Article:
Kendrick, Kobin H. (2015) Other-initiated repair in English. Open Linguistics. pp. 164-190. ISSN: 2300-9969

Open Linguistics 2015; 1: 164–190 DE GRUYTER OPEN

Research Article **Open Access**

Kobin H. Kendrick

Other-initiated repair in English

Abstract: The practices of other-initiation of repair provide speakers with a set of solutions to one of the most basic problems in conversation: troubles of speaking, hearing, and understanding. Based on a collection of 227 cases systematically identified in a corpus of English conversation, this article describes the formats and practices of other-initiations of repair attested in the corpus and reports their quantitative distribution. In addition to straight other-initiations of repair, the identification of all possible cases also yielded a substantial proportion in which speakers use other-initiations to perform other actions, including non-serious actions, such as jokes and teases, preliminaries to dispreferred responses, and displays of surprise and disbelief. A distinction is made between other-initiations that perform additional actions concurrently and those that formally resemble straight other-initiations but analyzably do not initiate repair as an action.

Keywords: other-initiated repair; action formation; conversation analysis

DOI 10.2478/opli-2014-0009
Received October 6, 2014; accepted November 24, 2014;

1 Introduction

Nowhere has other-initiated repair been studied more than in English conversation. For more than 35 years, since the landmark study by Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977), conversation analysts have scrupulously documented the practices that speakers of English use to resolve troubles of speaking, hearing, and understanding (e.g., saying *what?* if one has not heard or understood a prior turn; see Kitzinger, 2013, for a review of the literature). Without ways to recognize and remedy such problems, conversation – and the myriad social activities accomplished in and through conversation – would break down under the weight of mishearings, misunderstandings, and conflicts (Schegloff, 1992). Although the body of work on other-initiated repair in other languages and cultures is substantial (see Dingemanse and Enfield, this issue) and grows even more so with the articles in this special issue, the literature on other-initiated repair in English is unparalleled in both its breadth and its depth.[1]

How, then, can one add to this wealth of knowledge? In his reflections on quantification in conversation-analytic research, Schegloff (1993) considered whether one could apply quantitative methods to the study of other-initiated repair. He concluded that indeed one *could*, but whether or not one *should* remained unclear to him. What, he asked, would be the distinctive payoffs? The current study, the first quantitative survey of the practices of other-initiation of repair in English, is addressed to this very question.[2] The payoffs of this

1 This article refers to the literature on other-initiated repair in English, with few exceptions. See Kitzinger (2013), Dingemanse and Enfield (this issue), and the articles in this special issue for references to research on other-initiated repair in other languages.
2 To survey a domain is to take a comprehensive view of it, as one would survey a tract of land to determine its occupants and boundaries. This is not the first study of other-initiated repair to use quantification. Quantification has been used by Zahn (1984), Robinson (2006), and even Schegloff himself (2000, p. 211), among others, to answer specific questions about other-initiated repair, but not to describe the full set of practices observed in a corpus.

Article note: Part of a special issue on other-initiated repair across languages, edited by Mark Dingemanse and N. J. Enfield.

***Corresponding author: Kobin H. Kendrick:** Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, P.O. Box 310, 6500 AH Nijmegen, The Netherlands, E-mail: kobin.kendrick@mpi.nl

approach, it will be seen, are answers to some basic questions, such as the following.

- What is the complete inventory of practices for other-initiation of repair in English? While the literature has identified and described numerous practices for other-initiation of repair, no attempt has been made to produce such an inventory for a given corpus of recordings.
- What are the most frequent practices for other-initiation of repair? Given that other-initiations of repair that specifically locate sources of trouble are preferred in English over those that do not (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 369), a question that arises is whether the frequency of the practices reflects this preference.
- How does one define the boundary between genuine other-initiations of repair and secondary uses of the practices? Research has shown that speakers can use practices for other-initiation of repair to perform other actions, such as displaying one's surprise or disbelief (Selting, 1988; Wilkinson and Kitzinger, 2006). But for the answers to the preceding questions to have value, a clear line must be drawn.

The goals of the study are thus threefold: (i) to describe the complete set of practices that speakers of English use for the other-initiation of repair (OIR) within a corpus of video-recorded conversations; (ii) to summarize the quantitative distribution of the practices within the corpus; and (iii) to examine the actions that speakers use these practices to perform in addition to initiating repair. After a discussion of the corpus and the identification of OIRs (Section 2) and a review of the basic structure and composition of OIR sequences (Section 3), the article considers each of these goals in turn. Section 4 describes and exemplifies the practices of OIR identified in the corpus, the quantitative distribution of which are reported in Section 5, and Section 6 examines the boundary between genuine OIRs and a class of cases that formally resemble OIRs but do not perform other-initiation of repair as an action.[3]

2 The corpus and collection

The data for this study come from video recordings of informal social interaction between speakers of English from the U.K. and U.S. The corpus consists of 15 recordings with a total duration of 411 minutes. The majority of the video recordings used for this study were made by Giovanni Rossi in the U.K. in 2011 on behalf of Nick Enfield's Human Sociality and Systems of Language Use group. Informed consent was obtained from all participants. In addition, the study also used a video recording of a family mealtime conversation entitled *Virginia*. See Dingemanse and Enfield (this issue) for a detailed discussion of the method of data collection and sampling. All instances of other-initiation of repair were systematically identified and analyzed in two phases (see Schegloff, 1996a). First, a broad collection was assembled that included not only clear cases of OIR but also many equivocal cases (n=278). Second, a series of systematic exclusions were made, based on previous research on OIR in English and formal criteria from the comparative study (see Dingemanse, Kendrick, and Enfield, this issue), to arrive at a core collection of other-initiations of repair (n=227).

The core collection systematically excluded cases in which speakers use practices of other-initiation of repair to perform actions *other than* repair initiation (see, e.g., Schegloff, 1997). The question of the actions that OIRs perform and the boundary between genuine OIRs, which were included in the collection, and a class of pseudo OIRs, which were excluded, will be taken up in detail in Section 6. In brief, the core collection included only cases that recipients treated as possibly genuine other-initiations of repair through the provision of a repair solution (see Dingemanse and Enfield, this issue).

A set of cases on the boundary between initiating repair and responding to news was also excluded. This included pro-repeats (e.g., *you did?* or *did you?*), response tokens (e.g., *really?* and *oh really?*), and ritualized expressions of disbelief (e.g., *are you serious?*). While some researchers have included these in studies of repair (see, e.g., Schegloff, 2000, p. 223; Wilkinson and Kitzinger, 2006, p. 169; Schegloff, 2007, p. 155), they have been excluded from the current study on the grounds that they tacitly claim to have

3 The abbreviation OIR is used throughout this article to refer to other-initiation of repair, the turn through which an other-than-speaker of the trouble source initiates a repair procedure. The plural form OIRs refers to a multiple of such turns. Within this special issue, the term other-initiated repair is used to refer to the general phenomenon.

heard and understood the prior turn, even though they may display one's doubt or disbelief towards it. The decision to exclude such cases was made within the context of a comparative study of OIR across cultures (see Dingemanse and Enfield, this issue), in which English was but one language among many. To date no systematic investigation of the complex relationship between such practices and the domain of repair has been conducted. Further research is needed to clarify this relationship.

Finally, the core collection also excluded repeats with final-rising intonation that function as answer prefaces (Schegloff, 1997; Bolden, 2009), other-initiations of repair in reported speech (e.g., *I was like, excuse me*), and laughter-infused repeats that formally resemble other-initiations but do joke appreciation (Jefferson, 1972).

3 The structure of OIR sequences

In research on conversational repair, a distinction is made between one who identifies a trouble and initiates a repair procedure and one who provides a possible solution to the trouble (Schegloff et al., 1977). A self-initiation of repair is one in which a speaker identifies a trouble in his or her own talk and initiates a repair procedure to resolve it (e.g., replacing an incorrect word with a correct one). In contrast, an other-initiation of repair, the focus of the current study, is one in which someone *other* than the speaker of the trouble identifies it and initiates a repair procedure. The practices of other-initiation of repair locate the source of trouble in a prior turn (e.g., pinpointing a specific word) and in some cases also characterize the type of trouble (e.g., as one of hearing or understanding). Although all practices of other-initiation locate a trouble source to some extent, with the maximum generality of scope being a turn-constructional unit as a whole (Robinson, 2014), not all practices characterize the trouble type, leaving this for the speaker of the trouble source to determine (Drew, 1997; Benjamin, 2013).

3.1 Minimal OIR sequences

A minimal OIR sequence includes three turns: a turn that contains a trouble source (the trouble-source turn), a turn that locates the trouble source and initiates a repair procedure (the other-initiation of repair), and a turn that resolves the trouble (the repair solution).

Extract 1 : RCE06 22:00

1	Jes:	Josh, were you drunk last night?	T-1
2 ->	Jos:	What?	T0
3	Jes:	Were you drunk last nigh[t?	T+1
4	Jos:	[Yeah.	

In Extract 1, after Josh apparently fails to hear Jessica's question, he initiates repair with *what?*, locating the prior turn as a trouble source and making relevant a repair solution. Jessica responds with a repeat of the question and thereby resolves the trouble, allowing the sequence to move forward.

3.2 Non-minimal OIR sequences

An expansion of an OIR sequence beyond its minimal form can occur if a repair solution fails to resolve a trouble adequately such that the sequence to which the trouble source belongs cannot move forward. The non-minimal OIR sequence in Extract 2 illustrates three recurrent contingencies that can lead to an expansion of an OIR sequence.

Extract 2: RCE08 UK Housemates I 29:23

1		Jam: Right, when are you ready?	T-1
2		(1.1)	
3	->	Ker: Ready for what?	T0
4		(0.9)	
5		Jam: To do the boost.	T+1/T-1
6		(0.7)	
7	->	Ker: What boost.	T0
8		(1.1)	
9		Jam: Out the room.	T+1/T-1
10		(0.8)	
11		Ker: ↑Ah >in about five minutes.<	
12		(0.2)	
13	->	Ben: What room.	T0
14		(0.8)	
15		Jam: This room.	T+1
16		(0.5)	
17	->	Ben: Boost? What's a boost.	T0
18		(0.8)	
19		Jam: Do the boost.	T+1/T-1
20		(0.2)	
21	->	Ben: I don't understand.	T0
22		(1.0)	
23		Jam: Leave.	T+1
24		(2.8)	
25		Ben: Whenever we're ready.	

First, the repair solution for one OIR can become the trouble source for a next OIR, a phenomenon referred to as cascading troubles by Lerner, Kitzinger, and Raymond (2009) in the domain of self-initiated repair. The repair solution at line 5, for instance, contains the trouble source for the OIR sequence initiated at line 7. Second, if more than two speakers participate in an OIR sequence, multiple other-initiations of repair or multiple repair solutions can occur. Although the repair solution at line 9 apparently resolve the trouble for Kerry, allowing her to respond at line 11 to James's question, the trouble persists for Ben, who reopens the sequence with an other-initiation of repair at line 13. Third, if the repair solution for one OIR fails to resolve the trouble, a speaker can issue additional OIRs until an adequate repair solution is obtained. When the repair solution at line 15 evidently fails to resolve the trouble, Ben initiates an additional OIR sequence at lines 17, one that does not locate the repair solution to the previous sequence as its trouble source. And after one final other-initiation of repair at line 21, also an example of cascading troubles, the trouble is finally resolved, allowing Ben to respond to James's question. Although the inadequacy of the repair solutions in this case appears to be by design, as James repeatedly offers playfully opaque solutions to the troubles, the three contingencies which result in the expansion of the sequence occur across the corpus.

4 The practices of other-initiation of repair

This section presents the practices for other-initiation of repair in English identified in the corpus. The aim is to describe and exemplify as many practices as space allows. To this end, I forgo the rich descriptions that are common in contemporary CA for a more minimal presentation of the data.

4.1 Open

An open other-initiation of repair indicates that the speaker has identified a trouble in the prior turn, but it does not localize the trouble to a specific turn component (e.g., to a particular word), nor does it characterize the type of the trouble (e.g., as one of hearing) (Drew, 1997; Benjamin, 2013). Research on the use of open OIRs to identify troubles in turns with more than one turn-constructional unit (TCU) – that is, a word, phrase, clause, or sentence that constitutes a possibly complete turn at talk (Sacks et al., 1974) – has shown that open OIRs do not identify troubles in prior *turns* per se, but rather in immediately prior turn-constructional units (Robinson, 2014).

The two most frequent practices for open OIR in the corpus are *what?* and *huh?*. Note that these practices must occur with rising intonation to do open other-initiation of repair (Schegloff, 1997; Egbert, Golato, and Robinson, 2009). Extract 3 below illustrates *huh?* (see Extract 1 for *what?*).

Extract 3: RCE15b 07:04

1	Wil:	Got football later.	
2		(0.7)	
3	Jam:	.fhh Yeah. ((looks down at watch))	
4		(0.8)	
5	Max:	Are [you playing?	T-1
6	Wil:	[Better go soo(h)n actually.	
7 ->	Jam:	Huh?	T0
8	Max:	Are you playing footy?	T+1
9	Jam:	Y:eah I think so.	

The less frequent practices for open OIR in the corpus are *pardon?*, *what's that?*, *what did you say?*, and *sorry?* (on which see Robinson, 2006).

4.2 Category-specific interrogatives

Interrogative words refer to specific semantic categories (e.g., persons, entities, times, locations) and as OIRs locate corresponding sources of trouble in a prior turn. The interrogative words *what* and *which* can serve as interrogative determiners and as OIRs to locate a definite reference as a trouble source.

4.2.1 Interrogative words as complete TCUs

A subset of interrogative words in English (*who*, *what*, *when*, *where*), produced on their own as complete turn-constructional units, can serve as other-initiations of repair (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 367-368).

Interrogative words produced with rising intonation as complete TCUs indicate that the OIR-speaker has either failed to hear or is unable to recognize the trouble source (Heritage, 1984, p. 316-317; Sidnell, 2010, p. 124-125; Benjamin, 2013, p. 75-94). The interrogative word *who?* in Extract 4 locates an animate nominal reference in the prior turn as the trouble source. (Following CA usage, a period indicates falling intonation and a question mark rising intonation, both in the transcripts and the text.)

Extract 4: Virginia 11:26

1	Bet:	They said that Phillips got um (0.5) knee: wa:lking	T-1
2		dru::nk at the reception.	
3		(0.5)	
4 ->	Mom:	Who:?	T0
5		(0.3)	
6	Bet:	Phillips,	T+1

The repeat of the trouble source at line 6 reveals the trouble-source speaker's analysis of the trouble as one of hearing.

Interrogative words produced with falling intonation indicate that the OIR-speaker has failed to identify the referent of an indexical reference in the trouble-source turn (Egbert et al., 2009; Benjamin, 2013). The interrogative word *who.* in Extract 5 identifies an animate pronominal reference in the prior turn as the trouble source.

Extract 5: RCE07 Duck 23:59

1	Tra:	Do you know who he is.	T-1
2		(0.5)	
3 ->	Kev:	Who.	T0
4		(0.4)	
5	Tra:	e- The one who slept with Imogen Thomas.	T+1
6	Kev:	Yeah, Ryan Giggs [isn't it.	
7	Tra:	[Yeah.	

The association between the intonation contour of the interrogative word and the specification of the trouble source as either a 'full' nominal reference or an indexical pronominal reference appears to hold for all interrogative words that can serve as OIRs (see, e.g., Benjamin, 2013, p. 105-108), with the notable exception of *what*. With rising intonation, *what?* is an open other-initiation of repair and does not specifically locate a nominal reference in a prior turn as a trouble source. (The gap in this paradigm is filled by a partial repeat + *what* format; see Section 4.2.2.) But like other interrogative words produced as complete TCUs with falling intonation, *what.* locates an inanimate pronominal reference in a prior turn as a trouble source (Egbert et al., 2009), as in Extract 6.[4]

Extract 6: RCE08 UK Housemates I 06:25

1	Jam:	Have you heard of that one?	T-1
2		(0.2)	
3 ->	Ker:	What.	T0
4		(0.6)	
5	Jam:	It's like a documentary about Bono.	T+1

In addition, the corpus also includes cases in which *what.* locates troubles in another class of indexicals, namely forms that index affective states, such as some interjections. Like pronouns that index entities in the world or the conversation, interjections can index the private affective states of speakers and thereby display them publicly (Kockelman, 2003). In Extract 7, *what.* locates the interjection *o::h,* which is hearable as a display of 'disappointment,' as a trouble source. The trouble-source speaker then repairs this to a more explicit reference to an affective state.

Extract 7: RCE02 Two Friends 03:34

1	Fab:	I've got a:n alumni dinner to be fair.	
2		(0.5)	
3	Fab:	uhm: on Saturday evening, that's it.=	
4	Kat:	=O::h ((sounds disappointed))	T-1
5		(1.7) ((Fabrice directs gaze to Kate))	
6 ->	Fab:	What.	T0
7		(0.6)	
8	Kat:	Sad.	T+1

4 See Egbert et al. (2009, p. 125-127) on the similarities between *what.* as an other-initiation of repair and as a 'go ahead' response in a pre-sequence.

9 (0.4)
10 Fab: It's only for two hours.
11 (0.6)
12 Kat: >Yeah<

The use of *what*. to initiate repair on affective displays is not limited to interjections. It can also be used to target laughter and facial gestures for which a 'source' for the 'reaction' cannot be found.

In addition to *who* and *what*, the interrogative words *when* and *where* (see Extract 10) also occur as other-initiations of repair in the corpus. Although *how* and *which* can occur as complete TCUs and can plausibly serve as OIRs, they are unattested in the corpus. The interrogative word *why* occurs frequently but constitutes a request for an account (Bolden and Robinson, 2010), not an other-initiation of repair.

4.2.2 Interrogative words with partial repeats

In addition to the interrogative words that stand alone as complete TCUs, interrogative words can also occur together with a partial repeat of the trouble-source turn (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 368). The result is a *wh*-question with an interrogative word *in situ*, that is, in the same position as the corresponding word would occupy in a declarative clause (Dryer, 2013). The interrogative word refers to the trouble source and the partial repeat helps to locate it, serving as a 'frame' (Jefferson, 1972).

Together with a partial repeat of the trouble-source turn, the interrogative word *what* can identify troubles with grammatical constituents at various syntactic positions within a clause or phrase. In Extract 8, *the what?* locates the head noun *study* at line 2 as the trouble source.

Extract 8: RCE06 Grass 21:40

1 Bra: ((leans forward and looks into camera))
2 Sar: I'm pretty sure that just ruined [the study. T-1
3 Jes: [We're in a
4 stud[y,
5 Mat: [We're-
4 (0.3)
5 -> Bra: The what?= T0
6 Mat: =It's som:e linguistics study about how (.) T+1
7 people interact in conversation.

The interrogative words *what* and *which* can occur as interrogative determiners with partial repeats of a noun phrase to locate a determiner (e.g., *the, that*) as a trouble source. In Extract 9, *what one on the bridge*. locates the definite article *the* in *the one of me on the bridge* at lines 2-3 as the trouble source.

Extract 9: RCE28 Lake

1 Kel: But like the only picture other people f-
2 (0.2) can see is like the one of me on the T-1
3 bridge with my hair like ((whoosh sound))
4 (0.9)
5 -> Hea: What one on the br[idge. T0
6 Kel: [In Newcastle T+1
7 (0.4)
8 on Sund[ay
9 Hea: [Oh god yeah yeah yeah okay

The nature of the trouble in such cases involves a claim to recognizability (Sacks and Schegloff , 1979) or identifiability (Du Bois, 1980) embodied in the form of a reference. A recipient of such a form who fails to identify the referent can repeat the noun phrase and replace the determiner with an interrogative determiner to initiate repair.

Whereas the interrogative determiner *what* signals a trouble with the identification of a referent, the interrogative determiner *which* signals a trouble with the identification of a *unique* referent. In Extract 10, drawn from a conversation outside on a university campus, a reference to *the wall* together with a deictic pointing gesture picks out a unique referent in the participants' visual field.

Extract 10: RCE02 Two Friends 04:36

1	Fab:	Where did that guy go.	
2		(1.5)	
3	Kat:	He's over ther- ((points)) I think that's his head.	
4		(0.9)	
5	Fab:	Where.	
6		(0.7)	
7	Kat:	Like (.) do you see the wall, ((points))	T-1
8		(0.8)	
9 ->	Fab:	Which wall.	T0
10		(0.6)	
11	Kat:	That wall. ((points))	T+1
12		(1.8)	
13	Fab:	Oh yeah yeah yeah I can see it.	

The selection of *which* over *what* indicates that the speaker has identified more than one possible referent for a reference that claims there to be relevantly only one.

Although the collection only contains instances of the interrogative words *what* and *which* together with partial repeats of a trouble-source TCU, the interrogative words *who* and *where* are attested in other studies (see Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 368; Benjamin, 2013, p. 111-132).

4.3 Repeats of the trouble source

Another set of practices that speakers can use to initiate repair involves repeats of a trouble source in a prior turn. Three types of repeats were identified in the corpus: (i) partial repeats, in which a speaker repeats part but not all of a prior TCU (e.g., a word or phrase); (ii) full repeats, in which a speaker repeats a prior TCU as a whole; and (iii) incomplete repeats, in which a speaker repeats part of a prior TCU and constructs the repeat prosodically to be hearable as incomplete.

4.3.1 Partial repeats

A partial repeat of a prior turn, produced as a complete TCU with rising intonation, as in Extract 11 below, locates the repeated component as the trouble source (Jefferson, 1972; Schegloff et al., 1977; Robinson and Kevoe-Feldman, 2010; see also Robinson, 2013). The trouble source in this case is a reference to a Kubota, a small utility vehicle manufactured by a company of the same name.

Extract 11: RCE01 Cigarette

1	Liz:	A:h you get the best things to clean up horse
2		shit out of the field. They're like- they're
3		like tractors, (0.4) th- mini trac- well like-
4		they're not like- (0.3) they're not (.) as big
5		as tractors by any means. They're like those

6 little Kubota things. T-1
7 (0.5)
8 Liz: The tiny little-
9 -> Cha: Kubota? T0
10 (0.3)
11 Liz: Yeah, it's a: (.) bra:nd. T+1

The trouble-source speaker confirms the partial repeat with *yeah*, which orients to the possibility that the OIR-speaker may have misheard the trouble source, and then uses a predicate nominal clause to assert its membership within a class (*it's a brand*), thereby treating the trouble as one of understanding (cf. Robinson and Kevoe-Feldman, 2010, p. 237). In the corpus, partial repeats occur with a variety of intonation contours, including the high rise-fall contour described by Benjamin and Walker (2012).

4.3.2 Full repeats

In contrast to a partial repeat, a full repeat of a prior TCU does not localize the trouble to a specific component of a prior TCU, but rather indicates that the speaker has encountered trouble with the TCU or action as a whole (Robinson and Kevoe-Feldman, 2010).[5] In Extract 12, a full repeat of a question, produced as a complete TCU with rising intonation, locates the question as a whole as the trouble source. Here, as three students wait outside on a university campus for the researcher to return to retrieve the camera, one of them, Paul, decides to leave early, announcing his departure. Only moments later, Travis asks where Paul has gone.

Extract 12: RCE07 Duck 16:28

1 Tra: If we just- if we just stand up, see what
2 happens.
3 Pau: I'm going.
4 (0.4)
5 Kev: Oohhh=
6 Tra: Oo[h
7 Pau: [I'm off. ((stands up, walks off camera))
8 ((15 seconds omitted))
9 ((lapse))
10 Tra: Where did Paul go. T-1
11 (0.7)
12 Kev: .tk.hhhh
13 (0.4)
14 -> Kev: Where did he go, T0
15 (0.2)
16 Tra: .hhhhh He go in there [then? ((points)) T+1
17 Kev: [He went in there.
18 Yeah.

The question at line 10 is problematic in that it suggests a lapse in the speaker's awareness: *where did Paul go* could be understood as a first noticing of his absence and the repair at line 16 (*he go in there then?*) identifies a destination that lies directly in front of the trouble-source speaker, fully within his field of

5 The category of full repeat in the current study includes changes in deixis (e.g., A: *I wanna be a farmer.* B: *You wanna be a farmer?*) as well as one instance, given in Extract 12, in which a name in the trouble-source turn occurs as a pronoun in the other-initiation of repair.

vision. According to Robinson and Kevoe-Feldman (2010), a full repeat of a question indicates trouble understanding "the thrust of the question-as-a-whole" and in some cases can characterize the question "as being, for example, ridiculous" (p. 256). The full repeat at line 10 may therefore characterize the question as 'ridiculous' because it requests information that should have been known to its speaker, based on his own perceptual access to events that took place only moments before. Within the corpus, full repeats with rising intonation are the most common, but other intonation contours, such as a final fall or high rise-fall, are also attested.

4.3.3 Incomplete repeats

The production of partial and full repeats as *complete* TCUs is a crucial aspect of these practices. The completeness of a TCU is a product of its lexico-syntactic structure, its pragmatic function, and its prosodic composition (Ford and Thompson, 1996; Torreira, Bögels, and Levinson, submitted). A partial repeat of a component in a prior TCU produced *without* prosodic completion, as a designedly incomplete utterance (Koshik, 2002; Rossi, this issue), constitutes a distinct practice for other-initiation of repair, exemplified in Extract 13.

Extract 1 3: RCE28 Lake 01:31

1	Kel:	Lisa's a chemist as well.	T-1
2		(0.3)	
3 ->	Hea:	Lisa::[::	T0
4	Kel:	[Williams.	T+1

A prosodically incomplete repeat of a specific component of prior TCU is a practice for soliciting a relevant completion of that component, in this case a last name. A repeat is hearable as incomplete if it lacks a coherent intonation contour (e.g., with neither a final rise nor a final fall in pitch) and if the final sound of the repeat its noticeably stretched (see Lerner, 2004, p. 172-174).

4.4 Copular interrogatives

A practice for other-initiation of repair that occurs in the corpus but has received relatively little attention in the literature on English consists of a clause in which the subject is an interrogative noun phrase (e.g., *who*, *what*, *which one*) and the predicate is a repeat of the trouble source.[6] The subject and predicate are linked by the copula (i.e., a form of the verb *to be*), resulting in a copular interrogative clause, as in Extract 14.

Extract 14: Virginia 11:26

1	Bet:	They said that Phillips got um (0.5) knee: wa:lking	
2		dru::nk at the reception.	
3		(0.5)	
4	Mom:	Who:?	
5		(0.3)	
6	Bet:	Phillips,	T-1
7		(0.4)	

6 Sidnell (2007) identifies *who's X* as a practice for initiating repair on person references in English (see also Sacks, 1992, p. 448-449) and describes a similar practice used by speakers of an English creole in a small Caribbean community. For the English creole, Sidnell argues the practice consists of a repeat of the trouble source together with a 'who'-preface, citing forms such as *huu Jee*, which he translates as 'who Jay'. Such forms may in fact be interrogative predicate nominal clauses, if the language does not require (or allow) a copular morpheme, as many languages do not (Stassen, 2013). If so, one would analyze the interrogative pronoun as the subject noun phrase of a full clause, not a preface to a phrasal TCU. The practice that Sidnell describes may therefore be equivalent to the practice described here, the only difference being the obligatory copula in standard English.

8 -> Mom: Wh[o's Phillips. T0
9 Bet: [Pa:m Bensen's (.) husband. T+1

As declaratives, predicate nominal clauses – clauses whose semantic predicates are noun phrases – assert the membership of the subject within a class (e.g., 'he's a drunkard') or assert the identity of a subject (e.g., 'he's her husband'), according to Payne (1997, p. 114). As interrogatives, predicate nominal clauses request descriptors of membership or identity and are therefore well suited to resolve troubles with the recognition of noun phrases, especially proper names (see Sacks 1992, p. 448-449 on the use of *who is X* for troubles with recognitional references). A noteworthy characteristic of this format is its frequent occurrence *after* the next position to the trouble-source turn, that is, with one or more turns intervening between it and the trouble-source turn (see Schegloff, 2000; Wong, 2000; Benjamin, 2012), as in the preceding case. In comparison to category-specific interrogatives, which most frequently occur in next position directly after the trouble-source turn (75.6%, *n*=31), and open OIRs, which almost exclusively do (90.5%, *n*=38), copular interrogatives seldom occur in this position (22.2%, *n*=2).

4.5 Candidate understandings

The practices for other-initiation of repair examined thus far, with the exception of some repeats, each identify a trouble in a prior turn and create an opportunity for the trouble-source speaker to self-repair the trouble in response. An alternative is for a next speaker to proffer a candidate repair, which the trouble-source speaker may then accept or correct. If the candidate repair does not differ from the trouble source, it may be heard as a repeat (see Section 4.3), but if it alters or transforms the trouble source in some way, the result is a so-called 'candidate understanding', whereby the speaker checks whether he or she has adequately understood the trouble source. In this section, I briefly outline the three most frequent operations – to borrow a term from Schegloff's (2013) analysis of self-repair – that speakers use to generate candidate understandings: replacement, continuation, and insertion.

4.5.1 Replacement

A first operation that speakers use to produce candidate understandings is replacement, through which a next speaker proffers a turn component that corresponds formally and semantically to the trouble source. In Extract 15, the prepositional phrase *about GPs again* corresponds to the prepositional phrase *about that thing* in the prior turn and includes a replacement, in this case a specification, of the trouble source *that thing*.[7]

Extract 15: RCE01 Cigarette 08:09

1 Liz: .hhh God. (0.5) I was really drunk last night and
2 me and Kenny had another a:rgument about °that thing°. T-1
3 (0.4)
4 Liz: At about five o'clock in the morni:[ng
5 -> Cha: [About GPs again, T0
6 (0.7)
7 Liz: GPs,
8 (0.2)
9 Cha: Yeah, didn't you have an argument about G[Ps?
10 Liz: [Oh yeah.hh

7 As this case makes clear, candidate repairs can also repeat components from the trouble-source turn and thereby 'frame' the trouble source, as *about* does here (cf. Benjamin, 2013, p. 223-226).

Although most candidate replacements in the collection occur with final rising intonation, not all do (see Sidnell, 2013; Couper-Kuhlen, 2012). The status of such replacements as provisional, that is, as questions, appears to depend not on the form of the replacement, but rather on the epistemic status of the speaker with respect to the information in question (Heritage, 2012).

4.5.2 Continuation

A second operation that speakers use to produce candidate understandings is continuation, also referred to as incrementing, through which a next speaker proffers a turn component that continues the grammatical structure of the trouble-source turn (Sacks, 1992a, p. 660-663; Schegloff, 1997, p. 511; Lerner, 2004; Sidnell, 2012). In Extract 15, the prepositional phrase *in France?* is hearable as a continuation of the trouble-source turn at lines 1-2.

Extract 16: Duck RCE07 09:37b

1	Tra:	Some of the stuff- some of the stuff they've	T-1
2		done is pretty- pretty [rotten.	
3	Pau:	[Mm:	
4	Kev:	Who.	T0
5		(0.4)	
6 ->	Kev:	in France?=	T0
7	Tra:	=Yeah.	T+1

In the corpus, nearly three quarters of continuations are prepositional phrases (73%, *n*=11). These include adverbials of time, place, and manner, as well as specifications of nominal heads (e.g., A: *I really want to do like a many thanks at the end*. B: *What, of your presentation?*). Note that while most continuations occur in next position after the trouble-source turn, the case above demonstrates that this is not a necessary condition for the operation.

4.5.3 Insertion

A third operation that speakers use to produce candidate understandings is insertion, through which a next speaker proffers a turn component that fits into the grammatical and semantic structure of the trouble-source turn (see Hayashi and Hayano, 2013, for an analogous practice in Japanese and Wilkinson and Weatherall, 2011, on insertion in self-repair). In Extract 15, the noun phrase *a single one* includes the adjective *single* that fits into the grammatical and semantic structure of a noun phrase in the prior turn (i.e., 'a single chocolate biscuit').

Extract 17: RCE06 Grass 14:27

1	Sar:	↑What are you eating?=Where did you ↑get that from↓	
2	Mat:	.hh Ye(h)ah I was thi(h)nk[ing the sa(h)me °thi(h)ng°	
3	Jes:	[I had a chocolate bi:scuit	T-1
4		in my bag.	
5		(1.4)	
6 ->	Mat:	A <u>si</u>ngle one.	T0
7		(1.2)	
8	Jes:	I have s<u>o</u>me.	T+1

Two types of insertions occur in the corpus: insertions of adjectives and other modifiers into a noun phrase

in the trouble-source turn, in which case the pronoun *one* occurs as an obligatory head of an English noun phrase, as in the preceding case, and insertions of temporal adverbs into the trouble-source turn (e.g., A: *I can't go to the compulsory dinner.* B: *What, Wednesday?*).

4.5.4 Complex candidate understandings

In addition to candidate understandings that appear to be the output of a single primary operation, such as those presented in the preceding sections, the corpus also includes cases that cannot be described in such terms. Consider the candidate understanding in Extract 18. Prior to this extract Max has told Jamie and Will about a play in which he will perform that will include a silent auction for one of the props, a white canvas. Jamie has evidently failed to understand that the audience will take part in the auction.

Extract 18: RCE15b Swimmers II 04:20

1	Max:	So it's going to be interesting to see w[hat people=	
2	Wil:	[Yeah	
3	Max:	=put down for like a white (0.2) canvas.	T-1
4 ->	Jam:	Wha- oh what.=so the people in the audience are gonna	T0
5		(1.3) ((Max nods))	
6 ->	Jam:	bid for it.	
7		(0.2)	
8	Max:	.t Apparently.	T+1
9		(0.3)	
10	Wil:	That's quite cool.	

The construction of the candidate understanding in this case differs from those in the preceding sections in a number of respects. Rather than having a phrasal format, it has the format of a full clause. It employs not one but two repair operations within the same turn: replacement (*put down for* > *bid for*) and insertion (*in the audience*). And it includes a number of turn-initial components, such as an initial *what*, self-repaired to *oh what*. These turn-constructional features adapt the candidate understanding to the particular task at hand: a clausal format is necessary in this case because the operations address troubles of understanding in both the subject and predicate of the prior clause, and the insertion of *oh* before the explicit repair initiator *what* (see Section 4.8) signals a change of state (Heritage, 1984) and may be designed to manage the 'lateness' of the speaker's understanding. Although the majority of candidate understandings in the corpus can be characterized in terms of a single primary operation (replacement, continuation, or insertion), a large minority have more complex designs, employing multiple operations.

4.6 Other practices

In addition to open OIRs, which specify nether the source nor the type of trouble, there are also practices for OIR that specify the trouble type (e.g., to one of understanding) but do not localize this trouble to a specific component of the prior turn. One such practice is *what do you mean?* (Schegloff 1997, p. 520-524; Hayashi, Raymond, and Sidnell, 2013, p. 22-29). In Extract 19, Heather has just told Kelly about a classmate who posts intimate messages about her boyfriend on an online social network.

Extract 19: RCE28 13:35

1	Kel:	Is it both of them,	T-1
2		(0.8)	
3 ->	Hea:	>What'd you [mean?<	T0
4	Kel:	[Is it two people,	
5		(0.3)	

6 Hea: No [it's just one person. T+1
7 Kel: [Oh it's just one person. Oh:,

The *what do you mean?* repair initiation is addressed to a trouble of understanding the prior turn, but it does not locate a specific component of the prior turn as the trouble source.

Another practice that leaves the source of the trouble 'open' but specifies the trouble type is *I don't understand*. The only instance of this practice in the corpus is shown in Extract 2, apparently as a last resort after a series of OIRs have failed to elicit an adequate solution to the trouble.

4.7 Other-corrections

A practice for other-initiation of repair that specifically locates a source of trouble in a prior turn and characterizes the trouble as one of 'accuracy' (i.e., the trouble source is treated as an 'error') is other-correction (Schegloff et al., 1977; Jefferson, 1987; Haakana and Kurhila, 2009). To be analysed as an other-correction, the OIR had to (i) include a possible replacement of the trouble source (cf. Section 4.5.1), (ii) uses prosodic resources (an accented syllable and final falling intonation) to assert the replacement as definitive, and (iii) make self-correction (not confirmation) the conditionally relevant response. Extract 20 exemplifies this practice.

Extract 20: RCE09 UK Housemates II 05:27

1 Ben: She's ea(h)ting the Butterwo(h)rth di[e(h)t. T-1
2 -> Jam: [Bu(h)tterfi<u>e</u>(h)ld. T0
3 (0.9)
4 Ben: Butterfield. T+1

In Extract 20, the other-correction *Butterfield* corresponds to *Butterworth* in the prior turn. The accent on *fi<u>e</u>ld* indicates that this specific component is the correction and thereby identifies *worth* as an error, and the final falling intonation contour indexes a high degree of certainty (Couper-Kuhlen, 2012), asserting the replacement as a correction rather than proffering it as a candidate understanding. In response, the speaker of the trouble source repeats the correction and thereby corrects the error in the prior turn.

4.8 Complex other-initiations of repair

In a large majority of cases, the turn at talk with which a speaker initiates repair contains a single OIR practice (79.3%, *n*=180). But speakers do, on some occasions, produce more than one practice in a single turn. There are multiple ways this can occur. If one practice does not receive a response, a speaker can produce a second to pursue a solution to the trouble (e.g., *who. (0.4) in France?* in Extract 16). A speaker can self-repair one practice, resulting in two or more within the same turn (e.g., *wha- oh what.* in Extract 18). Or a speaker can produce multiple practices, one after the other, with varying degrees of prosodic integration between the them (e.g., *boost? what's a boost.* in Extract 2, in which two practices are prosodically independent, and *<u>oh</u> what.=so the people in the audience are gonna* in Extract 18, in which two practices are prosodically integrated).

The most frequent complex OIR in the corpus is a combination of a turn-initial *what* and a candidate understanding in which the interrogative word occurs as a prosodically-integrated turn preface (see Extract 18 and Extract 21 for examples). Indeed, close to one quarter of all candidate understandings include a *what*-preface (23.4%, *n*=15). Whether and how such cases differ interactionally from candidate understandings without a *what*-preface is an open question, but a *what*-preface appears to serve as an explicit indicator that a repair procedure has been initiated.

In addition to the *what*-preface, a number of other turn-constructional components were observed in complex OIRs: turn-final *or* (e.g., *is that like a fam day or:*); *as in* (e.g., *what.=as in the Russian-Afghan war*

or:); the insertion of *the fuck* into a copular interrogative (e.g., *who(h) the fu(h)ck is He(h)len Woo(h)d.*); and *you mean* (e.g., *you mean the wash?*). The low frequency of *you mean,* which occurs in only 3 percent (*n*=2) of candidate understandings, stands in stark contrast to previous reports that describe it as a common feature of the format (e.g., Schegloff, 1997, p. 504; Kitzinger 2013, p. 249; see also Benjamin, 2012). Further research is needed to determine the precise functions of these practices in the construction of complex OIRs.

4.9 Bodily-visual practices

Previous research has shown that head movements, such as lateral tilts or forward extensions of the head, can serve to occasion self-repair without a verbal OIR (Seo and Koshik, 2010) and that body movements, such as leaning forward, can co-occur with verbal OIRs (Rasmussen, 2013; Li, 2014). And indeed in sign language bodily-visual practices such as these rule (see Manrique, this issue). In the present corpus, however, the use of bodily-visual practices to initiate repair without a verbal OIR was rare, with only two cases identified, a lateral head tilt and a frown. More frequent, however, was the use of a forward head extension together with a verbal OIR, which was observed in 10.6 percent of all OIRs (*n*=24).

5 The quantitative distribution of OIR practices

The current study of OIR in English is both an intralinguistic comparison, in that the particular practices in English are compared to one another, and one piece of an interlinguistic comparison, in which observations from English are compared to those from other languages and cultures. The rich literature on OIR in English offers a well established set of terminology and categories for the comparison of practices within the language (see Section 4), most of which have their roots in the taxonomy introduced by Schegloff et al. (1977, p. 367-368). The comparative study of OIR across languages did not, however, take this taxonomy as its point of departure, for a number of practical reasons. Rather than classify cases according to a taxonomy of format *types*, the comparative study identified a set of formal and functional *properties* along which practices of other-initiation vary (see Dingemanse and Enfield, this issue), a complete list of which can be found in Dingemanse, Kendrick, and Enfield (this issue). Thus the analysis of the quantitative distribution of OIR practices in English, the focus of this section, is beholden to two masters, as it were: the long tradition of research on OIR in English, on the one side, and the aims of the comparative study, on the other. To meet the demands of each, this section presents two separate analyses of the same collection of 227 cases of other-initiation of repair, one grounded in the terminology and categories from previous conversation-analytic research on OIR and the other based on those developed for the comparative study.

5.1 Distribution of OIR practices in English

Table 1 presents the quantitative distribution of OIRs within the corpus for both the general formats and the particular practices described in Section 4.

For OIRs with complex turn designs (see Section 4.8), a distinction was made between those with prosodic integration across the multiple practices (e.g., *what.=it was Benjamin's birthday.*) and those in which each practice occurs as a prosodically independent unit (e.g., *boost? what's a boost.* in Extract 2). In Table 1, OIRs with multiple prosodically-independent practices appear under the category of multiple in a turn, whereas those with prosodic integration appear as instances of the final, response-relevant practice (e.g., *what.=it was Benjamin's birthday.* was analysed as a candidate understanding).

Table 1 The distribution of general formats and particular practices for other-initiation of repair in English. Proportions for formats occur in bold.

Format	Practice	Frequency	Proportion
open		42	**18.5%**
	what?	17	40.5%
	huh?	17	40.5%
	what's that?	4	9.5%
	apology	3	7.1%
	what did you say?	1	2.5%
category-specific interrogatives		41	**18.1%**
	with repeat	21	51.2%
	stand-alone	20	48.8%
repeats		40	**17.6%**
	partial	26	65.0%
	full	9	22.5%
	incomplete	5	12.5%
copular interrogatives		9	**4.0%**
candidate understandings		64	**28.2%**
	replacement	19	29.7%
	continuation	15	23.4%
	insertion	6	9.4%
	other	24	37.5%
other-corrections		13	**5.7%**
visual only		2	**0.1%**
multiple in a turn		8	**3.5%**
other		8	**3.5%**
	what do you mean?	4	50%
	I don't understand	1	12.5%
	uncategorized	3	37.5%
		227	**100%**

Based on the frequencies and proportions of OIRs presented in Table 1, a number of further observations can be made.

- The vast majority of other-initiations, 81.5 percent of cases (n=185), locate a specific trouble source in a prior turn (only 18.5% are open), in line with the preference for specificity in the selection of other-initiations of repair (Schegloff et al., 1977; Clark and Schaefer, 1987).
- The most frequent format for other-initiation is a candidate understanding (28.2%, n=64). Within this type, the majority of cases employ a single operation, either replacement, continuation, or insertion (62.5%, n=40), whereas a minority employ multiple operations.
- The two most frequent practices for open other-initiation are *what?* and *huh?* (40.5%, n=17, in each case). The occurrence of two distinct practices for open other-initiation with the same proportion is unique to English within the comparative sample. The functional distinction between *what?* and *huh?*

remains an open question.[8]
- The practice of other-correction, as defined in this study, is relatively infrequent. This observation lends support to the preference for self-correction (Schegloff et al. 1977).
- The use of bodily-visual resources to initiate repair without a linguistic component is rare. But to put this into perspective, the frequency of visual only OIRs in the corpus is equal to that of the common open OIR *pardon?* (*n*=2, in each case).

5.2 Distribution of OIR types in English for the comparative study

The sample for the comparative study excludes other-corrections and complex OIRs (see Sections 4.7 and 4.8), which reduces the size of the sample by nearly one quarter to 175 cases. Table 2 presents the frequencies and proportions of the OIR types in English for the comparative study.

Table 2 The distribution of types of other-initiation of repair for cross-linguistic comparison.

Specificity	Type	Frequency	Proportion
open		41	**23.4%**
	interjection	17	41.5%
	with interrogative word	21	51.2%
	formulaic	3	7.3%
restricted		134	**76.6%**
	request type	60	44.8%
	offer type	74	55.2%
	alternative type	0	0.0%
		175	**100%**

A basic distinction was made between OIRs that locate a trouble source, referred to as restricted, and those that do not, referred to as open (see Section 4.1). Within the category of open OIRs, interjections (i.e., various phonetic variants of *huh?*) were distinguished both from open OIRs that include an interrogative word (i.e., *what?*, *what's that?*, and *what did you say?*) and from those that derive from an apology (i.e., *sorry?* and *pardon?*), referred to as formulaic OIRs. Within the category of restricted OIRs, a distinction was made between OIRs that offer a candidate for confirmation or disconfirmation (e.g., *Kubota?* in Extract 11), whether or not the recipient in fact responds with confirmation, and those that request a repeat or repair of the trouble source (e.g., *who:?* in Extract 4). This corresponds generally to a grammatical distinction between polar interrogatives, which offer a repair solution for the recipient to accept or correct, and content interrogatives, which request a repair solution, although a small number of cases do not fit into the dichotomy of polar and content interrogatives (e.g., *Lisa::::* in Extract 13 is neither a polar interrogative nor a content interrogative, but is nonetheless an instance of a request type OIR).

8 Although the overall frequency of *what?* and *huh?* is the same, the distribution of the two forms differs in certain contexts. *Huh?* is more common than *what?* if the OIR speaker does not gaze at the trouble-source speaker during the trouble-source turn (82.4% of *huh?* cases occur in this context, in contrast to 52.9% of *what?* cases). *Huh?* is also more common than *what?* in multiparty conversation (88.2% of *huh?* cases occur in this context, whereas 58.5% of *what?* cases do). These figures suggest that *what?* and *huh?* may not be equivalent, though further research is necessary to verify this and to characterize the functional distinction between the two forms.

6 The actions of other-initiations of repair

In addition to genuine other-initiations of repair, through which speakers deal with troubles speaking, hearing, or understanding a prior TCU and analyzably do no more than this (initiating repair *simpliciter*), the systematic collection of all possible OIRs in the corpus yielded a substantial proportion of cases for which an analysis as a genuine OIR would be either incomplete or inaccurate. In some cases, a speaker uses a practice for OIR not only to initiate repair but also to perform some other action concurrently. Such cases were included in the quantitative study. In other cases, a speaker may use a practice that formally resembles an OIR, but the action that the practice analyzably delivers is *not* an other-initiation of repair. It may be, for example, a disagreement in the guise of an OIR. Such cases, which I refer to here as *pseudo* OIRs, were systematically excluded from the quantitative study but will be examined qualitatively in this section. After an illustration of the distinction between OIRs that speakers use as vehicles for other actions and pseudo OIRs (Section 6.1), I examine this boundary across the three most frequent classes of action that speakers use OIR practices to perform *other than* initiating repair: non-serious actions, such as jokes and teases (Section 6.2); preliminaries to dispreferred responses (Section 6.3); and displays of surprise and disbelief (Section 6.4). For each class of action, I present cases on both sides of the boundary between genuine and pseudo OIR, illustrating cases that were included in the collection as well as those that were excluded.

6.1 The contrast between OIR and pseudo OIR

A comparison of the following two cases illustrates the distinction between OIRs that speakers use as vehicles for other actions, on the one hand, and pseudo OIRs, on the other. In Extract 21, after Jamie tells about a minor trouble, namely that he has to read two books before class the next morning, Will initiates a repair sequence before he names a possible solution to the trouble, a website that offers abbreviated versions of books for students.

Extract 21: RCE15b Swimmers II 07:13

1	Jam:	I've got a nine [fifteen tomorrow morning.	
2		[((sets two books on table))	
3		I've got to read those.	T-1
4		(0.3)	
5	Max:	Jenkins. (0.5) Rethinking History, ((reading title))	
6 ->	Wil:	What.=a:ll the book.=that who:le book.	T0
7	Jam:	Yea(h)h:. No both.=heh::	T+1
8	Wil:	Spot notes.=hehhh	

Will's other-initiations locate the reference to *those* as a trouble source and proffer candidate repairs (*a:ll the book.=that who:le book.*), through which he checks whether Jamie means that he must read the book (or books) completely or only partially. This is, on the face of it, a genuine inquiry, and Jamie treats it as such, confirming and correcting the Will's candidate understanding (line 7). But there is evidence that the OIR sequence deals with more than a possible ambiguity. The construction of the OIRs, in word selection and prosodic composition, show them to be calibrated to a specific sequence of actions. The quantifiers *a:ll* and *who:le*, both of which receive prosodic prominence through additional length and stress, formulate the task as 'extreme' (cf. Pomerantz, 1986; Edwards, 2000) and, in so doing, affiliate with the troubles-telling, treating the task as difficult or impossible. The confirmation *yea(h)h:* not only accepts the candidate repair, but though the interpolation of laughter, also displays a stance towards the trouble (Jefferson, 1984), one echoed by the laughter after the possible completion of the turn (Schegloff, 1996b). Thus an analysis of this as an OIR sequence would be correct, but one that goes no further than this and fails to address the multiple relevancies that the speakers manage through the OIR sequence would be incomplete. Such cases in which a genuine OIR serves as a vehicle for an additional action were included in the collection.

In contrast, an analysis of the sequence in Extract 22 as OIR would be inaccurate, despite a formal and functional resemblance to a genuine OIR. As Charlotte and Liz sit on the lawn of a university campus, Charlotte positively assesses an administrative office building, done as a concession to her previous negative assessment of university administrators.

Extract 22: RCE01 Cigarette 02:26

1 Cha: (It's a) nice place to work though.
2 (0.9)
3 -> Liz: °Ehhh° what.=the concrete jungle,
4 (0.2)
5 Cha: Aww:::::.=I think it's quite pretty.
6 It has ree:ds.

The response that Liz gives to Charlotte's assessment employs practices that speakers commonly use to initiate repair. The *what* in turn-initial position, as an explicit initiator, is common in candidate understandings (see Section 4.8), and *the concrete jungle* (a term that typically refers to a city with a high density of large, unattractive, modern buildings) is the output of a replacement operation on the reference to *a nice place to work* (see Section 4.5.1). Through these practices, the turn is built like an OIR. Crucially, however, Charlotte dose not treat it like one. Rather than accept or correct the ostensible repair (cf. Jamie's response in the preceding case), she responds with a positive assessment (*I think it's quite pretty*) and thereby treats the prior turn as an assessment that disagreed with her own. In effect, then, what is designed as an OIR is understood not as an genuine indication of lack of understanding, but rather as a negative assessment.[9] Unlike the preceding case, the turn does not perform other-initiation *plus* some other action; it performs *only* some other action. All such cases of pseudo OIRs were excluded from the collection.

6.2 Non-serious actions (jokes and teases)

Non-serious actions, such as jokes and teases, are like hermit crabs. With the exception of some formulaic jokes, which have canonical forms (e.g., knock-knock jokes), non-serious actions commonly inhabit the forms and formats of other actions, including other-initiations of repair. In this section, I present two cases in which speakers use practices for OIR to perform non-serious actions. The first, which was included in the collection for the quantitative study, demonstrates that recipients can treat such actions both as jokes or teases *and* as other-initiations of repair concurrently. The second, a pseudo OIR that was excluded, demonstrates that in some cases recipients treat such actions as jokes or teases and no more.

In the following extract, which comes from a conversation between three friends as they play a board game, after Shannon playfully compares the appearance of a game piece (a small, dark brown rectangular piece of wood) to that of a chocolate bar, Rachel initiates repair, ostensibly checking whether she has understood Shannon.

9 An anonymous reviewer suggests that the cases of pseudo OIRs in this section deal with "troubles of acceptability" – one possible specification of what Schegloff et al. (1977) meant by "troubles of speaking" (see Svennevig, 2008) – and therefore do in fact initiate repair as an action. This, in my opinion, conflates first and second order uses of the practices of other-initiation of repair. As Schegloff (2007) notes, the properties of OIRs "make them apt and suitable instruments for addressing disagreement-implicated talk" (p. 151). But it is precisely because the practices can be understood as *not* being addressed to such matters that they are so suitable. If disagreement were the accountable, first order use of the practices, the special utility they have for the management of disagreement would be lost, as the rift between the participants would be fully exposed. The utility of the practices of other-initiation of repair for such tasks is built on the back of the more basic (and more frequent) use of them to address troubles of hearing, understanding, and those troubles of speaking that put hearing and understanding at risk.

Extract 23: RCE26a Catan I 24:23

1	Shan:	I think these look like Mars Bars.	T-1
2	Beck:	°hhheh°	
3	Rach:	°heh° heh heh	
4	Beck:	.hhheh	
5 ->	Rach:	Fried ones?	T0
6		(0.5)	
7	Shan:	Yep .nhhhh heh heh heh	T+1
8		(0.7)	
9	Beck:	$Especially fried ones$.	

Before Rachel initiates repair, she and Becky both respond to the comparison with laughter (lines 2-4), through which they orient to the action as non-serious, playful, or otherwise laughable. The OIR that Rachel produces is, then, a second reaction, one that comes after she has already produced a relevant response that demonstrates an adequate understanding of the turn. The OIR locates the reference to *Mars Bars* as a trouble source and proffers *fried* as a candidate repair – more specifically, an insertable component (see Section 4.5.3). With this Rachel checks whether the referent of *Mars Bars* should be understood as 'fried Mars Bars,' perhaps because the game pieces, which are made of wood, are much harder than a normal chocolate bar. Shannon accepts the candidate repair and then laughs, orienting to the non-seriousness of OIR sequence. In this case, then, the recipient treats the OIR both as an other-initiation of repair, confirming the candidate repair, *and* as a non-serious action, an elaboration of a joke. Cases such as this were included in the collection.

The response that a possible OIR receives is crucial to the distinction between OIRs that speakers use as vehicles for other actions, like the preceding case, and pseudo OIRs, in which case the response provides no grounds for an analysis as an other-initiation of repair. In the following extract, a playful self-deprecation by Liz elicits laughter from Charlotte, who subsequently uses practices for OIR to tease her.

Extract 24: RCE01 Cigarette 09:41

1	Liz:	God if I'd have known I was gonna be on camera
2		I might've wore something better.
3		(1.5) ((Charlotte turns to Liz, smiles))
4	Cha:	nhhhh hem heh °heh heh° °°heh heh°° .hhhh
5	Liz:	Like the one [day that-
6 ->	Cha:	[What.=like a ba:ll go:wn.
7	Liz:	ehh heh heh heh °°heh heh°° .hhhh
8	Cha:	([ )
9	Liz:	[Might start doing it.

The tease at line 6 employs practices that speakers commonly use to initiate repair. The turn-initial *what.* typically serves as an explicit repair initiator (see Section 4.8) and *a ba:ll go:wn* is the output of a replacement operation (see Section 4.5.1) on Liz's reference to *something better*. With these practices, Charlotte appears to initiate repair, checking whether she has understood what Liz meant by *something better*. But this is a thin veil, one that Liz evidently sees through, responding to Charlotte's turn with laughter (line 7). Crucially, Liz does not accept or correct the ostensible repair and thus does not treat it as a genuine (or possibly genuine) other-initiation of repair. Cases such as this were excluded from the collection for this reason.

6.3 Preliminaries to dispreferred responses

In addition to non-serious actions, such as jokes and teases, speakers also use OIRs as preliminaries to dispreferred responses, such as challenges, rejections, disagreements, and so on (Schegloff et al., 1977, p.

380; Schegloff, 2007, p. 102-104). According to Schegloff (2007), there is a structural basis for this: an OIR that locates a trouble in the first pair part of an adjacency pair displaces the second pair part from next position and thereby breaks the contiguity of the sequence. In so doing, OIR sequences can signal that a dispreferred response is in the works.

In the following extract, after Ben leaves the room, a lapse in the conversation emerges and occasions an assessment of the situation by James (line 1). In a position in which agreement or disagreement with the assessment is relevant, Kerry initiates repair, an instance of OIR that was included in the collection.

Extract 25: RCE08a UK Housemates I 09:27

1	Jam:	It was much easier with him,	T-1
2		(0.7)	
3 ->	Ker:	What,	T0
4		(0.5)	
5	Jam:	It was much easier with him in here,	T+1
6		(0.5)	
7 ->	Ker:	Yeah but he just breaks out into song.	

In response to Kerry's open OIR, James repeats the assessment, adding the locative phrase *in here*. The OIR sequence displaces Kerry's response from next position and breaks the contiguity of the assessment sequence. Rather than agree with James's assessment, Kerry disagrees: she first prefaces her response with *yeah but*, a pro-forma agreement (see Schegloff, 2007, p. 69-70), and then formulates Ben's actions (singing) as complainable. The formulaic expression *to break out into* conveys a sudden outburst, one motivated by internal pressures, not the external demands of the occasion. In this way, Kerry formulates Ben's actions as inappropriate and in effect disagrees with James's assessment. The self-repair that James produces at line 5 displays his understanding of Kerry's turn as a genuine other-initiation of repair, even though it can subsequently be seen as a pre-disagreement.

While the OIR speaker's subsequent action (disagreement) provides some evidence that *for her* the OIR was possibly a preliminary to a dispreferred response, the trouble-source speaker's treatment of the OIR provides no such evidence. It treats the OIR as a genuine other-initiation of repair and no more. In other cases, however, one does find such evidence. In the following, an OIR occasions a 'back down' by the trouble-source speaker, whereby the trouble-source speaker orients to the OIR as disagreement-implicative (see Schegloff, 2007, p. 103).

Extract 26: RCE28 Lake 19:34 (about the end of the academic term)

1	Kel:	I just get bo:red. I'm- like we've got two-	
2		a week. (0.4) °shit°.	T-1
3		(1.0)	
4 ->	Hea:	A week till what.	T0
5	Kel:	We fi:nish. (0.4) isn't it. (0.5) ten days.	T+1
6		(0.3)	
7	Hea:	No, wait. We're week six.	

Heather's OIR locates the time reference *a week* as a trouble source and requests a specification of the terminal boundary of the interval. After Kelly responds with *we fi:nish* (i.e., the academic term finishes in one week), which treats Heather's OIR as a genuine lack of understanding, she backs down from the assertion. First, she indicates her uncertainty through the addition of a tag question (*isn't it*), and second, she repairs the time reference in the trouble-source turn from *a week* to *ten days*. In this way, Kelly orients to Heather's OIR as disagreement-implicative, a possible preliminary to a dispreferred response. Kelly's ascription proves correct: after the OIR sequence Heather challenges Kelly's assertion, stating that they are in the sixth week of the academic term and thereby finding fault in Kelly's calculation. The full richness of cases such as this, where a recipient first responds to an OIR as genuine and then subsequently displays a

revised understanding, was not addressed in the quantitative study. The provision of a repair solution (*we fi:nish*) was grounds to include the cases in the collection.

In the preceding cases, there is evidence, either in the trouble-source speaker's treatment of the OIR or in the OIR speaker's subsequent actions, that the sequence involves more than just the other-initiation of repair. But equally there is also evidence that the OIRs genuinely indicate possible troubles of hearing or understanding. In contrast, the following case of a pseudo OIR demonstrates that speakers can use practices for OIR to do pre-rejection and no more than this. Drawn from the same conversation as the preceding extract, here Kelly makes a proposal to Heather to study together on Saturday. In next position to the proposal, Heather ostensibly initiates repair.

Extract 27: RCE28 Lake 29:57

1 Kel: Are you going to come to campus and w<u>o</u>rk
2 with me, .t on Saturday.=
3 -> Hea: =What.=on S<u>a</u>turday?
4 (0.5)
5 Kel: I th<u>i</u>nk you sho<u>u</u>ld:.
6 (0.3)
7 Kel: It [will be fun.
8 Hea: [I don't know. I might be he:re on Sunday.
9 It depends how much I get do:ne, sort of
10 toni:ght.

The construction of the turn at line 6, like the pseudo OIRs in the previous sections, employs specific practices that speakers commonly use for OIR: a turn-initial *what*. (Section 4.8) and a repeat of a component in a prior TCU (Section 4.3.1). The turn is thus hearable as a request for confirmation of the day on which the proposed activity would take place. But Kelly does not confirm the day, neither verbally nor nonverbally. Instead, she reaffirms the proposal by transforming it into a suggestion: *I th<u>i</u>nk you sh<u>ou</u>ld:* (line 5). This reveals Kelly's analysis of the turn not as an OIR, but rather as a display of reluctance, an indication that Heather may not accept the proposal. For this reason, cases such as this were not included in the collection. Heather's response indeed does not accept the proposal to meet on Saturday (lines 8-10), but the offer of Sunday as a possible alternative to Saturday suggests that Heather's pre-rejection may have been designed, through OIR practices, to pinpoint a specific element of the proposal as a barrier to acceptance and to provide Kelly with an opportunity to revise the proposal accordingly. This case thus demonstrates that speakers can use practices for OIR to signal that a dispreferred response is in the works. The relevance of that signal may, in some cases, be the only relevance that recipients orient to, treating an action whose formal construction resembles an OIR as something *other than* an indication of a possible lack of understanding.

6.4 Displays of surprise and disbelief

The systematic collection of all possible OIRs in the corpus also revealed cases in which speakers use OIRs and practices that formally resemble OIRs to react to a prior TCU with surprise or disbelief, in line with previous conversation-analytic research (Heritage, 1984, p. 339-344; Selting, 1988; Wilkinson and Kitzinger, 2006). Although many such cases were analyzed as OIRs and included in the collection, despite the observation that repair initiation is not the only action they perform, some cases were systematically excluded because recipients did not treat them as possible indications of trouble in hearing or understanding a prior TCU.
In the following extract, after Kelly reports her brother's plan to cycle from Paris to London, an extreme distance to travel by bicycle, Heather reacts with surprise, using a practice that speakers commonly use to initiate repair.

Extract 28: RCE28 Lake 15:09

1	Kel:	He just did London to Bedford last year,	
2		.hhh he's doing Paris to London (0.4)	T-1
3		this year.	
4		(0.2)	
5 ->	Hea:	Cycling?	T0
6		(0.3)	
7	Kel:	Yeah he wants to cycle round Engla:n:d	T+1
8		[and then he wants to cycle round	
9	Hea:	[Won't he be like shattered.	
10	Kel:	Yea::h	

The surprise reaction employs a replacement operation to specify the pro-verb *doing* as *cycling* (see Section 4.5.1), through which Heather ostensibly checks whether she has understood Kelly correctly. The prosodic composition of the replacement, with prominence (e.g., higher pitch) on the first syllable, displays an affective stance of 'surprise' or 'astonishment' (cf. Selting, 1996). In effect, Heather uses a practice that speakers commonly use to initiate repair as a display of "ritualized disbelief" (Heritage, 1984; Wilkinson and Kitzinger, 2006). Kelly confirms the replacement, treating it as candidate understanding of her prior TCU, and then expands the report of her brother's plans (line 7). In this case, then, although Heather uses an OIR practice to react to a prior TCU with surprise, the sequence develops like an OIR sequence, through which a candidate repair is proffered and accepted. Consequently this case and others like it were included in the collection. An analysis of this case as an OIR and no more would be incomplete, but so too would an analysis of it simply as a display of surprise. The speaker *uses* an other-initiation of repair to do surprise.

In other cases, however, speakers use practices that formally resemble OIRs to do surprise and no more (cf. Wilkinson and Kitzinger, 2006, p. 169). One such practice that occurs with high frequency in the corpus is a specific phonetic and prosodic realization of *what* as a complete TCU. This pseudo OIR is produced with a high and level pitch, which neither rises nor falls but begins high and remains high throughout the word. It is hyperarticulated through an increase in the duration of each segment and a release of the final stop consonant, resulting in audible aspiration. Similar to a variant of *was* 'what' in German (Selting, 1988, 1996), the high-pitch *what* in English formally resembles practices for OIR, namely *what?* and *what*. (see Section 4.2.1), but it does not indicate a genuine trouble of hearing or understanding. Rather, the speaker of the high-pitch *what* feigns incomprehension of a prior TCU and in so doing claims it to be incomprehensible. The specific action that this practice performs depends on the action of the TCU that it locates as its source. As a reaction to a complaint or accusation, for example, the high-pitch *what* does objection or protest, but as a reaction to a report of an extreme or unexpected event, as in the following case, it displays surprise or disbelief. Here, after Hanna reports that a mutual friend Jacob wants to finish his degree in two years, an extremely short amount of time, Molly reacts with a series of surprise displays.

Extract 29: RCE25 Bench 15:19

1	Mol:	Have you seen other Jacob.
2		(0.3)
3	Mol:	recen[tly.
4	Han:	[.hh No: I think he (0.6) uhm (0.5) he's just-
5		(0.7) staying at home and (.) [working. A lot.
6	Mol:	[Mm
7		(0.4)
8	Han:	Because (1.9) he wants to finish within two years.
9	Mol:	((turns head quickly to look at Hanna))
10	Han:	(°Yeah°)
11		(0.3)
12 ->	Mol:	↑WHAT*(h)

13 Han: ((nods))
14 Mol: ↑How is that gonna be po:ssible.
15 (1.7)
16 Han: Well, I think he's got a lot- ...

Immediately upon the completion of Hanna's report, Molly quickly turns to look at her, producing a facial gesture with noticeably furrowed brows that displays a stance of 'astonishment' or 'incredulity' towards the news. This creates an opportunity for Hanna to expand the report, but Hanna merely reaffirms it and aligns with Molly's stance (line 10). The high-pitch *what*, a lexical explication of the facial gesture, creates a second opportunity and thereby pursues an expansion of the report, but Hanna once again merely aligns with Molly's reaction. Finally, an explicit request for an account of the situation, the design of which also expresses incredulity, succeeds in soliciting an expansion of the report.

Crucially, the response that the high-pitch *what* receives differs from the responses that the formally similar practices *what?* and *what.* make relevant. In reaction to the report, *what?* (an open OIR) could have elicited a repeat of the prior TCU, and *what.* (a specific OIR) could have received a specification of the implicit reference to 'his degree' in the prior TCU. In contrast to *what?* and *what.*, the high-pitch *what* takes for granted that the speaker has heard and understood the prior TCU adequately. What the speaker hears and understands evidently comes as a surprise, and the speaker may even doubt its veracity, but the high-pitch *what* does not indicate that the speaker has failed to hear or understand the source of his or her surprise, disbelief, or doubt. However, to ignore the relationship between the high-pitch *what* and genuine OIRs would be wrong. Not only would this dismiss the formal resemblances between the practices, as well as their analogues in related languages, it would fail to account for the intuition that the speaker of the high-pitch *what* feigns incomprehension as a means for doing surprise. Thus while pseudo OIRs such as this were excluded from the core collection, they nonetheless have a proper place on the periphery of the domain.

7 Conclusion

To return to Schegloff's (1993) question, what, then, are the distinctive payoffs of a quantitative analysis of OIR? The current study has presented a systematic survey of the practices of other-initiation and a critical examination of the boundary between genuine and pseudo OIRs within a corpus of English conversation. The inventory of practices generally confirmed previous research and yielded a number of discoveries, the use of copular interrogatives as a general format for other-initiation being one. The results also provide a new sense of proportion, as particular formats and practices emerged as relatively common or rare. The most frequent format for OIR in English is a candidate understanding, one that results from a single operation of replacement, continuation, or insertion on the trouble-source turn. Candidate understandings are the most specific or "strongest" of all OIRs, according to Schegloff et al. (1977), and are preferred over less specific formats for this reason. The quantitative evidence lends further support to this generalization. Less expected, however, was the paucity of *you mean* and the prevalence of turn-initial *what* in candidate understandings, the latter of which calls for further investigation. In addition, the analysis of the actions that OIRs perform, including the systematic exclusion of cases that formally resemble OIRs but do not initiate repair as an action, not only uncovered the previously undocumented use of OIR practices to perform non-serious actions such as joking and teasing, but also brought the boundaries of the domain, first laid down by Schegloff (1997), more clearly into focus. To answer Schegloff's question, a sober assessment of *this* quantitative analysis suggests the payoffs are incremental. But after more than 35 years of research on other-initiated repair in English, even incremental advances are hard-won.

Acknowledgements: This research was conducted within the other-initiated repair project of Nick Enfield's Human Sociality and Systems of Language Use group (European Research Council Starting Grant 240853 HSSLU). I would like to thank the initial members of the project – Julija Baranova, Joe Blythe, Mark

Dingemanse, Tyko Dirksmeyer, Nick Enfield, Simeon Floyd, Rósa Gísladóttir, Steve Levinson, Ely Manrique, Giovanni Rossi, and most especially Paul Drew – for many valuable and energetic discussions in data sessions, meetings, and workshops over the years. I would also like to thank Giovanni Rossi for access to video recordings used in this study. This research was made possible by the financial support of the Language and Cognition Department at the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics.

References

Benjamin, Trevor. 2012. When Problems Pass Us By: Using "You Mean" to Help Locate the Source of Trouble. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 45(1). 82–109.

Benjamin, Trevor. 2013. Signaling trouble: On the linguistic design of other-initiation of repair in English conversation. The Netherlands: University of Groningen Ph.D. dissertation.

Benjamin, Trevor & Traci Walker. 2013. Managing Problems of Acceptability Through High Rise-Fall Repetitions. *Discourse Processes* 50(2). 107–138.

Bois, John W. Du. 1980. Beyond Definiteness: The Trace of Identify in Discourse. In Wallace L. Chafe (ed.), *The Pear Stories: Cognitive, Cultural, and Linguistic Aspects of Narrative Production*, 203–274. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Bolden, Galina B. 2009. Beyond Answering: Repeat-Prefaced Responses in Conversation. *Communication Monographs* 76(2). 121–143.

Clark, Herbert H. & Edward F. Schaefer. 1987. Collaborating on contributions to conversations. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 2(1). 19–41.

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth. 2012. Some truths and untruths about final intonation in conversational questions. In Jan Peter De Ruiter (ed.), *Questions: Formal, Functional and Interactional Perspectives*, 123–145. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Drew, Paul. 1997. "Open" class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 28(1). 69–101.

Dryer, Matthew S. 2013. Position of Interrogative Phrases in Content Questions. In Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. http://wals.info/chapter/93.

Edwards, Derek. 2000. Extreme Case Formulations: Softeners, Investment, and Doing Nonliteral. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 33(4). 347–373.

Egbert, Maria, Andrea Golato & Jeffrey D. Robinson. 2009. Repairing reference. In Jack Sidnell (ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Comparative Perspectives*, 104–132. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ford, Cecilia E & Sandra A Thompson. 1996. Interactional units in conversation: Syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for the management of turns. In Elinor Ochs, Emanuel A. Schegloff & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and Grammar*, 134–184. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haakana, Markku & Salla Kurhila. 2009. Other-correction in everyday interaction: some comparative aspects. In Markku Haakana, Minna Laakso & Jan Lindström (eds.), *Talk in interaction: Comparative dimensions*, 152–179. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Hayashi, Makoto & Kaoru Hayano. 2013. Proffering insertable elements: A study of other-initiated repair in Japanese. In Makoto Hayashi, Geoffrey Raymond & Jack Sidnell (eds.), *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding*, 293–321. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hayashi, Makoto, Geoffrey Raymond & Jack Sidnell. 2013. Conversational repair and human understanding: An introduction. In Makoto Hayashi, Geoffrey Raymond & Jack Sidnell (eds.), *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding*, 1–40. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, John. 1984. A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, 299–345. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, John. 2012. Epistemics in Action: Action Formation and Territories of Knowledge. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 45(1). 1–29.

Jefferson, Gail. 1972. Side sequences. In David N. Sudnow (ed.), *Studies in Social Interaction*, 294–333. New York: Free Press.

Jefferson, Gail. 1984. On stepwise transition from talk about a trouble to inappropriately next-positioned matters. In J. Maxwell Atkinson & John Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies of Conversation Analysis*, 191–222. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jefferson, Gail. 1987. On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In G. Button & J.R.E. Lee (eds.), *Talk and social organization*, 86–100. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Kitzinger, Celia. 2013. Repair. In Jack Sidnell & Tanya Stivers (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, 229–256. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Kockelman, Paul. 2003. The Meanings of Interjections in Q'eqchi' Maya: From Emotive Reaction to Social and Discursive Action. *Current Anthropology* 44(4). 467–490.
Koshik, Irene. 2002. Designedly Incomplete Utterances: A Pedagogical Practice for Eliciting Knowledge Displays in Error Correction Sequences. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 35(3). 277–309.
Lerner, Gene H., Celia Kitzinger & Geoffrey Raymond. 2009. Some Sources of Cascading Troubles in the Organization of Repair. Paper presented at the 95th Annual Convention of the National Communication Association, Chicago, IL, 13 November.
Lerner, G. H. 2004. On the place of linguistic resources in the organization of talk-in-interaction: Grammar as action in prompting a speaker to elaborate. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 37(2). 151–184.
Li, Xiaoting. 2014. Leaning and recipient intervening questions in Mandarin conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 67. 34–60.
Payne, Thomas E. 1997. *Describing Morphosyntax: A Guide for Field Linguists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Pomerantz, Anita. 1986. Extreme case formulations: A way of legitimizing claims. *Human studies* 9(2). 219–229.
Rasmussen, Gitte. 2013. Inclined to better understanding—The coordination of talk and "leaning forward" in doing repair. *Journal of Pragmatics* 65. 30-45.
Robinson, Jeffrey D. 2006. Managing Trouble Responsibility and Relationships During Conversational Repair. *Communication Monographs* 73(2). 137–161.
Robinson, Jeffrey D. 2013. Epistemics, action formation, and other-initiation of repair: The case of partial questioning repeats. In Makoto Hayashi, Geoffrey Raymond & Jack Sidnell (eds.), *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding*, 261–292. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Robinson, Jeffrey D. 2014. What "What?" Tells Us About How Conversationalists Manage Intersubjectivity. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 47(2). 109–129.
Robinson, Jeffrey D. & Galina B. Bolden. 2010. Preference organization of sequence-initiating actions: The case of explicit account solicitations. *Discourse Studies* 12(4). 501 –533.
Robinson, Jeffrey & Heidi Kevoe-Feldman. 2010. Using Full Repeats to Initiate Repair on Others' Questions. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 43(3). 232–259.
Sacks, Harvey. 1992. *Lectures on conversation*. (Ed.) Gail Jefferson. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.
Sacks, Harvey & Emanuel A. Schegloff. 1979. Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. In George Psathas (ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*, 15–21. New York: Irvington.
Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff & Gail Jefferson. 1974. A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language* 50(4). 696–735.
Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1992. Repair After Next Turn: The Last Structurally Provided Defense of Intersubjectivity in Conversation. *American Journal of Sociology* 97(5). 1295–1345.
Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1996a. Confirming Allusions: Toward an Empirical Account of Action. *American Journal of Sociology* 102(1). 161–216.
Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1996b. Turn organization: One direction for inquiry into grammar and interaction. In Elinor Ochs, Emanuel A. Schegloff & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and Grammar*, 52–133. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1997. Practices and actions: Boundary cases of other-initiated repair. *Discourse Processes* 23(3). 499–545.
Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2000. When "others" initiate repair. *Applied Linguistics* 21(2). 205–243.
Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2007. *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2013. Ten operations in self-initiated, same-turn repair. In Makoto Hayashi, Geoffrey Raymond & Jack Sidnell (eds.), *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding*, 41–70. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Schegloff, Emanuel A., Gail Jefferson & Harvey Sacks. 1977. The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation. *Language* 53(2). 361–382.
Selting, Margret. 1988. The role of intonation in the organization of repair and problem handling sequences in conversation. *Journal of pragmatics* 12(3). 293–322.
Selting, Margret. 1996. Prosody as an activity-type distinctive cue in conversation: The case of so-called "astonished" questions in repair initiation. In Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen & Margret Selting (eds.), *Prosody in Conversation*, 231–270. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Seo, Mi-Suk & Irene Koshik. 2010. A conversation analytic study of gestures that engender repair in ESL conversational tutoring. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42(8). 2219–2239.
Sidnell, Jack. 2007. Repairing person reference in a small Caribbean community. In N. J. Enfield & Tanya Stivers (eds.), *Person reference in interaction: Linguistic, cultural, and social perspectives*, 281–308. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Sidnell, Jack. 2010. *Conversation Analysis: An Introduction*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
Sidnell, Jack. 2012. Turn-Continuation by Self and by Other. *Discourse Processes* 49(3-4). 314–337.
Sidnell, Jack & Rebecca Barnes. 2013. Alternative, subsequent descriptions. In Makoto Hayashi, Geoffrey Raymond & Jack Sidnell (eds.), *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding*, 322–342. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stassen, Leon. 2013. Zero Copula for Predicate Nominals. In Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. http://wals.info/chapter/120.
Svennevig, Jan. 2008. Trying the easiest solution first in other-initiation of repair. *Journal of Pragmatics* 40(2). 333–348.
Wilkinson, Sue & Celia. Kitzinger. 2006. Surprise as an interactional achievement: Reaction tokens in conversation. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 69(2). 150-182.
Wong, Jean. 2000. Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/non-native speaker English conversation. *Applied Linguistics* 21(2). 244–267.
Zahn, Christopher J. 1984. A reexamination of conversational repair. *Communication Monographs* 51(1). 56–66.