Practices and Actions: Boundary Cases of Other-Initiated Repair

EMANUEL A. SCHEGLOFF

University of California, Los Angeles

Working within a naturalistic paradigm for which the notion of "practices" is more apt than "processes," I address the multiplicity of ties between practices of talk-in-interaction and the actions which they accomplish. After describing common procedures of data collection and preparation in this mode of inquiry and the "boundary cases" which these procedures may engender, I explore alternative actions which can be recognizably produced by practices of talking ordinarily associated with the action of "initiating repair." Two practices in particular are examined: questioning terms ("huh?," "who?," etc.) and certain forms of repeats. As well, I show that in some contexts the action of initiating repair can be produced by a practice which does not ordinarily produce it. The moral of the article is that situated analysis must go hand-in-hand with more formal analysis in order to arrive at satisfactory accounts of discourse practices, and of discourse processes as well.

From the beginning, the journal *Discourse Processes* (whose anniversary we are commemorating) and the constituency which it serves have included a variety of styles of work. Although the predominant tenor was from the outset psychological and experimental, the original editorial board included linguists such as Chuck Fillmore and Robin Lakoff among others, anthropologists such as John Gumperz and Dell Hymes among others, and even an occasional sociologist such as myself—*not* among others. And although the first issue was composed entirely of papers which were experimental in execution or intention, by authors in departments of psychology, immediately ensuing issues included work which escaped conventional experimentalism (although it was often intrusive and con-

trolled in various respects), and included as well a "think-piece" with policy concerns regarding the simplification of legal language. Although a heavy preponderance of the papers were preoccupied with individual psychological processes—processes of inference, memory, comprehension, and the like—the first issue included a paper of Catherine Garvey's on contingent queries which was preoccupied with a phenomenon inseparable from interaction. In a note from the founding editor, Roy Freedle, which I found tucked behind the cover of my copy of Volume 1, Number 1, he remarks that "The second issue is more clearly multidisciplinary than the first and this will be true for subsequent issues as well." And so it has been, although the predominantly psychological cast, while waxing and waning, has never disappeared.

I had originally intended to use this occasion to address the notions "text" and "discourse" as ways of framing events in the world and thereby shaping the character of inquiry into them. I thought I would then explore the interface between those conceptions on the one hand, and, on the other, an orientation to "action" and "interaction" which is at the heart of work on conversation. The latter two terms have featured centrally in my own engagement over the last several decades with the discourse-analytic communit*ies* (I think the plural is the apt form here). In writing three papers with the title or subtitle "Discourse as an Interactional Achievement" (Schegloff, 1982, 1988a, 1995), I have perhaps belabored the point that the production of discourse—in the sense of a multi-sentence production of coherent language use—*is* an inescapably interactional achievement. Rather than being the product of a single mind—a mind with structure, processes, and so forth—a "cognitive" product, which is dumped into a bland, featureless interactional medium, to understand discourse we must understand its origins in the interactional practices in which it was initially formed as a possible product (cf. also Schegloff, 1989).

Another theme which cannot be stressed too much but which I suspect someone else should now take up is that discourse is not just about conveying information, but that in the primordial site of language, that is, in talk-in-interaction, it virtually always implicates *action*, and without taking into account the actions being done both by speaker and by interlocutors, we will not in the end understand how discourse is formed up, even *as discourse*. This I have written about as clearly as I can in a version of the third of my "Discourse as an Interactional Achievement" papers (1996c), in a way that speaks directly to those with psychological and experimentalist leanings.

So enough already. Although these themes will not be absent from this article, I want to do something else. The theme I will address instead is the relationship between actions and the practices by which they are formed up. Substantively this article is about other-initiated repair, and methodologically it is about

"boundary cases." Let me say a bit about each, and about the aptness of the topic for its occasion.

I will, in a moment, review what we meant by the terms "repair," "other-initiated repair," and "next turn repair initiation" (or NTRI) in the Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks paper on "The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation." Let me mention, in passing, that it was published in 1977, just about the time that *Discourse Processes* was getting under way, with the earlier-mentioned article by Garvey and Debba (1978) in the first issue closely related to its empirical domain. This is a field which Herb Clark and his colleagues, and I and mine, have both tilled with mutual resonances and to our mutual benefit (I hope). All of which encourages the prospect that this may be an attractive point of possible rapprochement with the psychological side of this area of discourse studies—even if I choose to think of "practices" while psychologists prefer to think of "processes," a theme to which I will return at the end.

THEMATIC ORIENTATION AND BACKGROUND

Method

In naturalistic inquiry of the sort I am committed to, it happens that, while examining a naturally occurring event (or, rather, a *record* of it), one notices something. Sometimes it is a single-faceted observation (look, that speaker is repeating what the prior speaker said); sometimes it is two-faceted (look, that speaker is agreeing with the other by repeating the thing she's agreeing with); sometimes it is three-faceted (look, in agreeing by repeating what is being agreed with, the repeater is confirming not only its substance, but that she had conveyed it before). More often than not, I should say, such a third facet comes only in the course of a research process, not at its beginning (Schegloff, 1996a).

For many workers, such observations—however many-faceted—are made on a *non*-first exposure. I don't mean that they have looked at that very event before and not noticed the observation, though that surely happens a lot as well. What I mean is that the noticing, even if made on a first exposure to that bit of material, presents itself as "Oh, I've seen something like that before!," which is to say that the present observation is at least the *second* case. And the observer may not be able to say, or say adequately, what the "that" is that they think they have seen before and are now seeing again, or they may be able to say a little, but (it may turn out) not what in the end is most important.

When an investigator is at such a juncture—they have seen something and think they have seen it before—the first step is to find those earlier "cases," and see whether they hold up as relevantly similar. Often enough they do not; one remembered it wrong; one remembered it right, but the contexts render the simi-

larities superficial and analytically uncompelling, and so forth. But if the current observation and the remembered precedents cohere, or if the observation has been made without remembered precedents, a common next step is to assemble a collection of candidate other instances.

Assembling such a collection can be a strange operation. Though sometimes one has quite a clear idea of what one is collecting, often one does not. If one does, the effort to collect more "specimens" may quickly muddy that "clear idea," or transform it. If one does not, one is involved in finding out what one is collecting in the very process of collecting it, and this mandates certain wise practices in doing the work of assembling the collection. For example, one assembles the collection "generously," that is, including in it occurrences which prima facie appear *different* from the target instances—the initiating observation(s). On the one hand, this can help avoid freezing the grasp of what is being studied at the initial understandings of the initial instances; it is allowed to grow and be informed by subsequently encountered material. On the other hand, this practice of generous inclusion allows us—indeed *forces* us—later on, when we discard these instances, to make explicit just what it is which makes them different from our targets, and thereby potentially forces us to specify progressively just what (if anything) is distinctively going on in the fragments which set us off.

It is these challenging materials, ones which eventually get excluded and ones which require careful specification of the grounds for *including* them after all, which are what I am calling the "boundary cases." They generally "look like" our emerging phenomenon, even if they do not turn out to be instances of it. In specifying what *makes* them "look like," we learn about our phenomenon; and in specifying why nonetheless they *"are* not," we learn as well. And in specifying why some instances which look *un*like our initiating instances belong nonetheless (as in Schegloff, 1991), we do the same.

Boundary cases are on *both* sides of the boundary, and in specifying the boundary, they help specify what belongs inside it and what does not. They also help us convert mere *interpretation*, based on what something seems or appears to be, into *analysis*, where that "seeming" is empirically grounded in analytically formulated features of the conduct, features by which it does what it is designed to do, and gets so understood by co-participants.

In this article, then, I will be examining some boundary cases—mostly ones which were *ex*cluded from the class "other-initiated repair," in a data-base of some 1350 candidate instances in a study of other-initiated repair sequences.

For those whose own preoccupations have not recently, or perhaps ever, steered them into this neighborhood, let me quickly review the key points of reference in this domain, as initially sketched in the "The Preference for Self-Correction" paper.

Repair

By "repair," we refer to practices for dealing with problems or troubles in speaking, hearing and understanding the talk in conversation (and in other forms of talk-in-interaction, for that matter). I want to underscore the phrase "the talk" in my reference to "problems in understanding the talk;" for we did not mean to include within the scope of "repair" *all* practices addressed to problems of understanding (like understanding exactly how the Internet works), only the narrower domain of "understanding what someone has just said" (though there can, of course, be a fuzzy boundary between these). We proposed that these practices for dealing with trouble form an orderly *organization* of practices, some of whose basic dimensions are the following.

Episodes of repair activity are composed of parts, for our purposes most importantly a repair *initiation*, marking possible disjunction with the immediately preceding talk, and a repair *outcome*—whether solution or abandonment of the problem. Much of the working of the organization of repair is shaped by features of repair *initiation*.

First, there is the matter of *who* initiates repair. The organizationally relevant way of understanding this is to differentiate between repairs initiated by the *speaker* of the problematic talk (what we refer to as "the trouble-source" or "repairable") and those initiated by anyone else—self-initiation and other-initiation respectively.

Second, there is the matter of *where* repair is initiated. This too is organized by reference to the trouble-source, with virtually all repair that gets initiated being launched in a very narrow window of opportunity *around* the trouble-source— specifically in the *same* turn as contains the trouble-source or just after it, in the *next* turn following the trouble-source turn, or in the turn following *that*.

These two dimensions of the organization of repair are related. Virtually all repair initiated by someone *other* than the speaker of the trouble-source—what I will be referring to as *other-initiated repair*—is initiated in the next turn after the trouble-source turn; hence another way of referring to them is as "next turn repair initiations" or "NTRI"s. (For the exceptions, cf. Schegloff, 1992, pp. 1320-1326.) *Self*-initiated repair, on the other hand, occurs in all the other positions.

Considerable differences in the "technology" of repair come with these differentiations. There isn't the space to review them here, other than to note one that is key to our current focus. That is that *self*-initiated repairs ordinarily involve the speaker of the trouble-source initiating repair and prosecuting it to conclusion in the same turn. *Other*-initiated repair, by contrast, generally involves a *recipient* of the problematic talk *initiating* the repair, but leaving it for the *speaker* of the trouble-source to deal with the trouble themselves in the ensuing turn. Other-initiated

repair, that is, involves a *sequence*, and sequence organization in conversation is an organization not only of turns-at-talk, but of *action*.

The organization of repair, then, is an organization of *action*. The action, or actions, which compose one of its occurrences include (among possible others) initiation and solution or abandonment. Its actions can *supercede* other actions, in the sense that they can replace or defer whatever else was due next—a next sound in a turn-constructional unit, a next turn-constructional unit in a turn, a next turn in a sequence, a next element of a story-telling, and so forth. It is the *only* action type that we know of now which has this property. (And by including among the loci of supercession the observation that a repair-initiation can replace or defer a next sound (or word) in a turn-constructional unit, I mean to have conveyed the point that *self*-initiated repair partakes in the organization of action as well. It is not merely a kind of psycholinguistic detritus; it, and its parts, can constitute actions in their own right.)

Any action type with this immensely powerful privilege of displacing any other due item must surely be restricted in its privilege of occurrence, and the repair initiation opportunity space represents that restriction and its consequence, that is, that virtually all repair *initiations* occur within the already mentioned limited space around their self-declared *trouble-source*, and that virtually all *repairs* (i.e., *solutions*) occur within a very narrowly circumscribed space from their repair *initiations*. Although many other action types have a discernible distributional tendency (e.g., arrangement-making near closings, requests deferred until late or after other requests, noticings at earliest possible opportunity and therefore early in conversations, and the like), few have as well-defined and circumscribed a provenance as repair does (perhaps only greetings and farewells).

The Self-Correction paper was based on and reported our noticing and examining repair as an action-type and an activity. We characterized four *central* features (among a number of other ones): first, its *internal structuring*; second, its *distribution*; third, its *personnel*—these I have already mentioned; and, fourth, its *practices*, including the types of "turn-constructional devices" (as we called them) by which its components were formatted. It is the last of these which will preoccupy us in what follows.

The Present Inquiry

Among these practices for the initiation of repair by "other" were some recurrently employed questioning terms and forms (like "huh?" and "what?"); category-specific question words, such as "who?," "where?," or "when?;" some more formally characterizable practices, such as partial or full "repeat" of the trouble-source turn; and various forms of re-saying the trouble-source turn or part of it in other words, often framed by "y'mean," and, finally, practices of combining

these, as in a partial repeat of the trouble-source turn with a question word (e.g., "you went where?").

In the aftermath of the Self-Correction paper, there has been an inclination, understandable even if mistaken, to treat instances of these practices—these "turn-constructional devices"—as providing a kind of default analysis of the activity of repair—a virtually automatic analysis of its implementation. So I want in this paper to "rotate" the domain we are studying, if I can put it that way.

Instead of focusing on the activity of repair and its initiation, and asking what practices may be used to implement it, I want to focus on some *practices*—practices which *can* be used to initiate repair—and ask instead what, if any, *other* activities they may be deployed to implement. One upshot and result, I hope, will be to caution analysts not to abdicate analytic responsibility to some one-to-one practice/action pairing, but to remain alert to an *action-formation resource pool*, in which practices, deployed always in some position, can accomplish *different* actions; and actions can be accomplished through a *variety* of situated practices.

Let me make it clear at the outset that I am *not* doing here two things which might plausibly be taken to be the article's commitment.

First, I am not concerned here with other actions which can be implemented by use of other-initiated repair *by virtue of being other-initiated repair*. Other-initiated repair may be used as a vehicle or instrument for doing displays of doubt, non-alignment, disagreement, challenge, rejection, etc. The accomplishment of these outcomes can turn on the recognition of the utterances involved by interlocutors *as* other-initiated repairs, and this can be displayed by interlocutors responding to them *as* other-initiated repairs, while at the same time responding to whatever other action(s) is being implemented by the repair initiation, e.g., by a repair-relevant response which embodies a back-down in the face of incipient disagreement. Although this is a worthy and important topic, it is not the one being addressed here. The focus here is on actions *alternative to* other-initiated repair which can be accomplished by practices of speaking which may also be used for repair-initiation—that is, instances in which analysis as other-initiated repair would not be merely insufficient, but would be incorrect.[1]

Second, I would like it to be clear that, although I am speaking in the first instance about practices usable for the action of initiating *repair*, I mean thereby to be speaking about a much broader domain, and that is potentially *all* action. With that I implicate, if not all discourse, then a very hefty chunk of it indeed. For there is a tendency in formulating an object of inquiry as "discourse" to focus on its formal aspects *as* discourse alone—how narratives are put together and how they are understood, how they generate the inferences they do, etc. But in the real world (if I may beat this horse one more time), virtually all discourse is a vehicle for action. And the action being accomplished by some discourse—whether narrative, extended description, argument, whatever—that action surely figures in

how it is *put together* as discourse, and how it is *understood* as discourse. After all, *discursive* practices are among the practices in the action-formation resource pool. Among the ways of complaining, or requesting, or reassuring, and many others is, for example, the telling of a story of the "right" sort, one which builds into it the elements from which its recipient can analyze out the request, the complaint, the reassurance which it is conveying. And recipients *will* be in search of that: the single most telling orientation of recipients of discourse in the real world is, "why that now?," a central specification of which is "what is the speaker *doing* by that?" (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). So, although this paper is about repair, and other-initiated repair in particular, it is meant to focus attention more broadly on the generic problematicity of the linkage between practices and the actions they effectively produce.

WHAT ELSE GETS DONE BY THE PRACTICES THAT DO OTHER-INITIATION OF REPAIR

It is tempting to think of particular lexical items, or classes of them, or usages of a describable sort, as being dedicated to particular processes or actions in conversation—much as "hello" seems to be dedicated to doing greetings. This turns out only rarely to be the case, though it takes examination of empirical materials to establish the range of deployments which words or usages are given, and what features of their deployment provide for their uptake in any given instance.

Here I want to engage in a limited exercise along these lines, examining a number of usages or practices commonly employed to initiate repair. For each of them we will examine occasions in which they are deployed to quite different effect. They would thus defy a simplistic search procedure which might try to find "other-initiated repairs" by locating instances of these words or usages. They underscore for us as analysts the problem of developing an account of what enters into the constitution of the action "initiating repair on the talk of another," and an account of what enters into the understanding by a recipient that another's talk and/or other conduct is possibly doing such an action. In what follows, I deal with two types of practice—one, a set of question forms and another, certain practices of repeating.

Some Practices of "Question"-Deployment

Consider first "huh." Or rather "huh?" with upward intonation—a first occasion to register that the units we are dealing with are not items in a dictionary, but articulated, intoned, produced items. "Huh?" may seem fairly straightforward, a virtually pre-lexical grunt which constitutes the weakest of the repair initiations, or the strongest, depending on how you look at it. "Weakest" in the

sense that it displays the least grasp of the problematic utterance which is its target, and in the sense that it gives the least help to its recipient in locating what the trouble-source is, and what the trouble with it is. "Strongest" in the sense that it is so powerful that its user needs nothing more to deploy it than to take it that something was said to her or him; it does not even require an actual trouble-source, only a putative one. Sitting quietly in your living room with your significant other and reading, you say "huh?" into the silence and they nonetheless know what you are up to and what you think; "I didn't say anything," they will say.

Below I have provided a few actual exemplars; it is these, and not plausible imaginings, which are the target of inquiry here. I will not greatly elaborate these instances, except to note that in the first two the trouble-source is repeated more or less exactly in response to the "huh?," displaying a treatment of it as possibly claiming a problem in hearing or grasping, and that in Extracts (03)-(05) the response is recognizably the same utterance, but changes have been introduced, ostensibly addressed to other possible types of trouble. (Note that single-headed arrows mark the trouble-source turn, double-headed arrows mark the other-initiation of repair, and three-headed arrows mark the candidate solution. Other notational conventions are explained in the Appendix).

Extract (01)-(05)

(01) Virginia, 2:30-3:04

```
 1  Mom:         [No, I didn' jog th]is mornin' 'cause I didn' have tah:me.
 2               (1.9)
 3   Wes:        Wel[l uh
 4  Mom:              [eh-huh! _hh [I h a d d a l s a l e t h a t |startid tida- ]
 5   Wes:->                        [I thought youl wuh gettin' readylfuh next week.]
 6               (.)
 7  Mom:->>      Huh?
 8   Wes:->>>    I thought you were gettin' ready fuh next week.
 9               (1.1)
```

(02) NB, 1:1:19

```
 1  Eddy:        Oh I'm sure we c'get on at San Juan Hills.
 2               That's nice course, I only played it once.
 3   Guy:        Uh huh.
 4               (1.0)
 5   Guy:->      It's not too bad,
 6  Eddy:->>     Huh?
 7   Guy:->>>    'S not too bad,
 8  Eddy:        Oh.
 9               (1.0)
10  Eddy:        What time you wanna go.
```

(03) Upholstery Shop, 27:28-38

```
 1  Mike:       Wanna get some- wannuh buy some fish?
 2  Rich:       Ihhh ts-t
 3  Vic:        Fi:sh,
 4  Mike:       You have a tank I like tuh tuh- I-I [like-
 5  Vic:                                           [Yeh I gotta fa:wty::
 6              I hadda fawtuy? a fifty, enna twu[nny:: en two ten::s,
 7  Mike:                                       [Wut- Wuddiyuh doing wit=
 8              [dem. Wuh-
 9  Rich:->     [But those were uh::: [Alex's tanks.
10  Vic:                              [enna fi:ve.
11  Vic:->>     Hah?
12  Rich:->>>   Those'r Alex's tanks weren't they?
```

(04) Shaw AFB (cf. Schegloff, 1989:144-51)

```
 1  Mom:->      Cut that up Rob.
 2  Rob:->>     Hm?
 3  Mom:->>>    I sai:d, "cutt it(h)"
```

(05) Upholstery Shop, 52:31-53:01

```
 1  Vic:        I left- Have a beeuh.
 2  James:      (Hey no) less gi(h)tta- less ge(h)tta bo(h)ttle
 3              wai(h)ta sekkin=
 4  Mike:       =E wantsa boddle. [uh huh-huh-huh!
 5  James:                       [(Down with beer!) Agghh! [Shit
 6  Mike:                                                  [(Yeh=
 7  Mike:       =[get         )
 8  Rich:       =[(Ha hah hah hah[hah)
 9  Vic:->      =[I'm not intuh [the boddle.
10  James:                      [Hu:h?
11  James:->>   Huh?
12  Vic:->>>    I'm not intuh liquor.
```

So this is the "huh?" (or "hm?"; I have not been able to establish any interaction-ally relevant differences between the open and closed realizations) which we have under examination, and surely "initiating repair" is what it does...

Except when it used to do something else. What else?

1. *Pursuit of Response*:   One usage "huh?" turns out to have is as a pursuit of response to a question which has not been answered. For example; in Extract (06) Grace and Pat have been discussing meeting at a place which Grace has been describing to an apparently uninformed Pat.

(06) JG, Patt and Grace

```
 1  Pat:        Oh
```

```
 2   Pat:       Uh huh.
 3   Grace:     so umn=
 4   Pat:       Sure that would be alright cuz I know
 5              exactly how to get down there.
 6   Grace:     Oh you do
 7   Pat:       Yeah [I know exactly where it is
 8   Grace:          [( )
 9   Grace:     Oh you do
10   Pat:       Yeah
11   Grace: ->  Where is it
12   Pat:       Ha ha ha ha
13   Grace: ->> Huh?
14      Pat: ->>> It's way down by the ocean
15              (0.2)
16   Pat:       way down off the end of Jefferson Blvd
17   Grace:     It is
18   Pat:       Yeah
19   Grace:     Oh:::[:
20   Pat:            [Right on the ocean
21   Grace:     Oh uh huh
22   Pat:       Nice place
23   Grace:     It is,
24   Pat:       Oh: beau:tiful
25   Grace:     Um hum
26   Pat:       Beau:tiful
```

When Pat claims to know just where it is (lines 4-5, 7), Grace marks this as news (lines 6, 9), and when Pat does not volunteer an account, Grace asks for one overtly (line 11). When Pat extends the teasing withholding of response by responding to the question with laughter (line 12), Grace reinstitutes the question with a prompt, a pursuit of response to the question (line 13), and one which succeeds (lines 14-16, 20). That pursuit of response is implemented with "huh?"

In Extract (07) Madeline is a guest for fried chicken dinner with a family of four, acquaintances of hers. While the mother and her little boy are otherwise occupied (not with one another, by the way), the little girl of the family indicates a piece of chicken which she wants to eat (line 1):

(07) Oolie, Chicken Dinner, 9:30
```
1     Girl:     [ I  w i s h  I  h a d  t h a t ]
2     Mom:      [What would you go to FREDricksberg]
3               I mean what a jungleland
4 Madeline:     Hoh?
5               (·)
```

```
6        Girl:      I wish I had that
7                   (·)
8 Madeline: ->      You wanna wing?
9                   (0.2)
10       Boy:       Melodie's h[aving marshmellow soup hh
11 Madeline: ->>                [huh?
12                  (1.0)
13       Girl: ->>>yah
```

Perhaps because the little girl's request is obscured by being said in overlap (lines 1-2), Madeline initiates repair with the very form of repair initiation which we have been taking as our point of departure, the "huh" at line 4. This elicits a repeat of the problematic utterance but apparently not a fully clear deictic gesture accompanying it. Madeline follows up with another repair initiation, this time a candidate understanding of the "that," i.e., what the little girl's object of desire is ("you wanna wing?" at line 8), and when there is a delay in response, she pursues it with the prompt at line 11, again in the form of a "huh?"[2]

There is a sense, of course, in which these "huh?"s are also initiating repair, but repair of a very different sort than has otherwise been described (except perhaps for Jefferson, 1981)—repair of a sequence's proper development. These "huh?"s are also initiated by "other," but now not "other than speaker of the trouble-source," but rather "other than the *non*-speaker of the trouble- source," and it is the non-speaking which, in a manner of speaking, *is* the trouble-source. As noted earlier, repairs like "huh?" have sometimes been characterized by their position rather than by their speaker, that is, as "next turn repair initiations" (or NTRIs), and the turn that they are "next" after has been by another speaker. Here the "huh" *is* a "next turn," but one of a different sort. It is a virtually paradigmatic instance of a next turn—and clearly a separate one—by the same speaker as prior turn, with no intervening turn by another. However much this "huh?" bears its *own* marks of doing repair, it is a very different object than the one with which we began.

That it is so understood by co-participants is evidenced by the very different type of response which it elicits. Like the more familiar "huh?" with which we began, it *is* successful, and quickly. Response follows it directly—marked by the triple-headed arrows in the Extracts. But here, in Extracts (06) and (07), that response is provision of an answer to the previously unanswered question, not a repeat or modification of a previously articulated utterance (as in (01)- (05)).

It turns out that "huh?" is not the only form of repair initiation that has the pursuit of response as an alternative deployment. Consider, for example, the form of repair initiation which Sacks (1992, I, pp. 652, 660-663) some years ago (actually in Fall, 1967) termed an "appendor question." Appendor questions are fashioned almost always out of phrasal constructions, designed to be grammatically symbi-

otic with the preceding trouble-source turn of which they offer a candidate understanding. Extract (08) offers a canonical case in point:

(08) GTS, 4:3

1	Roger: ->	They make miserable coffee.
2	Ken:	hhhh hhh
3	Dan: ->>	Across the street?
4	Roger: ->>>	Yeh
5	Ken:	Miserable food hhhh
6		(0.4)
7	Ken:	hhhh So what'djudo East-er-over Easter Vacation

Early in this group therapy session with adolescent boys, Roger offers an assessment of the coffee which has been brought in from a local café, and Dan checks his understanding of the referent of "they" by appending to the trouble-source turn a phrase embodying that understanding ("across the street?"). Appendor questions are a quite common format for other-initiated repair in conversation. But look at Extract (09).

(09) KC-4,2:18-28

1	Freda:	This is nice did you make this?
2	Kathy:	No Samu made that.
3	Freda:	Who?
4	Kathy:	Samu
5		(1.0)
6	Kathy: ->	(Sh) You remember my [aunt?]
7	Dave:	[Aunt S]amu
8	Kathy: ->>	[From Czechoslovakia?
9	Freda:	[Yyeeah
10	Freda:	Oh she's really something
11	Kathy:	Yeah

Here Freda has appreciated a rug in the home of her hosts for dinner, Kathy and Dave (line 1), but fails to recognize the name of the artist who created it. At line 6 Kathy solicits Freda's recognition while supplying a clue, and when recognition is not immediately forthcoming, pursues it with ... a construction very much like the appendor question just examined in Extract (08) (as it happens, this is offered just as Freda is in fact claiming recognition).

Here again, as with "huh?", the different environment makes of the apparent similarity one which is sequentially and interactionally superficial. Here the phrase is added to the *same* speaker's prior turn—the one at line 6, not another speaker's prior turn, as in Extract (08). It is not, then, initiating repair of the same

sort; it does not offer a candidate understanding of another's otherwise problem-
atic utterance. Rather than being an appendage to *another's* turn, it is an incre-
ment (Schegloff, 1996b) to the *same* speaker's prior turn, which is a question, one
which has not received a response, a response which this increment is in pursuit of
(as the "huh?"s were in Extracts (06) and (07) .

Alright then, so we have found that constructions which can be used for one
form of repair can be used for quite different forms of repair. Indeed, we have
been led to register and add to our understanding a previously unnoticed (or
barely noticed) type of repair, a repair of a sequence's progressivity. But this turns
out to be the most conservative finding in this area—conservative in the sense
that, while expanding our understanding of the provenance of these forms, their
basic import has remained in the same domain—the practices of repair. Other
forms used for repair, it turns out, are deployed in sequential environments more
remote from that domain.

Let us remain at the same end of the strong/weak continuum. There are what
are taken to be more "formal" usages to do the job which "huh?" does in initiating
repair on the talk of another, and which are as strong or weak in claiming no grasp
of the trouble-source other than that something was said. For example, the
"Excuse me?" in (Extract (10)):

(10) BC Beige, 20-21 (Schegloff, 1992:1332-34)
```
1    A:        ...You uh:: wha'diyuh do, fer a living.
2    B:        Eh::m I woik inna driving school.
3    A:        Inna dri:ving school.
4    B:        Yeh. I? spoke t'you many ti:mes,
5    A:        Oh yeah. You gottuh beautiful thing goin'. Haven'tche.
6    B:        Yea[::h,
7    A:            [You can'- You can' make a living.
8    B:        No, I manage yih know, I go by bus, de fellehz drive me
9              over you know,
10   A: ->     Yeh but ha'di- whaddiyuh do et school
11             ((pause))
12   B: ->>    Excuse me?
13   A: ->>>   Whaddiyuh do et school.
14   B:        Whaddiyuh mean 'n school.
15   A:        Well you work ettuh driving school, [Right?
16   B:                                            [Yeh but I jus' go to
17             the motor ve'icle 'n awl that. I'm not an instructor ye[t.
18   A:                                                               [Oh
19             I see. Y'dun 'aftuh worry abuht that.
20   B:        No,
21   A:        Okay.
```

But some "excuse me"s, including upwardly intoned ones, are *not* being used to initiate repair, even when repair initiation turns out to be relevant, as can be seen in the following.

2. *Ritual Remedy*:   In Extract (11), the college-aged Fred is deputized by his mother Anne to attend to the needs of his visiting sister, Deb, her husband, Marty, and their daughter, Naomi.

(11) Post-Party, 15:27-41

```
1    Anne:      Ask Uncle Freddy nice[ l y ]
2    Fred:                          [Whatchu] want Naome,
3               c'mon (I- ) come t'the ki[(tchen.)
4    Naomi:                              [Please a glass a'milk,]
5    Deb:                                [Water fer me FRE:d,]
6    Fred: ->   Ajuu[ahhh! ((sneeze))
7    Marty:         [En'n ash[tray fer ]me Fred,
8    Fred: ->>              [(Scuze me?)]
9    Fred: ->>  What?
10   Marty:     A:shtray fer me,
11   Fred:      (Two [ashtrays?)]
12   Deb:            [Ash tray,] water, milk.
13   Fred:      Okay. En ashtray en ennything tuh drink.
14              (0.5)
```

As can be seen at line 9, other-initiated repair—and of just this level of strength—*is* relevant at this juncture, but the "excuse me?" (at line 8) is not doing it. Rather, it is a ritual marker for the sneeze, a kind of etiquettal absolution for the physiological eruption. Placed after an occurrence which can prompt such a ritual marker, that is what "excuse me?" is used to do even when it could also otherwise be used for, and be taken as, an other-initiation of repair.

Once mentioned, of course, we are readily reminded of other environments in which terms such as "excuse me?" and "pardon me?" serve to initiate what Goffman (1971) called "remedial interchanges" and "access rituals," though what we are readily reminded of and what can be established by multiple observation of recorded events are regularly quite different. Still, before deciding whether "excuse me?" or (the much more common) "pardon me?" are doing repair initiation, we need to know what has occurred in the immediately preceding moments, for, though each *could* be initiating repair, if there has been a sneeze, or a burp, or a tripping over another, etc., "excuse me?" or "pardon me?" will very likely have been directed at those events, and not a trouble-source turn.

3. *Promoting a Telling*:   Forms of turn-constructional unit which can be used to initiate repair on another's prior turn can also be used as types of response in what we have come to call "pre- sequences" of various types. The so-called

"generic pre-sequence," which serves advance notice of some upcoming "business" without marking what that is, is the summons/answer sequence (Schegloff, 1968). In co-present interaction, this is commonly initiated with a co-participant's name as the summons. The response that advances the course-of-action which is to be launched is a display of mobilized attention—by redirecting gaze at the summoner and/or by responding with a "go-ahead" type of utterance, such as "yeah" or ... various forms that otherwise serve to initiate repair.

In Extract (12), Mike has forgotten to send in the check for his rent, and is addressing himself to the janitor/custodian of his apartment building in the Bronx to determine whether to give the check to *him* or send it to the landlord.

(12) Upholstery Shop, 58:1-5

```
1   Mike:  ->    Sh'd I jist uh- Jim.
2   James: ->>   [Huh?
3   Mike:        [Sh'd I j's send it or uh:::
4                (0.3)
5   James:       send it.
```

Here I wish only to point out that Mike interrupts his inquiry-in-progress (at line 1) with a summons to James—very likely noting him not to be an aligned recipient (Goodwin, 1981, 1987)—and that James responds with a "huh?". Similarly, in Extract (13), in which the college-aged Fred is being assigned various service tasks at home, his mother summons him in the midst of other ongoing activities (at line 2) and his aligning response is "what" (line 3).

(13) PostParty, 23:32-38

```
1   Naomi:        ·hh if you [ d o t h is]one [you wi][n,
2   Anne:  ->                     [ Fredeluh,  ]  [     ][
3   Fred:  ->>                                    [Wha:t,][
4   Anne:                                                 [Wouldju=
5                 =wan[na give yer dog a li'l salaami,]
6   Naomi:            [En if you do only these, you lo]se.
7   Fred:        Oh (     )
```

Although the answer to the summons here is "what," this is not the "what" which, were it being used to initiate repair, would be of the same type or strength as "huh?," "excuse me?," or "pardon me?" (what Drew, frth terms "'open'-class repair initiators").

There are, in fact, two different "what"s used to initiate repair. One of these targets the whole of a preceding turn as the trouble-source, as in Extract (14), in which the 14 year old Bonnie has called her friend Marina with a late invitation to a New Year's Eve party and to discuss her friend Jim's reaction to a similar invitation:

(14) Post-mortem, New Year's Invitation

```
 1                   (2.5)
 2 Bonnie: ->        A:nd (3.0) okay d'you think you c'd come? pretty much
 3                   for sure?
 4 Marina: ->>       What?
 5 Bonnie: ->>>      D'you think yuh c'd come pretty much for sure?
 6 Marina:           Sure.
 7                   (0.7)
 8 Bonnie:           ·hh Okay. ·hhYuh should've seen Jim
                     when I called 'm, ...
```

Bonnie's response (at line 5) shows her to take virtually the whole of her prior turn to be implicated in the trouble (as was also the case in Extracts 1 and 2).

There is a different repair-initiating "what" which targets some *component* (most often an object-mention) in a preceding turn as the trouble-source. In Extract (15), Michael and Nancy have been having dinner at Shane and Vivian's place and are arranging to meet early the next morning. Shane had mentioned the need for contact lense cleanser a few moments earlier, but the talk had quickly turned to something else.

(15) Chicken Dinner, 48:34-49:11

```
 1     Shane ->      =Lemme have some (0.2) t'night (.) 2 2 Lemme hev- cz I ran ou:t.
 2                   (0.4)
 3 Michael :->>      Wha̱t.
 4                   (.)
 5 Shane: ->>>       u-Saline solution gunnuh git s'm duhmorr'.
 6                   (0.7)
 7 Michael:          Mm:.
 8 Vivian:           W'l if I wind u[p staying over th e[n I jis' won't go.
 9 Nancy:                           [I thought you wr goin [a
10 Michael:                                                [W't kinda solution
11                   yo[u-=
12     Shane:          [°(Good.)°
13 Michael:          =you: uh: u:se. Yi[h yee-
14 Vivian:                             [Bausch 'n Lomb,
15                   (0.3)
16 Michael:          Oh do yih? Yaa w'you us[e?
17 Vivian:                                  [°Yeh°
```

Here Shane's response to "what" at line 5 shows him to have understood the trouble-source to be not the whole of his prior turn but the reference to "some" in the prior turn, and it is that which he addresses.

These two "what"s are roughly—but only roughly—differentiated by intonation, with the whole- turn-targetting "what?" commonly given a full rising intonation and the component-targetting one given a full-fall or comma intonation. As between these two "what"s, the "what" that is used as a response to a summons in Extract (13) above is prosodically like the second, although it is not, of course, being used as a repair initiation on prior turn in Extract (13); that is the point of this discussion—it is being used as a go-ahead type of response to a summons, and it is understood as doing that, as the ensuing turn manifests: that ensuing turn is a request, not a repair of the speaker's prior turn.

The same "what" is used in another form of pre-sequence, what Terasaki (1976) discussed under the term "pre-announcement" and we can more broadly formulate as a pre-telling. In such exchanges, one speaker projects the possibility of telling some news or story, contingent on the recipient's response to that prospect. Commonly such pre-telling sequences are begun through utterance formats such as "Guess what" or Guess what X" (e.g., Guess what I got"), or "Y'know what" or "Y'know what X", although other categorial question words can replace "what" (as in "Guess who's coming to dinner"). Recipients can here too (as in summons/ answer sequences) respond with such classes of response as a go-ahead, a blocking response, a preempting response, and others. Go-ahead responses often return the question word employed in the pre-announcement, as in Extracts (16)-(18).

(16) Bookstore, 17

```
1   Loren:  ->    Oh guess what.
2   Leslie: ->>   What.=
3   Loren:        = Professor (Diggins) came in.
4   Leslie:       Yeah?
5   Loren:        N' he- put another book on his order.
6                 (1.0)
7   Loren:        I told im [(      )-
8   Leslie:                 [ANOTHER BOOK ON THAT ORDER.?!
9                 (1.5)
```

(17) Hyla, 12:1-4

```
1   Hyla:  ->    ˙tch! A:u::nd, whut a:lse. ˙hhh D'you know w't I did t'day
2               I wz so proud a'my[s e l]f,=
3   Nancy: ->>                    [What.]
4   Hyla:       =˙h I we:nt- (0.2) A'right like I get off et work et one,...
```

(18) Hyla, 15:1-12

```
1   Hyla:  ->    Y'know w't I did las'ni:[ght?
2   Nancy: ->>                           [Wha:t,=
3   Hyla:        = Did a terrible thi::::[ng,
```

```
 4  Nancy:                          [You called Si:m,
 5           (0.4)
 6   Hyla:   No:,
 7           (·)
 8  Nancy: ->>  What,
 9           (·)
10   Hyla:   ·t·hhhh[Well I hed-]
11  Nancy:          [You called ]Richard,=
12    ( ):   =hh-hh=
13   Hyla:   =(h)y(h)Yea(h)h en I h(h)ung up w(h)un 'e a(h)nswer...
```

And other category-specific question words, which in other environments might be initiating repair, in these environments serve as go-ahead responses in pre-telling sequences. So, for example, "where"—in both upward and downward terminal intonation contours—can serve to initiate repair. (Extract (19) displays one with an upward contour, at line 10:

(19) Chicken Dinner, 13:1-18

```
 1    Shane:   I rib um a lot.
 2             (2.7)
 3    Vivian:  But- when- That's the: prob'm when yih try tih carry on a
 4             conversation with im
 5             (3.9)
 6    Nancy:   He's fr'm Nih York ri:ght?
 7             (0.5)
 8    Shane:-> L'ng Isl'nd
 9    Vivian:  khhh ·hafh
10   Michael:->>      [ Whe:re?
11    Vivian:->>> ·hhh (·) Long Isl'n hh
12    Shane:   Ye:h.
13   Michael:  Long Isl'n?
14             (1.4)
```

So also can "where" with downward intonation initiate repair, a usage which can be employed if the place reference which is its targetted trouble-source was conveyed non-lexically, as in the exchange in Extract (20), while in a car on the road.

(20) Chris and Janine (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 368)

```
1 Janine:->    There's MayCo: (hh)
2 Chris:->>    Where,
3 Janine:->>>  There.
```

But, as with "what," "where" is not always initiating repair. Again as with "what," it can serve as a go-ahead type response in a pre-telling sequence, as in Extract (21):

(21) Family Dinner (cf. Schegloff, 1988, 1992, p. 1323)
```
·1   Kid: ->      I know where yer goin.
 2   Mom: ->>     Where.
 3   Kid:         To the uh (eighth grade )=
 4   Mom:         Yeah. Right.
```

And it can be used to forward the course of a telling already underway. In Extract (22), Hyla is telling how she came to propose to her friend Nancy that they go to a theater production of the play "Dark at the Top of the Stairs," to which they have tickets that evening:

(22) Hyla, 6:1-14
```
 1  Hyla:     =·hhh En the:::n, (0.3) I wz thinkin:g I'd be rilly
 2            disappoin'if it did'n live up thho thhe mhho[vie.
 3 Nancy:                                                 [Uh hu:h,=
 4  Hyla:     =So I 'eciuh f'rget it I dint wanna see it.·hh Tihda:y there
 5      ->    wz a who::le (·) review on it'n [the paper.]
 6 Nancy: ->>                                [u-Whe:re. ]
 7            (·)
 8 Nancy:     Oh ril[ly I'm'nna go loo:k,]
 9  Hyla:          [In the View section.]
10            (0.2)
11 Nancy:     In the [Vie:w¿
12  Hyla:            [·p·hh
13  Hyla:     Yeh- buh I don' wantchu tuh read it.
14            (·)
```

This "where" is not addressed to trouble in hearing or understanding the previously produced talk (note that it is said simultaneously with "'n the paper," and thus is not initiating repair on it); it promotes the telling of a *further* bit of the story.

So also with "when;" it can serve to initiate repair on preceding talk, as in Extract (23):

(23) Upholstery Shop, 120:27-40
```
 1  Carol:       This the way you shoulda put it.
 2               (0.7)
 3  Mike: ->     En you you got- rilly got mad et me de udduh da:y,
 4  Carol: ->>   °When.=
 5  Mike: ->>>   =I wz tryina be nice t'[you.
```

```
 6  Carol:                        [Oh I thoughtchu wz gonna
 7               [come out with sumpn e:l[se ( )
 8  Mike:        [(En we were in uh) [
 9  Vic:                            [Attitude don' know where it
10               [comes from.
11  Carol:       [No I thougtchu were kuh- comin with sumpn [else ( ).
12  Mike:                                              [Shee. You ran out
13               w-intuh d'hall scream[ing.
14  Carol:                      [I apologize,
15               (0.7)
16  ???:         Ahh!
17  Carol:       Yeh I thoughtchu w' g'nna come out w'summ'n else.
```

Although the "when" at line 4 could be understood to be advancing the telling, the claim that Carol was using it to initiate repair on Mike's preceding turn is reinforced by the "Oh" with which she begins her next turn at line 6 and receives the intervening turn by Mike—a "success marker" commonly used in third position to register the adequacy of a "solution" response to a repair-initiation.

Still, "when" can also be used to prompt the advancement of a telling, and thus *serve*, rather than *retard*, the progressivity of a sequence, as in Extract (24).

(24) Schenkein, p. ??
```
1  Joe: ->     Oh you know, Mittie- Gordon, eh- Gordon, Mittie's
2      ->      husban' died.
3              (0.3)
4  Edith: ->>  Oh whe::n.
5  Joe:        Well it was in the paper this morning.
6  Edith:      It wa::s,
7  Joe:        Yeah,
8              (1.2)
```

Ordinarily it is clear whether such a categorical question construction is designed to initiate repair or to implement some other action—most notably by whether or not the preceding turn includes some element of that category which could be its targetted trouble-source. But on occasion this determination can be equivocal.

For example, a deployment of "where" after a turn which ostensibly contains no place reference would appear to be a usage which advances the telling rather than one which initiates repair. But speakers may use a person reference, especially of the indefinite form "they," to refer at the same time to the personnel of some place and the place itself. When they do so, an immediately following "where" may be

properly understood as addressing a problem of understanding posed by an element of the preceding turn. This seems to be the case in Extract (25):

(25) Schenkein II, 38
```
1   Joe: ->      They gotta- a garage sale.
2   Leni: ->>    Where.
3   Joe:         On Third Avenoo.
4                (1.0)
```

The "they" (in line 1) invokes a venue, and the "where" is used to target it (in place of a "who," which might be used in a different type of community, in which the prospect that the asker might recognize the answer was more entertainable). (Recall Extract (08) above, where "They make miserable coffee" is followed by an other-initiated repair also directed to place, "across the street?")

As Extract (25) suggests, the determination of whether a turn-constructional unit which can serve to initiate repair or not is doing so in any given case can be equivocal. But two kinds of equivocality can be discriminated.

On some occasions, the indeterminacy of our understanding will appear to be a trouble on the analyst's part: which analysis is correct may turn on ethnographic knowledge which we do not possess but the parties to the interaction did (as is very likely the case in Extract (25)); or we lack the analytic tools or personal acumen to come to a defensible analysis, and so forth. On other occasions, the equivocality is internal to the data; parties to interaction *do* speak in ambiguous ways, sometimes in calculatedly ambiguous ways. Questions by recipients of some turn such as "Are you asking me or telling me?" "Am I supposed to know this person?" and the like reflect such members' problems—equivocality internal to the data, not between data and academic analyst. To render an unequivocal analysis one way or the other with *such* occurrences, rather than laying bare the basis for the ambiguity, is faulted analysis.

One more juxtaposition of repair-action outcome and other-action outcomes of the same or similar practices of turn design and construction at this level of weakness/strength will have to suffice.

The turn design takes the form "What do you mean" (ordinarily articulated more like "whuddiyuh mean") or "what do you mean + X" (where "X" is some further component of the turn). This usage in the design of repair initiation is exemplified, for example, in Extract (26), between Mr. K, tending the phone at a suicide hot line and Miss L, a caller:

(26) SPC, 69:4
```
1   Mr. K:     Does he tell you why he married her? Or anything of
2              that kind?
```

```
 3  Miss L:       Well, he said everything about her was good except
 4                that after he'd been out with her a few times he
 5                realized one thing else was OK between them, that it
 6                would work out. And evidently after they got married,
 7                after the honeymoon was over they didnt have much of
 8                a sex life- didnt bother him. He said he could love her
 9                anyway. He found out that it wasnt that important.
10  Mr. K: ->     And what about between you and him?
11  Miss L: ->>   What do you mean?
12  Mr. K: ->>>   Well, do you have a sexual relationship?
13  Miss L:       Ah, yes.
14  Mr. K:        And have you noticed any change in his attitude toward
15                this lately as he becomes more depressed?
16  Miss L:       No, I havent.
```

Or the beginning of a telephone call in Extract (27), in which Jean is calling her friend Penelope to find out what the police were doing in front of the store at which she works.

(27) Trio, 2:1
```
 1  Penny:        H'llo:::.
 2  Jean:         Penelope?
 3  Penny:        Ye::ah!
 4  Jean: ->      What happen'tuhday.
 5                (0.5)
 6  Penny: ->>    Whaddya mea::n.
 7  Jean: ->>>    What happened at- wo:rk. Et Bullock's this evening.
 8                (0.5)
 9  Penny:        W'll I don't kno:::w.
```

And, the "whuddiyuh mean + X" form is exemplified in Extract (28); guests Freda and Rubin have complimented hostess Kathy, who is a weaver, on a piece of her work (lines 1 and 3), a compliment which she deflects at line 5 (after having aligned with it at line 2):

(28) KC-4, 16:7-38
```
 1  Freda:        That is (.) [°be:^autif]ul.=
 2  Kathy:                    'n [that nice,]
 3  Rubin:        =Yah. It really is:.
 4                (0.8)
 5  Kathy: ->     It wove itself once it was set up.=
 6  Freda:        =Its woo:l?
 7  Kathy:        Its wool.
```

```
 8                    (0.8)
 9 Rubin: ->>        Whaddyou mean it wove itself once it w's set up.=
10                   =[What d's that] mean.=
11 Kathy:            =[ O h  i -  ]
12 Kathy: ->>>       =Well I mean it's ve:ry simple, (·hhh)
13                   (0.8)
14 Kathy: ->>>       t's exac[tly the same in the we]:ft as it is in the warp.
15 Dave:                     [ She also means th't- ]
16                   (0.2)
17 Kathy: ->>>       That is if the warp has sixteen greens an two blacks an
18                   two light blues and two blacks an sixteen greens an:
19                   sixteen blacks on sixteen blues an so on, ·hh y'know the
20                   warp are the long pieces.
21                   (0.5)
22 Freda:            Mhhm
23 Kathy:            The weft has exactly tha:t.
24 Freda:            Yah.
25                   (0.5)
26 Rubin:            Oh. So [its square,] °in o[ther words.°
27 Kathy:                   [Y a s e e?] [
28 Kathy:                                [It's perfectly sq[uare yah.=
29 D,R:                                                    [Mm hmm
30 Kathy:            =·hhh So once I'd set up the wa:rp, (0.8) it was very simple
31                   to jus keep- jis to weave it.
32                   (1.0)
```

In each of these extracts, the "whuddiyuh mean" form, with or without a follow-
ing "X," is taken (correctly) to be initiating repair, addressed to a problem in
understanding the preceding talk, and gets a response addressed to that type of
problem.

   4. *Challenging*: But this turn design gets used to implement a quite differ-
ent action as well, exemplified in the following exchanges. In Extract (29), two
sisters in their middle years are discussing the efficacy of a salve recommended
by one of them for the fungal growth on the feet of the other. At line 1, Agnes
deflects the recommendation:

```
(29) NB
 1 Agnes: ->    W'l that's not therepeutic Clara, really, It says on the
 2              (0.4)-thing, uh-theh-when yih- uh this proxide is uh kind
 3              of a- (0.2) ·hhhhh
 4 Clara: ->>   Whaddiyuh mean uh-th-uh doctors use it,
 5              (0.8)
 6 Agnes:       ·hh W'l on the little jar it says not therapeutic so,
```

```
 7              (0.7)
 8   Agnes:     Yih know what I mean? Ih doesn' ki^ll any::infection
 9              If I'm not mistaken, I don' know. The doctors use it?
10   Clara:     Wul uh Doctor Hathaway gave it to me,
11   Agnes:     ·hh This Revlon?
```

What may be noted right away is that, in the "What do you mean + X" format, a turn which is implementing *repair initiation (as in Extract (28))* has as its X component something from the (or a) preceding turn by another. In Extract (28) above, the *"It wove itself once it was set up"* in Rubin's turn at line 5 comes from Kathy's utterance several turns earlier. In Clara's turn at line 4 in Extract (29), on the other hand, the X component is *not* taken from her recipient's prior turn; rather it is the grounds of a challenge *to* her recipient's prior turn. And that is the action which this "Whaddiyuh mean" format can implement *other* than repair initiation—*challenging*.

This can be seen in Extract (30) as well. The talk at this backyard picnic has turned to the automobile races the previous night, won by one Al, the "he" in the first turn by Curt:

(30) Auto Discussion, 5:35-6:14 (simplified)
```
 1   ·Curt: ->    He- he's about the only regular <he's about the only
 2          ->    good regular out there'z, keegan still go out?
 3   Mike:        Keegan's, out there he's, He run,
 4                (0.5)
 5   Mike:        E:[r h e's u h::]
 6   Gary: ->>      [Wuhyih mean my:,]My [brother in law's out there,]
 7   Mike:                               [doin real good this year'n ]
 8                M'Gilton's doin real good thi[s year,
 9   Curt:                                     [M'Gilton still there?=
10   Gary: ->>    =hhHawk[ins                         ˅
11   Curt:               [Oxfrey runnin- I heard Oxfrey gotta new ca:r.
12   Gary: ->>    Hawkins is ru[nnin,
13   Mike:                     [Oxfrey's runnin the same car 'e run last year,=
14   Phyllis:     =Mike siz there wz a big fight down there las'night,      .
```

Here again the X component of the format (at line 6) presents the grounds for the challenge which the turn is implementing to the turn which it targets, and which the X component may serve to locate (here via the use of a repeat of "out there" from line 2 as a framing device).

Nor do such challenge turns always require an X component. In Extract (31), taken from the same occasion as the preceding Extract, Carney has fallen to the *ground while trying to sit on her husband Gary's lap. There is much laughing, and*

Curt teases her that in the course of the fall she took care not to spill her drink (line 9)—"Never spilled a drop." To this Carney protests (line 16), "Wahddiyuh mea::n!"

(31) Auto Discussion, 2:23-40
```
 1 Carney:      [((little shriek)) Ohh!=
 2   Gary:      =[ah!ah!ah![ah! ah!=
 3 Phyllis:     =[ehhuh-h- [-huh huh
 4   Curt:                 [hhah: hha:=
 5   Gary:      =[ah! ah! ah! ah! ah! ah! ah! ah! ah! ah!=
 6 Carney:      =[Ga(h)ry(h)y haha
 7   Curt:      =[hha:huh, °hn-n-hn!
 8   Gary:      =[ah! ah! ah!
 9   Curt: ->   =[Never spilled a[dro:[p=
10 Carney:                    [·hh [·hhh[h! ·huh-
11   Curt :->                      =[Look it that.
12   Mike:                         =[ah ah ah- hah!
13   Gary:                         =[ah! ah! ah! ah! ah!=
14   Gary:      =[ah! ah! ah!=
15   Curt:      =[Outstanding.
16 Carney: ->>  =[Wahddiyuh mea::n!
17   Gary:      =[ah! ah!
18   Curt:      [Neh[hu:h hu:h huh.
19 Phyllis:          [°hmhh.
```

We see here, then, that this turn design can be used to implement quite different types of action. Although this last contrast (of alternative deployments of "whaddiyuh mean") is interactionally rather more volatile than the ones previously displayed, analytically they are quite similar. Still, it may well repay further inquiry to ask whether there is some "contamination" between action types implemented by the same practice. We know that other-initiated repair (without respect to type) can, in many sequential and interactional contexts, serve as a harbinger of disagreement and disalignment, if not an actual token of it. Does the use of the "Whuddiyuh mean" repair format, by virtue of its *other* use as a challenge, aggravate that possibility?[3]

Some Practices of Repeating

The usages examined so far are all at one end of the strong/weak spectrum of repair initiation, revealing on the part of a recipient of a turn a substantial lack of grasp of what was said in it. (I should make clear here, by the way, that there has been no effort to be exhaustive either in spelling out the set of alternative deployments which a practice can have, or in the account given of any one of them which is mentioned). With the exception of those forms which add something to "what

do you mean?", they indicate either that all that was heard is that something was said, or that the trouble-source turn included a reference of a determinate category type—a reference *to place, person, time, object, etc.*

Next we examine a practice which displays a rather stronger access to preceding talk, and that is repetition of either all or part of some preceding turn, most commonly the immediately preceding turn of another. The use of the term "repetition" or "repeat" here is more or less strict; that is, it allows for transformations geared to deixis, tense shift, speaker change, etc., as well as changes of prosody; it excludes paraphrase and other substantial rewording of its target (cf. Schegloff, 1996, p. 179; compare Tannen, 1987a, 1987b, 1989, and various other authors who include paraphrase as as type of repetition).

In this regard it should be noted that some turns are hearably and analyzably produced as "repeats," even if in one or more respects they actually fail to reproduce (either in whole or in part) their apparent, nonetheless retrievable, target. That is, exact matching to some prior utterance or utterance part is *not* a sole or strict criterion for recognizing these repeats as repeats, else one major use they have in repair would be impossible (cf. Extract (32) below). Recipients can hear that such turns were designed to be repeats even if, and for repair purposes *especially* if, they mis-represent their target in some important respect. Here (in Extracts (32)-(34)) are three fairly straightforward exemplars of the deployment of repeats as a practice for initiaing repair.

(32) IND PD 59

1 Police:	Radio,
2 Caller: ->	One six nine South Hampton Road, on the east side,
3 Police:	What's the trouble lady,
4 Caller:	I don't know my husband's sitting in his chair I don't
5	know what's wrong with him he can't talk or move or anything.
6 Police: ->>	Four six nine South Hampton?
7 Caller: ->>>	One six nine South Hampton.
8 Police:	That's <u>one</u> six nine,
9 Caller:	Yes.
10 Police:	Alright. We'll be right [out.
11 Caller:	[Please hurry,

(33) TG 11:1-18

1	Bee:	Mm, tch! <u>I</u> wz gonnuh call you. last week someti(h)me
2		·hhh[hh!
3	Ava:	[Yeh my mother a:sked mih I siz I <u>d</u>on'know I haven't
4		<u>h</u>ea:rd from her.I didn' know what day:s you had._h[hh
5	Bee:	[Yeh
6		en I[: didn' know w-]

```
 7  Ava:       [ cla:sses 'r ] a[nything,
 8  Bee:       [I didn'know when you were hh[ome=
 9  Ava:                                  [Tch!
10  Bee:       =[or-I wz gunnuh k-]
11  Ava:        [We l l M o n d a] y:::,
12             (0.2)
13  Ava:       Lemme think. ·hhh Monday::: Wednesday, (0.5) and Friday(s).
14  ->         I'm home by one ten.
15  Bee: ->>   One ten↓
16  Ava: ->>>  Two uh'clock. My class ends one ten.
17  Bee:       Mm hm,
18  Ava:       An:d Wednesdays I go back in the evening.
```

(34) NB, 1-2-1
```
 1  Guy:       What's-w-'what kind of a starting time ken:: we get
 2             fer:: hh sometime this afternoon.
 3             (0.7)
 4  Guy:       Any[time-
 5  Clerk:        [ Oh:::, [let's see.
 6  Guy:                  [Any time tuhday.
 7  Clerk:      Two fordy.
 8  Clerk: ->   One, thirdy.
 9  Guy: ->>    One thirty?
10  Clerk: ->>> Mm hm::?
11  Guy:        One thirty.
12             (1.0)
13  Guy:       ·hh W'l at sounds like a good time?
14             (0.4)
```

In the first of these (Extract (32)), the Dispatcher at the Police Department produces an analyzable repeat of the address given in the caller's first turn, one recognizable as such despite the mismatch with the turn which is its target. The turn is designed, of course, to *check* the address, a job which it could not do when most needed if perfect matching were a condition for recognizing it. In this case, the repair initiation leads to correction when the "repeat" reveals a mis-hearing/understanding/remembering.

In the second of these instances (Extract (33)), from a conversation between two young women who have grown up near each other but have not spoken for a while, one is recounting her college class schedule to the other. Unlike the previous instance, the repeat here (by Bee at line 15) is accurate, but reveals something nonetheless in need of correction. (I omit full discussion of how this possibility might have come to be suspected, merely mentioning that the "precise" time formulation (Sacks, 1992) at line 14 is ill-suited to that which it is supposedly reporting.)

These two instances should make clear the basis for including the third Extract of this set, (Extract (34)), among the exemplifications of the use of repeats to initiate repair. Because so many such repeats are responded to with routinized confirmations, as this one is, and no problem seems to have attended the initial mention of that which was repeated, some investigators have been *inclined to* skepticism about the role of such exchanges as instances of repair. But the prior two segments are indistinguishable from the third in other than outcome, and that, of course, is an entirely *contingent result*, not related to the design and co-construction of the *type* of activity being engaged in. No actual modification turned out to be needed in this instance, but that does not mean that an episode of the organization of repair was not being worked through here (for example, a possible hearing problem being addressed) as much as in the preceding instances.

Having established and exemplified the use of repeats as practices for initiating repair, we must now register that many repeats are *not* used for repair, but to implement other actions, and particular, describable ones. This is, of course, a topic much written about (Tannen, 1987a, 1987b, 1989), but not necessarily along the lines pursued here (but cf. Schegloff, 1996a).

1. *Registering Receipt:* One common use of repeats *not* implicated in repair is their service as a receipt of what another has said, and this is the main one to be treated at any length here. There are various features of repeats which can be taken as indicating this usage, most prominent among them being production of the repeat with downward—even clause-final—intonation (in contrast to an upward intonation, or a continuative or "comma" one, in many repair initiation deployments). Though this may well be so, a great many such downward-intoned repeats are nonetheless followed by some form of agreement or confirmation token by the initial sayer of the repeated material. Whether or not this indicates a hearing of the repeat as possibly repair-implicated, whether or not it indicates some other form of alignment, it displays an inclination to treat the repeat as *response-worthy*.

For present purposes, therefore, I will offer a most conservative set of exemplars of repeats used as acknowledgements of receipt—ones which themselves receive no response in next turn. Most commonly, such receipt tokens occupy third position in an adjacency pair sequence structure, following a first pair part (e.g., a question) and a second pair part response (e.g., an answer). Although responses in this position *can* have repair initiated on them, and can have it initiated by a repeat, the repeats in the Extracts which we take up next seem clearly produced and understood *not* as repair initiations but as receipt tokens, receipting both the preceding turn and the action(s) done in it—for example, correction in Extract (35) below.

(35) TG 4:12-19

| 1 | Ava: | ... I have one class in the e:vening. |
| 2 | Bee: | On Mondays? |

```
3  Ava: ->     Y-uh::: Wednesdays.=
4  Bee: ->>    =Uh-Wednesday,=
5  Ava:        =En it's like a Mickey Mouse course. ·hh It's a joke,
6              hh ih- Speech.
7              (0.2)
```

(36) BH 1a, 9

```
1  Bob:        What floor do you all work on?
2  Kit: ->     Three
3  Sue: ->     Three
4  Bob: ->>    Three. I get so damn confused now I don't remember which
5              is which.
```

In Extract (37) below, the wife of the Mayor of a major city in the midst of a natural disaster is serving as an information transfer point in the emergency response, and is conveying to the Director of Civil Defense where sandbags are needed.

(37) CDHQ, #120

```
1  Sunny:       Well they are asking fer sandbags to be sent to the-
2        ->      by the pumping station at Hayn-Haynes by Vanderkloot Street.
3  Lehroff: ->> Aright. Pumping station,
4  Sunny:       It's- ((pause))
5  Lehroff:     To where now,
```

Although Colonel Lehroff is about to initiate repair (at line 5), he first indicates successful receipt of part of what he has been told, and does so by the repeat at line 3, a construction to which his interlocutor does not appear to be responding (that is, the "It's-" at line 4 appears to be a resumption of her prior talk, not a response to his).

    In Extract (38), Mark is inquiring about arrangements for Sherri's forthcoming wedding.

(38) SN-4, 1:22-32 (simplified)

```
 1  Mark:       [Didja e-] by the way didja ever call up uh: Century City
 2              Hotel'n
 3              (1.0)
 4  Sherri:     Y'know h'much they want fer a wedding; It's incredible.
 5              (0.5)
 6  Sherri: ->  We'd 'aftuh sell our house 'n car 'n evryt(h)hing e(h)l(h)se
 7              [tuh pay fer the wedding .]
 8  Mark: ->>   [Shhh'er house 'n yer car.]
 9  (??):       [(hh heh heh huh huh )]
10  Mark:       ·hh What about the outside candlelight routine izzat still
11              gonna go on?
```

Here, at line 8, Mark is doing more than simply receipting Sherri's response; in the manner of its delivery, his repeat displays a stance toward it, and toward the manner of its expression, as well. Still the repeat itself serves as a receipt.

Extract (39) is taken from a telephone call between a suicide hotline counsellor and a person who has been reported to be suicidal.

(39) SPC, 129

1	Couns:	Is he correct in thinking that you're thinking about
2		killing yourself?
3	Caller:	Yes
4	Couns:	You are thinking about it. Are you planning to?
5	Caller:	Oh, yes. It's not really- It's not like I'm really blue,
6		but, I mean, that's the way it is.
7	Couns:	It's what way?
8	Caller: ->	I would rather not discuss it. It's hopeless.
9	Couns: ->>	It's hopeless.
10	Caller:	I would say this.
11	Couns:	Yeah?
12	Caller:	Quite seriously. Instead of trying to help me,...

Although the counsellor is not necessarily accepting the discouragement and rejection of the suicidal person, the declaration of hopelessness is being registered, acknowledged and receipted by the repeat (at line 9).

I have displayed a number of apparently clearcut uses of repeats to initiate repair on an interlocutor's preceding talk, and a number of equally clearcut cases in which the repeats are deployed to register receipt of an interlocutor's turn and possibly what is being done in it. "Clearcut" here refers not only to an analytic assessment of this investigator, but the take of the co-participant as unequivocally displayed in a next turn.

However, here as elsewhere, there can be ambiguity as to what is going on. In some instances, it is simply unclear (at least to this academic analyst) what basis there is for different responses by recipients—reflecting different analyses on their part—of apparently similar turns composed of repeats, though this does not appear problematic to them. In other instances, the parties *themselves* appear to have problem in dealing with the ambiguous status of some repeats.

With respect to the former, for example, consider Extract (40), in which an Avon lady is arranging for a potential customer to call in an order.

(40) SBL, 1:9:1

1	B:	Uh my number is uh here at the store is five seven
2		four one oh:
3	A:	Five,

```
4                (.6)
5      B:->      seven, four, one oh 'n just [ask-
6      A:->>                                 [five seven four one oh.
7      B:->      uh huh 'n j's ask for Audrey.
8    \ A:->>     Audrey.
9      B:        And if I'm not here, just leave a message y'know, ....
```

Not much differentiates the repeats at lines 6 and 8; both repeat the critical component of the preceding turn, and do so with terminal intonation. But the repeat at line 6 seems to be taken by its recipient as possible repair initation, one which makes confirmation or correction relevant next, and it is so treated with the "uh huh" at line 7. The repeat on line 8 seems to be done in just the same manner, and yet appears to be taken as a receipt. It is given no response of its own, is taken to display satisfactory completion of the name-and-number part of the instructions, and displays that by proceeding to their next step. However equivocal this may be to an external analyst, it seems, at least on the face of it, *un*equivocal to the parties.

But ambiguity can affect the analysis of the parties as well regarding whether, on some particular occasion of use, a repeat is being used to accomplish repair initiation or receipt-marking. Consider Extract (41).

(41) SBL, 1:8:2
```
1      B:        Ok, we'll-we'll make-look at it right away.
2      A:        Oh and say there- I want to mention, ·hhh uhm,
3         ->     the living room is on the back ·hh And [if you -
4      B:->>                                           [Living room's
5         ->>    onna back.
6      A:        And it ha-so you don't see that from the front.
7                ·hh An it has some nice metal awnings.
8      B:        uh huh
9      A:        on the living room.
```

Here, a woman who has advertised the availability of rental accomodations is speaking on the telephone to a possibly interested renter. They are arranging for the caller (B) to come by and look at the place. In the course of calling particular attention to the awnings on the living room windows (line 7), A appears to mark for special attention the location of that room (lines 2-3). Lines 4-5 can be taken as a receipt of this information (perhaps while B is writing notes on what A is telling her), and the beginning of the ensuing turn ("And it ha-") does not appear in the first instance to indicate a response to the repeat as an initiation of repair. Indeed, the turn (at line 6) begins by apparently starting another installment of the description of the rental accomodation being discussed (much as in Extract (40) above, proceeding to a next component of a continuing activity marked sat-

isfactory closure of the prior one). But that new departure is momentarily abandoned (note its resumption at line 7 by re-use of the same words as began line 6) in favor of talk which amounts to giving an account of the relevance of the prior observation about where the living room is. This account does seem responsive to the prior repeat as a repair initiator, as a display of puzzlement at the relevance of this description of location. In this exchange, it appears that the ambiguity of usage between receipt and repair initiation is not just for the professional analyst, but for the parties themselves.

2. *Targetting a Next Action:* What is in many ways a usage even more closely related to repair initiation, yet set apart from it, is the use of repeating to articulate at a turn's start the element of preceding talk by another which is the target or point of reference for a further action to be taken in an subsequent turn constructional unit (tcu) in the turn. This practice (engendering turns often charaterized as having a "topic/comment" format) has several characteristic features:

- the turn begins with a repeat of an element of prior turn by another, often though not invariably with upward intonation;
- something follows the repeating tcu in the turn;
- the following tcu may follow without a gap, i.e., it is not produced by virtue of a lack of response;
- the repeat is thereby rendered a "preliminary" to what follows it, as not having been itself produced with an eye to response;
- commonly (though not invariably) the following tcu is not overlapped, i.e., it does not collide with a next turn by other, even though it follows a possible turn completion and ordinarily one apparently asking a question (whether via upward intonation or not).

Here I can offer only a small selection of exemplars, chosen to display a bit of the range of sequence types in which this practice of turn-initial repeat figures, and one recurrent theme within that range.

One common sequential environment for these turn-initial repeats is before rejections, corrections, disalignments, and other negatively-valenced (or "dispreferred") actions (Pomerantz, 1984).

In Extract (42), food is being served out at the start of a meal.

(42) Virginia 2
```
1     Mom:      ^Jus' a ta::d. I been nibblin' while I was cookin'
2               supper.
3  Prudence:    °uh hhuh ((laughter))
4               (0.2)
5     Mom:      ·hhh But Vuhginia is very hungry.
```

```
 6              (1.9)
 7    Mom:      Very very.
 8              (1.9)
 9    Wesley: ->  I thoughtju was diettin'.
10              (·)
11    Virginia: ->>  Me? No. Beth.
12   Prudence:   °Beth is the one fo[r die[t(h)in'.
13    Wesley:                   [Oh. [ehh[hh! [heh! huh huh huh huh
14    Virginia:                         [eh heh heh[huh huh huh huh huh
15              (1.1)
```

When her brother chides Virginia about being on a diet, her correction—that it is
their sister who is dieting (line 11)—is prefaced with an upwardly intoned repeat
(adjusted for speaker change), which, although not apparently discriminable from
a repair initiation, gets no response from its recipient.

Indeed, even agreements can be done as corrections by the use of such a repeat;
it can set the repeated element up as something being contrasted with, replaced and
corrected, even if the replacement in effect is doing agreement, as in Extract (43).

(43) GTS 1:87
```
 1    Louise:   ...But that means that there was another bullet, from a
 2              different direction, shot. That [there was only two bullets
 3              could be shot from his gun. [
 4    Ken:                                  [Man, a colored kid?
 5    Roger:    They rationalized it. They say heh heh
 6    Louise:   It wasn't there it was all i(h)n his imagination.
 7    Roger:    It's a colored kid so somebody else was shootin 'im, you
 8              know,
 9              (0.4)
10    Roger:    Just so happens somebody was out coon hunting at the time.
11    Ken:      hehhhehhh
12    Louise:   [(Al,-)
13    Ken:      [You know in uh-
14    Roger: ->  Which is forgivable in Dallas.
15    Ken:      [In-
16    Louise: ->>  [Forgivable? You get an honor.
17    Ken:      In Mammoth I heard uh all these men from the Forest Rangers
18              department talking about ...
```

Here, Louise is apparently taking up a stance toward Dallas which is compatible
with Roger's, only more exaggerated. The format in which she delivers it, however,
confers on it the sense of correction, and does so in part by its turn-initial repeat.

In the same vein, turn-initial repeats are deployed at the start of turns in which rejection, disagreement, dismissal or disalignment are being done. Extract (44) is a straightforward rejection of a claim:

(44) Goodwin and Goodwin, 1987:88
```
1       Pam: ->    We found a frog.
2   Chopper: ->>   A frog, y'all did not.
```

In Extract (45), Virginia's mother is rejecting her request for a dress with a counter-suggestion:

(45) Virginia, 3:23-4:09
```
 1   Virginia:    Can I please get that dre:ss, please mom¿ Lemme g[et that-
 2      Mom:                   .                             [Dreh(ss)-?
 3   Virginia:    You know that [one-<
 4      Mom:                    [OH VUHginia, we('ve) been through this
 5               befa [wh, you've got enough summa d[resses now I think you=
 6  Prudnce?:        [hhhh! ((laughter?)) |
 7   Virginia:                              [uhhh! (("pained" sound))
 8      Mom:     =just wait an' get- some 'uh' the 'new fa:ll stuff when it comes
 9               in.
10   Virginia:    tch!
11               (0.5)
12  Prudence:    I[t's  s ol   frustratling havin'   al mothuh]
13      Mom: ->   [If you sl aved yer-l if you savedl   yer al]lowan[ce,
14  Prudence:                                                       [hhh ·hhh
15      Mom: ->  [(if you) save yer allowance, an:' um: you could get=
16  Prudence:    [w(h)ith a °sho°°(p) ((°° = mid-word trailoff))
17      Mom: ->  =these little extr[a things.
18   Virginia: ->>               [A(h)llo::wan(h)ce? I o(h)nly g(h)et
19               fi(h)ve d(h)ollars a week.That's rid(h)i(h)c(h)ul(h)ous.
```

Virginia's dismissal as "ridiculous" of her mother's suggestion that she save money from her allowance if she wants to buy a dress is launched by targetting "allowance" as the element in mother's turn to which what follows is addressed—by repeating it.

Similarly, a negative assessment or stance may get launched by repeating the element in the prior talk which is being assessed. In Extract (46), Bonnie has called just before New Year's Eve to invite her friend Marina to a party, and reports as well on her effort to invite her sometimes-boyfriend, Jim. Note how she reports (at line 16) his reaction to the request part of her invitation.

(46) Post-mortem, New Years Invitation

```
 1  Bonnie:     A:nd (3.0) okay d'you think you c'd come? pretty much for
 2              sure?
 3  Marina:     What?
 4  Bonnie:     D'you think yuh c'd come pretty much for sure?
 5  Marina:     Sure.
 6              (0.7)
 7  Bonnie:     ·hh Okay. ·hhYuh should've seen Jim when I called 'm, I
 8              I mean I:hhm tryin to decide if I wantuh call 'm back an
 9              convince 'm tuh come b'cuz_hhh I go Uhhm (1.5) oh an an if
10              he- d'yuh have any games Marina like Twisters or something
11              like that?
12              (1.0)
13  Marina:     Not really,
14  Bonnie: ->  Okay, I said uhhm (0.5) and—bring some food or some games
15              or records or something (0.4) an he says- he goes (.7)
16       ->>    ga::mes (1.2) you're kiddin, like that (0.5) ·hha:nd heh- I
17              go no y'know an and (0.4) an he- (0.6) he goes oh sure
18              y'know, an I go it's a straight party an he goes (0.5) o:hh
19              one of the:mm,—like that.
```

Whether or not Jim actually replied to her request that he bring games to the party with this format, one of Bonnie's practices for conveying the negative stance which he took toward that part of her request is to report him to have first repeated the targetted item and then questioned her seriousness.

Another environment in which these turn-initial repeats occur is in the aftermath of questions. There one may find a repeat of the question or part of the question as a kind of preliminary to the answer. For example, Extract (47):

(47) NB ?

```
 1  B: ->   Whaddiyuh doin.
 2          (0.9)
 3  A: ->>  What'm I do[in?
 4  B:                 [-cleaning?
 5  A: ->>  I'm ironing, wouldju believe that.
 6  B:      Oh, bless it's [heart.
 7  A:                     [In fact I, ire- I startid ironing en I d- I,
 8          somehow er another ironing jus' kind of leaves me cold.
 9  B:      Yeah,
```

Here two sisters in their middle years are talking on the phone. But, although it is true that A is repeating the question before answering it, we can note as well—

hardly surprisingly, in view of the preceding discussion—that the answer is negatively valenced, is in fact a complaint of sorts.

And the following Extract—(48)—is taken from a Los Angeles Times report on the commercial consequences of the construction phase of the remodelling of a shopping mall.

(48) L.A. Times, 8/14/88

```
1              Rita Beneliaan could barely hear the question over the
2              jackhammer ripping through the concrete sidewalk in front
3       ->     of her clothing shop."How's business?" she shouted over the
4       ->>    din. "It's terrible. Business is down the drain. Customers
5              are going to the Galleria." Beneliaan is manager of the
6              Casual Corner clothing store at Sherman Oaks Fashion Square,
7              a 26-year-old shopping center that is virtually being rebuilt
8              in a 11/2year construction project now getting under way.
```

Note, first, that we take the reported "How's business?" to be its speaker's repeat of a question which had been addressed to her, using the phenomenon being described here (among other resources) to reconstruct the scene where we otherwise lack "the data," and that the journalist has deployed this resource in writing the story (on including the question in newspaper reports, cf. Clayman, 1990). Having putatively reconstructed the scene in this circular process, we note once again that the repeat of the question before answering it accompanies an answer which "turns out" to constitute a complaint.

Finally, for present purposes, a contrasting environment, in which the repeat of an element from prior turn does *not* clearly embody the beginning of a disaligning, or otherwise negatively valenced, response. In the two request sequences in Extracts (49) and (50), the response is a commitment to compliance, but this commitment is prefaced by a repeat of the target item, the object of the request.

(49) MC2, 11:35

```
1    Jan:      But anyhow there's loads more of excitement here I'll, I'll
2              fill yuh in later. ·hh Anyhow ud- it's almost ten minutes
3              tuh ten so I'll letche go en we'll, we'll talk la[ter.
4    Pat:                                                      [Well uh
5              there's something else y-y'know if y-yer- yer in that shop,
6       ->     if anything comes in, any any uh-uh:: Rosicrucian books or,
7       ->     or:: yeah especially Rosicrucian. —I'm very interested
8              [(cuz I-)
9    Jan: ->>  [Rosicrucian? I'll keep en eye peeled,
10   Pat:      Yeh. [Because I save them.
11   Jan:           [·hh We have some- ux- a couple a' religious books I
```

```
12              don't remember what they were[a handful of 'em come in uh=
13      Pat:                              [Mhm, right.
14      Jan:    =when I wz there Fridee but a' course-='hh Yuh see when I by
15              the time I get there ( ) Fridee (honey) if...
```

(50) Hyla, 25:27-34

```
 1   Nancy:    You think I'm made a' money er shhomehhn-hhn=
 2   Hyla:     =ee=
 3   Nancy:    =·hhi::[::hh
 4   Hyla:           [t k °h-h°
 5             (0.3)
 6   Nancy:    ·hhheh[hh
 7   Hyla: ->        [·hhhOh en yihknow w't I wan'my book ba:::ck.=
 8   Nancy: ->> =Yer book. ·Okay:, I'll haftih look for it,=
 9   Hyla:     =dUhhhhh=
10   ( ):      =(k-k-k)=
11   Hyla:     =eh-uh ·hhh
12             (0.2)
13   Nancy:    I d'know where it [is b't ah'll fin[d it.
14   Hyla:                       [°·hhhhhhhhhhhh [((?? squeek))
15             A'right,=
```

In both of these exchanges, the recipient of a request undertakes to attend to it, or at least to try to do so. If there is an element of the negative even here (as in line 13 of Extract (50)), surely it is minimized.[4]

The point in these instances, as in all the others in this section, has been that a construction produced by the practice which we are examining—repeating all or part of a prior turn, even with upward intonation—need not be initiating repair, and need not be taken as doing so by recipient. I leave for another occasion, and another venue, a fuller explication of what is going on here.

Whatever that may turn out to be, the caution is reinforced that repeats need to be examined by academic analysts in each case for what action they are being used to do in that local, interactional context, as they are examined by their recipients. Repair initiation is surely one common result of this examination, but not the only one.

A CASE OF *INCLUSION*

In our consideration of boundary cases to this point we have been preoccupied with utterances whose form might lead the uncareful analyst to treat them as instances of repair initiation because they employed particular lexical items, constructions or practices of talking which are regular resources for intitiating repair.

Thereby we may hope to alert students of material of this sort that such a procedure involves an abdication of analytic responsibility. Once we see that virtually every lexical or grammatical construction or other practice of turn-design can get used for a variety of actions, it becomes clear that the analyst must examine each instance to see what that form of talk is being used to do on that occasion. (On the other hand, the practices underlying the usage may surely guide that examination, both by interlocutors and by academic analysts, and serve as resources in grounding and warranting a resulting candidate analysis.) Because repair initiation is such a common action, the turn designs which implement it come to have for professional or academic analysts a prima facie identification with that type of action.

Accordingly, much of the effort here has been to take forms likely to be identified as repair-related and show that they can be otherwise engaged. And this theme has been reinforced by the earlier methodological one, in which initially generous gatherings of candidate instances of a phenomenon must be followed by a methodical and accountable exclusion of candidates which do not belong. I want to end, however, by going in the other direction, and considering for inclusion in the corpus of other-initiated repairs an exchange which does not on the face of it invite it .

We earlier had occasion to examine a brief exchange from a chicken dinner occasion involving a family of four with a guest. Extract (51) reproduces a slightly expanded version of that exchange.

(51) Oolie, Chicken Dinner, 9:30
```
 1    Girl:      May I please have summo::::?=
 2    Mom:       =Some more what.
 3               (3.0)
 4    Girl:      Please
 5               (1.0)
 6 Madeline: ->  Whad dyou (want)?
 7               (1.0)
 8    Girl:      [ I   w i s h   I   h a d   t h a t ]
 9    Mom:       [What would you go to FREDricksberg]
10               I mean what a jungle land
11 Madeline:     Hoh?
12               (.)
13    Girl:      I wish I had that
14               (.)
15 Madeline:     You wanna wing?
16               (0.2)
17    Boy:       Melodie's h[aving marshmellow soup hh
18 Madeline:                [huh?
19               (1.0)
20    Girl:      yah
```

It appears that the little girl has asked for some more of some food on the table (line 1), and when Mother does a terminally positioned interrogative ("some more what," line 2) to get a specification of what is wanted, the little girl hears it as ... a request for the courtesy term "please;" that is, she hears that this has become, for the moment, an etiquette lesson. And so, instead of supplying a chicken-part term, she supplies (at line 4) a courtesy term (though it might be noted that she had included one in her original request). It is the following turn by Madeline which is of interest here.

If we just look at Madeline's utterance "Whad d'you (want)?" taken by itself out of context, it does not embody any of the forms commonly used for initiating repair, and one would not ordinarily treat it as initiating repair. It rather appears to be initiating an insert sequence after a request, looking to specify the target of the request before doing a response to it—compliance or rejection or whatever.

But in this sequence, the initial response by the mother to little girl's "May I have sumore" is clearly a repair initiation, one that gets a response meant to be a repair, though almost certainly not the type of repair that the initiator was after. Madeline's turn is a follow-up, more explicit, version of that other-initiated repair; and in this context, though it otherwise and elsewhere might not be one, in redoing the *mother's* repair initiation, it appears itself to be initiating repair. It affords us a beautiful example of the point that an utterance's function or action is not inherent in the form of the utterance alone, but is shaped by its sequential context as well.[5]

As we can see, this refers not only to such formal considerations as place in adjacency pair organization, but to idiosyncratic features of just this occasion, at just this moment, arrived at by just this trajectory. It is to that—however informed by its formal characteristics—that the participants are attentive; and what they do is grounded in what they attend; so if we are to grasp what they do and how they understand it, this is how *we* must attend to it as well.

Once again the central question, at least for the study of this species of discourse, is how "the production of a world of particular specific scenes through a set of general formal practices is accomplished and exhibited" (Schegloff, 1972, p. 117).

.

CONCLUSION

One central theme here has been that there are design and constructional practices for turn- constructional units which can be mobilized by speakers and attended to by recipients for their bearing on a variety of actions and activities. All facets of such connections between practices and actions or activities require empirically grounded analytic specification and this enterprise will be enhanced

by addressing the conduct of the participants as the outcome of *practices* of discourse, action and interaction.

Whereas an orientation to "discourse *processes*" (and its likely origin in "*processing*") has in the past apparently often encouraged investigators to take the input as given—or at least essentially unmotivated, and track the consequences it sets off, an orientation to "discursive or interactional practices" underscores that actors/speakers are *doing* things, and that actors/recipients "process" them in part by reference to what such practices are being used to do.

For some investigators, especially ones working in experimentalist paradigms, this may appear to introduce an uncomfortable element of looseness, subjectivity and indeterminacy into the work. But its measure will be whether proceeding this way allows us to capture what happens in interaction for the participants, and to do so with rigor and objectivity. Nothing but method keeps us from being "objective" about the subjective.

A second theme has been to alert investigators and readers of their work to a necessary caution in assessing the relationship between practices of conduct (here, practices of talking) and the actions which they in effect engender. This relationship will rarely be a simple and straightforward link between a simply formulated practice and a single, vernacularly nameable action.

A third theme has been that the practices engendering talk in interaction deploy more than the articulated items themselves. "Huh?" is not enough; more is needed to have it do something and to understand what it is doing—its sequential positioning (and terms for its description), its attachment to and targetting of prior talk, etc. This is not a new theme (Schegloff, 1984), but one whose embodiment in additional facets of conduct requires renewed and extended documentation. Here, for example, we have registered that same usages do different things when affiliated to their own speaker's prior talk than when affiliated to an interlocutor's prior talk, affiliations achieved by a variety of resources

A fourth theme is that there is both room and need in naturalistic studies of discourse—at least in studies of talk-in-interaction—both for formal, general analyses of recurrent features of actions and the practices which provide for their production and understanding, *and* for the particularizing focus on individual instances in their idiosyncratic contexts.

Paradoxically, it is when we insist on pursuing the individual case to check out the more formal and general claim, that we are most likely to be led to discover *another* general or formal practice intersecting it. This may take several passes, and that is why in assembling collections we first include generously, and then exclude accountably. And boundary cases are the sparks struck by the collision of these two analytic practices.

APPENDIX

Transcription Conventions

A brief guide to a few of the conventions employed in the transcripts may help the reader in what may appear to be a more formidable undertaking than it actually is. It is apparent from the excerpts printed in this article that some effort is made to have the spelling of the words roughly indicate the manner of their production, and there is often, therefore, a departure from standard orthography. Otherwise:

- —> Arrows in the margin point to the lines of transcript relevant to the point being made in the text.
- ( ) Empty parentheses indicate talk too obscure to transcribe. Letters inside such parentheses indicate the transcriber's best estimate of what is being said.
- hhh the letter "h" is used to indicate hearable aspiration, its length roughly proportional to the number of "h"s. If preceded by a dot, the aspiration is in-breath. Aspiration internal to a word is enclosed in parentheses. Otherwise "h"s may indicate anything from ordinary breathing to sighing to laughing, etc.
- [Left-side brackets indicate where overlapping talk begins.
-] Right-side brackets indicate where overlapping talk ends, or marks alignments within a continuing stream of overlapping talk.
- ((points)) Words in double parentheses indicate transcriber's comments, not transcriptions.
- (0.8) Numbers in parentheses indicate periods of silence, in tenths of a second.
- ::: Colons indicate a lengthening of the sound just preceding them, proportional to the number of colons.
- becau- A hyphen indicates an abrupt cut-off or self-interruption of the sound in progress indicated by the preceding letter(s) (the example here represents a self-interrupted"because").
- He says Underlining indicates stress or emphasis.
- · dr^ink A "hat" or circumflex accent symbol indicates a marked pitch rise.
- = Equal signs (ordinarily at the end of one line and the start of an ensuing one) indicates a "latched" relationship—no silence at all between them.

Fuller glossaries may be found in Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, (1974,731-4) in Atkinson and Heritage, 1984, pp. ix-xvi, and in Ochs, Schegloff and Thompson, (1996, pp. 461-465).

cation in the 20th Anniversary issue of *Discourse Processes*. The work partially reported here was supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. BNS 87-20388. I have benefited from questions and comments following presentation of the paper, especially from Herb Clark, and subsequently from my colleagues, Steven Clayman and John Heritage.

NOTES

1. Some instances appear to straddle this boundary, as in the following exchange. An undergraduate couple, Shane and Vivian, are hosting friends Michael and Nancy for chicken dinner. Vivian has pointed out that there is one piece of chicken remaining, and this sets off a lively exchange about the distribution of food around the table.

(a) Chicken Dinner, 8

```
 1    Nancy:      Ah [think wir g'n[noo- a(h)a(h)ll b]e [fight'n [over it.=
 2    Shane:         [·hhhhh [e h heh heh heh ] [·hhhh [hhh
 3    Michael:    =(Ari' [wait)
 4    Shane:           [We gudduh- ·i[h ·ih
 5    Michael:                       [B'd ah'm th' ·gues[:t.
 6    Shane:                                           [·huh ha ha hah=
 7    Michael:    =°B'd ah ['m the] ·gues:t.°
 8    Nancy:          [mmm:::] hm-hm-hm-hmgh.=
 9    Shane:      =·ih ·ih ··ih ·i[h
10    Vivian: ->             [I gave Michael the bigges' ·piece- too:.
11                (0.9)
12    Shane: ->> What?
13                (0.7)
14   (Michael):   °( [ )°
15    Nancy:         [Yeh I sa[w tha:t.
16    Shane: ->>           [Wha:t?
17    Michael:    We know'oo [rates he:re:.=
18    Vivian:               [Of chicken,
19    Shane:      =Is this true?
20    Michael:    ·t ·hh- ·hh (0.2) She gaym' the biggis'
21                b'·ta:y ((potato)) the biggis' ·vchicken=
22    Shane:      =nah ·ha:h ·O-kay (ul en w') talk about that later.
23                (.)
```

At the two double-headed arrows, Shane's "What"s appear more to be expressions of shock and outrage at having been shortchanged by his companion (akin to what Goffman (1978) termed "response cries") than other-initiated repair, nor does their efficacy as shock/outrage turn on their being repair-initiators. And they

do not appear to be taken as such or responded to as such. After the first "what?", for example, there are no repeats or explications of Vivian's utterance in response; instead there are expressions of registering and appreciating the action which Vivian has described. On the other hand, the second "what" is followed by responses which are not, strictly speaking, repair, but which nonetheless are designed to convey supplementary information which bears on the utterance which was the source of this to-do.

     2.   This "huh?" appears to be a variant of the tag question "huh" which may be appended to a declarative clause, ostensibly to mark it as a request for confirmation, as in exchanges such as these:

(a) GTS 4:3

```
1   Ken:       hhh So what'djudo East-er-over Easter Vacation?
2 Roger:       ((through laughter)) I don't remember hhhehhh
3   Ken: ->    It was that bad huh?
4 Roger:       Lemme see...
```

(b) Pre-Auto A, 9:06-29 (simplified)

     Mike and Phyllis have just arrived at a picnic; Pam is the hostess.

```
 1   Pam:     =We've go:t r:ru:m: bu:r:be::n: vo:dka, Co:ke, Diet Rite'n
 2            bee:r.
 3  Mike:     I:(guess ah'll drink a) beer.
 4   Pam:     A::lrighty?
 5  Mike:     A[h'll splu:rge,]
 6 Candy:      [Ah'll get it P]am,
 7   ???:     [W o : w.]
 8   ???: ->  [Yu'll sp]lu:rge[(°huh?°)]=
 9  Mike:                  [U h : , ]=
10  Curt:     =Jee(h)eez,
11            (0.9)
```

When appended to a turn constructional unit, "huh" is unlikely to be taken for an other-initiated repair. When detached and used as a prompt, as in the extracts treated in the text, however, "huh?" stands alone and is vulnerable to such treatment by outside analysts, though only improbably by interlocutors.

    The possibility should be mentioned that, although the deployment of "huh" as a prompt does not directly exploit its usage as an other-initiation of repair, there may be an "affinity of practice" between them. The suggestion is that the prompt works via the sense of "huh?" as an indication of "I didn't hear your answer" as a way of registering the absence of an answer, much as "You're welcome" can be used sardonically to register the absence of an interlocutor's "thank you," where one was claimably relevant and appropriate.

3.   What bearing might this have, for example, on our understanding of the well-known demonstration by Garfinkel (1967, pp. 41-44) in which persons began without warning to question the meaning of plain enough utterances which interlocutors had just produced? An examination of Garfinkel's text will show that virtually all the cited exchanges took the form "What do you mean?" or "What do you mean X?" The possibility that the hearing of these utterances was informed by a sense of challenge is most vividly exemplified by the first case reported, in which "What do you mean you had a flat tire" is responded to with "What do you mean, 'what do you mean?'..."

4.   The extract reproduced below embodies another kind of positively-valenced alignment to what is repeated. But it is displayed here to show that not all repetitions of other's prior turn are as compact as the ones so far displayed. Here a 72 year old jazz trombonist, Zalman "Porky" Cohen, is being interviewed by Bob Edwards on the United States National Public Radio program, "Morning Edition." After years of playing as a "sideman" in largely African-American groups, this Jewish musician had recently appeared on a new recording as a "front man," i.e., a featured player.

(a) Morning Edition, 9/13/96

1   Edwards: Maybe every seventy two years you should do a solo album.
2   Cohen: Every seventy two years I should do a solo album¿ (0.5)
3   Thank you.

5.   The point here is exemplified by an utterance which does not have the ordinary form of repair initiation nonetheless serving as one, in contrast to a discussion some years ago (Schegloff, 1984) of an utterance which appeared to be a repair initiator turning out, in its particular local context, to be implementing quite a different action. My thanks to John Heritage for pointing this resonance out to me.

REFERENCES

Clayman, S. (1990). From talk to text: newspaper accounts of reporter-source interactions. *Media, Culture and Society, 12*, 79-104.

Drew, P. (forthcoming). 'Open' class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Garvey, C. & Debba, M. Ben. (1978). An experimental investigation of contingent query sequences. *Discourse Processes, 1*, 36-50.

Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in public: Microstudies of the public order*. New York: Harper and Row.

Goffman, E. (1978). Response cries. *Language, 54*, 787-815.

Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational organization: Interaction between speakers and hearers*. New York: Academic Press.

Goodwin, C. (1987). Forgetfulness as an interactive resource. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 50*, 115-130.

Goodwin, M.H. & Goodwin, C. (1987). Children's arguing. In S. Philips, S. Steele & C. Tanz (Eds.), *Language, gender, and sex in comparative perspective*. (pp. 200-248). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jefferson, G. (1981). *The abominable 'ne?': A working paper exploring the phenomenon of post-response pursuit of response*. Occasional Paper No.6, Department of Sociology, University of Manchester, Manchester, England,

Ochs, E., Schegloff, E.A. & Thompson, S. (Eds.) (1996). *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pomerantz, A. (1978). Compliment responses: Notes on the co-operation of multiple constraints. In J. Schenkein (Ed.) *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 79-112). New York: Academic Press.

Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J.M. Atkinson & J.C. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57-101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation*. Ed. By G. Jefferson. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schegloff, E.A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist, 70*, 1075-1095.

Schegloff, E.A. (1972). Notes on a conversational practice: Formulating place. In D.N. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in social interaction* (pp. 75-119). New York: Free Press.

Schegloff, E.A. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of 'uh huh' and other things that come between sentences. In D. Tannen (Ed.) *Georgetown University roundtable on languages and linguistics 1981: Analyzing discourse: Text and talk* (pp. 71-93). Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Schegloff, E.A. (1984). On some questions and ambiguities in conversation. In J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 28-52). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E.A. (1988a). Discourse as an interactional achievement II: An exercise in conversation analysis. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Linguistics in context: Connecting observation and understanding* (pp. 135-158). Lectures from the 1985 LSA/TESOL and NEH Institutes. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Schegloff, E.A. (1988b). Presequences and indirection: Applying speech act theory to ordinary conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 12*, 55-62.

Schegloff, E.A. (1989). Reflections on language, development, and the interactional character of talk-in-interaction. In M. Bornstein & J.S. Bruner (Eds.), *Interaction in human development* (pp. 139-153). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Schegloff, E.A. (1991). Conversation analysis and socially shared cognition. In L. Resnick, J. Levine & S. Teasley (Eds.), *Perspectives on socially shared cognition* (pp. 150-171). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Schegloff, E.A. (1992). Repair after next turn: the last structurally provided place for the defence of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology, 95*, 1295-1345.

Schegloff, E.A. (1995). Discourse as an interactional achievement III: The omnirelevance of action. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 28*, 185-211.

Schegloff, E.A. (1996a). Confirming allusions: Toward an empirical account of action. *American Journal of Sociology, 104,* 161-216.

Schegloff, E.A. (1996b). Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E.A. Schegloff & S.A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 52-133). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E.A. (1996c). Issues of relevance for discourse analysis: Contingency in action, interaction and co-participant context. In E.H. Hovy & D. Scott (Eds.), *Inter-disciplinary perspectives on discourse* (pp. 3-35). Heidelberg: Springer Verlag.

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

Schegloff, E.A. & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica, 8,* 289-327.

Tannen, D. (1987a). Repetition in conversation: Toward a poetics of talk. *Language, 63,* 574-605.

Tannen, D. (1987). Repetition in conversation as spontaneous formulaicity. *Text, 7,* 215-243.

Tannen, D. (1989). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Terasaki, A. (1976). *Pre-announcement sequences in conversation.* Social Science Working Paper 99, School of Social Sciences, Irvine California.