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ABSTRACT

This paper reports on an investigation of instances of lexical replacement repair, in which a speaker replaces one lexical choice with another, sampled from Dutch spontaneous interaction. The study is driven by the question as to what motivates a speaker to produce a particular instance of self-repair with or without ‘prosodic marking’ — with or without notable prosodic prominence — and the notion that a close consideration of the discourse context in which the repair is embedded, and its function in that context, is paramount in addressing this question. The study explores the empirical grounds for two proposals regarding the function of prosodic marking: one in which marking is a response to the speaker’s embarrassment or unease at the error or infelicity, and one in which marking is done for the listener’s benefit, to highlight particularly important information. This paper describes three discourse contexts in which prosodic marking is notably common, and argues that both proposals find some support in these contexts. The analysis suggests that speakers’ decisions for or against prosodic marking are based at least on considerations of epistemic authority, precision and exaggeration, and discourse coherence.
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Discourse constraints on prosodic marking in lexical replacement repair

1 INTRODUCTION

This paper reports on an investigation of instances of lexical replacement repair sampled from Dutch spontaneous interaction. By lexical replacement repair, I mean a type of same-turn, self-initiated self-repair (Schegloff et al. 1977) in which a speaker replaces one lexical choice with another: an English example is *I’m going on Thursday – Friday*, where *Thursday* is replaced with *Friday*. In what follows, I will refer to the first, replaced item as the ‘trouble source item’, and to the second, replacement item as the ‘repair item’.

Much recent discourse-analytic work on self-repair has focused on its various syntactic shapes, its structural motivations and its interactional import (e.g. Schiffrin 2006, Lerner & Kitzinger 2007, Egbert et al. 2009, Fox et al. 2009, 2010, Bolden et al. 2012, Drew et al. 2013, Raymond & Heritage 2013, Romaniuk & Ehrlich 2013, Schegloff 2013). While some of the insights from these studies are relevant to the current study, its main focus is elsewhere — namely, on self-repair prosody. In particular, I focus on the perceived prominence of the repair item relative to the trouble source item, taking inspiration from Goffman (1981), who distinguishes ‘flat’ and ‘strident’ repairs. In the former, the speaker does the correction ‘apparently unselfconsciously and with no change in pace’ (Goffman 1981: 215), while in the latter,

the speaker gives the impression of suddenly stopping in midstream because of being struck by what he has just heard himself say. Voice is raised and tempo increased. He then seems to redirect his attention to the single-minded task of establishing a corrected statement, as if this could (done quickly and forcefully enough) somehow grind the error into the ground, erase it, obliterate it, and substitute a corrected version. (Goffman 1981: 216)

Goffman’s observation was taken up by Cutler (1983) and Levelt & Cutler (1983), who renamed Goffman’s ‘strident’ repairs ‘prosodically marked’, and his ‘flat’ repairs ‘prosodically unmarked’. Cutler (1983) describes an ‘unmarked’ repair as one in which the pitch, intensity and speaking rate of the repair solution are not noticeably different from those of the trouble
source. A ‘marked’ repair, on the other hand, ‘is distinguished by a quite different prosodic shape from that of the original utterance’ (Cutler 1983: 81).

1.1 WHY MARK A REPAIR?

A relevant question is, of course, what motivates a speaker to produce a particular instance of self-repair with or without prosodic marking. Goffman (1981: 215-216) appeals to the speaker’s level of unease, or embarrassment, at the error or infelicity: ‘flat’ repairs are produced ‘as though the correction … is itself nothing to be ashamed of’, while ‘strident’ repairs suggest that ‘although the speaker may have been asleep at the switch, he is now more than sufficiently on his toes, fully mobilized to prove that such indiscipline is not characteristic of him’. This implies that the main effect of prosodic marking is to divert attention away from the error or infelicity (see Nooteboom 2010 for a similar interpretation), and that the choice to implement it is to a large extent motivated by a desire to maintain ‘face’ (Goffman 1967a, 1967b) — although Goffman (1981) does not refer to this concept. Unfortunately, Goffman does not elaborate on how speaker embarrassment might be empirically assessed: clearly, without access to speakers’ feelings at the time of producing repairs, it is impossible to directly measure the extent to which they considered the corrected errors or infelicities a source of unease, or constituting enough of a threat to face to attempt to ‘erase’ them.

Levelt & Cutler (1983) take a different tack, proposing that the speaker’s choice for or against prosodic marking is constrained by what they call the ‘semantics’ of the repair. Like Levelt (1983), Levelt & Cutler distinguish between ‘error repairs’, in which a factual or linguistic error is corrected, and ‘appropriateness repairs’, in which the problem with the initial lexical choice is one of felicity rather than error. The example of Thursd- Friday above illustrates error repair: Thursday and Friday have mutually exclusive denotations, so if one is factually accurate the other cannot be. An example of appropriateness repair would be I saw that guy- uh, man yesterday, where guy and man have the same referent, but the latter is — presumably, from the speaker’s point of view — more appropriate given the discourse context. In a study of Dutch task-oriented speech, Levelt & Cutler observe that while a majority of error repairs is perceivable as prosodically marked, a majority of appropriateness repairs is perceivable as
unmarked. They take this to mean that the likelihood of prosodic marking is correlated with the degree of semantic contrast between the two lexical items involved in the repair: the greater the contrast, the more informative the repair, and the more likely it is that the speaker will choose to produce it prominently. Levelt (1989: 495) points out that the proposal that semantic contrast constrains repair prosody neatly explains the reported absence of prosodic marking in phonological repair, where a mispronunciation is corrected (Cutler 1983, Shattuck-Hufnagel & Cutler 1999): here, the trouble source and repair are two productions of the same lexical item, so no semantic contrast exists between the two.

While Goffman’s account of prosodic marking is predominantly a ‘speaker-oriented’ one, concerned with the speaker’s feelings at the time of the repair, Levelt & Cutler’s (1983) account is more ‘listener-oriented’: in this account, the speaker produces informative discourse content prominently for the listener’s benefit. This is consistent with the recurrent finding in phonetic studies that new, unpredictable or otherwise important information is more likely to be produced with prosodic salience, emphasis or ‘hyperspeech’ than old, predictable or unimportant information, based on speakers’ estimations of listeners’ knowledge and general intelligibility (Lindblom 1996, Baker & Bradlow 2000, Aylett & Turk 2004, Pluymaekers et al. 2005, Smiljanić & Bradlow 2009, Seyfarth 2014). The reasoning in relation to repair is made explicit by Geluykens (1994: 60), who suggests — unfortunately without elaboration — that in a subtype of repair in which a pronominal reference is replaced with a full noun, ‘it is important that this reparans gets some prosodic prominence, to facilitate comprehension for the hearer, and thus to ensure the resolving of the referential problem’. Studies focusing specifically on the relationship between prosody and information status (see Calhoun 2010, Ito & Speer 2011 and Genzel et al. 2014 for recent reviews) support this reasoning — but to my knowledge, none has investigated repair.

Since Goffman’s (1981) and Levelt & Cutler’s (1983) studies, little progress has been made in furthering our understanding of the function of prosodic marking in self-repair — including both its motivation from a speaker’s perspective, and its effect on the listener. Goffman’s hypothesis has not been addressed in subsequent work on repair, and the only
comprehensive study following up on Levelt & Cutler (1983) is that by Plug & Carter (2013), on instances of replacement repair taken from Dutch spontaneous speech. Plug & Carter report that distinguishing error and appropriateness repairs does little to explain why prosodically marked repairs are prosodically marked, although dividing error repairs up further into repairs of factual versus linguistic errors — the latter involving an initial lexical choice that results in obvious ill-formedness or ungrammaticality — does: repairs of factual errors are more frequently marked than repairs of linguistic errors and appropriateness repairs alike. A general conclusion to draw from Plug & Carter’s (2013) study is that while repair semantics, as operationalized by Levelt & Cutler (1983), have some explanatory value in accounting for the distribution of prosodic marking, they provide only partial insight into speakers’ motivations for producing instances of self-repair with or without marking.

1.2 THIS PAPER

This paper reports on a qualitative study of instances of replacement repair sampled from Dutch spontaneous interaction; the collection includes that analysed quantitatively by Plug & Carter (2013). The study is based on two related assumptions, which yield two related hypotheses. First, I assume that if the relative information value of a repair item is an important parameter informing speakers’ choices for or against prosodic marking, as Levelt & Cutler (1983) and Levelt (1989) suggest, a full analysis should take account of the wider discourse context in which repairs are embedded. As Plug & Carter (2013: 157) point out,

> It does not, in principle, seem difficult to conceive of discourse scenarios in which an appropriateness repair carries more weight than a correction of factual accuracy or linguistic well-formedness: for example, an inappropriately phrased reference to a person familiar to both conversation partners is likely to have an observable impact on subsequent turns in the interaction; a topically peripheral error of fact or an isolated instance of ungrammaticality is not.

We can hypothesize, then, that there are discourse contexts or repair functions that are routinely associated with prosodic marking, and the repairs’ information value or discourse salience will be relevant in understanding why marking occurs.
Second, I assume that a close consideration of the discourse context is mandatory if we want to assess Goffman’s (1981) account of prosodic marking in self-repair, which as it stands is based solely on an intuition regarding speakers’ feelings. While a consideration of context is likely not to provide concrete evidence of speaker embarrassment, it will allow us to explore the empirical grounds for Goffman’s intuition: if there are discourse contexts in which repairs are routinely associated with prosodic marking, it should be possible to establish whether these are contexts in which speakers’ feelings of unease and desire to ‘grind the error into the ground’ (Goffman 1981: 216) plausibly inform repair design. Goffman’s own writings on ‘face’ are particularly relevant to this assessment. Goffman (1967a) establishes a strong connection between embarrassment and threat to face — and, by extension, ‘self’. According to Goffman (1967a: 105-106), ‘[d]uring interaction the individual is expected to possess certain attributes, capacities, and information which, taken together, fit together into a self that is at once coherently unified and appropriate for the occasion’. When ‘an event’ throws doubt on this coherence and appropriateness, embarrassment is the result. Given this connection, we can hypothesize that if there are discourse contexts that are routinely associated with prosodic marking, these include contexts in which threats to face and ‘face-saving’ can be observed.

The general approach I take here is in line with that advocated by Sanders (2005). Sanders points out that despite a general ‘animus towards attention to cognition within discourse studies’ (2005: 57), accounts attributing actions to participants in interaction are often based on implicit or explicit assumptions about participants’ motivations, (shared) knowledge, and competences — for example, their abilities to monitor each others’ turn constructions, recall prior utterances, draw inferences and so on. According to Sanders (and see also Pomerantz 2005), it is reasonable to ask whether such assumptions are backed up by independent evidence — or in Sanders’ (2005: 60-61) terms, to establish whether it is known that participants could do what the account suggests they do. Moreover, Sanders suggests that close attention to participants’ motivations, knowledge and so on may help in deciding between alternative accounts of a given interactional phenomenon. Here the argument may rest partly or wholly on what participants plausibly would do in the discourse context in question, and an important question is whether there is evidence consistent with the cognitive processing attributed to the
participants beyond the utterances it is meant to account for (Sanders 2005: 62-63). At the same time, close analysis of sequences of interaction can inform our understanding of the cognitive processes involved in language use in discourse (Sanders 2005: 59; see also Schegloff 1991, Potter & Edwards 2013). In the case of this study, we have alternative accounts of an interactional phenomenon — prosodic marking in self-repair — phrased in unambiguously cognitive terms: that is, with reference to speakers’ motivations for choosing a particular turn design. Given the approach outlined here, it is good practice to ask whether close attention to relevant discourse context provides evidence consistent with either account.

I will show in what follows that both hypotheses formulated above find some support in the current collection: there do appear to be discourse contexts and associated repair functions that favour prosodic marking, and both considerations of information value and face help us understand why this might be. I will describe three contexts in detail, under the headers of maintaining discourse coherence, maintaining epistemic authority and strengthening and weakening formulations.

2 DATA COLLECTION AND METHOD

2.1 DATA COLLECTION

The collection for this paper comprises 247 instances of replacement repair extracted from four sub-corpora of the Spoken Dutch Corpus (Oostdijk 2002), containing spontaneous face-to-face conversations, semi-structured interviews with teachers of Dutch, broadcast interviews, discussions and debates, and non-broadcast interviews, discussions and debates. I only selected instances in which exactly one word is retroactively replaced with another. I discarded many potential instances because of poor audio quality or overlapping speech, to allow for acoustic phonetic analysis not reported here (but see Plug & Carter 2013, Plug 2014a, 2014b). I also discarded instances in which the trouble source item was incomplete and no reasonable guess could be made as to its identity. This selection was done by myself in the first instance, and was later verified by the linguist who assisted in the prosodic analysis of the repairs, as described
below. (1) contains representative examples from the collection. The trouble source and repair items are in bold.

(1)  
  a. met de **au**- met de **bus** (*by ca- by bus*)  
  b. als er met tekst **gebruik**- **gewerkt** wordt (*when one use- works with text*)  
  c. de **koelk**- **koelcel** (*the refrigerate- cold store*)  
  d. die **drie** da- of die **twee** dagen (*those three day- or those two days*)  
  e. een **leuke k**- een **mooie** keuken (*a nice k- a beautiful kitchen*)  
  f. een **telefoon- of mijn** telefoonnummer opschrijven (*write down a phone- or my phone number*)  
  g. in de **computerwe**- uh in de **bankwereld** (*in the world of compu- er of banking*)

The examples in (1) illustrate that some cases the trouble source item is cut off prematurely, as in (a), (b), (c) and (g), and in others it is completed, as in (d), (e) and (f). In some cases, lexical material preceding the trouble source item is repeated in the repair, as in (a), (d), (e) and (g); and in some cases, the repair is initiated by an ‘editing term’ (Levelt 1983) such as *of‘ or ‘ in (d) and (f) or the hesitation marker *uh in (g). This structural variation plays no role in the analysis presented below, and there is no evidence to suggest it is relevant for prosodic marking (see Plug & Carter 2013).

### 2.2 Prosodic Analysis

All instances of repair in the collection were classified as prosodically marked or unmarked on the basis of auditory analysis. The crucial question in each case was whether the repair solution sounds particularly salient because of its pitch, loudness or tempo, or a combination of the three, relative to the trouble source. Unlike Levelt & Cutler (1983), I allowed for the intermediate classification of ‘possibly marked‘; this was to facilitate the quantitative analysis reported by Plug & Carter (2013). The classification was done by two raters: myself and a Dutch linguist with a research specialism in pragmatics and discourse studies. Neither of us had particular expectations as to which types of repair should or should not be marked at the time of the classification, and the dataset considered at the time contained phonological repairs as well as the lexical replacement repairs considered here. We classified all instances independently in the first instance, reaching the same judgement in 221 cases out of the 247 considered here (89%). We considered the remaining 26 instances in more detail and agreed on
a consensus judgement. For the purpose of the analysis presented below (as well as the analyses reported by Plug 2014a, 2014b), I conflated the categories ‘marked’ and ‘possibly marked’, on the understanding that ‘possibly marked’ indicates the presence of some perceptual correlates of marking. In the binary classification, 74 instances (30%) are prosodically marked and 173 (70%) unmarked. Acoustic phonetic analysis not reported here (but see Plug & Carter 2013, Plug 2014a, 2014b) confirmed that in most cases, the auditory impression of prosodic marking is associated with a substantial upstep in pitch and intensity on the first stressed syllable of the repair item, relative to the trouble source.

2.3 DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

My methodology in investigating the repairs’ discourse context was consistent with that of other recent work on the prosody-discourse interface, such as the contributions to Barth-Weingarten et al. (2009, 2010), in applying the general principles of Interactional Linguistics (Selting & Couper-Kuhlen 2001, Fox et al. 2013). In the first instance, I located each repair in the wider topical and sequential structure of the conversation as a whole, drawing on work in Conversation Analysis (Sacks et al. 1974, Schegloff 2007, Sidnell & Stivers 2013) in identifying relevant units, boundaries and transitions. Further analysis focused on a coherent sequence containing the repair, which I transcribed using conversation-analytic conventions for representing the temporal and prosodic organization of conversational data (see Hepburn & Bolden 2013). If either of the two lexical items involved in the repair was mentioned prior or subsequent to the transcribed sequence, I included notes of these occurrences. In the transcriptions I present below, I have not attempted to reflect pronunciation variation in the orthography. Any special markings are to be interpreted as explained by Ten Have (2007), Sidnell (2010), and others.

I then subject the transcribed sequences to repeated rounds of qualitative analysis. I looked primarily for recurrent discourse features among the subset of prosodically marked repairs, and tried to identify contexts and repair functions described in previous studies (see Kitzinger 2013 for a review). In some cases, the latter proved fruitless: for example, the current collection contains a number of ‘reference recalibration repairs’, in which the precision or scope of a
referring expression is adjusted without a change in the referent (Lerner & Kitzinger 2007, Lerner et al. 2012). However, nothing suggests that relevant subsets of instances are notable in relation to prosodic marking. In what follows, I do not attempt an exhaustive analysis of the discourse environments in which the repairs are embedded, but focus on three environments that appear to be associated with recurrent prosodic marking.

3 ANALYSIS
My analysis suggests that at least three subsets of instances established on discourse-related grounds show quite different proportions of prosodically marked and unmarked repairs than that observed across the collection as a whole — that is, prosodic marking in 30% of instances. As we will see, the subsets are not entirely discrete. In this section, I elaborate on them in turn, under the functional headers of maintaining discourse coherence, maintaining epistemic authority and strengthening and weakening formulations. I will not refer to Levelt & Cutler (1983) and Goffman (1981) here, leaving discussion of the relevance of their accounts to the next section.

3.1 MAINTAINING DISCOURSE COHERENCE
A recurrent feature among prosodically marked repairs, accounting for 16 out of the 74 instances according to my analysis, is that the semantic contrast between the trouble source and repaired lexical items has salience beyond the utterance in which the repair occurs. When this is the case, the repair is a component of the ‘visible, ongoing process of “negotiation” of coherence’ that characterizes spoken interaction (Lenk 1998: 246), as the error or infelicity would leave an utterance that is notably inconsistent with prior or subsequent talk. To illustrate, I first discuss instances of repair in which the contrast between the trouble source and repaired lexical items is not particularly meaningful beyond the utterance in which the repair occurs.

3.1.1 INCONSEQUENTIAL REPAIR
The repairs in Extracts 1 and 2 both fall in the category of repair in which the contrast between the trouble source and repaired lexical items is not obviously meaningful beyond the utterance in which the repair occurs. As we will see, this is not to say that they lack a plausible motivation — that is, they are not necessarily repairs of apparently ‘unblemished formulations’ (Kitzinger
2013: 232). However, they do not address an issue of lexical choice that appears consequential for the listener’s understanding of prior or subsequent utterances, and as such they are perhaps what Kitzinger (2013: 241) has in mind when she asserts that ‘[s]ometimes a repair is just a repair’: they fix a perceived problem with the ongoing utterance, without major implications beyond this. The repairs in Extracts 1 and 2 are both prosodically unmarked.

In Extract 1, two students are discussing their plans for the coming days. B has indicated that he does not want to go out tonight.

Extract 1. Comp a [SPONTANEOUS FACE-TO-FACE] fn000537

1 B: gewoon effe goed slapen en een beetje rustig aan en. just have a good sleep and taking it easy a bit
2 (0.4)
3 mis>>>schie en va van nog heel effe oefenen maar. maybe I’ll go and practice very briefly tonight but
4 (0.7)
5 gewoon effe rustig lopen just a bit of easy running
6 A: [ja yes
7 (0.3)
8 ➔ A: ik heb echt uh super gsp- stijve= I’ve got er super tens- stiff
9 B: [niet not
10 A: =kuiten hier.= calves here
11 B: =ja?: yes?
12 A: =da’s echt he lemaal niet to:f want. that’s really not fun at all because
13 B: nee. no
14 (0.8)
15 A: ik bedoel: gewoon: (0.2) als ik van m’n knie: last had I mean just, when I had trouble with my knee
16 ja was ‘t na twee da:gen o:ver maar dit well it would be gone after two days, but this
17 heb ik nou al sinds di:nsdag. dus= I’ve had since Tuesday already, so
A’s repair in l. 8, which (in all likelihood) replaces gespannen ‘tense’ with stijve ‘stiff’, is embedded in a topic nominating turn, or ‘news announcement’ (Button & Casey 1984, 1985). The new topic of A’s injury is touched off by B’s account of his plans for tonight, which include football practice (oefenen ‘practice’, l. 3). B provides a go-ahead response (l. 11) and advises A on treatment (l. 18). In subsequent turns not shown here, A elaborates on how he sustained the injury. A undoubtedly corrects gespannen for a reason, and stijve is arguably more clearly indicative of injury, as gespannen could be interpreted as ‘flexed’. However, the precise details of A’s injury are not further addressed, so that the semantic contrast between gespannen and stijve has little salience in the wider discourse.

In Extract 2, B tells A about a remark by a mutual friend, Marleen, that she considers amusing. It is clear from the audio that the clause in which the repair is embedded, starting ga je nou in l. 1, is B’s attempt at a direct quotation of the remark in question (cf. Holt & Clift 2007).

Extract 2. Comp a [SPONTANEOUS FACE-TO-FACE] fn000391

1 B: en Marleen, .mthh ga je nou met de trein naar Loon Op Zand and Marleen: “do you go to Loon Op Zand by train

2 of met de au- met de bus: hhheh £’k zeg novo: d’r komt geen or by ca-by bus?” ((laughs)) I said “well, there is no

3 trein in [Loon Op Zandf train stop in Loon Op Zand”

4 A: [vanuit ¶TILburg from Tilburg

5 B: ja ((laughing)) en (. ) ja toen zei ze †oh dan komt yes ((laughing)) and, well then she said “oh, then

6 Peter zeker altijd uit ¶Waaiwijk als ik ¶m op ¶t station Peter must always be coming from Waalwijk when I see him at the

7 zie. ((laughing)) ‘k zei nou in Waalwijk komt ook station”, ((laughing)) I said “well, in Waalwijk there’s no

8 geen trein [hoor, train stop either you know”

9 A: [((laughs))

10 B: £zij vond het echt super raar dat er geen ¶trein kwam she really thought it was super-strange that there was no train stop
In this repair (l. 2), B corrects *auto* ‘car’ to *bus* ‘bus’, presumably to provide as faithful a quotation of Marleen’s remark as possible. In semantic terms, *auto* and *bus* seem more clearly distinct than *gespannen* and *stijve*. Nevertheless, it should be clear from the rest of the fragment that again, the semantic difference between *auto* and *bus* is inconsequential beyond the clause in which the repair is embedded: in this case, the focus of B’s telling is on the amusement value of Marleen’s assumption of a *train* stopping in Loon Op Zand, and no further reference is made to any alternative modes of transportation to which she might have referred. The fall in pitch on *bus*, reflected in the transcript, is not hearable as prosodic marking.

### 3.1.2 Consequential repair

Having seen examples of repairs that seem inconsequential beyond the utterance in which they occur, let us now compare Extract 3. This fragment is part of a conversation between a husband and wife. Both work as primary school teachers. Prior to this fragment, A has talked about his time in a particular village, working at a school which only admitted catholic pupils. Much of the fragment revolves around the meaning of *Nutsschool*, which refers to a specific type of school independent of any religious or social movement.

**Extract 3. Comp a [SPONTANEOUS FACE-TO-FACE] fn000272**

1. A: *want je had ook een n::iet-katholieke (1.2) of because you also had a non-catholic, or*

2. *een een N:utsschool a a ‘Nutsschool’*

3. *(0.2)*

4. *dat is [uh that’s er*

5. B: *[NUTS:: school ‘Nutsschool’]*

   ((about 20 turns omitted, focusing first on A’s pronunciation of ‘Nutsschool’, then on a singer with atypical speech patterns))

6. A: *nee maar alle leerlinkjes die waren allemaal katholieke no but, all pupils they were all catholic*

7. *maar je hebt een ;N:utsschool, >ik weet niet wat het i- but there’s a ‘Nutsschool’, I don’t know what it i-“*
In l. 6, speaker A returns to the topic of Nutsschool introduced in lines 1 to 3: notice *nee maar* ‘no but’ signalling a return to prior talk (cf. Mazeland & Huiskes 2001, Lee-Goldman 2011). Following the re-introduction of the notion, A first claims a lack of knowledge as to its meaning (*ik weet niet wat het is* ‘I don’t know what it is’, l. 7), and then asks B whether she knows what it means (l. 8). B’s response is delayed and negative. The repair — produced with prosodic marking, as indicated by the underlining of *protestants* — comes in A’s refinement of the question ‘what is it?’, querying the religious affiliation of this type of school (l. 12). This can be seen as a pursuit of a positive response (see Bolden et al. 2012); however, B’s response (l. 13) reconfirms that she does not have any relevant knowledge to share. In a context where both participants have explicitly expressed a lack of knowledge as to what a Nutsschool is, a choice between ‘catholic’ and ‘protestant’ in querying the school’s religious affiliation would not seem particularly consequential. However, it may be noted that A initially introduces the school as non-catholic (*niet-katholieke*, l. 1). A query as to whether it is a catholic school would clearly be difficult to square with this initial introduction — so A not only fixes the current utterance, but also avoids retrospective doubts on B’s part about the appropriateness of his earlier characterization, in introducing the topic of its identity, of the Nutsschool.

Extract 4 provides a similar example. In this fragment, B is a teacher of Dutch who is quizzed by A on educational issues.
Extract 4. Comp b [SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS] fv400169

1   A: bent u iemand die vindt dat bijvoorbeeld de de leerkracht are you someone who thinks that for example the teacher of
geschiedenis of de leerkracht fysica punten moet aftrekken history or the teacher of physics should deduct points
voor spellingfouten? for spelling errors?

2   (2.0)

5   B: ja: uh ik vind van niet:? ik denk een aantal jaar geleden well er I don’t think so, I think a couple of years ago
dat ‘k zou gevonden hebben van wel, that I would have said yes
((digression on differences between educational levels omitted))

7   ik trek wel punten af natuurlijk, ik vind voor mijn vak I deduct points of course, I think for my subject

8   m:OEt het wel: maar andere vakken niet nood>zakelijk. it must be done, but other subjects not necessarily,

9⇒ ze moeten< wel de pun- de fouten a<nduiden? .hh maar geen they should highlight the poin- errors, but not

10  punten voor aftrekken vind ik. deduct points I think

In this repair (line 9), speaker B replaces punten ‘points’ with fouten ‘errors’. Both lexical items have been mentioned before: see A’s inquiry in lines 1 to 3. Moreover, in B’s response to the inquiry, the relationship between ‘points’ and ‘errors’ is crucial: while the inquiry is designed to prefer a ‘type-conforming’ confirmation that highlighting errors and deducting points should go together (see Raymond 2003), B proposes that they should be dissociated. From the start, her response has features marking its dispreferred status (Pomerantz 1984): for example, it is delayed (line 4) and it is prefaced by ja, which in this context can be glossed ‘well’ (cf. Mazeland 2004: 104). Mixing up punten and fouten later on in the extended turn is likely to lead to a perceived lack of coherence in its design.

The fragments in Extracts 3 and 4, and most of fragments like them in my collection, have in common that the repair addresses an issue of lexical choice whose salience has already been established. Interestingly, my collection also contains several examples of prosodically marked repairs involving a lexical contrast whose salience becomes clear in subsequent
discourse. In these, it is not beyond question that the speaker’s choice for prosodic marking is in response to this, as yet covert, salience — but this is at least one possible account. Extract 5 provides one example. In this fragment, A is telling B about recent developments in the amateur orchestra he plays in. *Gerrie* (l. 1) is one of several trainee conductors who work with the orchestra, each of whom has selected a piece to rehearse.

**Extract 5. Comp a [SPONTANEOUS FACE-TO-FACE] fn400343**

1  A: Gerrie die heeft st- de de de moeilijkste stukken
   *Gerrie has pie- the the the most difficult pieces*
   2  eigenlijk. en uh kun je ook wel aan d’r zien
   *really and uh you can see it in her,*
   3  ze kan ’t heel moeilijk dirigeren
   *she has real difficulty in conducting it*
   4  B: wa- [welke is dat dan?] so wha- which is it?
   5  A: [kan ze kon ’t ook niet UItleggen] .hh da’s de::
      *she can also couldn’t explain it well, that’s*
   6  → Sonata Nummer Zes, uh N- Nummer *DrIE* van REUser
      *Sonata Number Six er N- Number Three by Reuser,*
   7  .hh w[at we ooit in Obrecht hebben gespeel[d.
      *the one we once played in Obrecht*
   8  B: [ja: ]  [hja hja]
      *yes yes*
      ((eight turns omitted, focusing on the difficulties in learning the selected piece))
   9  B: Reuser heeft ook *pr:a:chtige muziek geschreven.*
      *Reuser has also written wonderful music*
   10 A: [ja maar dan ]
      *yes but then*
   11 B: moet je< de S- Sonata Nummer *2es nemen die is*
      *you should take S- Sonata Number Six, that’s*
   12 h[a:rtstikke mooi ]>die [is veel mooier.<
      *extremely beautiful that’s much nicer*
   13 B: [ja ]  [ja]
      *yes yes*

In the first turn, A asserts that Gerrie has selected a very difficult piece (l. 1), and is having trouble conducting it (lines 2-3). B inquires as to the identity of the piece (l. 4), and A’s prosodically marked repair (l. 6) comes in his response to this inquiry: he initially goes for
Reuser’s ‘Sonata Number Six’, and corrects it to ‘Sonata Number Three’. Neither sonata has been alluded to before, and the contrast between the two pieces has played no role in the talk up to the repair. If we ignored the following discourse context, we could reasonably assume that speaker A has made a random number substitution error. In accounting for the prosodic marking of Drie, we might observe that B’s inquiry in 1.4 makes relevant a certain degree of precision in describing the piece of music in question (cf. Drew 2003), and B’s displays of recognition (l. 8) suggest she might have been informed enough to recognise A’s error.

However, a look at the following discourse reveals that in addition, the trouble source Sonata Nummer Zes returns later on in the sequence, in A’s indirect recommendation (dan moet je de Sonata Nummer Zes nemen ‘then you should take Sonata Number Six’, lines 11-12) and assertion of preference over Gerrie’s choice (die is veel mooier ‘that’s much nicer’, l. 13). This casts doubt on the characterisation of A’s error in 1.6 as a random number substitution error, allowing for at least two analyses. First, we might consider A’s overt comparison of the two sonatas (lines 11-12) to be occasioned entirely by B’s assessment of Reuser’s music in line 10. In this analysis, A’s comparison can be treated as a post hoc account of his earlier error, but the design of the error’s repair could not have been informed by A’s ‘looking ahead’ to subsequent interactional moves, and the error itself is not explained by these moves either. Alternatively, we might consider A’s comparison of the two sonatas, and suggestion of the sonata Gerrie should have chosen to conduct, part of his plan for this interactional sequence. In this analysis, the incipient salience of the contrast between the two sonatas may be taken to explain both why A substitutes one for the other in the first place, and why he might choose to produce the error’s repair with prosodic marking. Clearly, the latter analysis is appealing in the context of this study, and there is certainly evidence from a range of discourse studies that suggests that participants can operate with substantial ‘look-ahead’: for example, in designing ‘pre-sequences’ to test possible contingencies of subsequent turns (e.g. Schegloff 2007), in formulating person references in story-telling to suit subsequent narrative developments (e.g. Shiffrin 2006), or in constructing responses to questioning based on projections of where this questioning might lead (e.g. Nofsinger 1983, Penman 1991). Still, the first analysis cannot be ruled out. Ultimately, the choice
between the two analyses may rest on the plausibility of A having arrived at his recommendation even if B’s assessment had been absent — and this is difficult to evaluate.

### 3.1.3 ADDITIONAL OBSERVATION

At this point it is worth highlighting that while in the instances of repair illustrated in Extracts 3 to 5, the semantic contrast addressed through the repair is a salient one in the wider discourse, this does not necessarily mean that both the trouble source and the repaired lexical choice have been mentioned in the talk leading up to the repair. Interestingly, the collection contains two examples in which the semantic contrast involved is clearly salient in the wider discourse, and both lexical choices have already featured in prior talk — but prosodic marking is absent. What sets these examples apart from those discussed above is that the lexical contrast around which the repair revolves is explicitly addressed in one or more previous turns. Extract 6 is one of the examples. A and B are partners on a waiting list for new accommodation, discussing their holiday plans.

Extract 6. Comp a [SPONTANEOUS FACE-TO-FACE] fn007856

```
1 A: ligt er maar net aan of we een huis krijgen of niet.  
   depends whether we get a house or not
2   (0.2)
3   als dat nou a- als we een huis krijgen dan uh:  
   if that, i- if we get a house then er
4   ga ik niet op vakantie.  
   I'm not going on holiday
5 B: appartement.  
   apartment
6 A: dan ga ik lekker ’t huuske opknappen.  
   then I’m just going to do up the little house
7   (0.5)
8 B: huis. (0.4) we krijgen een appartement.  
   house, we’ll get an apartment
9   we krijgen echt niet meteen een huis.  
   we’re really not getting a house right away

((noise and subsequent apology by third participant omitted))

10 A: een appartement IS een huis.  
   an apartment IS a house
11   (0.4)
```
In lines 1 and 3, A refers to their future accommodation as a *huis* (‘house’). B corrects his lexical choice to *appartement* (‘apartment’) in l. 5, in a straightforward example of other-initiated other-repair (Schegloff et al. 1977). After A fails to acknowledge B’s correction (*huuske*, l. 6, is a colloquial diminutive of *huis*), B elaborates on the correction, stating that the accommodation they can expect will most likely qualify as an apartment, not a house. In response, A topicalizes the relationship between the two notions by asserting his understanding that an apartment is a type of house (l. 11). The repair comes in B’s subsequent account of her understanding of what *huis* refers to: initially she goes for *appartement*. Clearly, the semantic relationship between *huis* and *appartement* is highly salient in the immediate discourse context: it is, in fact, the current topic of discussion at the time of the repair. Unlike in the examples described above, here the speakers have already gone back and forth between the two terms more than once, and both have explicitly addressed their semantic relationship. It is perhaps this ‘givenness’ of the semantic contrast around which the repair revolves that helps account for its production without prosodic marking.

### 3.2 Maintaining Epistemic Authority

Turning to the second subset of instances of interest here, a context in which marking is also notably prevalent is that in which the speaker has presented him- or herself as a particular expert on the current topic — or claimed particular ‘epistemic expertise’ (Stivers & Rossano 2010, Heritage 2012). While issues of epistemic authority have been shown to inform various types of repair (see Bolden 2011, 2013, Kitzinger & Mandelbaum 2013, Romaniuk & Ehrlich 2013), and the finding that prosody is manipulated systematically in managing epistemic stance is not a new one either (e.g. Aijmer 1997, Dehé & Wichmann 2010, Heritage 2013, Roseano et al. 2014), the discourse context and repair function alluded to above have not, to my knowledge,
received detailed attention. My analysis suggests that among the 74 instances of repair classified as prosodically marked, 11 fit the description of being uttered by a speaker who has presented him- or herself as a particular expert on the current topic; among the 173 instances classified as unmarked, none clearly do. While some of these instances address salient lexical distinctions, and could therefore be taken to illustrate maintaining discourse coherence, not all do. The speakers’ methods of presenting themselves as experts varies, but in all cases there is evidence that, in the terminology of Heritage (2012: 4), the speaker has assumed a position on the ‘epistemic gradient’ at the ‘more knowledgeable’ end.

To illustrate, I start with a fragment that is very similar to those illustrating the repair function maintaining discourse coherence. Extract 7 is part of a discussion between two friends about hiking. Much of the discussion involves B asking A, a seasoned hiker, about her personal experiences.

Extract 7. Comp a [SPONTANEOUS FACE-TO-FACE] fv400743

1 A: ik uh .hh ik raad in feite voor elke w- wandeling die meer
   I er, I basically recommend for any walk that is more
2 dan dan .hhh uh tien kilometer lang is, raad ik altijd van
   than, than, er ten kilometers, I recommend
3 dat goeie schoeisel aan.
   that good footwear
4 B: ja:, yes
5 A: alleen het feit dat die echte wandelschoenen zodanig zijn dat
   just the fact that those real hiking boots are such that
6 uw voet .hh goed balanceert,
   your foot, is well balanced
7 (1.8)
8 en (dat dan) toch wel
   and that then therefore
9 (0.7)
10 een groot gedeelte van de ver;moedens [opvangt da’s [mijn=]
   carries a large part of the fatigue, that’s my
11 [mmm] [mmm
12 B: =ondervin[ding toch
   experience I must say
13 A: [ja:
In lines 1 to 3, A offers a recommendation regarding appropriate footwear for longer hikes. A’s recommendation and account contain two references to the preferred footwear: dat goeie schoeisel ‘that good footwear’ (I. 3) and die echte wandelschoenen ‘those real hiking boots’ (l. 5). Following receipt, but apparent non-uptake by B (lines 13-15), A illustrates her recommendation with reference to the shoes she is currently wearing (lines 16-20). Her point is, of course, that these shoes do not meet the requirements for use on longer hikes: eigenlijk ‘actually’ (l. 17) hints at this interpretation before any concrete description of the shoes in question (cf. Clift 2001), and daar zou ik toch niet aan denken ‘I wouldn’t think about it’ (lines 18-20) makes it explicit. The repair involves the lexical label attached to the shoes: initially A goes for wandelschoenen ‘hiking boots’ but corrects this — with prosodic marking — to sportschoenen ‘sports shoes’. The motivation for A’s repair seems clear: having used the term wandelschoenen to describe the recommended footwear, using it again to describe footwear that is not recommended is likely to lead to a perceived lack of coherence between recommendation and illustration. As such, the fragment appears very similar to those in Extracts 3 and 4, and the label maintaining discourse coherence would seem appropriate for this repair.
However, a notable feature of the discourse context in Extract 7 is that speaker A explicitly claims particular expertise on the topic at hand. First, she formulates her recommendation for appropriate footwear to suggest that she habitually offers advice on these matters (*altijd* ‘always’, l. 2); second, her subsequent account (lines 5-12) refers to first-hand, personal experience (*da’s mijn ondervinding* ‘that’s my experience’, lines 10-12). Thus, A lays claim to a substantial ‘epistemic advantage’ over B (Heritage 2012: 4), who assumes the recipient role throughout the fragment. Similar features can be recognized in fragments in which it is not obvious that the lexical contrast introduced by the repair has particular discourse salience — that is, in which the speaker corrects a seemingly peripheral detail in talk on a topic for which they have claimed particular expertise. Extract 8 is a representative example. It is part of a discussion between two friends on political systems. Prior to this fragment, A has contributed the observation that some leaders of Soviet communism seemed to live rather stylish lives. The fragment constitutes B’s response to this observation.

**Extract 8. Comp a [SPONTANEOUS FACE-TO-FACE] fv400543**

1  B:  ja _da’s_ een _beetje_ ‘t _pro_{bleem_ ook van_ yes that’s pretty much the problem of,

2  (0.5) _de_ top was _eigenlijk aristocratisch,_ the leadership was really aristocratic

3  _van:: [(…) communistische:= of, communist

4  A:  _[ja_ yes

5  B:  =_communistische za_– _ja_ _ja_ , ‘t was _eigenlijk_ communist ... well, it was really

6  _ge_{woon een een reactie tegenover de tsaar? just a, a reaction against the czar

7  (0.7)

8  A:  _ja_ yes

9  (0.6)

10 B:  _van de:: (0.6) bolsjewieken? _[en de bolsjewieken= of the, Bolsheviks and the Bolsheviks

11 A:  _[ja._ yes

12 B:  =_dat was_ was een _verschil_ tussen de _;mensjewieken en de
that was, was a difference between the Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks.

B: en de mensjewieken waren meer (0.7) meer uh:mm (0.3) 
more, more ern

Marxisten? (0.7) die (waren) niet echt zo radicaal: Marxists, they were not really all that radicaal

A: [ja:
yes

B: [maar zij waren eerder voor een democratische vorm=
they were more in favour of a democratic form

B: =van socialisten, .hhh en de bolsjewieken waren zo- een
of socialists, and the Bolsheviks were an
aristocratische meerderheid, (0.4) en dan
aristocratic majority, and then

daaronder iedereen gelijk voor uh:
then everyone below that equal for er

A: ja.
yes

B: voor de staat.
for the state

A: ja.
yes

B’s response treats A’s observation as adequate (ja ‘yes’, l. 1), but restatable in more general terms (de top was eigenlijk aristocratisch ‘the leadership was really aristocratic’, lines 1-2), and explainable on historical grounds. In the sequence that follows, there is a clear asymmetry in ‘epistemic stance’ (Heritage 2012) between the participants. A assumes the recipient role, repeatedly using ja ‘yes’ to claim understanding of the explanation that B develops, but passing on the opportunity to display relevant prior knowledge. This is particularly notable in l. 7, where the silences around A’s ja suggest an expectation on B’s part that A should offer a more substantive display of understanding of the point he has just made, and l. 15, where a display of recognition in response to B’s marxisten ‘Marxists’ is noticeably absent. B, by contrast, presents
his explanation as straightforwardly in his domain of expertise, using een beetje ‘pretty much’ (l. 1), eigenlijk ‘actually’ (l. 2) and gewoon ‘just’ (l. 4) to suggest that the arguments that make up his explanation are clear and readily accessible to him. It is in this context that B erroneously labels the Bolsheviks an aristocratic majority, and immediately and prominently repairs the latter to ‘minority’.

3.2.1 ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS

At this point some observations are in order. First, one might argue that in all cases of repair in the current collection, the speaker can be considered to have some degree of epistemic primacy over his or her own words: according to Schegloff et al. (1977) it is this assumed primacy that explains the relative infrequency of other-repair compared with self-repair. What we are looking at in the extracts discussed here, however, is cases in which speakers have more or less directly claimed authority over the topic at hand. Second, the current collection contains 48 repairs taken from radio talk, most of which are produced by speakers who have been invited onto a current affairs programme to provide expert comment on the topic under discussion, or to participate in debate. In addition, 41 instances come from semi-structured interviews with teachers of Dutch, mostly about their work. Many of these repairs correct errors or infelicities that relate to topics that are quite evidently in the speaker’s domain of epistemic expertise.

Some are prosodically marked, and in a few cases, this can be accounted for with reference to the repair functions of maintaining discourse coherence (see Extract 4 above) or strengthening and weakening formulations (see Extracts 13 and 16 below). But most are unmarked, and it can be difficult to discern what motivates speakers’ choices. Compare, for example, Extracts 9 and 10.

In both, the speaker is an invited expert on a radio programme. In Extract 9, an expert on child education elaborates on the position that children do a lot of their education themselves. In Extract 10 an expert on Turkish history addresses the tension between Eastern and Western influences in Turkey.

Extract 9. Comp f [BROADCAST TALK] fn007362

1 A: als ze dat niet ze:lf zou:den doen zouden ze tuurlijk
   if they didn’t do that themselves then of course they

2 ⇒ ook nooit ze:lf hun eigen identifi- (0.3) id:en:ti:tEIt
would never be able to create their own identity,

that’s something you do yourself

Extract 10. Comp f [BROADCAST TALK] fn007365

1...2...3...4

These fragments are notably similar: not only do the repairs occur in the speech of very similar speakers in very similar settings, but they are also structurally and semantically alike. In both, the speaker initially selects a word that is phonologically and morphologically akin to the target word, but semantically inappropriate (identificatie ‘identification’ and fundamentele ‘fundamental’ respectively), and in both cases the speaker cuts off the problematic word in the second half of its production to initiate repair. In both, the point made by the speaker is not particularly central in the wider discourse. Yet, the repair in Extract 9 is produced with prosodic marking; that in Extract 10 is not. It remains to be seen whether future research will reveal patterns in instances like these; for now, I should emphasize that here, unlike in Extracts 7 and 8, the speakers have epistemic authority, but do not explicitly claim it in the sequence leading up to the repair (see Koole 2010, 2012 on this distinction). When they do this explicitly, their repairs are prosodically marked. Extract 11 is a good example of this. In this fragment, B, who trains future teachers of very young children, has been asked by his interviewer A, a literature student, whether there is much scope for incorporating literature into pre-school teaching.

Extract 11. Comp b [SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS] fv400136

1...2...3...4

because, the more I read about it, right?
Of particular interest in this fragment are lines 4 and 6. While B can already lay claim to an epistemic advantage over A by virtue of his profession, and the epistemic asymmetry motivated A’s initiating question in the first place (see Stivers & Rossano 2010), B here asserts that he has particular expertise in the epistemic domain under consideration: *hoe meer ik erover lees* ‘the more I read about it’ highlights the quantity of his research on the matter, and *want ik lees er dus over* ‘because I read about it’ marks this research as notable — that is, potentially beyond his regular professional duties. Through this assertion, B explicitly presents himself as an expert on the topic under discussion, and it may be this epistemic stance that motivates the prosodic marking of his polarity error repair in l. 12.

Finally, it is worth noting that in addition to the fragments illustrated above, the current collection contains three instances of self-repair in a display of understanding of a co-participant’s prior turn, all of which are prosodically marked. Extract 12 is one. B is a theatre actor and director; A is his interviewer. Before this fragment, B has talked about how he deals with linguistic variation in his plays. He has explained that his group has performed in a range of accents and dialects, but that the play he is directing at the moment is written in a very specific dialect (*Antwerps*) which he has decided not to attempt to adopt.
Extract 12. Comp b [SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS] fv400137

1 B: dan kan je beter .hh uh duidelijk maken kijk (. ) dit is: uh then it’s better to make clear, look, this is er

2 mijn jargon dit is mijn dialect uh in plaats my jargon, this is my dialect er, instead

3 van: (0.2) dit is pseudo-Antwerps [want dat= of, this is pseudo-Antwerps because that

4 A: [ja yes

5 B: =dan val je door de mand. then you’ll get caught out

6⇒ A: ja (. ) ja ja: dat zou waarschijnlijk een beetje uh onnauw- yes, yes that would probably seem a bit er imprec-

7⇒ .hh onnatuurlijk uh overkomen hè? naar p- unnatural er, right? to th- to the audience

8 naar het publiek toe, to the audience

In lines 1 to 5, B restates his main point, namely that in this particular case, imitation would lead to a lack of authenticity (pseudo-Antwerps, l. 3) that is likely to be perceived by the audience (dan val je door de mand ‘you’ll get caught out’, l. 5). The figurative expression dan val je door de mand (literally ‘then you fall through the basket’) is summative and closure-implicative (Drew & Holt 1998), and in response, A attempts another reformulation, which will both display understanding of B’s main point, and confirm that sequence closure is appropriate, as no new information is immediately available. The repair (lines 6-7), produced with prosodic marking, addresses a problem in this reformulation.

Heritage (2013) characterizes displays of understanding such as that in Extract 12 as utterances whose speaker is less knowledgeable than the co-participant, but only just: while the co-participant is the source of the information, the speaker of a display of understanding shows that they are ‘with’ the co-participant, as in cases of collaborative completion (Lerner 1996, 2002). Displays of understanding are inherently closure-implicative (Heritage 2013), and they ‘cultivate’ intersubjectivity (Schegloff 1992: 1300) — but only if the understanding expressed in them is appropriately formulated. In the case of Extract 12, A’s first lexical choice, onnauwkeurig ‘imprecise’, does not accurately reflect B’s concern with authenticity; onnatuurlijk ‘unnatural’
clearly does. Moreover, onnauweurig could be interpreted as underestimating B and his actors’ skills in performing dialect material, which B has earlier characterized as considerable. In other words, A’s first lexical choice would suggest that she really has not been listening to B, and would most likely lead to an extension of the sequence. In this context, then, it is of particular interactional importance that speakers present themselves as knowledgeable. Their error or infelicity might call their epistemic status into question, and this may motivate an association with prosodic marking.

3.3 STRENGTHENING AND WEAKENING FORMULATIONS

For the third and final subset of instances of interest here, Kitzinger (2013: 243) points out that self-repair can have two closely related discourse functions, which she describes in terms of ‘[u]pgrading or downgrading the force of the action of a turn’. In particular, repair can occur in utterances which convey a claim, and serve to strengthen it. In these cases, the speaker replaces an initial weaker formulation with a stronger one, as in I won five ti-six times. Of course repair can also serve to weaken a formulation, as in I won six ti-five times: such cases are similar to what Couper-Kuhlen & Thompson (2005) call ‘concessive repair’, although they lack an explicit concession. Given the findings of various studies on prosody and sound patterns in interaction, in particular those on prosodic ‘upgrading’ versus ‘downgrading’ (Curl 2005, Ogden 2006, Couper-Kuhlen 2012, Plug 2014b), it would seem plausible that these two discourse functions are associated with different prosodic profiles. In fact, my analysis suggests that repairs which serve to strengthen the force of the turn’s action and repairs which serve to weaken it are equally frequently prosodically marked — and both are marked more often than repairs without these functions: 12 instances in the current collection clearly fall in these two categories, of which 10 are prosodically marked. It may be noted that while in principle, these repairs could be produced by speakers who have claimed particular epistemic expertise in relation to the current topic, and therefore fit the label maintaining epistemic authority, this is not the case for the examples in my collection. Below, Extracts 13 and 14 illustrate strengthening, and Extracts 15 and 16 weakening.
Extract 13 is part of a radio debate on a political issue. Speaker A represents the party CVP, and has argued that his party should have primary decision power on the issue at hand.

Extract 13. Comp f [BROADCAST TALK] fv600225.31

1 A: trouwens als CVP (0.5) [wij zijn nog= by the way as CVP, we are still

2 B: mm

3 A: altijd de sterkste partij in België, we hebben .hhh the strongest party in Belgium, we have,

4 we hebben *vierenzes-* >: zEsenzestig< parlementsleden, *we have sixty-f* sixty-six members of parliament

5 (0.7)

6 de: VLD

the VLD

7 B: u moet even even goed kijken hè? want [uh you have to look carefully, because er

8 A: 

9 in [totaal, dat mag ne KEER GEZEGD [WORden in total, it’s worth saying this for once

10 B: [‘t is ‘t is wat MINder it’s, it’s become

11 geworden [natuurlijk hè less of course, hasn’t it

12 A: [nee daarjust (0.3) ging het over de CVP, >we no just now, we were talking about the CVP, we

13 zijn nog altijd< (.): nee !NE we zijn met ZESenzestig are still, no no we’ve got sixty-six

14 parlementsleden, .hh als men kamer, senaat, (0.7) uh members of parliament, when you take chamber, senate, er

15 Vlaams parlement neemt en Brussel, Flemish parliament and Brussels

In this fragment, A puts forward the claim that his party is the strongest in Belgium (l. 3). He backs this claim up with a calculation of the number of parliamentarians belonging to his party (l.4), and the repair occurs as part of this calculation: A initially goes for *vierenzes* ‘sixty-four’, and corrects this to *zesenzestig* ‘sixty-six’ — with a prosodically marked repair. The higher number evidently upgrades A’s claim regarding his party’s majority. A himself presents the
number as notable (dat mag ne keer gezegd worden ‘it’s worth saying this for once’, l. 9); his co-participant first expresses difficulty accepting it (u moet even goed kijken ‘you have to look carefully’, l.7) and then contests it (het is wat minder geworden ‘it’s become a bit less’, lines 10-11); and A’s calculation turns out to depend on an unusual inclusion of members of senate and European Parliament (lines 14-15). A, then, makes a concerted effort to make his party’s majority seem as large as possible, and the repair’s direction — less replaced with more — fits with this overall strategy.

Extract 14 is part of a wider sequence in which A provides B with highly negative feedback on a book manuscript that B has written and asked A to read. The book is an introduction to the psychology of perception. Before this fragment, A has already indicated, in a sequence of increasingly negative assessments, that he was disappointed by B’s book, that he did not enjoy reading it and that he did not find it very informative.

Extract 14. Comp a [SPONTANEOUS FACE-TO-FACE] fn007877.44

1 A: [ja en ik heb geen bladzijde overgeslagen maar die neiging was and I haven’t skipped a page, but that inclination was]

d’r dan wel. ik denk nou dan gaan we maar ‘ns door tot ik there, I was thinking well, let’s continue until I

3 wel iets íe leukst tegenkom maar [goed=] do spot something entertaining, but anyway

4 B: [ja]

5 A: =nee: misschien dat er nog net in de volgende no maybe just the next

6 regel [weer iets íe leukst staa[t line may have something good in it

7 B: [mmm][mmm]

8 (0.8) [mmm]

9➔ A: (...) voorbeeld íja: kijk uh:: dat (0.5) bijna afgekloven example, well look er, that almost gnawed off

10➔ voorbeeld of vol:ledig afgekloven voorbeeld van Freud uh::: example or completely gnawed off example of Freud er

11 met die naakte juffrouw op z’n neus:, .hhhhh dat gebruik je with that naked lady on his nose, you use that

12 en dan denk ik íja je kunt- íIJ kunt toch vast wel iets and then I think well, you can, surely YOU can
In lines 1 to 6, A formulates a thinly veiled complaint directed at B: he had read the entire manuscript because B had asked him to, but the poor quality of B’s writing had made this task very difficult. He then provides an example (voorbeeld, l. 9) of B’s unengaging writing; B’s discussion of an ambiguous image known from Freud’s work. A considers this image old material not fit for a new book (jij kunt toch vast wel iets nieuws verzinnen ‘surely you can think of something new’, lines 12-13), and uses the adjective afgekloven ‘gnawed off’, meaning ‘done to death’, to describe it (lines 9-10). The repair concerns the modifier for this adjective: initially A goes for bijna ‘almost’, but replaces this with the stronger volledig ‘completely’. Through the repair, A works towards the strongest possible formulation of his sense that the Freud image no longer constitutes engaging material for a book such as B’s.

Turning to examples of repair serving to weaken formulations, in the case of Extract 15, two students are discussing essay writing. Before this fragment, A has claimed that he has never handed in an essay that he considered unfinished. In response, B has indicated that he often does, because he cannot find the right ways of expressing his ideas, and is therefore left with holes in his arguments.

Extract 15. Comp a [SPONTANEOUS FACE-TO-FACE] fn000435.46

1 ➔ A: †nee: daar heb ik (.) nooit of ¡ZELden in ieder geval
no I never, or at least seldom have

2 proble_ men mee. (0.9) >en als ik iets niet heb dan weet
problems with that, and when I don’t have something then I

3 ik daar over ‘t algemeen wel een aardig originele<
generally manage to put a pretty original

4 †draa:i aan te geven.
spin on that

In his response, A is initially consistent with his earlier categorical claim of ‘no trouble in this area’: his initial plan appears to be for nee daar heb ik nooit problemen mee ‘no I never have problems with that’ (lines 1-2). However, he downgrades the force of this denial of common ground with B by replacing nooit ‘never’ with zelden ‘rarely’. A’s subsequent formulation is
reminiscent of the repairs of exaggerations analysed by Drew (2003, 2005). As in the cases described by Drew, A may be seen to admit that he has previously overstated the case: *en als ik iets niet heb* ‘and when I don’t have something’ entails that there *have* been occasions when his essays have not been complete. However, A also maintains the ‘essential correctness’ (Drew 2003: 934) of his claim: on those occasions, the incompleteness was unproblematic — if not beneficial, generating creative solutions (*dan weet ik daar over het algemeen wel een aardig originele draai aan te geven* ‘then I generally manage to put a pretty original spin on that’), lines 2-4).

Extract 16 is part of a radio interview with A, a linguist who has just published a book on Dutch dialects. The interview takes place on a day in which the news is dominated by reports of great human suffering from the war in Yugoslavia, and the interviewer has questioned the morality of talking about anything else. A has indicated that she is in fact preparing a book on language and national identity, and has done research on Yugoslavia.

Extract 16. Comp f [BROADCAST TALK] fn007364.31

1 A: *en uh door ’t lezen over hoe mensen denken over hun taal en* and er through reading about how people think about their language and

2 *over .hh uh d- hoe de cultuur .h in ’t ene land (. is .)* about, er th- how the culture in one country, has,

3 *uh geweest, (. ) uh >ten opzichte van ’t ander en de* er, been, er in comparison with the other, and the

4 *verschillen< (0.2) en ook wel de overeenkomsten, .hh kun je* differences, and also the similarities, you can

5 *ook meer begrijpen in ieder geval wat er nu daar >speelt* understand more in any case of what is going on there,

6 ➔ *h dus op die manier, denk i- of >hOOp ik dat je een klein* so in that way I think- or I hope that one can make a small

7 *steentje bij kunt dragen, .hh >in ieder geval< aan begrip* contribution, in any case to understanding

In this fragment, A highlights the relevance of her work in analysing the current situation. In lines 4 to 7 she formulates this in terms of her contribution to creating understanding. The repair adjusts the level of certainty she attaches to her argument — or ‘restricts its epistemic status’ (Romaniuk & Ehrlich 2013): her initial formulation presents it as a matter of opinion
(denk ik ‘I think’), while the correction turns it into a matter of wishful thinking (hoop ik ‘I hope’). Here there is nothing to mark A’s initial formulation as an exaggeration, or subsequently maintain its essential correctness; rather, the repair here seems part of a wider effort on A’s part to present her argument in modest terms: notice meer begrijpen ‘understand more’ (l. 5), with which A avoids suggesting that her research leads to a comprehensive, or even a good understanding of the situation; her use of klein (l. 6), which highlights the small size of her proposed contribution to understanding; and her repeated use of in ieder geval ‘in any case’ (lines 5 and 7), suggesting that creating understanding in itself is only a minor component of addressing the situation.

To summarize, the instances of repair illustrated in Extracts 13 and 14 involve lexical ‘upgrading’ (Pomerantz 1984, Kitzinger 2013), in some case along with other features of extreme case formulation (Pomerantz 1986, Edwards 2000), and those illustrated in Extracts 15 and 16 involve lexical ‘downgrading’, in some cases along with other features of mitigation (Pomerantz 1984). Nevertheless, the prosody of these repairs does not reflect this difference — unlike, for example, in second assessments, in which lexical downgrading is associated with what would seem to be the opposite of prosodic marking (Ogden 2006). Rather, ‘downgrading’ repairs appear equally likely to be prosodically marked as ‘upgrading’ ones, and both types of repair appear to be associated more closely with prosodic marking than repairs in other discourse contexts.

4 DISCUSSION

Having shown that there are indeed discourse contexts or repair functions that are routinely associated with prosodic marking, and having characterized the crucial subsets of instances, I now return to the two hypotheses that motivated this study: first, that the repairs’ information value or discourse salience is relevant in understanding why marking occurs where it does, and second, that marking is associated with contexts in which threats to face and ‘face-saving’ can be observed. While these could be interpreted as competing hypotheses, both find support in the current collection, in that both seem compatible with particular subsets of instances. I first revisit these subsets in turn, and then suggest it may be useful to distinguish subtypes of self-

4.1 Motivations for Prosodic Marking

Instances of repair discussed under the header of maintaining discourse coherence are clearly compatible with Levelt & Cutler (1983) and Levelt’s (1989) ‘listener-oriented’ account of the function of prosodic marking. In these, the speaker fixes a problem with the current utterance that has implications for the listener’s wider comprehension, in that the problem creates a possible contradiction or ambiguity with an utterance already in the discourse, or an utterance that the speaker is heading towards. Prosodic marking therefore highlights a stretch of speech that has a relatively high information value.

Goffman’s (1981) account of prosodic marking appears particularly pertinent to the instances of repair discussed under the header maintaining epistemic authority. It seems reasonable to argue that in cases in which a repair is relevant to a topic at which the speaker has explicitly assumed epistemic authority, the initial erroneous or infelicitous lexical choice is corrected precisely because it cannot be ‘integrated’ into the ‘line’ that the speaker has maintained for him- or herself (Goffman 1967b: 8). Thus, the lexical choice threatens the ‘internal consistency’ of the speaker’s projected self-image, and therefore warrants ‘face-work’ (Goffman 1967b: 6) — whether or not measurable embarrassment is caused (see Heritage & Raymond 2005 and Langrebe 2012 for discussion of links between authority and face). It also seems reasonable to extend this argument to displays of understanding of others’ talk: displays of flawed understanding can be interpreted as displays of incompetence or inattentiveness, which threaten both the speaker’s own face and that of the co-participant whose talk they are responding to (Goffman 1967b: 37). An account of these instances in terms of information value is less convincing: the lexical content of the repairs in this subset is not necessarily crucial for the listener’s wider comprehension. This is, of course, especially clear in cases of understanding displays: by their very nature, these contribute no new information to the discourse at all.

Considerations of face would also seem to be pertinent to the repair function of weakening formulations. In these cases, the appropriateness of the speaker’s projected image is as
much at stake as its internal coherence. As indicated by Goffman (1967b: 37), ‘[b]y saying something, the speaker opens himself up to the possibility that the intended recipients ... will think him forward, foolish, or offensive in what he has said’, and ‘should he meet with such a reception, he will find himself committed to the necessity of taking face-saving action against them’. Seen in this light, correcting a self-perceived overstatement can be understood as a pre-emptive face-saving move, akin to formulating a precautionary concessive clause (Montoliu 2000: 164; see also Barth 2000: 430, Günther 2000: 452). This is interesting given that the observation of marking in repairs that serve to weaken formulations does not tally well with previous findings on lexical and prosodic ‘upgrading’ versus ‘downgrading’: for example, in Ogden’s (2006) study of assessment pairs, second assessments that involve lexical ‘downgrading’ — such as it’s okay offered in response to a co-participant’s it’s nice — tend to be associated with phonetic correlates that do not enhance local prominence, such as low volume and narrow pitch range. Goffman’s (1981) account of prosodic marking thus gives us a handle on an otherwise unexpected observation.

The observation of recurrent prosodic marking in repairs that serve the function of strengthening formulations is arguably most difficult to account for from the perspectives explored here. In these, it is hard to see the information value of the repair item as particularly high, as its core meaning is the same as that of the trouble source item. It also seems hard to see speaker embarrassment as a reasonable response to the initial, relatively moderate phrasing which the repair serves to replace. If the notion of face is at all relevant here, it is in terms of what Goffman (1967b: 24) calls the ‘aggressive use of face-work’. Goffman describes relevant discourse contexts as ones in which there is an element of competition, and ‘the winner not only succeeds in introducing information favorable to himself and unfavorable to the others, but also demonstrates that as interactant he can handle himself better than his adversaries’. It is not difficult to recognize this description in political debates (Extract 14) and extended critiques (Extract 15), but more research is needed to establish whether repairs strengthening formulations do indeed routinely occur in such contexts of adversarial ‘point-scoring’. At the same time, the observation does tally well with previous findings on ‘upgrading’ versus ‘downgrading’: lexical strengthening — for example, a second assessment it’s great offered in
response to a first assessment *it’s nice* — is expected to be accompanied by prosodic prominence (Curl 2005, Ogden 2006, Couper-Kuhlen 2012).

4.2 **SUB-TYPES OF REPLACEMENT REPAIR**

Recall that Levelt & Cutler (1983) report that repairs that can be categorized as ‘error repairs’ are significantly more frequently produced with prosodic marking than those that can be categorized as ‘appropriateness repairs’. Recall also that Plug & Carter (2013) do not find the same pattern in their instances of repair — all of which are included in the current collection — but do find that further dividing error repairs into repairs of factual and linguistic errors yields significant, albeit limited, prediction. A relevant question at this point is how the two sub-types of repair are distributed across the discourse contexts on which we have focused here.

A look across the fragments discussed in this paper confirms that in the three contexts identified as favouring prosodic marking, error repairs outnumber appropriateness repairs. This is particularly obvious for the repair function *maintaining epistemic authority:* what is at stake in these cases is first and foremost the speaker’s command of factual information relevant to the topic at hand. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that when considered out of context, a lexical distinction such as that between *onnauwkeurig* ‘imprecise’ and *onnatuurlijk* ‘unnatural’ (Extract 12) might seem rather subtle compared with, for example, *meerderheid* ‘majority’ versus *minderheid* ‘minority’ (Extract 8), and it is debatable whether *onnatuurlijk* should be considered a more accurate assessment term, or a more appropriate one (cf. Levelt 1983, Kormos 1999 on ‘coherence repair’). What is clear, however, is that it is the most fitting given the prior context. Similar questions are raised by several other instances. The repair in Extract 7 (*wandelschoenen* ‘hiking boots’ versus *sportschoenen* ‘sports shoes’) might be considered an appropriateness repair, on the understanding that hiking is a form of sport. A closer consideration of the context in which these repairs occurs warrants the conclusion that either these should be called error repairs — because for the speakers involved, these are repairs involving consequential lexical contrast — or the error-appropriateness dichotomy is of limited use in categorizing instances of spontaneous self-repair on pragmatic grounds.
Interestingly, the repair functions of strengthening and weakening formulations would seem closely associated with appropriateness repair. The repairs in Extracts 14 (bijna ‘almost’ versus volledig ‘completely’) and 16 (denk ‘think’ versus hoop ‘hope’) are uncontroversial examples of appropriateness repair (see Levelt 1983, Kormos 1999 on ‘appropriate-level repair’). The repair in Extract 15 (nooit ‘never’ versus zelden ‘rarely’) allows the same classification, especially if the speaker’s subsequent insistence on the ‘essential correctness’ of his initial overstatement is taken into consideration. Even the apparently straightforward example of error repair in Extract 13 (vierenzestig ‘sixty-four’ versus zesenzestig ‘sixty-six’) is open to reconsideration given the discourse context: if the speaker’s party really has sixty-six parliamentarians, it would not have been untrue to say that it has sixty-four — and it would probably have been treated as a more appropriate estimate by the co-participants. There is, then, some evidence to suggest that the context-sensitive grouping of instances of self-repair attempted in this study cuts across the ‘semantic’ classification of Levelt & Cutler (1983), as suggested by Plug & Carter (2013).

Unsurprisingly, Goffman (1981) proposes a more functionally-oriented subcategorization of repairs, and with some provisos, his categories provide a useful fit to the findings reported here. In particular, Goffman distinguishes, among other repair types, between ‘slips’ and ‘boners’. According to Goffman (1981: 209), the former ‘are to be seen as a consequence of confused production, accident, carelessness, and one-time muffings’, while the latter are faults which can be taken as ‘evidence of some failure in the intellectual grasp and achievement required within official or otherwise cultivated circles’. For Goffman, boners are primarily errors or infelicities that display ignorance of high culture and associated social norms, and as a rule they do not trigger self-repair: Goffman (1981: 208) describes them as “doesn’t know better” faults, along with ‘faux pas’ and ‘gaffes’. Nevertheless, Goffman’s distinction between one-off processing errors (‘slips’) and errors which reflect on the speaker’s wider competence (‘boners’) would seem pertinent to the current analysis — provided we include under ‘competence’ a speaker’s grasp of the topic at hand, command of salient lexical distinctions, sensitivity to discourse coherence and attentiveness to the co-participant’s talk. While ‘slips’ are faults, they primarily confirm that speech production is imperfect, and constitute little or no threat to face to the individual speaker. ‘Boners’, by contrast, are faults...
requiring face-work (Goffman 1967b: 14) to remedy possible speaker embarrassment (Goffman 1967a: 99). If the analysis reported on here is on the right track, it is repairs of the latter type of fault that are particularly associated with prosodic marking, whether the fault is classifiable as an error or an appropriateness issue.

5 CONCLUDING REMARKS

This paper has reported on an investigation of instances of lexical replacement repair sampled from Dutch spontaneous interaction. The study was induced by the question as to what motivates a speaker to produce a particular instance of self-repair with or without prosodic marking — with or without notable prosodic prominence — and the assumption that a close consideration of the discourse context in which the repair is embedded, and its function in that context, should be helpful in addressing this question. In conclusion, I should reiterate that the analysis presented here has not yielded an exhaustive classification of all instances of repair in the collection, and as such leaves many individual speakers’ choices for or against marking, in contexts other than those described in detail, unexplained. It remains to be seen whether future research will reveal patterns in these instances. Nevertheless, I hope to have shown that a close consideration of discourse context is informative in understanding the distribution of prosodically marked repairs, and in assessing with an appropriate degree of rigour the empirical grounds for what otherwise might seem little more than common-sense notions of what marking is for. In particular, given the observed contexts that favour prosodic marking, Goffman’s (1981) appeal to potential speaker embarrassment in explaining variation in repair prosody has a clear empirical basis, and his related identification of sub-types of repair is informative: in very general terms, the analysis presented here suggests that a speaker’s decision for or against prosodic marking is at least partly motivated by his or her estimation of whether the trouble source constitutes a ‘slip’, or can be perceived as a ‘boner’. Together with Levelt & Cutler’s (1983) distinction between ‘error’ and ‘appropriateness’ repairs, supplemented with Plug & Carter’s (2013) further subdivision among error repairs, this more context-sensitive distinction, taking in considerations of epistemic authority, precision and exaggeration, and
discourse coherence, provides us with a firmer analytical handle on the phenomenon of prosodic marking in self-repair.
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