



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Discourse constraints on prosodic marking in lexical replacement repair*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:  
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/88400/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Plug, L (2015) Discourse constraints on prosodic marking in lexical replacement repair. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 87. pp. 80-104. ISSN 0378-2166

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.07.005>

---

© 2015, Elsevier. Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International  
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

# Discourse constraints on prosodic marking in lexical replacement repair

Leendert Plug

Linguistics and Phonetics, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT

l.plug@leeds.ac.uk

## 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.

## KEY WORDS

Self-repair, prosody, discourse coherence, epistemic authority, precision and exaggeration

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the Economic and Social Research Council grant RES-061-25-0417 *Prosodic marking revisited: The phonetics of self-initiated self-repair in Dutch*. I would like to thank Christina Englert and Paul Carter for their contributions to the research reported here, and Dagmar Barth-Weingarten and two anonymous reviewers for helpful comments on drafts of this paper.

# 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 Thursd- 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 **gebrui- gewerkt** wordt ('when one use- works with text')
- c. de **koelka- koelcel** ('the refrigera- 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>↑schien ga `k vana:vond 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 s:u:per **gesp- 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::lemaa:l 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*

=moet je eens ↑rekken ofzo vandaag ook  
*you should stretch or something, also today*

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 Mar↑leen, .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 bu:s** hhheh ɛ'k zeg nou: d'r komt geen  
*or by ca- by bus?" ((laughs)) I said "well, there is no*
- 3 trein in [Loon Op Zandɛ  
*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 ↑↑Waal↓wijk 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: ɛzij vond het echt super raarɛ 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 katholiek.  
          *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-*

8                    weet je wat het is?< Nutsschool?  
                       do you know what it is, 'Nutsschool'?

9                    (1.0)

10        B:        niet precies.  
                       not exactly

11                    (0.8)

12 → A:        **is dat kath- is dat protestANts?**  
                       is that cath- is that protestant?

13        B:        nee weet ik ↑echt niet  
                       no I really don't know

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 the teacher of*
- 2 geschiedenis of de leerkracht fysica punten moet aftrekken  
*history or the teacher of physics should deduct points*
- 3 voor spellingfouten?  
*for spelling errors?*
- 4 (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*
- 6 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** aa: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 she also couldn't explain it well, that's*
- 6→ Sonate 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:  
*yes* [hja hja  
*yes yes*
- ((eight turns omitted, focusing on the difficulties in learning the selected piece))
- 10 B: Reuser heeft ook ↑pr:a:chtige muziek ges[chreven].  
*Reuser has also written wonderful music*
- 11 A: [ >ja maar dan  
*yes but then*
- 12 moet je< de S- Sonata Nummer ↑Zes nemen die is  
*you should take S- Sonata Number Six, that's*
- 13 h[a:rtstikke mooi >die [is veel mooier.<  
*extremely beautiful that's much nicer*
- 14 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 l.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 l.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 krij:gen 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 krijge:: 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)

12                    [een WOON:huis.  
                          *a dwelling*

13        B:        [nee (...)  
                          *no*

11                    (0.3)

12 →                **een apparte- een huis** is een (1.1) een beneden en boven.  
                          *an apart- a house is a, an upstairs and downstairs*

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 vermoeienis [opvangt da's [mijn=  
*carries a large part of the fatigue, that's my*
- 11 B: [mmm [mmm
- 12 A: =ondervin[ding toch  
*experience I must say*
- 13 B: [ja:

*yes*

14 (0.6)  
 15 ja dat [zou  
*yes that would*

16 A: [dus ik kan met hetgeen dat ik momenteel aan m'n  
*so I can with what I have on my feet at the moment*

17 → voeten heb, dat eigenlijk ook ↑heel gemakkelijke **wandel-**  
*which are actually very comfortable hiking-*

18 → ↑**spOrtschOEnen** zijn? .hh [maar daar zou ik toch=  
*sports shoes, but I would not*

19 B: [ja?  
*yes*

20 A: =niet aan denken om daar [vijftien kilometer mee te lopen.  
*dream of walking fifteen kilometers on those*

21 B: [om dAAr nEE nEE: nee nee nee.  
*to, no no no no no*

22 dus die: d'r is een zekere grens.  
*so those, there is a certain boundary*

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' (l. 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 probleem 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. 't was eigenlijk  
*communist ... well, it was really*
- 6 gewoon 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







*would never be able to create their own identifi-, identity,*

3           kunne- (0.6) creëren. >dat is iets wat je< ↑zelf doet,  
*that's something you do yourself*

Extract 10. Comp f [BROADCAST TALK] fn007365

1           B:     je kan ook zeggen dat is de ↑rijkdom van Turkije, .hhh  
*you can also say that is the richness of Turkey,*

2           waardoor 't ook misschien wordt behoed voo:r zeg maar  
*through which it is also perhaps protected against, if you like,*

3→         erg fundamente- fundamentalistische ontwikkelingen  
*very fundamenta- fundamentalistic developments*

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           B:     uhm als 't uh: (.) als (.) allee als ik mocht beslissen zou  
*erm if it er, if, well, if it was my decision we*

2           daar ↑veel meer ↑tijd aan uh: besteed moeten worden?  
*should er devote much more time to that*

3           A:     mm-mm

4           B:     omdat: (0.2) hoe meer ik erover lees hè?  
*because, the more I read about it, right?*

5 A: mm-mm  
6 B: >want ik lees er dus over< .hh hoe duidelijker het mij toch  
*because I read about it, the clearer it is to me*  
7 wordt, ik meen daarin te ↑mogen gelo<sub>v</sub>en dat een uh (0.9)  
*I believe it's reasonable to assume that an er,*  
8 ↑vroeg geconfronteerd worden met allerlei ↑VORmen van  
*early confrontation with all sorts of forms of*  
9 geschreven taal. .hhh liefst oo:k >literatuur,< van in de  
*written language, preferably also literature, in the*  
10 ↓kleUtertijd dat dat ↑veel meer kansen geeft, niet alleen  
*toddler ages, that that provides many more chances, not just in terms*  
11 wat uw persoonlijkheidsontwikkeling betreft (0.5) maar oo:k  
*of one's personality development, but also one's*  
12 → uw (.) ↑LEER:moei- ↑MOgelijkheden later  
*one's educational difficul- abilities later on*  
13 A: mm-mm

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 ↑mI Jn 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 ↑onna↑tUUrlijk 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, *onnauwkeurig* 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-fo- sixty-six members of parliament
- 5 (0.7)
- 6 d[e: VLD  
the VLD
- 7 B: [u moet even even goed kijken hè? want [uh  
you have to look carefully, because er
- 8 A: [zesenzestig  
sixty-six
- 9 in [totaal, dat mag ne KEER GEZE<sup>EGD</sup> [WORDen  
in total, it's worth saying this for once
- 10 B: ['t is 't is wat Minder ['t is wat Minder  
it's, it's become it's become a bit
- 11 geworden [natuurlijk hè  
less of course, hasn't it
- 12 A: [nee daarjuist (0.3) ging het over de CVP, >we  
no just now, we were talking about the CVP, we
- 13 zijn nog altijd< (.)↑nee ↑nee 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 *vierenzestig* '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: en ik heb geen bladzij:de overgeslagen maar die neiging was  
*and I haven't skipped a page, but that inclination was*
- 2 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 ↓leuks tegenkom maar [goed=  
*do spot something entertaining, but anyway*
- 4 B: [ja  
*yes*
- 5 A: =nee: misschien dat er nog net in de volgende  
*no maybe just the next*
- 6 regel [weer iets ↑leuks staa[t  
*line may have something good in it*
- 7 B: [mmm [mmm
- 8 (0.8)
- 9→ A: (...) voorbeeld ↓ja: 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 ↓ja je kunt- ↑JIJ 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 ↑**ZEL**den in ieder geval  
*no I never, or at least seldom have*
- 2 problemen 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-

repair beyond Levelt & Cutler's (1983) distinction between error and appropriateness repair, based on categories introduced by Goffman (1981).

#### 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 preemptive face-saving move, akin to formulating a precautionary concessive clause (Montolio 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 sub-categorization 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.

## References

- Aijmer, Karin 1997. *I think* – An English modal particle. In *Modality in Germanic languages: Historical and comparative perspectives*, ed. Toril Swan & Olaf J. Westvik, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1-47.
- Aylett, Matthew & Alice Turk 2004. The smooth signal redundancy hypothesis: A functional explanation for relationships between redundancy, prosodic prominence, and duration in spontaneous speech. *Language and Speech* 47: 31-56.
- Baker, Rachel & Ann Bradlow 2000. Variability in word duration as a function of probability, speech style, and prosody. *Language and Speech* 52: 391-413.
- Barth, Dagmar 2000. 'That's true, although not really, but still': Expressing concession in spoken English. In *Cause, condition, concession, contrast: Cognitive and discourse perspectives*, ed. Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen & Bernd Kortmann, Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, 411-438.
- Barth-Weingarten, Dagmar, Nicole Dehé & Anne Wichmann, eds 2009. *Where prosody meets pragmatics*. Bingley: Emerald.
- Barth-Weingarten, Dagmar, Elisabeth Reber & Margret Selting, eds 2010. *Prosody in interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bolden, Galina B. 2011. On the organization of repair in multiperson conversation: The case of 'other'-selection in other-initiated repair sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 44:237-262.
- Bolden, Galina B. 2013. Unpacking 'self': Repair and epistemics in conversation. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 76: 314-342.
- Bolden, Galina B., Jenny Mandelbaum & Sue Wilkinson 2012. Pursuing a response by repairing an indexical reference. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45: 137-155.
- Button, Graham & Neil Casey 1984. Generating topic. In *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, ed. J. Maxwell Atkinson & John Heritage, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 167-190.
- Button, Graham & Neil Casey 1985. Topic nomination and topic pursuit. *Human Studies* 8: 3-55.
- Calhoun, Sasha 2010. What makes a word contrastive? Prosodic, semantic and pragmatic perspectives. In *Where prosody meets pragmatics*, ed. Dagmar Barth-Weingarten, Nicole Dehé & Anne Wichmann, Bingley: Emerald, 53-78.
- Clift, Rebecca 2001. Meaning in interaction: The case of *actually*. *Language* 77: 245-291.



- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth 2012. Exploring affiliation in the reception of conversational complaint stories. In *Emotion in interaction*, ed. Anssi Peräkylä & Marja-Leena Sorjonen, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 113-146.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth & Sandra A. Thompson 2005. A linguistic practice for retracting overstatements: 'Concessive repair'. In *Syntax and lexis in conversation*, ed. Auli Hakulinen & Margret Selting, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 257-288.
- Curl, Traci S. 2005. Practices in other-initiated repair resolution: The phonetic differentiation of 'repetitions'. *Discourse Processes* 39: 1-43.
- Cutler, Anne 1983. Speakers' conceptions of the function of prosody. In *Prosody: Models and measurements*, ed. Anne Cutler & D. Robert Ladd, Heidelberg: Springer, 79-91.
- Edwards, Derek. 2000. Extreme case formulations: Softeners, investment, and doing nonliteral. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 33: 347-373.
- Dehé, Nicole & Anne Wichmann 2010. The multifunctionality of epistemic parentheticals in discourse: Prosodic cues to the semantic-pragmatic boundary. *Functions of Language* 17: 1-28.
- Drew, Paul 2003. Precision and exaggeration in interaction. *American Sociological Review* 68: 917-938.
- Drew, Paul 2005. The interactional generation of exaggerated versions in conversations. In *Syntax and lexis in conversation*, ed. Auli Hakulinen & Margret Selting, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 233-256.
- Drew, Paul & Elizabeth Holt 1998. Figures of speech: Idiomatic expressions and the management of topic transition in conversation. *Language in Society* 27: 495-523.
- Drew, Paul, Traci Walker & Richard Ogden 2013. Self-repair and action construction. In *Conversational repair and human understanding*, ed. Makoto Hayashi, Geoffrey Raymond & Jack Sidnell, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 71-94.
- Egbert, Maria, Andrea Golato & Jeffrey D. Robinson 2009. Repairing reference. In *Conversation analysis: Comparative perspectives*, ed. Jack Sidnell, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 104-132.
- Fox, Barbara A., Yael Maschler & Susanne Uhmman 2010. A cross-linguistic study of self-repair: Evidence from English, German, and Hebrew. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 2487-2505.
- Fox, Barbara A., Sandra A. Thompson, Cecilia E. Ford & Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen 2013. Conversation analysis and linguistics. In *The handbook of conversation analysis*, ed. Jack Sidnell & Tanya Stivers, Oxford: Blackwell, 726-740.
- Fox, Barbara, Fay Wouk, Makoto Hayashi, Steven Fincke, Liang Tao, Marja-Leena Sorjonen, Minna Laakso & Wilfrido F. Hernandez 2009. A cross-linguistic investigation of the site of initiation in same-turn self-repair. In *Conversation analysis: Comparative perspectives*, ed. Jack Sidnell, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 60-103.
- Geluykens, Ronald. 1994. *The pragmatics of discourse anaphora in English: Evidence from conversational repair*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

- Genzel, Susanne, Shinichiro Ishihara & Balázs Surányi 2014. The prosodic expression of focus, contrast and givenness: A production study of Hungarian. *Lingua*, advance online access. [doi 10.1016/j.lingua.2014.07.010]
- Goffman, Erving 1967a. Embarrassment and social organization. In *Interaction ritual: Essays in face-to-face behavior*, ed. Erving Goffman, London: Random House, 97-112.
- Goffman, Erving 1967b. On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements of social interaction. In *Interaction ritual: Essays in face-to-face behavior*, ed. Erving Goffman, London: Random House, 5-46.
- Goffman, Erving 1981. Radio talk. In *Forms of talk*, ed. Erving Goffman, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 197-327.
- Günther, Susanne 2000. From concessive connector to discourse marker: The use of *obwohl* in everyday German interaction. In *Cause, condition, concession, contrast: Cognitive and discourse perspectives*, ed. Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen & Bernd Kortmann, Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, 439-468.
- Hepburn, Alexa & Galina B. Bolden 2013. The conversation analytic approach to transcription. In *The handbook of conversation analysis*, ed. Jack Sidnell & Tanya Stivers, Oxford: Blackwell, 57-76.
- Heritage, John 1984. A change of state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, ed. J. Maxwell Atkinson & John Heritage, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 299-345.
- Heritage, John 2012. Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45: 1-29.
- Heritage, John 2013. Action formation and its epistemic (and other) backgrounds. *Discourse Studies* 15: 547-574.
- Heritage, John & Geoffrey Raymond 2005. The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68: 15-38.
- Holt, Elizabeth & Rebecca Clift, eds 2006. *Reporting talk: Reported speech in interaction*, ed. Elizabeth Holt & Rebecca Clift, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ito, Kiwako & Shari R. Speer 2011. Semantically-independent but contextually-dependent interpretation of contrastive accent. In *Prosodic categories: Production, perception and comprehension*, ed. Sónia Frota, Gorra Elordieta & Pilar Prieto, Dordrecht: Springer, 69-92.
- Kitzinger, Celia 2013. Repair. In *The handbook of conversation analysis*, ed. Jack Sidnell & Tanya Stivers, Oxford: Blackwell, 229-256.
- Kitzinger, Celia & Jenny Mandelbaum 2013. Word selection and social identities in talk-in-interaction. *Communication Monographs* 80: 176-198.
- Koole, Tom 2010. Displays of epistemic access. Student responses to teacher explanation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 43: 183-209.

- Koole, Tom 2012. The epistemics of student problems: Explaining mathematics in a multi-lingual class. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44: 1902-1916.
- Kormos, Judit 1999. Monitoring and self-repair in L2. *Language Learning* 49: 303-342.
- Landgrebe, Jeanette 2012. 'I think – you know': Two epistemic stance markers and their significance in an innovation process. *Språk och Interaktion* 3: 107-130.
- Lee-Goldman, Russell 2011. No as a discourse marker. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 2627-2649.
- Lerner, Gene H. 1996. On the 'semi-permeable' character of grammatical units in conversation: Conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker. In: *Interaction and grammar*, ed. Elinor Ochs, Emanuel A. Schegloff & Sandra A. Thompson, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 238-276.
- Lerner, Gene H. 2002. Turn-sharing: the choral co-production of talk-in-interaction. In: *The language of turn and sequence*, ed. Cecilia E. Ford, Barbara A. Fox & Sandra A. Thompson, Oxford: Oxford University Press: 225-256.
- Lerner, Gene H., Galina B. Bolden, Jenny Mandelbaum & Alexa Hepburn 2012. Granularity recalibration repairs: Refining formulations for the task at hand. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45: 191-212.
- Lerner, Gene H. & Celia Kitzinger 2007. Extraction and aggregation in the repair of individual and collective self-reference. *Discourse Studies* 9: 526-557.
- Levelt, Willem J.M. 1983. Monitoring and self-repair in speech. *Cognition* 14: 41-104.
- Levelt, Willem J.M. 1989. *Speaking: From intention to articulation*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Levelt, Willem J.M. & Anne Cutler 1983. Prosodic marking in speech repair. *Journal of Semantics* 2: 205-217.
- Lindblom, Bjørn 1996. Role of articulation in speech perception: Clues from production. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 99: 1683-1692.
- Local, John 1996. Conversational phonetics: Some aspects of news receipts in everyday talk. In *Prosody in conversation: Interactional studies*, ed. Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen & Margret Selting, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 177-230.
- Mazeland, Harrie & Mike Huiskes 2001. Dutch *but* as a sequential conjunction: Its use as a resumption marker. In: *Studies in interactional linguistics*, ed. Margret Selting & Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 141-169.
- Montolio, Estrella 2000. On affirmative and negative complex conditional connectives. In *Cause, condition, concession, contrast: Cognitive and discourse perspectives*, ed. Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen & Bernd Kortmann, Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, 143-172.
- Nofsinger, Robert (1983), Tactical coherence in courtroom conversation. In *Conversational coherence: Form, structure, and strategy*, ed. B. Craig & K. Tracy, 243-258. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Nooteboom, Sieb G. 2010. Monitoring for speech errors has different functions in inner and overt speech. In *The linguistic enterprise: From knowledge of language to knowledge in linguistics*, ed. Martin B. Everaert, Tom Lentz, Hannah d. Mulder, Øystein Nilsen & Arjen Zondervan, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 213-233.
- Ogden, Richard 2006. Phonetics and social action in agreements and disagreements. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38: 1752-1775.
- Oostdijk, Nelleke 2002. The design of the Spoken Dutch Corpus. In *New frontiers of corpus research*, ed. P. Peters, P. Collins & A. Smith, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 105-113.
- Penman, Robyn 1991. Goals, games and moral orders: A paradoxical case in court? In *Understanding face-to-face interaction: Issues linking goals and discourse*, ed. Karen Tracy, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 21-42.
- Plug, Leendert 2014a. Acoustic correlates of prosodic marking in spontaneous self-repair in Dutch. *Proceedings of the Tenth International Seminar on Speech Production*, Cologne.
- Plug, Leendert 2014b. On (or not on) the 'upgrading-downgrading continuum': The case of 'prosodic marking' in self-repair. In *Prosody and phonetics in interaction*, ed. D. Barth-Weingarten & B. Szczepek Reed, Mannheim: Verlag für Gesprächsforschung, 70-86.
- Plug, Leendert & Paul Carter 2013. Prosodic marking, pitch and intensity in spontaneous lexical self-repair in Dutch. *Phonetica* 70: 155-181.
- Pluymaekers, Mark, Mirjam Ernestus & R. Harald Baayen 2005. Articulatory planning is continuous and sensitive to informational redundancy. *Phonetica* 62: 146-159.
- Pomerantz, Anita 1984. Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, ed. J. Maxwell Atkinson & John Heritage, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 57-101.
- Pomerantz, Anita 1986. Extreme case formulations: A way of legitimizing claims. *Human Studies* 9: 219-229.
- Pomerantz, Anita 2005. Using participants' video-stimulated comments to complement analyses of interactional processes. In *Conversation and cognition*, ed. Hedwig te Molder & Jonathan Potter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 93-113.
- Potter, Jonathan & Derek Edwards 2013. Conversation analysis and psychology. In *The handbook of conversation analysis*, ed. Jack Sidnell & Tanya Stivers, Oxford: Blackwell, 701-725.
- Raymond, Geoffrey & John Heritage 2013. One question after another: Same-turn repair in the formation of yes/no type initiating actions. In *Conversational repair and human understanding*, ed. Makoto Hayashi, Geoffrey Raymond & Jack Sidnell, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 135-171.
- Romaniuk, Tanya & Susan Ehrlich 2013. On the interactional import of self-repair in the courtroom. In *Conversational repair and human understanding*, ed. Makoto Hayashi, Geoffrey Raymond & Jack Sidnell, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 172-197.

- Roseano, Paolo, Montserrat González, Joan Borràs-Comes & Pilar Prieto 2014. Communicating epistemic stance: How speech and gesture patterns reflect epistemicity and evidentiality. *Discourse Processes*, advance online access. [doi 10.1080/0163853X.2014.969137]
- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff & Gail Jefferson 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking for conversation. *Language* 50: 696–735.
- Sanders, Robert E. 2005. Validating ‘observations’ in discourse studies: A methodological reason for attention to cognition. In *Conversation and cognition*, ed. Hedwig te Molder & Jonathan Potter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 57-78.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1991. Conversation analysis and socially shared cognition. In *Perspectives on socially shared cognition*, ed. L. Resnick, J. Levine & S. Teasley, Washington DC: American Psychological Association, 150-171.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1992. Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology* 97: 1295-1345.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2007. *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2013. Ten operations in self-initiated, same-turn self-repair. In *Conversational repair and human understanding*, ed. M. Hayashi, G. Raymond & J. Sidnell, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 41-70.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A., Gail Jefferson & Harvey Sacks 1977. The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53: 361-382.
- Schiffrin, Deborah 2006. *In other words: Variation in reference and narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Selting, Margret & Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, eds 2001. *Studies in interactional linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Seyfarth, Scott 2014. Word informativity influences acoustic duration. *Cognition* 133: 140-155.
- Shattuck-Hufnagel, Stefanie & Anne Cutler 1999. The prosody of speech error corrections revisited. *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Congress of Phonetic Sciences*, San Francisco, 1483–1486.
- Sidnell, Jack 2010. *Conversation analysis: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sidnell, Jack & Tanya Stivers, eds 2013. *The handbook of conversation analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Smiljanić, Rajka & Ann R. Bradlow 2009. Speaking and hearing clearly: Talker and listener factors in speaking style changes. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 3: 236-264.
- Stivers, Tanya & Federico Rossano 2010. Mobilizing response. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 43: 3-31.
- Ten Have, Paul 2007. *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide*. Second edition. London: Sage.

