussion

e.g. Schegloff (1939a, p; 39)

A: C' mon down he:re = = it's okey.

(0.2)

A: I got lotta stuff, = = I got be: er en stuff.

**hh** : indicates an audible out breath, .hh and an in- breath

e.g. Sack, Schegloff and Jeffersons (1978, p.25)

C: Well no I'll drive (I don't mi // nd ).

J: hhh.

(as cited in Levinson 1983, pp. 294 - 370 )

### 1.1.2 Conversation Repair

Conversation does not necessarily run smoothly. People always cannot explain things properly. They make mistakes or the persons they are talking to make mistakes. According to Atchison (1995), these breakdowns have to be corrected which gives additional insights into the way in which human comprehend one another.

'Repair', for the first time, defined by Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977, p. 43) as 'a variety of ways of handling troubles that arise in the process of speaking, understanding and communicating in an interactional setting'.

Repair is the orderly system we use in conversation to ‘fix’ our talk so that we can continue to talk. We may stop and go backward and change something we said or we can go ‘forward’ and pause to think of a word we need to complete our sentence. In this way, repair and syntax work together as we try to complete the next part of our sentence. Repair includes correction of errors but it may be a change without grammar or lexical error (ibid).

By observing definitions given by different scholars it can be said that repair refers to an organized set of practices through which participants are able to address and particularly resolve troubles or problems of speaking, hearing or understanding in talk. ‘The repair mechanism has been described in terms of two interested components. ‘Initiation’ and ‘repair’ Schegloff et al. (1977, p.53).

Thus, repair is used in conversation in the following conditions:

- i. failures to understand
- ii. failures to hear
- iii. interruptions
- iv. silences
- v. several speak at once

### **1.1.3 Types of Repair Organization**

Mirzayan (2003, p.21) says that repairs are orderly and describable across different languages but may be subject to language specific rules.

Schegloff et al. (1977) present four types of repair on the basis of initiation and use of repair, which are as follows:

### **1.1.3.1 Self-initiation, Self-repaired**

e.g.

N: She was giving me a: ll the people that were go: ne this yea! r. I mean this quarter y'll know

I: Yeah

In the above example (conversation) participant N does not find right word and after a small pause he finds it and corrects himself.

### **1.1.3.2 Other-initiation, Self-repaired**

e.g.

A: Have you ever tried a clinic?

B: What?

A: Have you ever tried a clinic?

Here the speaker A produces an utterance and B misunderstands. B initiates the trouble source and A corrects.

### **1.1.3.3 Other-initiation, Other-repaired**

e.g.

A: Lissena pigeons.

B: Quail. I think.

In the above excerpt the speaker A does not find right word and B finds right word and fills it for A.

### **1.1.3.4 Self-initiation, Other-repaired**

e.g.

B: hhh. Well I'm working through the Amfat Corporation.

A: The who?

B: Amfah Corporation. T's a holding company

Here the speaker A produces incorrect facts in utterance and B corrects A. (As cited in Levinson 1983, pp.339-348).

Thus, this research seeks how speakers of the Nepali language use repair in conversation and how they initiate and repair it. Not only that the researcher also compare the findings of the use of repair organization in Nepali conversation with the use of repair organization in English conversation.

## **1.2 Review of the Related Literature**

The last two decades have been growing interest in repair phenomenon. While most of the studies report findings from English conversation, investigations into a few other languages have also been carried out. This chapter reviews some of the studies along these different perspectives from which repair organization is commonly studied. The existing literatures related to this study are divided into two broad areas: studies conducted in the foreign universities and studies carried out in the department of English Education.

Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1979) carried out a study related to overall structure of repair organization of how repair operates in American English conversation. In their description repair organization is characterized with reference to the various sequential positions where a repair is initiated relative to the trouble source and each other; the various ways of doing the initiation of repair and the trajectories from initiation to repair out come, such characteristics are possible because of the distinctions made between self and other and between initiation and out come based on their distinctions four types of repair identified: self initiated self repaired, other initiated other repaired, self initiated other repaired and other initiated other repaired. The significance of Schegloff et al.' s

work is that they have proposed repair as a domain for study in which repair is not limited to correcting errors rather it includes the systematic practice of dealing with trouble source in speaking, hearing and understanding in talk- in interaction in general.

Wei (1998) conducted a study of the organization of repair in talk in- interaction entitled 'Repair in Chinese Conversation'. The aim was to describe the routine practices that constitute conversational repair for Chinese speakers. About 15 hours of tape recordings, mainly on radio programmers in Shenzhen, China, were collected for analysis. A conversation analytical approach was adopted in both data collection and data analysis. Findings from the study suggested that repair organization in the Chinese data was generally compatible with (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) American English data in terms of the techniques and positions of repair initiations and the trajectories from repair initiation to repair outcome. Chinese data also showed that repair and syntax are closely related. But the present research will try to seek fresh data for the existing body of work on repair and add to our understanding of how repair is sequentially organized in the Nepali language than English. This is not only related to analyze repair in a Nepali and English languages. Wei (1998) only analyzed how Chinese speakers used repair. It failed to compare repair in Chinese with Schegloff et al.'s findings.

Mirzayan (2003) conducted a study on some aspects of self-repair initiation in Wichita conversation. He aimed to explore some of the phonetic, morphological and syntactic resources of same turn self- repair initiation that were available to speakers of Wichita, a North Native American language from the Caddoan branch. The immediate goals of this study were descriptive, focusing on a form based analysis that illuminates the possible means for self-repair initiation in language, as well as giving insight into some of the phonetic and prosodic aspects that



accompany self-repair initiation. The study also has touched on the few morphological issues by considering the nodes within complex 'words' where self-repairs are initiated. He found that there were five means of self-repair initiation

1. Cutoffs
2. Lexical perturbations
3. Lexical delay
4. Syllable lengthening
5. Micro pauses

Mirzayan (2003) concentrated his study only to find out the phonetic, morphological and syntactic basis for self-initiation repair but my study is not such limited one. It will try to seek aspects related to all four types of repair in Nepali conversation.

Saito et al. (2006) carried out a research entitled 'An Analysis of Conversation Quanta for Conversational Knowledge Circulation'. They aimed to investigate what the nature of conversation Quanta was. They attempted to extract conversation quanta from two types of videos by hand. In conclusion they presented a computational approach to understanding and augmenting the conversational knowledge process. They introduced the notion of conversation quantization, a technique of approximately a continuous flow of conversation by a series of conversation quanta that represent point of discourse. They obtained profitable suggestion about the nature of conversation quanta by extracting them from practical situation by hand.

The present research does not aim to find out any approach in Conversation Analysis rather it only tries to find out how Nepalese speakers use repair in

conversation and compare English conversation and Nepali conversation in terms of repair organization.

Though many researches have been conducted in conversation repair, relatively it is least studied area. In our department no research has been conducted in conversation repair yet. Even the whole area of pragmatics is the least studied area. Only two researches are carried out which are related to discourse.

Some of the researches related to classroom discourse were carried out in our department. Though they are not directly related to my topic, they are valuable for the researcher to carry out present research. So, the summary of these reviewed studies is presented below:

Sah ( 2003) carried out a study entitled' An Analytical Study of Classroom Discourse' which attempted to present an analytical study of classroom discourse in terms of acts, moves and exchanges from the perspectives of their classification, structure and realization. Data were collected from English classes of grade nine in Kathmandu valley, by observing the classroom interaction between teacher and students. He compared his findings with Sinclair Model in terms of similarities and differences. He found that conversations were initiated by teacher. Generally initiations were done by signaling. Sah's study was limited to class room interaction. He did not pay his attention towards other components of conversation. He also did not compare Nepali conversation with English conversation. So my research is completely different from him.

Similarly, Neupane (2007) conducted a study in which he attempted to present an analytical study of classroom discourse of public and private schools. The main objective was to analyze and compare the classroom discourse of the public and private schools in terms of move and acts. Data were collected from language

classes. Classroom interactions of grade eight were observed. The study clearly showed that one of the real problems of teaching English in public schools was the lack of the interaction and exposure in the classroom. He found that discourse was dominated to teacher. Teachers were the main initiators of discourse. Students of private school were found to have actively participated in conversation than students of public schools. Students of private schools were found involved in discourse initiation than students of public schools. Neupane was also confined with classroom discourse. He neglected to analyze the natural conversation. The present research is related to natural conversation. It not only analyses Nepali conversation but also compare Nepali conversation with English conversation in terms of repair.

The studies reviewed above were different from the present study. Though the present study is related to the conversation but from different perspectives i.e. repair point of view. The above reviewed two studies did not touch this area.

### **1.3 Objectives of the Study**

The objectives of this study were as follows:

- i. to find out repair in Nepali conversation in terms of:
  - trouble source initiation;
  - repair mechanism and
  - repair organization.
- ii. to explore some lexical and non-lexical resources of repair initiation.
- iii. to compare repair used in Nepali and English conversations.
- iv. to suggest some pedagogical implications.

#### **1.4 Significance of the Study**

Once Tara Nath Sharma (Tana Sharma) said in an interview that no one can be competent in language, even native speakers cannot get complete mastery over language. Getting mastery over second or foreign language is like chewing iron chips. In our country, English has been taught and learnt for many years. Learners may know about the English language but they fail to know language. Even though they know the English language, they fail to know each and everything. The present study is related to how Nepalese speakers use repair while having conversation with others. It also compared the use of repair in Nepali conversation with English. By comparing these two languages it located the area in which the languages differ. This facilitated the Nepali English learners and Nepali English speakers to pay their attention while having conversation in English. Not only that it will turn to be the foundation for the new comers and other concerned people who want to conduct similar researches. It will also help the planners, course designers and teachers to design the course with a new vision rather than in a traditional way.

## **CHAPTER- TWO**

### **METHODOLOGY**

Repair is an active field of research. Many things can still be studied in greater depth, and how repair organization works in Nepali conversation is largely unknown. Therefore, this thesis aimed to study repair organization in talk- in – interaction conducted in Nepali, with a focus on describing how Nepali speakers use repair in conversation. For this purpose a conversation analytical approach was adopted in data collection and analysis. As a distinctive line of research conversational analysis has proved to be particularly useful in explicating the organizational feature of various, naturally occurring, interactional phenomenon. Conversational analysis is distinctive both in the way data are collected and the way in which they are analysed. To conduct this study the researcher followed following methodology.

#### **2.1 Sources of Data**

Data are the backbone of any kinds of study. This study is based on two types of data. To get the required data the researcher consulted two types of sources: primary and secondary.

Nepali is the medium of every day communication in most of the situations in Kathmandu valley. So, the main body of the data consists of recordings of informal conversation among people in different public places in Kathmandu valley and two formal conversations from each programmes of radio and television. These programmes were recorded during mid 2066 B.S. from Kantipur F.M. radio and Kantipur T.V. This study used both types of sources, which are as follows:

### **2.1.1 Primary Sources**

To conduct this study the researcher needed various types of conversation in Nepali. Various formal and informal conversations were recorded. So, the participants of Kantipur F.M radio interview programme ‘ The Headliners’ and Kantipur Television interview programme ‘Bahas’ and participants having conversation in public places in Kathmandu valley were the primary sources of data for this study.

### **2.1.2 Secondary Sources**

The researcher employed the work of Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) to take the data for English repair organization. Not only that, Different books, journals, articles, theses and newspapers were consulted while carrying out this research, each and everything which are related to my topic were the secondary sources such as Levinson (1983), Rai (2001) and Atchison (1995).

## **2.2 Population of the Study**

Twenty informal conversations were recorded. In these conversations there were two or more participants talking to each other. Likewise, in formal conversation there were two or more participants taking part in conversation. So, no specification was done related to number of population. Generally, participants involved in radio interview program and having conversation in public places were the population of the study.

### **2.2.1 Sampling Procedure**

The researcher applied purposive and accidental sampling procedures to select sampling population. To record the informal conversation the researcher visited

different public places around the Kathmandu valley. Whoever and wherever he found people engaging in conversation, he recorded their conversation using audio recorder without giving notice to them. To record the formal conversations the researcher selected Kantipur F.M. and Kantipur Television purposively. The formal recordings were totally based on the F.M. radio interview programme 'The Headliners' and television interview programme 'Bahas'. These two programmes were selected purposively by the researcher.

### **2.3 Tools for Data Collection**

The researcher used audio recording device to record conversations. The recordings were later transcribed by the researcher using the conventional transcriptions developed by Jefferson (1977). Transcribed data are listed in appendix I of this study.

### **2.4 Process of Data Collection**

This research needed two types of data; data from formal conversation and data from informal conversation. The researcher first selected two interview programmes: one Kantipur T.V. interview programme and another Kantipur F.M. Radio interview programme. Then, he recorded the interview program by using audio recording device. For informal data the researcher visited different public places of Kathmandu valley and recorded people's conversation without giving them any notice. The researcher recorded twenty informal conversations and four formal interview programmes.

## 2.5 Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this study were as follows:

- i. Kantipur Television and Kantipur F.M. were formal fields of the study. The interview program *Bahas*, broadcasted by Kantipur T.V. and *The Headliners* by Kantipur F.M. were recorded.
- ii. The participants involved in interview programmes and informal talking were the population of the study.
- iii. Data were transcribed using conventional transcription developed by Schegloff Jefferson and Sacks (1977).
- iv. The study was both comparative and descriptive.
- v. Findings of Schegloff et al. (1977) were taken as the basis for English Conversation repair.
- vi. Only twenty informal conversations were recorded.
- vii. Two episodes of each formal program were recorded.



## **CHAPTER - THREE**

### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

In this study the researcher reports on the study of the organization of repair in Nepali conversation. When we engage ourselves in conversation or other kinds of talk-in – interaction, it is not uncommon that we experience moments of disfluency in talk. Being participants in the conversation we also make an effort to deal with these disfluencies in order to keep conversation going. Study of disfluency in talk has shown diverse disciplinary interest. This study is quite concerned with this type of disfluency in Nepali conversation. Conversation repair is not only related to speech error correction rather it is concerned with the method participants used to deal with the problem in talk-in – interaction which is systematic and observable. So conversation repair is defined as the broader domain for the study addressing what Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977, p. 361) described as “recurrent problems in speaking, hearing and understanding”. The effort that participants do is referred to as repair. Repair organization is common in the conversation of all languages. In this section the researcher analysed the repair organization in Nepali conversation and later compared with the SJS’ findings. The researcher used qualitative technique to analyse and interpret the data. The researcher used utterances of different people in the form of conversation. These conversations are transcribed using conventional transcription developed by Jefferson. The conversations are translated into English and analysed. This chapter deals with the trouble source initiation techniques and their types, types of repair in Nepali conversation and comparison with SJS’ findings.

### **3.1 Analysis of Repair in Nepali Conversation**

This section deals with the analysis of Nepali conversation from repair point of view. Conversations are transcribed using Jefferson's technique. Conversations were recorded using audio recorder and then transcribed. In this section the researcher analysed those conversations from trouble source initiation and repair point of view.

#### **3.1.1 Trouble Source Initiation in Nepali Conversation**

The organization of repair is described in terms of initiation and repair sequence. Initiation is the signal for repair starts. In this section the researcher analyses different techniques and types of trouble source initiation in the Nepali conversation.

##### **3.1.1.1 Initiation Techniques**

The researcher analysed different expressions of repair initiation in the Nepali conversation. Here, initiation technique means the morphological or lexical and non-lexical expression used by speakers in conversation, so that, one of the speakers knows that s/he produced wrong expression. The researcher analysed the trouble source initiation techniques of the speaker's of the Nepali language during their conversation as follows:

###### **i. Lexical Expression**

Lexical expressions are the most explicit initiation techniques that indicate either the trouble source or the kind of items a search is set up to find. Lexical expressions are common in Nepali conversation. The following examples show

how Nepali speakers apply lexical expression to initiate the trouble source in conversation:

16. A: Aaja dhe :: rai chiya pieyo. = Today we drank lots of cup of tea.  
B: Ke :: ...? = What :: ...?  
A: Kafi. = Coffee.
9. A: Nirmal... (.) Nir... m. Eh :: ... Kamal kata chha? = Nirmal... Nirmal (.)  
o..h...Where is Laxman?  
B: Aagadi. = Ahead.  
A: Parkhi rakh bhan. = Tell him to wait.
22. A: Jaun...ghar jaun . = Go... let's go home.  
B: Ghar jaun? = Go home?  
A: Bhhannu ko matlab(.) dera. = I mean (.) rented room.
7. A: Falgun 19 ko Shahi ku pachhi ....= Since Gyanendra's Phalgun  
19 sack Nepal.....  
B: Magh 19.= Magh 19.  
A: Uhn. Magh 19. tespachhi ko Nepal sankraman kalin abasthama gujri =  
raheko chha. = Yes Magh 19, since then Nepal is going.....

Above examples are the samples of how Nepalese speakers initiate trouble source using lexical expressions. Generally, they use the following expressions to initiate trouble source of conversation:

Ke? = What? (Example 16)

Ghar jaun? = Go home? (Example 22)

Eh :: = Oh! (Example 9)

Magh 19 = Magh 19<sup>th</sup> (Example 7)

Nepalese speakers generally produce 'Ke ?' if they do not hear others' voice clearly or they think others are producing wrong and want to be conformed again. Not only that much, as in the example 22, repeating the trouble area with rising

tune (voice) speakers produce them i.e. ‘Ghar jaun?’. In the example 9, the speaker himself takes short pause and corrects his mistake by producing the expression ‘Eh ::’ as the initiation of trouble source. Similarly, example 7 shows that speaker B produces the correct utterance that the speaker first failed to produce the right expression i.e. ‘ Magh 19’.

## ii. Non-lexical Expression

In the repair organization not all the time overt lexical expressions are used for trouble source initiation. Sometimes non-lexical expressions are produced to indicate trouble source. They are the phonetic and syntactic resources of repair initiation. In Nepali conversation, non-lexical expressions of trouble source initiation are common. Syntactic resources of repair initiation are widely used in Nepali conversation. The researcher explains the non-lexical expression of initiation in Nepali conversation from the data as follows:

21. A: Hijo tyaksi walale kamal gardiyo yar. = Taxi driver had done amazing thing.

(o.o)

B:??

A: Maile tyaksi bhene? ...(.) Hoina tyampu walale. = Did I say taxi?...

(.)No... No... Tempo

22. A: Hijo ma gha...r = Yesterday I ho...me

(o.o)

B:??

A: Dera ma jadai thiya (.) batoma Hari sanga bhet bhayo, kasto motako. = I was going to my room, I saw Hari on the way, and he was so fat.

Nepalese speakers, during the conversation use non-lexical expression like; raising eye brow, weaving hand with queries on their face and so on. By observing that, the first speaker repeats or corrects his utterance. This happens in the same turn or next turn as well. In the example 21, speaker A conveys something about tempo driver but by mistake he produces taxi. Participant B wants to be sure about whether A is talking about 'tempo' or 'taxi'. He does that using non-lexical expression i.e. facial expression. Similarly, in the example 22, participant A expressed the utterance 'gha...r' which is wrong because participant B shows his surpriseness with A's expression using facial expression.

### **3.1.1.2 Types of Trouble Source Initiation in Nepali Conversation**

During the conversation, it may not happen all the time that the hearer understands everything conveyed by the speaker and whatever the speaker conveys all the time is correct. A mistake may occur from both sides. Conversation goes smoothly if one of the participants signals the disfluency occurred. According Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977), this process is called initiation. The researcher found different ways of initiation in Nepali conversations that are described below:

#### **i. Self-initiation**

In the conversation one of the participants takes the turn called the turn taking then s/he speaks something. Not all the time he produces correct utterance, sometimes s/he produces wrong utterance but s/he gets notice about that and provides the signal about that himself. This is called self-initiation. The researcher found self-initiation in Nepali conversation. Let us see how Nepalese speakers initiate the trouble source themselves.

9. A: Nirmal... (.) Nir.. m. Eh :: ... Kamal kata chha? = Nirmal... Nirmal (.)  
o..h...Where is Laxman?

B: Aagadi. = Ahead.

A: Parkhi rakh bhana. = Tell him to wait.

23. A: Fyan..(ta) ko... (.) sparit chha? = Fan... (ta)... (.) Co... ke ...(.) Do you have sprite?

B: Chha. Kina? = Yes. Why?

24. A: ..... tapainlai dekhna ta dekhe ko hun ta :: ra...

(o.o)

Tapain Ra...m (.) Rajen... Rajendra Bist , hoina? = I have seen you.

You are Ra...m. Rajendra. Rajendra Bist, aren't you?

B: Ho... Ho... = Yes... Yes.

All the above examples are related to the self-initiation. In the example 9 the speaker A (self) wants to inquire where Nirmal is but he produces Kamal instead. He immediately knows about that and corrects it. Before the correction he produces 'Eh...:' which signals the trouble source. Similarly, in the example 22 speaker A (self) tends to ask a cold drink sprite but he produces 'fan..t' and 'co..ke'. He gets notice about that and he corrects his mistake taking a short pause (.) The pause is the signal of trouble source. Extract 24 is another example of self-initiation in which participants A and B meet together. A (self) tries to recall the name of B but after a short trial he manages to produce right utterance i.e. Ra...m (.) Rajen...(.) Rajendra Bist. Here, hesitation and pause signal the trouble source.

## ii. Other-initiation

Disfluency is common during the conversation but to have the conversation smoothly one of the participants should initiate the trouble source and one of them should correct that. Sometimes the self fails to get noticed about the mistake but other participant knows about that and signals the trouble source area called 'Other

Initiation'. This type of initiation is common in English conversation. The researcher has found some evidences of other initiation in Nepali conversation also which are as follows:

2. A: E :: Ram ! (.) U... U... dena. = Hey :: Ram ! (.) give me tha... t.  
that..  
B: Ke? (.) Kitab? = What? Book?  
A: Uhn :: Kitab dena. = Yes. Give me book.
5. A: Ghar ko halkhabar ke chha? = What's the message about home?  
(o.o)  
B: Thikai hola. Ma nagayako dui barsha bhaisakyo. = Everything will be ok.I haven't visited since two years.  
A: Dui barsha ki ? Dui mahina? = Two years or two months?  
B: Dui mahina.. Dui mahina. = Two months... Two months.
11. A : Maile aaja... ((nai sanga hune kam)) garnu chha.= Today I need to have... (( with barber))  
B: Hun...= Ye...s?  
A: Kapal kataunu chha. = Have my hair cut.
16. A: Aaja dherai chiya pieyo. = Today we drank lots of cup of tea.  
B: Ke :: ...? = What :: ...?  
A: Kafi. = Coffee.

All the above extracts show that trouble source is also initiated by other participant in the conversation. In the previous section we came to know that Nepali speakers self initiate the trouble source area. So, either participant signals the trouble source. Example 2 shows that speaker A could not produce right word at right time. So, B locates the trouble source area using the expression 'Ke...?'. Likewise, in the example 5, speaker A produces an utterance but B thinks that the utterance

produced by A is wrong, so, to be conform he initiates the trouble area using the utterance ‘Dui barsha ki ? Dui mahina?’. Similarly, in the example 11 A speaks something, which the speaker B could not hear. So, he initiates trouble source using the expression ‘Hun...?’ with rising tone. In the example 16, speaker A also produces something but B can not get complete sense from it. So, B initiates the trouble source using the expression ‘Ke...?’.

### **3.1.2. Repair in Nepali Conversation**

It is obvious that if conversation cannot run smoothly due to the disfluency occurred in between the conversation one of the participants initiates trouble source area and other repairs that. This is called repair in conversation. Repair is common in the conversation of all languages. In this section the researcher analyses how Nepalese speakers use repair mechanism during their conversation. The analysis of repair mechanism is given below:

#### **i. Self-repair**

All the conversations can not run smoothly because sometimes the speaker produces a wrong utterance and the hearer also can not hear properly due to lack of attention or due to some disturbances. To run conversation further more they need to do two things; first, trouble source initiation and second, repair of the trouble area. In this section the researcher discusses how the speaker (self) repairs the trouble area, which is given below:

3. A: .....

B: .....

(o.o)

B: Kunma hola? = In which?



- A: NTC. (.) Namas... Namaste ma. = NTC. (.) Nameste.. Nameste.  
 B: Hunchha. = Ok.
- 4 A: Ghar ko halkhabar ke chha? = What's the message about home?  
 (o.o)  
 B: Thikai hola. Ma nagayako dui barsha bhaisakyo. = Everything will be ok. I haven't visited since two years.  
 A: Dui barsha ki ? Dui mahina? = Two years or two months?  
 B: Dui mahina.. Dui mahina. = Two months... Two months.
- 6 A: Shahu ji ! faunten pen ko mashi dinusna. = Give me fountain pen ink.  
 (o.o)  
 B: Faunten pen ko mashi? = Fountain pen ink?  
 A: Faunten pen ! hoina hoina pailat pen. = Fountain pen! No! No! pilot pen..
- 9 A: Nirmal... (.) Nir.. m. Eh :: ... Kamal kata chha? = Nirmal... Nirmal (.)  
 o..h...Where is Laxman?  
 B: Aagadi. = Ahead.  
 A: Parkhi rakh bhana. = Tell him to wait.
- 11 A: Maile aaja... ((nai sanga hune kam)) garnu chha.= Today I need to have (( with barber))  
 B: Hun...= Ye...s?  
 A: Kapal kataunu chha. = Have my hair cut.
- 16 A: Aaja dherai chiya pieyo. = Today we drank lots of cup of tea.  
 B: Ke :: ...? = What :: ...?  
 A: Kafi. = Coffee.

- 17 A: Garimi dheri bhayo, jhyal kholana. = Its too hot, open the window.  
 B: Hun ::... = Pardon ....  
 A: Garimi...(( Jhyal dekhayara)) = Ups ! Hot ((showing window))
- 23 A : Fyan..(ta) ko... (.) sparit chha? = Fan... (ta)... (.) Co... ke ... Do you have sprite?  
 B: Chha. Kina? = Yes. Why?

All the above examples are related to self-repair in Nepali conversation. Example 3 shows that speaker A (self) wants his mobile to be recharged. First, he produces wrong utterance because 'NTC' is the name of telecommunication. So, he realizes about that and repairs his mistake with 'Namaste' after a slight hesitation and short pause. In the example 4, the speaker A produced an utterance which is questioned by B so later A (self) corrects his utterance by substituting it by another word. Similarly, example 6 also shows that the speaker A wants an inkpot of pilot pen but he produces fountain instead. B conforms about that. Finally, A (self) repairs his mistake. Likewise, in the examples 9,11,16,17 and 23, speakers (self) first produce wrong utterance and later repair themselves. Though all the above extracts are the examples of the self-repair but some examples show that the speakers repair their utterances in the same turn and some of the other examples show the self-repair in the next turn. Examples 3,9 and 23 show that the speakers (self) repair their utterances in the same turn but in the examples 4,6,11,16 and 17, the speaker self repairs in the next turn.

## ii. Other-repair

Disfluency during the conversation is not only repaired by self but also repaired by other than the self-called other repair. Other repair is common in English

conversation. The researcher has found many evidences of other repair in Nepali conversation. Other repair in Nepali conversation is described with different examples, which are as follows:

1. A: Aaja mobail set ra... (ra...) uhn... :: = Today I will buy mobile set and uhn...  
(o.o)  
B: Pen daraiv? = Pen drive?  
A: Ho :: Uhn. Uhn. = Oh! Yes. Yes.
2. A: E :: Ram ! (.) U... U... dena. = Hey :: Ram ! (.) give me tha... t. that..  
B: Ke? (.) Kitab? = What? Book?  
A: Uhn :: Kitab dena. = Yes. Give me book.
4. A: .....  
B: Ho? Teslai Bhaktapur ma ke :: Ju... ju.. = Did you? What do people call ... that... ju.. ju..  
A: Ju Ju Dhau? = Ju Ju Dhau?  
B: Uhn. Uhn. Ju Ju Dhau bhanchhan.= Yes Yes it is called Ju Ju dhau.
7. B: .....  
A: Falgun 19 pachhi ko Shahi ku pachhi ....= Since Gyanendra's Phalgun 9 sack Nepal.....  
B: Magh 19.= Magh 19.  
A: Uhn. Magh 19. Tes pachhi ko Nepal sankraman kalin abasthama gujri raheko chha. = Yes Magh 19, since then Nepal is going.....
- 13 A: Kirpaya ek botal kalsbarg huiski dinusna. = Excuse me! Bring one

bottle of Carlsberg Whisky.

B: Kalsbarg biyar? = Carlsberg beer?

A: Uhn Biyar. = Yes beer.

15. A: Hijo ketaharule bhalibal ramro kheleka thiya? = Yesterday, boys had played volleyball very well.

B: Aasti. = The day before yesterday.

(o.o)

A: Aasti! umm.. ho aasti ramro khele ka thiya. = The day :: before yesterday! Umm.. Yes the day before yesterday they had played very well, hadn't they?

B: Dherai ramro. = Excellent.

All the above examples are related to the other repair in Nepali conversation. In the example 1, the speaker A wanted to say something but he does not have appropriate word for that so other speaker B supplies the utterance 'pan darai?' for him. Example 2 is also similar to example 1 but, in the example 2, the speaker B does not supply the word straight rather he asks him question 'Ke...?' and then supplies the word 'kitab' for him. Example 4 is quite similar to example 1 because B directly supplies the word for A. Example 7 is also related to 1 but here B initiates the trouble source and repairs it himself thinking that the utterance produced by A is totally incorrect. Example 15 is also related to 7. From the above examples it can be observed that in Nepali conversation speaker B corrects A if something wrong is produced by the latter. This can be done by two ways; one, by supplying the suitable utterance with rising tone like question. Other speakers do this if they are not completely confirmed with their correction; second, they supply the correct utterance directly as normal statement. They do this if they think their answer is completely correct.

### 3.1.3 Repair Organization in Nepali Conversation

Repair organization is analysed in terms of the initiation and repair sequences. In the previous two sections the researcher discussed the trouble source initiation and repair of the disfluency during the conversation. In this section, the researcher analyses the repair organization of Nepali conversation. The analysis of the repair organization is totally based on the previous two sections. The repair organization of Nepali conversation is discussed as follows:

#### i. Self-initiation and Self-repair

The researcher analysed different types of trouble source initiation and repair in Nepali conversation in the previous two sections. The researcher found many evidences of self-initiation and self-repair. From the data (Nepali conversation) the researcher found the following examples in which speakers self initiate and repair the trouble area.

3. A: .....  
B: .....  
(o.o)  
B: Kunma hola? = In which?  
A: NTC. (.) Namas... Namaste ma. = NTC... (.) Namas.. in  
Nameste.  
B: Hunchha. = Ok.
9. A: Nirmal... (.) Nir.. m. Eh :: ... Kamal kata chha? = Nirmal...  
Nirmal (.) o..h...Where is Laxman?  
B: Aagadi. = Ahead.  
A: Parkhi rakh bhana. = Tell him to wait.
19. A: Barsa kina na layaki tain.... (le) (.) timile hijo? = Why didn't  
yo..u..u bring brush yesterday.

- B: Hya :: ... kina chaiyo ra? = Why is it needed?
23. A: Fyan..(ta) ko... (.) isparait chha? = Fan... (ta)... (.) Co... ke ...  
Do  
you have sprite?  
B: Chha. Kina? = Yes. Why?
24. A: ..... tapainlai dekhna ta dekhe ko hun ta :: ra...  
(o.o)  
Tapain Ra...m . Rajendra. Rajendra Bist , hoina? = I have seen  
you. You are Ra...m. Rajendra. Rajendra Bist, aren't you?  
B: Ho... Ho... = Yes... Yes.

All the above utterances are the examples of the self- initiation and self- repair because in the entire conversations speaker A (self) produces an utterance, which is wrong, immediately self-speaker knows his mistake and repairs himself with some hesitation and pause. In the example 3 above, the speaker A (self) wants his mobile to be recharged but by mistake he produces 'NTC' instead of saying ' Namaste' but he knows his mistake and immediately corrects himself. Similarly, in the example 9, the speaker A (self) produces 'Nirmal' which is wrong then he knows that and repairs it by ' Kamal'. Speaker A, in the example 19, wanted to produce 'timi' but by mistake he produces ' tan' but he repairs his mistake himself. In the example 23, the speaker A produces the utterance 'Fan..(ta) ko...' but he immediately supplies the correct utterance 'isparait' himself. Finally, in the example 24 the speaker A tries to recall the name of his acquaintance. Initially he guesses his wrong name but later after a slight pause he produces the right name 'Rajendra Bist'.

## ii. Other-initiation and Self-repair

The researcher has found lots of evidences of 'other-initiation and self-repair' in Nepali conversation. This is discussed with examples below:

6. A: Shahu ji ! faunten pen ko mashi dinusna. = Give me fountain pen ink.  
(o.o)  
B: Faunten pen ko mashi? = Fountain pen ink?  
A: Faunten pen ! hoina hoina pailat pen. = Fountain pen! No! No! pilot pen..
8. A: Jaun chhito jaun. Dipendra hospital baseko hola.= Lets go quickly. Deependra might have reached in hospital.  
B: Hospital ! Kina? = Hospital! Why?  
A: Hospi :: tal ! nai nai hostel.= Hospi.. tal ! No No hostel.  
B: E :: ..... = Oh!
10. A: Maile aasti bhaneko kam garnu bhayo? = Have you done that I asked yesterday?  
B: Ke :: ...? Bektigat bibaran? = What? :: Personal profile?  
A: Bayodata. = Biodata.  
B: Ma... ta birseko. Aaj banauchhu. = Oh ! I forgot that. I will prepare that today.
11. A: Maile aaja... ((nai sanga hune kam)) garnu chha.= Today I need to have (( with barber))  
B: Hun...? = Ye...s?  
A: Kapal kataunu chha. = Have my hair cut.
16. A: Aaja dherai chiya pieyo. = Today we drank lots of cup of tea.  
B: Ke :: ...? = What :: ...?  
A: Kafi. = Coffee.
17. A: Garmi dheri bhayo, jhyal kholana. = Its too hot, open the window.

B: Hun ::...? = Pardon ....

A: Garmi...(( Jhyal dekhayara)) = Ups ! Hot ((showing window))

20. A: Jaun...Ghar jaun . = Go... let's go home.

B: Ghar jaun? = Go home?

A: Bhhannu ko matlab(.) dera. = I mean (.) rented room.

Above utterances are the evidences of the 'other-initiation and self-repair' in which self-speaker produces wrong utterance and other speaker repairs the mistake. In the example 6, the speaker A produces an utterance 'Shahu ji ! fauntan pan ko mashi dinusna' which the speaker B (other) thinks wrong, so he repeats the trouble area so that A corrects his mistake. Finally, A (self) corrects that. In the example 10, speaker A produces an utterance 'Maile aasti bhaneko kam garnu bhayo?' but B thinks that the utterance lacks some information. So, he initiates the trouble source with 'Ke...?' along with the possible correct option then A supplies the correct information. So, other speaker initiates the trouble source area either with the repetition of trouble area or with the 'Ke...?' (What...?). Sometimes they initiate with 'Hun...?'. 'Hun ...?' and 'Ke...?' which are similar in meaning. Repair is also done either supplying missed information as in examples 11,16 and 17 or correcting the mistake produced in previous turn as in the examples 6,8,10 and 20.

### iii. Self-initiation and Other-repair

Generally 'self-initiation and other-repair' is not common in Nepali conversation. Researcher has found only two evidences of this type of repair organization which is analyzed along with the examples below:

2 A: E :: Ram ! (.) U... U... dena. = Hey :: Ram ! (.) give me tha... t.



that..

B: Ke? (.) Kitab? = What? Book?

A: Uhn :: Kitab dena. = Yes. Give me book.

4. A: Ho? Teslai Bhaktapur ma ke :: Ju... ju.. = Did you? What do people call .. that.. ju.. ju..

B: Ju Ju Dhau? = Ju Ju Dhau?

B: Uhn. Uhn. Ju Ju Dhau bhanchhan.= Yes Yes it is called Ju Ju dhau.

As already discussed 'self- initiation and other-repair' is not a common type of repair organization. It is hardly used in Nepali conversation. The above extracts are the example of this. In the example 2 above, the speaker A (self) wants something from B but A is unable to produce that. He knows that he is missing some information, so knowing about that B (other) chooses the right word for A. Similarly, in the example 4, speaker A produces something but unable to produce it completely. B supplies the correct word to A. In both of the examples above 'self' wants to produce something but unable to produce and 'other' supplies the correction for 'self'.

#### **iv. Other-initiation and Other-repair**

Like repair organization 'self-initiation and other-repair' 'other-initiation and 'other-repair' is not common in Nepali conversation, though some evidences have been found by the researcher. They are analysed below:

7. B: .....

A: Falgun 19 pachhi ko Shahi ku pachhi ....= Since Gyanendra's Phalgun 19 sack Nepal.....

B: Magh 19.= Magh 19.

A : Uhn. Magh 19. Tes pachhi ko Nepal sankraman kalin abasthama gujri = raheko chha. = Yes Magh 19, since then Nepal is going.....

15 A: Hijo ketaharule bhalibal ramro kheleka thiya? = Yesterday, boys had played volleyball very well.

B: Aasti. = The day before yesterday.

(o.o)

A: Aasti! umm.. ho aasti ramro khele ka thiya. = The day :: before yesterday! Umm.. Yes the day before yesterday they had played very well, hadn't they?

Both of the above examples are related to the repair organization in which trouble source area is initiated and repaired by other than the self-speaker. This can be seen in the example 7 in which A (self) produces 'Phalgun 19' which is wrong, B (other) signals that the utterance produced by A is wrong and provides the correct utterance 'Magh 19'. Similarly, in the example 15 A produces 'hijo' which B thinks wrong and supplies the correct utterance 'Asti'.

### **3.2 Repair Organization in Nepali and English Conversation**

Throughout this study report, the researcher discussed the mechanism of repair organization. So, it is clear that speakers of all languages certainly do some mistakes during their conversation. It is universally accepted that one of the participants initiates (signals) the 'trouble source' and another repairs that. In previous sections of this chapter the researcher discussed the repair organization of Nepali conversation. In this section, the researcher compares the repair

organization of Nepali with Schegloff et al. (1977) finding based on American English corpus.

Nepali Repair Organization	English Repair Organization
<p><b>a. Self-initiated, Self-repair</b>  A: Nirmal... (.) Nir.. m. Eh :: ... Kamal kata  chha? = Nirmal... Nirmal (.) o..h...Where is  Laxman?  B: Aagadi. = Ahead.  A: Parkhi rakh bhana. = Tell him to wait.</p> <p><b>b. Self-initiated, Other-repair</b>  A: Ho? Teslai Bhaktapur ma ke :: Ju... ju.. = Did  you? What do people call .. that.. ju..  B: Ju Ju Dhau? = Ju Ju Dhau?  A: Uhn. Uhn....</p>	<p><b>a. Self-initiated, Self-repair (Schegloff et. al. 1977, p: 370)</b>  R: We are just workin on a different thing the  same thing.</p> <p><b>b. Self-initiated, Other-repair (Schegloff et. al. 1977, p: 364)</b>  R: He had dis uh Mistuh W- whatever k- I  can't think of his first name, Whats on ,  the one thet wrote [tht price,  A: Dan Watts.</p>
<p><b>c. Other-initiated, Self-repair</b>  A: Jaun...Ghar jaun . = Go... let's go home.  B: Ghar jaun? = Go home?  A: Bhannu ko matlab(.) dera. = I mean (.) rented  room.</p> <p><b>d. Other-initiated, Other-repair</b>  A: Falgun 19 pachhi ko Shahi ku pachhi ....=  Since Gyanendra's Phalgun 19 sack  Nepal.....  B: Magh 19.= Magh 19.  A: .....</p>	<p><b>c. Other-initiated, Self-repair (Schegloff et. al. 1977, p: 370)</b>  Ken: Is Al here today?  Dan: Yeah.  (2.0)  Roger: He is? hh eh heh  Dan: Well he was.</p> <p><b>d. Other-initiated, Other-repair (Schegloff et. al. 1977, p: 365)</b>  B: = [ Oh :::  A: = [ Half the group thet we had la:s term wz  there en we jus' playing arrou:nd.  B: Uh- fooling around.  A: Eh- yeah....</p>

Schegloff et al. (1977) found that English speakers employ different four techniques to handle the disfluency occurred during conversation; self-initiation, self-repaired; self-initiation, other-repaired; other-initiation, self-repaired and

other-initiation, other-repaired. According to them, English speakers self-initiate and repair the trouble area with the signal of ‘glottal stops’, ‘lengthened vowels’, ‘low schwa’. Similarly, other initiation is signaled with ‘Why?’, ‘Scuse me?’ or ‘echo question; repetition of problematic area with stress on the problem area’ etc.

Like Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977), the researcher has found four types of repair organizations in Nepali conversation, they are compatible to Schegloff et al.’s findings. During the conversation both self and other can initiate trouble area and repair that. Self-initiation is signaled by ‘some micro pause’, ‘Eh...’, ‘Uh’, long schwa’, and ‘vowel lengthening’ etc. Similarly, other initiation is signaled with ‘repetition of problematic area with stress like eco question, ‘Hun...’ etc.

Levinson (1983), Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) have given rank to different types of initiation and repair organization. This can be presented in the box below comparing with the ranking of Nepali repair organization.

Nepali	English
<p>High</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>↓</p> <p>Low</p>	<p>High</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>↓</p> <p>Low</p>
<p><i>Preference 1:</i> Self-initiated, Self-repaired (own turn)</p> <p><i>Preference 2:</i> Other-initiated, Self-repaired (NTRI)</p> <p><i>Preference 3:</i> Self-initiated, Other-repaired (TRP)</p> <p><i>Preference 4:</i> Other-initiated, Other-repaired (Next turn)</p>	<p><i>Preference 1:</i> Self-initiated, Self-repaired (own turn)</p> <p><i>Preference 2:</i> Self-initiated, Self-repaired (transition space)</p> <p><i>Preference 3:</i> Other-initiated, Self-repaired (NTRI)</p> <p><i>Preference 4:</i> Other-initiated, Other-repaired (Next turn)</p>

Nepali repair organization rank order  
(based on the analysis done by the researcher)

English repair organization rank order  
(As cited in Levinson, 1983, p. 341)

From the above chart, it can be pointed out that in English repair organization ‘self-initiated, self-repaired’ is frequently used and ‘other-initiated, other-repaired’ is the least used. Similarly, ‘self-initiated, Self-repaired’ (TRP) and ‘other-

initiated, other-repaired' used respectively. Like English in Nepali conversation 'Self-initiated, Self-repaired' is frequently used and 'other-initiated, other-repaired' is the least used but 'other-initiated, self-repaired' comes in the second order and 'self-initiated, other-repaired' comes in the third order.

## **CHAPTER – FOUR**

### **FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Analysis of the repair organization during the Nepali conversation and comparison between the repair organization of Nepali and English conversation was the central concern of this study report. To accomplish that target the researcher collected the data in the form of conversation using audio recording device. Schagloff et al. (1977) and Levinson (1983) were taken as the main source of the English repair organization. Analysis and comparison was done in the previous chapter. On the basis of the analysis and comparison of the data the researcher traced out the following findings and recommendations. So, this chapter consists of two sub sections: findings and recommendations.

#### **4.1 Findings**

On the basis of the analysis and interpretation of the data, the following findings have been pointed out:

##### **Repair Organization in the Nepali Language**

- i. Nepalese speakers are found to edit their mistakes occurred during the conversation.
- ii. Both participants of conversation; self and other, initiate the trouble source area. Self-initiation is signaled by ‘small micro pauses’, ‘glottal stop’, ‘Eh...’, ‘Uh...’, ‘syllable vowel lengthening’ etc. and other-initiation is signaled by ‘Ke...?’ , ‘Hun..?’ , ‘??’ , ‘repetition of trouble area with stress like echo question’ etc.
- iii. Initiation of trouble area is found to be signaled with the lexical and non-lexical expressions.

- iv. Both participants; self and other, repair the trouble area (make the correction of the mistakes). ‘Self-repair’ is done in the same-turn and next-turn and ‘other repair’ is done in the next-turn only.
- v. Four types of repair organizations are found in Nepali conversation; ‘Self-initiated, Self-repaired’, ‘Other-initiated, Self-repaired’, ‘Self-initiated, Other-repaired’ and ‘Other-initiated, Other-repaired’.
- vi. ‘Self-initiated, Self-repaired’ repair organization is frequently used and ‘Other-initiated, Other-repaired’ is the least used by Nepalese speakers.
- vii. ‘Other-initiated, Self-repaired’ appears in the second position in rank of the most used repair organization and ‘Self-initiated, Other-repaired’ appears in the third position.
- viii. Repair organization is more frequent in informal conversation than in formal conversation.

### **Comparison between Repair Organization of Nepali and English**

- i. Repair organization in conversation of all languages is universal but repair techniques are language specific.
- ii. Both Nepali and English conversations have four types of repair organization but their frequency of use is different.
- iii. Other initiation of trouble is less frequent in English conversation but in Nepali it is quite frequent.
- iv. Self-initiation is signaled with ‘small micro pauses’, ‘glottal stop’, ‘Eh...’, ‘Uh...’, ‘syllable vowel lengthening’ which is compatible to English.
- v. Other-initiation is signaled with ‘Ke...?’, ‘repetition of trouble area with stress like echo-question’ in Nepali, which is quite similar to English.
- vi. In English ‘Self-initiation, Self-repair’ is possible in the third turn but in Nepali no such evidences are found.

- vii. Repair techniques are similar in both languages.
- viii. In both languages, disfluency occurs due to the lack of proper selection of right utterance, lack of good knowledge, tongue slip, not hearing properly, not giving the proper attention to the speaker and high speed of the utterance production.

## **4.2 Recommendations**

- i. Repair is common phenomenon in the conversation of all languages but subjected to language specific rules. So, it should be analysed taking consideration of rules of particular language.
- ii. Techniques and types of repair organization are common in the Nepali and English languages but the way they are employed is different. So, Nepalese English learners should learn how native speakers use repair during their conversation.
- iii. Conversation and interaction should be more focused while teaching English.
- iv. Language should be taught in real life and natural situation.
- v. Repair organization is new and the least studied subject area. So, it can be the interesting subject for the enthusiastic researcher.
- vi. This study is only the glimpses of repair organization of Nepali conversation. This left so many areas untouched. Those who are interested to this area can study further in depth.
- vii. Error should not be taken as the curse but learner should be taught how to deal with errors.



## References

- Aitchison, J. (1995). *Linguistics: An introduction*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Atkinson, J. M. & Drew, P. (1979). The organization of verbal interaction in judicial setting. London: McMillan Press.
- Atkinson, J. M. & Heritage, J. (eds.) (1984) *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Arthur, L. (1987). *Conversation*. ELBS: OUP
- Bhattarai, A. (2001). Writing a research proposal. *Journal of NELTA*, Vol. 6.45-51.
- Bhattarai, G.R. (2005). *A thematic analysis of research reports*. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar.
- Chui, K. (1996). *Organization of repair in Chinese conversation*. Text, vol. 16/3, pp343-372.
- Dwines, W. (1998). *Language and society*. New York: CUP
- Drew, P. (1997). Open class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 29, pp69-101.
- Fox, B. A., Hayashi, M., & Jasperson, (1996). *Resources and repair: A cross-linguistic study of syntax and repair*. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (eds.)
- Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational organization: Interaction between speakers and hearers*. New York: Academic Press.
- Jefferson, G. (1972). Side sequence. In D. Sudnow (ed) *Studies in Social Interaction*, 294-338. New York: Free Press.
- Levinson, S.C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Merit, M. (1976). On question in questions in service encounters: *Language in Society*, Vol. 5,3.

- Mirzayan, A. (2003). *Some aspects of self-repair initiation in Wichita Conversation*: An unpublished master degree thesis. Michigan: University of Colorado.
- Moerman, M. (1977). The preference for self-correction in a Thai conversational corpus. *Language*, Vol. 53, pp872-882.
- Neupane, D.P. (2007). *Analysis of classroom discourse: A case of grade VII*, an unpublished M. Ed thesis. Kathmandu: T.U
- Rai, V.S. (2003). *Semantics and pragmatics*. Kathmandu: Bundipuram Prakashan.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation*. Edited by G. Jefferson; *with an introduction* by E. A. Schegloff. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organisation of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, Vol. 50, pp696-735.
- Sah, B.K. (2003). *An analytical study of classroom discourse: An unpublished M. Ed thesis*. Kathmandu: T.U
- Schegloff, A. 1979. *The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation*. In Talmy Givón, ed., *Discourse and syntax*, 261-286. New York: Academic Press. (Retrieved on 12th Nov.2008 from <http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/schegloff/>)
- Schegloff, E., A. (1987a). *Some sources of misunderstanding in talk-in-interaction*. *Linguistics*, Vol. 25, pp201-218 (Retrieved in 12th Nov.2008 from <http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/schegloff/>)
- Schegloff, E., A.(2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*, *Language*, Volume 1, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.(Retrieved on 12th Nov.2008 from <http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/schegloff/>)
- Schegloff, E., A., Jefferson, G. & Sacks, H. (1977). The preferences for self

- correction in the organization of repair in conversation: *Language*.  
Vol53, No2. (Retrieved on 12th Nov.2008 from  
<http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/schegloff/>)
- Schenkein, J.(1978). *Study in organization of conversational interaction*. New  
York: Academic Press.
- Sparks, R., B. (1994). *The structure of self-repair in English conversation  
(natural language discourse):* An unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of  
Colorado at Boulder.
- Suita, K. et al.. (2006). *Analysis of conversation quanta for conversational  
knowledge circulation*. Japan: Kyoto University.
- Tao, L. (1995). *Repair in natural conversation of Beijing Mandarin*. The Yuen  
*knowledge circulation*. Japan: Kyoto University. (Retrieved on 12th  
Nov.2008 from <http://www.hu/hub/online service/thesis/>)
- Varsney, R.,L. (1995). *An introductory text book of linguistics and phonetics*.  
Bareilly: Student Store.
- Wei, Z. (1998). *Repair in Chinese conversation*, An unpublished Ph.D. thesis.  
Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong. (Retrieved on 12th Nov.2008  
from <http://www.hu/hub/online service/thesis/>)
- Yule, G. (1993). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: OUP.

## Appendix

### Transcription of the Data

1. A: Aaja mobail set ra... (ra...) uhn... :: = Today I will buy mobile set an..d  
uhn...  
(o.o)  
B: Pen Daraiv? = Pen drive?  
A: Ho :: Uhn. Uhn. = Oh! Yes. Yes.
2. A: E :: Ram ! (.) U... U... dena. = Hey :: Ram ! (.) give me tha... t. that..  
B: Ke? (.) Kitab? = What? Book?  
A: Uhn :: Kitab dena. = Yes. Give me book.
3. A: .....  
B: .....  
(o.o)  
B: Kunma hola? = In which?  
A: NTC. (.) Namas... Namaste ma. = NTC. (.) Nameste.. Nameste.  
B: Hunchha. = Ok.
4. A: .....  
B: Ho? Teslai Bhaktapur ma ke :: Ju... ju.. = Did you? What do people call  
.. that.. ju.. ju..  
A: Ju Ju Dhau? = Ju Ju Dhau?  
B: Uhn. Uhn. Ju Ju Dhau bhanchhan.= Yes Yes it is called Ju Ju dhau.
5. A; Ghar ko halkhabar ke chha? = What's the message about home?  
(o.o)  
B: Thikai hola. Ma nagayako dui barsha bhaisakyo. = Everything will be  
ok.I haven't visited since two years.

- A: Dui barsha ki ? Dui mahina? = Two years or two months?  
 B: Dui mahina.. Dui mahina. = Two months... Two months.
6. A: Shahu ji ! faunten pen ko mashi dinusna. = Give me fountain pen ink.  
 (o.o)  
 B: Faunten pen ko mashi? = Fountain pen ink?  
 A: Faunten pen ! hoina hoina pailat pen. = Fountain pen! No! No! pilot pen..
7. B: Tapaile hal ko Nepal lai (.) kasari mulyankan gari rakhnu bhayako chha?  
 = How are you evaluating present scenario of Nepal?  
 A: Falgun 19 ko Shahi ku pachhi ....= Since Gyanendra's Phalgun  
 19 sack Nepal.....  
 B: Magh 19.= Magh 19.  
 A : Uhn. Magh 19. tespachhi ko Nepal sankramankalin abasthama gujri =  
 raheko chha. = Yes Magh 19, since then Nepal is going.....
8. A: Jaun chhito jaun. Dipendra hospital baseko hola.= Lets go quickly.  
 Deependra might have reached in hospital.  
 B: Hospital ! Kina? = Hospital! Why?  
 A: Hospi :: tal ! nai nai hostel.= Hospi.. tal ! No No hostel.  
 B: E :: ..... = Oh!
9. A: Nirmal... (.) Nir.. m. Eh :: ... Kamal kata chha? = Nirmal... Nirmal (.)  
 o..h...Where is Laxman?  
 B: Aagadi. = Ahead.  
 A: Parkhi rakh bhan. = Tell him to wait.
10. A: Maile asti bhaneko kam garnu bhayo? = Have you done that I asked  
 yesterday?  
 B: Ke :: ... Bektigat bibaran? = What? :: Personal profile?  
 A: Bayodata. = Biodata.  
 B: Ma... ta birseko. Aaj banauchhu. = Oh! I forgot that. I will prepare  
 that today.

11. A: Maile aaja... ((nai sanga hune kam)) garnu chha.= Today I need to have (( with barber))  
 B: Hun...= Ye...s?  
 A: Kapal kataunu chha. = Have my hair cut.
12. B: Aajkal tapain kanha basi rakhnu bhayako chha? = Where are you staying these days?  
 A: Pyaradaij hotel ma... = In Paradise Hotel.  
 (o.o)  
 .... Sundhara ma chha. = Near Sundhara.  
 B: Pyaradaij hotel ta Jamal ma chha, hoina ra? = Paradise Hotel... isn't that in Jamal.  
 A: Hoin ... hoina. Heritej hatel bhanna kojeko. = No... No I meant to say Heritage Hotel.
13. A: Kirpaya ek botal kalsbarg huiski dinusna. = Excuse me! Bring one bottle of Carlsberg Whisky.  
 B: Kalsbarg biyar? = Carlsberg beer?  
 A: Uhn. Biyar. = Yes beer.
14. A: Kanha... jandai hunuhunchha? = Where are you going?  
 B: Hostel. = Hostel.  
 C: Hospital bhanana. = Tell hospital.
15. A: Hijo ketaharule bhalibal ramro kheleka thiya? = Yesterday, boys had played volleyball very well.  
 B: Aasti. = The day before yesterday.  
 (o.o)  
 A: Aasti! umm.. ho aasti ramro khele ka thiya. = The day :: before yesterday! Umm.. Yes the day before yesterday they had played very well, hadn't they?

- B: Dherai ramro. = Excellent.
16. A: Aaja dherai chiya pieyo. = Today we drank lots of cup of tea.  
 B: Ke :: ...? = What :: ...?  
 A: Kafi. = Coffee.
17. A: Garmi dheri bhayo, jhyal kholana. = Its too hot, open the window.  
 B: Hun ::... = Pardon ....  
 A: Garmi...(( Jhyal dekhayara)) = Ups ! Hot ((showing window))
18. A: Chau chau banauna jau. = Go. Prepare noodle.  
 B: Chau chau kanha bata banaunu maile? = Where... how do I prepare?  
 A: Eh.. Chiya... chiya. = Oh! .. Tea..tea.
19. A: Bras kina na layaki tain.... (le) (.) timile hijo? = Why didn't yo..u.. you bring brush yesterday.  
 B: Hya :: ... kina chaiyo ra? = Why is it needed?
20. A: Jaun...Ghar jaun . = Go... let's go home.  
 B: Ghar jaun? = Go home?  
 A: Bhannu ko matlab(.) dera. = I mean (.) rented room.
21. A: Hijo tyaksi wala le kamal gardiyo yar. = Taxi driver had done amazing thing.  
 (o.o)  
 B: ??  
 A: Maile tyaksi bhane? ...(.) Hoina tyampu walale. = Did I say taxi?...  
 (.)No...No... Tempo
22. A: Hijo ma gha...r = Yesterday I ho...me  
 (o.o)  
 B: ??  
 A: Dera ma jadai thiya (.) batoma Hari sanga bheth bhayo, kasto motako. =  
 I was going to my room, I saw Hari on the way, and he was so fat.
23. A: Fyan..(ta) ko... (.) isparait chha? = Fan... (ta)... (.) Co... ke ... Do you

have sprite?

B: Chha. Kina? = Yes. Why?

24. A: ..... tapainlai dekhna ta dekhe ko hun ta :: ra...

(o.o)

Tapain Ra...m . Rajendra. Rajendra Bist , hoina? = I have seen you. You  
are Ra...m. Rajendra. Rajendra Bist, aren't you?

B: Ho... Ho... = Yes... Yes.

