To Fix What's Not Broken

Repair Strategies in Non-Native and Native English Conversation

Charlotta Plejert

ABSTRACT
Plejert, C., 2004. To Fix What's Not Broken: Repair Strategies in Non-Native and Native English Conversation. *Studies in Language and Culture*. *5*. 229 pp. Linköping. ISBN

The thesis investigates conversations involving native speakers and non-native speakers of English. The non-native speakers partaking in the study have a well developed knowledge of the foreign language. The study is particularly concerned with the function and interactional relevance of repair strategies that interlocutors employ when they talk to each other. The results of the analyses highlight issues such as participants' self-representations as competent speakers, the notion "non-nativeness", and language learning, relating to current developments within conversation analytic research on second/foreign language conversations. Comparisons between non-native and native speakers are made, highlighting similarities as well as differences in participants' use of repair strategies.

   The study adopts a conversation analytic framework but is also influenced by studies of second/foreign language acquisition. Conversation analytic research has, until recently, dealt with conversations involving non-native speakers who have a limited or intermediate command of the second/foreign language. Repair behaviours of advanced foreign language users are thus a little investigated area. Whereas non-native speakers with limited experience in using the second/foreign language often employ repair in order to solve problems that are related to their linguistic knowledge, such as finding or knowing words and constructing utterances that are understandable in the context in which they occur, this thesis shows how an increased knowledge of the foreign language involves a shift in focus as repair is carried out, i.e. repair is used to address problems of a linguistic as well as of a social nature. Since an increased knowledge of a foreign language is accompanied by an increase in the range of jobs that repair strategies do, "doing repair" is an important part of the development of non-native speakers' interactional and linguistic competence.

Key words: repair, non-native speakers, native speakers, conversation analysis, foreign language conversation, language learning, English language.

Table of Contents

Part II: Self-repair

Part III: Other-repair

Acknowledgements

Many people have contributed to this work, and I am indebted to them all. A very special thanks to my supervisors, Richard Hirsch and Jan Anward, whose expertise, guidance, wisdom, patience, and cheerful support have been invaluable during the entire process. Throughout, Richard and Janne have had the ability to give the right kind of advice at the right time, ranging from comments that improve analyses, to suggestions concerning which walking trails in Europe would be inspirational and energising. I would also like to thank all my friends and colleagues at the Department of Language and Culture at Linköping University. It has been a delight from the very start to work there. During my time as a PhD student, I have felt their never ending support, and enthusiasm for my work and for the development of the Graduate School in Language and Culture in Europe. I am indebted to everyone at this workplace for guiding my research and introducing me to the challenges and joys of teaching. Thanks to these people, I have rarely felt lonely or lost on my way towards completing this work. The frequent laughter and cheerful atmosphere that permeate the Department in general, and the English Department in particular, have given me a bright view of life as an academic. A warm thanks to Norman Davies at the English Department, who helped me improve on the language of my thesis.

Another important source of inspiration has been the cross-disciplinary stance taken at the Department. I would like to thank specifically my fellow doctoral students who have accompanied me during the past five years. Writing a thesis is very much a collaborative task, and we are all in it together. It would have been a very difficult chore without their support. A particular thanks to Jenny Öqvist, who swept into my life like a snowstorm one morning in January in the year 2000. The friendship that we have developed and our many conversations concerning our common research interests, and other things, the

Part I: Introduction

1. Introduction

Conversation involving non-native speakers (NNSs) of a language, in interaction, either with other non-native speakers or native speakers (NSs), has met with increased interest from scholars working within conversation analytic (CA) methodology. Before the 1990's, this type of interaction was mainly approached within the field of second and foreign language acquisition (S/FLA) research. Whereas S/FLA studies have been concerned with the effect of interactional phenomena on processes of language acquisition, CA investigates second and foreign language in *use*, taking into account participation frameworks (symmetric/asymmetric), conversational setting (everyday/institutional/other), and participants' local management of conversational practices and actions in relation to framework and setting. Despite these rather disparate points of departure, some spoken phenomena that have been investigated in order to make claims, either about cognitive processes or the management of interacting in a second or foreign language, have often come down to what CA denotes "repair", i.e. the strategies participants in a conversation use to address problems in speaking, hearing and understanding (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977[1]). Since understanding is vital for all communicative activities, conditions under which the goal of understanding may not so easily be reached are perhaps of special interest. Talk-in-interaction[2] involving NNSs

---

[1] Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) are hereafter referred to as Schegloff et al.

[2] Talk-in-interaction refers to the activity of people talking to each other in a range of different situations (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998: 13). It can be viewed as an overarching term that covers different types of interactions, e.g. casual conversation between partners or friends, a teacher instructing a pupil, a brief exchange between strangers in a bar, a courtroom hearing etc. The term talk-in-interaction is sometimes used interchangeably with the term conversation in this dissertation. From a strict CA perspective, however, this could lead to misunderstandings considering the type of data being investigated. Within CA, the terms conversation and talk-in-interaction tend to refer to naturally occurring, casual spoken interaction although the latter term also opens up for a diversity of

provides one condition that may affect understanding, depending, of course, on the various abilities of the participants to use the second/ foreign language in satisfactory ways.

This dissertation investigates conversations involving NNSs and NSs of English. Focus is directed towards the function and interactional relevance of repair strategies[3] that participants employ to manage interaction on a turn-by-turn basis. Since there is already one answer to the question why participants use repair strategies, i.e. to maintain intersubjective understanding (cf. Schegloff, 1991, 1992a, for intersubjectivity in native conversation; Kalin, 1995; and Kurhila, 2003, on understanding in NS-NNS data), this issue is only indirectly addressed. This dissertation approaches repair strategies on the microlevel, investigating the environments in which they occur, what forms they take and how they affect the ongoing conversation.

Schegloff et al. (1977), who formulated an early, influential description of the organisation of repair, acknowledged that some types of repair were preferred to others by participants in casual conversation. To correct or repair one's own turn-at-talk proved to be what speakers made their first hand choice at a point of trouble. However, it was pointed out that repair patterns could vary depending on the speech exchange system. Instances of repair of some trouble in another person's speech were assumed likely to appear more frequently in childadult interactions or involving someone "not-yet-competent in some domain without respect to age" (Schegloff et al., 1977: 381). Both these aspects of participants' orientations to repair are of interest from a language learning perspective. Within psycholinguistics, it has been shown how repair behaviours of NNSs on different levels of second/ foreign language proficiency become more like that of NSs' as language knowledge develops (cf. van Hest, 1996; or Kormos, 1999, for an over-

---

types of conversational data. The interchanges recorded and investigated in this dissertation are forms of talk that only partly can be described as casual or naturally occurring, cf. section 1.2.

[3] The strategies dealt with in this dissertation are employed by participants to address problems in speaking, hearing and understanding as they have occurred as well as in order to *prevent* such problems from occurring. Not all of the strategies necessarily fit happily under the label "repair". This issue is further discussed in chapter 2, section 2.10.

view). CA as well as psycholinguistics note that there tends to be a correlation between command of a language and the type of repair preferred by a participant, i.e. as the NNSs develop an increased ability to use the target language, the frequency of occurrence of self-repair increases and repair initiated by their interlocutors decreases. In addition, participants' motivations for repair are assumed to shift, from a focus on lexical, phonological or grammatical problems, to a focus on pragmatic difficulties (Rieger, 2003). In this sense, CA-studies of talk-in-interaction involving NNSs and psycholinguistics have a common research agenda, i.e. to expand the view of language learning from that of treating it as some internalisation of syntactic rules and enlargement of vocabulary, to an individual's ability to manage various communicative situations involving interaction with different people. Language learning would then come closer to the notion "*interactional competence*" (Eerdmans, 2003: 97). Recent CA-influenced studies that emphasise this broadened perspective are found in Kramsch (2002) and Gardner & Wagner (2004).

The descriptions of repair provided in the analytic chapters of this dissertation also contribute to a discussion about the necessity for an expanded view of language learning as a development of pragmatic skills as well as of syntax and vocabulary. Pragmatic skills depend on participants' cultural and world knowledge. This is knowledge that affects conversation just as does the ability to use a certain set of words when formulating what to say. The knowledge and experience of participants govern how they interpret contributions to talk, and how they act when they face problems of various kinds, e.g. of a linguistic or social nature. Repair reflects participants' interpretations of the on-going activity[4] and the choices they make from these interpretations.

---

[4] "Activity" in this dissertation is used to capture two interrelated aspects of what participants do in talk-in-interaction. On the one hand "activity" is employed in a "global" sense, referring to participants' engagement in "discussion", "interview", "casual talk" etc., and on the other hand, it is used in a "local" sense that can be compared to what Linell (1998: 207 ff) denotes a "communicative project", i.e. participants' coordination of actions over time in order to achieve a goal, e.g. the goal of solving a problem in understanding. When participants' engage in repair, they are, from this perspective, engaged in a communicative project, a local activity. Similarly, Goodwin & Goodwin (1992: 81) use the term "*interactive activity*" (italics in original text) to describe assessments. Irrespective of terminology, what characterises an activity (in the sense of a communicative project), is

The conversations investigated in this study involve NNSs who have developed a good knowledge of the English language[5]. The general impression of the conversations is that of equal engagement by participants. This said, the roles of participants do, of course, continuously change during the course of the talk.

The character of the conversations and some points of interest are illustrated in example (1:1) involving a NNS and a NS[6]. Magnus (Ma) and Tim (Ti) are talking about more or less serious cases of theft.

```
(1:1)
14   Ti:  yeah but I think about that guy who:em stole=(was a guy)
          was it Asia? eh: nt he stole all the eh:: you know he was
          in  banking n finance (0.6) n the [bank(x x)]
15   Ma:                                    [oh oh] the English one
16   Ti:  ye[ah]
17   Ma:    [or] British no= [En]glish one.
18   Ti:                     [(yeah)] yeah h. he [((laughs))]
19   Ma:                                         [((laughs))]
20   Ti:  °or British°
21   Ma:  >no no no< [English= this time it is English]
22   Ti:            [he's *also a British Engl]ish guy*
23   Ma:  >yeah yeah< whatever
24   Ti:  ah
25   Ma:  an-
26   Ti:  but that is kind of stealing big (x x) but then (it's)
          stealing little [things]
27   Ma:                  [but] there is eh: is there a difference↓
          (0.7) I'm not sure (0.6)I don't really think so. (0.6)
          eh[m::]
28   Ti:    [f] it's all °h
29   ps:  (2.2)
30   Ma:  °h well not on a: (0.9) .hhh >sort of< (1.1) when it
          comes to morals (1.2) or (1.7) stealing is stealing
31   Ti:  yeah
32   ps:  (0.7)
33   Ma:  whether you steal (0.5)(a) few things or many things.
34   Ti:  bu' you c'n >if you steal a few things ye can get away
          with it (pro[bably)<]
35   Ma:              [oh] that's
36   Ti:  [(with((laughs)) wi-(you) stea- ((laughs))]
37   Ma:  [that's well↓ or if you steal loads of things]
          like all the dictators who (0.4) s:: stash
```

that it is dynamic and develops turn-by-turn as participants interpret each contribution to talk and respond to it in accordance with their presumptions about the activity at hand.

[5] Participants are described in more detail in section 1.2. It should be noted that the data also comprises two conversations where British or American English NSs interact with each other, i.e. there are no NNSs involved.

[6] Transcription conventions are found in section 1.5, this chapter.

```
              away money in[S]wiss
38   Ti:                [((coughs))]
39   Ma:  bank accounts and stuff
40   Ti:  .hhh((coughs)) bu' that's a kind of petty stealing s-
           people stealing stuff from work= pens, pape:r (photo-
           copies) [and all that kind of stuff]
41   Ma:          [that's (true)]
```

The first point of interest occurs at the very beginning of the excerpt, as Tim is searching for the name of a person. The search is indicated as Tim stops, restarts and makes hesitant sounds such as "em", "eh:" and "eh::". Apart from this display of hesitancy, Tim tells Magnus details that may be helpful in order to understand what person he is referring to, such as the place of the action and that a bank was involved[7]. The question "was it Asia?" (line 14) is directed partly to Tim himself, partly to Magnus, inviting assistance in the search as Tim turns his gaze towards Magnus. As soon as Magnus has come to a recognition of the person whose name is sought for, he responds to Tim (line 15). Magnus too does not single out any name, but contributes to the construction of the event that he believes that Tim is referring to by means of specifying the nationality of the felon. That Magnus is on the right track is verified by Tim, subsequent to which Magnus adds an alternative modifier; "or British" (line 17). However, the first option is then quickly returned to and Magnus makes up his mind to use "English".

A word or name search of the type just described is ordinarily viewed as a type of repair. In this case, the name sought for is not found, but the "problem" that Tim was facing can be viewed as resolved since Magnus' assistance displays that he knows who Tim is talking about. The referent is identified but not named. As soon as this understanding is achieved, Tim and Magnus can leave the activity of name search and go on developing the topic that preceded the search.

Whereas interlocutors may collaboratively fix communicative trou-

---

[7] In a retrospective interview Tim revealed that he had been thinking about the fraud involving Baring's bank in 1995, but that he had been unable to remember the name Nick Leeson. Magnus also spontaneously commented on this name search and claimed that he knew exactly whom Tim was referring to, but that he could not at that point recall the name.

bles like the one just mentioned, speakers also continuously attend to their own talk, revising and reconstructing utterances. Magnus, for example, alters his initial choice of "English" into "British" and then back again. Such actions are also described as repair within the framework of CA. The achievement of picking between the two terms is that Magnus displays that he is aware of the potential consequences of choosing one over the other. As the conversation unfolds, it also shows that this alteration means something to Tim, who initially laughs at Magnus' worry, and then, in a teasing way, suggests that "British" would be just as good as "English". Tim's response could be interpreted either as a suggestion, or, a correction of Magnus' word choice. Magnus does not buy Tim's wording and, in fact, expresses his objection fairly strongly (line 21). Tim, however, continues in a teasing manner suggesting a third expression, this time with laughter to his voice; "[he's *also a British Engl]ish guy*"(line 22). Magnus now says in a friendly but annoyed voice (as if he "gave up") that Tim is, of course, also correct and he closes the issue with an admitting hedge, before the topic of theft is returned to.

Magnus' attention to the choice of words displays that he has a knowledge of the potential social consequences of using one or the other. To use "British" is the "safe" bet from a social point of view, since the term covers people from the whole of the United Kingdom and not only those from England. Tim is English, and, at least in other circumstances, it could be ignorant, inappropriate or offensive to use the "wrong" modifier. Although Magnus finally chooses to stick to "English", he has shown to Tim that he is aware of a distinction between the terms. His objection to Tim's candidate expression also reveals that the matter of nationality has probably been discussed before in some other situation; ">no no no< [English=*this time* it is English]" (italics added).

There are other instances in the excerpt where a unit of talk is cut off and altered. One such example is found as Magnus suddenly stops and changes what has the form of a declarative into that of a question: "[but] there is eh: is there a difference↓" (line 27). This turn-at-talk is a response to Tim's differentiation between "stealing big (x x) but then (it's) stealing little [things]" (line 26). The alteration results in a less

forward way of expressing that he does not entirely agree with the perspective introduced by Tim.

Tim also alters his utterances in different ways. As he is busy talking about degrees of stealing, he suddenly stops and inserts an if-clause (line 34) that relates to what Magnus has previously said. Having inserted this clause, he recycles the phrase that was cut off, subsequent to which he completes his turn. The achievement of the insertion is that it makes the turn-at-talk cohere with preceding talk and makes his own contribution relevant as well as unambiguous in relation to what has been said previously.

The instances of interest analysed in the excerpt display how participants in conversation in different ways modify their speech, either collaboratively in order to solve an explicitly expressed difficulty, e.g. the search for a name, or, as individual alterations of utterances in progress. Although changes of this latter type affect the structure and meaning of single turns, they reflect the speaker's orientation to the person spoken to, e.g. attempts not to be offensive, or to align with something previously said. They display how participants in conversation manage to orchestrate their talk in ways that enhance intersubjective understanding.

In contrast to conversations involving NNSs who have a less developed knowledge of the language being spoken, whose utterances tend to be hesitant and where words are often sought for, the speech of the NNS, Magnus, procedes at a steady pace. Tim and Magnus appear to contribute to the talk to an equal extent and as they chat away, they continuously recycle bits and pieces of each other's turns-at-talk[8] (cf. lines 26, 33, 34, 37, 40). There are no indications that one of the participants is trying to dominate the other (although Tim is teasing Magnus).

The collaboration and individual alterations referred to here as

---

[8] Tannen (1989) shows the many functions of repetitions in talk-in-interaction, stressing the way discourse coherence is enhanced by means of repetitions as well as how they display participants' involvement in the conversation. Anward (e.g. 2000:16) discusses repetitions of parts of speech in the sense of frames, i.e. recurring structures that are governed by "lexical, morphological, syntactic, prosodic, semantic and pragmatic demands" (my translation).

"repair" appear ordinary and uncomplicated. What does it mean then that these adjustments are performed as speakers interact? Are there really no differences from NSs in the ways in which NNSs who may be perceived as proficient in the foreign language conduct alterations of their turns-at-talk, or do NNSs and NSs behave in entirely similar ways? These are questions that this dissertation aims to address.

1.1 Aims

The overall aim of the study is to investigate the function and interactional relevance of repair strategies in conversations involving NSs and NNSs of English, with emphasis on how the latter manage conversation in a language other than their mother tongue. The study is concerned with the achievements of repair and investigates what possible factors are involved in participants' interpretations at a point of repair[9]. The results of analyses highlight issues concerning participants' self-representations as competent native and/or non-native speakers, the notion "non-nativeness", and language learning, relating to current developments of CA research on second/foreign language conversations.

Comparisons between NNSs and NSs are made, highlighting, where proven relevant, similarities as well as differences in participants' use of repair strategies. Approaching talk-in-interaction using pre-determined social membership labels such as NNS and NS is not altogether uncomplicated (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998: 1–14). Although participants indisputably are NSs and NNSs, this is only one thing that may affect an interactional event. The prospects and consequences of approaching data in the sense that conversational behaviours are assumed to take place according to participants' statuses as NSs and NNSs, have been a topic for continuous discussion within CA and S/FLA studies (e.g. Firth, 1996; Wagner, 1996, 1998; Long, 1997; Poulisse, 1997a; Firth & Wagner, 1998; Gass, 1998; Markee, 2000; Kramsch, 2002;

---

[9] The role of participants' and the analyst's interpretations are discussed in more detail in section 1.3.

Kurhila, 2003; Gardner & Wagner, 2004). Even if this study compares the speech of NNSs to that of NSs, micro-level analysis enables determining what participants themselves make relevant at a point of repair. This degree of detail at times reveals that NNSs do things that NSs do not do and the other way around. This does not, however, automatically mean that such differences display "nativeness" or "non-nativeness". Generally, any motivation for repair is of interest in the data investigated here.

Another aim is to increase the understanding of repair behaviours of NNSs who have a well developed knowledge of the foreign language (often referred to as "advanced learners"), to present findings of CA-studies where mainly NNSs with a limited or intermediate command of the second/foreign language are studied (e.g. Gaskill, 1980; Schwartz, 1980; Norrick, 1991; Kalin, 1995; Kurhila, 2003, Carroll, 2004; Mazeland & Zaman-Zadeh, 2004). Repair behaviour of advanced foreign language users is not yet a well investigated area[10], and of interest in relation to the already mentioned issues concerning a broadened view of language learning in the sense of interactional competence. A lot of the work performed by repair in talk involving NNSs with a limited command of the second/foreign language, is to deal with problems that are related to finding or knowing words and to construct utterances that are understandable in the context in which they occur. As NNSs develop their knowledge of a language, the strategies that they employ in order to co-construct understanding with others change. If increased knowledge of a foreign language is accompanied by an increase in the range of jobs that repair strategies do, "doing repair" is an important part in the development of interactional competence.

---

[10] NNSs who are advanced speakers of a second/foreign language (not only English) do appear in ethnographic work on intercultural/interethnic communication (e.g. Gumperz, 1982, 1992ab; Scollon & Scollon, 1995). The focus of such ethnographic studies is wider than that of repair strategies, although there are also many common points of interest, some of which are attended to in this dissertation, e.g. the ways participants draw from their knowledge (linguistic as well as cultural) in order to interpret the activities that they engage in, which, in turn, affect the linguistic choices made at a particular moment of talk-in-interaction.

1.2 Conversations and participants

The data investigated in this dissertation comprise informal, yet elicited conversations where NSs and NNSs of English form six (2 NS-NS, 2 NNS-NNS and 2 NS-NNS) pairs. Audio and video recordings were made of all six conversations. The recordings took place in the Student Union at Linköping University, a place familiar to all participants. Each conversation is approximately 45 minutes long. In addition to the conversations recorded in the Student Union, each participant attended a viewing session within five days of the original recording. The session was conducted following the procedures described by Erickson & Schultz (1982), and Hawkins (1985), the latter for second language conversation; i.e. a participant watched the videotape together with the researcher and was asked to stop the videotape and comment on any point of interest. The researcher, who had watched the tape before the session, had a small number of pre-formulated questions prepared that concerned instances in the conversations where participants had word-finding difficulties, or, where there seemed to be misunderstanding between the interlocutors. Since, at the time of the recording, there was no predefined subject of analysis, but a general interest in how understanding was achieved, anything that the participant said was considered important. It should be stressed that the focus during the viewing session was not on the researcher's questions, but on the participant's own spontaneous observations. The comments and the interaction between informant and researcher were tape recorded. An advantage of recording the retrospective session is that it is easy to trace back each comment to a certain point in the video recording, as this is simultaneously taped with the comments. The motivation for using retrospective interviews is explicated further below. Before doing so, however, details about the participants and the conversations are given.

The NNSs are Swedish. At the time of the recording four of them are attending a 40 point course in English language at university level, one is a former student of English at university level, working part-time with translation, and the remaining one has nine years of compulsory English studies and is exposed to vast amounts of English, as most of

the literature in the computer science program in which he is enrolled is in English. The NSs are current or former exchange/foreign students at Linköping University. Participants are friends with the NNS or NS with whom they talk.

The NNSs are not referred to as "learners" or "advanced learners" in this dissertation even though, indisputably, five of them *are* or *have been* advanced learners from the point of view of studying English as a foreign language at university level. To attend such courses requires a certain level of grammatical and communicative skill that can be measured by means of grades and tests. In the interactions recorded for this study, however, the more general term NNS is chosen, to avoid presuming that "learning" is the major aim of the NNSs as they chat away with a friend (although asked to do so by a researcher).

In order to protect the integrity of participants, their real names are not used in this text. All participants have agreed that personal information would only be used for scientific purposes. Information was obtained in a short questionnaire and consists of details concerning participants' educational background and their relationship with the person with whom they are talking. Information of a personal nature was also revealed in the viewing session. If there was any uncertainty at any point in the conversations that a participant would feel uncomfortable making public some topic talked about or opinions expressed, they were asked if they wanted the episode to be excluded from analysis. As far as the viewing session is concerned, only such information that is directly relevant to the aims of this dissertation is used and participants have given their consent to the use of retrospective comments for this purpose.

The participants are presented in pairs below:

Erik (NNS) and Linda (NNS) are studying English language as part of their teacher training programme. They are acquainted as class-mates and have recurrently been working together during their time on the programme. Outside of university, however, they do not spend time with each other.

Monika (NNS) and Jenny (NNS) attend the same teacher training programme as Erik and Linda and know each other this way.

John (NS) and Tobias (NNS) live in the same hall of residence. John is a British foreign exchange student and Tobias is an undergraduate in computer science. They consider themselves to be good friends.

Tim (NS) and Magnus (NNS) are house-mates. Tim comes from England and is currently attending a university course in Swedish as a second language at the beginners' level. Magnus has studied English language for two years at university level and works part-time with translation.

Michael (NS) and Anne (NS) are native English speakers who have previously studied Swedish as a second language. Both have moved to Sweden permanently and live and work here. They are close friends who spend a fair amount of time together.

Emily (NS) and Celia (NS) are American exchange students who attend some common courses at Linköping University. They spend some time outside of university together and move in the same social circles.

The motivations for asking speakers with different linguistic and cultural backgrounds to get together and talk were multiple. Previous research, within CA as well as studies of S/FLA, reports how the participation framework influences the way a conversation unfolds, and both perspectives take an interest in symmetry/asymmetry relations that may depend on nativeness vs. non-nativeness, as well as the importance of participants' relationship with, and knowledge about each other (e.g. Norrick, 1991; Zuengler, 1991, 1993). More psycholinguistically oriented research also points at factors such as how the amount of speech yielded in NNS-NNS conversations is greater than when NS-NNS talk to each other (Long & Porter, 1985; Varonis & Gass, 1985) and also, that NNSs who collaborate on a source of trouble, are able to change their original choice of word into one that better conforms to what may be considered "native-like" from a normative point of view (Swain, 1985). NNSs may thus benefit from their knowledge of each other, and need not necessarily interact with a NS in order to develop their grammatical and communicative skills. These latter S/FLA studies approach conversational data with a different set of questions and assumptions from what is customary from a more social interactional point of view.

Despite the small size of the conversational corpus, it seemed that

fine grained analyses covering all different combinations of NSs and NNSs could reveal interesting aspects connected to symmetry/asymmetry relations, and/or show relevant similarities or differences in interlocutors' conversational conduct that might be tied to the participation framework. The entirely native (NS-NS) conversations were used as a "control". The size of the corpus, however, does not permit any generalizations about NNSs' and NSs' repair behaviour. However, the NSs' conversations at least helped prevent ascribing certain repair behaviour as typical for "non-native" settings, when, in fact, similar behaviour was found among NSs. The variation of participation framework in combination with micro-analysis thus enable a study of what participants orient to at points of trouble, and it may turn out that what initially appears typical for the NNSs, is related to other factors than simply participants' linguistic or cultural origins.

The information given in order to gain the interest of NNSs and NSs in participating was that the aim of the study was to investigate how different speakers, NNSs and NSs, manage to interact with each other in English, and that not so much is known about the *spoken* language of NNSs who have a good knowledge of a foreign language. It was clearly pointed out that the study was not aimed at evaluating their contributions to talk[11]. Participants were offered coffee or tea to drink during the recording. They were told that they could talk about what they liked but were also given some topics for discussion. The topics were formed as general questions that concerned moral issues that the participants were likely to have opinions about or experiences of.

Most participants chose to attend to the topics for longer or shorter periods during the talk, but also addressed matters that were completely unrelated to the topics. There were differences in the ways participants in the pairs attended to the topics and to the recording situation. Whereas NSs who talked to other NSs chatted

---

[11] Interestingly, two of the participants who attended the teacher training programme stated that such an approach would have meant no problem to them. Rather, they thought it would have been interesting to have their speech studied from that perspective in order to find out how to improve their communicative skills.

about many different things (the suggested topics included), NNSs appeared, at least to some degree, to perceive the situation as a task to be conducted. The NNSs viewed the occasion as an opportunity to practice communicating in English or participated since they found the study of spoken English interesting. The NSs of English who formed two native pairs also volunteered as they thought it might be an interesting experience. Thus, all participants expressed a sincere and genuine interest in the study which resulted in a small but in many ways rich collection of native and non-native English conversations.

During the course of talk, participants engaged in different activities in accordance with how they perceived the situation and how they chose to attend to the topics suggested for conversation. By and large, the presence of the topics yielded an activity that may be described as a "discussion". Discussion as a social activity constitutes a certain organisation which is displayed in the ways participants contribute to the talk as the topic is dealt with, e.g. that participants mutually assume that there is no predetermined answer to the issue/question to be discussed (Liljestrand, 2002). Discussions may take place in focus groups where some agenda is to be dealt with (Wibeck, 2000). Participants' engagement in the activities is reflected in the ways topics are introduced, developed, closed and/or shifted (Bublitz, 1988; Myers, 1998; Svennevig, 1999). Commonly, one participant takes on the role of being in charge of the ways in which the topic is attended to (i.e. as a "moderator"). In relation to this brief description of the nature of the conversations, it should be mentioned that the overall activity of discussing the topics, in itself, hosted many local activities. Such local activities could be the telling of a story, giving of accounts, assessments, or repair, to mention a few. These are activities that, of course, in no way are bound to the context of discussion but permeate all talk-in-interaction. From this point of view the conversations, although described as "elicited", do not consist of predefined material that is forced upon the participants. Just as with people in naturally occurring situations, the associations and thereby the talk produced come from within the people who are talking and their interactional work. It is not claimed here that the elicitation by means of topics should be com-

pared or equated with naturally occurring conversation, but elicited conversations are also "organic" in the sense that whatever phenomena inspire interlocutors to interact, be it a predefined topic, a good looking man passing two women in the street, or a casserole from the university food court, people tend to draw from within their own present or past personal and/or shared impressions, knowledge and experiences. There are therefore reasons not to underestimate the usefulness of elicited conversational material. As to the naturalness of naturally occurring conversations, this is a matter of definition that could be discussed at length. The point made is simply that the recordings conducted for the purpose of this study became an event in the life of the people participating and the interactions are treated as such when analysed.

As the topics were discussed, the speech rate of participants was sometimes slow, pauses were frequent and long pauses were not uncommon as the topics from time to time demanded reflection and contemplation. However, also at points where participants talked about everyday matters, the speech rate varied. In general, the speech of the NNSs contained more pauses that may be considered long from the point of departure of observations of casual English conversation. The frequency of occurrence and length of pauses in the different conversations analysed here, are not treated as deviant or problematic, but are viewed as consistent with the activity that participants are engaged in and the characteristics of each single conversation. If participants themselves orient to pauses, e.g. a long pause may be interpreted as a lack of response, or slow speech may indicate hesitancy, attention is paid to these features in the analyses.

1.3 Method

The method employed in this dissertation draws from multiple fields of research that deal with talk-in-interaction, either of an intra-cultural or inter-cultural nature. In the following, four main inspirational sources for the present work are presented, i.e. CA, ethnography, S/FLA theory, and learning theories that emphasise the role that social

interaction plays in the learning process[12]. The basic assumptions of each framework are outlined with particular focus on aspects that are consequential for the theoretically and methodologically eclectic stance taken in this dissertation.

1.3.1 Conversation analysis

The main parts of this section explicate the relevance of CA for the study of interaction involving NNSs whereas the methodology is not explained in any great detail. The roots of CA are found in Garfinkel (1967), Heritage (1984), and Sacks (1992). Introductions are manifold, e.g. Psatas (1995), Hutchby & Wooffitt (1998), ten Have (1998).

Originating within ethnomethodology as developed by Harold Garfinkel (1967), conversation analysis is concerned with investigating "the *competences* which underlie ordinary social activities. Specifically it is directed at describing and explicating the competences which ordinary speakers use and rely on when they engage in intelligible, conversational interaction"(Heritage, 1984: 241). The methodology was developed by Harvey Sacks (1992) during the 1960's and early 70's and has from then on paid attention to analysis of talk-in-interaction predominantly occurring among interlocutors within the same society. A fairly recent development is, however, to employ CA in order to investigate interaction involving people with various cultural and linguistic backgrounds (e.g. Gaskill, 1980; Schwartz, 1980; Kalin, 1995; Firth, 1996; Wagner, 1996; Markee, 2000; Wong, 2000; Rasmussen & Wagner, 2001; Kurhila, 2001, 2003; Gardner & Wagner, 2004).

CA rests on three fundamental assumptions, all of which are more or less applicable to the study of interaction involving NNSs. Firstly, social action and interaction are found to "exhibit organized patterns of stable, identifiable structural features" (Heritage, 1984: 241). Partici-

---

[12] No common label is suggested for this source of influence but what is referred to is a variety of approaches to language learning in social interaction, e.g. "situated learning theory" (Lave & Wenger, 1991), Vygotskian perspectives (e.g. Lantolf & Appel, 1994) and language learning as part of the socialization process (e.g. Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986; Kramsch, 2002). Each one of these perspectives stresses some aspect of the importance of differences in knowledge and experiences of participants (not only linguistic knowledge) for processes of learning.

pants in conversation bring with them knowledge of such features and act, under normal circumstances, according to this knowledge when they speak or interpret what is being said. Members of the same community are, within CA, assumed to share knowledge of this kind (or "competences" cf. Heritage (1984: 241)) and it is displayed in "stable organizational patterns of action to which the participants are oriented" (Heritage, 1984: 241). This is, as Kurhila (2003) notes, an aspect of CA which makes it challenging to use in investigations of conversations involving speakers from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. She states: "CA set out to study members' practices, which are taken to be shared and arise from shared competencies involved in being a user of a language. It has thus been (at least tacitly) assumed that sharing practices presupposes sharing a language (cf. Firth, 1996)" (Kurhila, 2003: 23). It may, however, be questioned to what degree this presumption really obtains or if it is simply a matter so far overlooked, as the main body of CA-work up until recently has dealt with conversations involving speakers of the same language who live in the same society. Recent CA studies of talk-in-interaction involving NNSs of a language have focused on the means by which understanding is achieved (Kalin, 1995; Kurhila, 2003). The results of these studies present interesting details about how participants handle understanding difficulties when they do not share the linguistic resources to interact in the way NSs do.

Two questions of importance for a CA analysis of talk-in-interaction involving NNSs are to what extent participants who face speaking and/or understanding difficulties manage to orient to stable patterns of social organisation, and, whether or not the conditions created when linguistic asymmetry is involved, should be approached/treated as a specific circumstance with an organisation of its own? It is, of course, possible that participants who share neither a language nor a culture, may still share knowledge about how to behave, what to say, what to expect, and how to interpret a range of situations (Gumperz, 1992b: 51). It seems, however, that one primary orientation of many NNSs is to overcome the obstacles in producing and understanding the second/foreign language, and for the NSs (in NS-NNS conversations) to orient to the activity of promoting understanding.

A further assumption of CA is that every contribution to talk is context oriented in the sense of being "both *context-shaped* and *context-renewing*" (Heritage, 1984: 242), i.e. each contribution to talk is shaped by reference to preceding context (talk) and constitutes, in itself, grounds for subsequent interpretation and contributions. In this sense the thoughts of CA and ethnography intersect (cf. "moves" in Gumperz, 1992ab, 2003) as participants are viewed as drawing from preceding contexts in order to interpret contributions to talk, as well as displaying understanding, which, in turn, is interpreted and responded to in subsequent contributions (Goffman, 1981; Linell & Gustavsson, 1987; Linell, 1998; Gumperz, 1992abc, 2003). Thus, actions and responses to actions in talk-in-interaction are sequentially organised and shaped and reshaped by participants (Boden & Zimmerman, 1991). These manifested conversational patterns create expectations in interlocutors, i.e. that individuals within reasonably similar groups (communities, societies etc.) know the linguistic as well as behavioural register of their society[13] (Schegloff, 1990). When it comes to syntax, it is also assumed that speakers of a language carry with them a certain knowledge that makes them produce and perceive utterances of a certain structure, expecting others to conform to this pattern[14]. This assumption is, of course, less clear-cut for interactions involving foreign language users. Still, the major parts of the conversations studied here show that the Swedish participants have developed a knowledge of English that enables them to produce contributions to talk that are treated by the English NSs as perfectly comprehensible.

The last of CA's assumptions concerns the way data should be approached. Firstly, no details in conversation "can be dismissed *a priori* as insignificant" (Heritage, 1984: 242). The data should be analysed departing from what participants themselves orient to in a

---

[13] It is, however, quite clear that the sequential organization of common activities, e.g. telephone calls, varies even within reasonably similar societies (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1991).

[14] Interlocutors' ability to design talk and to foresee what potentially comes next in a turn constructional unit or turn is discussed by Fox & Jaspersen (1995: 116), who take into account constructions such as lexical heads with slots for arguments, as well as more lexicalized (formulaic) constructions, referring to Pawley & Syder's (1983) work on "native-like selection".

moment of talk-in-interaction. Accordingly, the analyst cannot base a study on predetermined social categories, such as "non-native speaker", since it cannot be presumed that participants act in a certain way just because they are not NSs of a language. "Non-nativeness" can only be described at points where there is evidence in the data of a participant's orientation to this type of membership. This, again, is not unproblematic for the analyst who wants to approach talk-in-interaction involving NNSs. On the one hand, there are aspects of the talk of NNSs that are clearly "non-native-like" in the sense that in comparison to some native "standard", the language of the NNSs very often displays pronunciation, vocabulary, and collocations that a NS (as well as other NNSs) would perceive as foreign or odd. On the other hand, these features are not necessarily oriented to or made relevant in a conversation. They are simply there. CA analysis of NS-NNS talk-in-interaction, however, has proven useful in order to target ways in which participants do make "nativeness" and "non-nativeness" relevant categories (Kalin, 1995; Kurhila, 2003: 304). This is an issue attended to in this dissertation as well.

1.3.2 Ethnography

Ethnography investigates how social organisation is manifested and maintained in communicative activities and uses different techniques for analysis of speech events than recordings only, e.g. observation, note-taking, and interviews. The various techniques are employed in order to understand the surrounding circumstances that affect participants' interpretations of an ongoing activity. Ethnography, then, acknowledges participants' background knowledge and experiences and how they affect as well as are affected by the context of the interactional event. Knowledge is gained from participation in interaction in different situations over time. Such a view is consequential for language learning and conversations involving participants from varying backgrounds. Learning of a first, second or foreign language, from this perspective, involves managing to incorporate, not only adequate grammar, vocabulary and prosody, but knowledge of what behaviour, verbal and non-verbal, is appropriate in relation to different events

from moment to moment within a society. As mentioned in the intro-
duction, rather than just focusing on linguistic competence, inter-
actional competence (Jacoby & Ochs, 1995; Eerdmans, 2003) is
stressed, i.e. the ability to employ the adequate competencies for any
moment in interaction.

As people engage in interaction, they continuously interpret what is
going on and what is being said. Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz (1982: 17)
describe listeners' interpretations of speakers' intent[15] as "a function
of (a) listeners' linguistic knowledge (b) contextual presuppositions
informed by certain cues, and (c) background information brought to
bear on the interpretation". Conditions for participants' interpreta-
tions may, however, vary considerably, e.g. in interactions involving
NNSs, or, between speakers of varieties of the same language (cf.
Gumperz, 1992c). The linguistic knowledge of participants is an impor-
tant asset in order to interpret what is going on in the first place, and,
not the least, in order to express this interpretation and thereby con-
tribute to the construction of the activity. But linguistic knowledge, of
course, combines with world knowledge for satisfactory interpreta-
tions. Scollon & Scollon (1995) point to how participants' interpreta-
tions in intercultural conversation (or "interdiscourse communica-
tion"[16]) is facilitated if participants share, not only linguistic knowl-
edge, but a knowledge of what behaviour is to be expected from one's
interlocutor in different situations. Such a cultural awareness facili-
tates interpretations, the joint construction of an activity, and also
enhances the ability to avoid, or at least, understand misunderstand-
ings when they occur. These aspects of interpretation are of impor-
tance for the conversations investigated in this dissertation. Although
the situation of the recording, for the NNSs and some of the NSs, is
associated with foreign language education, their individual contribu-
tions to the conversations are coloured by their cultural backgrounds,

---

[15] Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz (1982: 17) specify that speaker intent is meant in the sense of
"socially recognized communicative intent that is implied in particular kinds of social
activities signalled in discourse".

[16] "Interdiscourse communication" is a general term used by Scollon & Scollon (1995) that
covers a full range of discourse systems, e.g. between men and women, across genera-
tions, different social groups, within a workplace etc. Intercultural conversation is
included as one such discourse system.

world knowledge and personal experiences that may differ from as well as concur with that of their interlocutor. As the participants are friends, they have also established shared knowledge/experiences.

A major benefit of ethnography is that it provides the analyst with different types of data. As described in section 1.2, participants took part in a viewing session within a few days of the first recording, and provided retrospective comments on moments in their conversations that they found interesting. The nature of these comments ranges from how they perceive their own verbal and non-verbal behaviour, to instances where they think that they do not make themselves clear, that they do not understand their interlocutor, and also to how they perceive the recording situation. In the analytic chapters, the data from these viewing sessions is mainly used to add a nuance to analyses on the micro-level of the conversational material. Whereas CA methodology may be described as relying on the analyst's co-membership with participants, ethnography allows for "triangulation" of materials (Gumperz, 2003: 117), i.e. the analyst checks his or her interpretations of an event with different, related materials, e.g. comments from an interview, other scholars' interpretation of the data, and preceding and/or subsequent sources within the data that may prove relevant for the sequence of interest. As Gumperz (2003) points out, attempting to understand how participants in interaction perceive an activity, comes down to a matter of interpretation that may, of course, be inaccurate. The more relevant contextual information an analyst has access to, however, the greater is the likelihood of conducting valid interpretations.

1.3.3 Studies of second and foreign language acquisition[17]

Conversations involving NNSs have been the focus of studies that are concerned with language learning (or acquisition). Different S/FLA

---

[17] Krashen (1982) distinguishes between "learning" and "acquisition", the former referring to gaining knowledge of rules of grammar from learning in the classroom, whereas the latter refers to the way grammar and vocabulary are stored and automatized in long term memory. Acquisition is claimed to take place only in "meaningful interaction", preferably in natural settings. In his original works, Krashen claimed that learned rules could not become acquired, a statement which he has later modified.

approaches to this type of interaction have in common that acquisition may be traced to the "input" (and particularly "modified input") that the NNS receives (Krashen, 1982; Long, 1983; Gass & Varonis, 1985ab, Varonis & Gass, 1985; Pica, 1988; Pica, Lincoln-Porter, Paninos & Linnell, 1996; Gass, 1997) and/or the "output" (Swain, 1985; Nobuyoshi & Ellis, 1993; Swain & Lapkin, 1995) that the learner produces. The notion of input originates in the work of Stephen Krashen (1982), who claimed that the ultimate condition for language acquisition is when learners are exposed to a level of language that is slightly above that of their present level of competence, i.e. "i+1" (input+1) (Krashen, 1982: 20 ff.). It is implied that a linguistically superior, e.g. a NS, a teacher, or a parent, adjusts his/her talk in a way that provides the learner with adequate "comprehensible input".

Just as the form of input has been the focus of many studies, Swain (1985) worked with the hypothesis that learning/acquisition must take place as a NNS attempts to formulate utterances in the target language. More recent studies have concentrated on instances where learners "notice a gap" in their linguistic knowledge (Schmidt & Frota, 1986; Schmidt, 1990, 1993) and by various means try to get round the difficulties[18].

The more prominent lines of thought about language acquisition through interaction are captured in interactionist[19] models (cf. Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991, Markee, 2000, for an overview) where "negotiation for meaning" (Gass & Varonis, 1985ab; Varonis & Gass, 1985; Gass, 1997) is a key concept. In this model, input and output are both important for the acquisition process. As interlocutors engage in conversations, the various modifications/adjustments that are made during these interactions are claimed to benefit the way input becomes "intake", i.e. integrated with the rest of the learner's present second/ foreign language system. Once this has taken place, the acquired

---

[18] These means are denoted "communication strategies" (e.g. Faerch & Kasper, 1983, for an overview) and are described further in chapter 2, section 2.5.

[19] "Interactionist" here is not to be confused with CA perspectives on social interaction. There is a branch within S/FLA research that is often referred to as "interactionists", e.g. Long (1983, 1996) and his associates (e.g. Long & Porter, 1985; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991) .

knowledge is involved in processes of language output. Output, in turn, affects the adjustments of the NS in negotiations for meaning, and in this way acquisition results from interaction.

Interactionists within S/FLA research place a great deal of responsibility for the acquisition process on the person who is linguistically knowledgeable, since it is the adjustments that lead to comprehension that are vital. Long (1983, 1996) works on finding evidence for the hypothesis that conversational adjustments lead to acquisition. He states that "negotiation of meaning, and especially negotiation work that triggers interactional adjustments by the NS or more competent interlocutor, facilitates acquisition because it connects input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways" (Long, 1996: 451–452). It has, however, been hard to find empirically valid proof for the link between comprehension and acquisition, whereas it is clear that participants' adjustments enhance understanding (or comprehension, which is a more commonly used term in S/FLA studies). The hard part is to find out just how the adjustments made in order to achieve mutual understanding, e.g. clarification requests, confirmation checks, recasts and reformulations, affect the acquisition process, and also, what parts of language are acquired by these means. One of the more ambitious attempts to deal with these questions is Mackey, Gass & McDonough (2000) who investigated how learners perceive interactional feedback, i.e. input.

Although the objects of study of research on S/FLA and CA sometimes concur (particularly "repair" in the form of the adjustments mentioned above), the aims of the two fields are clearly different. Whereas the interest of S/FLA studies primarily is processes of language learning and acquisition in the sense of cognitive internalisation of vocabulary and syntactic rules and structures, CA stresses language *use* as people partake in social activities, with little or no focus on learning (an exception is Markee, 2000).

From the middle of the 1990s, CA has objected to a number of theoretical and methodological aspects of studies of input and output (Firth 1996; Firth & Wagner, 1997; Wagner, 1996, 1998; Markee, 2000). The critique has concerned the way in which assumptions are made about the link between comprehension and acquisition, the type of

data studied (often experimental), attempts to generalise from phenomena that might be specific for individual learners/speakers in various settings and participation frameworks, and an emphasis on syntax that downplays the importance of language use.

There are, however, a few CA studies that are influenced by interactionist work (e.g. Kalin, 1995; Lehti-Eklund, 2002; Kurhila, 2003) and this dissertation also follows this tradition. Many of the studies of S/FLA provide interesting results of NNSs' interactional behaviour in different speech exchange systems, e.g. experimental, semi-natural, and the classroom (Chaudron, 1988; Lyster & Ranta, 1997). There are many descriptions of sequences of talk-in-interaction where NNSs on various levels of second/foreign language proficiency interact with other NNSs or NSs, and of how understanding is created and maintained in these contexts. Although the aims of this dissertation and S/FLA studies differ, the vast body of work on modified input and output cannot be neglected.

1.3.4 Learning theories

The perspective of learning that is compatible with studies of interlocutors' employment of repair as a means for maintaining interaction, is Vygotsky's (1986) notion of scaffolding, i.e. participants in interaction collaboratively construct talk, and when faced with trouble, a participant with the required competence (e.g. linguistic skill) assists less skilled participants in developing their linguistic knowledge. Cognitive development (including the development of language) takes place in situated activity (Wertsch, 1979, 1985; Lave & Wenger, 1991).Vygotsky applied the term mainly in relation to children's first language development, but the idea of the successive development of knowledge through interaction with others, is popular in research on the learning of a second or foreign language (e.g. Lantolf & Appel, 1994, for an overview). This view has much in common with ethnographic perspectives on how knowledge development is intertwined with the socialisation process (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986; Kramsch, 2002). Language is, from this perspective, only one aspect of knowledge that develops in interaction with others. And, importantly, language is not

viewed as an abstract system of rules, but comprises interactional competences that are related to social/pragmatic abilities in a wide sense. Some such behaviours are culture specific but some may also be universal, e.g. the ability to take a turn and to construct sequences in talk-in-interaction (Lehti-Eklund, 2002). There is evidence that even in participation frameworks where there is "asymmetry" in linguistic knowledge, the turn-taking system is robust and appropriately attended to by participants, despite limitations in the ability to construct spoken language that conforms to forms recognised as "standardized" by a majority of speakers[20]. Talk-in-interaction involving NNSs and NSs is, of course, one such system where turn-taking competences are revealed. Whereas there are no problems in taking a turn, or knowing that a response to a turn is requested, the major problems of NNSs seem to be to fill a turn-at-talk with understandable contents, displaying understanding of a prior turn, and/or contributing to the development of a topic etc. This last aspect, of course, points at the importance of vocabulary learning for second/foreign language speakers. It should be mentioned that a broadened view upon language learning as comprising knowledge that is not of a purely linguistic nature (from a traditional perspective that is), is not to dismiss these important parts of the development of interactional competence. Many CA influenced studies, this one included, often describe isolated conversations and do not capture aspects of, for example, word learning, since such phenomena tend to require studies of a longitudinal nature. There is, however, some such research, e.g. Wootton (1997), who studies how a child comes to develop a knowledge of the sequential organisation of interaction in a first language, and Pallotti (2001), who studied a five-year-old girl's development of her second language, describing how she attempted to partake in activities and how she successively came to adopt the appropriate actions and language from interacting with others.

---

[20] Goodwin (1995, 2003) shows that aphasics are well aware of the turn-taking system.

1.4 Turns-at-talk and turn constructional units

A turn-at-talk (or just turn) refers to a participant's spoken contribution to a conversation. Turns are of varying length, from single words or vocal expressions to longer stretches of speech. They may also occur in overlap as participants sometimes talk simultaneously. By and large, one may say that a person holds a turn at a specific moment whereas other people attend to the turn in various ways, e.g. listening and/or providing feedback signals (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). Turns-at-talk are made up of turn constructional units (TCUs). A turn that consists of a single word, a single clause, or sentence, is also made up of a single TCU. Longer turns however, consist of multiple TCUs. The exact nature of a TCU is still a matter of investigation (e.g. Ford & Thompson, 1996; Schegloff, 1996; Selting, 1996, 1998) but most researchers agree that participants in conversation recognize these units in accordance with the interplay of syntactic, prosodic, semantic and pragmatic features of a stretch of speech. Although these units have a fair amount in common with written language forms such as "sentence", "clause", or "phrase", studies show that syntactic "completion" in a traditional sense is not the only criterion in order for a chunk of speech to be interpreted as a potentially complete turn (Ford & Thompson, 1996; Selting, 1998). What is of particular interest is that people are able to predict the possible ending of a unit before it is actually completed. Participants in conversation thus perceive "projections" of different kinds, i.e. the possible syntactic, prosodic and/or semantic continuations of an utterance in progress. Such expectations are of great interest for studies of repair, since indications of uncertainty concerning the production of these recognizable units signal that a speaker is facing some trouble. They may also invite an interlocutor to come to assistance in order to complete the TCU.

Units that are interpreted as possibly complete allow for speaker change. These points are denoted transition relevance places (TRPs). Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson (1974) provide a framework for how speaker transition is performed in conversations. However, as Selting (1998) points out, it is not the case that any unit that appears syntacti-

cally, prosodically, semantically and pragmatically complete, necessarily allows for speaker change. Participants also take into account the type of activity that they are engaged in. An example of a multi-unit turn comprising possibly complete units occurs in story-telling, where the activity as such blocks speaker transition until the project of the story is understood as completed. Selting (1998) also shows how prosody can be used by a speaker in order to indicate that there is more to come, despite syntactic, semantic and pragmatic completeness. A unit that appears, at least in retrospect, to be finished, does not lead to speaker change, since there are various ways in which the speaker may indicate to the recipient that there is more to come. These subtle means, or contextualisation cues (Gumpertz, 1992abc), contribute to a participant's interpretation of a unit or turn as complete or incomplete. TCUs in this dissertation are interpreted according to their syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, and prosodic features, keeping in mind the complex interplay of these factors.

Interlocutors' interpretations of the completeness of turns and units are of great importance for the present study, since repairs are a means of structuring and restructuring talk in progress. CA studies show that speakers who share a common culture and language (or languages) also share tools for interpretation and for collaborative construction of turns-at-talk. Studies of conversations that involve speakers who use a language other than their mother tongue, may add to the understanding of how interlocutors in such speech exchange systems manage to interpret units in talk as well as how they are able to construct such units themselves.

1.5 Transcription and transcription conventions

The transcription conventions in this dissertation are adapted, with some modifications, from Ochs et al. (1996). The recordings that took place in the Student Union were transcribed in full using CLAN software. The retrospective viewing sessions were also transcribed, how-

ever, not in as great detail as the original recordings, since the main focus of the retrospections was *what* was being said rather than *how* something was said (In fact, everything in the original recordings was treated as potentially relevant, in a true CA spirit). A weakness of the present study, however, is the lack of prosodic detail, plus the fact that non-verbal aspects of the conversations are mainly mentioned in the body of the text when relevant, and not so often in the transcript. There are conventions for describing non-verbal communication (e.g. Goodwin, 1981; Heath, 1997). The major reason not to employ these means rests in the choice of analysing fairly long stretches of talk (particularly in chapters 5 and 6) and the addition of another transcription system would be very space consuming. I have, however, tried to capture instances of non-verbal cues and marked prosody in the text when they are relevant for the repair strategies being investigated. The following conventions were used:

[ ]	overlapping utterances	> <	quicker pace
=	turn immediately latched to the previous one	< >	slower pace
		,	continuing intonation
-	interruption	?	question intonation
(0.6)	pause	.	falling intonation
:	extension of a phoneme	!	exclamation
hel<u>lo</u>	stressed syllable	↑	high rise
°mhm°	quiet talk	↓	high fall
.hh	inbreath	(x)	one inaudible word
h.hh	outbreath	(x x)	two inaudible words
he	laughter	(yes)	unclear hearing
yes	laughter in voice	(( ))	transcriber's comment
wha'	word not fully pronunced		

The points of interest in the transcription excerpts are marked with boldface. Sometimes an extensive exchange between participants is of interest. The whole section is then boldfaced and moments of speech of special importance are referred to with line numbers in the body of the text. As far as line numbering is concerned, it follows speaker turns, i.e. a long turn is not divided into plenty of lines but gets one number (the number of the turn). Pauses that appear between speaker changes get their own numbers. Turn-numbers of the transcription

excerpts do not always start with number one, but could start, for example, with number 312. This is to give the reader an idea of how far into the conversation an example occurs.

1.6 Outline of the thesis

The dissertation is divided into four parts. Part I comprises, apart from the introduction and the considerations concerning method just presented, a chapter that gives an overview of different approaches to repair within CA, S/FLA and psycholinguistics. There is also a critical discussion of the term "repair" and a specification of how repair is viewed in this study.

Parts II and III comprise the analytic parts of the text and are divided according to the types of repair being investigated. Part II primarily deals with such instances of repair that are carried out by one and the same speaker. The motivation for presenting this category of repair separated from such repair strategies that involve the collaboration of interlocutors over a number of turns-at-talk, is simply that the study of this former type of repair involves some theoretical and methodological difficulties that may benefit from an introduction of their own. Chapters 3 and 4 both stress the interactional character of self-initiated self-repair and how this type of repair, apart from mending troubles as they have already occurred, may also display the participants' anticipation of possible interactional difficulties. The chapters point to some similarities and differences in the conversational conduct of NNSs and NSs and discuss these results in relation to current issues addressed in CA and S/FLA research. These issues concern theoretical assumptions dealing with membership categories such as "NNS" and "NS", and how the employment of a repair strategy may represent or misrepresent a participant as a "competent speaker". Chapter 4 looks at repair that occurs as a participant indicates uncertainty of a word. Since some such troubles are solved by the speaker him/herself, and others lead to collaboratively accomplished repair, this chapter serves as a link to part III.

Part III presents analyses of collaboratively accomplished repair

sequences. In chapter 5, cases are investigated in which a participant finds something in the prior speaker's talk problematic. The chapter focuses on mismatches in participants' interpretations of a turn-at-talk (or an activity) and how such misinterpretations are solved. The instances of repair are discussed in the light of conversational coherence, i.e. why a contribution to talk may be reacted to as being "out of place". The chapter also presents cases where the link between repair-initiation and the source of trouble is easily identifiable, e.g. when a participant faces hearing difficulties. Chapter 6 investigates instances where one participant attempts to correct something in the prior speaker's turn-at-talk. Such other-initiated other-repair is uncommon in casual conversation and there were very few instances of this phenomenon in the data analysed here. Nonetheless, the cases found exhibit some interesting aspects of the behaviour of the NNSs (and in one case a NS) as they are being "corrected" by a NS peer. The chapter brings to the fore issues concerning the effect of language and topic knowledge in relation to the occurrence of other-initiated other-repair and how this type of repair is responded to.

In part IV the results from the analyses presented in parts II and III are discussed in relation to the aims of the dissertation and to the theoretical considerations taken. The discussion also comprises some suggestions for future investigations arising from results and observations of the present study. The dissertation is concluded in chapter 8.

2. Repair

Repair is a key concept within CA, and it is commonly investigated within S/FLA research, although under a different label, i.e. as "communication strategies". There are, however, sometimes discrepancies in the definitions of what phenomena should be comprised by the term, within CA as well as within other theoretical and methodological fields (cf. Tarone, 1980, for a discussion). The aim of this chapter is to review some of the more prominent lines of thought about, and definitions of repair within CA and studies of S/FLA. One section of the chapter discusses the prospects and consequences of using terminology such as "trouble source" and "repair" for phenomena that permeate conversations in general. Also, last in this chapter there is a brief discussion of structural aspects of spoken language in the sense of the turn constructional unit (TCU). This section is perhaps of greatest importance for the analyses of self-initiated self-repairs, since these are commonly defined as repair specifically because they obstruct a participant's execution of a unit in one or more ways.

2.1 CA and repair

The breakthrough and establishment of the term "repair" came with the work by Schegloff, et al. (1977), whose analyses of the organisation of the turn-taking system have served as a platform for many subsequent categorisations and studies of repair. Their basic description of repair in conversation allows for a wide interpretation (1977: 363):

> 'An organisation of repair' operates in conversation, addressed to recurrent problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding.

Schegloff et al. note that repair may occur in utterances where there is no "hearable error, mistake or fault" (1977: 363) and that a hearable error, in turn, "does not necessarily yield the occurrence of repair/correction"(1977:363). They also describe what constitutes the trouble source, i.e. what it is in interaction that needs to be fixed by means of repair:

> We will refer to that which the repair addresses as the 'repairable' or the 'trouble source'. In view of the point about repair being initiated with no apparent error, it appears that nothing is, in principle, excludable from the class 'repairable'.

Anything that participants perceive and make relevant as a problem of speaking, hearing and understanding may be labelled "trouble source" and is resolved by means of repair. Therefore, repair comprises processes of speech production, i.e. speaking in the sense of finding words and forming utterances in a satisfactory way, and speech perception, i.e. reaching a sufficient level of understanding to be able to continue a dialogue in an, for participants, adequate way.

The organisation of repair described by Schegloff et al. (1977) comprises four categories, depending on the indication, initiation and resolution of a point of trouble. Each of these categories are described in greater detail in subsequent sections but can be briefly described as follows: Repair may be initiated by "self", i.e. the speaker who holds the turn and suddenly finds something in his/her own speech troublesome. The trouble is commonly solved within a single turn and described as *self-initiated self-repair* (or even same turn self-initiated self-repair if one wants to stress the fact that repair is initiated within the same turn that comprised the trouble source). If the present speaker is unable to solve the difficulty, s/he may appeal for the assistance of an interlocutor, i.e. the "other", yielding *self-initiated other-repair*. *Other-initiated self-repair* concerns such cases where a participant does not hear or understand something uttered in a prior turn and therefore makes the speaker aware of the difficulties. The speaker of the troublesome turn then repairs in the turn following the initiation. Finally, a participant in conversation may initiate repair of

another speaker's turn-at-talk. These *other-initiated other-repairs* are strongly associated with the act of correction and rarely appear in casual conversations.

That there is a source of trouble is indicated in various ways depending on whether it is the speaker, or the recipient, who finds something problematic. In order to describe the techniques that participants use to target the trouble, it may be valuable to discuss the notions of indication of trouble and initiation of repair as these can be viewed as two sides of the same coin. Indication of trouble, e.g. hesitant speech, prolonged sounds, long pauses, self- or other- directed comments such as "what's it called", non-verbal signs such as a thoughtful face or other gestures indicate to the recipient that the speaker is searching for a word, or is occupied with formulating what to say. These indications are often referred to as initiation techniques (Schegloff et al., 1977). The indications function as a trigger for repair to be conducted, by self or by other. In order to speak about self-initiated other-repair, however, one could perhaps elaborate on the extent to which the speaker who experiences some difficulty is turning to the recipient for help. There are degrees to which a phrase such as "I can't find the word" is directed towards the recipient. When participants interpret whether indications of trouble should be treated as an invitation for repair or not, gaze has turned out to be decisive, i.e. if the speaker is looking at the recipient as s/he is talking, this is more likely to be responded to with other-repair, than if the speaker is looking elsewhere (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Kurhila, 2003). Likewise, when an interlocutor does not hear or understand something previously expressed, there are many ways in which these difficulties can be indicated to the prior speaker.

In the following, each category of repair is presented as defined by CA research.Within these categories there are subclasses of repair based on different criteria, e.g. the nature of the trouble, the way repair is initiated, or on how the structure of a unit of talk is affected when participants face some kind of trouble and conduct repair.

2.2 Self-initiated self-repair within CA

Descriptions of self-initiated self-repair are manifold and there are few studies that systematically investigate them all. In addition, the broad definition of repair as addressing "recurrent problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding" (Schegloff et al., 1977: 363) makes the interpretation of self-repair a complex matter. Here, some of the more prominent CA works on self-initiated self-repair are presented. However, since repair is such a fundamental concept and the literature vast, many important works are left out. The selected sources presented here, however, are meant to give an overview of the field.

Within CA, self-initiated self-repair is described as a cut off (or stopped) unit of speech in a turn-at-talk within a word or at a word/phrase boundary, due to some source of trouble (the nature of which is not always transparent). The stop is followed by a repair, the function of which is to adjust or alter the utterance in progress in a way that the speaker finds satisfactory. Apart from simply a stop in the flow of speech, hesitation markers, e.g. "uh", pauses or prolonged sounds, may, as mentioned, work as initiators (Schegloff et al., 1977; Schegloff, 1979). Example (2:1) illustrates a case of self-initiated self-repair. Magnus (Ma) is one of the NNSs who participate in the present investigation. The point of interest is marked with boldface:

```
(2:1)
183  Ma:  because (0.2) I mean if we don't forgive (0.8) we can't
          excep- e- eh:: expect forgiveness (2.0) ourselves
```

Magnus' initial choice of word "excep-" is cut off before it has been fully pronounced. It is followed by an editing sound and the repair-item "expect" before the unit is continued and completed. The indications such as pauses and hesitation markers vary and are often plentiful when the speaker is searching for a word. Other troubles are indicated differently, or sometimes only indicated by the sudden cut-off, followed by a modification of the unit that was abandoned.

Disrupted units of talk often figure in investigations that emphasise the interdependency between repair and syntax (Goodwin, 1979; Schegloff, 1979; Fox & Jasperson, 1995; Fox, Hayashi & Jasperson, 1996,

the latter from a cross-linguistic perspective). These studies look closely at how the structure of the turn-at-talk in terms of the "sentence" (Goodwin, 1979; Schegloff, 1979) or TCU (Fox & Jasperson, 1995) is affected by repair. Fox & Jasperson (1995:90) present seven ways (types) in which self-initiated self-repair are executed, based on the form of the unit/turn that is cut off and how the syntax is affected by some of the changes that take place as the talk proceeds after the cut-off. Each type described by Fox & Jasperson as self-repair, is exemplified below by means of a short excerpt from the data analysed in this dissertation. The speaker conducting self-repair may be either a NS or a NNS. In relation to the presentation of the different types drawing from Fox & Jasperson (1995), references to other relevant CA sources are also given.

Self-initiated self-repair may involve the repetition of a single word as in example (2:2), or a phrase as in (2:3):

(2:2) Repetition of a word
```
13    Li:   yeah. and I- I felt sorry for my boyfriend too because he
            was so ashamed. (1.1) it was [very embarrassing]
```

(2:3) Repetition of a phrase
```
149   Er:   but then again it's not= it's not wrong to take home
            things (0.9) because you need them (0.8) to do work at
            home
```

The repetitions in the examples above occur as the speaker is expanding on a topic. In (2:2) Linda (Li) initially gives feedback to her interlocutor Erik (Er) before she resumes a story that she was telling him. The repeat of "I" is part of Linda's process of formulating a new unit. In (2:3) Erik repeats a phrase right after an expression that indicates that an elaboration may be expected ("but then again"). None of the examples exhibits hesitation, apart from possibly being indicated by the repeat in itself. Repetitions are studied by Goodwin (1979, 1980, 1981), Schegloff (1987), French & Local (1983), Local (1992). Goodwin (1979, 1980, 1981) stresses the interdependency between repetitions and gaze. He claims that repetitions may be used in order to gain the attention of one's recipient/s, i.e. if the recipient is looking in a direction other than at the speaker, the repeat may draw attention to the speaker. Schegloff (1987) describes the relevance of recycled (repeated)

turn-beginnings. He suggests that repetitions may serve as a device for minimisation of gap and overlap at turn-transitions, and also that it can be an efficient way to compete for the floor, i.e. to become the next speaker in a conversation. He also claims that continuous recycling buys a speaker time in case a word does not immediately come to mind. It appears that depending on the degree of hesitancy indicated by means of the repetitions, they are generally interpreted as if the speaker will continue to talk. There are also suggestions that the occurrence of repetitions depends on the speech rate and speech style of the speaker (Allwood, Nivre & Ahlsén, 1990).

Instead of being repeated, a word or phrase may be "replaced". Two such cases are exemplified in (2:4) and (2:5):

(2:4) Replacement of a word
```
679  An:  [(I was) (x)] but I would probably actually be paying-
          playing Bingo Lotto not se[eing] (x x) on Robin[son (x x)
          friends]
```

(2:5) Replacement of a phrase
```
75   Li:  this just e: showed how much=how little respect she had
          for me
76   Er:  m
```

In (2:4) and (2:5), the cut-off is followed by a repair that may be interpreted as the replacement of one item with another. Once the repair has taken place, the utterance continues as initially projected[1], i.e. the trouble source and the repair can be viewed as filling a "slot" within a (syntactic) unit. The term "replacement" is, of course, not unproblematic since it implies something about interlocutors' interpretations of the trouble source and repair. Fox & Jasperson (1995) point out that not much has been said about hearers' perception of a word or phrase as a replacement of the trouble source. Part of the problem may arise from the fact that the term somehow presupposes a deletion of the preceding item, which Jefferson (1974) argues is not the case.

---

[1] In this sense, the categories presented here differ somewhat from the replacement repairs discussed by Schiffrin (1987). Schiffrin denotes all types of words/longer units that follow a cut-off, and can be interpreted as substituting one idea for another "replacement repairs", whereas the categories presented by Fox & Jasperson (1995) refer to the way elements within a TCU are recycled and may be exchanged within a syntactic slot.

Anne (An) in example (2:4) seems to mispronounce a word. The repair-item that follows is coherent with the continuation of the utterance although it is naturally hard to know what Anne might have been wanting to say at the point of the cut-off. Presuming that Anne had planned to talk about the television show Bingo Lotto, the repair makes sense of an utterance that otherwise would have been perceived as odd, at least for anyone familiar with the show which is (season-wise) broadcasted as a Saturday evening amusement in Sweden. Thus "paying Bingo Lotto" simply does not make much sense to people who share this knowledge, whereas "playing Bingo Lotto" does. Anne assumes (or knows) that her interlocutor Michael knows what Bingo Lotto is, and this is revealed in the repair. In this sense then, it is possible to talk about "replacement" not only from a syntactic point of view, but from a pragmatic[2] one.

Items may also be added to a unit, subsequent to which there is a repetition of the elements that preceded the addition:

(2:6) Repetition with addition
```
31   Ti:  yeah
32   ps:  (0.7)
33   Ma:  whether you steal (0.5)(a) few things or many things.
34   Ti:  bu' you c'n >if you steal a few things ye can get away
          with it (pro[bably)<]
35   Ma:              [oh] that's
```

Example (2:6) conforms to what Schiffrin (1987: 300–301) calls "background repair", i.e. the addition of clarifying/specifying information in order to utilize comprehension. In Tim's (Ti) case, the added if-clause recycles a part of the immediately preceding talk (line 34). It can be noted that additions could be removed without violating any syntactic relations. The importance of the addition seems to be on the semantic level and the main achievement is of a pragmatic nature. The example reveals how repair orchestrates participants' meaning construction, the individual's speech formulation, recipient design in the sense of enhancing understanding, and how prior speech may affect a current formulation.

---

[2] By pragmatic is meant the interactional nature of the repair, i.e. that Anne is designing her talk in certain ways because she knows things about Michael and about the world.

Additions may also affect the syntactic framework of a TCU. In (2:7) the added material embeds previously expressed items and makes them subordinate to a superordinate clause:

(2:7) Repetition with an addition that affects the syntactic framework of a turn-at-talk
```
293  Er:  no exactly (0.4)y-you y- you'll just talk yourself [(x)]
294  Li:                                                     [yeah]
295  ps:  (1.0)
296  Er:  you you'll I think you'll pull yourself further away from
297  ps:  (0.8)
298  Li:  yeah
299  Er:  from belief
```

A unit under construction may suddenly be cut off and followed by something apparently "new" from a syntactic and prosodic point of view. The contents of the new unit often seem related to the talk that preceded the cut-off:

(2:8) Abandonment of a structure, followed by a "new" structure
```
486  Ma:  [okey we're not allowed to. oh no no the thing is] we had
          (0.2) or we have eh one of my teachers at uni (0.8) is
          doing a project on (0.4)human (0.3) value of the value of
487  Ti:  human life
```

In (2:8) Magnus takes the turn after some overlapping talk. As he gets into the clear he begins a unit exhibiting a subject and a verb "we had", which can be interpreted as being replaced with "we have" before there is a little hesitation and a new subject is introduced. This time the unit proceeds beyond the verb. It may be noted that the unit is not completed by Magnus, but by Tim, who obviously has heard Magnus talk about this topic before. Fox & Jasperson (1995) discuss abandoned constructions in the sense of the speaker coming to a grammatical deadlock. It is, however, difficult to know exactly what it is that makes a speaker stop and recast his/her speech. This difficulty is perhaps particularly interesting when one investigates the spoken language of NNSs whose recasts of the type above are often described as strategies used in order to compensate for a lack of vocabulary or a lack of grammatical knowledge. This issue is further dealt with in part II, chapter 4.

In their description of self-intiated self-repair, Fox & Jasperson

(1995) leave out utterances that are cut off and exhibit a hesitation marker, e.g. *uhm* subsequent to which the utterance is continued in a grammatically coherent way. Neither do they investigate utterances that are cut off "as if initiating repair" (1995: 81), i.e. a unit of talk that is cut off, followed by a pause, and then continued. It should be noted, that even if these latter types of modified units are not studied, they are still considered repair phenomena. This means, broadly speaking, that the only units that do not exhibit self-initiated self-repair, are those that come in a syntactically, prosodically and semantically continuous package. This is not entirely unproblematic and is discussed further in section 2.10.

Self-initiated self-repairs thus prototypically take place within a single turn-at-talk. Less commonly, an interlocutor may speak after the turn exhibiting trouble and before the repair:

(2:9) Self-repair in third turn
```
41   Je:   and eh that's two different kind of forgive[ness]
42   Mo:                                         [I- I] think
           that to[o]
43   Je:        [for]give*ness[es I guess*]
44   Mo:                    [mm mm] yeah the o- the other way
           around an' you say I forgive you but not actually [do it]
```

In example (2:9), Jenny (Je) uses the word "forgiveness" and Monica (Mo) responds with agreement. Monica does not seem to find Jenny's utterance at all problematic. Jenny, however, tries out (with slight laughter in her voice) a plural form, adding "I guess" which further displays her uncertainty about the form of the word. The repair is thus "delayed" in the sense that one speaker speaks in between the trouble source and the repair[3].

Although most CA scholars agree with the classifications proposed by Fox & Jaspersen (1995) it is rarely the case that the range of self-initiated self-repairs are studied all at once. Rather, the types of self-repairs that are studied vary according to different research agendas within CA. For example, Schiffrin (1987) mainly deals with self-repair as replacing or redistributing information, and is not concerned with the effects on the grammatical properties of the utterance in

---

[3] This example is commented on further in chapter 3, section 3.1.

progress[4]. Local (1992) studies units that comprise recycling and additions from the perspective of prosody. Jefferson (1974) is concerned with replacements in the sense of "error correction". "Self-correction" it should be noted, is viewed as a subcategory of self-repair (Schegloff et al., 1977). Goffman (1981: 209), however, presents a classification of repair using a terminology quite of his own, dividing errors into "influencies", "slips", "boners" and "gaffes". Whereas the first two classes denote interruptions in the flow of speech such as restarts, repetitions (influencies), and accidental mispronunciation or the mixing up of words (slips), the two latter classes take into account possible motivations for repair, e.g. the speaker's lack of knowledge in some domain. This could refer to topic knowledge, linguistic knowledge, social or world knowledge, which may make an interlocutor appear ignorant, inknowledgeable and even tactless in certain social circumstances. Goffman's (1981) classification nicely covers the range of phenomena studied in this dissertation. However, I have chosen not to use his terminology in the analytic chapters but keep to the more overarching "self-initiated self-repair". Subsections further present the nature of participants' trouble and the achievement of repair.

In sum: CA studies of self-initiated self-repair in native conversations approach cut off units of talk from three interrelated angles. On the one hand, the function of self-initiated self-repair as a means to organise the syntax of speech, a "syntax-for-conversation" (Schegloff, 1979) is emphasised. On the other hand, studies focus on the interactional relevance of self-repair, e.g. as a means to take a turn, to project the continuation of an utterance, to "mark time" in the search for a word or expression, to gain the attention (and gaze) of a recipient or

---

[4] Schiffrin (1987: 300–301) distinguishes between "background repairs" and "replacement repairs" suggesting that "Background repairs are subordinate asides which provide information to modify and/or supplement hearers' understanding of surrounding material. After the speaker inserts the aside into discourse, s/he repeats or paraphrases the material which had been interrupted" (1987: 300). Background repairs correspond to example (2:6). Replacement repairs are described as substitutions of a speaker's intention. The form of such repair may be the exchange of words or phrases within a syntactic "slot" (cf. (2:4) and (2:5)), or reformulations, i.e. an utterance is abandoned and the turn-at-talk takes a different syntactic and semantic course than was the case up to the point of the cut-off (corresponding approximately to (2:8)).

to conduct a correction of one's speech (Goodwin, 1979, 1980, 1981; Schegloff, 1979). Finally, as an encompassing framework, repair (not only self-initiated self-repair) is viewed as the resource that participants employ in order to create and maintain intersubjectivity in conversation (Schegloff, 1990, 1991, 1992a).

As far as NNSs are concerned, CA investigations of self-initiated self-repair are few in number. In most cases self-initiated self-repair is briefly dealt with together with more thorough investigations of complex[5] repair sequences (e.g. McHoul, 1990 [6]; Kalin, 1995; Rasmussen & Wagner, 2001; Kurhila, 2003; Brouwer, 2004). The restricted interest in self-initiated self-repair in second and foreign language data is most likely explained by the fact that almost anything in the talk of NNSs on the beginner's level of language learning, could be viewed as self-initiated repair, or unresolved trouble. Schwartz[7] (1980), however, provides an interesting account of self-initiated self-repairs in the talk of university students who attend classes in English as a second language. Schwartz emphasises the interactional function of repair as a means of achieving understanding in conversation, taking into account extra-linguistic features (gaze, gestures) apart from simply looking at different types of repair. One result of her investigation is that the preference-pattern for self-repair detected in casual native conversation (Schegloff et al., 1977) also holds for her informants. A recent study of self-repair in the form of recycled turn beginnings is also provided by Carroll (2004). Like Schwartz, and similar to findings by Goodwin (1979, 1980, 1981) and Schegloff (1987) for native conversations, Carroll (2004) emphasises how novice second language speakers use repeats at turn-beginnings as different resources, for instance to start in the clear at points of overlapping speech, and for gaining the attention (and gaze) of recipients.

---

[5] "Complex" refers to such repair sequences where interlocutors collaborate on the resolution of a trouble.

[6] In Mc Houl's (1990) study, teachers conducted self-initiated self-repairs more than students did. This difference in frequency of occurrence was explained by the imbalance in speaking time, i.e. largely, the teacher holds the floor during class.

[7] Schwartz (1980) also looks at complex repair-sequences, but in the first part of her paper, she presents analyses of self-initiated self-repairs.

Word search has received attention, but not specifically in the form of self-initiated self-repair, since it invites "other" to assist or to repair, leading to collaboration of the interlocutors over many turns (Gaskill, 1980; Schwartz, 1980; Kurhila, 2003, for a detailed report on word search in NS-NNS talk-in-interaction). Word search is discussed in greater detail in section 2.4 below.

2.3 S/FLA and psycholinguistic approaches to self-initiated self-repair

Some of the self-initiated self-repairs studied in CA coincide with S/FLA studies of communication strategies (e.g. Tarone, 1980; Faerch & Kasper, 1983; Bialystok, 1990; Kasper & Kellerman, 1997). The measures that the NNSs take to overcome troubles in speaking are described as either productive or reductive (Faerch & Kasper, 1983) depending on to what extent the strategies may contribute successfully to the speaker's ability to communicate and whether or not they are beneficial to the language learning process. Reductions comprise units that are abandoned (primarily syntactically) and ways in which NNSs are assumed to avoid a difficulty, e.g. by means of codeswitching. Within this field, it is assumed that the different strategies used by NNSs come as a result of their *lack of* proficiency in the target language. Bialystok (1990) however, notes that there are many similarities in the ways that NSs and NNSs structure and modify their turns-at-talk, and that it may be venturesome to assume that NNSs always recast their talk as a result of linguistic deficiencies. Although this problem is acknowledged by Bialystok (1990), it is not considered in many S/FLA studies and has contributed to the already mentioned methodological debate between scholars of CA and S/FLA (cf. chapter 1, section 1.1). One main point of criticism from the part of CA is that NNSs in studies of S/FLA are viewed as deficient communicators and not as participants in a conversation in their own right. CA emphasises that problems in speaking, hearing and understanding should be studied based on what participants orient to as troublesome at a particular

moment in talk. Nativeness and/or non-nativeness or language learn-ing may or may not be issues in relation to such orientations.

Although psycholinguistics was not introduced among the fields of research that have influenced the present study, it ought to be men-tioned here since it, in fact, is an area in which CA and S/FLA interests partly intersect. In addition, psycholinguistics provides many studies of self-repair drawing from native as well as non-native speech data. Some such studies are of a comparative nature, involving children (Fathman, 1980), adults (Seliger, 1980; Wiese, 1984; van Hest, 1996; van Hest, Poulisse & Bongearts, 1997) or NNSs only (Kormos, 1999, for an overview).

Psycholinguistics is concerned with posing models for speech pro-duction (e.g. Laver, 1980; Levelt, 1983, 1989), and rules for the monitor-ing, detection and repair of "errors" in speech (Nooteboom, 1980; Levelt, 1983; Blackmer & Mitton, 1991) and self-repair behaviour in the sense of the type of trouble that is repaired (Levelt, 1983; Blackmer & Mitton, 1991; van Hest, 1996; Kormos, 1999) The tradition of studying slips of the tongue reaches far back in time (Hockett, 1967; Fay & Cut-ler, 1978; Fromkin, 1980, for an overview).

Levelt (1983) has offered an influential classification system for self-initiated self-repairs. In his framework self-repairs are classified according to what a speaker is monitoring for. According to Levelt, there are repairs for lexical, phonological and syntactic errors, and for appropriateness in the sense that lexical items may be replaced or an utterance reformulated in order to enhance clarity and comprehensi-bility. Levelt also distinguishes between "overt" and "covert" repairs, the former referring to such instances of self-repair that are observable in the utterance as a trouble source, cut-off, editing term and repair item, and, the latter to utterances that only show an interruption and an editing term (cf. the types that Fox & Jasperson excluded from their study but nonetheless were referred to as repair), or repetitions. Covert repairs are particularly problematic "in that it is almost always impossible to determine what the speaker is monitoring for" (Levelt, 1983: 55). They are, however, treated as an argument in favour of "inner speech" which is monitored before an utterance is articulated. Blackmer & Mitton (1991) suggest that repeats without pauses or hesi-

tations could be autonomous restarts ascribed to the process of articulation, and used when material for the continuation of an utterance is not yet accessed by the speaker. Although spoken of in different terms, covert repairs thus concur with CA descriptions of the means by which a speaker for example indicates that more talk is to be expected (a turn-holding device).

CA, S/FLA theory, and psycholinguistics thus tend to approach cut-off units of talk from partly concurring, partly diverging perspectives. There will be reasons to return to these different perspectives, since analyses of self-initiated self-repair in the talk of NSs and NNSs are perhaps not ideally viewed from one angle only.

2.4 Self-initiated other-repair within CA

By means of self-initiation speakers indicate to their current recipient/s that there is some trouble in production, e.g. that they cannot find a particular word or name (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). Self-initiated other-repair is often referred to as "word search" although it is not always the case that the trouble oriented to by the speaker is the lack of a word. In the case of NNSs' turns-at-talk, it appears that speakers sometimes display uncertainty of the grammatical form of an item, as well as sometimes search for longer expressions[8]. At times it is impossible to determine what the speaker is searching for. The turn-taking format for self-initiated other-repair is represented by example (2:10). The search, other-repair, and response to the repair are marked with boldface:

```
(2:10)
134  Ce:   so (0.7) (°cause°) (1.3) (Don an) Nellie ar:e (0.2) gonna
           go (0.3) or well they might go (0.8) ehm (1.2) some time
           in November (1.4) and they're only paying a hundred some
           crowns because (0.5) the- you know ahm (0.8) nt (0.3)
           ah::eh oh I can't think of his name right now (1.3)
           that Swedish guy in our (0.9) in our European (and)
           (inte[gration)]
```

---

[8] Cf. chapter 4 in this dissertation. Likewise, Kurhila (2003:183–201) presents "grammatical" searches.

```
135  Em:        [jo-] jo- jo- Johan
136  ps:   (0.2)
137  Ce:   Johan yeah he works for a radio station
```

In (2:10) Celia (Ce) cannot find the name of a mutual class mate of hers and Emily's (Em). The metalinguistic comment "oh I can't think of his name right now" (line 134) makes explicit to Emily the nature of the trouble. The comment is preceded by a number of pauses, a hedge and indications of hesitancy, such as "ahm" and "eh" as well as prolonged sounds "ah::". Since Emily does not immediately come to Celia's assistance, Celia adds specifying information about the person whose name she is searching for. Emily is now able to come up with a suggestion. In the subsequent turn, Celia verifies that "Johan" was indeed the person of whom she was thinking.

In CA, word search is treated as a certain type of trouble; one which often, but not necessarily leads to other-repair. Sometimes a speaker manages to resolve the search, sometimes the speaker requests assistance, or assistance is offered by the recipient. Sometimes the search simply is not resolved at all. For native casual conversations, Goodwin (1979, 1980, 1987) and Goodwin & Goodwin (1986) emphasise the role of gaze, facial expressions and gestures in relation to participants' interpretations of indications of trouble as requests for assistance. Lerner (1996) stresses the invitational features of a search, i.e. the indications of trouble justify "other" to aid the speaker in producing a turn. In other contexts, "other-repair" may be perceived as face-threatening.

It may be stressed that it is hard to distinguish between a word search that is self-initiated and self-repaired, a word search that is other-repaired, and so called "collaboratively completed" turns-at-talk, i.e. when the recipient completes the prior speaker's turn, without attempting to correct or without any (observable) hesitancy on the part of the speaker whose turn is being completed. Lerner (1996:240) discusses certain positions in a turn-at-talk that allows for other-completion, so called "compound TCUs" that "furnish the sequential resources for the *anticipatory completion* of the TCU by another speaker". An example provided by Lerner (1996) is the *if*-clause, which projects a *then*-continuation (italics in the original text). Lerner (1996) observes that there is often a beat of silence in-between parts of com-

pound TCUs. Such pauses, however, are not similar to pauses involved in turns that exhibit trouble (e.g. word search), depending on their positions within the TCU. Importantly, collaborative completions are, as the term suggests, employed in an aligning fashion by participants to display their understanding and/or shared knowledge with the speaker. Differences in participants' interpretation of a prior speaker's turn as inviting other-repair may thus be explained by a variety of cues that are available, e.g. syntactic structure (Lerner, 1996), gaze and gestures (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986) as well as by prosodic features (e.g. sound stretches, pauses etc.).

A recent analysis of word search in NS-NNS talk-in-interaction is given by Kurhila (2003). Since her study and the research interests of this dissertation partly concur, her main findings are reported here. Kurhila (2003:145) focuses on what she calls substantial searches, i.e. such instances of repair in which a speaker indicates that assistance is needed to be able to complete a turn-at-talk and continue the conversation and, in most cases, are responded to with other-repair. She presents the ways in which the indication of trouble is performed by the speakers in her data, e.g. by means of hesitation and/or the presence of an "interrogative" (2003: 148), of the type *what's it called?*[9]. The interrogative is either directed towards the recipient or self-directed. Similar to Goodwin & Goodwin (1986), in Kurhila's data, gaze is crucial for the interpretation of hesitations and the interrogative as a more or less direct appeal for assistance. The speaker also tries to resolve the search him/herself, for example by using loan words, "Fennizised words" (2003: 164–175), i.e. the attempt to produce a word that is close to the native Finnish target word but not entirely correct, and negations of semantically contiguous referents (to the troublesome word, that is). In all cases but a few brought up by Kurhila, the recipient responds in a collaborative fashion and attempts to assist in the search. In the instances in which no repair item is offered, participants seem to orient to the trouble in different ways. Whereas a NNS may be interested in the linguistic aspects of a word or expression, a NS may

---

[9] This example is not a quote from Kurhila (2003), but simply an illustration of a commonly used expression for indicating word search.

orient to the lexical information provided. One participant can thus prolong a search, e.g. by means of repetition of the troublesome word/expression over a number of turns, whereas the other responds to the initiation with tokens of comprehension, trying to get the conversation going. It should be noted that overwhelmingly, the NNSs initiate repair as word search in the institutional and everyday conversations that constitute Kurhila's corpora. Also, when comparing the types of trouble addressed by NNSs and NSs, Kurhila finds that only NNSs orient to grammatical difficulties. She suggests that this might reflect linguistic identities such as being the less "linguistically knowledgeable" participant in a conversation (2003: 216):

> Since the linguistic conduct of the NNS can be connected to (and explained through) her non-nativeness, she is under greater pressure to show that certain features in her talk are not signs of her incompetence (as a speaker). The less knowledgeable position of the NNS creates a paradoxical situation: the NNS has a greater need to portray herself as a competent speaker and, hence, she pays special attention to her linguistic choices and formulations. This attention results, for example, in grammatical searches and self-corrections which, in fact, can be interpreted as signs of her nonfluency (i.e. incompetence).

The results of Kurhila's study are clearly important for this dissertation, and her suggestion about the reflection of linguistic identities is returned to in the analytic chapters.

2.5 S/FLA approaches to self-initiated other-repair

In S/FLA research, self-initiated other-repairs are comprised in the work on communication and learning strategies (Faerch & Kasper, 1983; Bialystok, 1990; Kasper & Kellerman, 1997, all provide detailed orientations in the field) which, as mentioned, also conforms to certain types of self-initiated self-repairs. The strategies concurring with the CA notion of self-initiated other-repair, and word search, belong to a subsection of strategies denoted "co-operative" (Faerch & Kasper,

1983: 50–52) typically referring to situations where a NNS benefits from the language knowledge of a NS in the sense of receiving assistance in order to fill lexical gaps. The NNS is also viewed as learning by means of his/her own internal feedback, i.e. to detect a problem when formulating what to say and to attempt to solve this problem. This perspective follows "the comprehensible output hypothesis" (Swain 1985) that proposes that learners of a language benefit from the processes involved in planning and executing speech in a second or foreign language[10]. This approach is intertwined with studies that emphasise the role of "attention" or "awareness" (Schmidt, 1990, 1993; Leow, 1997) "noticing" (Truscott, 1998, for an overview) and "consciousness" (Schmidt & Frota, 1986) in the language learning (or acquisition, rather) process.

In most S/FLA-data it is also uncommon that the NS appeals to the NNS for assistance, or that a teacher (who may be a NNS too) would appeal for the assistance of a student (Kasper, 1985). This, in turn, seems to be the result of the speech exchange system that is asymmetrical in various ways and often takes place in laboratory settings where different tasks are carried out, such as direction giving or picture description. Linguistic asymmetry, however, is reflected in the distribution of repair-initiation in experimental as well as naturally occurring conversations. As is evident in Kurhila (2003), the majority of substantial searches in her data were initiated by the NNSs. In this study, NNSs as well as NSs conduct searches for words. However, the nature of the search may differ somewhat between speakers. Word search is addressed in chapter 4.

2.6 Other-initiated self-repair within CA

Other-initiations occur when a participant in conversation experiences difficulties in hearing or understanding what someone has said. Once the speaker of the troublesome turn is notified of the difficulties, s/he self-repairs in the turn following the initiation. In (2:11) Linda does not

---

[10] For a critique of the comprehensible output hypothesis, cf. Krashen (1998).

perceive what Erik says. She initiates repair by politely asking "pardon?" (line 213) subsequent to which Erik repeats a part of what he has just said. He also adds specifying information about the author of the book that he is referring to. Linda is happy with this response and the conversation can continue:

```
(2:11)
210  Li:   that's how I wanted it to be and I still do (0.5) kind of
           actua[lly it's so beautiful]
211  Er:        [the b- the Brothers Lionheart]
212  ps:   (0.8)
213  Li:   pardon?
214  Er:   the Brothers Lion[heart a-Astrid Lindgren's]
215  Li:                    [yeah they're so beautiful]
```

It should be noted that troubles of hearing and/or understanding do not always yield repair-initiation (Schegloff et al., 1977), i.e. an interlocutor may choose not to make the difficulty relevant. On other occasions, other-initiation is "delayed"[11] (Schegloff, 2000; Wong, 2000) and appears later than in next turn to the one that was troublesome. It occasionally happens that other-initiation is not responded to by means of self-repair.

Linda (line 213) uses a question word to make Erik repeat what he just said, but initiations come in many different forms. Schegloff et al. (1977: 367) present "a group of turn-constructional devices to initiate repair". These consist of question words, e.g. *huh?*, *what?*, *who?*, the partial repeat of a prior turn with the insertion of a question word, partial repeat of a turn without a question word, and finally, candidate understandings that are preceded by *Y'mean*[12]. Schegloff et al. (1977) rank the initiation techniques according to what degree they serve to specify the trouble source. Strong forms are of the type that clearly pinpoint the source of trouble, whereas weak forms less clearly target

---

[11] The notion "delayed" is to be viewed as the position of other-initiation in relation to the trouble source. Schegloff (2000) treats all other-initiations occurring later than immediately after the turn exhibiting the trouble source as somehow delayed, thus using next turn repair initiation (NTRI) as a baseline to which all other occurrences of other-initiation are compared. There is no doubt NTRI is a dominating format for other-initiation. There was only one case of a delayed repair initiation in the data analysed in this dissertation.

[12] Schegloff et al. (1977) point out that there are additional forms of initiations besides the ones that they present in their paper.

what it is that the recipient finds problematic. These latter initiation techniques (weak forms) are investigated by Drew (1997: 69) who denotes them "open class repair initiators", that he claims "treat the whole of the prior turn as in some way problematic". Examples of such initiations are similar to the one exemplified in (2:11) above, e.g. *sorry?* and *pardon?*.

For data involving NNSs, the indistinct features of open class repair initiators are acknowledged by Kalin (1995: 136). In a study of NNSs and NSs of Swedish, Kalin describes them as "non-focused meta-communicative requests". Kalin's (1995) study involves Finnish learners of Swedish as a second language. The informants are able to communicate in most everyday situations but are not quite so proficient as not to face difficulties in expressing themselves as well as of understanding the native Swedes or the Swedish-Finnish bilingual participants with whom they are talking. Another initiation technique which Kalin studies is repetition of the trouble source. She finds that NNSs often interpret NSs' repeats as indications of hearing difficulties rather than as problems of understanding. She also shows how NNSs may sometimes have difficulties in repeating the word that they find troublesome in the preceding turn, which, of course, makes it hard for the NS to interpret exactly what the difficulty is about. A common observation is that NNSs' repair-initiations often lead to extended repair sequences, i.e. the trouble is rarely solved over three turns. As Kalin (1995: 182), points out, NSs must struggle to formulate their (self-)repair in a way that can be understood by the NNS:

> The NS ends here as in most negotiations in complicated word searches which display the fact that the term native speaker is not quite adequate when dealing with intercultural conversations. NSs do not have the same mastery of the language as they would in conversations with equals.

In the speech exchange system presented by Kalin, there are frequent mismatches in participants' interpretations concerning what the source of the trouble is. Her results, however, just as Kurhila's (2003), display the characteristics of being, on the one hand a competent speaker (in many ways), and, on the other, a NNS, a fact that increases

the complexity of appropriately expressing what is troublesome in the turn of a NS.

Kurhila (2003) did not find many instances of open repair initiations in her data. She focuses rather on candidate understandings as repair initiations, i.e. turns-at-talk which display the recipient's interpretation of the preceding turn. The self-repair in response to this type of initiation frequently consists of an acceptance or rejection of the understanding that is displayed. Kurhila (2003: 297) stresses the heterogeneous nature of candidate understandings as they may be either "backward-looking" or "forward-oriented". The former type is used for checking one's understanding of the prior turn, whereas the latter, not only displays (or is used to check) the recipient's understanding, but also displays an interest in what was said and encourages the speaker to continue talking. Kurhila observes that the NSs in her data do not treat NNSs' troublesome turns in a way that forces them to modify their talk as self-repair. Rather, the NS (the initiations in her material are largely performed by NSs) formulates a candidate understanding which the NNS may confirm[13]. One of the most interesting findings in Kurhila's data is that the repair sequences initiated by means of a candidate understanding show how NSs orient to understanding rather than non-understanding, i.e. they do not "push" the NNSs to modify their prior turn. This is an important observation in relation to S/FLA studies in which the opposite situation is emphasised. This issue is returned to in the section below that presents S/FLA approaches to other-initiated self-repair.

For native conversations, there seems to be some correlation between initiation technique and the type of difficulty that the recipient is facing. As Drew (1997) shows, some techniques may be related to hearing difficulties. Couper-Kuhlen (1992) observes that the speech rate in sequences dealing with hearing difficulties is slow in comparison with turns-at-talk preceding and following the repair initiation. Other types of trouble, e.g. understanding difficulties, are indicated by initiations and self-repairs that are faster than preceding talk. The trouble is

---

[13] Sometimes the NNS's confirmation of the NS's candidate understanding, in turn, is responded to with the NS's confirmation of the confirmation, i.e. a "double confirmation" (cf. Kurhila 2003: 234–235).

dealt with as quickly as possible, subsequent to which the speech rate again is decreased. These differences, she argues, may be linked to the more face-threatening act of targeting someone's talk as troublesome in the sense of what is said, rather than displaying insufficient hearing, as the problem in the latter case "can easily be attributed to some insufficiency in the channel only (rather than in the persons involved)" (Couper-Kuhlen, 1992: 350).

Other-initiations also occur as a participant interprets the prior turn as puzzling, but not incomprehensible in a literal sense. Drew (1997) observes how open repair initiations are related to discourse coherence and cohesion in native English conversations. This is an aspect of other-initiated self-repair that is emphasised in chapter 5 in this dissertation.

2.7 S/FLA approaches to other-initiated self-repair

S/FLA studies of other-initiated self-repair have largely dealt with the initiation of a NS as a response to a NNS's erroneous or incomprehensible turn-at-talk and the effect that the initiation has of "pushing" the learner to produce a more comprehensible (and possibly more native-like) contribution to talk (e.g. Gass & Varonis, 1985a; Pica, 1988; Nobuyoshi & Ellis, 1993; Gass, 1997; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Mackey, Gass & McDonough, 2000). The underlying hypothesis is that when NNSs need to restructure an utterance, they pay attention to parts of language that deviate from the norms of the target language[14] (Mackey, Gass & McDonough, 2000). Again, to notice such gaps (Schmidt & Frota, 1986; Schmidt, 1990, 1993) is, from this perspective, vital for NNSs to be able to change and improve their competence in the language being learned. Since NSs are viewed as pushing NNSs to produce more understandable utterances, it is interesting to note that in

---

[14] It is, of course, difficult to establish to what degree interlocutors know what these norms are. The major idea of S/FLA studies in this respect, is that the negative feedback that the NNS receives from the NS, indicates that a contribution does not conform to the native standard.

the natural conversations investigated by Kalin (1995) and Kurhila (2003), this is exactly what NSs did *not* do. In Kalin's (1995) data, it was NNSs who pushed NSs to modify their talk. Reasonable explanations for these differences may be found in the speech exchange systems investigated in CA and S/FLA studies. Classroom studies, for example, observe how teachers use various techniques to push learners to modify their speech. Lyster & Ranta (1997) describe a variety of such techniques, the form of which sometimes concurs with the forms observed in everyday conversations, e.g. clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback that explicitly points out the source of trouble, and repeats. The main difference between the function of these initiations and the ones found in casual NS-NNS conversations seems to be the speaker's as well as the recipient's orientation to the initiation. The language classroom and the asymmetrical relation between teacher and student provide a certain language teaching/learning frame, in which the teacher uses initiation techniques as a tool to make the student self-correct and to evaluate the student's self-correction[15]. Simplified, of course, one could say that certain activities are clearly expected in the classroom, e.g. to teach and to be taught.

2.8 Other-initiated other-repair within CA

Other-initiated other-repair is the least frequently occurring type of repair, in casual talk as well as in other conversational settings. Its dispreferred status may be explained by its corrective function. Depending on participation framework, corrective behaviour may appear offensive or threatening. Consistent with the results of other studies, there were very few cases of other-initiated other-repair in the data analysed here. Example (2:12) illustrates an instance of other-initiated other-repair[16]:

---

[15] I-R-E (initiation-response-evaluation) sequences apply to many teaching-situations, not only the language classroom (e.g. Cazden, 1988; Lerner, 1993).

[16] Example (2:12) is returned to in chapter 6.

```
(2:12)
108  To:  the general=what people in general feel is right.
109  Jo:  public opinion.
110  To:  yeah not re- (0.2) the (0.2) the public opinion more like
           a (0.7) a (0.4) public eh perception of morals (0.3) (or)
           (the) perception of what is right an' what is wrong.
111  ps:  (0.3)
112  Jo:  m: (1.8) m
```

In a response to Tobias (To), John (Jo) makes an interpretation of Tobias' expression "what people in general feel is right" (line 108), saying in a fairly frank manner "public opinion." (line 109). Tobias, in turn, may choose to accept or reject this expression as a substitution for his own formulation. As may be noted, Tobias does something in-between, as he recycles the word "public" but not "opinion" in his continued talk.

Again Kurhila (2001, 2003, 2004) provides the most recent work on other-corrections that occur in everyday and institutional NS-NNS conversations. In her data, the NSs are responsible for the corrections of errors in the talk of the NNSs. However, since far from all linguistic errors that occur in the NNSs' turns-at-talk are corrected, Kurhila's main concern is at what points NSs do choose to initiate and carry out repair and how it is performed. One of her main findings concerns what she calls *en passant* repairs, i.e. instances where NSs carry out other-correction in a straightforward and smooth way, in some sense using their identity as NS, to justify their action as one that cannot be challenged. The repair item in these cases often consists of a replacement of an ungrammatical word or phrase in the talk of a NNS. In addition, the turns that the NS responds to by means of other-repair, are often marked by uncertainty, i.e. the NNS hesitates in different ways when attempting to produce a word. The repair provided by the NS is rarely rejected. In contrast to the ideas of other-correction being dispreferred and face-threatening, Kurhila (2003) suggests that the NS may even use other-repair to avoid embarrassing situations for the NNS, particularly in relation to such instances of difficulties where the NNS's hesitancy displays that s/he probably does not know the correct form. If the NS at that point initiates repair in a way that forces the NNS to self-repair, the NNS's linguistic inability may become salient, which at times could

be an equally or even more sensitive issue than being provided the correct form directly. Kurhila concludes that the environments in which outright corrections occur, are instances where the NS can repair as smoothly as possible without disrupting the ongoing activity. In addition, Kurhila looks at to what degree NNSs repeat the repair item. It turns out that repeats of the correct form are mainly found in everyday conversations and do not appear in the institutional settings, possibly since, in the latter case, the repair is "merged" (Kurhila 2003: 137) with another activity, i.e. checking or confirming.

Kurhila stresses that sequential constraints, as well as participants' relations may have an impact on the initiation and outcome of other-correction in the NS-NNS conversations that she investigated, referring to Norrick's (1991) findings that other-correction is largely influenced by the relationship between participants, i.e. it is not necessarily the linguistically knowledgeable participant who carries out the correction (Plejert, 2003). As will be shown in chapter 6, Norrick (1991) as well as Kurhila (2003) receive some support. It happens that NSs try to perform linguistic corrections that are rejected by NNSs (or as in Tobias' case above, he picks up the bits and pieces that he finds useful). In addition, it is the NNS who has initiated the topic when the correction takes place. The impact on the initiation and outcome of other-repair on participants' perceptions of themselves as "topically" knowledgeable (as well as linguistically knowledgeable) and their status as good friends with their interlocutor are looked at more closely in the analytic chapters.

It is interesting to note that Schegloff et al. (1977), although stressing the dispreferred status of other-repair, mention contexts in which other-correction is likely to appear less infrequently, e.g. "in the domain of adult-child interaction, in particular parent-child interaction; but it may well be more relevant to the not-yet-competent in some domain without respect to age" (1977: 381). They suggest that other-correction can be a part of the socialisation process and that it is used transitionally as a person who develops competence (communicative competence) successively manages to self-monitor rather than being dependent on the assistance of others. Interestingly, this relates to observations from S/FLA studies, as well as to theories of learning

that stress apprenticeship in the sense of developing one's knowledge under supervision by other skilled members (cf. chapter 1, section 1.3.4).

2.9 S/FLA approaches to other-initiated other-repair

In accordance with the just mentioned observation made by Schegloff et al. (1977), there are environments in which other-initiated other-repair does occur more frequently. One such environment is the language classroom as the teacher corrects linguistic errors in the speech of pupils (e.g. Kasper, 1985; Chaudron, 1988; McHoul, 1990; Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Van den Branden (1997: 621) gives an illustrative example:

```
P:   Yes, the other one...he order a pint too and those others they
     were...
R:   Uhm, he order is not correct, it should be he ordered, ordered
     a pint
P:   Yes, ordered a pint
```

In this example, the researcher (R) is overtly correcting a pupil's (P) use of an incorrect form of the present tense. The researcher does not only provide the correct form of the verb, but adds a metalinguistic comment: "he order is not correct". The pupil's response to the correction is to repeat the suggested word. From the perspective of the researcher, this is an ideal response as there is overt evidence of the learner's production of the grammatically correct form. It is, however, important to notice that this repair occurred in a situation that was specifically designed to investigate the function of corrective feedback and that the researcher consciously initiates and carries out the repair.

Studies that take an interest in the role that repair plays in the acquisition of a language have dealt, not only with the effect of other-repair in the sense of correction, but also with what types of errors yield corrections, and what types of initiation techniques are responded to with students' self-repair/corrections (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). In many S/FLA studies it is assumed that other-correction in the sense of "negative feedback" to a NNS's utterance, provides input that

is beneficial for the NNS's subsequent modification of his/her internal linguistic system. Ideally, the NNS should repeat the correct expression provided by the NS. From a CA perspective it is difficult to accommodate to the concept of acquisition, at least in the sense that it is used within S/FLA theory. Markee (2000), however, tries to draw from CA as well as S/FLA theory when he investigates the spoken language of students in different educational situations. He claims that it is possible to observe how, for example, a word that has not been known but collaborated on by many students in one situation, is used in another situation in a productive way by the student who initially did not know the word. Although the examples provided by Markee (2000) are not cases of other-corrections but of other-repair as a response to indication of hesitancy and search, the influence of interlocutors' cooperation at points of trouble on the subsequent use of a word or expression (in that sense learning) is highlighted.

2.10 Some reflections on "repair"

Before heading on to the analytic parts of this dissertation, it may be worthwhile to reflect a moment or two on the definitions of repair and the various studies presented above. As one dives into what appears to be an ocean of investigations of repair in conversation, only a puddle of which are brought up here, some thoughts on the definitions and descriptions of spoken phenomena denoted "repair" inevitably float to the surface. This section is therefore devoted to a critical discussion focusing on interrelated aspects concerning studies of repair. The reflections deal with the possible consequences of using definitions and a terminology such as *repair*, *trouble source*, *problems*, etc. in descriptions of the ways in which participants in a conversation work to achieve understanding. Additionally, there seems to be a risk that some analyses of repair could be interpreted as being influenced by a normative view about language, interfering with the participant perspective pleaded for within CA. This is an issue that is of importance for analyses of all kinds of talk-in-interaction, and very much so for conversations involving NNSs.

The first issue arises when one studies the achievements of interlocutors' employment of repair in conversation. Irrespective of whether it is "self" or "other" who initiates and/or carries out repair, it has turned out to be an important resource for participants to enhance and maintain intersubjective understanding in conversation (e.g. Schegloff, 1990, 1991, 1992a). If repair is to be viewed as an integral part of human language use, it may appear contradictory that a terminology is used that implies that spoken language is full of flaws and problems that require repair.

It is, however, possible that the discussion presented here is simply a misreading or misinterpretation on my part of the initial description of repair as a resource used to address problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding (Schegloff et al. 1977). At least it sometimes seems that it is not always clear-cut what the nature of these problems is, and who it is that decides that there are problems from the beginning. Despite the ambitions of CA methodology to focus on what participants themselves make relevant, it is questionable to what degree a participant perspective is always maintained, perhaps particularly in analyses of self-initiated self-repair where the interdependency of repair and a syntax-for-conversation (e.g. Schegloff, 1979; Fox & Jasperson, 1995) is stressed. These studies show a competing interest in, on the one hand, participants' orientations to some problem in speaking, and, on the other, criteria for repair that are based on the cut-off in the flow of speech. These latter criteria *could be* interpreted as implying the existence of a perfect, fluent structure similar to the "ideal delivery" that Clark (1996: 254) describes:

> Every use of a word, phrase, or sentence has an *ideal delivery*—a flawless presentation in the given situation (Clark and Clark 1977). It is flawless in that it is fluent, and the pronunciation, intonation, speed, and volume are appropriate to the circumstances. It is the delivery speakers would make if they had formulated what they were going to say before speaking and could follow through with this plan.

It appears that classifications of repair that are based on various deviations from an ideally delivered unit in a turn-at-talk may violate the application of a participant perspective. As one shifts focus, however,

from the very stop in the flow of speech to the interactional achievements of the stop and of the means taken immediately following, it seems that many instances of repair, but not all, fit well within the framework of *problem*. This is perhaps why papers that present analyses of such achievements, often use other labels in addition to *repair*, e.g. recycled turn-beginnings. Recycled turn-beginnings, to stay with that one example, appear mainly to be a problem if they are to be compared with the form of a written sentence, in which a repeat of a subject would not only look awkward, but be unnecessary.

The problem is perhaps only a matter of the choice of terminology, but it could possibly also be the result of the fairly difficult task of analysing what is going on when people produce units in a turn-at-talk. Thus what it comes down to is basically this: Should all deviations from a flawless unit of speech be denoted repair, or is it possible to distinguish between instances that are oriented to as a problem in speaking, and instances that are not, or at least cannot be proven to be?

Goffman (1981) also acknowledges the potential problems involved in denoting something "repair". In a footnote, he states that the term repair may be "implying the fixing of something that has been broken and although this nicely covers the substantive reconstructing of a word or phrase, it less happily fits a range of other kinds of works in the remedial process"[17] (1981: 212). What may require remedy are the competencies of everyday life; the range of acts and activities that constitute a person's socialisation within a society. To act according to the expectations posed by conventions and rituals involves avoiding "faults" (could be spoken as well as other ways of behaving in an inappropriate way) before they occur, as well as fixing them after they have taken place. This, again, suggests that there are norms, forms of behaviour that interlocutors must acknowledge. These norms, however, are of a social rather than a syntactic nature and participants themselves are active agents in creating and recreating them.

The preventive nature of self-initiated self-repairs is acknowledged here alongside their more "corrective" function. In addition, they are

---

[17] Goffman's footnote (1981: 212) is the inspirational source for the title of this dissertation.

viewed as an integral part of talk-in-interaction as it unfolds turn-by-turn, *not* as an external device operating on an ideal delivery. Paradoxically perhaps, self-repairs thus fix something that is *not* broken, i.e. spoken language is inherently disfluent (from the perspective of the written language norm), since it is affected by and affects constantly changing contextual circumstances.

Part II: Self-repair

3. The fluency of disfluency

This chapter investigates moments when a speaker attends to troubles that concern pronunciation, word choice, or, grammar. The TCU is affected in that the speaker suddenly stops within a word or at a word boundary. The stop is followed by an addition of a word that fits syntactically (and prosodically and semantically) within the same construction as the word that is interrupted. In the case of pronunciation, there is a repeat of the mispronounced word before the TCU is brought to completion. The examples looked at here correspond to the types of self-initiated self-repair that were presented in chapter 2 as examples (2:4) and (2:5) where a word or phrase can be viewed as replacing another word or phrase[1].

The instances investigated have in common that they concern getting something "right", one way or the other. What is displayed is the way in which a speaker does not leave a word or expression unattended to, and how such alterations influence the impression given of the speaker's knowledge of the world as well as of the language spoken, to put it simply. This is particularly important from the point of departure of how a speaker's "non-nativeness" is made manifest by the orientation to formal aspects of the foreign language (cf. the quote from Kurhila (2003) in chapter 2, section 2.4). The analyses presented in this chapter follow along these lines and circle around the theme of participants' self-representations, specifically in the sense of linguistic and/or interactional competence.

Speakers may indicate that they are experiencing some trouble in more or less explicit ways. Some sources of trouble are accompanied by metalinguistic comments and other cues that draw participants' attention to the activity of repair, whereas in most cases the repair is

---

[1] The frequency of occurrence of the self-initiated self-repairs that are analysed in this chapter is presented in Tables 1 and 2 in the Appendix, last in this dissertation.

carried out with a minimum of effort. Although indicated differently, the nature of the trouble may, of course, be similar in both cases. However, the instances that are more explicitly indicated are treated in a section of their own here, as the way the trouble is targeted reveals the speaker's attitude to it, whereas less explicitly indicated troubles offer fewer such clues. Section 3.1 thus deals with self-repair that becomes a salient activity. The subsections are divided according to *how* repair is carried out and what it means that repair is conducted in this marked way. Subsequent sections (3.2 and onwards) are divided according to the types of troubles involved as speakers deal with them in an unmarked, smooth way, e.g. grammatical correctness (section 3.2.1), mispronunciation (section 3.2.3), or word choice (section 3.3). Subsections also explicate some possible interactional factors that may constitute *motivations* for the occurrence of a trouble source and repair. Thus, section 3.2.2 shows some examples of how interactional activities such as story-telling and quoted speech potentially increase the cognitive load for the NNS which may result in efforts concerning the choice of tense. The initial use of a word can possibly be a result of preceding formulations (section 3.3.2). The chapter ends with a section that displays how self-repair occurs at a point where the initial choice of a pronoun could be interpreted as face-threatening and/or offensive because the topic talked about is of a delicate nature (section 3.3.3). The repair behaviours of NNSs and NSs are compared throughout analyses and differences and similarities are pointed out when relevant.

The results of the analyses show that the NNSs indeed conduct repair of formal aspects of their speech more often than the NSs. However, participants' repair behaviours largely display their knowledge and ability to adapt to the immediate circumstances of the interaction, e.g. as instant alterations of words that could be interpreted as offensive, or to slips that negatively affect the impression of the speaker's knowledge.

3.1 Self-repair as a salient activity

In this section, six examples are presented that show how a speaker pays attention to the activity of language production rather than to what is being said, using comments, sometimes accompanied by non-verbal cues and prosodic emphasis (Goffman, 1981[2]; van Hest, 1996: 37 on editing terms with a "semantic value").

Although the speaker's attention is turned to the activity of repair, the way in which the recipient responds to the speaker's repair behaviour varies. The comment that targets the trouble appears to be self/other-directed to various degrees[3].

3.1.1 Exclamations of dissatisfaction or surprise

In (3:1) Linda is giving an account of whether or not she believes in God. In the middle of a fairly long turn, she mispronounces a word:

```
(3:1)
34   Li:  but well (0.2) eh .hh it's much eh of a question if you
          believe in God or not
35   ps:  (0.8)
36   Er:  yeah
37   Li:  actually. .hh and I don't know (0.6) I I prepared myself
          eh going here he he he .hhhh an eh:::: (0.8) I thought
          (0.7) the question would be do you believe in God and .hh
          well I I  ↑well I prepared myself an I (1.1) I come to
          the conclusion I don't (0.7) know↓ (0.4) eh:: spontaneous
          you eh (p)ough! <spontaneously> (0.5) I would say
          no(0.8)but (0.3) I ('ve) found myself eh:: surprisingly
          enough eh:: to turn to God (0.9) in rough times.
```

As the repair occurs, Linda tells Erik that she had thought that one question for discussion would be "do you believe in God" (line 37). "spontaneous you" is prosodically and semantically the first word in a new TCU. Right after the cut-off, there is a hesitation marker followed by a very loud groan: "(p)ough!" at the same time as Linda makes a frustrated facial expression and rolls her eyes. These indications of

---

[2] Goffman (1981: 281) denotes these metalinguistic elements "gambits".

[3] This is similar to the metalinguistic comments employed when a speaker is uncertain of a word (cf. chapter 5).

trouble are increased as the speech rate of the repair item is very slow and pronunciation clearly exaggerated. It is, however, not entirely clear whether Linda is concerned with pronunciation or grammar here. On the one hand, Linda may be saying "spont<u>an</u>eous yu" rather than "spont<u>an</u>eous you" (as written in the transcript), since the subject that follows the correctly produced word is the personal pronoun "I". On the other hand, viewed as concerning grammatical accuracy, Linda might initially use "spont<u>an</u>eous" together with the generic pronoun "you" but realises that the form of the initial word is grammatically erroneous. The strong reaction could then be explained in terms of embarrassment since the adjective-adverb distinction, just like subject-verb concord, are features of English that are drilled in the language classrooms. In Swedish, adjectives carry gender and plural agreement. When there is a neuter singular correlate, the forms of modifying adjectives and adverbs are identical[4].

The way in which Linda indicates her concerns is thus highly salient, even to participants looking at the conversation in retrospect, as was done during the viewing session. Although Linda herself did not comment on this instance, her interlocutor Erik stopped the film at this particular point. His perception of Linda's behaviour was that it was a matter of grammatical correction. He thought that it displayed that Linda was a conscious user of the English language, relating her carefulness to the fact that they were both teachers-to-be. This does not mean, of course, that this type of explanation is valid for the experiences of Linda at the point of repair. What it does show, however, is that interlocutors acknowledge how utterances are designed as adaptations to contextual circumstances, e.g. concerning knowledge that participants assume to be shared. In Erik's case this could be the idea that he and Linda are *both* careful speakers of English.

An exclamation of surprise, rather than dissatisfaction occurs in the speech of Monica. In the middle of a turn-at-talk, Monica suddenly

---

[4] cf. Swe: "Han sade det <u>spontant</u>" (NP+V+NP+AdvP)
Eng: "He said it   spontaneous**ly**" (NP+V+NP+AdvPinfl.)
vs. Swe: "Han höll ett <u>spontant</u> tal" (NP+V+indef.art.neut.+AdjP+NPneut.)
Eng: "He gave a <u>spontaneous</u> speech" (NP+V+indef.art.+AdjP+ NP)

uses the Swedish hedge "liksom" instead of an English one (or none), e.g. "like". She seems startled and stops, hesitates and says with a surprised voice "liksom" followed by a long pause before she repeats the phrase that preceded the slip. In the repeat, she does not use any hedge at all:

```
(3:2)
415  Mo:  I go around you know telling myself that oh that wasn't
          so bad and
416  Je:  m*hm::*
417  Mo:  don't get liksom
418  Je:  °he [he°]
419  Mo:      [eh::] liksom (0.8) don't get upset on that thing 'n
          ['n you] know
```

Jenny's quiet laughter (line 418) may be an acknowledgement of the slip and it is, of course, possible that it is this reaction that triggers Monica to orient to the Swedish word. From this perspective one could say that the repair is in fact initiated by Jenny. This need not be so, however, since Jenny is continuously attending to Monica's talk at this point with a slight laughter in her voice. The speed with which the girls' turns are executed makes it difficult to interpret whether Monica's self-repair is a response to Jenny's laughter, or an action that is based on her own surprise (could be both).

3.1.2 Apologies

Whereas the two exclamations just presented are self-directed as well as directed towards the recipient, there are indications that primarily appear addressed to the recipient. Such examples concern cases where the speaker apologises for the choice of a word. In (3:3) Erik is occupied with his own use of the word "ink writers". He and Linda are talking about how expensive transparencies are when they are bought from a book store:

```
(3:3)
142  Er:  they can cost like t- ten crowns a piece (1.0) and i-
          it's absolutely ab↑surd
143  Li:  yeah
144  Er:  if they're good quality and and especially for for these
          ink writers you know. (0.6) °these° ink printers sorry
```

```
        (0.8) h eh but I mean (0.6) I:::I really don't ↑know=bc
        it- it's wrong yes but (1.8) who am I to blame people
        [for ↑doing it *I do it] my↑self*
145  Li:  [yeah yeah]
```

Although Linda is likely to understand what Erik is talking about as he first uses the term "ink writers", he is concerned with replacing it with another one which better concurs with the native English "standard" form. The repair item is preceded by a brief pause and then immediately followed by an apology and some hesitation before Erik leaves the activity of repair. It should be noted that the trouble source carries stress on the first part of the compound whereas the repair item carries stress on the word that replaces the troublesome one. This also contributes to making the action of repair explicit.

An additional interpretation involves Erik's use of the pragmatic marker "you know" (line 144) that is prosodically tied to the trouble source "these ink writers", treating this referent as mutually known (Schiffrin, 1987). If appropriateness of vocabulary is an issue for Erik, the apology may be a very clear way of indicating to Linda that he knows the correct word, and it may be of special importance to adjust the choice of word, since he has handled the referent as commonly known[5]. Again Erik acknowledges this sequence in retrospect and claimed that he replaced "ink writer" with "ink printer" since he wanted to use a more appropriate word when he noticed what he had first said. He also said that he perceived himself to be a speaker who values correctness in grammar as well as in vocabulary. Erik's comment is, as mentioned, naturally a reconstruction of what he perceives is going on in the prior event. What is perhaps of greatest interest is that the salience of these self-repairs is confirmed as attention is drawn to them, not only at the point when the conversation takes place, but also during the viewing session.

Apologies, however, were not exclusively used by the NNSs, but occurred once in the speech of Anne, a NS. Apologies in relation to NSs' slips are commonly acknowledged (e.g. Schegloff et al., 1977; Goffman, 1981; Levelt, 1983) so it should be remembered that although

---

[5] Most students (or members of staff) are familiar with the consequences of using cheap transparencies in the university's printers. They melt, jamming the machine.

they were largely performed by the NNSs in this study, they are by no means typically "non-native-like":

(3:4)
```
259  An:  *ehm* .hhh if they've been sexually abused then you can
          understand and I think you can forgive (0.5) because
          (0.5) (we-) [yeah]
260  Mi:              [no one has] the right to do that
          [(x x) you know that sort of (n) that moral]
261  An:  [oh even if they'd been like physically] abused eh: [eh:]
262  Mi:                                                      [(x)]
263  ps:  (0.3)
264  An:  (the-) I mean like m nt sorry (0.2) psychologically abu-
          sed as well.
```

In this instance the apology indicates that Anne is initially not happy with her use of the modifier "physically" (line 261). The pragmatic markers (line 264) are interpreted here as indications of hesitancy rather than as a beginning of a new TCU (e.g. an assessment)[6]. After the apology, Anne recycles part of the previously expressed phrase, exchanging "physically" with "psychologically" (line 264). It is noticeable, however, that Anne adds "as well" as the unit is completed, which suggests that rather than replacing one word with another one, the recycled phrase contributes an additional perspective. What is treated as a slip as Anne apologises, becomes transformed into an elaboration of something said previously.

3.1.3 The x, not x, y construct

The trouble may be targeted by means of a repetition in which a word is preceded by a negation, forming what could be described as an "x, not x, y" construct (cf. Jefferson, 1974). Jenny uses this technique and replaces one verb with another before the TCU is completed. Monica has just told her that she used to hang out with some girls who shoplifted and how she herself had shoplifted twice. Jenny displays her interest in Monica's story:

---

[6] "I mean" is preceded by hesitation sounds and overlapping speech, but *could possibly* be the beginning of a new TCU. The "like" seems to belong to the recycled phrase in which one word is replaced by another.

```
(3:5)
146  Je:  could that have n- inspired=
          not inspir[ed= encouraged y-]
147  Mo:           [yeah >(it di-)]of course of cour[se<]
148  Je:                                            [ye-]
```

It is worth noting that Monica responds to the question in overlap with
Jenny's replacement in a way that answers the question, irrespective
of what verb is chosen. That Jenny completes the replacement shows
that putting the words in a certain way is important even when the
recipient displays understanding prior to the completion of an altered
unit. One may perhaps say that the repair is performed partly for the
benefit of the recipient, partly due to the speaker's self-demands con-
cerning the choice of words.

This type of construction also appears once in the speech of a NS.
There is, however, a difference between that instance and the one dis-
played above in that the trouble for the NS involves correcting infor-
mational content that is inaccurate, whereas the nature of the trouble
looked at above, is more linguistically oriented. This difference does
not imply that NNSs always use constructions such as the one just dis-
played for targeting linguistic trouble, or, that a NS would never
change the choice of word in the way that Jenny does. In this data,
however, NNSs only employed the x, not x, y construct for strictly lin-
guistically oriented troubles.

3.1.4 Laughter as a marker of uncertainty

In one case, laughter accompanied by a hedge shows how the speaker
suddenly becomes weary of the form of a word. The recipient, how-
ever, does not react to the word first chosen, probably since it is per-
fectly comprehensible as it is. The excerpt exemplifies a delayed repair
initiation (Schegloff, 2000), i.e. a turn-at-talk is responded to without
orientation to any trouble, whereas the speaker responsible for the
first turn attends to what she previously expressed in "third" turn.
This excerpt also figured in the examples of repair formats presented
in chapter 2. It reappears here, however, with a focus on Jenny's
laughter:

(3:6)
```
41   Je:   and eh that's two different kind of forgive[ness]
42   Mo:                                    [I- I] think
            that to[o]
43   Je:        [for]give*ness[es I guess*]
44   Mo:                       [mm mm] yeah the o- the other way
            around an' you say I forgive you but not actually [do it]
```

Jenny and Monica are talking about bad behaviour, apologies and
ways of forgiving people. Just as Monica has agreed with Jenny (line
42), Jenny returns to the word "forgiveness", and adds an extra suffix
to mark the plural form. That she is uncertain of the correctness of the
form is revealed in the way she frames this action with a soft laughter,
and adds "I guess" (line 43). Monica does not acknowledge the alter-
ation but is busy aligning with Jenny. Apparently, Monica does not
make grammar relevant although Jenny just has. This example touches
on the border of vocabulary uncertainties looked at in chapter 4, where
a speaker's indications of uncertainty are responded to with a candi-
date repair item.

   The examples studied in this section show how speakers (particu-
larly NNSs) pay attention to some aspect of their own production.
NNSs primarily dealt with troubles that somehow violated norms of
the foreign language, e.g. concerning pronunciation, word choice, or
grammar. Irrespective of the degree to which the recipient overtly
acknowledges this type of self-repair, the speaker's attitude to his/her
own production is clearly displayed and the analyses of the present
study show expressions of frustration as well as of surprise in relation
to the use of certain words or word forms. Evidence from a retrospec-
tive interview also suggests that interlocutors perceive these explicit
self-repairs and relate them, at least in retrospect, to motivations of
self-representation such as ambitions to be accurate and to present an
image of being a careful speaker of the foreign language.

3.2 Non-salient repair of formal aspects of talk

Whereas the indications studied in the previous section displayed how a speaker got caught up with a source of trouble, expressing this orientation in a salient way, self-repair may also be conducted in a way that has a minimal effect on the completion of a TCU, i.e. there is no lengthy "stop" in the flow of speech, no exaggerated facial expression nor any exceptional increase or decrease in the speech rate as the alteration is performed.

In most of the cases the repair item is more appropriate than the word that it replaces, viewed from the perspective of a native English standard[7]. Although speakers do not make the activity of repair salient, the fact that they do carry out repair, and the types of trouble addressed, contribute to the image of their knowledge of the foreign language.

3.2.1 Alterations concerning number and modality

The first two instances in this section illustrate correction of grammar. For these examples, there are few signs apart from the alteration in itself, that target the nature of the trouble. The repair is conducted very quickly with no or just a brief pause, and hesitation sounds in between the word or phrase that is cut off and the altered item/s.

In (3:7), Magnus replaces a verb with a form that more appropriately agrees with the subject pronoun. The topic of his talk is the reclaim-the-streets movement:

---

[7] There are naturally also many instances where NNSs' formulations may be considered foreign that are not treated by participants as troublesome (by neither the NNSs nor the NSs). To investigate such cases would be very interesting, but requires the application of a different method than the one employed here. It is naturally also a tricky quest to make claims as to what counts as "native" or colloquial for any language, and in a rapidly shrinking world, English is one of the languages that are used by different speakers in a diversity of circumstances (e.g. Crystal, 1997; Battarbee, 2001, on "global English"; Seidlhofer, 2001 for a discussion about "world English"), i.e. it is difficult to talk about "norms" and "standards", particularly for the use of English in conversation.

(3:7)
```
120   Ma:   it is a way of voicing (0.5) what they e: (0.7) think is
            is wrong in society (0.3) but they don't know the the
            prop= or (0.6) what we think i= are the proper sort of
            channels to do it
```

It is a well known fact that subject-verb concord in English is difficult for Swedish learners of English, and this type of agreement is focused on very early in schools. Despite such efforts and students' awareness of the distinction, a full command is rarely achieved (Thagg-Fisher, 1986)[8]. It may be noted that the repair in (3:7) occurs in a context in which one utterance is cut off (line 120) and specifying information is added before parts of the prior talk are recycled. Apart from the actors "they", "we" is inserted adding to the syntactic complexity of the utterance. Examples such as this are hard to interpret, since potential explanations concerning *why* one expression is used rather than another, may only be obtained by analysis of the continuation of the turn-at-talk. Such an approach requires that one assumes that the speaker has access to what is overtly expressed later on, already at the point of the cut-off. It is, of course, possible to get an idea of what parts of speech are to be expected next drawing on syntactic, semantic, prosodic and pragmatic projections. However, since the speaker can always change the course of talk, it is difficult to make claims concerning a speaker's repair of grammar; in this particular case, of number. However, in (3:7) it appears that the preceding use of a grammatical frame (cf. Anward, 2000), such as "what [X] think is [Y]" where Y is the phrase "wrong in society", may affect a subsequent use where [X] and [Y] are new referents and where [Y], this time being "proper channels", requires plural agreement; cf:

"what they e: (0.7) think is wrong in society"
"they don't know the prop="
"what we think i= are the proper sort of channels"

Without making any claims about the degree of consciousness in-

---

[8] Subject-verb concord is discussed here from the perspective of standard British English and Received Pronunciation. Many British and American English dialects allow deviances from what is considered "correct" in written language and the just mentioned standard varieties.

volved in this alteration, it is fascinating to observe how smoothly Magnus manages to get this syntactic aspect of the foreign language right. The inserted phrase "what we think" (which may be a means for Magnus to align with Tim[9]) is used to contrast the viewpoints of different groups of people, at the same time as parts of previously used expressions are recycled. The influence of a prior construction on the occurrence of a subsequent trouble source is returned to in section 3.3.2 as it is also observed in participants' (NNSs' and NSs') alterations of seemingly synonymous expressions.

Some instances of NNSs' repair resulted in an alteration of the modality of a unit of talk. One example is found as Monica reveals to Jenny that she has shoplifted:

```
(3:8)
143  Mo:   I've shoplifted a bit when I was younger e- only chocola-
           te bars and so,
144  Je:   h°mm
145  Mo:   but ehm (0.4) I was to afraid to-to go on (0.5) but I had
           ↑friends who did it all the time an::: (0.8) I think you-
           you s-
146  Je:   could that have- n- inspired=
           not inspir[ed=encouraged y-]
147  Mo:             [yeah >(it di-)]of
           course of cour[se<]
148  Je:                 [ye-]
149  Mo:   I shouldn't have d- eh:: I wouldn't have= have done it if
           eh:: just by my ↑self [(x)]
150  Je:                         [no?]
151  ps:   (0.4)
152  Mo:   I-(x) I did it with ↓friends and
153  Je:   mm
154  ps:   (0.4)
155  Mo:   then I almost got caught eh::eh (0.3) d[oing it eh-]
156  Je:                                          [th°e::t] must
           have been   ↑horribl[e?]
157  Mo:                       [yeah!]
```

There is some slight hesitation between the beginning and the restart of Monica's turn-at-talk in line 149. The continuation is also hesitant as an if-clause is cut off and an alternative construction is produced. With similar reservations in mind concerning analysis that depends upon

---

[9] This turn-at-talk is preceded by a lengthy sequence in which "we" and "they" are used for multiple antecedents in fairly complex ways, and "we" in the excerpt here, is likely to include both Magnus and Tim.

what is first observable as a unit is completed, one can observe how the pieces that fit syntactically together, comprise an utterance where the auxiliary "would" is better suited than "should" in the current context of Monica's story, and as a response to Jenny's question concerning the influence of Monica's friends on how she had come to shoplift, i.e. "I wouldn't have done it just by myself". The stress on "<u>with</u>" (line 152) that follows the TCU that is repaired, emphasises Monica's standpoint that she would not have stolen had she not had friends who did.

3.2.2 Alterations of tense

It seemed that certain environments were more prone to the occurrence of a sudden change in tense than others, e.g. story-telling and quoted speech. Analyses presented here stress the interplay between the activity and the participants', particularly the NNSs', repair behaviours at these points. In the two examples presented below, the present is replaced by the past. In (3:9) Erik tells Linda about having been hit by a car on six different occasions:

```
(3:9)
261  Er:  yeah (0.6) I've been hit by a car six times so
          [e he he]
262  Li:  [you  ↑have?]
263  Er:  *yes I have↓* .hhhh so eh (0.3) eh the first
          [time was]
264  Li:  [seriously?]
265  Er:  yes I have but I (x x) I was never hurt [but the first]
266  Li:                                          [no]
267  Er:  time I'm I was thrown quite a bit (0.6) ehm I was thrown
          into a wall and and bounced back *he* [and I thought]
268  Li:                                         [(my God)]
269  Er:  Jesus Christ I'm gonna die but [I wasn't] even hurt
```

As Erik changes tense (line 267) the past has already been established. If, instead of replacing the present with the past, he continues the turn, the effect could be compared to the "dramatic present" which is sometimes used in fiction. However, at this moment of talk it would sound odd, particularly since Erik's story is already set as the telling of a past event. The conjunction "but" also suggests that the subordinate clause should preferably be told in the same tense as the preceding main clause.

Monica is also involved in the telling of a past event when she sud-
denly alters a verb. Since Monica and Jenny are both university stu-
dents, and the event she is referring to took place when she did her A-
levels (Swe. *gymnasiet* cf. line 8), the alteration of tense appears moti-
vated:

```
(3:10)
8     Mo:   I don't know (0.3) ehm (1.4) I get to think about eh:m
            (0.8) nt (0.7) e when we have eh when we had religion in
            (0.8) gymnꜜasiet ((different voice quality))
9     Je:   mm
10    Mo:   eh we talked about eh these people who (0.5) forgive
            (0.6) a person who has murdered (0.5) their daughter
            [for]
11    Je:   [mm]
12    Mo:   example and (0.9) eh:: (0.5) that's pretty forgiving I
            [think.]
```

It is perhaps not surprising that most instances of repair affecting
tense occur within story-telling, since this activity allows for elabora-
tions concerning the staging of time, place, actions and actors (cf.
Holt, 1996). Not infrequently, the stories are inhabited by actors who
are given voices of their own, often expressed in the present. An exam-
ple is given in (3:11) of repair appearing in the interface between the
speaker's own voice as teller of the story, and one of the actors within
the story. Magnus tells Tim a joke from a comic magazine called *Mad*:

```
(3:11)
358   Ma:   (they're) so good (0.3) there were like two American
            housewives meeting (0.3) three of them (0.4) and eh::
            (0.6) the two of them asked the third one that (0.4) (oh)
            why she's (0.4) she had become so fat (0.6) and she said
            (0.5) well (0.6) nt it's because of sin,
```

The introduction and presentation of the American housewives are
given in the past tense. Further into the story there is a moment in
which Magnus employs the present. At this point he is about to
recount a fictive conversation between the actors in the story. The
change from the present to the past could possibly come as the result
of a sudden decision not to use a "pretence" voice of an actor within
the story (there's an "(oh)" which sounds as if Magnus is about to imi-
tate one of the housewives). The continuation is told in Magnus' ordi-

nary voice[10]. In the following, Magnus introduces the answer in the past "and she said" but gives the quote in the present "it's because of sin," in a pretence voice. It appears then, that there are slight uncertainties in the use of tense and that Magnus acknowledges that he cannot use "she's" (line 358) even if he was to stick to a pretence voice, since this would violate the requirements of a direct report of the speech of the housewives (e.g. "(oh) why have you become so <u>fat</u>?" or "(oh) why has she become so fat?"). Instead he continues to re-tell what was said in an indirect fashion up to the point of introducing the direct reported speech of the woman who answers the question, i.e. "and she said" (cf. Tannen, 1986: 314 ff, for "introducers to constructed dialogue").

The above examples have in common that they involve activities in which elaborations of tense are necessary in order, on the one hand, to be accurate concerning the way things are, e.g. distinguishing between past and present situations of which both participants share a knowledge, and, on the other hand, to fulfil the requirements of activities such as story-telling where complex patterns of tense may be employed in order to stage an event and recount the voices of one or many participants who are part of the cast. An experienced speaker, native or non-native, is of course aware of these requirements and as a story is being told, immediate decisions about the use of tense must be made. A NNS may perhaps be more sensitive to making mistakes or feel uncertain in these environments, not as a result of not knowing what verb form to employ, but simply because of the speed with which a story or an account of a past event is to be executed (expected by oneself as well as by one's interlocutor). To what extent NSs ordinarily conduct repair of tense in these environments is also a question of interest. In this data there was only one example occurring in a story-telling preface. The tendencies observed in the NNSs' behaviour indicate a possible clash between demands of speed (since the speaker is familiar with the format and knows how to give voices to the actors), and the cognitive load involved in choosing tense.

---

[10] Just as one may say that a speaker "lends his voice" (Coulmas, 1986) in order to report the speech of someone else, the speaker may also *borrow* the voice of the person whose speech is being quoted, i.e. by using an "imaginary" voice (Tannen, 1989).

3.2.3 Attending to mispronunciation

Mispronounced words were commonly attended to by the NNSs whereas there were few such instances in the speech of NSs. Although the English pronunciation of all of the NNSs must be considered good, and for two of the participants (Erik and Magnus), very good, they all mispronounced words from time to time.

It should be kept in mind that it is sometimes difficult to know whether the trouble that is repaired has to do with pronunciation or whether it relates to lexical retrieval in the sense of "slips-of-the-tongue" (cf. Fromkin, 1980, for an overview). Although such psycholinguistic aspects are not dwelt on here, they cannot be completely ignored. In order to identify pronunciation difficulties, psycholinguistics stresses the speed with which a "phonological error" (Kormos, 1999) is detected by the speaker, i.e. as a TCU is interrupted, repair of a phonological error is initiated and carried out faster than is the case when it is a matter of a lexical slip. This is found in studies of self-repair of NSs (e.g. Nooteboom, 1980, 2003; Levelt, 1983, 1989) as well as of NNSs (e.g. van Hest, 1996; van Hest, Poulisse & Bongearts, 1997; Kormos, 1999). The instances that were perceived as repair of mispronounced words in this study all displayed how the repair item was immediately latched on to the item that was cut off.

Repair of pronunciation tended to affect words in the middle or towards the end of TCUs. In example (3:12), Linda adjusts the pronunciation of the word "angel" (line 277). Erik has just closed the story about having been hit by a car six times (which motivates Linda's initial question in the excerpt below, also cf. example (3:9) above):

```
(3:12)
273  Li:  [and you don't] believe in God=you've been [hit]
274  Er:                                             [no e he.]
275  Li:  six times.
276  Er:  .hhhh yeah [I have]
277  Li:             [and you don't] believe in a guardian
          anger=angel?
278  ps:  (0.3)
279  Er:  perhaps I do have (x) a guardian angel.
```

Linda is stunned when she learns that Erik has been hit by a car on six separate occasions (line 273). Rather than answering Linda's question,

Erik confirms that he has, in fact, been hit six times. Linda repeats her prior question this time exchanging "God" for "angel". As she asks this second question, she mispronounces the end of the word, i.e. the word is pronounced [ˈeɪndʒər]. There is an immediate correction and as Erik answers Linda's question (line 279) he shows that he has perceived the appropriately pronounced word.

Mispronunciation could also affect the beginning of a word. In (3:13) Monica repeats a pronoun when it does not come out right:

```
(3:13)
87   Mo:  [and they really forgive not just]
88   Je:  [(but) ((clears throat)) mm]
89   Mo:  accept and they forgive and they can go on you know
90   Je:  mm
91   Mo:  if you accept thomething=something (0.6) I don't really
          think that you could be with that person and feel (0.3)
          comfortable anymore.
```

Apart from the location of mispronunciations in the middle, or towards the end of TCUs, most parts of speech were affected, i.e. nouns, verbs, pronouns, etc. Interestingly the repair of adverbial phrases seemed to show a similar pattern in that a subsequent part within the phrase as a whole "interfered" with the initial pronunciation. This is illustrated in two short examples:

```
(3:14)
303  Li:  that's not the right way to do it.
304  ps:  (0.6)
305  Er:  no↓ that would be morle more or less self denial or
          something
306  Li:  yeah

(3:15)
45   Mo:  yeah the wa- the o- the other way around an' you say I
          forgive you but not actually [do it.]
```

In example (3:14), Erik slips on the first syllable of the expression "more or less" and the pronunciation is obstructed as the "or" is not pronounced in the first attempt (or one could perhaps say that it is assimilated within the slip "morle"). Likewise, in (3:15) Monica drops out a part of the adverbial expression and produces the first part of a word that occurs towards the end of the expression constituting the repair. The pronunciation difficulty also shows as Monica stutters on

the modifier "other" before she succeeds in producing the whole expression. It is interesting to consider the formulaic nature of these expressions, and how it may possibly be the case that they are treated as wholes rather than consisting of separate items.

It should be mentioned that there are mispronounced words that are never repaired, but these cases are few. Also, when a participant does not use his/her mother tongue, it is not always entirely clear whether or not a word is mispronounced or if it is simply the way it is formulated by a speaker. The instances looked at in this section only display subtle indications of "trouble" (i.e. the cut-off and sometimes slight hesitation), but participants obviously find it important to attend to mispronunciation even if the lack of repair would probably not violate the comprehensibility of the utterance. The speaker might, of course, think that misunderstanding may arise from this kind of trouble. The achievements of these self-repairs then, are not only that possible misunderstandings are prevented, but again that the image of the speaker as knowledgeable from a linguistic point of view is established.

3.3 Alterations of the initial choice of a word

In this section cases where a speaker decides to alter the initial use of a word and replace it with another word are investigated. In contrast to previous examples, the alteration does not affect grammar or pronunciation, but rather the "appropriateness" of a word in its local context from a semantic and sometimes social point of view. In psycholinguistics, this phenomenon has been acknowledged as "lexical substitution errors" (e.g. Fay & Cutler, 1978; Fromkin, 1980). Whereas troubles concerning formal aspects of talk were mainly carried out by NNSs, the types of repair presented here were also conducted by NSs.

The text below is divided into three subsections, each with a theme of its own, depending on the nature of the trouble source in its conversational environment. Firstly, instances are looked at where the speaker, by means of self-repair, displays his/her knowledge of the range of meanings of certain lexical items and how a TCU is revised in a way that suggests that the speaker finds it important to show this

knowledge. The focus of that section is on the repair-behaviour of NNSs. Secondly, cases are discussed where preceding utterances potentially affect a current formulation. These phenomena were found in all conversations. Finally, alterations of pronouns that occur in discussions of delicate topics are studied, showing how participants become weary of the possible threat to face of the initial choice of a referent. There is thus a slight mix in the focus of the texts concerning the interactional achievements of repair and potential motivations giving rise to repair.

3.3.1 Alteration of a word in a way that displays the speaker's lexical knowledge

All words that are treated as trouble source and repair, show some kind of meaning relationship, such as synonymy, opposite contrast or at least are comprised by a semantic field. An example of the latter is given below. Tobias and John are discussing politics and the status of democracy:

```
(3:16)
126  To:  [yeah] but then again [we] have democracy and e- the
127  Jo:                  [((clears throat))]
128  To:  govern- eh- the [p]arliament votes about it so
```

Tobias' initial word choice is that of "the govern-" which is not fully pronounced. After slight hesitation, he changes the word into "the parliament" before he completes the turn. When Tobias stops and alters his choice of word, he displays his awareness of the distinction between the parliament and the government in relation to the work that these institutions perform. The risk Tobias runs if he does not conduct a self-repair at this point, is to appear ignorant, either concerning what would count as general knowledge, or possibly that he appears linguistically ignorant since he does not use the word commonly associated with voting on political bills, which is done by the members of parliament, in Sweden as well as in Britain. He also runs the risk of being corrected, in case John finds the mistake severe enough to pay attention to it. The self-repair here is thus preventive as

not only does it put Tobias' linguistic competence in a better light, it also possibly hinders a future unwanted response from John in the shape of other-repair. As will be shown later on, other-repair is not always very well received. The repair shows that Tobias has developed an understanding of the range of meanings associated with the two words to be sufficiently able to adjust his utterance in a way that may be considered more "native-like" as well as more accurate concerning his and John's presumed shared knowledge of political institutions. Since Tobias has access to the two related words, he is, in contrast to less skilled speakers of a foreign language, able to choose the word that he knows is the preferable one, whereas beginners often have to employ a word for many purposes whether suitable or not.

For approximately the same reasons, Tobias also exchanges the words "watch" and "guard" with each other at another point in the conversation:

```
(3:17)
31  To:  everybody gets to (0.5) be trained as some sort of basic
         guardian duty
32  Jo:  mm
33  To:  (so) (0.6) he. (0.5) eh eh an any one at least any one
         who who's (been) in the military can can watch eh guard
         like (0.2) official buildings or bridges or livestock
34  Jo:  mhm
```

Tobias tells John how most young Swedish men ordinarily join the services (the armed forces) and are thereby taught certain skills in order to manage the country in a state of war. As he gives an example of one of the things that is learnt, he alters the word "watch" to "guard", the latter being a suitable choice in relation to the list that he subsequently presents (i.e. "official buildings or bridges or livestock"). It is, of course, not possible to speculate with what degree of consciousness a self-repair like this is conducted, but again the alteration may have the effect of preventing other-repair by John. The action thus reveals a speaker's orientation to and potential awareness of what might be expected next in relation to his/her own contribution to talk. It is also interesting to consider why certain words are altered but not others, particularly at points where the speech appears hesitant. In the above example, Tobias' talk has a staccato

quality as he produces the expression "basic guardian duty", which in communication strategy terms would be considered innovatory. This expression, however, is not treated as a source of trouble; neither does John come up with a candidate term. Perhaps it is the case that NNSs at times are so aware of their own "non-nativeness", that when an opportunity to conduct repair that would make them appear less so arises, they grab it.

Alterations of words not only minimize the risk for linguistic other-repair, but may also be preventive in the sense that potential under-standing difficulties or misinterpretations are anticipated:

```
(3:18)
75   Li:   this just e: showed how much=how little respect she had
           for me
76   Er:   m
77   Li:   and that's why I got hurt. (0.4) I mean I got my things
           back and- but that was not what it was about (0.3)
           really.
```

Despite the contrasting relationship between "much" and "little", the initial phrase may express the same thing as Linda's final choice of word when she completes the unit. Linda tells Erik about how the younger sister of a friend of hers once stole some things from her and how offended she had felt at the time. The effect of the alteration is that a more literal interpretation is facilitated and that ambiguity of interpretation is diminished, i.e. that the recipient would interpret "much" in a positive way. As an expression with a cynical touch, the original use of "much" would work just fine. However, the stress on the first syllable of the repair item "little" facilitates a non-ironic inter-pretation over an ironic one.

3.3.2 The possible effect of preceding formulations on the current choice of a word

What the instances presented here have in common is, on the one hand, that they involve words that are synonymous or at least partly synony-mous in the context in which they occur, and, on the other, that they appear in an environment where a preceding formulation potentially

gives rise to the occurrence of the item being altered[11]. From this latter perspective, a third factor comes into play, that of aesthetics. It seems that repeats, at times, are not treated as favourable. In example (3:19) for example, the verb "believe" that is suddenly being replaced by "think", has appeared at numerous occasions in the immediately preceding turns. To continue using the word could work, but might sound odd:

```
(3:19)
317  Er:   and I discuss quite a lot with them and I (1.4) I h.hh
           well (1.2) I talk about how it would be to be religious
           I- I- how I would believe that being religious would work
           actually.
318  Li:   mm
319  Er:   but anyway ehm (0.5) as long as they are tolerant to me
           (0.7) for not believing (0.4) I will of course be tole-
           rant to them [for]
320  Li:                [yeah]
321  Er:   believing I would not I- I don't believe that people are
           mad to to (0.5) to eh:: (0.5) believe and I don't belie-
           an' I- I- I don't think either that it's just a (0.5) a
           way of ex=escaping reality
322  Li:   no
```

The topic of the talk is faith and Erik is telling Linda how he and some friends sometimes talk about what it would be like to be religious (line 317), about his friends' beliefs and his own viewpoints (lines 317, 319, 321). As the perspective shifts from dealing with the belief in God to believing that being religious is not "just a (0.5) a way of ex=escaping reality" (line 321), the alteration achieves some stylistic variation in a TCU that unrepaired would have contained three occurrences of the verb "believe" (i.e. "I- I don't believe that people are mad to to (0.5) to eh:: (0.5) believe and I don't belie-") already preceded by three instances in the turn leading up to the TCU in which the repair is taking place. It also, in this case, adds a nuance to Erik's commitment to the statement in the slight semantic difference between "believe" and "think"[12].

---

[11] Preceding talk, with few exceptions, affect subsequent talk one way or the other. What is intended here is more specifically the impact of prior formulations on subsequent turns in the form of whole or partial repeats.

[12] It should be noted that this excerpt too exhibits further self-initiated self-repairs than the one dealt with. Instances such as the one observed in line 321 where a TCU is incomplete and a "new" one begun ("I would not I- I don't believe"), are discussed in chapter 4.

Aspects of aesthetics may also be involved in example (3:20). Celia and Emily are talking about the obscure types of jobs (from their perspective) that they have had in order to put food on the table during summer vacation from university. Celia reveals to Emily that she once worked as a telemarketer. In the turns leading up to the alteration, Celia explains how her boss had told the marketers that they should go about convincing a customer to accept an offer[13]:

```
(3:20)
390   Ce:  (go in a secon-) like we're told (0.7) try a second
           time and if they still say no (0.5) you know leave it
           alone.
391   ps:  (0.5)
392   Em:  oh you mean [(x)] one phone caller call again?
393   Ce:              [that's]
394   ps:  (0.8)
395   Ce:  no no no no!
396   Em:  one phon[e-(x x)]
397   Ce:          [on- one] phonec[all]
398   Em:                          [°okay°]
399   Ce:  if they say no the first time (0.5) they say try a second
           time
400   ps:  (0.2)
401   Em:  °yeah°
402   Ce:  an' (0.2) if they still say no you know just (0.2) **leav=
           let** it **be**
403   Em:  mhm
404   Ce:  that's what they told us (0.5) I (x x x[x x])
```

Emily asks for confirmation (line 392) of her understanding concerning the number of calls Celia had to make as she initially thinks that Celia had to *call* a customer twice rather than *asking* twice during one phone call (lines 395, 396, 397). Once this matter is sorted out, Celia repeats large parts of the turn that preceded Emily's request. The last bit of this utterance comprises the phrase "leave it alone" (line 390). When it reappears in the repeat, Celia changes the verb from "leav-" to "let" in "let it be" (line 402). The appearance of "leav=" is not surprising considering the fact that large parts of the prior utterance are being recycled. It should also be noted that the recycled utterance is a retelling of what someone else has said at a point in the past. Although she does

---

[13] This excerpt also hosts an instance of other-initiated self-repair, as Emily requests confirmation of her understanding (line 392). The focus here, however, is on Celine's self-initiated self-repair (line 402).

not use any (perceivable) pretence voice, Celia introduces what appears to be a quoted utterance with "like we're told" (line 390), "they say" (line 399) and "that's what they told us" (line 404). The replacement of "leav" with "let" is an alteration, not only of Celia's own talk, but a variant of what was said in the past event, staged by Celia.

The two examples presented above are in no way identical, but they are representative of the occurrences of this type of alteration of synonymous expressions occurring in the data. Preceding talk may be influential as suggested in the analyses. A repeat with a modification also strengthens coherence links with what has been said previously. This is perhaps most obvious in example (3:20) as there is a side-sequence between the first time Celine quotes her employer (line 390) and the point where she resumes the quote (line 402). The aesthetic aspects of an utterance should not be ignored either. Although repetition enhances conversational coherence and is often used by speakers to show their alignment with previous speakers (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Tannen, 1989; Anward, 2000), too much repetition in one's own speech, appears to be noticed and sometimes revised.

3.3.3 Minding one's p's and q's

Staying on a friendly, co-operative basis appears to be the default goal when friends talk. This is also true of the material investigated in this dissertation where friends were talking to each other. The topics brought up during the conversations varied considerably and attention was sometimes paid to those provided by the researcher, and at other times to everyday matters. Discussions were often open-hearted and it frequently happened that participants revealed private experiences and gave an account of their opinions about sensitive issues[14] related to the topics. In environments touching upon issues of delicacy it

---

[14] Linell & Bredmar (1996: 347–48) define a "*sensitive*, or interactionally *delicate* topic" as "one that cannot be addressed directly or explicitly by the speaker without endangering the interactional harmony of the encounter by threatening the listener's face (and therefore also the speaker's own face)". The topics talked about at the point of pronoun alterations in this data, fit well with this definition.

recurrently happened that speakers paid particular attention to their choice of words. One way in which this carefulness reveals itself is the initiation and execution of self-repair.

When people interact, they continuously inhabit their speech with actors and actions in order to perform various interactional jobs. Identification with certain actors can be more or less of an advantage. This section shows how self-repair is used as a resource in order to remedy a situation in which ambiguous interpretation concerning inclusion or exclusion among (groups of) people referred to *could be* interpreted as troublesome. The trouble source in such environments often concerns the use of a certain pronoun in units of talk which unrepaired could be interpreted as offensive and/or face-threatening to the speaker, the recipient, or to them both (cf. Brown & Levinson, 1987:190ff on impersonalization through the choice of pronouns). Most such cases concerned the inclusion or exclusion, or at least distancing, of the speaker or speaker and recipient together from the agent in a proposition or account where a sensitive topic was being talked about. It should, however, be noted that there were also instances of replacement of pronouns when less sensitive issues were being talked about[15]. Although the topics were not of a delicate nature, these self-repairs were related to the speakers' self-representation in the sense of identification with or distancing from a group of people being referred to. Focus in this section, however, is on the repairs that appeared to concern the avoidance of being misunderstood concerning the speakers' own position in relation to a sensitive topic, or the risk of including the recipient among agents who behave in an unfavourable fashion.

In English as well as in Swedish there are pronouns that may be used in an inclusive, exclusive as well as generic sense. Their interpretations are dependent on various aspects of the conversational setting, e.g. the topic being talked about, the participants' relationship, their knowledge of the language spoken, etc. In the following, four examples

---

[15] There were in total eight instances of repair where a pronoun replaced another pronoun in the talk of NSs and seven instances in the talk of NNSs. All but two cases in the talk of NNSs occurred in an environment that could be interpreted as sensitive, and the same figure was found for the NSs' replacement of pronouns.

are used in order to illustrate the interplay of such factors and their relation to participants' orientation to the *risk* of misinterpretations that may occur as a certain word or expression is used. The first and the third example come from the talk of a NNS. The second one occurs in the talk of a NS. Finally, an example is given to explicate the possible consequences of not minding one's p's and q's, when talking about matters of delicacy.

In (3:21) Magnus and Tim are involved in a discussion about moral boundaries and what actions should or should not be considered sinful. Magnus and Tim attend the same church and are practising Christians. In the excerpt, Magnus states that he finds it difficult to discuss the notion of sin from a perspective that is not founded in the belief in God. In order to elaborate on the ascription of something as truly wrong, possibly in an attempt to find examples of actions that would count as immoral from a general perspective (rather than from a specifically Christian one), he comes up with "atrocity" and "genocide" (line 445). The replacement of a pronoun occurs as he is introducing these examples after a contemplating (1.5) pause:

```
(3:21)
439  Ma:  [(so) eventually]
440  Ti:  [so there's] no kind of= the boundaries are (0.2) could
          be anywhere.
441  ps:  (0.4)
442  Ma:  exactly if you don't have any foundation
443  ps:  (0.3)
444  Ti:  hm
445  Ma:  for it (0.6) (au) (b) sort of (0.3) °mh°(0.9) outside
          yourself or= or higher than yourself, (1.8) it's (0.9)
          h.h(1.3) it's not very easy to discuss it I think. (1.5)
          okey we:(0.1)they commit atrocity to (0.4) to mankind.
          (0.5) yeah ↑sure but (0.7) who decides what is ↑that (1.2)
          like >genocide yes: [certainly]
446  Ti:                      [°mhm°]
447  Ma:  that is< (0.7) is an atrocity (0.6) e:hm
```

As Magnus introduces atrocity, he initially uses the pronoun "we:" (line 445) as the subject. The achievement of replacing "we:" with "they" is the avoidance of using a pronoun that may be interpreted as including Tim and himself amongst people who commit atrocities to mankind (line 445). The replacement occurs in what is prosodically, semantically, and syntactically a new TCU, introduced by "okey". The

vowel of "we:" is slightly prolonged and there is only a micro pause between the two pronouns. The speech rate in this instance is neither faster nor slower than preceding talk and the prolonged vowel may be interpreted as an attempt to smoothly integrate the replacement into the unit being constructed, providing an efficient transition between the two words. From a strict CA perspective, one could argue that there is no evidence in the data for claims as to the motivation for the replacement. However, it is equally hard to say that the addition of an element (in this case an item that may replace another one within a syntactic unit) during the production process, is *not* motivated by the social considerations that people take into account as they interact. Since pronoun replacements in the environment of sensitive topics recurred in the speech of NSs as well as NNSs, the argument here is, therefore, that such replacements could very well be conducted in order to avoid what the recipient may interpret as offensive or potentially face-threatening.

Another example of replacement of pronouns in an environment where a delicate topic is talked about is found in the talk of Anne and Michael. They are involved in a discussion about what it takes to be forgiven when a person has been emotionally injured. As the excerpt begins, Michael is commenting on the expression "to forgive and forget" (this is not included in the transcript below). The "that's" which occurs as the first word in Michael's turn (line 86) refers to this expression:

```
(3:22)
86   Mi:   [that's just something that has always]
87   An:   [m:::::::m]
88   Mi:   always bugged me for (0.8) for a long ti:me. (b)
           [cause (that was) something that my (mum)]
89   An:   [(x x x x)]
90   Mi:   used to always say. (0.4) ehm (0.7) I don- I don't
           know=and I think there can be forgiveness in in a way
           that you have to (1.3) some'n has to put up their own
           trust again= someone has to [sort of pro:ve]
91   An:                               [mm]
92   Mi:   their worth an' then you can (0.7) an ehm:(2.4) accept
           (2.0) an an apology or accept some'n (0.6) making it back
           up but I mean I- I think(1.2) >I don't know= I think I
           think< (there) is (something like) true forgiveness cause
           I think if you can actually understand (0.6) the person's
           motivation to doing something,
```

```
93   ps:  (0.3)
94   An:  mm
```

Michael's speech is slightly hesitant as he closes his assessment concerning the expression "to forgive and forget". A transition to a new perspective begins with a hedge, i.e. the phrase "I don- I don't know=" can be heard as a closing of the prior topic/perspective as well as a beginning of something new. In any case it helps Michael keep the turn and enables him to start an account in which he contrasts his point of view about the expression that had "bugged" him (cf. line 88) with the fact that it sometimes is necessary to do something in order to be forgiven[16]. The replacement of a pronoun occurs within this account (line 90). The item that is replaced refers to people who have done something wrong. What is of importance here is that the replacement of "you" with "some'n" (i.e. someone) diminishes the possibility of interpreting the referent as including himself and Anne in the unfavourable position of the wrongdoers. Subsequent to the replacement, Michael sticks to an unambiguous use of a generic "someone" (line 90) and "some'n" (line 92). The pronoun "you", however, reappears as referring to people who are in the position to forgive, and is not oriented to as problematic despite the possibility of interpreting it as including Michael and Anne. Within Michael's turn-at-talk there are thus two primary actors, i.e. "good guys and bad guys" or "victims and wrongdoers" and the achievement of the replacement is avoidance of inclusion among the bad guys, whereas possible inclusion among victims appears to be unproblematic. The pause (1.3) that occurs between the phrase that hosts the trouble source and the one that hosts the replacement is difficult to interpret. It may occur as Michael is planning what to say or it may appear as he detects that what he has just said might be interpreted in an unfavourable way, particularly since Anne does not provide any feedback despite the fairly lengthy break.

It is not only through the replacement of one word with another that participants display how inclusion is treated as something worth attending to. An utterance may also be cut off and material inserted

---

[16] This is, of course, an *interpretation* of what point Michael is making.

before parts of what has previously been said are recycled. In example (3:23) below, Magnus adds material which may help to avoid too narrow an interpretation of "we" (line 188) using a more impersonal pronoun, i.e. "everyone". The addition is a metacomment that seems not only to serve an explanatory purpose in relation to the pronoun initially used, but also prepares for the recycled if-clause which this time is completed (cf. Schiffrin's (1987: 300–301)"background repair"). As the if-construction is recycled, the pronoun from the cut off clause is replaced with the noun "people". This alteration can be argued to further distance the speaker and recipient from the agent referred to:

```
(3:23)
188  Ma:  well yeah (1.0) but no I think because (x) if we don't
          forgive (1.1) eh:: and tha' n this is like (0.4) for
          everyone (0.6) if people don't forgive (0.3) it's so
          easy for for that unforgiveness to turn into
          bitter[ness]
189  Ti:        [°yeah°]yeah
190  ps:  (0.3)
191  Ma:  and a bitter person is not a *nice [person to be with*]
192  Ti:                                     [((laughs))]
```

Similarly to prior examples, the addition and replacement occur in talk that can be considered sensitive and of a quite personal nature. Even if it is not possible to know, at the point of the cut off and addition, how Magnus will complete his if-clause, the successive distancing of himself and Tim from people who do not forgive enables him to elaborate on how unforgiveness turns into bitterness, and, consequently that "a bitter person is not a *nice [person to be with*] (line 191).

Participants in conversation clearly have a live and more or less conscious idea of (culturally) sensitive issues[17] that may affect face. The following example shows the consequences of *not* attending to the use of a reference that may be interpreted as an unfortunate inclusion of the recipient among people with whom s/he might not want to be asso-

---

[17] It should be pointed out that "sensitive" in relation to this example, does not refer to the fact that the choice of reference that is treated as troublesome, necessarily has to do with a difference between English and Swedish conceptions of age. Age (particularly in the sense of being included among "old" people), appears to be treated with caution in many different cultures, particularly within modern western societies (e.g. SOU, 2003: 65; Lindström, 2002: 233–259, for a popular account).

ciated. The example is used in order to stress what is at stake and what social considerations interlocutors bear in mind, but may sometimes miss out on. In a complex interplay of the actors and actions inhibiting speech, the speaker must orient to the recipient's perspective and possible interpretations. In terms of repair, unfortunate inclusion yields a lengthy sequence in which one speaker conducts numerous alterations in relation to the reaction of his interlocutor.

As the excerpt begins, Tim and Magnus are discussing the reclaim-the-streets movement in Sweden and in England. Since there are many points of interest in this excerpt, the part of it that exhibits these points is marked by boldface:

```
(3:24)
143  Ti:  [mm]it's just a shame though. I just  don't (0.4) you
          know (0.3) I mean (the political) situation in  England
          a= I just don't feel it's e- you know= they can achieve
          anything through (0.4) °h like this reclaim the street
          [things.]
144  Ma:  [((coughs)) m::]
145  Ti:  it's just it(s) just irritates loads * and loads of
          people you know I'm j[ust- he he*]
146  Ma:                       [I know I know]
147  Ti:  so you know so I don't know (0.3) (you know) really
          what(0.2)(x [x])
148  Ma:            [doesn't] it irritate mainly people (0.2)
          above (0.5) thirty. (0.4) the age of thirty. (1.0) I mean
          other young people,
149  ps:  (0.2)
150  Ti:  he he he [((laughs))]
151  Ma:           [aren't as-]
152  Ti:  be careful he [he he ((laughs loudly))]
153  Ma:                [okay! sorry! *(x x)* ((laughs))]
154  Ti:  ((continues laughing))[((laughs)).hhhh ((laughs)).hhhhh]
155  Ma:                        [okay people above twentynine then.]
156  Ti:  yeah alright.
157  Ma:  alri[ght]
158  Ti:      [e he.]
159  ps:  (0.8) ((sound from table))
160  Ma:  sorry Tim.
161  Ti:  e he
162  Ma:  eh::m (1.3) or above twentyfive (0.6) who (1.1) ((sound
          from the table)) we are old (0.2) er↓ (0.1) or old
163  Ti:  e he he ((laughs))
164  Ma:  sorry but, (0.2) and [we think]
165  Ti:                       [.hhh h.hh]
166  Ma:  oh they're just causing (0.2) eh: (0.6) a great deal of
          problems they ('re) just vandalising an- and things (0.6)
          whereas other young people (0.4)°nt° eh feel that they
```

```
         have a right (0.3) in what they're doing. (0.2) reclaim
         the streets=okay there's some (0.3) violence there,
167  ps:  (0.3)
168  Ti:  uh
```

In the beginning of the excerpt, Tim refers to the reclaim-the-streets movement as irritating "loads *and loads of people" (line 145). This view is supported by Magnus, in overlap with Tim's talk (line 146). Tim continues to talk but expresses some uncertainty and hesitation and Magnus takes the turn and asks a question that relates to what Tim has previously said about people being irritated. It should be noted that Magnus does not receive an answer to his question. After a (1.0) pause he continues and contrasts people who are irritated, presumingly people over thirty, with "other young people" (line 148). The first syllable in "other" is stressed, which emphasises it as a contrast to the group previously referred to. There is a brief pause and Tim begins to laugh loudly before Magnus has said anything further. Magnus tries to keep the turn but cuts off as Tim does not stop laughing. At this point Tim comes up with a friendly warning: "be careful" (line 152). Magnus appears to understand that what he has just said could be misinterpreted as presupposing that people above thirty are not young. Magnus' recognition of this mistake shows in his apology to Tim (which is pronounced with emphasis). In addition he recycles the phrase comprising "people above", this time including himself as he alters the age from thirty to twenty-nine. This correction is accepted by Tim (line 156). Magnus even apologises once more. During this repair-work, Tim continuously chuckles in a friendly, yet teasing fashion. Magnus now lowers the age limit to twenty-five to really be on the safe side and there is a pronoun replacement as he alters the relative pronoun "who" into "we", which clearly includes himself within the same group that he accidentally described Tim as belonging to. As if this is not enough, he stutters on the word "old (0.2) er↓ (0.1) or old" (line 162) which makes Tim laugh even more. Magnus apologises a third time, before he is finally able to go on, again using an inclusive "we" to mark the contrast between people who are causing trouble and those who are not.

The above excerpt is thus inhabited by numerous agents with whom

the interlocutors may or may not want to be associated, or, depending on the context, cannot be associated with. There are syntactic as well as semantic ties that relate the various expressions to each other and there are many possible interpretations concerning the inclusion with or the distancing from a referent. As Tim's interpretation emphasises age, and Magnus is aware that this can be a sensitive issue, he must apologise to Tim. His alignment by means of lowering the age limit for people who are "irritated" is also in line with remedial work in order to make up for what Tim reacted to. It should be noted that Magnus is not only referring to a contrast between people who are irritated and young people who cause trouble. After Tim's initiation and his own excuses, Magnus returns to "other young people" in the sense that there are, on the one hand, young people who are "vandalising an- and things" (line 166) and on the other, "other young people (0.4) °nt° eh feel that they have a right (0.3) in what they're doing" (line 166). Thus having attended to the age-issue, Magnus does not display full agreement with Tim's point of view about the reclaim-the-streets movement.

One further point can be made here concerning the risk of causing offence. It is noticeable that Tim is not making Magnus aware of the presupposition concerning age because it really offends him. The manner in which the issue is dealt with is conducted in a humorous manner by both parties. To point out to someone, as Tim does, that he could be offended by Magnus' choice of expression, is corrective in nature, which, in turn, is not entirely safe as far as face is concerned (cf. chapter 6 on other-initiated other-repair). Nonetheless, Tim has ridiculed Magnus and put the finger on his social carelessness as he did not acknowledge that his word choice could be interpreted as offensive in relation to what may be considered a sensitive issue.

The achievement of this type of self-repair is to display to one's interlocutor that staying on good terms is important. Knowledge of what may be considered offensive is also made explicit as the speaker adjusts an utterance in progress, influencing the way it may be interpreted. This is something that NNSs as well as NSs do in the data analysed here. To be able to anticipate the interpretation of one's interlocutor, and by means of repair, prevent a possible interactional problem

from occurring, in this particular case; avoiding being offensive, is thus part of the interlocutors' interactional competence. One may assume that NNSs with a less developed ability to use English in talk-in-interaction, would perhaps not put much energy into alterations of this kind, and also, one may hypothesise that NSs might be more accommodating to utterances that could be interpreted as offensive if they know (and notice) that the speaker is preoccupied with the very production of talk in the foreign language. The fact that all interlocutors here engage in repair that seems socially motivated points to a symmetric relationship concerning a knowledge of what may be interpreted as offensive or not.

3.4 Summary

This chapter presented analyses of units of talk in which a speaker stops in the middle of a word or at a word boundary and performs an alteration of some kind, subsequent to which the unit is completed. The results of analyses highlighted how self-repair may contribute to self-representations and interpretations of interlocutors as more or less competent participants in talk-in-interaction. Analyses acknowledged differences and/or similarities in the repair behaviours of NNSs and NSs.

One difference in NNSs' and NSs' orientations concerned troubles of a formal nature, i.e. NNSs' addressed grammatical difficulties and dealt with incorrectly pronounced words more often than did NSs. The outcome of this type of repair was favourable in that the completed TCU in almost all cases was more accurate than it had been, had the trouble source been left unattended to. It has been argued all through this chapter, that although the NNSs conduct repair that addresses linguistic, formal aspects of the foreign language, the way in which they accomplish repair, adds to the interpretation of them as competent and fluent speakers. Evidence from retrospective data, as well as from the transcripts where the very activity of repair was in focus, gave clues as to participants' attitudes to their own linguistic production. It *means* something to make a certain mistake as one is talking and it

means something to put it right. The way a point of trouble is marked can, for example, display the speaker's frustration about having made a certain type of mistake (cf. example (3:1)), particularly if the trouble is one that the speaker assumes that his/her interlocutor might acknowledge as a grammatical mistake. Thus, a speaker may want to create an impression of being careful and proficient and self-repairs add to such interpretations.

Despite differences between NNSs and NSs concerning grammar and pronunciation, there were also many ways in which participants attended to the same types of trouble occurring in similar types of conversational environments. For example, as competent speakers, NNSs and NSs were able to adjust to the demands of the immediate activity, and to their own requirements of a satisfactory level of language use (e.g. concerning rhetorical/aesthetic aspects of talk). The focus on a participant's own speech is not to be misread as a monological perspective of successful or unsuccessful message transfer. What is intended is rather the ability of participants to navigate through a conversation that is dynamic and requires that speakers are able, for example, to take social considerations into account, i.e. interpreting and estimating the potential interpretation and reception of an utterance by one's interlocutor. Repair of the initial choice of words, for example, could have a preventive effect in the sense that certain interpretations or responses would be less likely to occur if the repair was conducted. If the initial word choice might accidentally portray a speaker as ignorant concerning knowledge of a linguistic or of a worldly nature, self-repair could be used in order to remedy responses based on such interpretations. Alterations of pronouns were conducted since the ones initially used could be potentially face-threatening, not only to the recipient, but sometimes also to the speaker, particularly in conversational environments in which topics of delicacy were dealt with. Repair in these circumstances shows the recipient that social considerations are being taken, whether s/he would have reacted to the initially used form or not.

The results of analyses of the self-repairs conducted by NNSs contribute to the perception of these speakers' fluency, as the types of trouble addressed and the way they are managed, do not often deal

with linguistic incompetence, but rather display speakers' *inter-actional* competence (comprising, of course, the display of an extensive vocabulary). This competence perhaps shows the most in the abilities to anticipate the potential interpretations of one's interlocutor and thereby also possible responses. In contrast to NNSs with a limited knowledge of a language, part of becoming a fluent and competent speaker thus involves the ability to shift focus from formal aspects of talk to taking social and pragmatic considerations. Whereas NNSs in the beginning stages of language development *have to* conduct a continuous revision of the stream of speech (thereby often producing hesitant talk), the NNSs participating in this study largely conduct self-repair because they *want to* and *can*.

4. Vocabulary uncertainties

This chapter deals with such instances where a turn-at-talk is stopped as the speaker cannot find or is uncertain of an expression. The uncertainty is displayed by various means, ranging from very subtle indications such as pauses and hesitation sounds, to metalinguistic comments where the nature of the trouble is verbalised (cf. chapter 3, section 3.1). The speaker may come up with a way of handling the uncertainty him/herself or appeals to the recipient for assistance (or, the recipient interprets the speaker's hesitancy as an invitation for other-repair). The self-initiated self-repairs presented in the previous chapter proved to be highly interactional, i.e. they displayed a social orientation in which a speaker revised his/her own speech. This perspective is continued here showing uncertainties that are resolved by the speaker him/herself as well as how participants come to collaborate on the cause of the hesitancy over more than one turn. The chapter can thus be viewed as a transition space between repair that is initiated and carried out by the speaker him/herself, to collaboratively accomplished repair sequences[1].

The phenomena looked at here are commonly referred to as "word search" (e.g. Goodwin, 1980, 1987; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Iványi, 2001; Kurhila, 2003) even if some of the hesitancy may well concern something else than the search for a word. To determine what type of uncertainty is expressed is not always clear-cut. Kurhila (2003: 139–216) distinguishes between "lexical" and "grammatical" searches, in her study of conversation involving NSs and NNSs, but admits that the distinction has fuzzy boundaries. She bases her classification on the way a search is initiated. The approach here is a similar one, but I would like to be even more cautious concerning the nature of the

---

[1] An overview of the frequency of occurrence of the types of repair that are analysed in this chapter, is offered in Tables 3 and 4 in the Appendix, last in this dissertation.

search, particularly in cases where the indications of hesitancy are very subtle. There are, indeed, repair initiations that concern formal aspects of a word, but these instances can only be identified as such if they are targeted by means of an explication of the nature of the difficulty, e.g. a metalinguistic comment such as *what's it called*. But even a phrase such as *what's it called* does not necessarily indicate a lexical search. For example, in excerpt (4:5) below, *what's it called* precedes a self-repair where a participant manages to find the word "confirmation". However, the TCU preceding the search projects a verb phrase, not a noun phrase. As the talk proceeds it is clear that the participant needs a verb rather than a noun. *What's it called* thus indicates a search, but it is very difficult to establish this indication of hesitancy as being related to either a lexical or a grammatical search. Brouwer (2004) shows how pronunciation uncertainties are oriented to by NNSs and NSs by means of rising intonation, sometimes followed by a repeat of the troublesome word presented with an alternative pronunciation. These are initiation techniques that, like metalinguistic comments, target the nature of the participant's uncertainty and anticipate a response from the recipient, preferably a confirmation of one of the candidates presented, or the provision of an appropriately pronounced word[2].

Not all instances where uncertainty is indicated are responded to by the assistance of the interlocutor. Some cases where a TCU is cut off and marked with hesitancy appear to relate to processes commonly associated with psychological procedures such as problems in retrieving a word from the lexicon or that the speaker in fact is completely lacking a word. It is particularly the case that the latter description applies for subtly indicated searches when NNSs talk. These subtly indicated self-repairs are discussed in the first part of the chapter from the point of departure of analytical difficulties involved in targeting the nature of the trouble in these cases.

As far as collaboratively accomplished searches are concerned, Kurhila (2003) shows that it is mainly the NNSs who initiate word

---

[2] The recipient can, of course, also abstain from responding, but a lack of response can lead to further repair initiations depending on how eager the speaker who is facing a trouble is to resolve the difficulty (cf. Brouwer, 2004).

search (both lexical and grammatical). Corresponding to Kurhila's findings, searches that deal with formal aspects of an expression occurring in the data investigated in this dissertation, only appear in the talk of NNSs. The collaboratively accomplished searches are analysed stressing the roles of participants as friends who share a great deal of knowledge and experience that affect the way a search is resolved.

4.1 Permanent gap or lexical lapse?

This section addresses a specific difficulty involved in analysis of self-initiated self-repair in the talk of NNSs. The point of interest is such instances where a TCU is cut off and followed by a new unit that is semantically related to the unit that was not completed but displays a different syntactic structure. These instances correspond to the repair format presented as example (2:8) in chapter 2, section 2.2 where the speaker suddenly cannot find a word and therefore starts anew. The speaker's initial uncertainty is displayed to different degrees, ranging from a simple cut-off, to hesitation markers, pauses and/or meta-comments that explicitly point out that the speaker is engaged in a search. As far as NNSs are concerned, most studies of these phenomena are found within the framework of S/FLA theory (e.g. Faerch & Kasper, 1983; Kasper & Kellerman, 1997). Some of the examples discussed in this section resemble cases that have been described in terms of "compensatory strategies" (e.g. Faerch & Kasper, 1983:53), that is, as paraphrase or restructuring of a unit at a point where the speaker is assumed to lack a word. This issue is addressed here pointing to the difficulty involved in making claims concerning a participant's *lack* of a word/ expression, at least in the sense of a permanent gap in lexical or grammatical knowledge. From a CA perspective, it is not possible to connect an instance of repair to assumptions about participants' cognitive abilities unless there is satisfactory evidence in the data concerning the nature of the trouble and how the trouble is solved. Whereas S/FLA studies perhaps sometimes exaggerate the influence of the NNSs' lack of linguistic knowledge in these circumstances, CA possibly underesti-

mates the very same thing, since certain types of analysis are outside the scope of CA. An attempt to approach this methodological difficulty is made by means of providing alternative analyses of some illustrative examples from the data. This strategy should not be seen as a way of substituting for any shortcomings of CA and studies of S/FLA, but simply as a discussion highlighting some difficulties involved in the analysis of (particularly NNSs') self-initiated self-repair.

In the first example, Linda is telling Erik about the theft that she had experienced, where her friend's sister had stolen make-up and jewellery from her[3]:

```
(4:1)
5    Li:  there so I cn't check her but when I came back (0.3) and
          they had gone (1.0) I missed h. hh (1.0) two or three of
          my gold  ↑rings (0.8) I missed (0.3) one silver ring I
          missed glitter:: like make up glitter
6    Er:  mhm mhm↓
7    Li:  from my- (0.7) eh::(0.4)eh that she took from= from the
          bathroom (0.4) and e: one necklace (0.8) among other
          things (0.8) .h and that was (1.1) not very (0.3) very
          nice of her I think= I (0.2) just hated her.
```

"from my" (line 7) projects a noun phrase. The pause and hesitation markers indicate a search subsequent to which the that-clause may be viewed as a "new" unit that replaces the prepositional phrase that is never completed, i.e. the that-clause fits syntactically, prosodically and semantically with Linda's preceding unit (which prosodically was not completed although Erik provides supportive feedback). It should, however, be noted that a prepositional phrase recurs as Linda continues towards completion of the turn. The noun phrase "bathroom" occurs in a similar position to the one that was missing in the cut off unit. The question is then what the function of the that-clause is?

On the one hand, the cut-off, pause and hesitation markers indicate that Linda is engaged in some kind of search or process of speech planning and/or production. From the perspective of S/FLA research, the subsequent that-clause and not least the recycled prepositional phrase exhibiting a noun phrase that was never expressed at the earlier stage,

---

[3] If the story looks familiar it is because the topic of Linda's talk reappears further into her and Erik's conversation and an excerpt from that instance was presented as example (3:18) in chapter 3, section 3.3.1.

could be interpreted to mean that Linda is lacking a word at the point of the cut-off. It could even be suggested that this is due to a gap in her lexical knowledge, however, not necessarily of the word "bathroom" but possibly of some other noun phrase, such as *dressing case* or *bathroom cabinet*. Considering the contents of her prior talk and drawing from knowledge about where people ordinarily keep their jewellery and/or make-up, "the bathroom" is clearly a less specific option and perhaps a more common word which may be easier to come up with than more specific terms such as those suggested above. This is, of course, speculative. From this data, it is not possible to establish whether it is the case that Linda does not *know* a word or if it is simply the case that she does not *remember* a word at the point where she needs one.

An alternative interpretation concerns Linda's animation of the actors participating in the story. She has previously told Erik that she found a variety of items missing. The that-clause provides reference to the friend and contrasts Linda's missing things with specifying that her friend "took" (line 7) them. The insertion of the that-clause could thus be an important part in the staging of the event. Once Linda has added this perspective, she resumes the prepositional phrase and brings the unit to completion.

A third interpretation is to simply view the cut-off and hesitation as part of the production process. The "new" unit is what is first retrieved as Linda attempts to continue the turn as effortlessly as possible rather than being caught up in a lengthy word search which might even lead to other-repair.

A similar case occurs in Erik's talk. He and Linda are discussing items that young people are likely to shoplift:

```
(4:2)
117  Er:  they want like records but you cannot steal records
          because [they're]
118  Li:          [noo]
119  Er:  not in the (0.5) n eh:: th- they're behind this counter
          an' [so ]forth= I (°don't know°)
120  Li:      [yeah]
```

Here Erik appears to lack a noun. There is a pause and sounds of hesitation followed by a repetition of the subject ("they're") of the stopped

unit. The negated prepositional phrase is "replaced" by a new phrase in which Erik tells Linda where CD records are kept rather than where they are not kept. Anyone with knowledge of what most music stores in Sweden (and elsewhere) look like recognises that CD records are never kept in their sleeves on the shelves in the store, but are kept in a locker behind the salesmen's counter. One may presume that Erik is searching, for example, for the word *sleeve*, but either does not know it, or simply cannot retrieve it quickly enough to proceed with his turn in a satisfactory way. It may be noted that both the uncompleted syntactic construction "they're not in the [X]" and the completed unit "th-they're behind this counter an' so forth" manage to explain why "you cannot steal records" (line 117). Linda's feedback occurs in strategic places throughout Erik's turn; once as he has just proposed that one cannot steal records, and again right after the explanation why this is so. The display of understanding (and agreement) does not occur until he has completed the "new" unit. Linda thus lets Erik manage the search himself despite the pause and hesitation during which she could possibly have assisted him. Just as Kurhila (2003) points out, there are differences between searches that are responded to with other-repair and those that are not. Gaze, for example, is an important cue involved in the interpretation of markers of hesitation, and in the present example Erik is not looking straight at Linda. Despite the pause, the speed with which Erik manages to start repeating the subject, may also be interpreted as an indication that the turn is about to continue.

Again it is not possible to make any claims about whether or not it is the case that Erik does not *know* the word, although from a S/FLA perspective, this could be one explanation for the construction of a new TCU. One reason why it is difficult to relate this type of self-repair in the talk of NNSs to their linguistic ability is that similar cases are found in NSs' talk:

(4:3)
```
273  Em:   when I see the word sin that's a religious
           ter [m to me.]
274  Ce:       [yeah] to me that's a:: religious  term (1.6) uhm
           (0.8) and I guess for me:: (0.3) personally I'm a (1.1)
           e- I'm (0.5) I- I go to church↓
```

```
275  Em:   °mh[m°]
276  Ce:      [I be]lieve in God so I believe that there is such a
             thing
```

Emily and Celia are looking at the topics and Emily comments on the word "sin" which is included in one of the questions, stating that she finds that it is "a religious term" (line 273). Celia agrees and expands on why she agrees with Emily. In the middle of a TCU she stops, hesitates, and restarts. The units that are not completed both project some kind of complement, for example, a noun or adjective ("I'm a [X]" and "I'm [X]"). However, rather than specifying what she is (possibly what faith she conforms to), Celia chooses to tell Emily that she goes to church and that she believes in God.

The motivations for the restart can be manifold. It may, of course, be the case that Celia is unable to find a word (e.g. Christian, Catholic etc.). It can also be the case that she changes her mind just as she is to specify what faith she conforms to, choosing a more general description of going to church and believing in God.

Within CA one should not look further into the discourse than the point of interest and the turns leading up to it; in an attempt to take a participant perspective. However, in the current example, it is interesting to note that subsequent to the repair, Celia specifies that she is, in fact Christian. She does not do this until she has joked about her faith and has checked Emily's responses to her revelation about going to church and believing in God. As Emily laughs, Celia returns to her account about sin and how it is defined in relation to breaking "any of the (1.3) "°ten commandments°" (line 282):

```
(4:4)
273  Em:   when I see the word sin that's a religious
           ter [m to me.]
274  Ce:      [yeah] to me that's a:: religious  term (1.6) uhm
           (0.8) and I guess for me:: (0.3) personally I'm a (1.1)
           e- I'm (0.5)I- I go to church↓
275  Em:   °mh[m°]
276  Ce:      [I be]lieve in God so I believe that there is such a
           thing
277  Em:   mhm
278  Ce:   as sin you know. I mean I'm not gonna proclaim myself as
           some holy [per*]son but*
279  Em:             [((laughs))]
280  Ce:   eh h°m (1.6) yeah there's definitely sin you
```

```
        kn[ow]
281  Em:    [mhm]
282  Ce:  if you break any of the (1.3) °ten commandments° or some-
            thing like that= I mean me being Christian I mean
```

Even further into the discourse, it is revealed that Emily does not share Celia's religious conviction. Drawing from retrospective comments that occurred in relation to this sequence, it was revealed that although Emily and Celia were friends, they were not fully aware of the beliefs of the other. To present oneself as conforming to a certain faith can, of course, involve certain risks even in a situation like this one. It is noticeable that Celine just preceding the cut-off emphasises that she is referring to *her* standpoint; "for <u>me</u>:: (0.3) <u>per</u>sonally" (line 274)[4]. As she continues to develop the topic after the self-repair, she downgrades the role that religion plays in her life (line 278). When Emily responds with laughter and supportive feedback, Celia continues to elaborate on how she views sin and finally reveals that she is a Christian. One interpretation of Celia's initial hesitation is therefore based on the way in which a participant may check the grounds before presenting herself in a specific way. Presuming that it was the noun *Christian* that was projected in the uncompleted units, the downplay of the degree of her religiosness is an adjustment of her self-representation in relation to what she knows, or does not know, about Emily. Once this is responded to in a satisfactory way, she can use this new "identity" to explain why she argues the way she does.

An interpretation such as the one just provided draws heavily on the way the conversation unfolds. The point here, however, is mainly to emphasise that NNSs as well as NSs are simultaneously doing multiple things as they talk, and that an instance of self-initiated self-repair that seems to be a search for a word, may be more than just production/retrieval problems. In this data, as far as searches that are indicated by limited markers of hesitancy are concerned, it is very difficult to pinpoint any dramatic differences in the conduct of NNSs and NSs. However, although there is not sufficient evidence in the data for assuming that a word search is taking place *because* the

---

[4] Alternatively, this is simply a response to Emily's prior use of "to me" (line 273) and an elaboration of her own previous use of "to me" (line 274).

speaker does not know a word, the fact remains that anyone who is a NNS of a language knows that one indeed often lacks words, and one knows, at least retrospectively, that these gaps can be dealt with in various ways. From the point of analysis, what it often comes down to is the issue of intentionality in the sense that a choice is made as a unit is abandoned and something new is begun. Within studies of S/FLA, intentionality is addressed in relation to communication strategies, but acknowledged as a methodological difficulty since there are few satisfactory ways of empirically testing speakers as to why they behave the way they do when facing word finding problems. This intentionality is approached in the sense of establishing whether or not there are systematic relations between the use of certain strategies and specific factors of the situation (Bialystok, 1990: 5). An answer to this question can possibly be obtained if the conversational material is controlled and restricted in different ways. This is also most often the case with studies focusing on communication strategies. The difficulties remain for studies of naturally occurring conversation, where participants' behaviour is not governed by the design of an experiment (although social interaction also poses restrictions on conversational behaviour). Results from studies of S/FLA cannot therefore be applicable to any great extent to naturally occurring data. Even if it may turn out that the strategies are similar, there are limitations to the degree in which factors yielding the strategies are comparable from one situation to another.

From the perspective of CA each instance of repair must be viewed in relation to the context in which it occurs, but this approach also regulates the analyst's interpretations, particularly in relation to repair where indications of trouble in their minimal form consist of a cut-off unit followed by a new unit, or as the examples above show, cut-off units, slight pauses, and hesitation sounds, but no other indications that frame the nature of the "trouble". Even if it makes perfect sense from an empirical point of view not to make claims about speakers' intentionality that go beyond conversational evidence, it is perhaps questionable whether or not such an interpretation would be less correct a description of what is going on at a point of repair, in comparison with interpretations of instances displaying more overt indica-

tions of the nature of the trouble. This difficulty is probably one reason why self-initiated self-repair comprising subtle indications is less commonly investigated within CA, or is investigated from the point of conversational syntax rather than from a more interactional point of view (exceptions, however, being e.g. Goodwin (1979, 1981), Schegloff (1987) and Local (1992) on repetitions).

Analysis of self-initiated self-repair where indications of problems are subtle is thus problematic irrespective of how they are approached. The analysis offered in this section merely provides some alternative interpretations and emphasises that it is possible that preceding as well as subsequent turns may be of interest for an analysis of this type of "trouble", as is participants' knowledge on a social interactional level, since their turns-at-talk are continuously adjusted as the conversation unfolds. To single out a relation between isolated factors and a certain type of repair, is neither achievable nor a fruitful way of understanding what is going on at a point of self-repair, at least not for conversations of the type investigated here. There are, however, instances of terminological uncertainty that may be explained as being due to a *gap* in the NNS's lexicon. In order to make such an interpretation, evidence from more than a single occasion of a participant's uncertainty is looked at. As the same problem recurs during the conversation of Erik and Linda, they explicitly make clear that they are both unsure about a word that Erik is searching for initially. In addition, even in the viewing session it becomes clear that the word was (still) unknown to participants. Example (4:5) shows the first time Erik is faced with this difficulty:

```
(4:5)
97   Li:   so you mean God wouldn't wouldn't want se you there
           because you don't pray every night.
98   Er:   .hhh no not exactly ehm (0.6) it's more about (1.3) since
           I don't believe in God=for exa ⌈mple⌋ I-I- I did not ehm
           (1.4)ehm we- what's it called (1.2) you are (0.4)
           baptised and then you (0.2) confirmation it's called.
99   Li:   mm
100  Er:   .hh (x) I didn't eh: go through that procedure so to
           speak
101  Li:   okey
102  Er:   ehm:: my friends did most of my friends di[d]
103  Li:                                            [mm]
```

```
104  Er:  because they wanted presents.
105  ps:  (1.4)
106  Li:  yeah but that's
107  ps:  (1.7)
108  Er:  that's wrong.
109  Li:  ye[ah]
110  Er:    [ex]actly.
111  Li:  yeah.
```

Erik has revealed to Linda that he never goes to church because he does not feel welcome there. As he is characterising himself as a person who does not believe in God he suddenly stops, hesitates, and inserts a comment that shows that he is searching for a word (line 98). Even if there is a fairly long pause, Linda cannot at this point come to his assistance as he has just introduced a new topic concerning his own personal experiences. She is not likely to know much about what is to be expressed next.

Presuming that Erik is searching for the word *confirmation*, which he finally finds, his hesitancy can partly be related to a grammatical difficulty. The phrase "I-I-I did not" does not project a noun phrase but a verb phrase. In addition, the choice of the verb "did" does not go well with the verb form "confirmed". It is, of course, not easy to say whether or not Erik senses this, but if he does, part of the difficulty could be described as a grammatical deadlock (Fox & Jasperson, 1995). It seems however, that the verb form of "confirmation" is unknown to Erik. After Linda's supportive feedback (line 99), he resumes the project that was interrupted by the search and does not make use of the noun although it provides an answer to his own prior question "what's it called". Instead he refers to confirmation as "that procedure" (line 100) subsequent to which his uncertainty is again displayed by the expression "so to speak". This construction fits better with the verb "did" and reappears in the reference that Erik makes to his friends, who, in contrast to himself, were confirmed.

According to S/FLA theory, Erik's uncertainty and self-repair conform to two communication strategies, firstly "circumlocution" as he describes a related phenomenon to the one that he is missing a term for (line 98), and secondly "paraphrase" (line 100) when he starts talking about a "procedure" (For overviews and discussions of the communication strategy taxonomy cf. Tarone, 1980; Tarone, Cohen, & Dumas,

1983; Faerch & Kasper, 1983; Bialystok, 1990). All along, Linda is participating attentively and she and Erik collaboratively construct a unit towards the end of the excerpt, agreeing that it is wrong to go through with confirmation just because one wants gifts[5].

Erik's behaviour quite clearly indicates uncertainty about how to express the verb form of the noun confirmation, but is the evidence in the data sufficient to make claims that he therefore *lacks* the word? Indications of Erik's *and* Linda's uncertainty concerning the term do occur just a few turns after Erik's word search:

```
(4:6)
126  Li:  eh it's not that I- I((knocking sound)) practice (0.8)
          eh::: Christianity or- or anything [but]
127  Er:                                    [no no]
128  Li:  I did (0.9) eh:: (0.5) <the confirmation thing>
129  Er:  mhm [mhm]
130  Li:     [s-is] that the real world (0.5) word?
131  Er:  confirmation yes [it's a confirm]ation
132  Li:                   [(confirmation)]
133  Er:  of a-I believe so(x) a confirmation of- of- of the
134  ps:  (0.7)
135  Er:  [when you're baptised (you are)]
136  Li:  [the (x) the verb] of it
137  ps:  (1.6)
138  Er:  when you're confirmed (0.5) o: I really don't *know*
          [he]
139  Li:  [we']that's another word isn't it?
140  Er:  con- confirmated I- >I really don't know<
141  ps:  (0.4)
142  Li:  [(x) me neither but never mind.]
143  Er:  [confirmed well anyway] he
144  Li:  eh:: I did 't (0.9) and (0.8) well I feel even if I out-
          side church (0.3) I d- I don't th- say to myself >oh I
          believe in God and I believe in in Jesus< and all that
          but when I say the words (1.4)
```

Linda responds to Erik's account of his belief and the confirmation ceremony and is faced with the very same problem that Erik was. She hesitates and there are two rather long pauses before she says "the

---

[5] In Sweden many young people are confirmed at the age of fourteen. The ceremony is preceded by a period of in-depth study of the fundamentals of Christianity. It would be untruthful to say that all adolescents who are confirmed become active members of the church, and in fact, many teenagers (and others) joke about doing it because they know that they will receive gifts from their family. Erik's comment about his friends wanting presents can be viewed as a very typical association that many young people would have when talking or thinking about the confirmation ceremony.

confirmation thing[6]" (line 128) in a stuttering way, revealing that she is not sure about the correctness of the word. Although Erik displays his understanding, Linda orients to the expression that she finds difficult, starting a side sequence (line 130). The appeal for assistance is directed to Erik and produced with questioning intonation. Erik responds to her request by repeating the word that she is uncertain of. Erik's talk is then hesitant and he returns to the matter of being baptised that he has already touched upon (cf. example (4:5)). Linda quietly repeats the word confirmation in overlap with Erik (lines 131, 132), but knowing the verb form turns out to be important to her as she once more turns to Erik for assistance. It may be worth noting that in Swedish "confirmation" is commonly talked about using the verb form in a reflexive or passive construction, e.g. "Jag konfirmerade mig 1987/Jag konfirmerades 1987/I was confirmed in 1987". It is perhaps even the case that the search not only concerns the verb but the whole reflexive expression as an English equivalent to the almost formulaic Swedish construction. It may be noted that Linda, like Erik, uses the verb "did", which, in combination with the terminological uncertainty, does not lead to any resolution of the uncertainty[7].

Erik continues to be unsure. He suggests "confirmed" (line 138), exchanging "baptised" in a recycled unit that in all other respects is similar to the one just expressed in overlap with Linda. After a short pause he claims that he does not know, but this is not acknowledged by Linda who persists in her effort to find the appropriate expression. Erik is accommodating and suggests the hypothetical form "confirmated", a foreignisation that very much resembles the Swedish past "konfirmerad", again making clear that he really does not know the correct English form. After a brief pause, Linda responds that she too is unfamiliar with the correct form. Linda then indicates that it does not matter whether they find the word or not ("but never mind"). Erik is at this point also about to close the search ("well anyway") and he

---

[6] Poulisse (1997b) observes that learners sometimes use the word "thing" as a replacement for a word that they cannot find.

[7] "I did the confirmation thing" is, of course, satisfactory for understanding, but Linda shows that she is not happy with the term from the point view of her knowledge of vocabulary.

laughs before Linda resumes her account where she left it before she and Erik got caught up with questions of terminology. Interestingly, Linda, once she restarts says that she "did 't" rather than employing any of the terms suggested by Erik. Further evidence that Linda did not know how to express herself was revealed during the viewing session, as she reacted to this sequence asking what the word was, even mentioning that she had planned to but had forgotten to look it up in a dictionary.

This section has highlighted some methodological difficulties involved in the analysis of word search in the speech of NNSs. The status of conversational evidence was discussed showing that indications of hesitancy followed by new units cannot automatically be explained as being due to the NNS's gap in lexical knowledge, at least not when indications of trouble are fairly subtle. It is, however, possible to establish when a search is really conducted because interlocutors do not know a certain word. The evidence is drawn from the many attempts by participants over a great number of turns, to come to a consensus concerning a term. The uncertainty is recurrently established in the attempts to repair and in metalinguistic comments such as "I don't know", etc. Additional evidence is provided by the viewing session.

4.2 Codeswitching as repair-initiation

It has already been shown in the previous section, how vocabulary uncertainties can be collaborated on by participants (or, be resolved by the speaker who faces the difficulty). In this section continued attention is paid to such vocabulary uncertainty that leads to co-operation. Particularly, the interlocutors make use of their ability to speak English and Swedish as they switch from one language to the other at the point of trouble[8]. The codeswitching is related to the

---

[8] The codeswitching presented here is clearly related to word finding difficulties, in contrast to many other uses such as aligning with or distancing from a group, within quoted speech, or, in the display of speaker involvement, to mention a few tasks performed by codeswitching (e.g. Grosjean, 1982; Appel & Muysken, 1989, Gumperz, 1992a; Auer, 1998).

"bilingual"[9] setting of some, but not all pairs of participants. For natural reasons, all participants but three who partake in this study, speak English and Swedish to varying degrees. The three NSs who have a limited command of Swedish and their interlocutors do not employ codeswitching to solve word finding problems. The remaining participants do make use of Swedish and English on an everyday basis, although some of the native English speakers are clearly more skilled users of Swedish than others

The following excerpt displays how Magnus is able to make use of his friend Tim's knowledge of Swedish to solve the difficulty he has in finding a word. They are discussing politics and the lack of forums for young people to display their opinions. Reasoning about these matters, Magnus suddenly cannot find the English word for "arbetar-rörelse" (i.e. "the workers' movement"):

```
(4:7)
134  Ma:  [tha-] that's true (0.4) b- if it- if if this is like
          (0.3) I don't know some post-modern
135  ps:  (0.4)
136  Ti:  he he
137  Ma:  thing about not (0.4) believing in in (0.5)
          authority and (1.0) not thinking that eh (0.6) nt (0.3)
          arbetarrörelse whatever that
          [is]
138  Ti:  [the]workers' movem[ent he he he ((laughs))]
139  Ma:                      [the workers' movement exact thanks
          e:hm] eh:: (0.4) and eh föreningsverksamhet (0.4) like
          the union and their associations and political (0.3) eh
          movements (0.6) that they have sort of (0.9)(that) they
          are outdated
```

The subject of the talk is "young people", an antecedent collaborated on in the turns of talk preceding the excerpt, and it is to this group that Magnus refers when he states that it may be "some post-modern […]

---

[9] Bilingualism is a complex concept and used here to describe participants' abilities to employ English and Swedish in a useful way. The term is put within quotation marks to indicate its unorthodox use here. It is not to be equalised with bilingualism that develops from birth, as this does not go for any of the participants (There is naturally no one-to-one relationship between growing up surrounded by two (or more) languages and the active use of these languages). For the native Swedes and two of the native Brits, however, it is evident that they have developed a certain skill and fluency in English and Swedish respectively. Particularly the two native English speakers, who live and work in Sweden, employ their two languages to a fairly equal degree in their everyday life.

thing about not (0.4) believing in in (0.5) authority" (lines 134, 137). The word search is indicated by a hesitation mark, pauses, the codeswitch into Swedish, and the comment "whatever that [is]"(line 137). The Swedish word is pronounced in a very clear and slow manner with an intonation and form that do not integrate it with the English syntactic structure[10]. The indications of uncertainty are interpreted by Tim as inviting him to come to assistance. Tim even laughs as he is able to understand and translate a word from Swedish[11]. Likewise, Magnus responds to the repair with signs of satisfaction and not only repeats the repair to complete the unit that was cut off, but expresses his agreement and gratitude to Tim for solving his problem (line 139).

From a language learning perspective, Magnus' behaviour is the ideal one for integrating and remembering the word in question (Markee, 2000). In classroom studies, the preferred response to other-repair provided by a teacher is to repeat the suggested (and often correct) item in the turn following repair (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Van den Branden, 1997). It should also be noted that in the reformulation, Magnus once more makes use of the repair that he received from Tim as he recycles "movement", this time modified by "political" (line 139). The item is thus easily accessible for Magnus as it is used in the immediately preceding talk.

To relate to the topic of the prior section, it is difficult to establish whether or not the word search is taking place due to a proper gap in Magnus' lexical knowledge. For Magnus, it may just as well be the case that he simply did not recall the English word before the Swedish term appeared, i.e. as "the most available word" (Grosjean, 1982: 151). An efficient way of solving the trouble, is at that point to use the codeswitch and the metalinguistic comment, either as self-repair without expecting any assistance as Tim is likely to understand what he means anyway, as a time-buying-device while continuing the search,

---

[10] The Swedish word is used in its nominal form. If it was meant to be syntactically integrated (hypothetically that is) into the English construction one would expect the definite form "arbetarrörelsen".

[11] Tim is attending an intensive university course in Swedish as a second language. At this point in time, he has only studied Swedish for eight months. He uses a fair amount of Swedish outside class, since he is sharing accommodation with three Swedish males (who try to speak mainly Swedish at home in order to facilitate Tim's learning).

or, as it turns out, an appeal for assistance so that the turn can continue as smoothly as possible. Interestingly, there is yet another codeswitch in the continuation of his turn, i.e. "föreningsverksamhet" (line 139). However, this switch is not preceded by extended hesitation and as Magnus starts the subordinate clause "and eh föreningsverksamhet" (line 139), there is only a short (0.4) pause before he elaborates on the expression explaining it to Tim. The pause between the "like" and Magnus' elaboration could have been used by Tim to express his understanding or again, to suggest a word. The lack of response is thus possibly interpreted by Magnus as a lack of understanding, whereby he describes the term. It should also be noted that the hesitancy preceding the codeswitch is less marked than before and might not invite other-repair.

Not only the NNSs take advantage of the fact that more than one language can be used. Just a few turns before Magnus' codeswitching described above, Tim has already employed this means to solve an instance where he suddenly does not find an expression in his own mother tongue, English. The trouble is indicated by a pause, a discourse marker, hesitation sounds, and the phrase ">I can't think of the English word now<" followed by the change in language. Again Tim laughs as he uses a Swedish word, i.e. "genomfö*ra" (i.e. "carry out") instead of one in his mother tongue:

```
(4:8)
95    Ti:  I'm quite conservative I think he *in the end of the day
           cause you've got democracy you've got to* .hhhehm: (1.9)
           you've got to go-try an' go through the legal (0.2) means
           to achieve stuff .h >I think if everyone suddenly starts
           deciding to do things their own way it's just gonna get
           (unky) and [(careless)]<
96    Ma:             [sure] I- I- I definitely
           [agree] I [do:]
97    Ti:  [(yeah)]  [but eh] eh but then yeah I suppose if you
           can't (0.7) you know ehm >I can't think of the English
           word now< genomfö*ra hhh.* ha ha [((laughs))]
98    Ma:                                   [carry]  ↑through or:?
99    Ti:  ca- carry [through]
100   Ma:            [(say) carry out]
101   Ti:  you know what you want through democratic means and
           you're gonna get frustrated and .hh you know d-
           [som]etimes
102   Ma:  [mhm]
```

```
103  Ti:  people might think that there's no you know there's no
          option but to (0.7) .h eh like the reclaim the streets
          thing at the weekend in eh[m]
104  Ma:                           [in] Stock[holm]
105  Ti:                                     [Stock]holm
106  Ma:  yeah
```

Magnus quickly comes up with an expression that is satisfactory for Tim. He provides the repair with questioning intonation. Tim accepts the expression and immediately makes use of it as he continues and completes the unit that was obstructed by the word search. Magnus even offers a second suggestion although Tim has already accepted the first expression.

Codeswitching is also used as a resource at a point of word search for the two English natives who have a good command of Swedish. In example (4:9), Anne talks about downloading music from the internet, but is unable to find the English term "download". Again the switch (i.e. "ladda ner") is preceded by a pause and a metalinguistic comment. In this example, Anne manages to find the right word in overlap with Michael's attempt to repair:

```
(4:9)
65  An:  yeah cause I saw on television that you're officially not
         supposed to like (0.7) I can't remember what it's called
         now ladda ner
66  Mi:  ehm [I always get mixed up]
67  An:      [you know (download)]
68  Mi:  I always get mixed up download and upload and th'n just
         say load
69  An:  e he° [((laughs))]
70  Mi:        [((laughs))]
71  An:  we- you know you know I mean you're not supposed to down-
         load like mobilephone m::music or some[thin' that's what]
72  Mi:                                         [nyeeee::::]
73  An:  I've heard °h was on the news but I can't remember
```

Despite Anne's success, Michael provides her with a translation, embedded in an account of his own difficulties with the words "download" and "upload" (lines 66, 68). To repair is in itself not the salient activity (Kurhila, 2003). Anne's self-repair could possibly also affect the continuation of Michael's turn. However, since a large part of Michael's turn is immediately repeated after the overlap, it is interpreted here as being meant to assist Anne in her search for the English

equivalent to "ladda ner". The result of the self-repair and/or Michael's embedded other-repair (Jefferson, 1987), is that Anne can recycle large parts of her previously cut off utterance, after attending with laughter to Michael's account, and complete what she was about to say when she discovered she lacked the word. In contrast to prior examples, the repair-initiation and Michael's embedded repair do not produce a side-sequence since Linda is able to self-repair and Michael does not make explicit that he is "repairing", but gives an account of his own difficulties in distinguishing between the terms download and upload.

The NNSs also made use of their mother tongue at points of a word search when talking to another NNS. In the example to be presented, the codeswitching can again be viewed as a resource used to solve uncertainty of vocabulary, but it also relates to the issue of language learning by means of collaboration with a more "knowledgeable" inter-locutor. This is a theme that recurs in relation to many of the repair sequences looked at in this dissertation and is not only restricted to word search. The response to a candidate word reveals whether it is finding out the term in itself that is important for the participant who asks for assistance, or if it is understanding and smooth continuation of the conversation that are the main targets of the switch.

In example (4:10) Linda turns to Erik for assistance when she cannot find the English equivalent for the Swedish word "adekvat" (i.e. "ade-quate/proper") (line 203). Participants have been discussing for some time whether they believe in God or not and in the excerpt below, Linda tells Erik that she believes in a life after death. The repair occurs as she tries to explain that when she was a child, it was okay to talk about death (possibly implying that it is not common or appropriate to have such conversations with children):

```
(4:10)
196  Li:   yeah (0.3) [we]ll I believe in in some life after death
197  Er:              [(x)]
198  Li:   (0.4) because (0.5) I need to believe (0.3)
            [(I think)]
199  Er:   [yes]
200  ps:   (1.6)
201  Er:   yeah sure
202  ps:   (0.3)
203  Li:   when I was little I- I (1.7) well I- I was in a situation
```

```
                to (0.8) there (it) was (0.5) ehm (0.7) wha' is (1.8)
                eh:: adekvat (0.6) in English?
204  Er:   correct eh::m
205  Li:   >well you know what I mea[n< to- to speak about]
206  Er:                             [adequate (something)]
207  Li:   death and I
208  ps:   (0.4)
209  Er:   no
210  Li:   and I thought about (0.8) Astrid Lindgren's Nangiala
211  Er:   mhm mhm
```

Linda suddenly finds that she lacks a word in English. Her word search can be observed in hesitations, restarts, and many long pauses (line 203). After the (0.7) pause she initiates repair, and asks explicitly for a translation of the Swedish word "adekvat". Erik responds suggesting "correct" (line 204). One may notice that at this point, Erik is faced with a difficulty of knowing what term is searched for given the talk leading up to the search. Linda has just begun the telling of a story and it is hard to know what to expect although there may be syntactic cues as to what part of speech is being sought for. In this case, however, the hesitation also encompasses an alteration of syntactic framework, which possibly even makes syntactic expectations difficult. When Linda asks for assistance though, Erik can help her out.

In the turn following Erik's repair, it is uncertain to what extent Linda acknowledges the candidate word (she neither rejects it nor accepts it) (line 205). The comment explicating that Erik knows what she means is produced at a faster rate than the surrounding talk. It seems as if the orientation of a participant can change instantly, in Linda's case from receiving Erik's help concerning a word, to a focus on completing the turn as she (consciously or subconsciously) recognises that Erik will, of course, understand her turn-at-talk despite the codeswitch (or thanks to the codeswitch rather).

Erik, in turn, appears to interpret Linda's hasty response to the repair to mean that she is not entirely happy with his assistance and he offers a second candidate in overlap with Linda's continued talk. This time he suggests "adequate" followed by an expression of uncertainty; "(something)" (line 206). Linda again does not acknowledge the expression, possibly because it overlaps with her own speech. At the next turn transition, Erik has left the activity of repair and again attends to Linda's story.

For Linda then, although she has initiated repair at a point where she lacks an English word, and despite choosing to turn to Erik for assistance, it suddenly seems sufficient that Erik is likely to have understood what she means, rather than necessarily agreeing on a suitable word that has been suggested by Erik and that she could use in order to replace the Swedish one. Erik on the other hand, continues for some time to orient to the repair activity although Linda is already continuing her story.

The conditions created by participants' skills in more than one language are used as a resource at points of word search. In the literature on communication strategies, codeswitching is commonly pictured as a compensatory strategy due to an insufficiency in the NNS's lexicon (Faerch & Kasper, 1983). In the instances occurring in the conversational data investigated here, it appears that for the NNSs and the NSs, the Swedish term is simply the one which comes up first and that it is plausible that the English equivalent could be found if they had searched for a little longer. This, however, is not necessary as participants share a command of Swedish (to greater or lesser degree) and for them, codeswitching is a resource for smooth communication. Knowing the language proficiency of one's interlocutor well makes codeswitching the safe bet when the lack of an English word suddenly appears. In the viewing session, Tim and Magnus stated that they commonly used codeswitches to efficiently solve word finding problems. For Anne and Michael who both have an advanced command of Swedish, codeswitching is a natural feature of their everyday talk with each other, and occurs not only as a solution to word search.

4.3 When form is of interest (at least for a while)

This section presents two examples where NNSs display their uncertainty of the form of an expression in English and turn to their interlocutor for assistance. Admittedly, some of the examples previously presented would also fit well into this section, and will be referred to

when relevant for the discussion here. Throughout analyses of repair sequences it becomes evident that many things are being done at the same time by means of the actions of participants. Given this, a selection of cases is presented that will serve the purpose of an adequate discussion of some observable phenomena without therefore violating the accuracy of analysis.

As Kurhila (2003: 202) points out, the boundaries between different types of searches are difficult to set, and depend on what participants orient to at a point in the course of talk. This is, as was shown at the beginning of this chapter, particularly difficult when indications of trouble are very subtle, i.e. is the speaker uncertain about some grammatical aspect of a word, or is it a matter of not knowing or remembering a certain lexical item? In the instances examined below, the speaker adds a metalinguistic comment that targets the nature of the uncertainty as one that concerns the form of an expression. That this is the trouble at the point of the initial cut-off is, of course, not possible to determine. However, as the speaker tries to self-repair and then turns to his/her interlocutor for assistance or for confirmation of the candidate self-repair, s/he shows a concern with form. In (4:11) Linda appeals to Erik for assistance[12]:

```
(4:11)
5    Li:   there so I cn't check her but when I came back (0.3) and
           they had gone (1.0) I missed h. hh (1.0) two or three of
           my gold  ↑rings (0.8)I missed (0.3) one silver ring I
           missed glitter:: like make-up glitter
6    Er:   mhm mhm↓
7    Li:   from my- (0.7) eh::(0.4)eh that she took from= from the
           bathroom (0.4) and e: one necklace (0.8) among other
           things (0.8) .h and that was (1.1) not very (0.3) very
           nice of her I think= I (0.2) just ha̲ted her= she's (0.2)
           thirteen↓
8    Er:   ah
9    Li:   so-
10   Er:   fig[ures]
11   Li:      [j-] yeah (0.9) >but I mean it-it- it would have been<
           more explain- eh:: explainable (0.6) °is that right°?
           [well >never mind<]
12   Er:   [yeah I believe so (x)]
```

---

[12] The initial turns of this excerpt were used in order to discuss the issue of NNSs' lack of vocabulary, cf. example (4:1) above and it also relates to example (3:18) in chapter 3.

```
13   Li:  if she was a child or something but I mean she's thirteen
          she's a teenager she kno[ws what she is doing]
14   Er:                          [ye- she's a grown woman]
```

The word "explainable" is expressed in a hesitant way, firstly only
partly pronounced. After the second try there is a brief pause before
Linda turns to Erik and asks him if he considers her choice of word
"right" (line 11). However, once she has shown this uncertainty, the
matter no longer seems important as she quickly states "[well >never
mind<]" (line 11) in overlap with Erik's confirmation that he thinks
that the word is okay. Subsequent to this overlap, Linda continues her
turn adding an if-clause that is syntactically as well as semantically
coherent with the cut-off after "explainable". This example, as well as
Linda's word search presented in section 4.2, shows how the word is
first oriented to and displayed as troublesome, but is then quickly dis-
missed in favour of continuing the utterance that was cut off, no mat-
ter whether other-repair is provided or not. This behaviour is interest-
ing for a variety of reasons. Linda seems to use the comment simply to
display her uncertainty rather than using it as a question. The "[well
>never mind<]" is possibly a sign that she assumes that Erik will
understand what she means irrespective of the appropriateness of the
word. To become entirely sure of the form of the word, is not Linda's
main priority as long as Erik seems to understand what she is talking
about. The meaning of the word is fairly transparent. Linda makes
assumptions concerning Erik's knowledge of vocabulary as well as of
his understanding of her current utterance. Considering the fact that
both Erik and Linda are NNSs, there is, of course, a possibility that,
since Linda is uncertain of the word, she assumes that Erik may very
well be so, too.

The form of an expression is also explicitly commented on as
Magnus and Tim are talking about how difficult it may be to ask some-
one for forgiveness:

```
(4:12)
274  Ma:  (x) no it's the same with (0.2) it's it's the same with
          (0.3) well not my (0.3) but one of my (0.4) eh:: (1.1)
          sisters-in law (0.6) sister-in-laws?
275  ps:  (1.4)
276  Ti:  °sister-in-law° yeah
277  Ma:  yeah (0.6) o- or one of the
```

```
278  ps:  (0.2)
279  Ti:  (uh)
280  Ma:  I don't remember (x x) when we read English we did that
          thing [sisters-in-law or sister-in-laws]
281  Ti:         [(you) should try in *Swedish h.hh*]
282  Ma:  no sisters-in-law it should be the thing (0.3)
          [I (mean)]
283  Ti:  [((coughs))]
284  ps:  (1.9)
285  Ma:  eh::: ((sniffs)) (0.7) that I try not to get into an
          argument because (1.3) she's really fierceful (when she
          dis) (0.4) eh discusses with me [and] (0.3) vice versa
286  Ti:                                  [um]
287  Ma:  and it's just so tough afterwards like (0.3) oh ow! okay
          what do we do now
```

As the excerpt begins, Magnus starts to give an account of what it is like when he and a sister-in-law argue. The turn begins with a repeat of a TCU that is cut off twice after the preposition "with" (line 274). Syntactically, a noun phrase is expected to complete the unit. However, Magnus begins with what looks like a self-correction concerning some word that has not yet been expressed. This unit is not completed either (i.e. "well not my (0.3) but one of my (0.4)"). After hesitation sounds and pauses, he offers two candidate expressions, elaborating on the plural suffix, "sisters-in-law (0.6) sister-in-laws?". The latter is pronounced with a questioning intonation. The repair initiation here is similar to those described by Brouwer (2004) for "doing pronunciation" where repeats of alternating words and questioning intonation are used to elicit a supportive response from the recipient. Here, however, the issue is not pronunciation but morphology and this difficulty is not picked up on by Tim. When he responds, after a long pause, he quietly repeats the nominal form of the expression (line 276). The form of the confirming response suggests that Tim perceives that Magnus is concerned with the expression in some general sense. Magnus, however, continues to elaborate on the form. The following turns exhibit metalinguistic talk where Magnus explains that the forms "sisters-in-law" and "sister-in-laws" were brought up during his English studies, but that he does not remember which one would be appropriate in the context of his current expression. As he, once more, utters the two alternatives, Tim suggests, in overlap, that Magnus should try in Swedish. This comment is interesting consider-

ing prior examples of how interlocutors employed codeswitching at points of hesitancy. Magnus, however, does not follow this advice but decides that his first choice "sisters-in-law" is the appropriate option. Once he has made up his mind, he returns to the topic where he left it before he encountered the difficulties with the plural of the expression "sister-in-law".

These examples illustrate a point of particular interest in relation to ideas about language learning in interaction involving NNSs and NSs. As a speaker becomes uncertain of a word or of grammar, s/he turns to the interlocutor for assistance. In doing so, the person turned to is, if not assigned the role of being knowledgeable, at least assigned the role of being *possibly* knowledgeable. Direct requests for assistance are also, as is shown, taken seriously by the person turned to, who either suggests candidate expressions, or confirms that the word already used is accurate. Despite this help, it is not always the case that the speaker who initiates repair, responds to the assistance in a way that acknowledges the repair as helpful. In example (4:10) and also in example (4:6) (the latter looked at in section 4.1), participants' orientations change continuously. Linda turns to Erik for assistance when for a moment, form is of importance. The next moment, however, the project of finding a word or having a word confirmed can suddenly be abandoned in favour of returning to a project initiated before the obstruction. The sudden shift in focus in these cases does not seem to have so much to do with the repair provided by the interlocutor, as with the sudden restructuring of priority of the speaker requesting assistance. This, in turn, seems related to the display of understanding that comes with other-repair, i.e. when the recipient displays understanding by means of providing repair, the importance of form may decrease. This goes for examples (4:10) and (4:11) in which Linda turns to Erik for assistance, but as he provides her with candidate expressions, she is already shifting her orientation back to the topic preceding her uncertainty (Linda uses short phrases such as "well you know what I mean" and "well never mind" to indicate that the search is no longer an important issue). In Magnus' case, there is a misinterpretation concerning the nature of the trouble. Although Magnus continues to elaborate on an expression after having received

a confirmation that does not concur with his request, he too is quick to return to the topic dealt with before the uncertainty. It seems that irrespective of whether speaking to a NS or NNS, participants view each other as potentially linguistically knowledgeable at points of uncertainty of grammar and vocabulary. The display of understanding that comes with a suggested repair, however, may be sufficient to re-orient to the activity that preceded the uncertainty. From a learning perspective, one would traditionally assume that other-repair that is responded to by a repeat of the suggested item, would be beneficial for the process of acquisition. However, as far as learning is concerned, the status of cases where the problem of "form" is not solved, is difficult to determine.

4.4 Summary

The first part of the chapter dealt with TCUs consisting of syntactic projections that are not completed. As a construction is cut off, there are pauses and sounds of hesitancy, subsequent to which the speaker redirects the talk by means of a new syntactic construction. There appears, however, to be a semantic relationship between the cut off unit and the new unit. These instances of self-repair were discussed from an analytical point of view, challenging the ideas that speakers lack a word simply because they are NNSs, providing some alternative interpretations drawing from the course the turn takes after the cut-off. The methodological difficulties involved in understanding what is going on were stressed, as there is little "overt" evidence that targets the nature of the trouble. That the lack-of-word-because-a-NNS-is-talking-assumption is critically discussed here, does not mean, however, that there are never proper gaps as NNSs are searching for words, only that such assumptions must be made cautiously. Example (4:6) shows how Erik and Linda become involved in a lengthy negotiation concerning the word "confirmed", finally giving up as neither of them is sure enough to trust what candidate expression to use. Data involving proficient users of a second/foreign language is perhaps specifically challenging since the markers of uncertainty are subtle,

and proper communicative "breakdowns", where very limited degrees of mutual understanding are reached, are rare.

The collaboration on vocabulary reflects how the roles of speakers at the points of difficulty vary. As a participant gets involved in a search s/he may turn to his/her interlocutor for assistance, for a moment assigning the interlocutor the role of potential knower of the missing or uncertain item. This potential knowledge is not only (if at all) tied to participants' identities as NS and NNS of the language used. Since participants know each other, they draw from resources that they have in common. One such resource is the ability to speak more than one language. Codeswitching can therefore be observed, not only as repair initiation in the talk of the native Swedes, but used by the English speakers who have a command of Swedish.

Analyses also show how the orientation of a speaker may suddenly shift, from involving the interlocutor in a search, to resuming the project that preceded the point of uncertainty. The role that the repair-item plays is then also altered, as the finding of an expression becomes secondary to the assumption that a sufficient level of understanding has been achieved. In this data, it is always the participant who initiated the search, who also "dismisses" the activity, sometimes almost downgrading the candidate repair. These instances predominantly occur in the entirely non-native conversations. Exactly what this means is hard to say. From a S/FLA perspective, this lack of "uptake" could possibly be interpreted as the dismissal not only of the word in the current context, but of the opportunity to learn a word for future use. To what extent the participants make assumptions about the linguistic trustworthiness of their interlocutor based on what they know about "being a non-native speaker" can only be speculated on. As will be shown later (chapter 6), other-repair is not always accepted simply because it comes from a "linguistically knowledgeable" individual, i.e. a NS. Generally, for the sudden shifts of a participant's orientation, it seems that understanding becomes the primary, and the search the secondary point of interest.

Part III: Other-repair

5. Expected and unexpected contributions to talk

This chapter investigates instances where an interlocutor initiates repair as a reaction to a prior speaker's talk. The initiation is responded to with self-repair in the form of clarification, self-correction, confirmation, or rejection, depending on the nature of the initiation.

The study shows that other-initiations may occur in environments where the turn-at-talk is treated as troublesome when it is in various ways "unexpected". The phenomenon concerns sequential behaviour, discourse coherence and cohesion, participants' "common ground" (Clark, 1996), and sometimes participants' interpretation of their knowledge of the language spoken. In addition, it is argued that other-initiations may occur where there are mismatches in participants' interpretations of the activity they are involved in as well as of the appropriateness (relevance) of a certain word in a specific environment. Such results were first presented by Drew (1997) who observes how "open" repair initiations[1] are related to discourse coherence/ cohesion in native English conversation. Importantly, he suggests that "these environments are associated with certain kinds of troubles which a participant may have in understanding not so much what the other said, as why s/he said it" (1997: 72). Similar claims are made by Rasmussen & Wagner (2001: 16) for contributions to talk that may be interpreted as "unmotivated[2]" in certain conversational contexts. The observations presented in this study agree with some of Drew's (1997) findings.

Other-initiations, however, do not only occur as responses to "unexpected" turns-at-talk. Some initiations are associated with hearing

---

[1] Section 5.3 gives an account of "open" repair initiations.
[2] This is my translation of the Danish word "umotiveret" (Rasmussen & Wagner 2001: 16).

and/or understanding difficulties that make initiations take different forms such as "pardon?" (which would count as an open initiation), a whole or partial repeat of the troublesome turn with interrogative intonation, or candidate understandings. The sequential organization that results from these initiations turns out to differ somewhat from those triggered by something "unexpected"[3]. The former troubles are commonly solved over three turns, whereas the resolution of a trouble of an unexpected nature develops over longer stretches of talk, since more interactional work is required before participants reach a satisfactory level of understanding.

As far as differences and similarities between NNSs and NSs are concerned, the chapter presents one case of other-initiation that is performed as the NNS is uncertain of a word used by the NS. It is also shown that although the NNSs are proficient users of the foreign language, initiations performed by NSs are sometimes related to the way in which prior talk is formulated and could thus be discussed in relation to "non-native-like" constructions. This is in line with the reflections from previous chapters on how participants may interpret their interlocutors' identities based on characteristics of their speech, as well as on knowledge and experience held in common.

5.1 Other-initiation as a response to an "unexpected" contribution to talk

In the following, analyses of six excerpts illustrate how initiations occur at instances of talk where the troublesome turn is perceived as unexpected by a participant. To make claims of participants perceiving a contribution to talk as unexpected is of course allied with certain risks, the most venturesome of which is to say more about the data than can be empirically argued for. The claim that something is unexpected is tied to the assumption that participants who engage in a conversation make interpretations of the activity at hand, and act

---

[3] Tables 5 and 6 in the Appendix present the frequency of occurrence of repair as responses to expected and unexpected contributions to talk.

according to the expectations created by these interpretations. There may, however, be mismatches, or "troubles with mutualities" (Linell, 1993) in the way interlocutors perceive an activity. In order to explain such mismatches, evidence must be traced "backwards" in the data. This means that many of the current excerpts are long and comprise multiple turns leading up to the actual repair-initiation.

5.1.1 Other-initiation at a mismatch in participants' interpretation of the current activity

The first excerpt shows Tim and Magnus when they discuss one of the topics that were suggested for the conversation. At the beginning of the excerpt, Magnus abruptly changes the topic from having discussed civil disobedience, to that of the idea of forgiveness. His query (line 70) "shall we go over to the next question?", makes Tim glance at the instructions sheet and read its text out aloud. The question is the rather abstract: What is forgiveness? Does it exist? Magnus collaboratively repeats the first part of the question (line 72), and listens as Tim reads the second part. After a (0.8) pause, Magnus (line 75) answers the question and introduces a perspective that is tied to his belief in God. His account is responded to by Tim (line 80) after a long pause (1.7). The response "oy" is expressed with a slightly, but friendly mocking voice followed by laughter. Magnus, in turn, repeats Tim's "oj"[4] and then attempts to degrade the seriousness of his statement: "well (0.3) not so deep" (line 85). However, in the same turn-at-talk he stands up to the religious perspective that he introduced in his prior contribution. At this point, Tim develops the topic in a collaborative fashion (lines 87, 89, 92) contrasting Magnus' introduction of God's forgiveness with the existence of forgiveness "even on a human point of view [...] on a human level [eh::]". Magnus responds to Tim with a question (line 93) that Tim interprets as a challenge. After a long pause (2.2), Tim brings up an argument that draws from his own experience

---

[4] "Oj" in Swedish is an exclamation expressing positive/negative surprise or astonishment.

to support his prior account. Again, Magnus responds with a question (line 96) "but why?". The repair-initiation occurs in line 98, as Tim wonders what Magnus means by "but why?":

```
(5:1)
70    Ma:  >I don't know< I think (x) like (we're) in a house
           (group)= shall we go over to the next question? ((change
           in voice quality))
71    Ti:  (x) (0.3) what is forgiveness ((reads from the sheet))
72    Ma:  what is forgiveness
73    Ti:  does it exist ((reads from the sheet))
74    ps:  (0.8)
75    Ma:  it (0.7) most certainly does exist (0.7) [I think.]
76    Ti:                                          [((clears his
           throat))]
77    ps:  (0.9)
78    Ma:  eh huh (1.7) nt (0.4) why otherwise would (0.8) would eh
           God forgive us (0.7) if it didn't exist (1.0) (one) (0.9)
           or sort of if that is the basis (1.0) on which we form
           all other forgiveness.
79    ps:  (1.7)
80    Ti:  oy:
81    ps:  (0.3)
82    Ma:  oj (0.3) tha well [(x)]
83    Ti:                    [((laughs))]
84    ps:  (0.3)
85    Ma:  well (0.3) not so deep (°but°) (0.7) for me it is= I
           think that's true.
86    ps:  (0.7)
87    Ti:  but yeah I mean he does forg- it does exist.
88    Ma:  °m::°
89    Ti:  I mean even on a human point of view
90    ps:  (0.4)
91    Ma:  °yeah°
92    Ti:  on a human (0.7) level [eh::]
93    Ma:                         [or]does it?
94    ps:  (2.2)
95    Ti:  yeah I've (known) forgiveness from people he he (0.5) he
96    Ma:  but why?
97    ps:  (1.0)
98    Ti:  why.
99    ps:  (0.2)
100   Ma:  well (0.2) n when I when I [looked at the question(x)]
101   Ti:                            [((clears throat and coughs))]
102   Ma:  what is forgiveness (0.3) does it exist,(0.4)I felt like
           hm (does)forgiveness as (2.2) an entity (1.0) exist.
103   Ti:  what is it e [ha ha ha ((laughs))]
104   Ma:               [exactly yeah] it's over there
105   Ti:  he he
```

Magnus' repair in response to Tim's initiation is to refer to his own ini-

tial impression of the question "well (0.2) n when I [looked at the question (x)]". He then explains that he had thought of "forgiveness as (2.2) an entity (1.0) exist". By doing so he minimises the risk of Tim interpreting the troublesome turn as misaligning. Tim responds collaboratively to Magnus' repair adding a joking perspective that Magnus supports (line 104). Both end up laughing.

The environment in which the repair initiation takes place is the beginning stages of topic development, following a rather abrupt closing of a previous topic, "shall we go over to the next question?" (line 70). With respect to the activity, both interlocutors are in agreement concerning what they are going to do in the sense of discussing one of the questions written on the instructions sheet. How to discuss it, is a different matter. In this example, Magnus tends to acts as a self-assigned "moderator" whose function is to take responsibility for directing the topic (cf. Myers, 1998; Wibeck, 2000). According to Svennevig (1999: 164) "topic" in conversation may best be viewed as a process, and that "topic organization consists of a set of devices that interlocutors use to signal how their contributions relate to prior and subsequent turns". However, if participants are not in agreement concerning what type of activity they are engaged in, and consequently the way topic development is to be handled, the contribution of one interlocutor can come as a surprise to the other.

The long pauses that follow Magnus' question (line 93) and the challenge (line 96) indicate that Tim needs some time to interpret Magnus' contributions. As already pointed out, however, long pauses may also be characteristic of the activity of discussing the topics.

Considering what Drew (1997) says about understanding "what" was said but not "why" it was said, there is little doubt that Tim should understand the meaning and form of the utterance "but why". The trouble seems to be to understand *why* it was said at a particular moment. If one looks at the turns-at-talk leading up to the initiation, one may observe some differences between the pattern of the first occurrence of question and response (lines 93–95) and the second one (line 96). The first question (line 93) consists of recycled material from the task question, from Magnus' own speech as well as from Tim's contributions. These chunks of speech are excerpted below and dis-

played schematically to facilitate an overview. The recycled items are marked with boldface:

"**what is forgiveness**" (Tim, line 71)
"**what is forgiveness**" (Magnus, line 72)
"**does it exist**" (Tim, line 73)
"**it** (0.7) most certainly **does exist**" (Magnus, line 75)
"if **it didn't exist**" (Magnus, line 78)
"**it does exist**" (Tim, line 87)
"or **does it**?" (Magnus, line 93)

Considering these lexical and semantic ties, it is fair to say that Tim ought not face any particular difficulties in connecting Magnus' question (line 93) to prior talk. Tim also responds to it accordingly. Up to the point of the troublesome turn (line 96) "forgiveness" functions as an antecedent that interlocutors treat as mutually known and comprehended. In addition, participants are at this stage in agreement and Magnus' question "or does it?" (line 93) not only challenges Tim's point of view, but also his own previous statement that he believes that forgiveness exists (lines 78, 85).

In contrast, Magnus' second question "but why?" has no clear ties to prior formulations. Presuming that Tim interprets Magnus' second question "but why?" as a challenge of his account (line 95), the adversative "but" and the question word "why" seem slightly misplaced in relation to the form of prior talk. That Magnus, in fact, is not challenging Tim's account becomes clear in the repair (clarification) that follows the initiation. Magnus may, of course, attempt to elaborate on "but why does it exist?" but there is no evidence of this in the data. The accomplishment of the clarification is, on the one hand, to show Tim that the question was not meant as challenging, and on the other, to display how Magnus had initially reasoned about the question. As Magnus finishes the clarification, Tim aligns with Magnus' in a joke.

Throughout the talk, Magnus tends to take on the role of being responsible for attending to the topics suggested for the conversation. He decides when to change topic and also uses questions, as it seems, as a means of drawing out new perspectives. It might be this latter behaviour that causes Tim trouble. Before the point where Magnus

starts responding to Tim with challenges, they have contributed with standpoints that they agree upon (i.e. that forgiveness does exist). Possibly indicated by the pauses that precede his responses, Magnus then initiates a shift in activity that Tim seems unprepared for. In Tim's response to the first question, he continues to argue for the point of view that forgiveness exists. The challenge that follows may imply that this response is not satisfactory to Magnus and does not contribute to the activity of topic development. Magnus' second question also hands more responsibility for the talk over to Tim, as he is the first to come up with a response in line with the new perspective that Magnus tries to establish. Although both participants are involved in the activity of discussing one of the suggested topics, it may be the case that they suddenly find themselves uncertain of what sequential behaviour to expect from each other.

5.1.2 Other-initiation as a response to unconventional syntax

Repair can also be initiated as a response to a "vague" or "unusual" formulation. Example (5:2) displays a rather unconventional use of the verbs "stealing" and "stop" in a metaphorical expression, which John finds hard to understand.

The excerpt displays, again, how one participant tries to develop the topic by means of asking questions. This time participants discuss "stealing":

```
(5:2)
3    To:   what is stealing to you?
4    Jo:   h. ((coughs)) stealing ey? well (1.5)f I
           °let me see° (1.3) nt if I jumped up and
           nabbed that camera and ran out the door shou'in ha
           [ha! I stole this camera ((laughs))]
5    To:   [((laughs))]
6    Jo:   thinkin' [(x)]
7    To:            [well where does stealing] stop then?
8    ps:   (1.5)
9    Jo:   h°h
10   To:   what is almost stealing and what isn't?
11   ps:   (2.5)
12   Jo:   ehm (1.1) <where does stealing stop> (0.7) how d' you
           mean?
```

```
13   To:   yeah because it's quite rather easy to say if you nick
           that camera and ran out (of) the door-
14   Jo:   hm
15   ps:   (1.3)
16   To:   but I mean (0.4) th- e the question implies that e sort
           of (0.8) eh: [like] the the limits
17   Jo:                [.h]
18   ps:   (0.6)
19   Jo:   yeah
20   To:   of (wha') is stealing (0.6) if I take so-
           [some] of your milk and
21   Jo:   [((clears throat))]
22   To:   don't tell you is that stealing?
23   ps:   (1.3)
24   Jo:   don't know (0.3)did you?[((laughs))]
25   To:                           [((laughs))] not today
```

John's response to Tobias' question (line 4) is to repeat the word "stealing ey?" with questioning intonation. However, he does not intend this as a repair initiation as he keeps the turn, giving the question a little thought, adding "well (1.5) f I °let me see°(1.3)" (line 4). He then suggests that stealing would be if he took the video camera and ran out of the room, thus drawing from the immediate surroundings to provide Tobias with an answer (as well as showing to the analyst his awareness of the recording). Tobias seems neither entirely content with the answer, nor with John's joking attitude, which is indicated by the markers "well …then" in the question "[well where does stealing] stop then?" (line 7). John does not answer straight away and Tobias expands the question "what is almost stealing and what isn't?" (line 10). The expansion is followed by a pause before John initiates repair (line 12). The initiation consists of a repeat of Tobias' question. The repeat is articulated at a slow rate and John looks thoughtful. He also explicitly requests clarification, i.e. "how d' you mean?" (line 12) displaying the understanding difficulties. In subsequent turns Tobias evaluates John's initial suggestion about the camera as a simple way of dealing with the question. He returns to his own initial interpretation of the topic and then gives John a "case" to consider (lines 20, 22), i.e. whether or not it would be to steal if he took some of John's milk without asking permission[5]. John answers very quickly in a humorous fash-

---

[5] John and Tobias live in the same hall of residence and share kitchen facilities.

ion. At this point Tobias gives up the attempts to attend to the topic and joins in on John's joke. They both laugh.

Similar to the repair in (5:1), the problematic sequence is located subsequent to the closing of one topic and the introductory stages of a new one. Such an environment, at least in this data, seems to be a particularly likely place for other-initiation to occur. Quite naturally it is vital for the continuation of the conversation and for the accomplishment of discussing the topic that a sufficient degree of understanding is quickly established.

It is interesting to note that Tobias acknowledges his own contribution "well where does stealing stop then?" as insufficient. The expansion that follows may also, of course, be the result of a lack of response (Kalin, 1995) from John. As Tobias elaborates on the question, John has already reacted to the formulation "where does stealing stop?".

Syntactically, there is nothing particularly odd in combining the two verbs "stealing" and "stop". However, in the framework of the "where"-construction, the expression cannot be interpreted literally, but is best viewed as a metaphor. Thus, the construction is grammatical in a technical sense but requires more information in order to be easily comprehended. Once John is provided with elaborations such as a reformulation and a specification, he contributes with an example that is in line with the "limits" that Tobias has attempted to express by returning to the case of stealing the camera (lines 26, 27):

(5:3)
```
26   Jo:  [((laughs))] °s alright° eh e I think maybe (0.4) if tha'
          camera belongs to like (0.3) my best friend or something
          n' ey-
27   ps:  (0.5)
28   To:  alright
29   Jo:  sort of took it an' went off with it (0.3)(he) wouldn't
          mind.(0.4) and tha' wouldn't be stealing really (e) maybe
          be a bit annoyed (0.5) tha' I took his camera without
          asking bu- (0.7)when it's (0.5)suppose it's when it's
          somebody's (1.4) you don't know (0.5)((clears throat))
          like >mm ↑ that's a nice thing over there and I don't
          know whose it is so I'll [take it<]
30   To:                           [so you] mean you can't
          steal anything from anyone you (d) know?
31   ps:  (0.7)
32   Jo:  you can (0.5) bu'
33   To:  yeah
```

It seems then that an utterance, given too little "background information" in relation to the meaning formed by unconventional syntax, may cause understanding difficulties. Again, not as a result of the use of strange or unfamiliar words, but given the unusual combination of them in a context of limited pre-established mutual knowledge.

Interestingly, Tobias, just like Magnus in the first example, initiates topic shift and uses questions as a means for topic development. In this sense, the behaviour of the informants of this study differs from what other investigations on NS-NNS conversations report, where patterns of dominance in the sense of speaking time and length of turns most of the time are ascribed to the NS. In the conversations studied here there is variation in the way individuals take responsibility for different actions and activities throughout the talk. This variation seems to be related to participants' interest in and knowledge of the topic, rather than their use of a native or foreign language (cf. Zuengler, 1993 for similar observations). In examples (5:1) and (5:2), the NNSs are in charge of topic development and also assess the NSs' contributions as unsatisfactory for the purposes of the discussion. Another factor that may influence the NNSs' willingness to talk and engage in the task, is that they are interacting with a good friend, a NS with whom they talk regularly in their everyday life. S/FLA studies have shown that the amount of NNS talk increases in cases where interlocutors know each other and/or are both NNSs (Long & Porter, 1985).

5.1.3 Other-initiation at a mismatch in participants' perception of information as mutually known

So far, two sequences of other-initiated self-repair that deal with some aspect of an unexpected contribution to talk have been presented. Both examples may be difficult to interpret given their syntactic structure and a lack of obvious coherence, viewed in relation to preceding turns-at-talk. The first example seems more tied to an unexpected sequential behaviour, whereas the latter relates to syntax and the level of intersubjectivity established. In relation to this latter theme, the fol-

lowing example illustrates how mismatches in participants' inter-
pretations of their "common ground" (Clark, 1996) may yield other-
initiation, i.e. one participant initially treats a referent as mutually
known, whereas the other does not. The sequence occurred in Tim's
and Magnus' conversation. Again it is Tim who initiates repair:

```
(5:4)
323  Ma:  why do people (1.4) h. (0.8) say that they're sorry when
          they (1.2) really just excuse themselves (0.6) or make
          excuses (1.8).hhhhh h.hhh ((sighs deeply)) °de da°
324  ps:  (0.5)
325  Ti:  that's depressing h.hh
          [((laughs))]
326  Ma:  [(mm) we should ask] Peter about that.
327  ps:  (0.3)
328  Ti:  .hhh he. (0.2) ask who?
329  Ma:  Peter.
330  ps:  (0.7)
331  Ti:  Peter?
332  Ma:  yeah he's studying philosophy now.
333  Ti:  oh yeah.
```

Just before this excerpt, Tim and Magnus have talked about how hard
it can be to say that one is sorry. Magnus claims that people say that
they are sorry, although, according to him, they "just excuse them-
selves"[6] (line 323). His turn is not immediately responded to and
Magnus sighs deeply. When Tim takes the turn, he just quietly com-
ments that "that's depressing" (line 325) and laughs. At this point
Magnus introduces a new referent (line 326). This puts Tim in trouble
and he initiates repair (line 328). The initiation is formed as a partial
repeat of the troublesome turn where the problematic item is replaced
by the question word "who". Magnus interprets Tim's initiation as if
he has not heard the name properly. His first attempt to repair is thus
to repeat the name "Peter". The way in which Magnus introduces the
referent and the repeat of the name as a first repair attempt suggests
that Magnus believes the referent to be known to them both. Further
information should not be necessary to make Tim understand. This,
however, turns out not to be the case since Tim initiates repair again,
this time repeating the name "Peter?" in a questioning intonation (line

---

[6] Swedes commonly perceive that, particularly British people, say "sorry" a lot (by Swed-
ish standards, that is).

331). Again, the initiation is preceded by a pause (0.7). Magnus now finds it necessary to add more information and says about Peter that he "is studying philosophy now." This elaboration helps Tim understand who Magnus means and he responds "oh yeah." with falling intonation.

Even if the data provides evidence that the addition of more information (assumed by Magnus to be common knowledge to Tim and himself) facilitates Tim's understanding of the troublesome referent "Peter", some contextual information may shed further light on this particular sequence[7]: Tim and Magnus happen to be house-mates in a collective of four young male students. At the time of the recording they had been sharing a house for a year and a half. Apart from Tim and Magnus, the name of one of the house-mates is Peter. However, Peter commonly goes under the shorter "PO" [piːəʊ]. Drawing from this ethnographic information, Tim's repair-initiation is likely to surprise Magnus (unless Tim has a hearing difficulty), just as much as Magnus' use of their friend's full name must surprise Tim. In this sense, both interlocutors may consider the other's contribution as "unexpected". When Peter is referred to further on in the conversation, he is named "PO", a form that does not cause any understanding difficulties.

5.1.4 Other-initiation at sudden shifts in perspective

A case that initially is treated as a hearing difficulty turns out to involve rapid shifts in the perspective that a participant makes throughout an episode. Prior to the excerpt below, Linda has introduced the topic of believing in God. This leads to a side-sequence in which participants discuss if having sex before marriage should count as a sin or not. Erik then relates back to the question of believing in God:

```
(5:5)
69   Er:   well I-I-I really am no' I-I (0.7) coming back to the
           belief in God. (0.3) ehm (1.2) I think that (0.3) I would
```

---

[7] The contextual information comes from the retrospective interview, where both Tim and Magnus comment on this particular sequence.

```
            be ready (0.3) to believe in God (0.7)if (1.1) if he
            show d sh- showed himself in some way .hhh because I
            cannot believe I cannot s- sort of talk myself into
            believing.(1.1).hh [(e::)]
70   Li:                       [you mean] so you could see him?
71   ps:  (1.8)
72   Er:  [yes or see his work in some way.]
73   Li:  [y- you won't have to see him to] believe in him.
74   Er:  y- we in in some concrete way I wouldn't have to see him
            (now) n >I mean I don't believe that God is is eh is or
            would be a-a man with [beard sitting in]
75   Li:                         [noo]
76   Er:  heaven< s I mean [tha tha]
77   Li:                   [no]
78   Er:  that's child stuff but (0.5) ehm (0.8) I guess that (0.3)
            if (0.7) I went through some sort of crisis, I had an
            accident (that) changed my life or something .hh like
            that I-I may very wl well (stop) believing
79   ps:  (0.3)
80   Li:  mm
81   ps:  (0.6)
82   Er:  that it [(ends)]
83   Li:          [stop be]lieving?
84   Er:  stopped stop[ped yes]
85   Li:              [stopped yeah yeah]
86   Er:  exactly (0.7) ehm::: (1.2) so:: I'm not a (1.6) I-I-I
            really in I-I-I'm ready to start believing really.
     ps:  (0.4)
87   Li:  mm
88   Er:  but in the mean time I believe that for example I don't
            want to go into church in- into mass or something eh:::
89   ps:  (0.9)
90   Er:  [eh:]
91   Li:  [yo]u don't do that?
92   Er:  no I don't do that because I believe that I (0.3) don't
            belong there (0.7) unless I believe I really don't belong
            there and I (0.4) feel (0.3) sort of that I'm not (0.4)
            welcome either really.
```

Linda perceives the last part of Erik's utterance (line 78) as trouble-some and targets the trouble source by emitting the verb phrase "stop believing" (line 83) with questioning intonation. One might note that Linda does not acknowledge the problem in the turn following the trouble source, but provides a minimal response (line 80). The contribution "that it [(ends)]" (line 82) is possibly an expansion of the phrase "stop believing" (line 78). It is uncertain whether or not Linda perceives all of the expansion, since she initiates repair partly in overlap with it (lines 82, 83).

Erik responds to the initiation repeating the item that has been tar-

geted as troublesome, this time in the past tense and verifies that Linda is correct. Linda, in turn, repeats "stopped" in overlap with the last part of Erik's verification. In the turn that follows the repair, Erik once more confirms Linda's query before he resumes his former claim of being prepared to start believing in God, an account that he gave some turns before the trouble source-turn (line 69). Thus, throughout a long stretch of talk, there are elaborations of verb phrases involving "believing", occurring with the preceding elements "would be ready to", "cannot", "cannot talk myself into" and "stop":

"**I would be ready** (0.3) **to believe in God**"
"**I cannot believe**"
"**I cannot** s- sort of **talk myself into believing**" (Erik, line 69)
"[y- you won't have to see him **to] believe in him**" (Linda, line 73)
"**I I** may very wl well (**stop**) **believing**" (Erik, line 78)
"**I-I-I'm ready to start believing** really" (Erik, line 86)

In addition to the elaborated verb phrases, Erik contributes with two conditionals that are somewhat ambiguous. The first one is used when he tells Linda that he would be ready to believe in God "if he show d sh- showed himself in some way", implying that he does not yet believe in God. However, the second time he uses a conditional is in the trouble-source turn as he states hypothetically that "if (0.7) I went through some sort of crisis, I had an accident (that) changed my life or something .hh like that I I may very wl well (stop) believing" (line 78), indicating a perspective where the point of departure is that he believes in God. Thus, in previous talk Erik has told Linda that he does not believe in God and later he states that some things would make him stop believing in God. Linda's initiation is then needed as it must be made clear to her whether or not Erik says "stop", which, in relation to what Erik has said earlier, might be less expected than, for example, had he said that an accident or crisis might make him "start" believing. Erik's standpoint of not believing in God is re-established in subsequent turns (lines 88, 92), where he states that he is ready to believe but that not being religious prevents him from going to church.

The analysis above has mainly dealt with variations of perspectives and how these may affect Linda's perception. Of course, correct hear-

ing at this point is vital for Linda to gain a satisfactory level of understanding and to remedy ambiguity. It is a fact that Erik says "stop" very quietly (as is indicated in the transcription), so hearing may, possibly, be the only trouble.

5.1.5 Other-initiation at misinterpretation of a word

A participant's treating a word as being somehow out of place in a certain context is displayed in (5:6) below. Michael has just reasoned about how different people perceive what is and is not a sin (line 611). He asks a question (line 620) that Anne reacts to (lines 622, 624):

```
(5:6)
608  Mi:  if you're gonna use that word (0.3) s:in or
609  ps:  (0.6)
610  An:  and how many
          [times you are doing it as well (like x x talking about x)]
611  Mi:  [and the concepts and I think it's contravening your own]
          or breaking your own moral conduct that you've actually
          got yourself cause i- it's different for different
          people.
612  ps:  (0.2)
613  An:  °mm°
614  ps:  (0.2)
615  Mi:  ehm: almost I don't know
          [it c'n]
616  An:  [°mm°]
617  ps:  (0.4)
618  An:  nt
619  ps:  (1.0)
620  Mi:  do you (0.2) castigate yourself you know it's sort of
621  ps:  (1.5)
622  An:  e [he ↑ (s')]
623  Mi:    [he]
624  An:  called ↑ casti[gate!↓]
625  Mi:               [pun-] okay punishing then (thn
          js't') °it's a posh word for punishing°
626  An:  oh >I know ↑ [I know I've heard]
627  Mi:              [e he he he hh]
628  An:  the word before↓ I was [thinking castrating< (I'm sorry)]
629  Mi:                         [but I mean do y- do you ((laughs))]
          hh
630  An:  [((laughs)) like why would you say (you want) to castrate]
631  Mi:  [do you punish (x) do you punish yourself]
632  An:  °yourself°
633  ps:  (0.9)
634  Mi:  and should you (0.2) bu' (0.3) °I don't know° (1.1) (it's
```

```
       quite)(0.2) °I don't know° quite (0.2) I mean (you) could
       write a whole thesis on this
635  An:  m (na) yeah
```

Anne's initiation (lines 622, 624) is an exclamation with heavy stress on
the first syllable in "<u>cast</u>igate". Michael has no problems identifying
the trouble and starts his response in overlap with the last syllable of
the word. He interprets Anne to be unfamiliar with the term, and then
self-repairs providing a synonym. In addition, he adds some informa-
tion about the level of formality of the word: "[pun-] okay punishing
then (then js't) °it's a posh word for punishing°". Interestingly, Anne
responds to the repair claiming that she knew the word before and that
she had been thinking about a different word (that obviously did not
make sense in the current context). She even apologises for the initia-
tion, or possibly for the manner in which she uttered it. The apology is
followed by a metacomment that explains her mistake: "like why
would you say (you want) to castrate yourself" (line 630). Anne's
response to Michael's self-repair is interesting in many ways. Apart
from the strong reaction and the apology, she is very eager (in a frus-
trated way) to show that her trouble was not that she did not know the
word "oh >I know ↑ [I know I've heard] the word before↓" (lines 626,
628). The rate of speech at this point is also increased in relation to
prior turns.

   Considering that this example shows two NSs in a situation where
one interprets a repair-initiation as an indication of lack of under-
standing or lack of knowledge of a word, makes it particularly interest-
ing in relation to SLA studies of similar sequences in NS-NNS-talk (e.g.
Gass &Varonis, 1985a; Van den Branden, 1997; Shehadeh, 1999). These
studies claim that contributions in the form of an explanation or
simplification in response to indications of a problem are beneficial for
the understanding and language learning process of the NNS. One
might say that there is an element of implicit or explicit "teaching" in
such sequences. Michael's repair may thus be perceived by Anne as an
"instruction" alongside its explanatory function. Her eagerness to
point out that she knows the word, and the irritation in her voice, indi-
cate that Anne is not content with Michael's interpretation of her initi-
ation of repair due to lack of word knowledge.

Another interesting aspect of this sequence shows up in Anne's explanation of the nature of the trouble (not only that she claims that she knows the word), where she had mixed "castrating" with "castigate": "like why would you say (you want) to castrate °yourself°" (lines 630, 632). In fact, Anne's statement here is an overt display of how non-understanding and repair initiation are related to topic coherence in the sense discussed in prior cases. Since she thought "castrating" and could not relate it to what Michael had said so far, she initiates repair. "Castrating" is an unexpected item in the given context. What may seem a little odd is that Anne cannot have heard "castrating" as she repeats "castigate" (line 624). However, the turns where Michael repairs, seem to give her time to realise that she has mixed up the terms. In a sense then, Michael's repair does, in fact, remedy the difficulty, although he and Anne perceived the nature of the trouble differently.

5.2 Other-initiation as a response to an "expected" contribution to talk

The following sections present cases of other-initiated self-repair that display participants' difficulties with hearing or understanding a prior turn-at-talk. These instances are contrasted with the "unexpected" contributions presented in the preceding sections. The self-initiations investigated here, show that what creates a difficulty for the participant who initiates repair, is to be found in the immediately preceding turn. The trouble cannot be traced "backwards" in the conversation to syntactic or semantic ties. Also, instead of displaying the initiating participant's confusion with the prior speaker's contribution to talk, the initiation is more related to the perception of the participant who initiates repair, e.g. that he or she does not understand a turn-at-talk, or simply has not heard it properly. More responsibility for the difficulty appears to rest on the initiating participant's shoulders than in instances that seem out of place due to mismatches in participants' interpretation of the activities they engage in, or in the knowledge they share.

5.2.1 Other-initiation as a word is unfamiliar to a participant

Other-initiation may occur in situations where a participant does not recognise a word. In this section two such examples are presented; one conducted by a NNS and the other one by a NS.

An important difference between the examples to be presented and those previously analysed is that the trouble source constitutes a word that is not understood because it is unknown to the participant who initiates repair (cf. the difficulty discussed in chapter 4, section 4.1). The repair initiation consists, in both cases, of metalinguistic comments that explicate this fact. One might say that the nature of the problem is to grasp "what" is being said and not "why" it is said, to return to Drew (1997).

In (5:7) Tobias does not understand a word that John uses and initiates repair, repeating the item adding a metalinguistic element. The repair-initiation and John's repair evolve into an extensive definition sequence (Markee, 2000). Since there are many aspects of interest in this lengthy transcript, only the repair-initiation is marked with bold-face. Other points of importance are referred to in the text:

(5:7)
```
348  To:  [stealing doesn't] necessarily have to be religious the
          other two (0.5) the second one isn' (0.7) doesn't eit-
          her(0.7) isn't as religious that either but it's (1.5)
          could be fit(ted) better into the religious context.
349  ps:  (0.4)
350  Jo:  mm.
351  To:  the third one is eh
352  ps:  (1.3)
353  Jo:  very religious (0.4) [reli] giously weighted
354  To:                       [(x)]
355  ps:  (1.3)
356  To:  weighted? (0.2) what does that mean?
357  Jo:  hrm ((clears throat))
358  ps:  (0.3)
359  To:  I (know) what a waiter is but I guess that's not the same
          [*thing* he°]
360  Jo:  [it is when] ehm (1.6) for example these((sound of a
          paper)) these eh:: e- e- printed in [bold type]
361  To:                                      [ah weight] we're
          talking about the things like this has a weight ((lifts
          up a cup from the table))
362  ps:  (0.2)
```

```
363  Jo:  yeah.
364  To:  ah now I un- (I-) I thought about (nt) (0.2)
          [(x)]
365  Jo:  [you] thought of
366  To:  spelling (x x x)
367  Jo:  e he° (0.4) waiters-
368  To:  single v (0.2) a normal v not a doubleyu
369  ps:  (0.6)
370  Jo:  yeah ah- (1.5) °I see° well it's waited as in
371  ps:  (0.4)
372  To:  oh no! it's a doubleyu in the other one
          [(as well)]
373  Jo:  [I wait]for a bus.
374  ps:  (0.3)
375  To:  yeah.
376  ps:  (0.7)
377  Jo:  an:d then (0.3) a waiter waited upon you.
378  ps:  (0.2)
379  To:  yeah. (0.9) there is a [weight upon my]
380  Jo:                         [(x) (that's not the same)]
381  To:  shoulders
382  ps:  (0.3)
383  Jo:  yeah.
384  To:  [(anyway)]
385  Jo:  [(I know)] weight(1.5)probably some other kind of spel-
          ling(as well)
386  ps:  (1.3)
387  To:  °yes° (0.3) (some) very odd spellings in the
          [English language]
388  Jo:  [yeea]
389  ps:  (0.8)
390  Jo:  (°I know°)(0.6) a very old English word weight.
391  ps:  (0.6)
392  To:  °ye:°
393  Jo:  it means (something) °I don't know° (1.0) but yeah but as
          cause it's bold type I would say that that word is
          weighted in that sentence.
394  ps:  (1.1)
395  To:  no right you mean I [yeah (of course)]
396  Jo:                      [((coughs))]
397  ps:  (0.5) ((sound in the background))
398  To:  [(x)]
399  Jo:  [but normally]it's a word can be weighted with a like a
          (0.7) nt (0.8)phu° ((blows out air)) some kind of added
          meaning (2.3) I can't describe it rea[lly]
400  To:                                       [(no) (x x)]
401  Jo:  (no) (you always) say that you always (0.3) you ask me to
          define things *in [English]
402  To:                    [((laughs))]
403  Jo:  he°
404  To:  yeah (define) [(a word)]
405  Jo:                [what does >(that] mean John<=explain this
          complicated English thing °eh° (0.3) (why n) >we' I don't
          know<
```

```
406  ps:  (0.3)
407  To:  [(lots of)other times I can explain better than you can]
408  Jo:  [((laughs at length))]
409  To:  [he he he ((laughs))]
410  Jo:  [yeah he he ((laughs))] .hhh (0.3) (x) you look very stu-
          pid (0.4) he he he
411  ps:  (1.0)
412  Jo:  [((laughs))]
413  To:  [it's alright] he he
414  Jo:  I thought you were gonna say well it's not hard.
415  To:  [((laughs))]
416  Jo:  [((laughs))]
```

The repair initiation occurs as a response to a word that John uses when he collaboratively completes Tobias' utterance (line 353) after a (1.3) pause. Subsequent to John's contribution "religiously weighted" there is another (1.3) pause, during which Tobias turns his head towards John, looks straight at him and requests clarification (line 356). The request is not instantly responded to as John clears his throat. The lack of response gives Tobias time to expand the initiation[8]. Now Tobias shows that he knows of a homonymous word but that he understands that this cannot be the same as the one John was using (line 359). John's response this time is to give an example of a context in which the word weighted can be used. He leans forward and points at the bold typed text on the instructions sheet before them. Tobias is very attentive and simultaneously leans forward following John's extended arm with his gaze. Soon he utters "ah weight" in a tone that expresses his understanding. He then lifts his cup of coffee, weighing (!) it in his hand and requests confirmation: "we're talking about the things like this has a weight" (line 361). John confirms that he is right. Now, instead of returning to the topic preceding the trouble source, John and Tobias continue to elaborate on the word that initially was problematic, although the acute understanding difficulty has been cleared up. Tobias consigns the trouble to a misinterpretation of

---

[8] Kalin (1995:67) makes interesting observations about how a lapse, i.e. "a lack of response" functions as repair initiation in NS-NNS Swedish conversation. Such lapses can be followed by a reformulation of the trouble source-turn, thus conforming to the NTRI pattern. Applied to my data, however, it is not likely that Tobias interprets John's silence as a repair initiation. The reformulation (line 359) is more of an extended repair initiation that not only shows what Tobias does not know, but what he knows: "but I guess that's not the same *thing*"

spelling (lines 366, 368, 372). John does not take much notice of Tobias'
confusion at this point but gives some supportive feedback (line 370)
before he goes on to elaborate on the use of the homonymic "wait"
[weɪt], providing two examples. Tobias acknowledges John's efforts
and contributes with an example that goes well with the meaning of
the trouble source, i.e. "there is a [weight upon my] shoulders". John
returns to the issue of spelling, suggesting that there are likely to be
alternatives (385). Tobias then comments on the "odd spellings in the
[English language]" (line 387). John is not yet ready to leave the activity
of giving examples of the use of the troublesome word and returns to
the instructions sheet. Again he leans forward, points at the printed
bold typed letters and adds another sense to the word "weighted" (line
393). Tobias responds in a slightly hesitant way after a rather long
pause. This hesitant response seems to lead John to add further infor-
mation to his example. Possibly he interprets Tobias' hesitation as a
signal of uncertainty. Subsequent to the last example: "a word can be
weighted with a like a (0.7) nt (0.8) phu° some kind of added meaning"
(line 399), John decides to close the topic and shifts activity from
defining the word to metalinguistic talk about defining. He starts teas-
ing Tobias for always asking him about English words. This latter
aspect of the talk is discussed further below.

   In this excerpt one may argue that nativeness and non-nativeness
are on display in the way Tobias makes explicit that he does not know
a certain word in the target language and in the way John behaves, pro-
viding Tobias with a range of uses of the unfamiliar word as well as of
homonyms to it. He also corrects Tobias during their definition work.
This happens at the point where John has elaborated on the hom-
onymic "wait" (lines 367, 370, 373, 377) giving examples of "waiters",
"waiting for a bus" and "a waiter waited upon you". Tobias responds
to the examples with an idiomatic expression that contains the target
word: "there's a [weight upon my] shoulders" (lines 379, 381). In over-
lap with Tobias, John points out that the sense suggested by Tobias, is
not "the same" (line 380) as that of his own examples. One may argue
that the nature of Tobias' repair-initiation sanctions John to act as
"expert" or linguistically knowledgeable (Kurhila 2003). This can also
be seen when Tobias reasons about "(some) very odd spellings in the

[English language]" (line 387) and John again acts as someone who knows, stating "I know" and then adds that the word in question is "a very old English word <u>weight</u>" (390). In addition, at the point where John decides that he does not feel like coming up with further definitions, he gives an account of how Tobias keeps asking him "to de<u>fine </u>things in [English]" and he uses reported speech to stage these events "what does (that) mean John <=explain <u>this</u> complicated English thing" (line 405). Tobias responds to this mild accusation defending himself in a joking manner (line 407). John joins in and the excerpt ends with the two friends laughing heartily.

From a traditional language learning perspective, there is evidence that Tobias's comprehension of John's repair leads to his own subsequent use of the word "weighted", a behaviour denoted "uptake" (Selinker, 1972; Harris, 1992). Additionally, he is provided with contexts of homonyms of the unfamiliar word. He also elaborates on related words already acquired. Thus, the other-initiation yields a long sequence of collaborative metalinguistic talk. According to Markee (2000: 45) Tobias displays "successful learning behaviour" as not only does he show his understanding, but is able to use the trouble source-item productively. Thus, some factors suggest that the collaborative definition work and John's role as instructor help Tobias develop his vocabulary. Markee (2000) claims that repair in the shape of definition/clarification requests are conversational practices that participants orient to for language learning. This can indeed be argued for in this particular case. However, language learning is not the primary or only aim of Tobias when he initiates repair. He is equally eager to solve the understanding difficulty to be able to continue the conversation. It is clear that clarification requests in foreign language talk do many jobs, one of which is to facilitate the understanding and learning of unknown words. As has already been shown, it may well be the case that a repair that is perceived as a lack of word knowledge, concerns lexical confusion, as was the case for Anne and Michael.

In (5:8) Tobias resorts to his mother tongue as a means of self-repair in a word search. For this strategy to work John has to have some knowledge of the language, in this case Swedish. John's lack of this knowledge, results in repair-initiation.

```
98   Jo:  yeah stealing (1.6)((drinks coffee)) that's another
          interesting point you've just made there (0.6) it's the
          law that draws the lines (0.2) in public life isn't it?
99   To:  yeah (1.3) mje (I mean) that's (an) interesting (in a
          way) because I think n=I don't know about (0.2)(what is x
          the word ) but in the Swed(en) constitution we have a
          .hhh we' we don't have a natural constitution it's called
          the (0.6) base law(0.5)(foundation) law or:: but means
          (x) (probably) the same as constitution
100  ps:  (0.5)
101  Jo:  [((coughs))]
102  To:  [and] it says that the:: the law should eh (2.3) should
          e- coincide with the eh: with the general (0.5) concep-
          tion of what is right
103  ps:  (1.1)
104  Jo:  [mm]
105  To:  [there's]a word in Swedish=rättsmedvetande
106  ps:  (1.0)
107  Jo:  which means? (0.5)((clears throat))
108  To:  which means what I= *just about* what I just said
109  Jo:  right I see
110  To:  the general=what people in general feel is right.
111  Jo:  public opinion.
112  To:  yeah not re- (0.2)the (0.2)the public opinion more like
          a(0.7) a (0.4) public perception of morals (how)
          (the)perception of what is right an' what is wrong
113  Jo:  mm (1.8) m
```

In the turns leading up to the repair initiation Tobias has tried to explain to John how the Swedish constitution works. In this activity, he faces some problems of vocabulary and starts searching for words (line 99). To solve the problem, he tries to resort to innovations: "it's called the (0.6) base law (0.5) (foundation) law" (line 99)[9]. Apart from this strategy, Tobias expands on the innovations as he tries to describe the nature of the constitution (line 102). This description ends with his telling John what the Swedish word for this latter description is, i.e. "rättsmedvetande" (line 105). There is a pause (1.0) before John initiates repair.

John does not repeat the trouble source-item but uses a meta-linguistic comment to indicate that there is a problem in understanding. Because of the codeswitch, John need not (or perhaps cannot) repeat the troublesome word to target it. Just the fact that the word is

---

[9] Tobias has, in fact, already used the word "constitution" that is likely to work well.

in Swedish, makes it a difficulty for John[10]. Tobias responds to the repair initiation by repeating the metalinguistic comment and he laughs as he states that he has already explained the meaning of the Swedish word. John accepts this response (line 109), but receives a reformulation of Tobias' prior contribution: "the law should eh (2.3) should e- coincide with the eh: with the general (0.5) conception of what is right" (line 102), this time formulated as: "the general= what people in general feel is right" (110). John responds, suggesting (or possibly conducting other-repair, cf. chapter 6.) a suitable word in English. The suggestion, however, is not accepted by Tobias, who once more elaborates on a similar construction: "more like a (0.7) a public perception of morals (how) (the) perception of what is right an´ what is wrong" (line 112). John now accepts Tobias' explanation and the conversation continues.

Again then, the repair initiation results in a definition sequence. The metalinguistic comment that explicitly points to the nature of the trouble yields a number of elaborations on Tobias' part. Since the word is in Swedish, the role of knowing what it means now rests on Tobias, a fact that might allow him to reject John's attempt at other-repair (line 111).

5.2.2 Other-initiation at hearing difficulties

In previous sections, there were examples of other-initiations that were interpreted as hearing difficulties, but that turned out to be more complex. Example (5:9) below presents an instance where hearing really is the only problem:

```
(5:9)
202  Li:  when I was little I I (1.7) well I I was in a situation
          to (0.8) there (it) was (0.5) ehm (0.7) wha' is (1.8)
          eh:: adekvat (0.6) in English?
203  Er:  correct eh:::m
```

---

[10] This may be too strong a claim but is based on my impression of John and what he told me about himself and his life in Sweden: John is an exchange student of chemistry. He does not attend any language courses to learn Swedish and manages fine in his mother tongue. However, I do not know anything about his ambitions to learn Swedish or how much Swedish he knew at the time of the recording.

```
204  Li:  well you know what I mea[n to to speak about] death and I
205  Er:                          [adequate (something)]
206  Li:  (0.4)
207  Er:  no
208  Li:  and I thought about (0.8) Astrid Lindgren's Nangiala
209  Er:  mhm mhm
210  Li:  that's how I wanted it to be and I still do (0.5) kind of
          actua[lly it's so beautiful]
211  Er:       [the b- the Brothers Lionheart]
212  ps:  (0.8)
213  Li:  pardon?
214  Er:  the Brothers Lion[heart a-Astrid Lindgren's]
215  Li:                   [yeah they're so beautiful]
216  ps:  (0.5)
217  Er:  [(x)]
218  Li:  [and I- I want] all my family to come together again all
          pe- all the people that I've (0.4) loved [in my life]
219  Er:                                           [yes]
220  Li:  I want to see them again
221  Er:  mhm
```

Linda gives an account of a situation from her childhood where she had been talking about death (with somebody). After the word search and explicit request for Erik to assist her (line 202), Linda tells Erik about how she wanted it to be after death, referring to "Nangiala" (line 208), a world[11] created by the late Swedish children's author Astrid Lindgren. Before Linda finishes her utterance, Erik overlaps and contributes with the title of the novel in which Nangiala appears. There is a pause before Linda initiates repair for hearing (line 213). Erik responds by repeating the title of the novel. In addition, he recycles Linda's use of "Astrid Lindgren's". However, it is quite clear that Linda initiated repair for hearing, as Erik's initial part of the repair, i.e. the repeat, is sufficient information for her to sort out what she missed from the overlap, and she responds to the repair in a supportive fashion: "[yeah they're so beautiful]" (line 215). She then continues to tell Erik what she wants life after death to be like. This initiation-technique is also used in a few cases of hearing difficulties in the entirely native conversations.

Thus, the repair initiation occurs in Linda's assessment as Erik collaboratively comments on a part of Linda's talk. Equally supportive, the repair initiation shows that Linda is attentive to Erik's response as

---

[11] "Nangiala" appears in the well known children's novel "Bröderna Lejonhjärta" (Lindgren, 1973) and is the place people go to when they die.

it overlaps her own speech. Once the difficulty of hearing is solved, Linda continues the previous activity.

5.3 Candidate understandings

Candidate understandings[12] are types of other-initiations that differ somewhat from the ones described so far. One may say that instead of indicating non-hearing or non-understanding, they do, in fact, display an interpretation of what was said in order to receive confirmation or rejection of this interpretation[13] (Schegloff et al., 1977; Kurhila, 2003). Kurhila (2003) gives a detailed description of candidate understandings occurring in NS-NNS Finnish conversations. In contrast to Kurhila, who labels a variety of phenomena candidate understandings, only one type is dealt with in this section, i.e. an initiation that expresses uncertainty concerning the interpretation of some aspect of the pre-ceding turn. The uncertainty is displayed by means of interrogative intonation, or interrogative intonation and a metalinguistic element such as "you mean", accompanying the candidate expression. Candidate understandings are sometimes difficult to distinguish from other actions. One such example is a case where a participant questions the accuracy of the information conveyed in a prior turn, resulting in an argument or attempt to convince the speaker that the information pro-vided is in some way wrong. Another phenomenon that is not easily distinguishable from candidate understandings, is supportive ques-tions, i.e. turns-at-talk that display involvement and encourage a speaker to go on talking. Whereas questioning of accuracy is not dealt with in this section, some examples that could be interpreted as candi-date understandings *or* supportive questions are taken into account. One reason for the difficulties involved in distinguishing questions of accuracy and supportive questions from candidate understanding, apart from the sequential similarity, is that they often carry interroga-

---

[12] An alternative term to candidate understanding is "formulations" (cf. Heritage & Wat-son, 1979).

[13] As Kurhila (2003) points out, most responses in a conversation display some interpreta-tion of what was said in the previous turn.

tive intonation, consist of a whole or partial repeat of a part of the prior turn, and responses to them often begin with a marker of confirmation or rejection, e.g. "yes" or "no". Examples (5:10), (5:11) and (5:12) illustrate questioning of accuracy, candidate understanding and a supportive question. The initiation is marked with boldface:

(5:10) questioning of accuracy
```
680   Mi:  [watershed in the aft]ernoon you know (you're) not allo-
           wed like see nothing to do with blood or anything= the-
           re's (x) six o clock news an' you got people(whose) heads
           (are)chopped off  [(x x)]
681   An:                    [is it not ni-] is it not nine o clock
           or you're [talking about (x)?]
682   Mi:             [(x) six o clock] o- on the news
```

Anne questions the accuracy of the time reference in Michael's utterance as he is talking about the violence broadcasted on the six o'clock news. Although Anne displays her understanding as well as interpretation of Michael's previous turn, the aim of her request is not to receive a confirmation or rejection of the interpretation itself, but to express her doubts about the accuracy of what Michael is saying.

(5:11) candidate understanding
```
69    Er:  I think that (0.3) I would be ready (0.3) to believe in
           God (0.7)if (1.1) if he show- showed himself in some way
           .hhh because I cannot believe I cannot s- sort of talk
           myself into
           believing(1.1).hh [e::]
70    Li:                    [you mean] so you could see him?
71    ps:  (1.8)
72    Er:  [yes or see his work in some way]
73    Li:  [y- you won't have to see him to]believe in him
```

Linda requests a response from Erik concerning her interpretation of what he has just said. The initiation contains a metacomment (or is "uncertainty-marked" Kurhila, 2003:242), and a version (paraphrase) of Erik's conditional expression "I would be ready (0.3) to believe in God (0.7) if (1.1) if he show- showed himself in some way" (line 69).

Erik's response to the initiation is to confirm that Linda's interpretation is appropriate and he gives an additional interpretation, i.e. "or see his work in some way]" (line 72). In this example, the pause (1.8) is probably involved in the overlap at the point of Erik's reply. Linda's contribution (line 73) works as a disambiguation of the inferences that

she makes from treating Erik's silence as a confirmation of her interpretation.

Finally, supportive questions are used to encourage a speaker to go on and/or to give more elaborated information. In contrast to a candidate understanding, the person conducting the initiation does not seem to do so in order to avoid a conversational breakdown in case sufficient understanding is not achieved, rather the purpose is simply to elicit more information in a supportive fashion, or display interest, involvement and sometimes amazement:

(5:12) supportive question
```
261  Er:   yea (0.6) I've been hit by a car six times so [e he he]
262  Li:                                                  [you have?]
263  Er:   *yes I have* .hhhh so eh (0.3) eh the first [time was]
264  Li:                                               [seriously?]
265  Er:   yes I have but I (x)I was never hurt [but the first]
266  Li:                                        [no]
267  Er:   time I'm I was thrown quite a bit (0.6) ehm I
            was thrown into a wall and and bounced back *he*
            [and I thought] Jesus I'm gonna die
268  Li:   [(my God)]
```

Candidate understandings as defined here are thus characterised by their interpretation-checking function, i.e. they are requests for confirmation or rejection of the interpretation. Further, they contain an interrogative element, either the metalinguistic "you mean" or questioning intonation together with the candidate expression. According to the difficulties involved in distinguishing candidate understandings from other types of actions, some examples are given alternative interpretations where deemed relevant. It appears that participants themselves, at times, may misinterpret the function of some interrogatives, particularly the ones that are not preceded by the metalinguistic element "you mean"[14].

---

[14] In the viewing session, Linda revealed that she perceived that Erik had misinterpreted her use of "seriously?" (line 264). Whereas his response reveals that he treated her question as a question of accuracy or supportive display of amazement, she wanted to know whether or not he was "seriously hit by the car". Retrospectively, Linda reasons about her own intonation, claiming that it possibly was not quite right and therefore affected Erik's response. She also says that she could not be bothered to make Erik aware of his misinterpretation (Linda gets information about whether or not Erik was hurt anyway).

5.3.1 "You mean" plus a candidate understanding

There were three instances of initiations consisting of a metalinguistic comment plus a candidate understanding. The first of these cases was presented as example (5:11) above. The other two are looked at more closely in this section.

In the first example, Magnus gives a long account about how he handles arguments, and jokes about being a "conflict avoiding person" (line 229). After a long (5.8) pause, Tim picks up on this topic. Tim's speech at this point is slow and hesitant and Magnus does not wait till Tim is finished, before he asks what Tim means:

(5:13)
```
229  Ma:  there was one point in my life when I (0.7) I couldn't go
          into to an argument(0.6) eh::m (1.3) because I always
          well I pushed the arguments quite a lot and took a stand-
          point that I n:n not I didn't necessarily hold (0.8) but
          anyway afterwards I felt s:o bad (0.3) that I had sort of
          (x) just walked over the other person (0.3) (I felt) oh
          no sorry! sorry!(0.3)so (0.2) in a sense (0.5) eh: (0.5)
          took back what I had said (1.6)so we- (0.3) I don't do
          that anymore because I think that in (0.4) in an argument
          or a debate (0.7) it's definitely okay to have different
          viewpoints (0.3) but it's because I'm a conflict avoiding
          person as[(x x)]
230  Ti:         [((laughs))] he he he
231  ps:  (0.4)
232  Ma:  ((coughs)) (0.3) which perhaps sounds like a paradox but
          it isn't (0.7) hh.(0.7) believe me [it isn't]
233  Ti:                                     [((laughs))]
234  Ma:  mm ((sounds negating)) (0.8) so
235  ps:  (5.8)
236  Ti:  n it it's quite often rather than actually admitting it
          (0.2) you know you kind of (0.9) I don't know y- you kind
          of get alongside the person an (0.3) in other ways but
          (0.8) I just I- I just[(find it)]
237  Ma:                        [mm]
238  Ti:  it's much easier if if people are
          open and and (0.3) (and can) (0.7) you know say
          [(that they) (x)]
239  Ma:  [what do you mean] confront you?
240  Ti:  eh (x)
241  ps:  (0.2)
242  Ma:  [or ((coughs))]
243  Ti:  [can say that I know I wronged you] or whatever you know
          but it it actually takes a lot guts to do that a lot of
          time
244  Ma:  mm
245  ps:  (0.2)
```

```
246  Ti:  but eh: [I know that]
247  Ma:          [.(that's true).]
```

The response to the initiation is, interestingly, not a clear confirmation in the form of a "yes" or "no" answer. Rather, Tim does not really respond to the initiation that displays Magnus' candidate understanding (line 239), but continues his utterance (line 243) as if nothing had happened. The initiation does not pass by completely unnoticed however, as it disrupts Tim for a moment (lines 240, 241). In overlap with Magnus' "or" (line 242), Tim repeats the prior verb phrase adding a that-clause to complete the construction. He then makes a point in relation to what he has just said about admitting to being sorry. At this point, Magnus no longer needs confirmation of his suggested interpretation, and agrees with the things that Tim has said. This shows how a candidate understanding may be passed over with limited attention directed to it and without jeopardising understanding. It is possible that Tim assumes that Magnus will understand him if only he may just finish his turn.

The third instance occurs in the talk of Celia and Emily. Celia has told Emily about a job she once had as a telemarketer and explains why telemarketers are so persistent:

```
(5:14)
389  Ce:  you know .hhh just .hh d:um things like that you know
          it's(0.4) I don't know I'm (0.4) now (an') like I if I
          get telemarketers (0.6) cause like (0.3) a lot of times
          the reason that they keep asking is (x x) (make the
          sellers) cause they have to [you know]
390  Em:                              [mhm]
391  Ce:  they're told by their boss (0.2) (go in a secon-) like
          we're told (0.7) try a second time and if they still say
          no (0.5) you know leave it alone
392  ps:  (0.5)
393  Em:  oh you mean [(and)]
394  Ce:             [that's]
395  Em:  one phonecaller call again
396  ps:  (0.8)
397  Ce:  >no no no no<
398  Em:  one phon[e-(x x)]
399  Ce:          [on one] phone [call]
400  Em:                         [.okay.]
401  Ce:  if they say no the first time (0.5) they say try a second
          time
402  ps:  (0.2)
403  Em:  °yeah°
```

168

```
404  Ce:  in (0.2) if they still say no you know just (0.2) leav=
          let it be
405  Em:  mhm
406  Ce:  that's what they told us (0.5) I (x x [xx])
```

Emily does not get the full picture when Celia explains how tele-
marketers are instructed to work. Emily's candidate understanding
reveals that she thinks that Celia means that the telemarketer calls
more than once, whereas it becomes clear in Celia's clarification that
the telemarketer is supposed to *ask* twice during one phone call.
Emily's misapprehension is responded to with the rapid repetition of
"no" four times. Celia is looking straight at Emily during this misun-
derstanding, and nods as Emily suggests the alternative of "one
phon[e- (x x)" (line 398), which is also repeated confirmingly by Celia.
Mutual understanding is reached smoothly and Celia once more gives
a version of what she was told to do as a telemarketer (lines 401, 404,
406).

5.3.2 Candidate understanding with questioning intonation

Some candidate understandings appeared without "you mean" and
consisted of recycled material from the trouble source-turn. There
were two instances of this type in the data and both occurred in the
conversations that involved two NSs. As in example (5:13) neither of
the candidates are confirmed or rejected. A possible explanation may
be that both instances occur in overlapping speech and might not have
been perceived properly. In the first case, the lack of response makes
the person who initiates repair take her interpretation as sufficient for
continued use, and in the second, the lack of response does not affect
the continuation of the talk in any noticeable way.

Michael tells Anne about a dinner at his friend Lizzy's place. Lizzy's
family is deeply religious and a variety of things, more or less serious,
are considered sinful from their point of view:

```
(5:15)
565  Mi:  ehm (0.5) and we were having this (0.3) dinner (when you)
          just like have (that)[(you'll have a roast chicken]
566  An:                       [(x x x x)]
```

```
567   Mi:   and it was like e he. he.
568   An:   *hm*
569   Mi:   *.h it's* (and we) we had no vegetables whatsoever I mean
            she had to go to the supermarket (an') uncle Benny (0.3)
            he went (on) going oh you have committed a grave sin! an'
            .h you know you've (0.2) ehm
            [an' really made her feel bad I mean an' it's]
570   An:   [cause she got her vegetables in the supermarket?]
571   Mi:   something like that (th't) is just so: petty (0.3)
            there's (well) an I think people (just) (0.3)
            ((scratching sound)) use that word (somet-) just
            for the sake of it as well (0.5) ehm (1.6) you know
            [just *just* just you know just use it (x x)]
572   An:   [((laughs at length/giggles))]*h.Ih'm sorry I mean tal-
            king about sin if you gonna (be like) (0.3) e he. take
            that point of view (0.5) yeah well they're sitting there
            eatin' a dead bird but it's just [(a sin) because]
573   Mi:                                    [exactly]
574   An:   she bought the vegetables to eat
            [e he. he ((laughs)) .mm::.]
575   Mi:   [exactly you know yeah I know yeah]
576   An:   let's hope [it (was)]
577   Mi:             [(true)]
578   An:   *Kosher vege[tables*]
579   Mi:               [((laughs))]
580   An:   he. he. ha. .hhh
```

Ann's interpretation of Michael's dinner story is that uncle Benny considered it sinful of Lizzy's mum to buy vegetables in the supermarket. She offers a candidate understanding with a clear questioning intonation, recycling bits from Michael's turn, i.e. the agent "she", the object "vegetables", and the place "in the supermarket". Michael, however, does not respond to this initiation but continues talking, keeping the turn. The lack of response makes Anne stick to her understanding of the event and she starts joking about the fact that buying the vegetables is considered a sin, whereas "eatin' a dead bird" (572) is okay. All through this joking sequence Michael gives supportive feedback and shows no objection to Anne's understanding of the contents of his prior turns. Although there is no evidence of Anne's interpretation being "correct" or "incorrect" there is a question mark as to whether or not Michael actually said that it was the action of "buying" vegetables that uncle Benny considered a "grave sin!" (line 569) or whether it was the fact that they did not have any vegetables to begin with (we had no vegetables whatsoever) (line 569). In any case, he neither provides an accep-

tance nor a rejection of Anne's request for confirmation. Instead of orienting to the trouble in understanding, participants collaborate on the perspective that is introduced by means of the interpretation that was neither confirmed nor rejected.

Another case where the request for confirmation is not responded to is found in the talk of Emily and Celine:

```
(5:16)
465  Em:  [but I know] like every kind
          of bean that the[y (put)in a can]
466  Ce:                 [((laughs))]
467  Em:  who (0.1)[(are)-]
468  Ce:           [valuable] informa[tion that we]
469  Em:                             [yeah]
470  Ce:  all need to know[h.hh]
471  Em:                  [yeah]
472  Ce:  h. h.
473  Em:  well like (0.2) uhm (0.2) at (x) in our (0.2) in the
          dining centre sometimes they'll have chick peas or gar-
          banzo beans (0.6) uhm (0.2) .m. for the salad (0.7) do
          you know what I'm talking
          [about (this)]
474  Ce:  [yeah]
475  Em:  kind of beans[yeah]
476  Ce:               [yeah]
477  ps:  (0.3)
478  Em:  (and) (x x x) why do you have those on your salad what
          are those Emily= no- none of my friends knew what they
          [were nt .hhh those are]
479  Ce:  [they don't know what chick peas (are)?]
480  Em:  garbanzo *beans* [((laughs)) *because]
481  Ce:                   [((laughs))]
482  Em:  I knew the h.right* name because I('d) worked there*
          [(xx)]
483  Ce:  [(uh he.)]
```

Emily is telling Celia about a job she once had in a canning factory and how this job had given her an extensive knowledge about different kinds of beans. Celia responds to this information in a mocking voice (lines 468, 470). Emily, in turn, responds by telling Celia about an occasion where she actually used her knowledge about beans in the high school dining centre. The centre served beans for salad and Emily uses an imitating voice to illustrate how her friends asked her about the beans that she had on her salad (line 478), claiming that none of the friends knew what beans they were. At this point, in overlap with Emily, Celia requests confirmation with clear questioning intonation:

"[they don't know what chick peas (are)?]" (line 479). In the turn following the request for confirmation, Emily says "garbanzo *beans*" (line 480) with laughing voice. This is responded to by Celia with laughter. From one perspective, Emily's response looks like a case of other-repair, i.e. she is repairing Celia's utterance that Emily's friends did not know what "chick peas" were. However, another interpretation that gets stronger support from the data, is that Emily's response "garbanzo *beans*" (line 480), is not a response to Celia's initiation, but a continuation of the utterance where the overlap occurred. Right after the account that "no- none of my friends knew what they [were" (line 478), the quality of Emily's voice changes and she begins a new TCU that sounds like she is quoting herself at the time of the incident at the dining centre, answering her friends rather than responding to Celia, i.e. she answers the questions "why do you have those on your salad what are those Emily" (line 478). The answer is "those are garbanzo *beans*" (lines 478, 480). Again then, although the repair initiation is not responded to, the effect this lack of response has on the continuation of the talk, is marginal. Obviously Celia receives an answer to her initiation in Emily's continued construction: "those are garbanzo *beans*".

The instances analysed here reveal that the boundaries between actions, such as a request for confirmation, support of speaker, and display of understanding, are not easily distinguishable. The speaker of a turn-at-talk that is responded to by means of a candidate understanding, does not necessarily respond to it, but may sometimes continue his/her turn-at-talk. What the instances where lack of response occurred had in common was that the initiation appeared in part or full overlap with an ongoing turn. Reasons for the lack of response in these cases may only be speculated on. It may possibly be the case that the speaker who holds the turn simply wants to finish it, and sometimes finishing the turn will provide the recipient with clarifying information, so that an answer to the request is no longer necessary. Alternatively, the speaker may perceive the candidate understanding as supportive rather than questioning (and it may, of course, have been uttered as such too). The number of candidate understandings occurring in the data is not sufficient to be able to draw any conclusions as

to their function and why some are responded to whereas others are not.

5.4 Summary

In this chapter, analyses of sequences comprising the turns leading up to, as well as responses to repair-initiation are presented, providing descriptions of other-initiated self-repair in the conversations involving NSs and NNSs. Repair was initiated by NSs and NNSs in responses to troublesome turns to an equal degree.

In the first part of the chapter, it was argued that some other-initiations occur as reactions to a contribution to talk that is somehow "unexpected" and a variety of factors involved in such environments were pointed to. In this respect the observations made correspond to findings by Drew (1997) and Rasmussen and Wagner (2001). Of particular importance was the fact that this "unexpectedness" was related to discourse coherence in the sense of sequential organisation (Schegloff, 1990) as well as with syntactic and semantic ties in participants' local management of their turns. Analyses showed how the ongoing activity and the roles associated with the activity affected participants' expectations of the organisation of sequences. Also, the complexity of interpretation increased when a shift in activity signalled a sudden change in how participants' perceived the understanding established so far.

Some instances of other-initiation appeared in the beginning stages of topic development or at a topic shift. One such example showed how an unconventional expression caused trouble since the level of understanding that had been established between interlocutors was quite limited. The turn hosting the trouble source was treated as insufficient by the recipient as well as by the speaker himself, who managed to self-repair before other-initiation occurred.

Other-initiations occurred in relation to the unexpected use of a form that one participant interpreted as mutually known. The first interpretation was therefore to treat it as a hearing difficulty. Since this response led to a second initiation, the speaker realised that the difficulty was one of reference. In the analysis, retrospective material

was used to give a possible explanation of the trouble and repair and it supported the interpretation that there were more difficulties involved than a simple matter of non-hearing, since the repair evolved into a second initiation that framed reference as somehow problematic. Another case of other-initiation that was initially treated as a hearing difficulty occurred in an environment where the problematic item was used in a syntactic framework that had been recycled in previous turns-at-talk, alternating verbal expressions such as "stop" and "be ready to" in a participant's description of himself from two opposing perspectives. Correct hearing was vital to avoid an ambiguity of interpretation. Thus, the unexpected nature of a word seemed related to the way a syntactic structure was being recycled by one participant in a sudden shift in perspective. Despite the limited number of occurrences, it should be noted that the form of the other-initiations consisted of a repeat of an element or expression from the previous turn with an interrogative intonation, a technique commonly associated with hearing difficulties (or a request for confirmation of correct hearing) (Drew, 1997; Brouwer, 2004). Since it is in the interest of participants that conversations proceed with a minimum of effort, treating other-repair as a hearing problem may be the preferred strategy by the speaker of the turn that evokes repair-initiation. Providing a confirmation or correction of what the recipient has heard, does not lead to any side-sequence where information needs to be added or the trouble source turn clarified.

One case of other-initiation concerned the misinterpretation of a word by a NS as a response to the talk of another NS. The difficulty was solved as the NS claimed to hear a word differently from the one actually used. Again, the word perceived would arguably have been "unexpected" in relation to the surrounding talk. Interestingly, this initiation was interpreted as a case of lack of word knowledge on the part of the speaker of the problematic turn, which caused some frustration to the participant who misperceived a word in her mother tongue. As self-repair, the NS replaced the word in question with a considerably more common (or everyday) expression.

The second half of the chapter dealt with such sequences where other-initiation could not be related to misunderstandings, misper-

ceptions or obstructions of the coherence in relation to prior turns of talk. On the one hand, these other-initiations were treated as "expected" for the simple reason that participants did not show any signs of surprise or confusion in relation to initiations. Rather, the trouble source was targeted by means of metalinguistic comments that clearly pointed out the nature of the problem, or initiation techniques that were strongly associated with hearing difficulties, e.g. "pardon?". Additionally, hearing efforts and other-initiations in the form of candidate understandings were solved over three turns, i.e. trouble source-turn, other-initiation, and self-repair in the form of confirmation or "correction" in the form of a repeat of the troublesome expression. In contrast, even if the other-initiation functioned as a response to an immediately preceding turn, the difficulty of unexpected turns often evolved from aspects related to the turns-at-talk leading up to the trouble, and could sometimes be traced to turns quite far back in the preceding talk, e.g. in recycled structures that maintained shared reference that was suddenly violated.

NNSs and NSs did sometimes behave differently from each other in relation to other-initiated self-repairs, but it is often difficult to say that a participant is behaving in a specific way *because* he or she is a NS or NNS. Such conversational behaviour may just as well be characteristic for a certain individual in a specific context. In this study, NNSs attended to the topics suggested for the conversation more than did the NSs. In some instances, the NNS was in charge of the activity of discussing the topics, using questions as a means of topic development. Sometimes this behaviour created an environment that was conducive to the misinterpretation of the sequential organisation, since participants then, at least initially, approached the task with deviant attitudes, goals and expectations. In the retrospective interviews, some of the NSs claimed that they were not so used to discussing topics in the way the NNSs wanted to do it. This may explain why a turn-at-talk may sometimes be perceived as unexpected and how participants come to orient to activities differently.

In the sequence of talk where word knowledge was dealt with, participants behaved in accordance with their linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Participants showed that they did not know a word by

using metalinguistic comments, a behaviour that yielded an extended definition sequence. The NS used his expertise and provided the NNS with numerous examples of the use of the word that initially was unfamiliar as well as gave examples of homonyms. The NS gave information claiming the word to be old, displaying his knowledge. At one point he also commented on the NNS's contributions in a correcting manner. Finally, there was some metalinguistic talk about the recurring behaviour of the NNS asking the NS to define words in English.

Language learning may be discussed in relation to this definition sequence, in which the NNS is able to pick up the word, display his understanding and also, in subsequent turns, use the word appropriately. This corresponds to the successful learning behaviours that Markee (2000) describes in his proposals about clarification requests as conversational practices that participants orient to for language learning. However, sequences like this are rare in the data examined in this dissertation.

A word in Swedish led to other-initiation by the NS who had a limited command of the language (in contrast to the "bilingual" setting discussed in chapter 4.) More interesting aspects of this were found in the subsequent turns to the initiation and repair as the NNS's repair led to the NS's attempts to other-repair. This latter contribution, however, was assessed by the NNS as insufficient in relation to his own descriptions. Thus, the NNS's perception of his own knowledge of a topic overruled the power of the NS's suggestion, even where the NNS had displayed extensive difficulty in finding the "right word". This is a phenomenon often overlooked, or at best simply not observed, in studies of repair in SLA studies.

The last section of the chapter examined candidate understandings comprising interrogative intonation or interrogative intonation accompanied by a metalinguistic phrase, such as "you mean". Interestingly, mainly NSs used this technique in order to get feedback on their interpretation of something previously said. It is, of course, difficult to say whether this has anything to do with speakers' various backgrounds or whether it was simply due to differences related to the topics being talked about and participants' shared or non-shared knowledge. It was also interesting to note that a candidate understanding was not always

responded to with confirmation or rejection, but the speaker simply continued talking, anticipating that the contents of the turn under construction would provide sufficient material to enable the recipient to clarify any remaining question marks or uncertainties.

6. Corrections and suggestions

This chapter investigates sequences of talk that exhibit other-initiated other-repair. Other-initiated other-repair occurs when a participant in a conversation perceives something in a speaker's prior turn of talk to be odd or sometimes incorrect, and responds to this turn by contributing with an expression that could "replace" the one perceived as troublesome. In chapter 2, it was maintained that other-initiated other-repair is the least frequently occurring type of repair and that a possible explanation for this infrequent use is that it is associated with the loss of face of the participant who is being "corrected" (Schegloff et al., 1977; Kalin, 1995). Conversations between NNSs and NSs are perhaps particularly interesting in relation to "corrections" of this type, since it may be assumed that the linguistic asymmetry of participants should be reflected in NSs' repairs of inappropriate foreign language utterances. Classroom and psycholinguistic studies have frequently been concerned with this issue focusing on the effect of teachers' corrections of pupils' turns-at-talk, or of pupils correcting each other (Chaudron, 1988; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Van den Branden, 1997). A common finding of CA studies of casual conversation and classroom studies is that other-initiated other-repair is rare. This is also the case for the conversations investigated in this dissertation.

Norrick (1991) has argued that other-initiated other-repair in asymmetric conversations, e.g. where there are great differences in (linguistic) competence between interlocutors, is not marked as dispreferred, but rather treated as a way for the NS to help the NNS. Kurhila (2001, 2003) also finds that NSs rarely perform other-repair as outright corrections of the talk of the NNS and states that "linguistic corrections in NS-NNS (non-pedagogic) talk are, primarily, done in such a way that their interactional salience is minimised" (Kurhila 2001:1088). In addition, Kurhila (2001, 2003) identifies a number of environments in which

other-initiated other-repair occurs, e.g. where preceding turns display a speaker's uncertainty about an expression. Both these findings receive support from the analyses conducted here.

The most interesting finding of the present study is the way participants respond to other-initiated other-repair. Instead of accepting the repair, participants tend to "reject" or simply not agree with the repair provided by the person who initiates and carries out repair. The NNS involved in the instances of other-repair does not simply accept a repair as it comes from a NS. Analysis of the responses shows that the outcome of the repair is affected by factors other than merely the competence in a certain language, e.g. that a participant orients to his knowledge of and responsibility for a particular topic rather than being concerned with linguistic appropriateness. Mismatches in participants' perceptions of the ongoing activity or the topic talked about may also be involved in the way a participant carries out repair and how this repair is responded to. The complexity of other-initiated other-repair is thus brought to the fore, showing a variety of factors that are involved in the initiation and execution of repair, that go beyond a mere attempt by one interlocutor to correct another.

The chapter is structured around four sequences that exhibit other-initiated other-repair. Each analysis presents the environment in which the repair occurs and offers interpretations of why repair is initiated and why it is responded to in a certain way. Since a variety of phenomena are brought up, the more salient aspects of the analysis serve as headings for the presented excerpts. This means that one heading may emphasise the environment in which the repair occurs, another the way the repair is responded to, and yet another, the way a repair is executed. The results are summarised and discussed in the light of previous studies of other-initiated other-repair in casual native conversations as well as of conversations involving NNSs.

Only four instances of other-initiated other-repair were found in the data. Two instances took place in the talk of John and Tobias. In both cases, John initiated and carried out the repair. One case appeared in the talk of Anne and Michael and one in Jenny's and Monica's conversation. Thus, all participant constellations, i.e. NS-NNS, NS-NS and NNS-NNS pairs demonstrated an example of other-initiated other-repair.

6.1 Mismatches in participants' inter-
pretations of the need for other-repair

Example (6:1) presents an instance in which John responds to a turn of
talk with an expression that could possibly replace Tobias' expression.
Tobias has held the turn for some time telling John about an aspect of
the Swedish legal system:

```
(6:1)
98    Jo:   yeah stealing (1.6)((drinks coffee))  that's another
            interesting point you've just made there (0.6) it's the
            law that draws the lines (0.2) in public life isn't it?
99    To:   yeah (1.3) mje that's an interesting (thing in a way)
            because I think=I don't know about (0.2) (what's)(x)
            (words) x)(but)in the Swedish constitution we have hhh
            we' we don't have a natural constitution=it's called the
            (0.6) base law (or) (0.5)(foundation) law or:: (but)
            means(probably) >the same as °constitution°< (0.5)
            [and]
100   Jo:   [((coughs))]
101   To:   it says that the::the law should eh (2.3) should e- coin-
            cide with the eh: with the general (0.5) conception of
            what is right (1.1)[there's]
102   Jo:                      [mm]
103   To:   a word in Swedish=rättsmedvetande.
104   ps:   (1.0)
105   Jo:   which means? (0.5)((clears throat))
106   To:   which means what I= *just about* what I just said.
107   Jo:   right I see.
108   To:   the general=what people in general feel is right.
109   Jo:   public opinion.
110   To:   yeah not re- (0.2)the(0.2)the public opinion more like a
            (0.7) a (0.4) public eh perception of morals (0.3) (or)
            (the) perception of what is right an' what is wrong.
111   ps:   (0.3)
112   Jo:   m: (1.8) m
```

The turns leading up to John's repair are part of another repair-
sequence, in which John requests clarification as a response to a
codeswitch. Before the codeswitch, Tobias has struggled for some time
to find a way of explaining to John the particularities of the Swedish
sense of justice. His uncertainty of vocabulary is revealed in the
codeswitch (line 103). In addition, preceding turns consist of elabora-
tions and innovative expressions, e.g. "base law" and "(foundation)
law" (line 99) that Tobias states "means (probably) >the same as °con-
stitution°<". The exemplification that Tobias gives (line 101) is not

sufficiently comprehensible for John, who requests clarification following the codeswitch. Already at this point, one may observe that there is a mismatch in Tobias' and John's perceptions of the amount of exemplification- and/or explanation-work needed. John, on the one hand, reacts to the codeswitch, but his clarification request is initially not responded to with further clarification. Instead Tobias laughs and refers back to prior elaborations. Although this strategy is accepted by John (line 107), Tobias then decides to provide John with a clarification. This clarification is subsequently responded to with other-repair by John, who suggests "public opinion" as an expression that could be used in place of Tobias' longer construction, "the general=what people in general <u>feel</u> is right"(line 108).

Tobias' instant response is to accept the repair, but he quickly seems to change his mind. Instead of fully accepting the term suggested by John, he constructs an utterance that is a hybrid between his own previous formulations and a part of John's repair, i.e. he replaces "general" with John's "public" and a final version without any modifier at all: "more like a (0.7) a (0.4) public eh perception of <u>mora</u>ls (0.3) (or) (the) perception of what is right an' what is wrong". The repeats of constructions are presented schematically below to illustrate Tobias' use of certain phrases before and after John's repair. Recurring elements in Tobias' turns-at-talk are marked with italics or boldface. The expression introduced by John is underlined:

"with the *general* (0.5) *conception* of **what is right** (Tobias, line 101)
"the *general*" (Tobias, line 108)
"=**what** people *in general* feel **is right**" (Tobias, line 108)
"<u>public opinion</u>" (John, line 109)
"not re- (0.2) the (0.2) the <u>public opinion</u>" (Tobias, line 110)
"more like a (0.7) a (0.4) <u>public</u> eh *perception* of morals" (Tobias, line 110)
"(the) *perception* of **what is right** an' **what is wrong**" (Tobias, line 110)

John's repair influences Tobias' continued talk in what could be described as a partial uptake as Tobias recycles "public" as a modifier of "perception" in a construction which resembles the prior "general conception". In the final clarification, before participants continue to

develop the topic, "public" as well as "general" are excluded and only "perception" is recycled in a phrase in which "what is right" reappears. This last version is responded to by John with a minimal response. Tobias then drops the matter of clarifying to John what "rättsmedvetande" means.

From a language learning perspective, one could argue that Tobias' use of a part of John's repair affects the subsequent formulation. The productive use of the term may be viewed as evidence of the integration of an appropriate native word in Tobias' vocabulary (Markee, 2000). However, it is noteworthy that participants are not involved in the activity of language learning, but in resolving an understanding difficulty. Language learning in the form of uptake may at best be described as the cognitive by-product of a repair-sequence in which participants try to reach a satisfactory level of understanding. The result of Tobias' many reformulations is that the goal of understanding is achieved (at least, John does not request further clarification). To what extent the term "public", as it is used by Tobias, is an improvement on the form of the utterance, can also be debated.

The sequence illustrates the many complexities of other-initiated other-repair. Firstly, it is not self-evident that a repair from a NS is perceived to be correct and fully accepted by the NNS, even where, as in this case, there is a partial repeat of the NS's repair. Tobias clearly has an idea of what "public opinion" means, and does not think that it is entirely appropriate in relation to his explanation. A rejection of John's repair may be licensed for at least two reasons. Firstly, Tobias is responsible for introducing the topic (the Swedish sense of justice). Secondly, since he has not found any neat (or short) translation of "rättsmedvetande" and John's repair does not entirely cover what he is talking about, the codeswitch enables him to stick to his own formulations rather than adapt to a less suitable, although native English expression. Tobias is thus the "primary knower" of the topic as well as of the language, since the codeswitch into Swedish in a negative way affects John's ability to repair.

A second question that could be asked is why John provides Tobias with a repair at all at this point? The trouble source-turn in this case is a clarification in response to John's request concerning the word

"rättsmedvetande". The most plausible response to a clarification (lines 108, 109) would be for John to show whether he understands or not, rather than to attempt to correct Tobias. It is, in fact, possible that Tobias does interpret John's repair as a candidate understanding of the formulation "what people in general <u>feel</u> is right" (lines 108, 109). Treated as a candidate understanding, it is up to Tobias to assess the turn as an appropriate understanding or not.

It is, however, uncertain whether or not John intends the contribution as a candidate understanding. "Public opinion" is expressed with falling intonation and is pronounced in a very determined way in contrast to the candidate understandings presented in chapter 5. Prototypically, candidate understandings are framed with questioning intonation and a metalinguistic element such as "y'mean". In addition, from John's point of view, Tobias has displayed uncertainty about an expression over some turns-at-talk, finally resorting to a codeswitch that does not solve the problem since John does not know the Swedish term. From John's perspective, Tobias has probably indicated sufficiently that other-repair is welcome. This interpretation of the sequence receives some support from Kurhila's (2003) investigation of other-corrections in NS-NNS talk, as they were commonly found in an environment where the NNS had exhibited linguistic uncertainty. The example could also be related to the examples discussed in chapter 5 where other-repair occurred in relation to "self-directed" metalinguistic comments such as "what's it called", followed by self-repair. Nonetheless these turns-at-talk were responded to with other-repair. It might be the case that participants here have different perceptions of what activities are relevant and appropriate. Tobias may be oriented to explaining "rättsmedvetande" to John, and consciously or subconsciously considers himself authority, which also gives him the right to treat John's repair as a candidate understanding of the Swedish word. John, in turn, may be concerned with Tobias' difficulties in finding the appropriate expressions to explain what "rättsmedvetande" is. Being "primary knower" of the language spoken, he repairs for linguistic appropriateness.

6.2 Other-repair at a misapprehension of the trouble

Example (6:2) presents an instance of other-repair that occurs in a response to a turn-at-talk that displays some uncertainty on the part of the speaker. The prosody and manner in which Anne responds to this hesitancy suggest that she is being corrective in a friendly (yet teasing) way. It will, however, turn out that she has jumped to hasty conclusions at the point of the repair as to what Michael was about to say. The repair occurs as Michael has just characterized an incident as "that's sort of like a deadly sin" (line 309). In the following turn he tries to come up with which the deadly sins are. Anne misunderstands these attempts and seems to believe that he is thinking about the "ten commandments":

```
(6:2)
309  Mi:  [but I mean that's sort of like a deadly] sin
310  An:  [(in one way)]
311  Mi:  [(x x x)]
312  An:  yeah I [know (x x)]
313  Mi:         [but an then] there's the: there's the:
          [ehm]
314  An:  [((coughs))]
315  Mi:  concepts (0.7) n I mean I don't know (I mean) (these)
          seven::: or ten [(or how) (x x x) he ((laughs))]
316  An:                  [ten commandments dear]
317  Mi:  he. (0.3) .hhhh [(oh I can't remember) (x x) how many
318  An:                  [keep (several of them) ((laughs))
319  Mi:  sins there are (in there]
320  An:  ((laughs))] ((laughs)) .hhh[hh he.h]
321  Mi:                             [in the Bible] I mean you sort
          of (0.5)ehm:: (0.5) nt (0.5) h.hh I don't know jealousy:
          and things like that s [(I mean) (they) wo-]
322  An:                          [hm:::]
323  Mi:  they were natural human (0.5) human [things]
324  An:                                      [well yeah] it's not
          as if they're like completely .h exclusive to like (vis a
          vis) to Christianity
325  Mi:  mm
```

Michael's uncertainty is revealed in the hesitant repeats (line 313), the vague expression "the: [ehm] concepts" (lines 313, 315) and his alteration of number "these seven::: or ten [(or how)" (line 315). As he says "ten", Anne says, in a pretended, instructive voice "[ten command-

ments <u>dear</u>]" (line 316). Michael's response to this repair is simply to laugh. He then goes on to explain that he cannot remember how many sins there are in the Bible (lines 317, 319, 321), showing that he was referring to the deadly sins that had previously figured in his talk (line 309). In a sense then, Michael provides an embedded repair of Anne's attempt to correct him. In neither case is there a response that explicitly makes the act of correction salient. Obviously, the tease is responded to with some laughter and Michael's display that he did not have "commandments" in mind. This embedded repair, in turn, is not oriented to by Anne, who, instead listens to Michael as he tries to come up with examples of the deadly sins e.g. "jealousy: and things like that" (line 321). Anne is supportive and when she takes the turn again, she contributes in an agreeing fashion with the topic brought up by Michael.

Similar to example (6:1), the other-repair occurs in an environment in which the preceding turns have displayed a participant's uncertainty concerning an expression. The repair could thus be viewed as a co-operative attempt from the participant who initiates repair to solve what they perceive as a production problem. Likewise, the response to the repair is rejection since again, there is a mismatch in participants' perceptions of the nature of the trouble. Michael's strategy is to make Anne aware of her mistake by embedding the referent that he had in mind in a turn-at-talk that is a natural continuation of the turn that appeared before the repair, without making explicit that the expression she suggested was inappropriate (cf. Jefferson, 1987; Kurhila, 2003, 2004).

6.3 Other-repair as correction

In contrast to the examples presented in the previous section, the following excerpt illustrates how other-repair occurs as a more outright "correction". There are no signs of disfluency or uncertainty in the turn that is targeted as problematic. Participants are talking about the meaning of the word "sin" and Tobias tries to exemplify how it might be defined from a Christian point of view:

```
(6:3)
288  Jo:  [yeah ((coughs))]
289  To:  in re- in religious context (0.8) an (0.3) an' for exam-
          ple Christianity defines the sin as (0.4) violating one
          of Christianity's rules ((sound from table)) (0.3) (I)
          [(guess that)]
290  Jo:  [commandments.]
291  ps:  (0.6)
292  To:  yeah oh whatever=they g-got other rules mostly things are
          like (0.2) interpreted from different parts of the Bible.
293  ps:  (0.5)
294  Jo:  m.
295  ps:  (1.3)
296  To:  like this guy did this (0.3) thus this must be the
          law (0.8)[(x)]
297  Jo:            [mm](2.0)(so s-) something is a sin if you break
          a religious(1.5)[°commandment°]
298  To:                  [(I think)] I think that's the most com-
          mon definition of it (1.6) and on the other hand I think
          people in general have some sort of (0.4) their own defi-
          nition of (1.0) what a sin is a sin [is]
299  Jo:                                      [(x)]
300  To:  doing something bad
```

John reacts to Tobias' expression "Christianity's rules" (line 289) and
says "com<u>man</u>dments." with a determined, falling intonation (line
290) in overlap with Tobias. There is a brief pause, and Tobias then
displays that he does not fully approve of the repair, "yeah oh what-
ever=they g-got other rules mostly things are like (0.2) interpreted
from different parts of the Bible." (line 292) and he also gives an exam-
ple of something that he believes differs from the commandments (line
296). The rejection of the repair does not prevent John from continuing
to use the expression in a request for confirmation when he asks
Tobias if what he means is: "something is a sin if you break a religious
(1.5) [°commandment°]" This time, John's use of commandment is not
reacted to, possibly since Tobias has started to respond to John's ques-
tion before it is completed. As Tobias begins the utterance before hear-
ing "°commandment°" he may be confirming what he believes is the
partly expressed "religious rule" just as well as "religious command-
ment". The understanding established in the preceding turns-at-talk is
sufficient to allow a lexical gap without violating comprehensibility.
The pause may also indicate that John, in fact, is considering what
word to use, as Tobias has shown that he did not approve of "com-
mandments".

In this sequence, the attempted repair is not successful in the sense that Tobias accepts the formulation offered by John. John, instead of conforming to Tobias' rejection, continues to use the word "commandments" in a subsequent turn. Participants display that neither of them is happy with some aspect of the other's talk. John is concerned with an expression that he finds linguistically inappropriate, whereas Tobias is concerned with describing something that he perceives cannot be fully covered by the expression suggested by John. The fact that agreement on what vocabulary to use is not reached does not, however, prevent participants from understanding each other.

6.4 Embedded other-repair

In this section, a case of an "embedded" repair is analysed. As was mentioned earlier, embedded repairs occur in a turn-at-talk that does something else than explicitly repair/correct (Jefferson, 1987; Kurhila, 2003, 2004; Brouwer, Rasmussen, & Wagner, 2004). One explanation for the use of this type of repair is that it draws a minimum of attention to itself and as such, is a way for a participant to insert an "appropriate" expression without explicitly pointing out that something in the preceding talk was erroneous. The excerpt comes from the talk of two NNSs and is particularly interesting, since the repair item that is embedded in a supportive comment seems less appropriate than the word that it is a reaction to.

Jenny is telling Monica a story about an incident from her childhood. The point of the story is that Jenny and her friends had been drinking lemonade and eating cake that the local bank branch used to offer their members once a year and that Jenny had felt guilty although she had not known that the offer did not cover the bank's customers. The excerpt starts with Jenny reporting the conversation between herself and a person from the bank staff:

```
(6:4)
87   Je:  after a while someone came and asked us but are you real-
          ly members of this bank or are you customers here.
88   Mo:  mh[m]
```

```
89    Je:    [(x)]noo::  well then you can= you can't have any cake
             (0.4) and I felt so guilty for this lemonade that I- I
             took as I was= I mean afterwards I discussed with my * my
             friend * [an]
90    Mo:            [m h°]
91    Je:    I said maybe I should go and buy a *lemonade* ha ha ha
             *ha ha ha(x)
92    Mo:    * nooo! * he he he ((laughs))
93    Je:    * I mean it's silly [it's] really sil[ly* he he]
94    Mo:                        [noo]           [he he he]
             okey [you have a great conscience he he he]
95    Je:         [he he he((laughs))]  may[be too much consciousness]
96    Mo:                                   [°h he he he ((laughs))]he
             he he he °h [well I]
97    Je:                [(among other things) (he)]
98    Mo:    think it's- it's worse to to steal from somebody you like
             or so[me-]
99    Je:         [mm]
100   Mo:    some- some private perso[n (or)] to steal from a sho[p=
             I]
```

Monica responds with laughter to Jenny's story and both participants laugh at some length. Jenny comments on her own behaviour with a voice full of laughter, "I mean it's silly [it's] really sil[ly* (line 93). Monica, in turn, responds to the episode stating "[you have a great conscience" (line 94). Jenny agrees with Monica and claims to maybe have "too much consciousness" (line 95) in overlap with Monica's continued laughter. In the following turn, Monica returns to the topic discussed just before Jenny told the story.

The point of interest in this excerpt is Jenny's response to Monica's comment concerning "conscience" (line 94). The word "consciousness" in Jenny's response is puzzling, as Monica's word choice seems to fit well with the aspects of Jenny's description of feeling "guilty" (line 89). The contribution can be given various interpretations. As an alignment with Monica's turn, "consciousness" may be a way for Jenny to expand on how her behaviour can be perceived. Alternatively, Jenny finds Monica's vocabulary inappropriate and instead of conducting an outright correction, she provides a different word that is embedded in the aligning utterance. Another possibility is that she might simply have misheard what Monica says which results in an incorrect repeat. The modifying expression "too much" (line 95) resembles Monica's "great" and prosodically one expects the antecedent to be the same, i.e. "conscience". Irrespective of what interpretation is

most accurate, participants are not orienting to the activity of repair. Monica is responding to Jenny's story, and Jenny is agreeing with this response. Participants do not make the alternative expressions salient. Once Jenny has finished her turn, Monica laughs and then goes back to continue the development of the topic "stealing" of which Jenny's story had served as an illustration.

This example highlights the analyst's problem of identifying what participants are orienting to at any moment in talk-in-interaction. The mere fact that one participant uses a form that differs from one used by the preceding speaker in the co-construction of a sequence of talk, does not necessarily give evidence of whether or not the choice of word/expression is performed with the *intention* to correct or whether it is the case that it is simply an alternative term that is preferred to the prior one. In cases where NSs respond to NNSs turns-at-talk in a similar way, i.e. repeat a part of the NNSs turn-at-talk in a modified form that appears more "native-like", one may easily assume that the NS is, in fact, conducting an implicit correction, even if that is not necessarily the case from the perspective of participants.

6.5 Summary

This chapter dealt with the four instances of other-initiated other-repair that occurred in the talk of the NNSs and NSs participating in the study. The small number of other-repair concurs with the preference patterns for self-repair in casual conversation detected by Schegloff et al. (1977). However, interactions that are linguistically asymmetrical have proved to contain other-repair in the form of "corrections" more frequently than what is customary in ordinary talk. Schegloff et al. (1977: 381) count child-adult interaction as one such environment as well as more generally reckoning the occurrence of other-repair to belong to data involving a "not-yet-competent in some domain without respect to age". Results from studies of the language classroom support this picture, as teachers correct students'utterances that deviate from the desired native standard (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Van den Branden, 1997). It may be noted, that the classroom is an environment

which has been designed for the purpose of instructing students. In conversations in other settings where linguistic asymmetry is an element, e.g. institutional talk between NS and NNS (Kurhila, 2003) or international business transactions (Rasmussen & Wagner, 2001), the conditions specific for the respective setting influence the occurrence of other-initiated repair in a variety of ways. A common denominator of these environments is that other-initiated other-repair in the form of linguistic correction is not very common, whereas other-initiations that yield self-repair, appear frequently. One conclusion that can be drawn from these observations is that other-initiated other-repair clearly is associated with correction that may be associated with instruction, and language instruction in particular.

The degree of fluency of the NNS's talk (it is debatable to what degree and from whose perspective they would be judged "not-yet-competent") and the non-instructional setting of chatting with a friend, native or non-native, are possibly reflected in the low number of other-initiated other-repairs in this study. The fact that correction may also be considered to be face-threatening (Kalin, 1995; Markee, 2000), possibly explains the infrequency of correction, since it is unlikely that participants want to embarrass their friends.

The analyses of the instances of other-repair indicate that other factors than linguistic asymmetry play an important role in the execution and outcome of the repairs. Such factors, for example, concern how knowledgeable a participant considers him/herself to be concerning the topic discussed and how s/he takes or claims responsibility for the turns-at-talk. In these respects, the NS-NNS conversations presented in this chapter show that social symmetry among interlocutors clearly outweighs the impact of speaking in one's mother tongue as opposed to a foreign language. The issue of linguistic asymmetry is, however, not altogether ignored in the following discussion, since it still turns out to be relevant in relation to responses to other-repair. A proficient foreign language speaker seems to rely on extra-linguistic resources such as knowledge of a topic, and also dares to assess the repair of a NS as insufficient, not accepting an expression simply because it is offered by the linguistically superior other.

In all but one case, repair was initiated by a NS, either as a reaction

to a turn-at-talk produced by a NNS or by another NS. In two of the examples, other-initiated other-repair occurred subsequent to a turn-at-talk that exhibited some degree of uncertainty, e.g. numerous reformulations to explain a Swedish word, or hesitations and vague expressions in the search for more specifying terms. In this respect, the borderline between other-initiated other-repair and the cases of self-directed self-initiations that yield other-repair (cf. chapter 4.) is fuzzy. As mentioned, other-repair is known to occur in turns-at-talk marked by uncertainty (Rasmussen & Wagner, 2001; Kurhila, 2003). The action by a speaker of attempting to "replace" or correct some element in the preceding turn, rather than assisting in a word search, as well as certain prosodic cues, contributed to the researcher's interpretation of the present examples as cases of other-initiated other-repair, despite the many similarities with word search sequences.

One case of other-initiated other-repair was found in response to a NNS's turn-at-talk that was clearly fluent. The repair targeted a troublesome formulation by the NNS and consisted of an expression that, from the NS's understanding of the talk, was more appropriate—an interpretation not shared by the NNS.

The last example of other-initiated other-repair occurred "embedded" (cf. Jefferson, 1987) in some other non-repair activity, i.e. participants did not make repair the relevant activity but simply chose to use different words for the same referent.

Participants' responses to other-initiated other-repair were particularly interesting. In contrast to conversations involving less proficient users of a foreign language where other-repair by a NS is often accepted by the NNS, the repairs of the NS presented here were largely "rejected" by the NNS. One possible explanation for the rejection of the repair described in example (6:1) seemed to be that it could be attributed to mismatches in participants' interpretations of the activity of repair, the NNS's reliance on his own knowledge of the topic and interpretation of the NS's expression as inappropriate in relation to the topic that the NNS was talking about. The NS, on the other hand, might have interpreted the many reformulations and the codeswitch that appeared in the talk of the NNS, as an invitation for assistance, similar to ordinary cases of word search. From this perspective, the

other-initiated other-repair could be viewed as a co-operative suggestive offer rather than a correction of non-native-like formulations.

Similarly, the second example of other-initiated other-repair occurring in the same NS-NNS conversation was rejected because the NNS did not agree that the term suggested by the NS covered the full range of the perspective that he was trying to establish. The NNS drew from his present linguistic knowledge to assess the correction offered by the NS. Interestingly, the NS did not approve of the rejection and continued to use what he considered the more appropriate expression. In conversations involving proficient users of a foreign language, it is not always easy to identify the difference between the possibly "non-native-like" word, phrase or clause, and the repair provided by the NS, since the NNS often produces fluent talk consisting of words that in themselves are correct, grammatically as well as in pronunciation but are combined in a way that may be perceived as troublesome or unconventional by the NS. At present no other evidence of non-nativeness is to be found than the fact that NSs initiate and carry out other-repair of NNSs' turns of talk. Other-repair may be just as conversationally misplaced as a NNS's formulation may be "non-native-like".

Part IV: Discussion

7. Discussion

In this chapter, the results of the analyses are related to the aims expressed in the introduction concerning participants' achievement of repair, differences and similarities in NNSs' and NSs' repair behaviour, the notion "non-nativeness", and issues concerning foreign language learning.

7.1 NNSs' and NSs' use of repair strategies: same or different?

Analyses revealed many similarities in the way participants handled a point of trouble, but also showed examples of ways in which NNSs and NSs differed in their repair conduct. One such difference was that NNSs, as they initiated and carried out repair on their own turns-at-talk, more often attended to difficulties that concerned grammar and pronunciation than did NSs. Difficulties concerning grammar, pronunciation and sometimes the choice of words also occurred in complex repair sequences where participants co-operated in order to resolve a problem.

Some of the uncertainties that result in repair (self- and other-) seem tied to the fact that English is not the mother tongue of some of the participants. Kurhila (2003: 216) notes that the NNSs in her data conduct repair of grammar and vocabulary and she relates this behaviour to participants' ambitions to perform as competent speakers[1]. She suggests that the attention that a speaker pays to linguistic choices "can be interpreted as signs of her nonfluency (i.e. incompetence)". This seems to be the case in instances where the NNS is in a

---

[1] cf. the quote in chapter 2, section 2.4.

constant state of trying to find words, or has a limited command of articulating words or phrases in the second/foreign language. Repair strategies, for these speakers, as well as for more experienced NNSs, are the tool (just as they are for NSs), to reach mutual understanding and to achieve other goals. Although the repair that NNSs partaking in this study employ, may be interpreted as signs of their "non-nativeness[2]", some ways in which the repair strategies are used, in fact, add to the perception of their fluency, even when troubles of a formal nature are being fixed. As was mentioned in chapter 3, NNSs who are less flexible in their use of the second/foreign language often initiate repair because they *have to* whereas increased knowledge of a language makes NNSs perform self-repair because they *can* and *want to*. Most of the self-initiated self-repairs where NNSs' strategies differed from those of NSs displayed the NNS's ability to improve on his/her own speech. Since alterations of words within a TCU often occurred without salient markers of hesitation, such as lengthy pauses or hedging, they appeared not to disrupt the fluency of the ongoing turn to any great extent. Particularly repair of mispronounced words was immediately attended to by speakers. Self-initiated self-repair that concerned the initial choice of a word within a TCU was also often performed smoothly (however, not as quickly as in cases involving mispronunciation).

Apart from self-repairs that concerned formal aspects of talk, it was equally interesting to detect that the repair behaviour of NNSs and NSs greatly concurred. Analyses of repair revealed that social considerations seemed involved as a major motivation for the changes. Social considerations here refer to the way the speaker employs repair strategies in order to enhance the recipient's abilities to interpret a turn-at-talk in relation to the activity in which it occurs, e.g. that a contribution to talk is easy to understand, that it coheres with preceding talk, that it is truthful and appropriate, etc. Such aspects are, of course, also intertwined with how interlocutors relate to each other in terms of friendship and how they want to be perceived by the person with

---

[2] The term "linguistic incompetence" is avoided, since the results of this dissertation show that repair strategies employed by participants are rather the opposite, i.e. signs of linguistic competence.

whom they are talking. The orientation of participants is thus primar-
ily directed to their interlocutor[3].

The overall aim of participants in a conversation is to understand
each other. Repair shows the inferences that speakers make as they
construct contributions to talk. In the introductory chapters of this
dissertation, the term "repair" was critically discussed in relation to
some behaviour that turned out to prevent interactional problems
from occurring, rather than fixing them after they had already taken
place. Some items were, for example, replaced in order to avoid a situ-
ation where the recipient might make an interpretation that could
threaten the face of the speaker, or be offensive to the recipient. At
some points the speaker chose to stop in the middle of a structure, in
order to insert a word or a phrase that could add a nuance to a perspec-
tive, facilitate (or affect) the recipient's interpretation of some topic
talked about, or to enhance coherence between parts of speech (that
unaltered might have been hard to understand). Many of the strategies
that NNSs as well as NSs employed to structure their turns-at-talk,
were thus of a preventive character, i.e. used as the speaker antici-
pated the possible social consequences of using a particular form, or of
understanding difficulties arising unless further information was
added[4]. In order to make such inferences speakers have to draw on
their knowledge about what behaviour is appropriate in various activi-
ties. As shown in the analytic chapters, participants' different expecta-
tions could lead to misinterpretations of a contribution to talk result-
ing in a repair sequence.

The many similarities observed concerning the ways participants
use repair strategies in this data, are interesting from the perspective
of foreign language learning, particularly when results from former CA
and S/FLA studies involving less fluent NNSs are considered. The
finding that the NNSs mainly displayed orientations of a social nature
in relation to repair strategies, rather than being oriented to language
learning, is not surprising. The primary occupation of participants out-

---

[3] This orientation, of course, also goes for repairs that concern grammar and pronuncia-
tion.

[4] Kalin (1995: 184) speaks about "the active avoidance of potential problems" in conversa-
tions between NSs and NNSs.

side environments in which learning in the traditional sense is in focus (e.g. in the language classroom) is hardly "learning" although picking up words and syntactic structure are probable bi-products of the engagement in other activities. The results show, for example, that the same parts of speech were involved in certain types of alterations and could be tied to the same social considerations, in similar activities, irrespective of the speaker's language background. The similarities observed in participants' repair conduct show, not only how repair strategies influence NNSs' structuring of their turns-at-talk in the foreign language (which perhaps offers clues as to the development of a "native-like" syntax), but more generally the way social interaction influences the organization of talk and the development of knowledge that constitutes interactional competence.

The discussion so far has been held at a fairly general level, treating some of the regularities observed in the repair sequences as applying to all NNSs or NSs, not considering so much behaviour that may be related to the characteristics of individuals, or of combinations of individuals who converse. In this dissertation, there are many examples of instances in which a NNS, at least in comparison with studies involving less fluent NNSs, behaves in unexpected ways as far as repair is concerned. When these cases are investigated, factors appear that concern participants' relationships with each other, their assumptions about what knowledge they share or do not share, and how they interpret the ongoing activity. These aspects form the topic of the following section.

7.2 The role of participation framework for the initiation and outcome of repair

The ways in which participants' repair strategies are interpreted depend on interlocutors' roles in the interaction and the activities that they engage in. There are, of course, many more naturally occurring situations in which it may be very important for a NNS to perform as a proficient speaker than is the case for participants studied in this dis-

sertation. The consequences of making a disfluent impression (despite the contrary ambitions of a speaker – in this point I agree completely with the paradox that Kurhila (2003) points out) can be very serious, e.g. at the immigration office, a job interview, or in other institutional settings.

CA as well as studies of S/FLA show that participation framework plays an important role in shaping an interactional event. In this section, participation framework is discussed from four perspectives. Firstly, the role of participants' relationships in the sense of friendship, shared and non-shared knowledge and experiences, is discussed in relation to the ways in which repair is initiated and responded to. Secondly, misinterpretations of conversational activities are focused on from the point of departure of participants' varying cultural and linguistic backgrounds. This relates to the third point; the role of the setting and the activities that participants engage in during the recording. The last perspective is intertwined with the others and concerns behaviour that may be characteristic of individual participants.

Whereas CA emphasises the sequential and thereby social organization of certain speech exchange systems, e.g. institutional conversations, studies of S/FLA, for example, focus on the amount of talk occurring in different constellations of speakers, presuming that the more talk that is produced and "comprehended", the more likely NNSs are to acquire the desired vocabulary and grammatical structures. Gass and Varonis (1985b) showed that the amount of talk yielded in NNS-NNS dyadic conversations depended on the task conducted and on the degree of friendship of interlocutors, showing that NNSs who were friends produced more talk than participants who were unacquainted. These types of comparison are not possible to make and perhaps not relevant in this dissertation, since all participants are friends with the person with whom they talk. However, there are a number of aspects relating to friendship and the relationship between participants that may be of importance for the ways in which repair and alterations of turns-at-talk are handled (and, of course, for many other aspects of the conversations). It should also be pointed out that "being friends" cannot be viewed as a homogenous phenomenon. The NNSs and NSs taking part in this study know each other in different

ways and to different degrees. Whereas some of them spend a lot of time together and share experiences that go far back in time, others merely meet in classes at university and work together in this environment, having been acquainted for only a year[5].

The first aspect to be discussed concerns the ways in which some repair items were "dismissed" by the speaker initiating repair. One may consider that apart from the fact that a speaker may think that s/he is more knowledgeable concerning the topic talked about, the non-threatening milieu of talking to a friend may result in the speaker daring to trust his/her own knowledge despite receiving assistance from a speaker whom they know is a NS, or is perceived as more proficient in the language spoken. It should be noted that the atmosphere in all conversations was friendly, even at points where corrective action was taken. The only time a participant was obviously disturbed by an instance of repair, was when Anne perceived that Michael implied that she did not know a word in her own mother-tongue (cf. example (5:6), section 5.1.5). It is quite possible that even though NNSs do not necessarily accept repair items suggested by a NS, such behaviour is not completely unexpected for NNSs, since on other occasions, they use the NS as a resource in order to solve problems in finding words/expressions (note John's complaint in example (5:7) about how Tobias always asks him to explain "things in English"). This said, NSs, of course, also collaborate on word searches. The items searched for, however, are often slightly different from NNSs' searches, e.g. the name of a person or of a product, rather than issues that address morphology or idiomaticity. Returning to Anne and Michael, it should be noted that Michael, although explaining what he thought was a word unfamiliar to Anne, seemed aware of conducting an act that could be perceived as offensive. As he utters the explanation "°it's a posh word for punishing°" (example (5:6)), he does it in a whispering tone. Anne's

---

[5] Svennevig (1999: 34–37) shows that degrees of familiarity between conversants, such as being acquainted, friends, or intimates, depend on factors such as the amount of and the nature of knowledge and experiences held in common. According to such aspects, some participants should best be described as being acquainted (i.e. Jenny & Maria, and Erik & Linda), whereas the other pairs share more in common, and thereby can be looked at as being friends.

negative response to the explanation, still shows that an instance of linguistic correction by a fellow NS is sensitive and may be perceived as a way of misjudging someone's knowledge in a negative way.

Friendship does perhaps not only influence participants in the sense that they dare to dismiss someone's correction or suggestion, but may also affect the way interlocutors display their linguistic "incompetence". Participants, particularly in the NNS-NS and NNS-NNS pairs (not so much the NS-NS) seemed to rely on their interlocutor at points where a word or expression was not found or simply not understood. Instances of word search showed how some of the NSs and NNSs interacting with each other took advantage of the bilingual setting, making use of their cultural as well as linguistic knowledge of English *and* Swedish. From the perspective of cultural knowledge and experiences, the NNSs are in a milieu where they are "natives" although they are not speaking their native tongue. In a sense, all participants experienced foreignness in some respect.

The degree to which participants' varying cultural backgrounds influence the conversations in general, and the repair sequences in particular, is hard to determine. All participants are different individuals, and whereas it can be argued that they possess great amounts of knowledge that is gained from growing up in a certain society, the intracultural variations may be as influential on the talk-in-interaction, as intercultural variations (Günthner & Luckman, 2001). There is, however, some ethnographic data that suggests that participants in the NS-NNS pairs at times perceived that their cultural differences did have an impact in relation to repair and the conversation in general. Some of the NSs indicated in the retrospective interview that they sometimes felt uncertain of what to say whereas they perceived that the NNSs appeared more accustomed to tackling the topics. The NNSs, particularly those attending the teacher trainee programme, also sometimes viewed the conversations as an opportunity to speak English outside of class, treating the presence of the topics as a "task" to be carried out. Despite retrospective comments, no hasty conclusions can be drawn as to the influence of differences in the cultural backgrounds in the conversations studied. Rather, it seems that different aspects of participation framework, individual attitudes, participants' relationship to

each other, their shared or non-shared knowledge and experiences, the activities they engage in, and the topics talked about, should be taken into account in order to understand the motivations for participants' use of repair. The cultural background of participants is, of course, involved in all these factors, but cannot be singled out as being decisive for the way repair was carried out.

7.3 Knowing the language vs. knowing the facts

It was mentioned in the introductory chapters (e.g. section 1.3.4) that a NS, or an interlocutor who may be considered more proficient in the language spoken, assists the less advanced speaker to develop his/her knowledge. In the data, speakers frequently display that they are in need of assistance, either directly (turn to their interlocutor) or indirectly (hesitate or utter metalinguistic, self-directed phrases such as "what's it called"). Despite receiving responses in the form of suggestions for words or phrases, these repair items are sometimes rejected, or not acknowledged, even at points where, at least from the analyst's perspective, they seem appropriate and useful. A number of interesting examples of this phenomenon occur in the conversation between Erik and Linda, when Linda on separate occasions displays uncertainty and turns to Erik for assistance. Each time, Erik provides supportive feedback, claiming either that Linda's own choice is correct, or suggests one or more terms that may fit in with what he perceives that Linda is trying to express. One difficulty (example (4:11)) concerns the form of the word "explainable", which Erik confirms is accurate. Despite the confirmation, Linda responds, perhaps not with a clear rejection of Erik's confirmation, but with a token ("well never mind") that makes his contribution suddenly seem less important than it was just a moment earlier. Similarly, (example (4:10)) she switches orientation from that of wanting to know what a word is in English, to continuing her story even though Erik is engaged in the activity of repair. Finally, Linda (example (4:6)) chooses to close the activity of repair

despite Erik's extensive attempts to find a solution to the problem of the verb form of the word "confirmation". In the retrospective interview, Erik claimed that he really tried hard to find the right expression in order to solve Linda's problem: "but unfortunately I was not able to help her out with that one[6]". Linda, in turn, also reacted to this word search sequence during the viewing session, returning to the issue of the verb form of "confirmation", claiming that she still did not know what it was called and that she had not looked it up in a dictionary although she was really curious to find out. This showed that although Erik had, in fact, provided her with a correct form once, the uncertainty in his suggestions made her treat none of them as accurate, or at least not reliable. This illustrates an aspect of participants' relationships that may be worthwhile considering in relation to the initiation and outcome of repair. In one retrospective comment, Linda mentioned that she perceived Erik to be a very proficient speaker and an ambitious student in general. She also said that she was happily surprised at her own fluency, since she generally did not consider herself as proficient as Erik in the foreign language. It appears, however, that despite participants' estimations of the linguistic skill of their interlocutor, interactional circumstances, such as markers of uncertainty, affect whether or not a repair item will be fully accepted. Also, when understanding is the primary target, and a sufficient level is assumed to have been achieved, it is not surprising that a side-sequence such as word-search is abandoned in favour of going on with the activity that preceded the search.

The examples discussed relate to some cases where a word suggested by a NS is not fully accepted by the NNS. As is the case in the example concerning the word "confirmation", the environment preceding the turns comprising the repair item, is marked with uncertainty by the "linguistically knowledgeable" person, i.e. the NS. Tobias, for example, does not fully accept John's suggestion "public opinion" in relation to a topic that Tobias is trying to explain to John (examples (6:1) and (5:8)). In this sequence, there is an interesting

---

[6] Erik and I spoke Swedish during the viewing session. The quote is therefore my translation of a part of Erik's comment in relation to the word search sequence.

interplay of participants' perceptions of their own competences concerning the topic discussed, the languages used (there is a codeswitch into Swedish, which John displays that he does not understand), and the responsibilities for topic development. The topic talked about is the Swedish system of law, and apart from the use of a legal term in Swedish, Tobias has initiated the topic and knows more about it than John does. As John displays his interpretation of what Tobias is saying, this native expression is not acknowledged; however neither entirely rejected as Tobias recycles the pieces that he perceives fit his purposes. On another occasion, Tobias again does not accept a corrective response on John's part concerning the word "commandment", making clear that it does not cover all the aspects that he is thinking of. Tobias is the participant who has initiated the topic and is giving an account of his point of view. It is possible that John, in the role of NS, perceives that he may correct Tobias' unidiomatic phrase "Christianity's rules" (example 6:3). The outcome of the repair is that both interlocutors keep to the expressions that they prefer themselves and are still able to continue the conversation in a satisfactory way. The fact that John is a NS and that Tobias is not, however, is perhaps not even a factor involved in the repair sequence. A participant who thinks that the understanding expressed in a candidate repair is not satisfactory or sufficiently close to the word searched for, can respond to the suggested word in a way that shows that they were explicating a different perspective. In example (6:2), Anne and Michael also talk about Christianity, and similarly to John, Anne says in a joking fashion "ten commandments dear", although it turns out that what Michael, in fact, was referring to (although having difficulty in finding the word), was the seven deadly sins. In contrast to Tobias, however, Michael does not display directly to Anne that she has misinterpreted him, but simply goes on with his current project, whereas Tobias overtly rejects John's repair item. It seems then that the participant who has initiated the topic has the right to assess the suitability of the recipient's suggested word. The identities NNS and NS do not play the decisive role for a repair item to be accepted or turned down. Rather, the response to the repair seems to depend on speakers' estimation of their own knowledge (or expertise) of the topic of discussion and on signs of

uncertainty in the speech of their interlocutor. That factors such as participants' evaluation of their own expertise concerning a topic affect the practices of NS-NNS talk-in-interaction has been found in accommodation theory (Zuengler, 1991, 1993). Kalin (1995) also shows how role structures change at points where the NNS knows more about a topic than the NS.

7.4 Language learning

According to the learning theories referred to in the beginning of this dissertation (section 1.3.4) active participation in social activities is crucial for language learning (e.g. Wertsch, 1979, 1985; Vygotsky, 1986; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Kramsch, 2002; Gardner & Wagner, 2004), a perspective adopted not only to cover the development of second/foreign languages, but children's first language acquisition (e.g. Tomasello & Kruger, 1992; Wootton, 1997; Ochs, 2002). What these theories have in common with more traditional studies of S/FLA is that asymmetry in the knowledge of participants in an interactional event, plays an important role in the development of different competences. Within S/FLA these competences do not stretch much further than approaching language from the established normative perspective of rules of grammar and expansion of the lexicon, whereas the former studies emphasise the development of "mind" to use Vygotsky's and Wootton's wording. The results of CA studies of speech exchange systems involving participants who are not performing according to linguistic and social conventions ordinarily recognized by members of a culture (e.g. NNSs, people with speech impairments, such as aphasia etc), however, reveal that participants, irrespective of competence, are mutually responsible for conversational progress, although one participant may, of course, be more flexible in his/her use of a language than the other. The greater linguistic flexibility of the NS is reflected in numerous ways in interaction with a NNS. One such way could be the initiation and outcome of repair, but it also reveals itself in the amount and length of turns-at-talk held by the NS in comparison with those of the NNSs, in how top-

ics are introduced and developed, and in how participants attend to the talk of their interlocutor. This, at least, is the case for talk-in-interaction involving NSs and NNSs where the latter still have limitations in their ability to use the language spoken. This study, however, is different from many previous studies of conversations between NSs and NNSs in that it involves NNSs who are experienced users of the foreign language. The results of the analyses also reflect this difference in the sense that the types of trouble that participants orient to (in their own turns-at-talk and in the talk of others), in certain respects vary from those appearing in talk where the NNSs are less fluent. Whereas NNSs with a limited command of the foreign language often experience difficulty in understanding what an interlocutor says, this is rarely a problem for any of the participants taking part in this study.

The action of replacing one item with another reveals that the speaker is not happy with the original item for some reason. Almost all cases of such self-repairs performed by a NNS meant an improvement of the TCU being constructed. The replacing behaviour reveals (to the recipient as well as to the analyst), not so much what the speaker does *not* know, but rather what s/he does know. It appears that the NNSs who participate in this study, are no longer so dependent on someone who is more "competent" in the language used. Self-initiated self-repairs also displayed the speakers' awareness of a more or less appropriate use of a linguistic item and that such knowledge meant something to the participants. This was particularly clear in instances where repair was accompanied by a metalinguistic comment that drew extra attention to the replacing act and to the speaker's attitude toward his/her own mistake. Erik's apology in relation to a word choice is an illustrative example, together with his retrospective comment in which he stated that he was not happy with the term he had used at first. Similarly, he commented retrospectively on what he perceived as Linda's struggling with the adjective-adverb distinction of the word "spontaneously", a replacement that was accompanied by an aggravated groan[7]. Even if these are retrospective judgements, the

---

[7] As mentioned in section 3.1.1, it is uncertain whether Linda was facing pronunciation or morphological difficulties. What is interesting is that Erik perceived the difficulty as concerning grammar.

metalinguistic comments draw attention to an alteration, in retrospect, and probably also the moment in which they occur in a conversation.

A discussion that addresses language learning in conversation inevitably comes to touch upon the dichotomy between viewing language learning as the internalization of rules and expansion of vocabulary, on the one hand, and the perspective of development of knowledge where language is but a part, on the other, or, using the words of Kramsch (2002:2) that there has been a "gap between linguistic structure and social structure in language acquisition and use". The present study suffers from this gap as the method employed could neither reveal processes of language learning in the traditional sense, nor aspects of knowledge development in the sense posed by theoretical frameworks that view learning as comprising socialization processes. The results, however, are sufficient to be able to discuss these theoretical approaches, and the analyses also lead to ideas of how research methods influenced by CA might be developed in order to further explore processes of learning in the wide sense.

A problem common to any attempt (CA or S/FLA research) to investigate, or discuss language learning in talk-in-interaction comes down to finding empirical evidence for what parts of speech are learnt, what aspects of interaction resulted in learning and when (the moment of) learning took place. Donato (1994) and Markee (2000) show examples of word learning taking place as pupils conduct role plays and discussion tasks in groups before they are performed in front of class on a later occasion. By means of repair sequences (e.g. clarification requests or appeals for assistance at word search), pupils collaboratively solve problems when they do not know words, and show on a later occasion that they remember and are able to use them in new productive constructions. In this sense, the establishment of co-knowledge may lead to linguistic change for participants. These studies, of course, provide interesting results with transparent links between the language used and different activities (group-work and performance/ report). In most conversations in a second/foreign language however, casual/institutional/semi-natural, etc, there is rarely a naturally occurring connection between an instance of trouble, e.g. in finding a

word, and returning to it at a later stage (apart from the word-search sequence, in which the word is likely to be used in the turn following the repair[8]) unless a topic is dwelt upon for some time.

Similarly to NNSs with a limited command in the foreign language, the fluent NNSs sometimes face difficulty in finding words/expressions or, at times (although very rarely in this material), face understanding problems that are directly related to the form of talk of their peer. However, it appears that many of the difficulties are not related to the fact that the NNSs do not *know* or are not familiar with a word/expression, but rather that they are unable to come up with it when required. In the data investigated in the analytic chapters, there were some instances where there was evidence that the NNS did not know or felt uncertain about how to express something in English. All cases displayed varying outcomes concerning the "success" of finding a satisfactory solution to the linguistic problem. Also, at times orientations abruptly shifted from the need to know a word, to a continuation of the interaction, showing the dynamic nature of participants' collaboration from one moment to the next. Success may, in this sense, be ascribed to participants' management of their coordination of actions (and in understanding what to expect/attend to next), just as much as their ability to complete the initiated activity of finding a word.

Despite the difficulties in establishing what part of speech is learnt at what point in the course of talk, it may be possible to say that repair serves a memory-supportive purpose. Just as researchers working within the field of S/FLA suggest that "noticing the gap" facilitates acquisition, as NNSs become aware of words and structures that they do not know, the process of detecting what one knows and based on this knowledge how one alters and creates utterances that are interactionally satisfactory, may be viewed as learning in progress, or as the development of communicative skills in the foreign language. To be able to interpret an activity in a way that is appropriate considering

---

[8] The use of a word/expression as a repeat of a repair item is, of course, hardly convincing evidence that it is learnt and that the participant will be able to use it, say, five minutes later. Markee (2000: 45) makes clear that a CA-influenced methodology can be used in order to identify "both successful and unsuccessful learning behaviours, *at least in the short term*" (emphasis added).

what the participants presume to know about each other, may also be viewed as the ongoing progress of developing a social/pragmatic ability in the foreign language. Linguistic choice, appearing in the restructuring of a turn-at-talk, displays such a mutual social awareness on the part of the participants. The problem remains, however, to study these processes in a way that is empirical in nature, rather than based on theoretical assumptions about the link between social organization and cognitive processes. One way could perhaps be to focus more on NNSs' and NSs' unproblematic spoken exchanges (cf. Gardner & Wagner, 2004), e.g. the ways in which NSs and NNSs influence the speech of each other in the continuous recycling of parts and phrases of each other's speech. An expression used by a NNS is often picked up and elaborated on by a NS (and the other way around) in order to enhance coherence, and conduct social acts such as showing involvement or alignment, etc. This recycling behaviour is not particularly salient (to the analyst) until it is violated by a misunderstanding or misinterpretation of some kind. Interlocutors' unproblematic exchange of turns-at-talk with similar form and content surely contribute to the development of the linguistic knowledge of the NNSs. Pallotti (2001) shows how a five-year-old girl, by means of picking up and repeating parts of other participants' speech, successively learns to partake in conversations in ways that are linguistically as well as socially acceptable in kindergarten activities. Pallotti's (longitudinal) approach represents a fruitful way of combining micro-analysis of talk-in-interaction and sociolinguistic perspectives on socialization, in order to reveal processes of second language development. A study of NNSs' and NSs' continuous recycling behaviour in unproblematic sequences could thus add insights into the ways interlocutors affect each others' speech, and possibly also reveal new aspects of participants' co-construction of linguistic and social knowledge in different speech exchange systems.

The contribution of this study, although addressing issues concerning language learning, is that it provides evidence for what behaviours are comprised by participants' interactional competence; how NNSs make a fluent impression. The results of the analytic chapters suggest that participants orient to different aspects of talk-in-interaction,

either as preventive or as remedial measures as they attend to their own turns-at-talk, or to those of the other. Some of the participants' orientations are towards aspects of language that traditionally are treated as important for the process of language learning, e.g. correction/alteration of inappropriate grammar or pronunciation, or towards words in the foreign language that they do not know. At the same time, very much of what is revealed as the function of repair shows that interlocutors, NNSs and NSs, draw from their background knowledge (shared or non-shared with their interlocutor) and from the inferences they make as the conversation unfolds, turn-by-turn, in a way that reveals their skills as speakers, i.e. repair is often motivated by social considerations. The repair strategies employed by participants in the conversations studied here, in comparison with material dealing with less experienced NNSs, appear not so much to remedy gaps in linguistic knowledge, as to reveal existing knowledge of a social *and* linguistic nature. Also, the NNSs do not always trust the competence of the person who could be considered "linguistically knowledgeable" in order to solve problems, but rather rely more on their own capacity to handle them. Ironically, the impression of fluency is achieved through the ways in which the NNSs employ self-repair strategies, i.e. what one might, on first encounter, consider the disfluent aspects of speech.

8. Conclusion

This thesis is concluded by means of a three-part-list, i.e. *language is not a problem, non-nativeness is not oriented to,* and *learning is rarely an issue*. Each of these conclusions is explicated on below:

Firstly, *language is not a problem* for the non-native and native speakers partaking in this study. Although participants do indeed orient to problems of a linguistic nature, e.g. the search for a word, or correction of mispronounced or ungrammatical items, participants' (NNSs' and NSs') repair strategies are crucially embedded in the social process of achieving intersubjective understanding. Repair is designed to create images of participants as knowledgeable and accountable, speakers who competently contribute to the activities that they engage in, drawing on resources that they have access to at a particular moment of talk-in-interaction. Such resources can be their own knowledge of grammar or vocabulary, just as well as a knowledge of the world, including what they know or assume to know about their interlocutor's knowledge and experiences. Aligning with current CA approaches to second language conversations (e.g. Firth, 1996; Firth & Wagner, 1998; Wagner & Gardner, 2004), interactions involving NNSs should be viewed as conversations in their own right, a perspective that gives credit to what is really achieved in talk-in-interaction in the sense of participants' mutual contributions to the construction of conversational activities. On the local level of a speaker's structuring of a TCU, the disruption of the stream of speech at points of self-initiated self-repair, also supports the conclusion that language is not a problem. Rather, the achievement of the disruption, in accordance with the social motivation (such as self-representation as knowledgeable, or the active avoidance of being offensive) yielding the disruption, adds to the picture of interactional (and not only linguistic) competence. This is valid for all speakers taking part in this study.

Secondly, *non-nativeness is not oriented to*. Although participants turn to each other for assistance, for example, at points of word search,

there are no clear signs that these behaviours are conducted because the speaker encountering a difficulty is non-native or native. Furthermore, there is no one-way orientation on the part of the NNS towards the linguistic competence of the NS. Participants' mutual knowledge of the opportunity to employ more than one language (in the pairs where this was an option) to accomplish a smooth resolution of a search creates a situation where linguistic knowledge does play a part, however, not only in the sense that the NNSs rely on NSs. The results even point in the direction of an active deconstruction of participants as resourceful in the sense of being the "linguistically" knowledgeable person, since speakers' estimations of their own expertise tended to overrule the membership categories of non-native and native speaker.

Thirdly and finally, *learning is rarely an issue* that participants in this study make salient. Although there are instances where participants are eager to get to know a word or the form of a word, these instances are few in comparison to cases of, for example, understanding checks. In addition, at points of orientation to trouble sources of a linguistic nature, this focus is often rapidly left in favour of topic development, as soon as participants deem that a sufficient level of understanding has been achieved. The kind of learning that could be argued to be taking place, rather deals with participants' co-construction of knowledge on a linguistic and on a wider interactional level.

Although the conclusions presented are formulated as negations, their main message is positive. What is argued for and presented in this dissertation, is that language is used as a means, and not an end in itself. Despite variations in participants' experiences in using English in conversation, they are fully competent in creating their own criteria for satisfactory interaction.

The opportunity to make thorough analyses of conversational material is a rewarding endeavour. When conversations are analysed on a detailed level at the same time as factors such as the participants' social life and retrospective interpretations are taken into account, nuances of the interactional relevance of repair strategies come to life, contributing to an understanding of individual speakers' use of repair and to the development of an empirical approach that aims to avoid generalisations based on categories not relevant to the conversants themselves.

References

Allwood, J., Nivre, J. & Ahlsén, E. 1990. "Speech management—on the non-written life of speech". *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 13: 3–48.

Antaki, C. & Widdicombe, S. 1998. (eds.) *Identities in talk*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Anward, J. 2000. "Allt du önskar kan du få? Om SAG och talspråket" *Språk och Stil* 10: 197–220.

Appel, R. & Muysken, P. 1989. *Language contact and bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.

Auer, P. 1998. *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge.

Battarbee, K. 2001. "Norms for global English" in R. Hiltunen, K. Battarbee, M. Peikola & S-K. Tanskanen (eds.) *English in zigs and zags. Anglicana Turkuensia* 23: 1–14.

Bialystok, E. 1990. *Communication strategies. A psychological analysis of second language use*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Inc.

Blackmer, R. E. & Mitton, L. J. 1991. "Theories of monitoring and the timing of repairs in spontaneous speech" *Cognition* 39: 173–194.

Boden, D. & Zimmerman, D. (eds.)1991. *Talk and social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bongaerts, T. & Poulisse, N. 1989. "Communication strategies in L1 and L2: Same or different?" *Applied Linguistics* 10, 3: 253–268.

Brouwer, E.C. 2004. "Doing pronunciation: A specific type of repair sequence" in R.Gardner & J.Wagner (eds.) *Second language conversations*. London: Continuum. 2004: 93–113.

Brouwer, E. C., Rasmussen, G. & Wagner, J. 2004. "Embedded corrections in second language talk" in R.Gardner & J.Wagner (eds.) *Second language conversations*. London: Continuum. 2004: 75–92.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. 1987. *Politeness. Some universals of language use*. Cambridge University Press.

Bublitz, W. 1988. *Supportive fellow-speakers and cooperative conversations: Discourse topics and topical actions, participant roles and "recipient action" in a particular type of everyday conversation*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub.Co.

Carroll, D. 2004. "Restarts in novice turn beginnings: Disfluencies or inter-actional achievements" in R. Gardner & J. Wagner (eds.) *Second language conversations*. London: Continuum. 2004: 201–220.

Cazden, C. B. 1988. *Classroom discourse :The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Chaudron, C. 1988. *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, H. H. & Clark, E. V. 1977. *Psychology and language: An introduction to psycholinguistics*. New York: Hartcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Clark, H. H. 1996. *Using language*. Cambridge University Press

Coulmas, F. "Reported speech: Some general issues" in F. Coulmas (ed.) *Direct and indirect speech*. Berlin; New York; Amsterdam: Mouton, de Gruyter. 1986: 1–28.

Couper-Kuhlen, E. 1992. "Contextualizing discourse: The prosody of interactive repair" in P. Auer & A.Di Luzio (eds.) *The contextualization of language*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 1992: 337–364.

Crystal, D. 1997. *English as a global language*. Cambridge University Press.

Donato, R. 1994. "Collective scaffolding in second language learning" in P. J. Lantolf & G. Appel (eds.) *Vygotskian approaches to second language re-search*. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Company.

Drew, P. 1997. "'Open' class repair initiators in responses to sequential sources of troubles in conversation" *Journal of Pragmatics* 28: 69–101.

Eerdmans, L. S. 2003. "A review of John J. Gumperz's current contributions to Interactional Sociolinguistics" in L. S. Eerdmans, L. C. Prevignano & J. P. Thibault (eds.) *Language and interaction. Discussions with John J. Gumperz*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2003: 85–103.

Erickson, F. & Schultz, J. 1982. *The counselor as gatekeeper: Social interaction in interviews*. New York: Academic Press.

Faerch, C. and Kasper, G. (eds.)1983. *Strategies in interlanguage communica-tion* 1983: 20–60. New York: Longman Inc.

Fathman, A. 1980. "Repetition and correction as an indication of speech plan-ning and execution processes among second language learners" in H. Dechert & M. Raupach (eds.) *Towards a cross-linguistic assessment of speech production*. Frankfurt/Bern/Cirencester: Lang. 1980: 77–85.

Fay, D. & Cutler, A. 1978. "Introduction" in R. Meringer – C. Mayer *Ver-sprechen und verlesen. Eine spychologisch-linguistische studie. Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science II. Classics in psycho-linguistics*, vol. 2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V. 1978: 9–40

Firth, A. 1996. "The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis" *Journal of Pragmatics* 26: 237–259.

Firth, A. & Wagner, J. 1997. "On discourse, communication and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research" *The Modern Language Journal* 81: 285–300.

Firth, A. & Wagner, J. 1998. "SLA property: No trespassing!" *The Modern Language Journal* 82: 91–94.

Ford, C. E. & Thompson, S. A. 1996. "Interactional units in conversation: Syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for the management of turns" in E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff & S. A. Thompson (eds.) *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge University Press. 1996: 134–184.

Fox, B. A. & Jasperson, R. 1995. "A syntactic exploration of repair in English conversation" in W. P. Davis (ed.) *Alternative linguistics. Descriptive and theoretical modes*. John Benjamins Publ. Comp.Vol. 102: 77–134.

Fox, B. A., Hayashi, M. & Jasperson, R. 1996. "Resources and repair: A cross-linguistic study of syntax and repair" in E.Ochs, E.A. Schegloff & S. A. Thompson (eds.) *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge University Press. 1996: 185–237.

French, P. & Local, J. 1983. "Turn-competitive incomings" *Journal of Pragmatics* 7,1: 17–38.

Fromkin, V. A. (ed.)1980. *Errors in linguistic performance. Slips of the tongue, ear, pen, and hand*. New York: Academic Press Inc.

Gardner, R. & Wagner, J. (eds.) 2004. *Second language conversations*. London: Continuum.

Garfinkel, H. 1967. *Studies in ethnomethodology.* Engelwood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Gaskill, W. 1980. "Correction in native speaker—nonnative speaker conversation" in D. Larsen-Freeman (ed.) *Discourse analysis in second language research*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers. 1980: 125–137.

Gass S. M. & Varonis, E. M. 1985a. "Miscommunication in native/nonnative conversation" *Language in Society* 14: 327–343.

Gass, S. M. & Varonis, E. M. 1985b. "Task variation and nonnative/nonnative negotiation of meaning" in S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (eds.) *Input in second language acquisition*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers. 1985: 149–161.

Gass, S. M. & Varonis, E. M. 1994. "Input, interaction, and second language production" *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 16, 3: 283–302.

Gass, S. M. 1997. *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Gass, S. M. 1998. "Apples and oranges: or, why apples are not orange and don't need to be. A response to Firth and Wagner" *The Modern Language Journal* 82: 83–90.

Goffman, E. 1981. *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pensylvania Press.

Goodwin, C. 1979. "The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation" in G. Psathas (ed.) *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*. New York:Irvington Publishers. 1979: 97–121.

Goodwin, C. 1980. "Restarts, pauses, and the achievement of a state of mutual gaze at turn-beginning" *Sociological Inquiry* 50, 3–4: 272–302.

Goodwin, C. 1981. *Conversational organization. Interaction between speakers and hearers*. New York: Academic Press Inc.

Goodwin, C. 1987. "Forgetfulness as an interactive resource" *Social Psychology Quarterly* 50: 115–131.

Goodwin, C. 1995. "Co-constructing meaning in conversations with an aphasic man" *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 28, 3: 233–260.

Goodwin, C. (ed.) 2003. *Conversation and brain damage*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.

Goodwin, C. & Goodwin, M. H. 1986. "Gesture and co-participation in the activity of searching for a word" *Semiotica* 62: 51–75.

Goodwin, C. & Goodwin, M. H. 1992. "Context, activity and participation" in P. Auer & A. Di Luzio (eds.) *The contextualization of language*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 1992: 77–99.

Grosjean, F. 1982. *Life with two languages*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press

Gumperz, J. 1982. *Discourse strategies. Studies in interactional sociolinguistics 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. J. & Cook-Gumperz, J. (eds.)1982. *Language and social identity. Studies in interactional sociolinguistics 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. J. 1992a. *Language in social groups*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Gumperz, J. J. 1992b. "Contextualization revisited" in P. Auer & A. Di Luzio (eds.) *The contextualization of language*. 1992: 39–53.

Gumperz, J. J. 1992c. "Contextualization and understanding" in A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (eds) *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*. Cambridge University Press. 1992: 230–252.

Gumperz, J. J 2003. "Response essay" in L. S. Eerdmans, L. C. Prevignano & J. P. Thibault (eds.) *Language and interaction. Discussions with John J.*

Gumperz. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2003: 105–126.

Günthner, S. & Luckman, T. 2001. "Asymmetries of knowledge in intercultural communication. The relevance of cultural repertoires of communicative genres" in A. Di Luzio, S. Günthner & F. Orletti (eds.) *Culture in communication. Analyses of intercultural situations*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2001: 55–85.

Harris, M. 1992. *Language experience and early language development: From input to uptake*. Hove: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Ltd.

ten Have, P. 1998. *Doing conversation analysis*. *A practical guide*. Guildford, Surrey: Sage.

Hawkins, B. 1985. "Is an 'appropriate response' always so appropriate?" in S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (eds.) *Input in second language acquisition*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers. 1985: 162–178.

Heath, C. 1997. "The analysis of activities in face to face interaction using video" in D. Silverman (ed.) *Qualitative research. Theory, method and practice*. Sage. 1997: 183–200

Heritage, J. 1984. *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Heritage, J. & Watson, D. R. "Formulations as conversational objects" in G. Psathas (ed.) *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington. 1979: 123–162.

van Hest, E.1996. *Self-repair in L1 and L2 production. Studies in multilingualism 4*. Tilburg University Press.

van Hest, E., Poulisse, N. & Bongearts, T. 1997 "Self-repair in L1 and L2 production: An overview" *ITL, Review of Applied Linguistics* 117–118: 85–115.

Hockett, F.C. 1967. "Where the tongue slips, there slip I" in *To honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, 11 October 1966*. The Hague. 1967: 910–936.

Holt, E.1996. "Reporting on talk: The use of direct reported speech in conversation" *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 29, 3: 219–245.

Houtkoop-Steenstra, H. 1991. "Opening sequences in Dutch telephone conversations" in D. Boden & D. Zimmerman (eds.) *Talk and social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press. 1991: 232–250.

Hutchby, I. & Wooffitt, R. 1998. *Conversation analysis*. Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Iványi, Z. 2001. "Wortsuchprozesse bei Fremd- und Muttersprachlern. Eine konversationsanalytische Untersuchung " *Deutsche Sprache* 29, 3: 261–287.

Jacoby, S. & Ochs, E. 1995. "Co-construction: An introduction". *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 28, 3: 171–183.

Jefferson, G. 1974. "Error correction as an interactional resource" *Language in Society* 3: 181–199.

Jefferson, G. 1987. "On expressed and embedded correction in conversation" in G. Button & J. R. Lee (eds.) *Talk and social organisation*. 1987: 86–100.

Kalin, M. 1995. *Coping with problems of understanding. Repair sequences in conversations between native and non-native speakers*. Jyväskylä University Printing House and Sisäsuomi Oy.

Kasper, G. 1985. "Repair in foreign language teaching" *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 7, 2: 200–215.

Kasper, G. & Kellerman, E. (eds.)1997. *Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives*. London: Longman.

Kormos, J. 1999. "Monitoring and self-repair in L2" *Language Learning* 49, 2: 303–342.

Kramsch, C. (ed.) 2002. *Language acquisition and language socialization. Ecological perspectives*. London: Continuum.

Krashen, S. 1982. *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. 1998. "Comprehensible output?" *System* 26: 175–182.

Kurhila, S. 2001. "Correction in talk between native and non-native speaker" *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 1083–1110.

Kurhila, S. 2003. *Co-constructing understanding in second language conversation*. Doctoral dissertation. Department of Finnish Language. University of Helsinki.

Kurhila, S. 2004. "Clients or language learners—Being a second language speaker in institutional interaction" in R. Gardner & J.Wagner (eds.) *Second language conversations*. London: Continuum. 2004: 58–74.

Lantolf, P. J. & Appel, G. (eds.) 1994. *Vygotskian approaches to second language research*. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Company.

Larsen-Freeman, D. 2002. "Language Acquisition and language use from a chaos/complexity theory perspective" in C. Kramsch (ed.) *Language acquisition and language socialization. Ecological perspectives*. London: Continuum. 2002: 33–46.

Larsen-Freeman, D. & Long, M. 1991. *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. London: Longman.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. 1991. *Situated learning. Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.

Laver, J. 1980. "Monitoring systems in the neurolinguistic control of speech production" in V. A. Fromkin (ed.) *Errors in linguistic performance. Slips of the tongue, ear, pen, and hand*. New York: Academic Press Inc. 1980: 287–305.

Lehti-Eklund, H. 2002. "Dictoglossamtal som övningsform i svenska språk-badsklasser" in H. Lehti-Eklund (ed.) in cooperation with M. Saari & A-M Londen. *Samtal och interaktion*. Meddelanden från Institutionen för nordiska språk och nordisk litteratur vid Helsingfors universitet. 2002: 69–144.

Leow, R. 1997. "Attention, awareness, and foreign language behaviour" *Language Learning* 47: 467–506.

Lerner, G. 1993 "Collectives in action: Establishing the relevance of conjoined participation in conversation" *Text* 13: 213–245.

Lerner, G. 1996. "On the 'semi-permeable' character of grammatical units in conversation: Conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker" in E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff & S. A. Thompson (eds.) *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1996: 238–276.

Levelt, W. 1983. "Monitoring and self-repair in speech" *Cognition* 14: 41–104.

Levelt, W. 1989. *Speaking. From intention to articulation*. Cambridge, Massachusetts:MIT Press.

Liljestrand, J. 2002. *Klassrummet som diskussionsarena*. Doktorsavhandling. Örebro studies in education 6. Örebro Universitet.

Lindgren, A. 1973. *Bröderna Lejonhjärta*. Stockholm: Rabén & Sjögren.

Lindström, F. 2002. *Jordens smartaste ord: Språkliga gåtor och mänskligt tänk*. Stockholm: Bonniers.

Linell, P. 1993. "Troubles with mutualities. Towards a dialogical theory of misunderstanding and miscommunication" *Arbetsrapporter från Tema Kommunikation* 2. Linköping University. Department of Communication Studies.

Linell, P. 1998. *Approaching dialogue*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Linell, P. & Gustavsson, L. 1987. "Initiativ och respons. Om dialogens dynamik, dominans och koherens" *Studies in Communication* 15. Linköping University.

Linell, P. & Bredmar, M. 1996. "Reconstructing topical sensitivity: Aspects of face-work in talks between midwifes and expectant mothers" *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 29, 4: 347–379.

Local, J. 1992. "Continuing and restarting" in P. Auer & A. Di Luzio (eds.) *The contextualization of language*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 1992: 273–296.

Long, M. 1983. "Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers" *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 5, 2: 177–193.

Long, M. 1996. "The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition" in W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (eds.) *Handbook of language acquisition*. New York: Academic Press. 1996: 413–468.

Long, M. 1997. "Construct validity in SLA research: A response to Firth and Wagner" *The Modern Language Journal* 81: 318–323.

Long, M. & Porter, P. 1985. "Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition" *TESOL Quarterly* 19: 207–225.

Lyster, R. & Ranta, L. 1997. "Corrective feedback and learner uptake. Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 19: 37–66.

Mackey, A., Gass, S. M. & McDonough, K. 2000. "How do learners perceive interactional feedback?" *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 22, 4: 471–497.

Markee, N. 2000. *Conversation analysis*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Mazeland, H. & Zaman-Zadeh, M. 2004. "The logic of clarification: Some observations about word clarification repairs in Finnish-as-a-lingua franca interactions" in R. Gardner & J. Wagner (eds.) *Second language conversations*. London: Continuum. 2004: 132–156.

McHoul, A. 1990. "The organization of repair in classroom talk" *Language in Society* 19, 3: 349–378.

Myers, G. 1998. "Displaying opinions: Topics and disagreement in focus groups" *Language in Society* 27: 85–111.

Nobuyoshi, J. & Ellis, R. 1993. "Focused communication tasks and second language acquisition" *ELT Journal* 47, 3: 203–210.

Nooteboom, G. S. 1980. "Speaking and unspeaking: Detection and correction of phonological and lexical errors in spontaneous speech" in V. A. Fromkin (ed.) *Errors in linguistic performance. Slips of the tongue, ear, pen, and hand*. New York: Academic Press Inc. 1980: 87–95.

Nooteboom, G. S. 2003. "Self-monitoring is the main cause of lexical bias in phonological speech errors" in R. Eklund (ed.) *Proceedings of Diss '03. Disfluency in spontaneous speech workshop 5–8 September. Gothenburgh papers in theoretical linguistics* 90. Department of Linguistics, Göteborg University. 2003: 27–30.

Norrick, N. 1991. "On the organization of corrective exchanges in conversation" *Journal of Pragmatics*. 16: 59–83.

Ochs, E., Schegloff, E. A. & Thompson, S. A. (eds.) 1996. *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge University Press.

Pallotti, G. 2001. "External appropriations as a strategy for participation in intercultural multi-party conversation" in A. Di Luzio, S. Günthner & F. Orletti (eds.) *Culture in communication. Analyses of intercultural situations*.

Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2001: 295–334.

Pawley, A. & Syder, F. H. 1983. "Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Nativelike selection and nativelike fluency" In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (eds.) *Language and Communication*. 1983: 191–225.

Pica, T. 1988. "Interlanguage Adjustments as an outcome of NS-NNS negotiated interaction" *Language Learning* 38, 1: 45–71

Pica, T., Lincoln-Porter, F., Paninos, D. & Linnell, J. 1996. "Language learners' interaction: How does it address the input, output and feedback needs of L2 learners?" *TESOL Quarterly* 30, 1: 59–84.

Plejert, C. 2003. "Repair, learning and foreign language talk-in-interaction: A conversation analytic approach" in K. Aijmer & B.Olinder (eds.) *Proceedings from the 8th Nordic conference on English studies. Acta universitatis Gothoburgensis. Gothenburg studies in English 84.* 2003: 87–105.

Poulisse, N. 1997a. "Some words in defence of the psycholinguistic approach: A response to Firth and Wagner" *The Modern Language Journal* 81, 3: 324–328.

Poulisse, N. 1997b. "Compensatory strategies and the principles of clarity and economy" in G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (eds.) *Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives*. London: Longman. 1997: 49–64.

Psatas, G. 1995. *Conversation analysis.The study of talk-in-interaction*. Qualitative research methods. Vol. 35. A Sage University Paper.

Rasmussen, G. & Wagner, J. 2001. "Reparatur i international kommunikation" in M. Femø Nielsen, G. Rasmussen & J. Steensig (eds.) *Movin publications* No.1. http://www.conversation-analysis.net/Publications/publications.htm.

Rieger, C. L. 2003. "Disfluencies and hestitation strategies in oral L2 tests" in R. Eklund (ed.) *Proceedings of Diss '03. Disfluency in spontaneous speech workshop 5–8 September. Gothenburgh papers in theoretical linguistics 90*. Department of Linguistics, Göteborg University. 2003: 41–44.

Sacks, H. 1992. *Lectures on conversation I & II*. Jefferson, G. (ed.) Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A .& Jefferson, G. 1974. "A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation." *Language* 50, 3–4: 696–735.

Schegloff, E. A. 1979. "The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation" in T. Givón (ed.) *Syntax and semantics. Vol. 12. Discourse and syntax*. New York: Academic Press. 1979: 261–286.

Schegloff, E. A. 1987. "Recycled turn beginnings: A precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organisation" in *Multilingual matters Ltd*.

Schegloff, E. A. 1990. "On the organization of sequences as a source of 'coherence' in talk-in-interaction" in B. Dorval (ed.) *Conversational organization and its development*. *Volume XXXVIII*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation. 1990: 51–77.

Schegloff, E. A. 1991. "Conversation analysis and socially shared cognition" in L. B. Resnick, J. M. Levine & S. D. Teasley (eds.) 1991. *Perspectives on socially shared cognition*. Washington D C: American Psychological Association. 1991: 150–171.

Schegloff, E. A. 1992a. "Repair after next turn: the last structurally provided defence of intersubjectivity in conversation" *American Journal of Sociology* 97: 1295–1345.

Schegloff, E. A. 1992b. "In another context" in A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (eds.) 1992. *Rethinking context*. Cambridge University Press 1992: 191–228.

Schegloff, E. A. 1996. "Turn organization: one intersection of grammar and interaction" in E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff & S. Thompson (eds.) *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge University Press. 1996: 52–133.

Schegloff, E. A. 2000 "When 'Others' Initiate Repair" *Applied Linguistics*. 21, 2: 205–43.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., and Sacks, H. 1977. "The Preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53, 1–2: 361–82**.**

Schieffelin, B.B. & Ochs, E. 1986. *Language socialization across cultures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, D. 1987. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge University Press.

Schmidt, R. 1990. "The role of consciousness in second language learning" *Applied Linguistics* 11: 129–158.

Schmidt, R. 1993. "Awareness and second language acquisition." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 13: 206–26.

Schmidt, R. & Frota, S. 1986 "Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner of Portugese" in R. Day. (ed.) *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House. 1986: 237–326.

Schwartz, J. 1980. "The negotiation for meaning: Repair in conversations between second language learners of English" in D. Larsen-Freeman (ed.) *Discourse analysis in second language research*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers Inc. 1980: 138–153.

Scollon, R. & Scollon, S. 1995. *Intercultural communication. A discourse approach*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Seidlhofer, B. 2001. "Brave new English?" *The European English Messenger* 10, 1: 42–48.

Seliger, H. 1980. "Utterance planning and correction behaviour: Its function in the grammar construction process for second language learners" in H. Dechert & M. Raupach (eds.) *Towards a cross-linguistic assessment of speech production*. Frankfurt/Bern/Cirencester: Lang. 1980: 87–100.

Selinker, L. 1972. "Interlanguage" *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 10: 209–231.

Selting, M. 1996. "On the interplay of syntax and prosody in the constitution of turn-constructional units and turns in conversation" *Pragmatics* 6, 3: 357–388

Selting, M. 1998. "TCUs and TRPs. The construction of units in conversational talk" *InList* 4.

Shehadeh, A. 1999. "Non-native speaker's production of modified comprehensible output and second language learning" *Language Learning* 49, 4: 627–675.

SOU 2003: 91. "Äldrepolitik för framtiden. 100 steg till trygghet och utveckling med en åldrande befolkning".

Svennevig, J. 1999. *Getting acquainted in conversation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Swain, M. 1985. "Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development" in S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (eds.) *Input in second language acquisition*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers. 1985: 235–253.

Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. 1995 "Problems in output and the cognitive process they generate: A step towards second language learning" *Applied Linguistics* 16, 3: 371–391.

Tannen, D. 1986. "Introducing constructed dialogue in Greek and American conversational and literary narrative" in F. Coulmas (ed.) *Direct and indirect speech*. Berlin; New York; Amsterdam: Mouton, de Gruyter. 1986: 310–332.

Tannen, D. 1989. *Talking voices. Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tarone, E. 1980. "Communication strategies, foreigner talk and repair in interlanguage" *Language Learning* 30: 417–431.

Tarone, E., Cohen, D. A. & Dumas, G. 1983. "A closer look at some interlanguage terminology: A framework for communication strategies" in C. Faerch & G. Kasper (eds.) *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. 1983: 4–19. New York: Longman Inc.

Thagg Fisher, U. 1986. *The sweet sound of concord*. Malmö: Libers

Tomasello, M. & Kruger, A. C. 1992. "Joint attention on actions: Acquiring verbs in ostensive and non-ostensive contexts" *Journal of Child Language* 19, 2: 311–333.

Truscott, J. 1998. "Noticing in second language acquisition: A critical review" *Second Language Research* 14, 2: 103–135.

Van den Branden, K. 1997. "Effects of negotiation on language learner's output" *Language Learning* 47, 4: 589–636.

Varonis, E. M. & Gass, S. M. 1985. "Non-native/non-native conversations: A model for negotiation of meaning" *Applied Linguistics* 6, 1: 71–90.

Vygotsky, L. 1986. *Thought and language*. Cambridge Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Wagner, J. 1996. "Foreign language acquisition through interaction — A critical review of research on conversational adjustments" *Journal of Pragmatics* 26: 215–235.

Wagner, J. 1998. "On doing being a guinea pig — A response to Seedhouse" *Journal of Pragmatics* 30: 103–113.

Wertsch, V. J. 1979. "From social interaction to higher psychological processes. A clarification and application of Vygotsky's theory" *Human Development* 22: 1–22.

Wertsch, V. J. 1985. *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wibeck, V. 2000. *Fokusgrupper: Om fokuserade gruppintervjuer som undersökningsmetod*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Wiese, R. 1984. "Language production in foreign and native languages: Same or different?" in H. Dechert, D. Möhle & M. Raupach (eds.) *Second language productions*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag. 1984: 11–25.

Wong, J. 2000. "Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/non-native speaker English conversation." *Applied Linguistics* 21, 2: 244–67.

Wootton, A. J. 1997. *Interaction and the development of mind*. Cambridge University Press.

Zuengler, J. 1991. "Accomodation in native-nonnative interactions: Going beyond the 'what' to the 'why' in second-language research." in H. Giles, J. Coupland & N. Coupland (eds.) *Contexts of accommodation. Developments in applied sociolinguistics*. Cambridge University Press. 1991: 223–244.

Zuengler, J. 1993. "Explaining NNS interactional behaviour: The effect of conversational topic" in G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (eds.) *Interlanguage pragmatics*. Oxford University Press. 1993: 184–195.

Appendix

The appendix comprises tables that present the frequency of occurrence and distribution among participants of the repair categories described in the analytic chapters. Although participants formed different pairs of NNSs and NSs, tables present individual speakers and are divided into groups of NNSs and NSs. The order of the tables follows the order of the analytic chapters, starting with chapter 3.

Chapter 3

Tables 1 and 2 below present the frequency of occurrence of the different types of self-initiated self-repairs that were analysed in chapter 3. Rather than going into detail concerning the interactional relevance of the repair (e.g. the remedy of potential threat of face, cf. section 3.3.3), the columns present the way a cut-off unit was affected by the repair, e.g. that an alteration affected tense, pronunciation etc.

Table 1. Self-initiated self-repair in NNSs' turns-at-talk

NNSs	Alteration of mispronounced words	Alteration of the initial choice of a word	Alteration affecting tense, number, or modality	Alteration of the use of a pronoun	Repair plus a metalinguistic comment (MLC)	**Total**
Erik	2	3	2	1	1	**9**
Linda	3	2	1	–	1	**7**
Jenny	1	1	2	1	2	**7**
Monica	4	2	4	2	1	**13**
Tobias	1	5	2	–	–	**8**
Magnus	1	2	5	3	–	**11**
Total	**12**	**15**	**16**	**7**	**5**	**55**

Table 2. Self-initiated self-repair in NSs' turns-at-talk

NSs	Alteration of mispronounced words	Alteration of the initial choice of a word	Alteration affecting tense, number, or modality	Alteration of the use of a pronoun	Repair plus a metalinguistic comment (MLC)	**Total**
John	1	3	–	–	1	**5**
Tim	–	–	1	–	–	**1**
Michael	1	6	2	2	–	**11**
Anne	3	3	–	2	1	**9**
Emily	1	1	1	2	–	**5**
Celia	–	3	–	2	–	**5**
Total	**6**	**16**	**4**	**8**	**2**	**36**

Chapter 4

This section provides tables presenting the frequency of occurrence of instances of vocabulary uncertainties described in chapter 4, and their distribution among NNSs and NSs. The first column to the left displays the frequency of occurrence of turns-at-talk that are marked with hesitancy (H-marked) but are not responded to with other-repair (cf. section 4.1). Rather, the speaker him/herself finds an alternative continuation to the turn than the one started off. The following two columns present the frequency of occurrence of vocabulary uncertainties that were accompanied by a metalinguistic comment (MLC) of the type *what's it called* (section 4.1, 4.2 & 4.3). In some cases, such indications were responded to with other-repair and in others, self-repair followed the initiation. Finally, the two rightmost columns present indications of vocabulary uncertainty by means of codeswitching (CS) plus metalinguistic comments directed to the recipient (section 4.2). Similarly to turns hosting metalinguistic comments, however, codeswitching could be followed by self-repair (or function as self-repair), or be responded to with other-repair.

Table 3. Vocabulary uncertainties in the talk of NNSs

NNSs	H-marked turns not resp. to with other-repair	MLC followed by self-repair	MLC followed by other-repair	CS +MLC followed by self-repair	CS + MLC followed by other-repair	**Total**
Erik	9	1	–	–	–	**10**
Linda	6	–	2	–	2	**10**
Jenny	6	–	–	–	–	**6**
Monica	2	6	–	–	–	**8**
Tobias	4	1	–	–	–	**5**
Magnus	6	–	2	1	1	**10**
Total	**33**	**8**	**4**	**1**	**3**	**49**

Table 4. Vocabulary uncertainties in the talk of NSs

NSs	H-marked turns not resp. to with other-repair	MLC followed by self-repair	MLC followed by other-repair	CS followed by self-repair	CS +MLC followed by other-repair	**Total**
John	2	2	1	–	–	**5**
Tim	3	1	–	–	1	**5**
Michael	4	–	–	–	–	**4**
Anne	2	3	1	–	1	**7**
Emily	4	1	–	–	–	**5**
Celia	5	1	–	–	–	**6**
Total	**20**	**8**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**32**

A word of clarification may also be in place concerning the first column presenting hesitancy marked turns that are not responded to with other-repair (section 4.1). The column only comprises such examples of cut off TCUs in which there are pauses, prolonged sounds, markers of hesitancy such as "eh" and "uhm" followed by a new prosodic and syntactic unit (semantically, there is a relation between the cut-off unit and the new unit). There are, however, turns-at-talk that are reconstructed in a similar fashion, although even less saliently marked with hesitancy than the ones presented in tables 3 and 4. Included are thus only such examples that are perceived as word finding difficulties, although the motivation behind the repair can be

something else (which is not possible to determine due to the lack of overt evidence).

Chapter 5

Tables 5 and 6 present NNSs' and NSs' other-initiations as responses to the expected and unexpected contributions to talk discussed in chapter 5. As described in the analytic chapter, motivations for initiations vary, particularly concerning "unexpected" contributions to talk. The column presenting the frequency of occurrence of responses to expected contributions to talk, comprises hearing difficulties and candidate understandings.

Table 5. Other-initiations conducted by NNSs

NNSs	Repair initiation as response to an unexpected contribution to talk	Repair initiation as response to an expected contribution to talk	Total
Erik	–	–	0
Linda	1	5	6
Jenny	–	–	0
Monica	–	–	0
Tobias	–	3	3
Magnus	1	1	2
Total	**2**	**9**	**11**

Table 6. Other-initiations conducted by NSs

NSs	Repair initiation as response to an unexpected contribution to talk	Repair initiation as response to an expected contribution to talk	Total
John	2	3	5
Tim	2	1	3
Michael	–	–	0
Anne	1	2	3
Emily	–	2	2
Celia	–	1	1
Total	**5**	**9**	**14**

Chapter 6

Since there were, in total, four instances of repair initiated and carried out by "other", inserting tables that present all participants appear pointless. However, in accordance with the analyses in chapter 6, the participants who initiated and carried out other-repair are presented below:

John (NS) initiated and carried out other-repair twice on Tobias' (NNS) turns-at-talk (cf. sections 6.1 and 6.3).

Anne (NS) initiated and carried out other-repair on Michael's turn-at-talk (cf. section 6.2).

Jenny (NNS) initiated and carried out repair once on Monica's turn-at-talk (cf. section 6.4).