

# **SOME FIRST OBSERVATIONS ON THE ORGANIZATION OF REPAIR IN SECOND LANGUAGE INTERACTION. A SINGLE CASE INVENTORY**

Harrie Mazeland <sup>1</sup>

Contribution to the panel on *Repair in second language talk*, at the *International Conference on Conversation Analysis 2002, Copenhagen Denmark* May 17-21, 2002.

Department of Language and Communication, University of Groningen

© Harrie Mazeland (May 2002. *Email: h.j.mazeland@rug.nl*);

draft, please do not quote without permission

*contents:*

1. the basic question
2. types of second language talk
3. asymmetries in level of command
4. self repair and second language talk
5. collaborative completion
6. other-initiated self-repairs: candidate understandings
7. reformulations: a kind of embedded other-correction?
8. overt other correction
9. the collaborative orientation to minimization of discontinuity

*some references*

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper is a provisional draft, made for the occasion.

## *1. the basic question*

My first question is whether second language talk is a relevant category for the study of repair in second language talk.<sup>2</sup> That is, for some classes of other repair in second language talk it has to be shown that there is a relevant, specifiable connection between the repairs in the data and the fact that at least one of the participants is not talking in his or her 'first language.'

## *2. types of second language talk*

My data is an international phone call between two business partners: an account manager of a Dutch dairy concern and her Italian agent. The women have a durable professional relation. I have the impression - from this call and another one later on on the same day - that they speak each other on a regular basis (probably more than once each week). They use English when they talk to each other.

Some features of the interaction in this call are not independent from the type of activity that is carried out in it. And repair is also used as a practice for doing actions that contribute to the activity. For example, the other-initiation of repair in the fragment below is being dealt with as a way of negotiating the price policy that is proposed in prior turn:

**(1) M: Meredith, the Dutch account manager; P: Pia, the Italian agent**

216. M: so you want to make a bigger quantity  
217. and then- (.) ·h propose  
218. a:uh small reduction in the price.  
219. 0.5  
220. P: → a small↓::  
221. 0.6  
222. M: °ye↑ah:, because uh ·h i- (i-) it's not possible to give  
223. them the same pr↓ice. I'm afraid.°  
224. 0.6  
225. P: (°mh↓m)

---

<sup>2</sup> I assume the reader to be familiar with the following c.a. studies on the organization of repair: Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977, Jefferson 1974 and 1987, Pomerantz 1984, Schegloff 1979, 1987, 1992 and 1997a/b, and Drew 1997.

### ***3. asymmetries in level of command***

The participants speak English at an interactionally practicable level. They do business by talking with each other. Their command of English is not fully comparable, however. The Dutch woman speaks English relatively fluently and does not have manifest problems with pronunciation, word selection or grammar. The talk of the Italian woman is dispersed with hitches and perturbations.<sup>3</sup>

Systematic asymmetries in both the level and the type of command of 'the' second language have to be taken into account insofar the participants orient to such differences as a relevant feature of their talk. Differences in control of the second language may influence the ways repairs are done and by whom. In the phone call between the two business partners, for example, the more competent speaker more often completes ongoing turns of her colleague (collaborative completions, see section 5) and she is also the only one who proffers candidate understandings and reformulations of prior turn (section 6, respectively 8).

### ***4. self repair and second language talk***

Before dealing with some types of other repair and other-initiated repair, however, we want to dwell a little longer upon the possibility that the Italian participant produces her turns methodically in ways that continuously point to the fact that she is a less competent user of English than her interlocutor. Some turns at talk display a relatively high concentration of progression problems. See, for example, the turn marked with an arrow in the fragment below:

---

<sup>3</sup> See Schegloff 2000: 12. He characterizes *hitches* and *perturbations* as momentary arrests in the continuity or 'progressivity' of the talk's production (such as sudden cut offs, hesitations and repeats of a prior element) or other types of marked departures from the prosodic character of the talk's articulation to that point.

(2)

294. M: u::hm (0.2) I think we finished the contr\*a↓:ct.\*=  
295. P: =y:Ah,  
296. 0.9  
297. P: ·h[h  
298. M: [what are we gonna do now.  
299. 0.3  
300. P: → uh I ask uh for uh >I don't know< if  
301. you:ouu:h(oo:sh y::)you propo- (or) >I ask-  
302. I Ask< u:°↓:::h(m) ·h (at a tortal  
303. the[re are::-) ·hh °for: th- dhe:: a:h kind of contract.  
304. M: [yeah,  
305. P: (to see if) u:h [five u:h (o:r) [(four tons)  
306. M: [yeAh [what he wants. °yeah,  
307. 0.2  
308. P: >this afternoon,< I call[(him).  
309. M: [(°m:↓:.)  
310. (.)  
311. M: °okay. ·hh[h ] so you (call 'm.)  
312. P: [°yes.]

In the turn in lines 300-305, Pia -- the Italian agent -- demonstrates in many different ways that she has problems to manage the turn's progression. However, although her turn is dispersed with *uh*'s and almost every part of it is repaired, redesigned, recycled and re-begun, there is also steady progression. The packaging of progress seems to be a primary level at which a participant may methodically hint at the fact that she is talking in a second language.

At least some types of hitches may be examined with respect to the question whether there is a relation with the fact that the speaker is talking in a second language. For example, there may be different ways in which a speaker builds hitches into an ongoing turn constructional unit. In the fragment below, for example, the speaker permanently alternates between continuation with a next part of the ongoing TCU and the use of different prosodic variants of the pause filler *uh*:

**(3)**

137. P: → (...) >because uh they want uh u:h other six  
138. ton↓:uh ·h[h h]h for u::hm middl(in). (.) february.  
139. M: [°y:ah]  
140. P: °more or less:=  
141. M: =yeah.

From a productional perspective, the following pattern can be discerned in the turn-  
constructional unit in lines 137-38:

*(A) the steady-progress type of progressivity:*

(...) next word(s) + *uh* + next word(s) + *uh* + next word(s) (...)

This way of building in hitches into the ongoing TCU differs from types in which parts of the  
turn-so-far are recycled before progress is made by adding a next part:

**(4)**

160. P: ·hh and then uh [nho: I don't I don't want (it) to pay::.  
161. [(mimicks client's voice)]  
162. → I want u::h (0.5) <pleazuh keep u::h (keep) the pri↓:ze>  
163. (°and so'n and s'on.°) ·hhHh >I don't know Meredith.<  
164. → and THEN I uh- I: propose uh (a la) to:(m-) (0.7)  
165. ·hh to:°:::(m) increase the- the contracth.  
166. 0.5  
167. >(tsjange) the< quantit(ie[s])  
168. M: [yes.

The TCU's delivery is developing along the lines of a progress pattern like this:

*(B) the run-up-again pattern*

(...) next word(s) + *uh* + recycling of the last word + next word(s) + *uh* + recycling of  
the last word + next word(s) (...)

Speakers may do different things when using one or the other device for building in hitches into  
the ongoing turn-constructional unit. One of our wild speculations was that the run-up-again

pattern is used more often as a practice for inviting collaborative completions. However, we were not able to provide convincing evidence for this guess. So our first impressions with respect to this class of phenomena are still very premature and provisional. We do not know yet what to do with them.

We want to make two more observations with respect to within-turn self-repairs and how a speaker may use them as a way of dealing with the fact that (s)he is talking in a second language. First, the Italian agent sometimes uses an Italian expression when initiating a word search:

**(5) code switching in self-initiation markers**

216. P: (now) I don't know:. ·h becauseuh alora.  
 217. twenty four two- twenty four ton::uh  
 218. [·hh ] u::h is u:h- (0.4) u- (0.3)  
 219. M: [yeah.]  
 220. P: → (°>fattore dic o sei::<°) (.) FOR delivery.  
 221. 1.0  
 222. M: yeah. °four times six tonne[s.°°  
 223. P: [y(eah). ·h (and they don't)  
 224. know:. °five of six (or) six to- six uh (0.6) (zh)is  
 225. uh deli:very  
 226. 1.8  
 227. M: (°kayh.°) ·h >let me-< LEt me check.

The speaker switches to another language to mark the initiation of a word search. (Cf. Auer 1999 and Assmuss 2000). The code switching glosses the ultimate source of the trouble that the speaker is dealing with: she is using another language than the one she has readily available.

Second, some same-turn self-repairs deal with speaker uncertainties with respect to pronunciation (fragment 6), lexis and grammar (7), or idiomatic appropriacy (8):

**(6) pronunciation uncertainties**

95. P: (...) only the weather. (this a) disaster: [(°wha-]·h)  
 96. M: [WH↑Y ]:.=  
 97. =>what happened?

98. 0.3  
 99. P: → (my:s) fhree- thrEe weeks that u:h •h u::hm (.)  
 100. → evry day •h u:h ran (.) rain you:: °m::: u:h ff:ohg: (.)  
 101. pollut[iahn:.]  
 102. M: [°m:: ]:.

**(7) lexis and grammar uncertainties**

226. M: BECAUSE THEY'RE QUITE- (0.3) also behind on u:h (.) •hh  
 227. P: → (ma in) this moment(uh) do you have in stock u:h °how much.  
 228. → (°how man[y°°)  
 229. M: [m:↓: Pia. I have to check.  
 230. 0.3  
 231. P: huh ↓uh  
 232. M: °I don't know.°

**(8) idiomatic appropriacy**

280. M: •h and THEN I have another- a few questions. Pia.  
 281. 0.3  
 282. P: → °please. (.) °p[lease. (.) (°mak]e it.)  
 283. M: [U::hm:. ]  
 284. 0.3  
 285. M: because I'm [working on the SAles prognosis.  
 286. P: → [(°tell me)  
 287. 0.4  
 288. P: yea[h  
 289. M: [•hh (1.3) One: (.) numer one[: [is YUgoh,  
 290. P: [°ye↓a[h

In all these cases, the speaker shows that she is aware of a problem at the level of linguistic form. By the way, we do not know whether it is merely a coincidence that the self-corrections in the latter two fragments are done in transition space (7) and as a third-turn self repair<sup>4</sup> (8), respectively, whereas the pronunciation correction in (6) is initiated within the ongoing turn.

---

<sup>4</sup> See Schegloff 1997b.

### 5. collaborative completion

In the previous section, we have discussed some forms of self-initiation of repair and self-initiated self-repairs. There is one other class of self-initiated - or 'self-occasioned' - other-repair that is figuring relatively frequently in the business call: collaborative completion. See, for example, lines 150-52 in the fragment below:

**(9)**

143. M: but there's no- nothing on the contrac[t (now:)]  
144. P: [no ↓no.  
145. 0.2  
146. M: [no:.  
147. P: [no no. >and THEN a new co(r:)n°tract,  
148. (.)  
149. M: (°mh[↓m)  
150. P: → [new contract and that uh you:- (.)  
151. u:h [(°you-)  
152. M: → [>I give you] the< pri↓:ce=  
153. P: =ya↓: [h  
154. M: [yah.

It is hard to determine whether there is a relation with talking in a 'second language' in cases like the one above. The recipient does not give the impression that she is helping with a language problem when completing the turn of her colleague. Rather, she is volunteering the completion of a statement about a knowledge domain with respect to which she has a primary epistemic status: herself. The Italian agent is making a proposal how they will deal with a new contract for the customer they are talking about. The recipient takes over at a point at which the agent indicates that she is now beginning to describe her recipient's share to the project ('*and that uh you:-* (.) *u:h* // (°*you*) ...'). The recipient herself then volunteers a self-description of her own part. This kind of anticipatory collaborative completion may work as a very active way of jointly making a plan as a team (see Lerner 1991 and 1993).

Note that the recipient's assistance is occasioned by productional features of the ongoing turn. The stretching of the reference form (*you:-*) and the hitches that follow it do not solely enable the recipient's intervention. Perhaps they are even systematically used as practices for inviting a recipient take-over for this very part of the turn.



So the participants themselves do not deal with the hitches and perturbations in the ongoing turn as a second-language problem. Rather, they deal with this kind of production phenomena as something that has to do with the activity they are engaged in and perhaps even as a way of accomplishing the activity in an interactionally appropriate manner. Perhaps it is even their local achievement to deal with the problem as something else than a second language problem, that is, as something that can be touched upon smoothly in a way that contributes to the business at hand (we will return to this possibility in the concluding section).

There is one case of collaborative turn construction in this call in which there is more analytic evidence for a connection with the fact that the participants are talking in a second language. In line 336, the Italian participant waits a while with the delivery of the name of a firm that the other participant already has introduced a few turns earlier (line 323). After the recipient has provided the name one more time at a moment in which the speaker is undoubtedly delaying its delivery, the agent immediately incorporates it into the ongoing turn by repeating it:

**(10) collaborative turn-construction**

320. M: I remember we made a contract last year in June:,  
 321. 0.4  
 322. P: °ye[ah  
 323. M: → [•h for: (.) <deliveries for cordale.>  
 324. 0.2  
 325. P: yeah,  
 326. 0.2  
 327. M: remember?  
 328. 0.2  
 329. P: >yeah. yeah,<=  
 330. M: =•h and: I think we only used part of the contra:ct,  
 331. (.)  
 332. P: °ye[(s).  
 333. M: [and there is still some left. •h do you think  
 334. you're going to use that. yes or no↓:.=  
 335. P: •h yeah. >no(w) because uh-< ↓u::h WE HAv:e the contract  
 336. widzh u::hm:: •h[h  
 337. M: → [>with cordale.<=  
 338. P: → =with cordaleh •h[h. and then I tink  
 339. M: [yeah,

340. P: (this postureh) ·h and then u::h ·h if that for you  
 341. is possible to kee- to keep the pri:ces u-  
 342. [(th- that's impossible. <↓hey: °misses.°hh)  
 343. M: [(°yeah)

The agent's hesitation in using the name of the firm may be due to insecurity about how to pronounce it. The repeated mention of the firm's name is pronounced roughly in the same way as the recipient pronounced it (with an /ɛI/ as in *face* or *steak*; this is the 'correct' way, by the way). Later on in this episode, the Italian agent will use the same name four more times. On all these occasions, she pronounces it differently, - namely as '*cordalle*' (with /A/ as in *start*), as in line 386 and line 390:

**(10a)**

386. P: → yeah. [ma-) but uh] ·hh u:h when cordalleh give me the:-  
 387. M: [(depends.) ]  
 388. P: the contract, >because [I ha(ve) the contract with  
 389. M: [(°yeah.)  
 390. P: → cordalleh,

Note, however, that although we, as analysts, can identify retrospectively a possible second-language source of a pronunciation problem, the participants themselves do not deal observably with this problem as a second language problem in this case either.

Collaborative completions allow for incorporation of the repair within the boundaries a single turn. Most completions in our call are dealt with in this manner by the speaker of the trouble source turn. We have seen this already in fragment (10). The recipient's completion is immediately taken up as a contribution to an ongoing turn (lines 336-38):

**(10) detail of (10)**

335. P: ·h yeah. >no(w) because uh-< ↓u::h WE HAV:e the contract  
 336. widzh u::hm:: ·h[h  
 337. M: → [ >with cordale.<=  
 338. P: → =with cordaleh ·h[h. and then I tink  
 339. M: [yeah,  
 340. P: (this postureh) ·h and then u::h ·h if that for you



328 of fragment (12), for example, the recipient checks whether the response token in prior turn can be heard as a display of recognition of the referent that was introduced in the turn before it:

**(12)**

320. M: I remember we made a contract last year  
321. in June:,  
322. 0.4  
323. P: °ye[ah  
324. M: [•h for: (.) <deliveries for cordale.>  
325. 0.2  
326. P: yeah,  
327. 0.2  
328. M: → remember?  
329. 0.2  
330. P: >yeah. yeah,<=  
331. M: =•h and: I think we only used part of the contra:ct,

The candidate understanding in (13) is a little bit more explicit about the kind of work it is supposed to do because it is preceded by *you mean*:

**(13)**

160. P: •hh and then uh [nho: I don't I don't want (it) to pay::.  
161. [(*mimicks client's voice*)]  
162. P: I want u::h (0.5) <pleazuh keep u::h (keep) the pri↓:ze>  
163. (°and so'n and s'on.°) •hhHh >I don't know Meredith.<  
164. and THEN I uh- I: propose uh (a la) to:(m-) (0.7)  
165. •hh to:°:::(m) increase the- the contracth.  
166. 0.5  
167. P: >(tsjange) the< quantit(ie[s)  
168. M: [yes.  
169. 0.4  
170. P: and then uh- •h- ↓u::h- (.) >(it is:) impossible<  
171. to: keep °↓the pri:ceh.  
172. 0.7  
173. P: [(°I don't-)  
174. M: → [>you mean the same price they have< No↑:[w  
175. P: → [yah:

176. 0.5  
 177. P: >NO. no. si. (0.3) yah.=  
 178. M: =(u)o:↓:: [hwm  
 179. P: [zree point °tree zero.°°  
 180. 0.8  
 181. M: •mt °yeah, (0.8) •hh it's- it's- it's really not  
 182. fai:r:. becaus:e >↓you know↓< the cost price has-  
 183. has gone up a lot an- and they take small quantitie:s.

Candidate understandings are a very co-operative way of making sense of prior turn. The recipient is as helpful as possible without immediately correcting prior speaker. The decision about the correctness of the recipient's version is still in the hands of the speaker of the trouble source turn herself (see the speaker's confirmations in line 330 of fragment 12 and line 175 in 13).

### ***7. reformulations: a kind of embedded other-correction?***

The Dutch manager - who is not only the more proficient speaker of English, but who is also acting as the one who is managing the agenda in the call - regularly reformulates the preceding talk of her colleague. Like candidate understandings, reformulations proffer a candidate reading of the preceding talk as well, but they do so in a more conclusive and closure implicative way.

See, for example, the reformulation in the fragment below. The Dutch participant reformulates a long exposé of her colleague in line 515. As soon as the owner of its copyright has confirmed the summary, the recipient immediately continues with a concluding statement about how she will deal with this information (line 517-18):

#### **(14)**

501. P: and [then it izzuh •h iffuh tomorro::w:: the:  
 502. M: [yeah  
 503. P: the gooverment •h u::h maku:h this: uh this law:,  
 504. 0.3  
 505. M: ye[ah,  
 506. P: [I thinkuh bA:h subito the- h:huh inc[reazing  
 507. M: [°yeah.  
 508. P: very(s-) °yah,

509. (.)  
510. P: and then if no: again law:, ·h tri:al: and then  
511. some times <in one pro:doc:tion: and then  
512. °I do[n't u:h)] >is [it- [MOre-  
513. M: [(°yeah.)] [I'll PUT[h-  
514. P: more (va- va- >various [°peoples.) [°yeah.  
515. M: → [yea↓:h. it's [difficult to- to say.  
516. P: ya[h,  
517. M: [·h WELL, I first (°pu-) >I will put in a small quantity  
518. ·h u:h because (0.7)  
519. P: (°m[:.])  
520. M: [>it's a product that we don't MAKE u:h that much. of  
521. ↑hèh.

Reformulations often initiate a kind of sequence-closing sequences (*cf.* Schegloff 1995). In our data, most reformulations also display features that make them very similar to the kind of embedded correction that is described by Jefferson (1987). The reformulations of the Dutch agent modify or add to the talk that is formulated in it. The reformulation in the fragment above is a very accessible, clear and compact summary of the gist of something the previous speaker has been trying to say in a long exposé. In the fragment below, the recipient's reformulation in line 239 is specifying information that was not stated in the talk of prior speaker. Note that she does so in an almost aside-like mode of presentation:

**(15)**

546. P: (now) I don't know:. ·h becauseuh  
547. alora. twenty four two- twenty four ton::uh  
548. [·hh ] u:::h is u:h- (0.4) u- (0.3)  
549. M: [yeah.]  
550. P: (°>fattore dic o sei::<°) (.) FOR delivery.  
551. 1.0  
552. M: → yeah. °four times six tonne[s.°°  
553. P: [y(eah). ·h (and they don't)  
554. know:. °five of six (or) six to- six uh (0.6) (zh)is  
555. uh deli:very  
556. 1.8  
557. M: (°kayh.°) ·h >let me-< LEt me check.  
558. 0.6

Despite such clearly observable modifications and add-ons, the reformulation is nevertheless presented as an agreeing statement that is in line with the other party's sayings. Jefferson shows that embedded corrections allow for minimization of the discontinuity that would be caused by a more overt type of correction. The embedded type of repair is integrated into a turn that contributes to the progressivity of the talk. The speaker of the trouble source turn does not have to attend to the correction as a separate issue, but can process it as a part of the ongoing talk.

### **8. overt other correction**

We came across two cases of overt other repair in this phone call. One of them seems not be related to the issue of talking in a second language. The Italian agent can not remember the price for which a product was offered to a customer and she invites repair from her recipient<sup>6</sup>:

#### **(16)**

591. M:     •h and about: >u::h (1.1) Oh YEah! about u:h LACTose:  
592.         •h[h  
593. P:         [°yeah.=  
594. M:         =u::hm I GAVE you a prIce for: a full truckloa:↑:d,  
595.         0.3  
596. P:         (yeah,)  
597.         0.7  
598. M:         °u:h a few weeks ago.°  
599.         0.5  
600. M:         what- what do you think?  
601.         0.6  
602. P: → (°allo'rah,) (0.5) °u::h fo(u)r: I don't remember° •h  
603.         SI(era) oneh:, poin:t, (0.2)  
604. M:         (°m:↓m.° / 0)  
605. P:         [(°I don't-°)  
606. M: → [one point three °one.

<sup>6</sup> In a discussion about this fragment, Gail Jefferson did not consider the interaction in lines 602-16 as an instance of repair, but rather as a case of offering help. Although this is certainly not a correction, we think that some types of offering help still may be seen as a form of repair. Both the discontinuity that is

607. 0.4  
608. M: °it [was.  
609. P: [(°mh hm,)  
610. 0.4  
611. M: ((sniff))  
612. P: → [°yeah,  
613. 0.3  
614. M: °m↓hm.  
615. 0.6  
616. P: (yeah) I (now) remember (me). hh ·hHH huh yhah,  
617. [hoh  
618. M: [but you- you don't- you don't think that u:h (...)

The other case clearly has to do with talking in a second language. In line 390 of fragment (17), the recipient locates a trouble source in prior turn. The speaker of the trouble source turn herself then first tries to remedy the recipient's troubles. She does not solve the problem, however. Instead, she provides material that enables her co-conversationalist to claim and to show that she has discovered what the problem is ('o:h. the end. oh.', line 393):

**(17)**

383. P: (ma-) but uh ·hh u:h when cordalleh give me the:-  
384. the contract, >because [I ha(ve) the contract with  
385. M: [(°yeah.)  
386. P: [cordalleh, (it's in) this contract,  
387. M: [((sniffs))  
388. P: is not written ·h the:: the hen:(d) of con°tract.  
389. 0.9  
390. M: → (°hwha-°) >what do you mean,< ↑the  
391. 0.4  
392. P: → the hend. (is un[till:] (°untill:) ] uh u:uh)°°  
393. M: → [O:↓:h] >the end.<] o:↓h.]  
394. 0.4  
395. P: and [then I- I must ask(d). I HAvuh the contract.=  
396. M: [·hh  
397. P: =because ·h co- uh cordalleh sent me a contract.

---

occasioned by the recipient's contribution and the speaker's responses to it in lines 609, 612 and 616 provide evidence that the recipient orients to it as a repair, albeit a 'help-offering' type of repair.



398. [but uh ·h without u::u:h(m) (°t-) the hand uh.  
399. M: [°yeah.  
400. P: without (un)till u:h[:: (°and so on. ·h[h)  
401. M: [(°yeah.) [°yeah.  
402. 0.4  
403. M: >(°okay.°) PLEASE let me know.< because  
404. (°the:-) ·h you know (uh) ↑six months is ↓is u:h ·hh  
405. is (w)really (0.7) I think too lo↑:↓ng:  
406. 0.3

The other correction in line 393 clearly reveals that the recipient has made an analysis of the trouble source as a second-language problem (see Pomerantz 1984). The recipient shows that there was a pronunciation and/or word recognition problem by observably modifying the pronunciation of the repairable (from 'hand' into 'end'). By presenting her solution of the problem as a discovery ('O::h. the end. o:h.')<sup>7</sup>, the recipient is unmistakably pointing out the faultily character of the speaker's attempt to use the second language in an communicatively understandable manner.

Note that the recipient initially tries to leave the solution of the trouble to the speaker of the trouble source turn herself. She first only initiates repair by indicating that she has a trouble with understanding prior turn ('*what do you mean,*') and by locating the trouble source item very precisely through repeating the relevant syntactic framing element ('*what do you mean, the?*').<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Goodwin (1979) terms this type of use of *oh* a *discovery marker*.

<sup>9</sup> Note that the design of the *next-turn repair initiation* in line 390 displays an orientation to the relative strength of differential repair-initiating devices (see Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977, note 15). First something that might have become the open-class repair *what* (cf. Drew 1977) is self interrupted in favor of a more explicit statement of the occurrence of an understanding problem in prior turn ('(hwa-) *what do you mean,*'). The recipient then goes on with a device for identifying the trouble-source element in prior turn more precisely. By repeating the syntactic frame *the*, she enables the speaker of the trouble source turn to locate the exact word that is in need of repair. The design of the recipient's turn thus displays an orientation to a natural ordering of repair-initiating devices according to their relative capacity to locate a repairable. (See also Mazeland 1986)

In line with the observations made in Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977, the participants orient to self correction as an alternative that is preferred over other correction.

The aftermath of these two cases of other repair show some interesting differences. The other repair that has to do with the business at hand is taken up, acknowledged and elaborately attended to. The other repair that is dealing with the second-language trouble source is largely ignored by the speaker of the trouble-source turn, on the other hand. Although she does not continue any further with the clarification that was begun after the repeat of the trouble source, the Italian agent does not acknowledge or confirm the repair. Instead, she immediately continues with a next turn-constructural unit that is clearly designed as though it is *the* expectably projected next turn-constructural unit.

So, from the few cases of other repair that occur in this phone call we can conclude perhaps that the participants avoid other repair that is dealing with problems that are related to the language of communication. If other repair of a second language trouble source is being done, it is dealt with in a way that shows how delicate these issues are, particularly for the participant that is being other corrected.

### ***9. minimization of discontinuity***

The classes of repair that are discussed in this paper do not occur in great numbers in the business call. We are dealing with small numbers: 2 or 3 candidate understandings, 4 or 5 collaborative completions, 6 or 7 reformulations and 1 or 2 other repairs. However, when taken together for the whole phone call of about 15 minutes, we get an overall picture in which one party is very attentive, supportive and respectful in dealing with problems that arise in the interaction with a participant that has problems with the language of communication.

The types of interactive repairs that are used to solve problems and their packaging seem to show a preference for doing repair in such a way that the repair can be integrated smoothly into the ongoing talk. Collaborative completions allow for their incorporation into the ongoing turn. Reformulations offer candidate understanding while accomplishing other kinds of discourse-organizing work. Candidate understandings allow for minimization of the discontinuity that is occasioned by the insertion of a repair sequence. They only have to be confirmed by the speaker of the trouble source turn. And the one case of other repair that is

dealing with second-language trouble is not only oriented to as a less preferred second option. It is also dealt with in a way that covers it up as much as possible.

Both participants appear to orient to minimization of both the organization of repair and the ways repair is shaped and built into the talk. Repair of trouble that is connected to talking in a second language is avoided, incorporated and minimized. Second-language problems are a delicate issue for the participants in the business call and they are preferably covered up or dealt with as another type of problem.

\* \* \*

### *references*

- Auer, P. (ed.) 1999. *Code-switching in conversation*. London: Routledge
- Drew, P. 1997. "'Open" class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation.' In: *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol.28/1, p. 69-102
- Goodwin, C. 1979. 'The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation. In: G. Psathas (ed.) *Everyday language. Studies in ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington, p. 97-121
- Jefferson, G. 1974. 'Error correction as an interactional resource.' In: *Language in Society*, Vol.2. p.181-199
- Jefferson, G. 1987. 'On exposed and embedded correction in conversation.' In: G. Button & J. Lee (eds.) *Talk and social organisation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, p. 86-100
- Lerner, G. 1991. 'On the syntax of sentences-in-progress.' In: *Language in Society*, Vol.20, p. 441-58
- Lerner, G. 1993. 'Collectivities in action: Establishing the relevance of conjoined participation in conversation.' In: *Text*, 13/2, p.213-45
- Mazeland, H. 1986. 'Repair-organisatie in onderwijs-interakties.' In: A.Scholten & D.Springorum (eds.) *Gespreksanalyse*. Nijmegen: Neerlandistiek KUN, p. 233-46
- Pomerantz, A. 1984. 'Pursuing a response.' In: J.M.Atkinson & J.Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge University Press, p.152-163
- Schegloff, E. 1979. 'The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation.' In: T. Givón (ed.). *Discourse and syntax*. (Syntax and semantics, Vol.12). New York: Academic Press, p. 261-299

- Schegloff, E. 1987. 'Some sources of misunderstanding in talk-in-interaction.' In: *Linguistics* 25, p. 201-18
- Schegloff, E. 1992. 'Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation.' In: *American Journal of Sociology* 98, p. 1295-1345
- Schegloff, E. 1995 (mimeo). *Sequence organization*. Department of Sociology UCLA
- Schegloff, E. 1997. 'Practices and actions. Boundary cases of other-initiated repair. In: *Discourse processes* 23/3, p. 499-547
- Schegloff, E. 1997. 'Third turn repair.' In: G.R. Guy, C. Feagin, D. Schiffrin and J. Baugh (eds.) *Towards a social science of language 2*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, p. 31-41
- Schegloff, E. 2000. 'Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation.' In: *Language in Society* 29, p. 1-63.
- Schegloff, E., G. Jefferson and H. Sacks, 1977. 'The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation.' In: *Language*, Vol.53, Nr.1, p. 361-83