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Abstract
This article studies the Conversation Analysis (CA) of self-initiated repair structures in everyday conversations in Jordanian Spoken Arabic (JSA). It aims to cast light on self-initiated repairs practised by Jordanians. The data were collected in 2010; 18 dyadic-videotaped conversations totalling about nine hours, mixed and single-sex, were conducted at Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan. The data analysed include 1595 self-initiated repairs. The CA approach is employed as a theoretical framework for this study. The findings of this research indicate that Jordanian speakers practise 10 self-initiated repair structures, namely, expansion, hesitation, replacement, repetition, abort and restart, abort and abandon, insertion, deletion, meta-repair and modify order.
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Introduction
Language is usually seen as a social phenomenon; there is a reciprocal relationship between language and society (Holmes, 2006; Hymes, 1964, 1974; Labov, 1966, 1972; Meyerhoff, 2006; Trudgill, 1983; Wardhaugh, 2006). It is the basic means of communication in every speech community. People use language on a daily basis to communicate with each other and to exchange information, that is, asking versus giving. Their conversations can be idle talk, that is, it can be forgotten after a short period; this talk
can be used to pass the time, for example talking about the weather or talking on the phone with a friend. This kind of conversation may not have a pragmatic purpose, as speakers may talk about different topics during the same conversation (Al-Harahsheh, 2012). The purpose of this talk is to confirm social identity and interpersonal relations (Eggins and Slade, 1997: 20). Eggins and Slade (1997: 20) distinguish between pragmatic and casual conversations linguistically. Pragmatic conversation is shorter, more formal and has more polite expressions than casual conversation.

There are many intriguing issues in casual conversation structures, more specifically turn-taking, which have not been fully discussed and studied in Jordanian Spoken Arabic (JSA). In Jordan, there are three linguistic varieties: Classical Arabic, the language of the holy Quran and religious ceremonies; Standard Arabic, the official language of the state, that is, the language of education, media and courts; and JSA or colloquial. This study focuses on JSA.

Studying casual conversations helps others to understand the cultural norms of a given society, that is, how people use language to express themselves in certain social settings and to recognise what kind of speech is permissible and what is not on certain occasions. In addition, understanding the linguistic behaviours of the members of any speech community facilitates intercultural communications between them and other speakers in the world. This is what sociolinguistics aims to study: how language reflects the social norms and culture of a certain speech community. Therefore, this study is designed to cast light on self-initiated repair structures in casual conversations in JSA.

This study is original and significant since it is the first, to the researcher’s best knowledge, that studies self-initiated repair structures in JSA. This article also intends to answer the following questions:

1. What are the structures of self-initiated repairs in JSA?
2. Are self-initiated repair practices in JSA similar to English?

This article is also directed at those whose native language is not Arabic so that they can have a clear vision about Jordanian Arabic (JA) conversational styles and in order to remove any ambiguity or misunderstanding that may occur because of cross-cultural communication.

**Theoretical framework**

Theoretical framework is the backbone of any linguistic study. Since this article concerns the self-initiated repair structures in JSA, the most effectual framework is the Conversation Analysis (CA) approach. This approach is employed to investigate and analyse this intriguing linguistic issue in casual conversations in JSA. CA is ‘the systematic analysis of the talk produced in daily situations of human interaction: talk-in-interaction’ (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998: 13). It is the study of the exact usage of language in everyday life. The aim of CA is to reflect the proficiencies and processes occupied with the production of any kind of social interaction (Arminen, 1999; Wooffitt, 2005). Furthermore, CA considers the talk and the social interaction as the basis for studying social life; CA analysts...
treat talk as an adequate source in their data collection rather than a window to a wider social interaction (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998; Wooffitt, 2005). In CA, an utterance works in relation to the next one and the supposition that this utterance obligates on the next one (Arminen, 1999; Wooffitt, 2005). The crucial tactic of CA aims to make contrasts that can be either ‘imaginary or empirical’ (Arminen, 1999: 251). To illustrate, CA analysts rest on two strategies in interpreting the meaning of a turn. First, they gather parallel instances to find regularities by which the types of actions are performed, and second, they depend on their imagination to draw up the meaning of the actual discourse (Arminen, 1999; Wooffitt, 2005).

CA analysts concentrate on the notion that every new move of exchange helps them to understand the prior one (Heritage, 1984). This idea may not be so useful for self-repair as the self-repair position may be within the same turn constructional unit (TCU) or after it. In addition, CA studies what the utterance does in relation to the next one and the inference that it impresses on the next one (Arminen, 1999). Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) explain ‘the next-turn proof procedure’, which is a reflexive relationship that exists between adjacent pairs, the most important tool in CA, since the next utterance is evidence of the clarification of the meaning of the prior utterance. The ‘sequential implicativeness’ means that the conversational turns make sense because they are interpreted in a sequence (Eggins and Slade, 1997). This notion has been emphasised by Atkinson and Heritage (1984), who explicate, ‘no empirically occurring utterance ever occurs outside, or extends to, some specific sequence. Whatever is said will be said in some sequential context’ (p. 6). CA tests the validity of its analysis by examining its findings through the technique of next-turn proof procedure (Heritage, 1984). CA analysts also depend on the extended sequence of the exchange (Ten Have, 1999). The analysis is not supposed to be determined against other theoretical explanations of interaction. However, it is measured by the reality of the recorded conversations and their transcription (Arminen, 1999: 252).

Repair mechanisms

Repair mechanisms deal with turn-taking errors, problems in hearing, misunderstanding and violations such as the question ‘Who, me?’ Another example is the use of interruption marker, “excuse me,” false starts, or the reuse of some elements of the prior turn as well as early stopping (i.e. prior to possible completion) by parties to simultaneous talk (Sacks et al., 1974; Schegloff, 2000, 2007; Schegloff et al., 1977). These repair devices are employed to solve problems in the organisation and the allocation of turns in conversation (Sacks et al., 1974). In other words, when these repairs are initiated, the speaker of the turn or even the listener recognises something wrong has been uttered, and that it should be repaired. Thus, self-initiated repairs are conversational mechanisms intended to solve problems in conversations from the speaker’s part, that is, the speaker produces the error and he or she repairs it within the same TCU or at the end of it.

The speaker of a turn aims to produce a planned and processed discourse, which is faultless. Following Hieke’s (1981) assumption, the production process is the most complicated one, as the current speaker may discover some errors in his or her own speech. Therefore, he or she goes back to repair these errors. He or she switches from a
prospective to a retrospective process (Hieke, 1981). As a way of illustration, when a speaker suspects that he or she has said something that he or she may feel is inappropriate, he or she may remain silent for a while, thinking of a repair to what he or she has said (Al-Harahsheh, 2012).

Repair mechanism is essential to the system they repair. For example, when the current speaker stops talking and the next speaker does not select himself or herself, then initiation or completion of the current speaker is considered as a repair mechanism for the turn-taking system since it minimises the lapse. In addition, the turn-taking system implies ‘repairs of other than a turn-taking sort’ (Sacks et al., 1974: 724). For example, repairs by the next speaker are carried out after the completion of the current turn because of the allocation rights of a turn. However, most repairs (one word correction) occur within a turn. They argue that when the second speaker initiates a turn after the repairable one, then the sequence initiated follows the turn-taking system and the repair sequence exhibits the same features of the turn-taking. Therefore, the system of turn-taking has dual repair elements: it helps in repairing its source trouble, and it is the fundamental organisational device for the repair of any other troubles in conversations (Sacks et al., 1974).

Speakers may commit grammatical or word mistakes or they may have trouble in hearing or understanding the talk (Schegloff, 2007). Schegloff (2007) distinguishes between initiating a repair and ‘solving it’ or carrying it through by different parties. To illustrate, sometimes one speaker commences a repair and completes it, or he or she initiates it and the other speaker completes it. Sometimes, if someone involves himself or herself as the ‘self-repair’, then it is the ‘self-initiation of repair’. However, if someone other than the speaker of the trouble source makes effort to repair the problem, then it is ‘other-initiation repair’.

Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998: 61) define four types of repair:

1. self-initiated self-repair, one that is both initiated and carried out by the speaker of trouble source turn;
2. other-initiated self-repair, one that is carried out by the speaker of the trouble source turn but initiated by the recipient;
3. self-initiated other-repair, whereby the speaker of the trouble source may try to get the recipient to repair the trouble source, for instance if a name is proving troublesome to remember;
4. other-initiated other-repair, whereby the recipient of a trouble source turn both initiates and carries out the repair – this is closest to what is conventionally understood as ‘correction’.

Schegloff (2007) confirms that ‘the other-initiated repair sequences’ are organised by adjacency pairs, and that they are sequences per se (pp. 100–106). Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) propose three positions for repair: the first two places of repair occur within or after the TCU that has the trouble source (first position). The second position is at the next transition relevance place (TRP) after the trouble source. It is also carried out in the turn following the turn containing the trouble source, in ‘a next speaker’s sequence turn’ (p. 64). The third position is when the speaker’s turn is after the recipient’s response. These positions are represented as follows:
• First position: trouble source;
• Second position: next-turn repair insertion (NTRI);
• Third position: repair.

Third position can be after the insertion sequence, but refers to the turn prior to that sequence (Schegloff, 1992). In general, all the positions of repair sequences are close to the trouble source turn. Moreover, the function of the repair sequence is the upholding of reciprocal direction ‘to common topics and fields of reference in talk-in-interaction. Schegloff argues that the organisation of repair is closely connected with the question of interpersonal alignment, or intersubjectivity, in social life’ (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998: 66). This article focuses only on self-initiated repair structures in JA casual conversations.

Preference for self-initiated repair
Self-initiated repair can be defined as ‘the interruption of the speaker’s turn – by the speaker – followed by an operation performed on the repaired segment of the turn’ (Sparks, 1994: 66). The evidence for a preference for self-initiated repair is twofold: first, ‘the structural features of the repair system are “skewed” in favour of self-repair’ (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998: 66–67). For example, the four structural positions of the majority of repairs are within the same TCU, at the next possible TRP, in the other speaker’s next turn and in the subsequent third turn from the turn that has the trouble source. In fact, three of the four repair positions occur in the turn of the speaker who produces the trouble source (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998: 66–67). ‘The second source of evidence comes from the analysis of interaction during repair sequences’ (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998: 67). There are methods for facilitating self-initiated repair or displaying the suitability or the sensitivity of self-initiated repair or other repair. That is to say, the other speaker may repair the trouble without telling the first speaker about his or her mistake; here, it is a kind of politeness, or he or she may pause before the repair as a signal to give the prior speaker the chance to correct him or her. Another function of this type of repair is to maintain harmony between the interlocutors. For example, in a form of a joke ‘I think you mean . . . ’ that is employing an uncertain marker (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998: 67).

Participants
The participants of this study were 36 speakers ofJA who were university students. The data analysed consisted of 18 JA dyadic and casual conversations, which were conducted in January 2010 at Yarmouk University (Irbid, Jordan). Their ages were from 18 to 26 years. A total of 1595 self-initiated repairs were found in these conversations. The length of each conversation was 30 minutes and the data comprised nine hours of videotaped conversations and about 95,000 words.

Methods, procedures and data analysis
The methodology of the present paper was qualitative in nature. In addition, the researcher relied on his observations in analysing the data. The participants were met
in a staff room inside the university. The room was shown to them to reduce their unease in a strange environment. Then, they were asked about the suitability of the room to make sure that they were in a comfortable environment. After that, they were seated in two padded chairs, in front of each other. They were asked to talk about any topic they wished in order to have a casual conversation.

The stationary video camera was positioned about 3 metres away from the participants. The participants were asked to talk with each other for 30 minutes; the researcher left the room during the conversation to avoid any influence on the main stream of communication. After 30 minutes, the researcher came back to switch off the recording devices.

The data used in this study comprised 14 dyadic and casual conversations in JA. The researcher used the basic quantitative measures, which were the number of the frequencies of the self-initiated repairs and their percentages, since this procedure was suitable to fulfil the aim of this study.

**Findings of this study**

Following Sparks (1994), this study uses nearly the same criteria that Sparks (1994) employs in his study for the structure of self-initiated repair in American society. This study finds 10 self-repair types, namely, expansion, hesitation, repetition, replacement, abort and restart, abort and abandon, insert, delete, meta-repair and modify order. Table 1 shows these criteria, the number of their occurrences and their percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-repair type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expansion</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesitation</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abort and restart</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abort and abandon</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insert</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta-repair</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify order</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion and analysis of findings**

*Self-initiated repair operations*

Self-initiated repair has been viewed as self-interruption (Sparks, 1994), as the speaker of the current turn cuts off his or her speech and then he or she goes back to repair what has been said in the prior turn or utterance. The self-initiated repair structures have been
classified as expansion of the turn, hesitation, repetition of the previous word(s), replacement of a word or structure, abort and restart, abort and abandon, insert, delete, meta-repair and modify order. Repetition, deletion and insertion are the three basic repair operations; Sparks (1994: 87) refers to them as ‘primitive operations’, as they may all be employed in the same repair.

**Expansion.** Expansion means that the speaker of the repaired turn tends to expand the repairing turn by giving more explanations or examples to clarify the notion that has been mentioned in the repaired turn. This phenomenon is very common in Jordanian casual conversations. The findings of this study show that there were 960 expansions of self-initiated repairs in the data analysed, about 60.1% of the total of self-initiated repairs. In Extract 1, two young women are talking about an exam that they sat; F2 says that the proctor bothered her during the exam as a hind that he was severe. F2 utters the source trouble ſilmoraːh and then she repairs it as ſilmoraːqib; the first five letters of both words are the same, but the last syllable is different:

**Extract 1: Female–Female**

F1: ↑ʔaːh ʔaw bas (0.3) keef ilimtiːn? 
(0.5)  
F2: ↑ʔinsī ilmawdːo: ſilmoraːh ſilmoraːqib ḏanum umī (0.2) yaallah 
(0.4)  
F1: ↑leʃʔana ʔaːdi ḥaseːtoh 
(0.2)  
F2: ↑mahɔʔismaːfi yaʔniʔadʒa lama ḏab ṭaːriq ḏanbi hadaːk ṣabahni=  
F1:=ʔaːh 
(0.4)  
F2: hum hum↑ʃabahna=  
F1:= ↑ʔawalʔiʃi ṭaːriq maʃirifnʃ, maʔiʃrifiʔahilʔiʃi.=

F1:=ʔaːh, that is it, (0.3) how was the exam?  
(0.5)  
F2: Forget, the proctor bothered me (0.2) oh God.  
(0.4)  
F1: I think he was normal.  
(0.4)  
F2: Listen, like when he brings Tariq to sit next to me, he (Tariq) makes me suspicious.  
F1: Yeah  
(0.4)  
F2: hum hum he made me suspicious.  
F1: At the beginning Tariq did not know me, I did not know to solve anything.

The most common word which is used by Jordanian speakers is ‘yeʃni’ (I mean, or in other words). Rieschild (2011) finds that the word ‘yeʃni’ has the following pragmatic and semantic functions: ‘elaborating, correcting, creating narrative suspense, holding a turn, or, as sole constituent of a turn, hedging a response’ (p. 315). It can be used as a self-correction.
Discourse Studies

Extract 2 is a humble example of the use of ‘yeʕni’ as a self-repair strategy; the female is asking the male about the service of the Internet in general. In the following three turns, the word ‘yeʕni’ is uttered five times. Clearly, ‘yeʕni’ can be used when the speaker repairs himself or herself and he or she wants to hold the turn at the same time:

Extract 2: Female–Male

F: →↑ʃu: hab tihki? ?iḥkili. ʔa:n ?a::h (0.8) ↑ʃu: raʔyak bixdimit ʔiṅtiʔ (1.8) ↑ʃu: jayifha ʔiṅoh ʔiḥtiṣṭa:de: minha yeʕni wa la ḥe:k?

M: →↑yeʕni (clearing throat) ↑yeʕni ʔilint

F: What would like to say? Talk about ʔa::h (0.8) What is your opinion about the Internet services? (1.8) like it is, what do you think? Is it beneficial for you or not?

M: like (clearing throat) the Internet.

F: Do you use it in the right way?

The self-initiated repair word ‘yeʕni’ can also be used when the recipient asks the current speaker for clarification or explanation of what he or she has said. In this case, the recipient has a problem in understanding what has been said in the prior turn. Sometimes, the current speaker observes that his previous turn is unclear to the hearer. Therefore, he or she initiates a self-repair usually starting with ‘yeʕni’ in order to clarify what has been said in the prior turn. She tells him ‘not everyone thinks like you’, and then there is a 0.5-second silence. This silence is reflected in the male’s turn, as he has a problem in hearing or understanding what she has said. Therefore, he initiates a repair ‘ke::f?’ (What is that?). The female then introduces a self-repair starting with ‘yeʕni’. The pragmatic function of ‘yeʕni’ in this case is to repair and to clarify what has been said before, as she thinks she has said something that threatens the man’s face. In addition, the man produces another self-repair in the first line, and the repair consists of the sequence of operations ‘delete, insert, insert, insert, insert, repeat, repeat, repeat, delete’. That is, in the repairing segment, he deletes ʔinti (you) and inserts arbaʕisne:n bitkoːni (during four years you will be), repeats haqaqti ʔafyaːʔ ikθiːriḥ (achieve many things) and then he deletes bidiraːstik (in your study). This repair comes after a silence of 1.3 seconds. Obviously, the male is arranging his thoughts:

Extract 3: Female–Male

M: laʔ yaʕni haːi ʔinti haqaqti ʔafyaːʔ ikθiːriḥ bidiraːstik (1.3) ʔarbaʕisne:n bitkoːni haqaqti ʔafyaːʔ ikθiːriḥ (0.5) miʃ bas ʔino jihadaːḥ aw basa (0.4)laʔ bitkoːni ʔiṯalambi tʃafan

F: ↑tʃab miʃ kol innas bitfakir zayak?

(0.5)

M: ke::f?=

F: = miʃ kol innas bitfakir zayak heːk?= M: ke::f?
F: \(\rightarrow \) ye\(\text{ʔ}ni\) me\(\text{ʕ}lan\) ?enoh me\(\text{ʕ}ru\):d \(\rightarrow\) at\(\text{ʔ}xere\(\text{ʔ}\) (0.5) \(\rightarrow\) ma \(\text{ʕ}fe\(\text{ʕ}y\)lif \(\text{ʕ}ela\) ?asa:s ?in\(\text{ʔ}nu\): ?i\(\text{ʔ}tana\(\text{ʕ}\)it bikala:\(\text{mak}\) Okay\(\downarrow\).

M: No, like, you achieve many things by your study (1.3) during the four years you achieve many things (0.5) not only a certificate (0.4) but you will learn, you will benefit, there are many people.

F: Okay, not everyone thinks in this way.

M: What?

F: Not everyone thinks like you.

M: what?

F: \(\rightarrow\) I mean, I will not work after graduation (0.5), because I am convinced in your point of view

Overall, the pragmatic function of ‘ye\(\text{ʔ}ni\)’ in Jordanian spoken discourse can be seen as a repair and as a clarification of what has been said before. In addition, this word may occur at the beginning, at the middle or at the end of the turn. Therefore, the discourse analyst, the interpreter or the translator should be aware of the position and the pragmatic function of ‘ye\(\text{ʔ}ni\)’, as it is functional and serves crucial pragmatic and discoursal functions.

_Hesitation._ Another important finding was that Jordanian speakers use hesitation. What I mean here is the use of pause fillers (usually lengthened) and silence as a self-repair strategies. Levelt (1983) observes that hesitation (pausing) is utilised as a self-initiated repair strategy. Levelt (1983) refers to pause fillers as ‘editing terms’, such as ‘uh’. The speaker employs this kind of repair when he or she recognises that something inappropriate or incorrect has been uttered. It was observable that Jordanian speakers lengthen the pause filler in order to have enough time to organise their thoughts, on the one hand, and to give an indication to the other speaker that he or she still holds the turn, on the other hand. In JA, ‘\(\text{ʔe:::h}\)’ is the most common pause filler. This phenomenon is considered as ‘possible pre-indicators of repair initiation’ (Brouwer, 2004: 95). Schegloff et al. (1977) and Schegloff (1979) conclude that self-initiation of repair is configured and performed in two ways: pre- or post-positioned. Pre-positioned self-initiated repair takes place when the current utterance includes markers of hesitation or disfluency, such as pause or non-lexical markers that precede a next due item, whereas post-positioned self-initiated repair occurs when the speaker utters a repair and he or she does not complete it and then repairs it in the next utterance.1 The findings of this study indicate that there were 266 hesitation repairs in the data analysed, nearly 16.6% of the total of self-initiated repairs in this study. In extract 4, the male initiates a self-repair ‘As I told you before’. This repair starts with 1.0 second of silence and two pause fillers. ‘\(\text{ʔe:::h}\)’:

**Extract 4: Female–Male**

F: \(\text{ʕomrak fakarit tinzil lai\text{ʔ}ntixaba:t il\(\text{ʔ}xa:my\)ah?}

M: ?a:::::::h la?

(0.3)

F: Le:\(\text{ʃ}\)
F: Have you ever thought of university union election?
M: No. (0.3)
F: Why?
M: Because I was taught by my parents not attract attention to my family (0.3) that is, to my person, I do not like to attract the attention of others. For example, like (0.3) to appear on TV or something like this, it is impossible. (1.4)

F: Do you think, this is a good or a bad thing? (0.7) Does it push you forward or backward?
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Repetition. The second significant self-repair structure in JA is repetition. Repetition can be intentional (functional) or unintentional (non-functional). Bada (2010) concludes that repetition is employed both as vocalised fillers and as self-repairs. The speaker of the repaired turn tends to repeat a phoneme, a morpheme, a single word, a phrase or even the whole utterance to repair what he or she is trying say. In addition, ‘some elements from the repairing segment may be deleted’ (Sparks, 1994: 67). The speaker of a turn aims to produce a well-planned discourse, which is free of mistakes (Hieke, 1981). We should bear in mind that not all repetitions can be self-repairs. The findings of this study indicate that there were 228 self-repair repetitions in the data analysed, approximately 14.2% of the total self-repairs. In Extract 5, the female asks the male how he judges a female. He says that he cannot judge a female unless he deals with her or at least he has a relation-ship with her. The male repeats the utterance, ‘ma baħkum ſaša ilbihnt ila iða biṯamalt mašha’ (I don’t judge a girl unless I deal with her), twice in the same turn. We can observe that in the repairing utterance, he deletes the word ‘bišajjan’ (personally). The repetition of a whole utterance as a repairing segment is a common phenomenon in JA, especially when the speaker is talking about something sensitive or trying to avoid harming other people. In addition, the speaker is trying to be biased. For example, the wom-en’s honour in Jordanian society is something sacred. It is taboo. The speaker is, therefore, trying to select the precise words carefully, when he or she talks about a woman. Again, he repeats the same utterance at the end of his turn as an indication of emphasis:
Extract 5: Female–Male

M: 

\[ \text{I don't judge a girl unless I personally deal with her. I don't judge a girl unless I deal with her. Let's say. I mean, I don't accuse others as what they say. There are some people who make rumours about a girl. He said 'By God I saw this girl walking with a man or having a relation with a man' I am quite sure that she is innocent. There are many people who say like this, which is nonsense, but I am not of that kind of people, Thanks God. (0.9) I don't judge a girl unless I personally deal with her.} \]

F: Mmm, okay.

Extract 6 is an example of the repetition of a single word. F1 and F2 are talking about the difficulty of getting a job in Jordan without support from anyone. F2 repeats the word ‘kolu’ (all) three times in the same turn as a self-initiated repair structure. Actually, F1 is trying to organise her thoughts, and this is why she initiates a self-repair, as she aims to produce a well-planned and structured turn:

Extract 6: Female–Female

F1: 

\[ \text{Okay, now the problem is with getting a job. Is it available? Or does it need support from someone? Or is it the nature of work?} \]

F2: All all, it is, all

Replacement. Replacement is one of the significant self-initiated repair structures. The speaker of the repaired turn tends to replace a word or an utterance with new one; that is to say, the new element will appear in the repairing segment. Both the repaired and the repairing segment will have the same discoursal structure (Sparks, 1994). Clearly, replacement is employed as the speaker recognises that what has been said before is not the suitable word(s). Therefore, he or she tends to interrupt himself or herself to replace the word(s) with new suitable ones. The findings of this study show that there were 101 replacements, about 6.3% of all the self-repairs in the analysed data. In Extract 7, F1 is telling F2 about her family’s opinion about getting a job. To her father, salary is not important; the most important thing is to get a job. F1 initiates a self-repair which is a replacement repair ‘yis?alo:ni yhko:li’ (asked me, said to me). Again, F1 also initiates a self-repair ‘ma ?indi ma:nis? ?indi ma: moskilih’ (I don’t have an objection, I don’t have
a problem). Clearly, F1 is trying to organise her thoughts, and this is why she initiates self-repair, as she aims to produce a well-planned and structured turn. Moreover, she initiates an expansion repair ‘yeʕni’ (I mean) as well as a repetition repair in the same line ‘ʕan qød ʕan qød’ (really, really). Another self-repair is ʔani ʔana in line 2, the first pronoun ʔani (I) is the rural form, while ʔana is the urbanised one. Young women tend to use the urbanised dialect for prestigious purposes.

Extract 7: Females–Female

F1: → ↑ʔah ʔana lama ʔahli yisʔalo:ni yhkɔːli, ↓ ?inʃAllah ?ashtayil bihkɔːli miʃ mohim irraːtib bifakroːni ʔani ʔana haːtah bìbaːli irratib, ↓ ↑aboːi bhikhiːli liʔinoh ʔaham ʔiʃi ʔiʃa tʃəyalti shuː ma kan ❋awal ʔiʃi, → baːdeːn ilwaːh ʔiʃa ʔiʃa, bihkiliaː tuː tʃabʕan, ʔana law kan ʔinbnovetelː ma ʃindi maːniʃ → ʃindi maː maskililː ʔawalan ʔinʃAllah laː tʃabʕan bas maː ʔiʃi ↓ ↑yeʕni heh heh heh laʔ ʕan qød ʕan qød wallah bamzah. ↓

F2: Laʔ ʔana.

F1: Yeah, when my family asked me, said to me, God willing I will have a job. They told me salary is unimportant. They think that I am just interested in salary. My father said try to get any job whatever it is, after that you can look for something better. I told him, yeah, I don’t have an objection, I don’t have a problem in working in a naivétɛ firstly. God willing, no, of course, I don’t have. I mean, heh heh heh no really really. By God, I am joking.

F2: For me no.

Insertion. Inserting is another strategy of self-initiated repair structure in JA; the speaker of the repaired turn inserts a word or an utterance. It has been observed that the repairing segment includes a repetition of the repaired part. In other words, the speaker repeats what has been said before and then he or she inserts a new element that could be a word or an utterance. This study finds 61 insertion repairs, approximately 3.8% of all the self-repairs in the analysed data. F1 is telling F2 that she would like to bring her boyfriend, Hamoudeh, to have a videotaped conversation with him. Extract 8 consists of the sequence of the operations ‘repeat, repeat, repeat, insert’. F1 initiates an insertion self-repair ‘bidi ʔaʃɛːb Hamuːdih ʔatSʔawar ʔana wiyaːh’ (I would like to bring Hamoudeh to make a video conversation with him):

Extract 8: Female–Female

F1: ↑bidi ʔaʃɛːb Hamuːdih, bidi ʔaʃɛːb Hamuːdih ʔatSʔawar ʔana wiyaːh↓
F2: ↑ʔinti wiyaːh biʃɛːr Kaman marah↓

F1: I would like to bring Hamoudeh, I would like to bring Hamoudeh to make a video conversation with him.
F2: You and him again. Is it allowed to do that again?

Abort and restart. Abort and restart strategy means that the speaker of the repaired turn aborts or stops completing what he or she is talking about, and then he or she restarts a new turn. It is a self-interruption strategy where the speaker thinks that he or she is
diverting from the main topic or what he or she is trying to say is unimportant to the listener. The findings of this study indicate that there were 75 abort and restart self-repairs in JA, about 4.8% of all the repairs. In Extract 9, F1 initiates an abort and restart self-repair ‘leːʃ t’ulaːb ilkiː:mya bidursu? Leːʃ ṣadrus ṣuluum?’ (Why do the students of Chemistry study? Why should I study science?). Apparently, she changes her mind as she was talking about the necessity of the chemistry student to study only courses that relate to chemistry. However, she switches her question to herself as an exclamation (Why should I study science?). In this case, F1 aborts her initiation which is incomplete and then she initiates a new utterance ‘Leːʃ ṣadrus ṣuluum?’ (Why should I study science?):

Extract 9: Female–Female

F1: ↑tab ŋan maːnatiːh ŋaːna lisantna bnaːfis elmuʃkilih ŋaː leːʃ t’ulaːb ilkiː:mya bidursu? ↑Leːʃ ṣadrus ṣuluum? laʔ ŋaːna biiːd ŋaːdrus bas ŋuːlum ŋard haːdaː nafis taxaSuSi↓ =
F2: =↑Laʔ darasti taxaSuS, txaSaSti bas ŋiːnti daxiːl niːtːaːq kulieh ŋiːnti ʤuːz?↑ Min hai elkulieh yeːni lazizm ykuːn ŋiːndik law hata ʔaqaʃaː muːʃjarad ʔaqaʃiː ŋai elmawaːd iʔlaːn:yeːh↓.  
F1: Okay, this means that we have the same problem, why do the students of Chemistry study? Why should I study science? No! I wish to study only Geology. This is my field of study.
F2: No! You study a specialization, you are specialized, but you are within a faculty, you are a part of this faculty. I mean you must have knowledge, just a surface knowledge about the other courses.

Abort and abandon. The speaker of the current repaired turn tends to quit or abandon what he or she is going to say. In other words, the speaker suddenly abandons or stops his or her current utterance and then he or she initiates a new turn or utterance that does not relate to the previous one. It is different from abort and restart strategy, which can be considered as a false start. The findings of this study show that there were 67 abort and abandon self-initiated repairs, approximately 4.2% of the total self-initiated repairs. In Extract 10, F1 aborts her current turn ‘ʔah faːheːk ṣentʰabSaːt bʔadhaːnaʔ ŋiːnnaːs ŋiːnoh xalaːS ṣibbint (Yeah, so it was impressed in people’s mind that a girl), and she is silent for 0.4 of a second before she initiates her abort and abandon self-initiated repair. Her initiation ‘yeːni hatta bahib ŋiːnŋi ṭaːʃτayːil ṭakʔar šiː manaːʃiqim ʔiʃfɔːʃaːt’ (I mean I like to work in phosphates mines) starts with ‘yeːni’ (I mean):

Extract 10: Female–Female

F1: ↑ʔah faːheːk ṣentʰabSaːt bʔadhaːnaʔ ŋiːnnaːs ŋiːnoh xalaːS ṣibbint (0.4) yeːni hatta bahib ŋiːnŋi ṭaːʃτayːil ṭakʔar šiː manaːʃiqim ʔiʃfɔːʃaːt(0.4) maːsannıʔ ŋillːi bilhaːsa↓=
F2: = ↑ʔah bahkiːlik ŋaːna kαːn nafsi ŋiːʔmaSnαʔ ʔaːʃτayːil heheh ŋiːʔw xalaːS↓.
F1: Yeah, so it was impressed in people’s mind that a girl, (0.4) I mean I like to work in phosphates mines, the factories that are in El-Hassa
F2: Yes! I told you I wish I worked in a factory heh heh and that is it.
Deletion. Another significant self-initiated repair structure is deletion of an element from the repaired turn. The speaker tends to delete a word, or it could be an utterance in the repairing turn. This strategy is noticeable in Jordanian conversations since the findings of this study indicate that there were 53 deletions – self-initiated repairs – in the analysed data, about 3.3% of the total self-initiated repairs in this study. Apparently, Jordanian speakers use this strategy in order to avoid repetition, or he or she may recognise that the repetition of this word or an utterance is redundant or unimportant. In Extract 11, M is talking about how a student should learn presentation skills. He initiates a self-repair ‘te:ʤi bidak tiʕmali presentation, tiʕmali presentation’ (when you would like to make a presentation, make a presentation). We can see that in the repairing turn, the words ‘te:ʤi bidak’ (when you like to) are deleted:

Extract 11: Male–Male

M:


F:

↑Mmmm

M:

I mean, he will know himself better. For example, ?e::h let’s talk about a university student, there is something called presentation skills, do you know it? A lot of information, when you would like to → make a presentation, make a presentation, there are basic things that you should know when you make a presentation. You present or do something, you have to, all these things are important for you as they qualify you to be a professional person.

M2: Mmmm.

Meta-repair. According to Sparks (1994), meta-repair can be defined as follows:

the speaker, rather than simply performing the repair within the continuing flow of the talk, appears to ‘step out’ of the primary thread of the conversation momentarily in order to conduct the repair before returning to and continuing the primary thread. (p. 102)

In other words, the speaker stops the flow of the conversation suddenly in order to repair what has just been uttered. The speaker may use words such as ‘sorry’ and ‘or I mean to say’. Jordanian speakers also tend to use the utterance ‘xale:na nihkle’ (Let’s say). This utterance is significantly utilised in Jordanian conversations. This study found that there were 25 meta-repairs, about 1.5% of the total of self-repairs in the studied data. In Extract 12, F1 initiates a meta-repair ‘wa shard ilnisbih aw sorry wil Granite wil clay’ (The Charl and I wrote the percentage, and sorry the Granite and the Clay):

Extract 12: Female–Female

F1:

Modify order. Modification is another significant self-repair strategy, where the speaker tends to interrupt himself or herself when he or she recognises that there is a discoursal problem in ordering the utterance or the words that he or she uttered. The self-initiator cuts off the flow of the conversation and then he or she reorders the words in order to be discoursally correct or acceptable. This study indicates that there were 19 modify order repairs, about 1.1% of the total of self-repairs in the whole study. In Extract 13, the male initiates a repair, ‘शम बक्तोब शम बाँदीर किता:ब रह शादीर किता:ब बिषाहिर वा:हाद’ (I am writing a book, I published a book, I will publish a book). Apparently, the male recognises that he has a problem in selecting the tense of his sentence. This is why he repeats what he said before, and he corrects the tense of the verb (will publish) rather than (published):

Extract 13: Male–Female

M: ↑शादीर बाँदीर किता:ब रह शादीर किता:ब बिषाहिर वा:हाद बाहा:विल शादीर याला हा:ली यादाबियान रिनो: हेक रिसमि रिनार बाँदीर ज्वाई बाबालिफ़ stap =
F: ↑शादीर बाँदीर किता:ब रिह हो रिनहाद ?शादीर रिन ?िनरात रिज़ा:यार शादी?
M: It gives me a great opportunity, but I am writing a book, I published a book; I will publish a book in January. I am trying to improve myself in literature, like, my name will be famous, and then I will start.
F: That is awesome. You are specialized in Radio broadcasting.

Conclusion

The results of this study show that there is a similarity between self-initiated repair structures in JSA and in English conversations. The most significant self-repair operations are repetition, deletion and insertion, as they may be employed together within the repairing segment. Self-repairs are initiated as a strategy to have enough time to reorganise the speaker’s thoughts. Also, the speaker is planning what to say next by deciding what type of words he or she will say. Furthermore, he or she uses pause fillers in conjunction with repetition to gain enough processing time to think of the current lexis (Al-Harahsheh, 2012). Self-repairs also appear to accompany sensitive topics, such as sexual or political subjects. Self-initiated repair strategies play a pivotal role in managing the sensitivity of these topics. Overall, self-initiated repair strategies are employed when a speaker produces a semantic, or a phonological error and also to avoid saying inappropriate words, especially when the speaker utters a word that might be understood as critical.
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Appendix I

The phonemes of Spoken Jordanian Arabic

ʔ: voiceless glottal stop ء
B: voiced bilabial stop ب
T: voiceless dental stop ت
Θ: voiceless inter-dental fricative ث
ʒ: voiced palatal affricate (Jordanian Arabic) ج
ʤ: fricative voiced alveolar (Standard Arabic) ج
ħ: voiceless pharyngeal fricative ح
X: voiceless velar fricative خ
D: voiced dental stop د
ð: voiced inter-dental fricative ذ
r: alveolar tap ر
z: voiced dental fricative ز
s: voiceless dental fricative س
ʃ: voiceless palatal fricative ش
ʧ: voiced palatal fricative ض
sˤ: voiceless fricative alveolar ص
tˤ: stop voiceless emphatic ط
ðˤ: voiced fricative emphatic ظ
dˤ: voiced emphatic stop ض
ʕ: voiced pharyngeal fricative ع
ɣ: voiced velar fricative غ
f: voiceless labio-dental fricative  ف

g: voiced velar stop  ق (Jordanian Arabic)

q: voiceless uvular stop  ق (Standard Arabic)

k: voiceless velar stop  ك

l: alveolar lateral  ل

m: bilabial nasal stop  م

n: alveolar nasal stop  ن

h: voiceless glottal fricative  ه

w: approximant velar  و

y: palatal semi-vowel  ي

Vowels

Short vowels
I  high front
A  low back
U  high back
E  mid front
O  mid back

Long vowels
I:  high front
A:  low back
U:  high back
E:  mid front
O:  mid back
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