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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)
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)
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 one.

(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?

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-
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?

Marcia: ↑Alex.

Kyle: oh:: your (.) fr-
Marcia: 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-
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-
Display of understanding (SCT)
(Second) point of possible sequence completion;
Progressivity can resume
(Heritage, 1984)
Marcia: [no:] I mean (h) (h) (h) for example, Alex is a guy:

Kyle: who?

Marcia: Alex.

Kyle: oh: your fr-

Marcia: my friend who's coming here (and-)

Kyle: [yeah I think y- >for a second< I thought you (. ) meant Alex. Alan's roommate.]

Marcia: =I was like-

Marcia: [No::[

Kyle: [really?

Marcia: next Thursday, Alex (is coming)=
Marcia: I mean hh(h) hh(h) hh(h) hh(h) hh(h)

for example, Alex is a guy.

I really consider him one of my closest guy friends.

Kyle: who?

Marcia: Alex.

Kyle: oh: your fr-

Marcia: my friend who's coming here (and-)

Kyle: yeah

I think for a second I thought you meant Alex.

Alan's roommate.

Kyle: really?

Marcia: next Thursday,

Alex is coming.
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 initiation
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
Bibi: kunnen die gezien worden als slachtoffer van het nazi-regime. dan maar: (.) dat vond ze te stellig, maar: (.) dat vond ze te stellig, die Naziregime. maar (.) dat vond ze te stellig, de Naziregime. = maar (.) dat vond ze te stellig, de Naziregime.

Clara: als vic\[\text{ts} \text{ims of} \text{ the Nazi regime}\

Bibi: [ of als e:h ]

omdat ze zeg maar dAARheen zijn gegaan met een heel mooi beeld. weet je wel, ze waren helemaal daarheen. nice image. know you ADV 3PL were completely there. to
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

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

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

(0.4)

↑°dus° [( )]
so

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

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

=inneh oost-euro- ↓in oost-euro#pa#.
in.eh East Euro in East Europe
=in eh Eastern Euro- in Eastern Europe.

Display of understanding (SCT)
28 Bibi: [(die) nederland]ders gingen vrijwillig naar those Dutchmen went voluntarily to [(those) Dutch]men went voluntarily to

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

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.

31 (0.7)

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

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

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

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


Bibi: [ja,] [yeah,]

Clara: ↑oké;=

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