Expanding the repair space by accounting for trouble

Mick S. Smith & Lucas M. Seuren

17/12/2018

12th CA Day, Loughborough

Two basic principles

- Progressivity: ‘Moving from some element to a hearably-next-one with nothing intervening’
- Intersubjectivity: ‘Persons sharing a world in common’

(Schegloff, 2007: 15; Schutz, 1967; see also Heritage, 1984; Schegloff, 1992; Sidnell, 2014)

Balance

- Repair-opportunity space: after each turn a recipient has the opportunity to initiate repair
- Not initiating repair, i.e., maintaining progressivity, tacitly confirms that there are no problems, i.e., that intersubjectivity is maintained

(Robinson, 2014)

Conflict

It is evident that there are circumstances in which the conjoint operation of the principles of intersubjectivity and progressivity will result in conflict. (…) The very fact of repair means that the principle of intersubjectivity (…) has trumped the principle of progressivity.

(Heritage, 2007: 260-261)

Repair

When an ongoing production of whatever else was in progress is suspended so that managing troubles in speaking, hearing, and understanding come to be the focal activity of the interaction, we will call that "repair."

(Hayashi, Raymond, & Sidnell, 2013: 13)

UCLA

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

Progressivity

When an ongoing production of whatever else was in progress is suspended so that managing troubles in speaking, hearing, and understanding come to be the focal activity of the interaction, we will call that "repair."

Intersubjectivity

(Hayashi, Raymond, & Sidnell, 2013: 13)

Excerpt 18 (FD, IV, 66)

	Dispatch:	Now what was that house number you said =
		= [you were-
	Caller:	= [No phone. No.
	Dispatch:	Sir?
	Caller:	No phone at all.
→	Dispatch:	No I mean the uh house number, [Y-
	Caller:	[Thirdy eight oh one?
	Dispatch:	Thirdy eight oh <u>one</u>.

(Schegloff, 1992: 1318)

Progressivity v. Intersubjectivity

- Repair halts progressivity
- Upon possible repair completion, progressivity is resumed
  - Immediately after repair proper
  - After receipt of repair proper (*oh/okay*)
- Progressivity generally trumps intersubjectivity
- Progressivity provides for intersubjectivity

(Robinson, 2014; Schegloff, 1992)

Our data

- Participants register repair with *oh*
- Subsequently articulate a prior belief
  - English: *I thought X; I thought you meant/said X*
  - Dutch: *Ik dacht X; Ik dacht dat je X zei/bedoelde*
- X may be endogenous or exogenous
- Postpones resumption of suspended activity
- What do speakers accomplish with this practice?

(cf., Ekberg, 2012; Jefferson, 2004)

Expanding the repair space

```
Marcia   [↑no:. I mean hh(h) .hh(h) h
         for example, Alex? (.) is a guy:.
         I really >consider him one of my closest guy #friends#<=
   Kyle  =who?
         (0.2)
Marcia   ↑Alex.
         (0.3)
   Kyle  oh:: your (.) fr-
```

```
12   Marcia   [↑no:. I mean hh(h) .hh(h) h
13            for example, Alex? (.) is a guy:.
14            I really >consider him one of my closest guy #friends#<=
15      Kyle  =who?
16            (0.2)
17   Marcia   ↑Alex.
18            (0.3)
19      Kyle  oh:: your (.) fr-
```

Trouble Source

Repair Initiation

```
12   Marcia   [↑no:. I mean hh(h) .hh(h) h
13            for example, Alex? (.) is a guy:.
14            I really >consider him one of my closest guy #friends#<=
15       Kyle =who?
16            (0.2)
17   Marcia   ↑Alex.
18            (0.3)
19       Kyle oh:: your (.) fr-
```

Trouble Source

Repair Initiation

Repair Proper

UCLA

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

```
12   Marcia   [↑no:. I mean hh(h) .hh(h) h
13            for example, Alex? (.) is a guy:.
14            I really >consider him one of my closest guy #friends#<=
15       Kyle =who?
16            (0.2)
17   Marcia   ↑Alex.
18            (0.3)
19       Kyle oh:: your (.) fr-
```

Trouble Source

Repair Initiation

Repair Proper

Display of understanding (SCT)

(Second) point of possible sequence completion; Progressivity can resume

(Heritage, 1984)

UCLA

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

12	Marcia	[↑no:. I mean hh(h) .hh(h) h
13		for example, Alex? (.) is a guy:.
14		I really >consider him one of my closest guy #friends#<=
15	Kyle	=who?
16		(0.2)
17	Marcia	↑Alex.
18		(0.3)
19	Kyle	oh:: your (.) fr-
20	Marcia	my [friend who's coming here (and-)
21	Kyle	[yeah
22		I think y- >for a second< I thought you (.) meant Alex.
23		Alan's roommate.=
24		=I was like-
25	Marcia	↑No::[:.
26	Kyle	[really?
27	Marcia	next ↑Thursday,
28		Alex (is coming)=

Trouble Source

Repair Initiation

Repair Proper

Display of understanding (SCT)

Account

UCLA

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

12	Marcia	[↑no:. I mean hh(h) .hh(h) h
13		for example, **Alex?** (.) is a guy:.
14		I really >consider him one of my closest guy #friends#<=
15	**Kyle**	**=who?**
16		(0.2)
17	**Marcia**	**↑Alex.**
18		(0.3)
19	**Kyle**	**oh:: your (.) fr-**
20	Marcia	my [friend who's coming here (and-)
21	Kyle	[yeah
22		**I think y- >for a second< I thought you (.) meant Alex.**
23		**Alan's roommate.=**
24		=I was like-
25	**Marcia**	**↑No::[:.**
26	Kyle	[really?
27	Marcia	next ↑Thursday,
28		Alex (is coming)=

Trouble Source

Repair Initiation

Repair Proper

Display of understanding (SCT)

Account

Disconfirmation

Endogenous Trouble

- Repair possibly complete at line 17, and again at 19
- Progressivity is not resumed
- Adam articulates a now-abandoned belief (cf. Smith, 2013)
- Exhumes the nature of the trouble:
  - Not hearing or recognition (see Heritage, 2007; Sacks & Schegloff, 1979)
  - But apprehending
- Account for repair iniation

Conversational competence

- By providing an account, Adam shows that he had a good reason for doing the wrong thing
- Adam's apprehension was a reasonable misapprehension

(cf., Jefferson, 2004)

Exogenous Trouble

UCLA

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

09 Bibi: kunnen die gezien worde:n als: slachtoffer van
can they seen be as victims of
can they be regarded as victims of

Trouble Source

10 het nazi-regime.=maar: (.) dat vond ze te stel↓lig,
the Nazi.regime but that found 3SG too assertive
the Nazi regime.=but (.) she thought that was too assertive,

11 (0.5)

12 Clara: <als ↑s[lachtoffers van] het nazi-regime>?
as victims of the Nazi.regime
as v[ictims of] the Nazi regime?

Repair Initiation

13 Bibi: [of als e:h]
or as
[or as eh]

14 (0.7)

15 Bibi: ja:.
yeah.

Repair Proper

16 (0.3)

17 omdat ze zeg maar dAArheen zijn gegaan met een heel
because 3PL say but there are gone with a very
because they so to speak went there with a very

18 mooi beeld. weet je wel, ze waren helemaal daarheen
nice image know you ADV 3PL were completely there.to
nice picture. you know, they all got lured there

UCLA

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

19 gelokt van ^↑o:h we krijgen het heel mooi>, ↓maar ja
lured like oh we get it very nice but yeah
like oh we will have a great time, but yeah

20 eigelijk (0.2) zijn ze dus ook slachtoffer geworden
actually are 3PL thus also victims become
actually (0.2) they also became victims

21 omdat het gewoon heel ↓kut was #daar#. .hh
because it just very shitty was there
because it was just really shitty there. .hh

Repair Proper

22 (0.4)

23 ↑°dus° [( )]
so

24 Clara: [m- maar waar is daar;] dan?
but where is there then
[b- but where is there;] then?

2nd attempt Repair Initiation

25 ↓sorry ↑hoor, ik volg het °effe° niet=
sorry TAG 1SG follow it just not
sorry, I don't follow=

26 Bibi: =↑inneh oost-euro- ↓in oost-euro#pa#.
in.eh East Euro in East Europe
=in eh Eastern Euro- in Eastern Europe.

2nd Repair Proper

27 Clara: ^O[:h^;]
O[h;

Display of understanding (SCT)

UCLA

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

28 Bibi: [(die) nederlan]ders gingen vrijwillig naar
those Dutchmen went voluntarily to
[(*those*) *Dutch*]*men went voluntarily to*

29 oost-europa #toe#.
East Europe to
Eastern Europe.

2nd Repair Proper

30 Clara: ^ik dacht dat je het over ↑indië deed^.
I thought that 2SG it about Indies did
I thought that you were doing it about the East Indies.

Account

31 (0.7)

32 hoe ko[m ik-]
how come 1SG
how di[d I-

33 Bibi: [↑nee]: >nee ↑nee<;=
[*no*] *no no;=*

Disconfirmation

34 Clara: =hoe kom ik ↑daarbij dan.
how come 1SG thereby then
=how did I think that up then.

Further attempt at normalization

35 (1.1)

36 Bibi: ja dat heb ik dat ↑paper over gedaan.
yeah that have 1SG that paper about done
yeah I did that paper about that.

```
37                (0.6)

38  Clara:        sorry. oké. nea:- n- nu  begrijp    ik  het.=
                  sorry  okay          now understand 1SG it
                  sorry. okay. No- n- now I understand.=

39                oké. =de  oost-kolo- ↓ja   [oké] ja.
                  okay  the East colo-  yeah okay yeah
                  okay. =the east colo- yeah [okay] yeah.

40  Bibi:                                     [ja,]
                                              [yeah,]

41                (0.7)

42  Clara:        ↑oké;=
                  okay;=
```

Move toward sequence closure

Common ground

- Bibi designs her repair for a knowing audience
- Clara initiates repair assuming she knows that Bibi's thesis is about
  - Astonished prosody: Nazis in East Indies?! (Selting, 1996)
- Subsequent account reveals the actual nature of the trouble
  - Clara held incorrect prior belief
- Problem with *knowledge held in common*

Conversational competence

- Prior belief accounts for repair initiation
- Account reveals the actual nature of the trouble
- By providing an account, Clara shows that she had a good reason for not getting it
- Clara's apprehension, while wrong, was a reasonable misapprehension

Wrap up

Conclusion

- Progressivity normally takes over at repair completion
- Articulation of a now-abandoned mis-apprehension (understanding, assumption, hearing)
  - Accounts for the trouble
  - Exhumes nature of trouble
  - Normalizes the trouble
- Post-expansion of repair to explain the trouble

Discussion

- Possible additional expansion
  - *I was like, really?*
  - *Hoe kom ik daarbij dan?*
- Relational implications
  - Being a good friend
  - Being an attentive listener
- Minimizing the faux pas

References

Ekberg, S. (2012). Addressing a source of trouble outside of the repair space. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *44*(4), 374–386.

Hayashi, M., Raymond, G., & Sidnell, J. (2013). Conversational repair and human understanding: an introduction. In: M. Hayashi, G. Raymond, & J. Sidnell (eds.), *Conversational repair and human understanding* (pp. 1–40). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. (1984a). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Heritage, J. (1984b). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In: J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action* (pp. 299–345). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. (2007). Intersubjectivity and progressivity in person (and place) reference. In: Enfield, N.J. & Levinson, S.C. (eds.), *Person reference in interaction: Linguistics, cultural, and social perspectives* (pp. 255–280). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Jefferson, G. (2004). At first I thought - A normalizing device for extraordinary events. In G.H. Lerner (ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 131–167). Amsterdam, NL: John Benjamins.

Robinson, J. (2014). What “what?” tells us about how conversationalists manage intersubjectivity. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *47*(2), 109–129.

Sacks, H. & Schegloff, E.A. (1979). Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. In: G. Psathas (ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 15–21). New York, NY: Irvington Press.

Schegloff, E.A. (1992). Repair After Next Turn: The Last Structurally Provided Defense of Intersubjectivity in Conversation. *American Journal of Sociology*, *97*, 1295–1345.

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

Schutz, A. (1967). *The phenomenology of the social world* (F. Lehnert, trans.). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Selting, M. (1996). Prosody as an activity-type distinctive cue in conversation: the case of so-called 'astonished' questions in repair initiation. In: Couper-Kuhlen, E. & M. Selting (eds.), *Prosody in conversation* (pp. 231–270). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Sidnell, J. (2014). The architecture of intersubjectivity revisited. In: N.J. Enfield, Kockelman, P., & J. Sidnell (eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic anthropology* (pp. 364–399). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, M.S. (2013). “I thought” initiated turns: Addressing discrepancies in first-hand and second-hand knowledge. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *57*, 318–330.

We're grateful to Tom Koole for providing access to the Dutch data.

Mick S. Smith

mick.smith.us@gmail.com

@mck_smth

Lucas M. Seuren

lucas.seuren@phc.ox.ac.uk

@LucasSeuren

UCLA

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

"In articulating a now-abandoned, counterfactual belief participants sacrifice progressivity for intersubjectivity to exhume, account for, and normalize the nature of the trouble."

Mick S. Smith
mick.smith.us@gmail.com
@mck_smth

Lucas M. Seuren
lucas.seuren@phc.ox.ac.uk
@LucasSeuren