SELF-REPAIR OF ACTIONS IN GERMAN
A CASE FOR EMBEDDED

by

CHRISTOPHER SHANDON LEMON

B.S., Kansas State University, 2009

A REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Modern Languages
College of Arts and Sciences

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2011

Approved by:

Major Professor
Emma Betz

Copyright

CHRISTOPHER SHANDON LEMON

2011

Abstract

Using conversation analytic methodology, this paper examines the self-repair of actions in everyday German conversation, with focus given to the replacement of verbs and the subsequent effect on actions. While study has been done on the function of recycling repair within a turn (Fox, Hayashi, Jesperson, 1996) no research has been done on the function of verb replacement and its effect on talk.

This paper shows that verb replacement is a strategy employed by speakers in order to either a) negotiate what type of action is preferred within a particular TCU or b) to invoke external forces to either deflect an action, or to make a particular action available to an interlocutor.

This paper concludes by discussing the specific function of this particular type of repair and how it is useful in repairing problematic actions.

Das Ziel dieses Werkes ist die Analysierung der Selbstreperatur von Verben in deutschen alltäglichen Gesprächen, besonders die Ersetzung die Verben und den Beeindruckung des Turns. Obwohl es schon Recherche über der Funktion dem Recycling innerhalb eines Turns (Fox, Hayashi, Jesperson, 1996) gibt, gibt es keine Recherche über der Funktion Ersetzung und wie es Talk beeindruckt.

Dieses Werk zeigt wie die Verbersetzung eine Strategie ist, wie Sprechern entweder a) eine präferierte Aktion aushandeln können oder b) wie man Externe Kräfte aufrufen kann um eine Aktion abzulenken oder einen Gesprächspartner einer möglichen Aktion geben.

Als Ergebnis dieses Werk diskutiert die spezifische Funktion der Selbstreperatur und wie es eine nützliche Strategie ist um eine problematische Aktion zu reparieren ist.

Table of Contents

List of Examples

List of Tables

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the help and support that has been extended to me by everyone in the Department of Modern Languages, that has made the completion of my studies possible. I would specifically like to thank Drs. Jennifer Askey and Emma Betz, who I have had the opportunity to work very closely with. Without their advice and support I would not have been able to achieve all that I did.

I would also like to thank my mother for always supporting me in everything that I've done, and who has always pushed me to succeed.

Dedication

Für meine Mutter

Chapter 1 - Introduction

Very often in speech we encounter and produce what is referred to as self-repair. Fox, Maschler

and Uhmann (2010) define self-repair as the process "by which speakers of a language stop,

abort, repeat, or alter their turn before it comes to completion" (p. 2487). While psychologists

may stipulate that these types of repairs are random and are often a sign that a speaker does not

know what they wish to say (Freud, 1924), they are actually highly patterned, both phonetically

and morphosyntactically (Jesperson, 1924) and often have a very specific function, both socially

and linguistically (Fox, Hayashi, & Jesperson, 1996). For example, repairs involving recycling

(the reuse of part, or all, of a previously completed utterance) are often used as a delaying

mechanism, for example during word searches (Fox, et al., 1996). Replacements (the

replacement of one word with another) may also target an action (i.e. request), not just a word or

phrase. Self-repair of an action can be used to elicit a preferred outcome, as Example 1

illustrates.

Example 1: Essen/Dinner

```
71  S: ä:m willst du einfach nach ↑hause kommen wenn du fertig bist?
       u:m are you going to come ↑home when youre done?

72     (0.4)

73  S: oder wenn du soweit bist also wir [sind ]
       or   when  youre  as  far  as  we [are  ]

74  B:                                   [ja:, ] was macht-* wa-
                                          [yea:,] what do-* wha-
                                          [yea:,] what are you doing-* wha-

75     wollt i:hr irgendwas essen,
       would y:ou something eat,
       would y:ou like something to eat,


76     (0.8)

77  B: irgendwann,
```

```
        sometime,

78  S: ja: bestimmt.
       yea: of course.

79  B: thehe h hhhä(h)m sollnn wi::r um::: SIEben was essen
       thehe h hhha (u)m should w::e eat at SEven

80  S: klingt gut.=hh
       sounds good. =hh
```

In example 1, B initiates a first action, a pre-request through inquiry, with *was **macht-***/*"what
are you doing-*"* in line 74. *Macht/***"you doing"** is indicated as the trouble source (marked by
the (*) asterisk) because the word is abruptly cut off, which is marked in the transcription using a
(-) dash. In line 75, B continues with a second action by upgrading his pre-request to a request
by asking ***wollt** i:hr irgendwas essen*/ **"would"** you like something to eat. After a long pause in
line 76, B further modifies his request by adding *irgendwann*/ "sometime" leaving the timeframe
for the request open, making the request something that is easily agreed to. A more in-depth
analysis of this excerpt is provided below in the Examples/Data Analysis section, and a more
complete list of transcription conventions is available in Appendix A.

Much of the research that has been done in the realm of self-repair relates to the syntactic
structure of the actual repair (Fox et al., 2010; Uhmann, 2001; Schegloff, 1979). Fox et al. (2010)
performed a cross-linguistic study of English, German, and Hebrew that focused on the function
words (e.g. auxiliaries, prepositions) and content (e.g. nouns, verbs) words that are recurrently
repaired and the structural places where repairs take place inside of a sentence. In Example 1,
for example, B begins a to form a question with *was macht*/ "what are" you doing (line 74), then
initiates a repair with a cut off and recycling the question word, *wa*/"wha" (line 74). B then
replaces the content word (verb) *macht*/"doing" (line 74), with another content word (verb)
wollt/"would" (line 75), which, it should be noted, turns out to be the first element of a new
sentential unit (***wollt** i:hr irgendwas essen,*/would you like something to eat). Although Fox,

2

Hayashi and Jesperson (1996) discuss the function of recycling as a delaying strategy, few researchers discuss the function of the self-repair of verbs in particular and the function it may have within a turn or a conversation as a whole. This work will establish that the self-repair of verbs in German, more specifically the replacement of verbs within a single turn, has two separate and distinct functions that have implications not only within the turn itself, but also within a larger conversation: to repair actions in order to negotiate towards a preferred outcome as we can see in Example 1, and to invoke external forces to achieve a preferred outcome, which will be categorized in more detail below.

Chapter 2 – Previous Research

2.1 Forward and Backward Looking Repair

Research in Conversation Analysis has determined that there are two different types of repair that take place in a language. These types of repair are forward-looking and backward-looking repair, so called because of where their referents (or targets) are within a turn. Forward-looking repairs are most often word searches (Ivanyi, 2001) because the position of what is being repaired is an upcoming part of a speaker's turn. Backward-looking repairs, such as recycling and replacement, are so called because the trouble source that initiated the repair has occurred in a previous stretch of talk within a speaker's or a speaking partner's turn (Fox et al., 2010). The present study is concerned with the effect of the backward-looking replacement of verbs in German that result in the changing of actions. The findings from this research show that the repair of a word, phrase, or utterance is more than a simple "lexical" replacement. Instead speakers employ these repairs, specifically the replacement of verbs in this study, to achieve a preferred outcome.

2.2 Preference

Preference is an extremely integral part of Conversation Analysis and is also the basis for many

of the conclusions made in my research. The organization of preference, or "preference

structure" is based on a conversational unit called an "adjacency pair" consisting of a first pair

part (FPP) and a second pair part (SPP) (Koshik, 2002, p. 1852-53). For this study the main

focus will be on first pair parts, which is where all of the self-repair instances in my data occur.

Questions, which are first pair parts, require an answer (SPP), but they also "make relevant

"alternative types of response", which can be either preferred (i.e. acceptance) or dispreferred

(i.e. rejection) (p. 1853). In short a preferred response aligns the activity with what the speaker

wanted to accomplish in the FPP (i.e. requests prefer granting), and "can also be encoded

through grammar, prosody, or word selection" (p. 1853).

It is also possible for more than one set of preference structures to be active at the same time, one

activated by formatting (a yes/no question) and one activated by another action; these

preferences can be either "congruent" or "cross-cutting" (Schegloff, 2007, p. 76). With

congruent preferences the preferred response for the formatting aligns with the preferred

response for the action. With cross-cutting preferences, however, the preferred responses do not

align (p. 76). In this case it is the preferred response for the action that takes precedence, instead

of the design of the utterance that delivers the action (p. 77-78).

2.3 Self- and Other- Repair

Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) explain that a distinction needs to be made between who is

making, or initiating, a repair, and who completes it. These two dimensions systematically affect

the type, structure, and frequency of repair in conversation. Self-Initiated Repair is a repair that

is made on one's own utterance, while Other-Initiated Repair is made by someone else. The ability for either the speaker or another party to both initiate and or complete the repair allows for different combinations of repair actions which is displayed in the table below:

Table 1: Repair Initiation

Self-Initiated, Self Completed Repair

<pre>N: She was givin me a:ll the people that
->   were go :ne this yea: r I mean this
->   quarter y' l/ know
J: Yeah</pre>

Self-Initiated, Other Completed Repair

<pre>B: -> He had dis uh Mistuh W- whateverk- I can't
         think of his firstname, Watts on, the one thet wrote // that
         piece,
A: -> Dan Watts.</pre>

Other-Initated, Other-Completed Repair

<pre>B: Where didju play ba:sk//etbaw.
A: (The) gy:m
B: In the gy:m?
A: Yea:h Like grou(h)p therapy. Yuh know=
B: [Oh:::.
A: [half the group thet we had la:s' term wz there en we jus'
         playing arou:nd.
B: -> uh- fooling around.
A: Eh-yeah…</pre>

Other-Initated, Self-Completed Repair

<pre>Ken: Is Al here today?
Dan: Yeah.
        (2.0)
Roger: -> He is? hh eh heh
Dan: -> Well he was.</pre>

(Schegloff, 1977)

For this paper I will be focusing exclusively on self-initiated, self-completed repair (hereafter self-repair), which is also the preferred (and most common) form of repair (Uhmann, 2001; Schegloff, 1977).

Self-initiated self-completed repairs can take many forms (e.g. recycling, word search); the most prevalent type of repair in my data (all of which is German) is word replacement, during which a word or part of a word is completely replaced by another. Example 2 illustrates this procedure: In line 9 *ko-*/"co-" (projecting kommst/are you coming) is replaced by *kannst*/ "can you". In this example M is currently at work, while L is currently at home. With her action in line 9, L shows her preference for M coming home from work early by asking him if he is able to come home early. By making this request for information M is actually projecting her preferred response to the question.

Example 2: Früher kommen/ Come home early

```
   007 M:    ä: und wenn ich zurück bin dann bin ich ja- s↓owieso (.)
             a: and when I back am then am I yea anyway (.)
             a: and when I get back I'll.

   008       die ganze Zei[t (hier/im Büro)]
             the whole tim[e (here/at the office]
             be here at the office the whole time

=> 009 L:                      [ja=und du ko-*  ] kannst nicht eher kommen,
                               [yeah=and you com-*]can not earlier come,
                               [yeah and you are com-*] can't come earlier

   010       die verna geht ja morgen weg, hh
             the verna goes MP tomorrow away, hh
             verna is leaving tomorrow, hh
```

More specifically, I will be dealing with the replacement of verbs, which are linguistically categorized as content words. In a cross linguistic study Fox, Maschler, and Uhmann found that, within the context of self-repair, verbs are replaced 27% of the time in German compared to only 11% of the time in English (2010, p. 2492-93). The significantly higher percentage of verb replacement in German, shows that compared to English there is a preference for verb replacement, which possibly speaks to a specific function of the phenomenon in the German language.

2.4 Syntax of Self-repair

Repairs have a very specific syntax (cf. Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks 1977 for English; Uhmann, 2001 for German). I will not discuss all available findings here, but instead will give a short overview as applicable to the reading of this paper. All repair operations have three discernible parts: trouble source, repair initiation, and completion of repair (Uhmann, 2001, p. 380). The initiation of a repair is where the repair operation starts, that is, the place where the progress of a turn is put on hold. As Uhmann (2001) states, the repair initiation is especially important "since repairs can be performed anywhere and at any time" the repair initiation is the only way a speaker can indicate that a particular utterance is in need of repair (p. 378). In line 9 of Example 2 above, the repair initiation (which is marked for the reader with an asterisk) is a cut-off, often a glottal stop (in all languages), marked in the transcription by a dash. This cut-off takes place in the middle of what the speaker has determined to be the trouble source, which is one of three possible positions that a repair can take place. The three possible positions are explained in more detail in the following table:

Table 2: Repair Position

First Position:
Repair within the same turn as the repairable but before a possible turn completion point has been reached.
Second Position:
Repair in that turn's transition space, i.e. upon completion of a turn's constructional component.
Third Position:
Repair in the third turn after the turn containing the repairable.

(Uhmann, 2001)

In Example 2, the source of trouble is word choice, ***Ko-*(mmst)***/ "are you coming" (which again is marked for the reader in bold). The completion of the repair ***kannst***/ "**can you**" (which is also marked in bold) comes after the trouble source and as its name indicates, completes the repair sequence, which can be confirmed by L completing her action as well as her turn. All of the instances of self-repair in this study occurred in the first position.

2.5 Word Replacement

As mentioned before, the specific type of repair that this study will analyze is word replacement. This is just one of the many types of repair that are available to speakers and their conversation partners. To give the reader a better understanding of how word replacement repair differs from other types of repair, I will give a short overview of word-search repair as well as recycling, which is a strategy often found in different types of repair, as shown in Example 3.

In Example 3, both word-search repair and recycling take place simultaneously. I will begin my analysis of this example by first looking at the word-search portion of the example. As the name implies, word-search repair consists of a speaker stopping the talk in order to search for a

particular word; thus, word-searches are forward-looking repairs. Example 3 provides an

example of this phenomenon.

Example 3: Word Search (taken from Egbert 2009, 41)
```
      01   Stefan:   aber nicht als päde- pä- (der gilt) nicht als
                     but not as pedo- pe- (he is) not (considered) a
      02             als päde:: päde::
                     as pedo:: pedo::
  =>  03   Christel: ra[st
                     rest
  => 04   Justus:      [pädophil.
                       [pedophile]
```

<div align="right">(Egbert, 2009, p. 41)</div>

In line 1 Stefan is in the middle of his turn when he produces *päde-*/"peda-" and initiates a repair

with a cut-off. After the initiation of his repair he continues with the sequence by reproducing

the first part of his original utterance with *pä-*/"pe-" again ending this utterance with a cut-off.

He then continues his turn until he again reproduces *päde::*/"peda::" only this time lengthening

the vowel, which is indicated by ":" in the transcription. We can then see in lines 3 and 4 where

both Christel and Justus both attempt to other-complete the repair. Christel provides a possible

candidate solution with *rast*/"rast" (*pädorast*/"pederast"), while Justus supplies

pädophil/"pedophile". From the data we can assume that Justus provided the correct solution, as

the exchange ends with his candidate solution.

As mentioned above, Example 3 also contains instances of recycling, which is the re-use of

previously uttered parts of a turn, after the initiation of a repair. In Example 3, line 1, we can see

that after the initiation of the repair with *päde-*/"peda-", Stefan reproduces *pä*/"pe" and then *nicht*

als/"not as" which he also stated before the initiation of repair.

As we can see, although replacement, word-search and recycling have some commonalities (i.e. the syntax of repair as it relates to initiation, etc.), they are very different in overall form (how the are executed) and function (i.e. the use of recycling as a delaying strategy). This difference in form and function is particularly important for this study, as I will use the Conversation Analytic methodology to identify patters in my data and establish two distinct functions for the replacement of verbs in German, which I will display in the following analysis.

Chapter 3 - Data and Methodology

3.1 Data

The data from this study come from a collection of natural, non-elicited German language audio recordings and their subsequent transcription. Each of the 6 audio recordings consists of a single telephone conversation between native German speaking friends or family members with two participants in every conversation. The recordings are between two and sixty-seven minutes long. The speakers come from a wide variety of geographic regions, generations, and social classes. All are German native speakers with full command of the language and all of its nuances. The data was transcribed using the Jeffersonian Transcription Conventions[1] (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984), the most important of which are displayed below:

[start of overlap (simultaneous talk by two or more speakers) is marked with left-hand brackets
] the end of an overlap is marked by right-hand brackets
= (a) latching between turns (an utterance by one speaker starts immediately after the end of another speaker's utterance without the normal intervening beat of silence)
(b) latching between utterances in one turn

---

[1] Refer to Appendix A for a complete list of transcription conventions

(c) indicates the continuation of a speaker's turn across lines of transcript where this would otherwise be difficult to trace

:   a colon indicates an extension of the sound it follows

:::   multiple colons indicate a longer extension of the sound it follows

-   a single dash indicates an abrupt ending or cut-off of a word

<div align="right">Betz (2008: p. 183)</div>

The data were screened for the specific phenomena being investigated in this report: self-repairs of actions involving the replacement of verbs. The data yielded nine instances of such self-repair, of which four have been included in this study with a sequential analysis of the conversation. The five examples that do not appear in this paper display duplicate phenomena as those included and were excluded to better focus on each specific phenomenon. All instances of the phenomenon were included and no verbs were excluded based on verb type or inflection. The self-repair phenomenon was then coded in the data using an asterisk (*) to denote the point of repair initiation and **boldface** type was used to denote the item being replaced, as well as the item replacing it. There are two types of translation given for the data, an idiomatic for each data excerpt, and a third, word for word, translation is given for all self-repair instances. It is also important to note that for the scope of this study I have made a distinction between modal verbs and the greater class of auxiliary verbs, to which they normally belong. This was done because of the importance and prevalence of modal verbs in German conversation, given their importance in conveying deontic (ability, permission, and duty) and epistemic (likelihood and certainty) meaning.

3.2 Methodology

The data were analyzed using Conversation Analytic (CA) methodology, which is "an empirical methodology that studies the organization of naturally occurring conversations which have been captured on either video-tape or audio-tape" (Taleghani-Nikazm 2006). CA takes an analytic perspective to interaction, and it views social interaction as highly organized: turns, actions, and the organization of actions and turns into sequences and linked sequences of actions are the foci of CA research (Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006). This organization is based on turn taking, which, according to Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) can be classified into 1) a turn construction component and 2) a turn-allocation component. The turn construction component is the shaping and use of Turn Constructional Units (TCUs), of which a ratified speaker is initially allotted one, and the first possible completion of which constitutes a turn-transition relevance place (TRP) (p. 703). At a TRP it is relevant for the turn allocation component, a part of the turn-taking 'machinery' which determines how a next speaker is selected (either by other-selection by the current speaker or next potential speaker), to be utilized.

The concept and analysis of turn-taking has led to the conclusion that conversations are jointly constructed by the interactants, and as such speakers have resources available to them that they may use to project or inhibit the production of another speaker's actions (Davidson 1984). The ability to describe in detail how speakers make use of the resources of turn-taking and action projection, and action formation is what makes CA such an attractive methodology to study spontaneous conversations: it gives us the analytic power to uncover how speakers orient to the inherent patterns and rules in conversation and determine what their underlying functions are (Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006). In extension this methodology is particularly well suited for the study of self-repair, as we are able to identify a speaker's true actions, instead of only identifying the superficial word replacement. This is not to say, however, that CA can, or tries to, establish

the "why" of a persons actions, which is a matter dealt with in the realm of Psychology. What

CA truly shows, in a broad sense, is that much of what takes place in conversation is systematic.

Even when we think that we are being "original", we operate within a predetermined framework

with its own "rules" that govern interaction.

Chapter 4 - Examples/Data Analysis

The following are excerpts taken from my data of 2.5 hours of recorded every-day German

telephone conversations in which self-repair of a verb using replacement occurred. In Example

4, we see how a speaker in a dyadic conversation uses self-repair in the form of a replacement in

order to switch from one action to another.

Example 4: Essen/Dinner (Example 1 in context, reprinted for the reader's convenience)

```
71  S: ä:m willst du einfach nach ↑hause kommen wenn du fertig bist?
        u:m will you simply to home come when you done are?
        u:m are you going to come home when you are done?


72     (0.4)

73  S: oder wenn du soweit bist also wir [sind ]
        or   when  you  ready,   are so  we [are  ]
        or   when  you  are as   fare as we [are]

74  B:                                    [ja:, ] was macht-* wa-
                                          [yea:,] what do/does)-* wha-
                                          [yea:,] what (is/are)-* wha-


75     wollt i:hr irgendwas essen,
       want y:ou(PLURAL) something eat,
       would y:ou like something to eat,


76     (0.8)

77  B: irgendwann,
```

13

```
        sometime,

78  S: ja: bestimmt.
        Yea: of course.

79  B: thehe h hhhä(h)m sollnn wi::r um::: SIEben was essen
        thehe h hhha (u)m should w::e at: SEven something eat

80  S: klingt gut.=hh
        sounds good. =hh
```

In line 74, B initiates a pre-request through inquiry (Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006), or "a pre-sequence that prefigures a request, possibly by ascertaining the ability of the respondent to satisfy the coming request", (Levinson 1983, p. 347) with the action verb *was macht*/"what is/are, projecting *was macht Monica/ihr/ihr*/"what (is/are)/ (Monica/you) you doing." B then initiates the repair of his statement using a cut-off in line 74 (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977, p. 366), and then begins to recycle the beginning of his turn with *wa-*/"wha-" at the end of line 74. At the beginning of line 75, B replaces his original verb with the modal *wollt*/"would" which upgrades his initial action of a pre-request into a request. Again, the concept of a pre-request, or preliminary request is important as it projects the request that follows. In interaction "pre-"s can be used to project upcoming talk, and are treated as talk that precedes the projected action by the recipient (Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006). After the long pause in line 76, which may signal possible rejection (Davidson 1984, p. 49), B modifies his request by adding *irgendwann*/"sometime" in line 77. This addition of *irgendwann*/"sometime" broadens the request, making the request for any given time in the future, so that it is possible for S to give the preferred response to B's request, acceptance (Davidson, 1984). This is indeed what S does in line 78.

Example 5 is a continuation of the same conversation shown in Example 1. Here B

reintroduces the topic of eating, reintroducing a previously discussed topic in order to receive the

preferred answer to his request in the subsequent talk (Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006, p. 98). Again,

we can see how B uses the repair of actions in an attempt to achieve the preferred outcome for

requests: acceptance of a request.

Example 5: Essen gehen/ Having Dinner

```
    89  B: (sonst) fahr ich einfach, fahr ich hier um sieben los.
            (otherwise) drive i simply, drive i here at seven away.

             Otherwise I'll just, leave at seven.

    90  S: okee.
            okaay

    91  B: soll mers so machen?
            Should we+it do that

    92  S: >hm↑hum?<
            >mh hum?<

=>  93  B: (oder) wollt* habt ihr jetzt schon:* (.) habt ihr sch-*
            (or)   want* have you now already:*  (.) have you al-*
            (or)   would you* have you already:* (.) have you al-*

=>  94      wolltet ihr jetzt schon essen gehen.=
            would you now already to eat go.=
            would you like to go get something to eat now.=

    95  S: =nö:=ich hab jetzt grad en kaf↑fee >gemacht?<
            =no:=I just made a (cup of) c↑offee

    96  B: gut.
            good.


    97  S: un da:nn kucken wir (uns s nächstes) mal an. Hh
            and the:n we'll (look at it next) time . Hh

    98  B: oder isses zu fr↑üh. könn: auch en bisschen später.
            or is it too ↑early. (we) cou:ld also (meet) a little later.
```

```
99  S: ↑nönö, s:=okee.
       ↑nono, ts:=okay.
100 B: >gut.< °hmhm°
       >good.< °hmhm°
```

In Example 5 above (lines 74 and 75), B and S negotiate a request that was upgraded from a pre-request via self-repair; his request, however, only receives the preferred response after further modifications (line 77). The ambiguous inclusion of *irgendwann*/"sometime" in line 77 is actually what creates the possibility for the topic to be re-launched in line 93, without a definitive answer, the topic is essentially still open. In line 93 in Example 5, B reintroduces the topic of food by initiating a request with the modal verb *wollt*/"would" which he then immediately repairs: He replaces *wollt*/"would" with action verb *habt*/"have", thus effectively downgrading his request for a get-together to a pre-request for information. He then repairs this statement by replacing *habt*/"have" with his original modal *wolltet*/"wanted", line 94. By repairing the first part of his utterance three times, B signals that he is having trouble deciding on whether to use a pre-request with hopes of receiving an invitation from S (a preferred first action; Taleghani-Nikazm 2006, p. 5), or to launch the actual request (a dispreferred first action; Heritage 1984; Levinson 1983). B initiates a request with "wollt"/would in line 93, but is unsure if S will give the preferred action and accept his request (Davidson 1984). B abandons his request in line 93, downgrading to a pre-request. Using a pre-request would allow B to avoid a dispreferred face-threatening action (i.e. rejection) (Heritage 1984; Levinson 1983), by determining whether or not S is available for dinner (Taleghani-Nikazm 2006). If S is not available at the time in question, B can withhold the incipient request and thus avoid receiving a rejection. Conversely, if S's availability has been established, then B can upgrade his pre-request to a request with limited fear of rejection. B subsequently abandons his pre-request and finally produces a complete

16

action, a request, in line 94 with *wolltet*/"would you" ("**wolltet** ihr jetzt schon essen gehen."). S denies this request in line 95 and provides having just made a coffee as her reason for rejecting his request.

In Examples 4 and 5 above we see how speakers can use the repair of actions in order to negotiate the launching of problematic actions (requests, in both cases) and determine how they might best achieve the interactionally preferred outcome. In Example 6, M uses the repair of a verb in a different sequential environment and for a different purpose: in order to shift the focus of her statement and therefore project her preferred outcome, making the option available to L.

Example 6: Früher Kommen/Come Home Early

```
   002 L:    ja(h)
             yea(h)


   003 M:    ä:- hä=ich g↑eh ja nicht weg.=äh >sondern< ich geh jetzt nur
             eh:- ha i am not leaving.=uh >actually< i am just going


   004       zur apotheke, da nehm ich aber das handgerät nicht mit
             to+the pharmacy, for that im not going to take my cell phone with
             me though


   005       das bringt eh nichts,=ä-
             it won't be of any use,=uh-


   006       (.)


   007 M:    ä: und wenn ich zurück bin dann bin ich ja- s↓owieso (.)
             a: and when i get back then I'll be (as you know)- anyway(.)


   008        die ganze Zei[t (hier/im Büro)]
              the whole ti[me (here/at the office)]

=> 009 L:                  [ja=und du ko-*         ] kannst nicht eher kommen,
```

17

```
                        [yeah=and you com-*    ]cant not earlier come,
                        [yeah and you are com-*] cant come earlier


010      die verna geht ja morgen weg, hh
         verna goes away tomorrow(as you know), hh


011      (0.2)


012 M:   was?
         what?


013 L:   kannst nicht eher kommen ein wenich heut,=die verna
         can't you come home a little early today,= verna


014      geht ja morgen w↑eg, morgen   [     fr]üh;
         is leaving tomorrow, tomorrow [   morn]ing;


015 M:                                 [˚(aha)˚]


016 M:   vielleicht so eine halbe stunde kann ich schon vielleicht
         maybe a half an hour or so already maybe
```

In line 9, L starts to form a statement du ko-/"you're co-", most likely projecting du
kommst/"you're coming" and an estimation of the time at which she will return home. She then
abandons this statement and repairs her projected original statement du ko-*/"you're co-" with
(du) kannst nicht eher kommen/"you can't come earlier," replacing the action verb ko(mmst)
with the modal verb kannst/"can you". L's original statement is a particular type of statement
classified as a B-event statement (Labov & Fanshel, 1977, p. 100), which is a statement that L
(that is, more generally, a speaker A) makes about some piece of information that is within M's
(more generally speaking, a co-participant B's) sphere of knowledge. B-event statements are
particular in that they are a normal statement of fact, but due to the fact that this information is
not "shared knowledge", or something to which both parties have equal access (e.g., through

first-hand experience), it makes relevant a response from the other party, in this case M. This response is a confirmation or disconfirmation of the (B-event) information offered. This one-party knowledge gives M the opportunity to give a negative or dispreferred response, that is, that he will not come home early. In an attempt to avoid this, L repairs her original B-statement about coming home early, which used *du ko(mmst)*/"you're coming" in line 9 and to which the projected answer is no. Using the modal verb *kannst*/"can," L is invoking external forces (e.g. god, acts of god, work) as determiners of M's actions and thus gives M the option of giving L a preferred response. In this instance L employed cross-cutting preferences (Schegloff 2007, p. 76-78) to achieve her preferred "affirmative" response, which means that although her statements are syntactically formed so that the preferred response is a no, she shows through her actions that she would really prefer an "affirmative" response.

While Example 6 has shown us that a speaker may use verb replacement to invoke external forces in order to make a preferred response available to a speaker, Example 7 demonstrates how a speaker may invoke external forces in order to reject or to explain a problematic action.

Example 7:   C23 *garten/garden* [84_Kirsten1A] (Taken from Betz 2008, p. 86-87)

```
9     K:    u:nd dann ä:h aber jetz ham wer dat janze
            a:nd then u:h but  now have we the  whole
            a:nd then u:h but now we worked the whole


10          wochenende   am haus  jearbeitet,
            weekend on+the house worked,
            weekend on the house,


11          (.)


12    K:    wie verrückt.
            like crazy.
```

19

```
    13   K:      .hhh[hh am garten      ]
                 .hhh[hh on+the garden  ]
                 .hhh[hh on the garden  ]
                     [                  ]
    14   H:          [    ja sach mal] wann is denn euer haus mal
                     [    PRT say PRT] when is PRT your house PRT
                     [   (say/tell me)] when is your house (going to be)

    15           fertich.
                 done.
                 done (at last).

=>  16   K:      is ja ↑fertich↑ wir (ham)* am garten °mussten° wir
                 is PRT ↑done↑   we  (have) on+the garden °had+to° we


=>  17           arbeiten;=bei uns [war ne HEcke krank              ]
                 work;=at ours     [was a HEdge sick                ]
                 work;=one of our  [ HEdges was sick                ]
                                   [                                ]
    18   H:                        [ich hab gedacht (er/ihr)  macht ne  ]
                                   [I  have thought (he/youPL) make aFEM]
                                   [I thought (he/you) are building a   ]

    19           bierterasse dacht ich macht ihr [noch
                 beerdeck    thought I make you+PL [still
                 beer patio I thought you are     [still building
                                                  [
    20   K:                                       [.H ah  die  is fertich:=
                                                  [.H PRT thatFEM is do:ne=
                                                  [.H (oh) that one's do:ne=
```

In this example, K and H are talking about work that K and her husband did on her garden over
the weekend. H then poses a questionin in lines 14-15 *sach mal wann is den euer haus mal*

20

fertich/"say when is your house going to be finished", which K perceives as a challenge. This is evidenced by K's response in line 16 *is ja fertig*/"it is finished" to which she provides the following evidence. The challenge in line 14 prompts K to either accept, deflect or reject the challenge. She responds in line 16 starting with *wir ham*/"we have" and ultimately replaces her first statement with *mussten*/"had to". K's replacement of the auxiliary verb *ham*/"have" in line 16 with the modal verb *mussten*/"had to" signals a change in word choice and syntax that translates interactionally into an invoking of external forces (the hedge getting sick, which is attributed to an act of god), *wir **(ham)***(projecting: wir ham am garten gearbeitet) am g̲arten °**mussten**° wir arbeiten;=bei uns [war ne HE̲cke krank*/"we **(worked)*** on the garden °**we had to**° work;= a hedge was sick" . This serves to explain that having worked on the garden was not a choice but a necessity, and thus K can maintain her claim (line 16) that the house is done (and deflect the implication that she and her husband are constantly creating new work for themselves). By repairing her verb choice, K successfully rejects the challenge made by H in line 14 by stating that things were out of her control (line 16) and the conversation moves on. We can see that this strategy is successful, because the sequence comes to an end, with H making a new challenge about the backyard in line 18, challenging K on whether or not the *Bierterasse*/"beer garden" is done.

Chapter 5 - 5. Summary and Conclusions

5.1 Summary

This study has examined the self-initiated self-repair of verbs through replacement in everyday German conversations. Two and a half hours of data yielded 9 examples of this phenomenon, of

which four are discussed above. From the close analysis of these examples, we have learned that speakers use verb replacement to perform three distinct functions:

1) Negotiating towards a preferred response by repairing an action once or repeatedly within a turn (examples 4, 5)

2) Rejecting a challenge by invoking external forces (Example 7)

3) Making a preferred response available to another speaker by providing an available external   force (example 6).

As seen in Examples 4-7, the speakers use self-repair to change the words they use, but in doing so, they crucially also perform a very specific interactional function: They either repair the actions they are performing, or they invoke external forces to accomplish the locally preferred outcome, e.g., to negotiate towards a preferred response or to reject a challenge, as well as make a preferred response available. In all examples, repairs are initiated with a cut-off as soon as the speaker has identified the trouble source, which also typically corresponds with the end of the first syllable of the trouble source. The repairs are also completed successfully in the immediate aftermath of the repair initiation, which is to say in the same turn as well as the same TCU.

5.2. Conclusions

In examples 4 and 5 above, we have instances where the speaker is repairing actions in order to determine how they might best elicit a preferred response. In both examples, we have a cycle of pre-requests being upgraded to requests and vice versa. When this takes place, a speaker changes from the use of a modal verb (request) to a full or auxiliary verb (pre-request). On the other hand, as can be seen in examples 6 and 7 above, when a speaker is invoking external forces they switch from a full verb to a modal verb.

22

It is also interesting to note that in all examples the co-participants never react verbally to the repairs while they are in progress, not even in the case of the longer ones (see example 7 *garten*). This may be because the repairs are located well within the current TCU where the talk cannot be taken as potentially complete, but it would be worth more research with a larger data collection to determine if there is any sort of concurrent listener response to the changing of actions. It would also be worth researching if the same phenomena take place in face-to-face conversations.

I believe that further research on the self initiated self-repair of verbs through replacement is warranted to help reinforce the conclusions that I have drawn here. With a wider data set (25-30 examples or more), more evidence would be available to reinforce my claims, as well as to determine if these phenomena can be used for actions other than challenges and requests, as well as to determine if the same phenomena occur in different languages.

5.3 A Case for Embedded Repair

"The defining characteristic of conversational repair is that the current activity is put on hold; dealing with trouble is made the business of the interaction, and after the resolution of the problem, the main activity is resumed" (Betz, 2008, p.182). This describes one of two types of repair as defined by Jefferson (1987); exposed. The second type of repair, embedded repair, is distinct in that it does not become the overt business of the talk and instead remains hidden. The "embeddedness", therefore, makes it difficult for conversation analysts to identify, but Mandelbaum (2005) identified three distinct places in a conversation where embedded repair takes place:

1) When a speaker has said something that could be heard to implement a possible untoward action with regard to the interlocutor.

23

2) When a speaker says something that could yield a negative or problematic impression
   of them.

3) When a speaker produces a lexical infelicity.

<div align="right">(Mandelbaum, 2005)</div>

Mandelbaum's research establishes a way for conversation analysts to identify and explain

embedded repair, but only on a lexical level. What self-repair research has failed to explain up

to this point is the repair of actions, which takes place in my research. In the examples detailed

above only Example 7 exhibits embedded repair as described by Mandelbaum, where the speaker

has said something that could yield a negative or problematic impression of them (never being

finished in the garden), all of the examples, however, present embedded self-repair on the action

level.

In all examples the repair never becomes the overt business of the talk, and although on the

lexical level there are distinct repair initiations in Examples 4, 5, and 6 the shaping of the actions

is never put on hold. Which is best categorized in this simplified version of Example 5:

Example 8: Essen gehen/ Having Dinner, simplified
```
=> 93  B: (oder) wollt* habt ihr jetzt schon:* (.) habt ihr sch-*
          (or)   want* have you now already:*  (.) have you al-*
          (or)   would you* have you already:* (.) have you al-*

=> 94        wolltet ihr jetzt schon essen gehen.=
             would you now already to eat go.=
             would you like to go get something to eat now.=
```

The phenomenon of the embedded self-repair of actions is most easily seen in Example 8, as

there are four examples of verb replacement that categorize B's constant and uninterrupted

shaping of action on the turn-constructional level. B seamlessly transitions from a projected

<div align="center">24</div>

request in line 93 with *wollt*/*"**want***", a pre-request beginning with *habt*/"**have you**", restating the pre-request with *habt*/"**have you**", and finally a request with *wolltet*/"**would you**" in line 94. What I propose is an extension of the current definition of embedded repair removing sole focus from the lexical aspect of the repair sequence (*ham* to *mussten)* and including the underlying action aspect of repair sequence (e.g. pre-request to request), creating a more inclusive definition that can encompass all of the underlying activity within a conversation.

5.4 Applications to SLA and the Second Language Classroom

All of the above examples come from native speakers of German, who presumably have a perfect command of the language and its grammar. A casual on-looker could say that the points of interest in these particular examples are simply areas where the speaker does not know what to say, or is confused in their word choice. Through the use of CA and the sequential analysis of this phenomenon it can be seen that each of the examples above share systematic qualities (i.e., a describable repair syntax) which make the conclusion that the speakers are confused unlikely. Speakers use these repair strategies to serve a purpose in everyday conversation, whether they realize it or not.

A view of the minute details of interaction as systematic and interactionally meaningful could possibly alter how we look at the speech produced by learners, as it would make us more careful in considering and judging the utterances language learners make. If any of the above utterances were to be produced by a language learner, this would likely be labeled as a processing error, where the learner has not yet moved from controlled to automatic processing, that is, as a point where the learner experienced trouble locating the correct word in order to complete their utterance. Existing research shows that word finding trouble is quite distinct from other types of

self-repair, although strategies such as recycling and replacement can be found in all types of self-repair. The present research additionally shows that through repairs of word choice, speakers can actually carry out action repairs. So, while it is "technically" true that language learners commit more processing errors, we should allow for the possibility that the learner, as well as the native speaker, are actually searching for the right action when they self-repair a verb; that is, they are not experiencing retrieval difficulties but are repairing the shape of a larger action in an attempt to find the action shape which will be best received by their peers or which will best serve their interactional goals.

Another use of this material in second language learning and teaching could be to teach students about phenomena such as self and other repair of actions. The goal would be to help students understand the way language and interaction correspond to one another and "to facilitate awareness of German culture and, concurrently to foster cultural self-awareness in learners" (Huth, 2007 p. 21). Incorporating the findings of CA research into lesson plans on a regular basis gives students the opportunity to develop a more native-like version of their second language, while also learning what linguistic strategies native speakers use to accomplish different tasks in everyday conversations. That is, pragmatics, also defined by Crystal (1985) "…the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on the other participants in the act of communication" (p. 240). The explicit teaching of pragmatics in the language classroom is important as learners often "…transfer their L1 pragmatic resources on the target language community when they use the L2 to fulfill their social and interactional needs," sometimes to positive, but often to negative effect (Huth, 2007 p.21), and it has been shown that the explicit teaching of second language pragmatics using "CA-

Based instructional materials has a positive effective in teaching and learning pragmatic aspects of L2" (Huth and Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006 p. 72).

CA based instruction is superior to typical dialogues in textbooks as "dialogues in textbooks do not follow patterns of naturally occurring talk and are mainly designed to introduce new grammar and/or vocabulary" (Huth and Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006 p. 73). This focus on grammar and vocabulary means that in a typical second language classroom, language learners receive no pragmatic instruction in their second language, unless it is presented as an outside-of-text activity. Even when pragmatics are presented in the classroom, most pragmatic studies are based on "native speaker intuition" which has been shown to be potentially inaccurate (p. 62). CA research, on the other hand, is based on naturally occurring audio/video recordings, which are then transcribed to show the sequential nature of conversation, and thus present a more complete view of second language interaction. Furthermore, the incorporation of CA-based materials allows for the training of all four language skills simultaneously (speaking, listening, reading, writing), "since the data can be made available in the form of printed transcriptions, video or audio examples (p. 64).

Bibliography

Atkinson, J.M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1984). *Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Betz, E. (2008). *Grammar and interaction: Pivots in German conversation*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.

Crystal, D. 1997: *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. Cambridge University Press.

Davidson, J. A. (1984). Subsequent versions of invitations, offers, requests, and proposals dealing with potential or actual rejection. In J.M. Atkinson & Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action* (pp. 102-128). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ebert, M. (2009). *Der Reparatur-Mechanismus in deutschen Gesprächen*. Mannheim: Verlag für Gesprächsforschung.

Fox, B. A., Hayashi, M., & Jasperson, R. (1996). Resources and repair: A cross-linguistic study of syntax and repair. In *INTERACTION AND GRAMMAR: Ochs, elinor, schegloff, emanuel A., & thompson, sandra A. [eds]* (pp. 185-237). England: Cambridge University Press.

Fox, B. A., Maschler, Y., & Uhmann, S. (2010). A cross-linguistic study of self-repair: Evidence from english, german, and hebrew. *Journal of Pragmatics, 42*(9), 2487-2505.

Freud, S. (1924). *Zur Psychopathologie des Alltagslebens: Über Vergessen,Versprechen,Vergreifen,Aberglauben u. Irrtum*. Leipzig: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag.

Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 299-345). Cambridge: Cambridge-University Press.

Huth, T., & Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (2006). How can insights from conversation analysis be directly applied to teaching L2 pragmatics?. *Language Teaching Research, 10,* 53-79.

Huth, T. (2007). Pragmatics revisited: teaching with natural language data. *Die Unterrichtspraxis, 40,* 21-33.

Iványi, Z. (2001). Wortsuchprozesse bei fremd- und muttersprachlern: Eine konversationsanalytische untersuchung. *Deutsche Sprache: Zeitschrift Für Theorie, Praxis, Dokumentation, 29*(3), 261-287.

Jefferson, G. (1987). On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In G. Button & J.R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and Social Organization.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Jespersen, O. (1924). *The philosophy of grammar*. London: G. Allen & Unwin.

Koshik, I. (2002). A conversation analytic study of yes/no questions which convey reversed polarity assertions. *Journal of Pragmatics, 34,* 1851-1877.

Labov, W. and Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic Discourse: Psychotherapy as Conversation*. New York: Academic Press.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge England: Cambridge University Press.

Mandelbaum, J. (2005). *Dealing delicately with delicate matters: Embedded self-correction as a method for removing possibly available unwanted hearings.* Paper presented at the Interational Pragmatics Conference, July 1015, 2005, Riva del Garda, Italy.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis I*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1979). The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation. *Syntax and Semantics,* 12 (Discourse and Syntax), 261-286.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language, 53*(2), 361-382.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50*(4), 696-735.

Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (2006). *Request Sequences: The intersection of grammar, interaction and social context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Uhmann, S. (2001). Some arguments for the relevance of syntax to same-sentence self-repair in everyday German conversation. In M. Selting, & E. Couper-Kuhlen (Eds.), *Studies in Interactional Linguistics* (pp. 373-404). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Appendix A - Transcription Conventions

A.1.   Jeffersonian Transcription Conventions (cf. Atkinson & Heritage, 1984)

[start of overlap (simultaneous talk by two or more speakers) is marked with left

                hand brackets

]   the end of an overlap is marked by right-hand brackets

=   (a) latching between turns (an utterance by one speaker starts immediately after the

                end of another speaker's utterance without the normal intervening beat of silence

                (b) latching between TCUs in one turn (two TCUs by one speaker are latched)

                (c) indicates the continuation of a speaker's turn across lines of transcript where this

                would otherwise be difficult to trace

(.05)   silence; length of silence is timed relative to the speed of the surrounding talk

(.)   micro pause (less than 1/10 of a second)

.hh   audible inbreath

hh   audible outbreath

hahahihi   different vowels (i.e., e, i, a) indicate different quality of laugh tokens

(h) (hh)   laughter within a word

<u>word</u>   underlining of one or more letters indicates emphasis, usually higher pitch

WORD   capital letters indicate higher volume louder than the surrounding talk

°word°   degree sign indicates that the enclosed passage of talk is quieter than the

                surrounding talk (can be used as multiples)

↑   marks rising pitch on following vowel/syllable

↓   falling pitch on following vowel/syllable

↑word↑   enclosed stretch of talk is markedly higher in pitch than surrounding talk

(word)   words in single parentheses indicate transcriber's uncertain hearing

(   )   unintelligible stretch of talk

((   ))   transcriber's additional comments or transcription of events

>word<   increase in tempo relative to the surrounding talk (also as multiples)

<word>   slowing down in tempo relative to the surrounding talk (also as multiples)

:   a colon indicates an extension of the sound it follows

:::   multiple colons indicate a longer extension of the sound it follows

-               a single dash indicates an abrubt ending or cut-off of a word

.   a period indicates continuing, slightly rising intonation at the end of an utterance

?   a question mark indicates rising ('question') intonation at the end of an utterance

*   indicates the location of or the beginning and end of embodied action described by the transcriber above the actual transcription