When 'Others' Initiate Repair

EMANUEL A. SCHEGLOFF

UCLA

Early work on repair (Schegloff *et al.* 1977) had proposed that virtually all repair initiated by other than speaker of the trouble-source turn was initiated in the turn following the trouble-source turn. Such repair often came to be identified with this locus of initiation, being termed NTRI—an acronym derived from 'next turn repair initiation'. Subsequent work (Schegloff 1992) described another location in which 'other-initiated repair' is initiated—termed 'fourth position'. This paper revisits this issue and elaborates the locus of other-initiated repair. It reports on a number of environments in which 'others' initiate repair in turns later than the one directly following the trouble-source turn (without, however, occupying fourth position), and it describes several ways in which other-initiation of repair which occurs in next-turn position may be delayed within that position. These positionings of repair initiation in conversation among native speakers of English are briefly compared with a proposal by Wong that other-initiated repair by non-native speakers may regularly be delayed. A postscript suggests the prospect that studies of non-native speaker participation in talk-in-interaction be treated as not separable from the study of talk-in-interaction more generally.

INTRODUCTION

What follows started as something of a 'memorandum' on the location of other-initiated repair in conversation. It was prompted by an inquiry from Jean Wong, triggered by comments on the draft of a paper of hers on a 'candidate' phenomenon which she had encountered in work on native/non-native (henceforth N/NN) conversation (Wong 2000). The candidate phenomenon was (and is) 'delayed NTRIs' (by non-native speakers of English). The key observation which underlies Wong's proposal of this candidate phenomenon is the recurrence in N/NN conversation of repairs initiated by the non-native speaker on the talk of their interlocutor later than the position previously claimed to be the basic position for the initiation of repair by other than speaker of the trouble-source (TS)—namely, next turn (Schegloff *et al.* 1977). That claim had been so strong that such repair initiations were commonly known by the name NTRI—an acronym derived from the initial letters of the phrase 'Next Turn Repair Initiation'. Characteristic instances of such repair initiation (RI) in next turn are (Schegloff *et al.* 1977: 368 et passim):

Frieda:		This is nice, did you make this?
Kathy:	TS→	No, Samu made that.
Frieda:	RI→	Who?
Kathy:		Samu.

or

Caller: TS→   Why did I turn out this way.
Called: RI→   You mean homosexual?
Caller: Yes.

Wong's observation was that, this claim to the contrary notwithstanding, in N/NN conversation, NN speakers regularly initiated repair on the talk of the N interlocutor later than next turn, and that these repair initiations were, in a kind of analytic oxymoron, 'delayed NTRIs'. Consider, for example, the following exchange, taken from Wong's paper (2000: 244):

1 Joan: TS→   I- j- I jus' talk tuh Li Li Hwa?
2 Chen: Oh::
3   (0.2)
4 Joan: TS→   An:: that's how I got your number.
5   (0.2)
6 Chen: Oh.
7 Joan: An:: she [wa-
8 Chen: R→   [Oh:: you- you got my numbuh:: from Li Li Hwa.
9 Joan: Yeah

The trouble-source is at lines 1 and 4, targeted as such by the other-initiated repair at line 8, in large measure by the repetition (with adjustment for speaker change) of 'got your/my number'. The repair-initiation displays that there has been some trouble in understanding the targeted preceding talk (the trouble-source), and proffers a candidate understanding for confirmation. But note that between the trouble-source turn and the other-initiated repair is another turn, in next-turn position, namely 'Oh' at line 6 (as also the one at line 2). 'Oh' can constitute a possibly complete, lexically composed turn, and its 'final' prosody here is compatible with turn completion, as is its usage to register a 'change of state' (Heritage 1984). That Joan takes it to be a possibly complete turn is evidenced by her launching of a new turn of her own at line 7, directly on its completion. This exchange, then, offers one exemplification of the phenomenon which Wong undertook to register and explore.

   The comment that triggered the inquiry suggested that surely such occurrences were not distinctive to NN speakers, but occurred in ordinary conversation by native speakers as well, even if not as frequently. Wong had not encountered such occurrences in data with which she was familiar, and asked if I had. There was good reason for her to direct this inquiry to me; some years ago, with support from the National Science Foundation, I resumed on an expanded scale a project on such repair sequences which Harvey Sacks and I had started work on together in the early 1970s, but which had lain dormant for a number of years after his death. The data base assembled for this project came to include over 1300 candidate instances of its phenomenon of interest, which I now again ordinarily refer to as 'other-initiated repairs', for reasons to be explicated below. The memorandum—or research report—to follow is my

answer to Wong's inquiry, but it is otherwise motivated as well, grounded in developments in the field since Schegloff *et al.* 1977, which sketched the overall contours of the organization of repair as they appeared at that time. I will mention just three of the bases for renewed attention to the theme to be explored in what follows.

But before doing so, for those whose own preoccupations have not recently, or perhaps ever, steered them into the neighborhood of repair, or whose acquaintance with it has been refracted through the special professional and disciplinary prism of applied linguistics, let me briefly review the key points of reference in this domain, as initially sketched in the 'The Preference for Self-Correction' paper (Schegloff *et al.* 1977). This review is adapted from Schegloff 1997b: 502–4.

DIGRESSION: THE BASICS OF 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 on occasion be only a fuzzy boundary between these. (Nor, I might add, did we mean to refer to efforts to deal with tension or breakdown in the interaction, or violations of its so-called ritual order—what Goffman (1971) termed 'remedial interchanges'). 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 at all 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 has
been as 'next turn repair initiations' or 'NTRI's. (For the exceptions, cf.
Schegloff 1992: 1320–6 and the present paper.) *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 relevant to the concerns of this paper. 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 *supersede* 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 (for example,
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*; and, fourth, its *practices*, by which its

components were implemented. Wong's observation is addressed to the second of these.

Finally, the sorts of actions underwritten by the practices of repair are not limited to 'correction', nor are their targets limited to 'errors'—hence the use of the terms 'repair' and 'repairable' or 'trouble-source'. There can be 'trouble' grounded in other than mistakes—the unavailability of a word, such as a name, when needed (or of a name *recognition* on the recipient's side); hearing problems engendered by interference by ambient noise; an uncertain hearing or understanding in search of confirmation, and the like. And on the intervention side there can be practices directed to other than correction—for example, searching for a word, requesting repetition, or offering a candidate hearing or understanding for confirmation or replacement (Schegloff *et al.* 1977: 362–3). Nor are the latter practices instances of repair only when they receive modifications of the prior talk in response. Whatever the response—whether modification/correction or confirmation/repetition/reaffirmation—the ongoing trajectory of the interaction has been stopped to deal with possible trouble, and that marks this interlude of talk-in-interaction as repair (for further discussion of this last point, cf. Schegloff 1997b: 525–7, esp. p. 527; and for discussion of the contrasting case, correction which *does not constitute repair*—so-called 'embedded correction', cf. Jefferson 1987). With respect to this last paragraph, if not other of the preceding paragraphs, I am given to understand that some recent work in applied linguistics has taken up a different stance—also under the rubric of 'repair', and it is worth making explicit the differences between distinct takes on this area, and resolving them if possible.

With this brief overview of the initial work on repair sketched out, I return to the earlier-promised mention of just three of the bases for renewed attention to the theme to be explored in this paper—the specification of where repair which is initiated by other than speaker of the trouble-source is in fact initiated.

BASES FOR THE RE-EXAMINATION OF OI REPAIR AND SOME CAVEATS

First, the overall claim that virtually all repair initiated by other than speaker of the trouble-source is initiated in next turn after the trouble-source turn was based on the cumulative exposure of the three authors to an extensive array of data, but not a systematically gathered and arrayed set of data. What is reported below is based on a more organized database and a more systematically examined one (but see the caveat which follows below).

Second, work pursued subsequent to the 1977 paper has turned up a repair position of which we were unaware in 1977—what has elsewhere been termed 'fourth position repair' (Schegloff 1992). As it happens, this is a position in which other-than-speaker of the trouble-source initiates repair on it, and it is a position subsequent to next turn. All the more reason, then, to

re-examine the claim that virtually all other-initiated repair is initiated in next turn.[1]

Third, Schegloff *et al.* (1977) had already noted that other-initiated repair can 'move around' in next turn position, but had registered only one form of such movement—delay of the initiation of the repair, and, with it, delay in the initiation of the turn itself. Such delay, we remarked (1977: 374) afforded the trouble-source speaker a yet further opportunity for self-initiation of repair before intervention by a recipient. But subsequent inquiry has led to the noticing of other aspects of the placement of other-initiated repair *within* next turn position, but these have remained unreported.

There are other grounds motivating the present undertaking as well, but these three lines of development, as well as the issues raised by Wong's work and its commentators, provide proper warrant for the present effort. Its special interest to applied linguistics, with its special interest in those who specifically have—or encounter those who have—trouble in speaking, hearing and/or understanding talk, should be transparent. I explore one line of consequences for applied linguistics at the end of the paper in a Postscript.

However, this report needs to be prefaced by several caveats, terminological matters, and specifications of what it can and cannot do.

First a caveat. Although a number of publications have appeared in which the data of this project figure (Schegloff 1992, 1993) or which are designed to report on it (Schegloff 1997b), the work of the project remains incomplete. Because of the large number of cases, the large number of analytically distinct features investigated about each, and the effort not to lose individual case analysis in the face of the aggregate, not all of the instances of other-initiated repair in the corpus have been thoroughly examined, and some not at all. What is reported below is, therefore, not exhaustive even of the data set on which I draw, leaving aside what relationship there might be between that data set and the 'universe' of occurrences relevant to the practices of repair. This needs to be said because one issue which has already been raised about the questions at issue is one of frequency—the frequency of 'delayed NTRIs' (if there is such a thing) among N and NN speakers. Indeed, what universe would be the proper domain in which to pursue such a claim remains opaque to my own understanding (cf. Schegloff 1993). In any case, what I report in this memorandum focuses not on frequencies, but on features of 'delayed NTRIs' when they are found, and of the environments in which they are found. Even if comparative frequencies cannot be established, it might be possible to ascertain whether the 'delayed NTRIs' which Wong believes she has found have the same features as ones in 'ordinary' native conversation and whether they occur in the same environments. The examination of my database on this occasion preceded an examination of her materials[2] and my account of what I find in my database was drafted independently of her materials and her observations about them. I *have* looked at about 350 other-initiated repair sequences in responding to her inquiry and preparing this memorandum.

Second, an observation about terminology. One product of working on the larger project has been the decision on my part—and I would urge it on others—to refer to the object of interest not as an 'NTRI' but as an 'OI'—that is, as 'Other Initiation' of repair. The grounds for doing so are straightforward. The term 'NTRI' incorporates the positioning of these repair initiations—and the trajectory which they set off—into their very name, and thereby into a kind of conceptual stipulation to their 'essential' or defining criteria. But occurrence in next turn need not be a defining criterion; it can be treated as an empirical contingency. Rather than a stipulation, occurrence in next turn after the trouble-source can be an empirical finding, and a payoff of inquiry, rather than a pre-condition for it. It is in fact the case that the vast majority of other-initiated repairs (some 90 per cent in the subsample I examined for this report) are initiated in the turn following the one in which occurs the trouble-source which the repair initiation is targetting. But there are some such repair initiations—by other than speaker of the trouble-source, and implemented by the same array of constructional forms otherwise described as characteristic of this phenomenon—which do not occur in 'next turn'. Those need not be a conceptual embarrassment, nor need they verge on being oxymorons, as they do by both asserting and qualifying a claim about where they occur. Indeed, in Schegloff *et al.* (1977), it is the agent of repair initiation and relationship to the trouble-source (self or other) which is treated as one of the organizationally criterial features, not sequential position, which rather is invoked as an empirical indicator of the organizational consequentiality of relationship to the trouble-source.

One reservation must be entered about the term 'other-initiated' repair. As I tried to show in an earlier paper (Schegloff 1992), there is a position in which repair sometimes is initiated—what I called 'fourth position repair'—which was not mentioned in the Schegloff *et al.* (1977) paper describing the so-called 'repair initiation opportunity space'. Fourth position repair initiations characteristically take the form 'Oh, you mean X', and formulate a proposed alternative understanding of an interlocutor's earlier utterance, a re-understanding prompted by a subsequent utterance by that interlocutor. Note then that fourth position repairs are also initiated by 'other than speaker of the trouble-source', and occurrence later than next turn *is* part of their constitutive features. But they are not what I mean to call attention to with the term 'other-initiated repair'. The arbitrary convention which I am adopting is to refer to this relatively rare form of repair by its position—'fourth position repair'—which is, I believe, invariant, and not to refer to it by its initiator—not, then, 'other-initiated', even though it is in fact initiated by 'other'. I reserve the term 'other-initiated repair' for repair initiated by other than the speaker of the trouble-source in relatively close proximity to that trouble-source—ordinarily in next turn, but on occasion in places which are modifications of that 'natural position'. Indeed, the question addressed by the report to follow is: when an OI is not in NT (next turn), where is it, and why? How does it come to be 'displaced' *from* its natural position, and, as we shall see, *within* it?

Finally, one more preliminary observation. One of the main initial observations about the items—the repair initiations—which are the focus of research in this area was the capacity of these items to locate the trouble-source to which they were addressed (and as a by-product, their speaker; cf. Sacks *et al.* 1974: 717–18). This capacity seemed to turn centrally on positioning in next turn (hence the nomenclatural decision to refer to them as next-turn-repair-initiations). This capacity was one testament to the power of 'adjacency', so much so that even if a speaker 'meant' to retrieve something else, the target would be heard as prior turn—the reciprocal of 'next turn'.[3] So, as we make sequential position of occurrence a contingent feature of our analytic target, we need to keep front-and-center the issue of how a repair initiation—an OI—locates the trouble-source whose repair it seeks to occasion. We keep that issue central when adjacency itself does a large part of the work, and even more so when it does not, because the OI is not adjacently positioned.

OTHER-INITIATED REPAIR PAST NEXT-TURN POSITION

If the natural position for other-initiated repair is in the next turn after the trouble-source turn, how shall we understand those exchanges in which the repair is initiated later than that? This section characterizes some four environments for such occurrences. Some of these serve to mitigate the apparent 'deviance' of the occurrence from the natural positioning of OI, or even to assimilate it to the canonical operation of other-initiated repair as described in previous work. Other of the characterized environments offer cogent accounts of the non-repair related contingencies which may serve to defer repair initiation. Here then are accounts of these environments, with exemplary data.

Multiples

The organization of repair is generally extremely effective in dealing with trouble-sources in the talk. In the case of other-initiated repairs, a single repair initiator serves to locate the trouble-source and to permit analysis of the character of the trouble, and a solution is then readily provided in the next turn by the trouble-source turn's speaker. It does happen, however, that the response to the other-initiation of repair does *not* resolve the problem whose solution the OI made relevant. One way this outcome can be (and often is) displayed is by the deployment of another repair initiator (and, as noted in Schegloff *et al.* 1977: 369, a *stronger* one). Indeed, a second such repair sequence may also 'fail' to resolve the trouble or problem and a third repair initiator may be deployed. Such a trajectory may be characterized as involving 'multiple other-initiations of repair', or 'multiples' for short, and subsequent repair sequences can be characterized by their position in the sequence—as M(ultiple) 2 or M(ultiple) 3 (that being the limit of expansion of OI sequences

in my experience). In most instances, repair initiators which are either M2 or M3 (that is, second or third in a series or sequence of other-initiations) do not occur in next-turn position after the trouble-source—because M1 does.[4] In Extracts 1 and 2, the location of the trouble-source is marked with 'TS', the first OI of a multiple is marked with 'M1', and second with 'M2'.

```
(1)   TG, 1: (201z)
01    Bee:          hHowuh you:?
02    Ava:          Oka:::y?hh=
03    Bee:          =Good. = Yihs [sou:nd] hh
04    Ava:                        [<I wan] 'dih know if yih got a-uh:m
05          TS→     wutchimicawllit. A:: pah(hh))khing place °th's mornin'. hh
06    Bee:  M1→     A pa:rking place,
07    Ava:          Mm hm,
08                  (.4)
09    Bee:  M2→     Whe:re.
10    Ava:          t! Oh: just anypla(h)ce? I wz jus' kidding yuh.

(2) Virginia, (83az)
01    MOM:          hhh ^Well that's something else. (0.3) ^I don't think that
02                  you should be going to the parties that Beth goe:s to. She is
03                  eighteen years old.An' you are fou:rtee:n, da[rlin'.
04    VIR:                                                       [I KNOW::, BUT
05          TS→     A:LL THE REST OF MY: PEOPLE MY AGE ARE GWAFFS.I promise.they
06                  are si:[ck.
07    MOM:  M1→        [They're what?
08                  (.)
09    VIR:          GWAFFS.
10    ???:          ( )
11    PR?:  M2→     What's a gwaff.
12                  (3.1)
13    VIR:          Gwaff is jus' someb'dy who's really (1.1) I just- ehh! ˙hh
14                  s- immature.>You don't wanna hang around people like tha:t.<
```

In these exchanges and in ones like them (about a third of the OIs not in next turn which showed up in my data search), the M2 (or M3) repair initiator is not in next turn, but the M1 *was*. Initiation of repair was, then, *not* delayed, and such occurrences are not apt targets for our inquiry.[5]

Larger unit in progress

A second environment in which we find OIs occurring in a position that appears removed from next-turn relative to the trouble-source which it targets is marked by some equivocality in determining which is the relevant unit of sequential organization for determining 'next-turn position'. In each of these exchanges it is clear that a larger unit of some sort is in progress—a story, a shopping list, an instruction to be conveyed to a third party. As is common in the interactional construction of such units, there are places in the course of its development at which intervention is possible, and these allow repair initiation in some proximity to potential trouble-sources. They are, in a manner of speaking, 'manufactured' interstitial next-turn positions. At the

same time, they are interpolations into a larger continuing unit, designed to be in some sense a single, expanded turn. There can be a tension, then, between exploiting interpolated opportunities to initiate repair when they are made available, and passing them so as to allow the subsequent course of the telling to possibly resolve the problem. There is, after all, always a next-turn position after the larger unit has been brought to possible completion.

In Extract 3, Faye is telling Teresa what she (and the adult daughter, Cathy, with whom she lives) would like from the specialty store, and it may not be apparent from the outset that several items will compose a list. By the time a second item is specified, it becomes clear that Teresa is writing them down, but it is also clear from the end of the sequence that the first item had not been written down when first articulated.

```
(3)   Goldberg, (71)
01    Fay:          . . . he said that the tea didn't come only in pounds bu[t hhh
02    Ter:                                                                   [Oh no,
03                  no, no, no ih th- they p- they ba:g it for you in as much as
04                  you wa:nt.=
05    Fay:          I see. Well hh then Cathy would like a p- a ha- a quarter of
06         TS→      a po:und of that English Breakfast Tea:      hh[h
07    Ter:                                                         [Oka:y=
08    Fay:          An then she'd like to have a p- t'try.=Cause I don't know what
09                  that uh light French coffee is an I've never had it so: uh hh
10                  as long as there's no chicker in it hh yih know cause we-
11                  neither one can stand chickory.
12    Ter          Um: hum.
13    Fay:          hh Bu:tum ((clears throat)) if it does not have any I'd like
14                  t' have uh hh a pound of that light French.
15    Ter:          Light French. ((said as if being written)) If it doesn't have
16                  chickory.
17    Fay:          [Yeah.=
18    Ter:          [Okay.
19    Fay:          hh An:duh otherwise uh:   hh you c'ld bring down a pound of
20                  that other one h- um: oh:  what's that- the two names together
21                  that C- Cathy was talkin' about, what is it umm hhh wait an
22                  see if I c'n find the–paper.=I don't know wha' dih (4.0) hhh
23                  Oh the Mocha Java.=If he k- if you do not ha- i[f uh
24    Ter:          ((said as if being written–>))                 [Mo-cha Ha-va
25    Fay:          Yeah.=
26    Ter:          =If the other has no chick'ry ((said as if being read))
27    Fay:          Yeah. Mhm.=Mhm.=
28    Ter:  OI→     Ahkay. hh An a quarter pound of uh what- what te[a was it?
29    Fay:                                                          [O:h uh the
30                  English Breakfast tea.
31    Ter:          English Breakfast Tea. ((As if being written)) O:ka:y.
32    Fay:          Ah huh– [hhh
33    Ter:                  [Okay. Fine.
```

There is a proximate position at line 7 at which repair could be initiated on what turns out at the end to be a trouble-source (though it may not have been a trouble-source at that point). Although the OI at line 28 appears to be

quite removed from its trouble-source, and although there was a virtual next-turn position in closer proximity, this OI is nonetheless positioned in a next-turn position of sorts—next turn after completion of larger unit—'the list'. It seems likely that 'delayed' OIs of this sort will turn out often to target trouble-sources which occurred *early* in a larger discourse unit composing an expanded turn at talk,[6] as in the following instruction being given during a natural disaster by a Director of Civil Defense to the wife of the Mayor of the city for relay to him, which also starts to be written down after its onset.

```
(4)   Civil Defense Headquarters, 19 (246z)
01    Dir:   TS→    Now look [tell Jack that these people are reporting as far as =
02    Sue:                   [Mh hm?
03    Dir:           = the lake front's concerned to Ely-to Canal Boulevard, and the
04                   lake front.
05    Sue:           Mh hm,
06    Dir:           So somebody should be there to pick 'em up.
07    Sue:           Reporting to Canal Boulevard?
08    Dir:           A::nd, the the lake front.
09    Sue:   OI→     Who-who are these people [that're repor-
10    Dir:                                    [These are the voluntee::rs,
11    Sue:           Oh, I see.
```

Here again the item to which subsequent repair is directed occurs at the start of what turns out to be an extended turn, housing a multi-unit utterance.[7]

In other episodically structured larger units, OIs may be positioned at junctures in the telling at which it appears that a next episode is being launched, thus exploiting a post-possible completion position like that previously noted, but located by references to *episodes* of the larger-unit-in-progress, rather than the whole of the larger unit itself. Extract 5 is taken from a group therapy session with teenagers; Dan is the therapist; Ken is describing a discussion with his father about beginning a course of family therapy as well.

```
(5)   GTS 3:31 (88)
01    Ken:           . . . d'you think that was wrong though, for me
02                   to say, y'know, th-that I didn't care what he said?
03                   (0.2)
04    Dan:           What do you think?
05    Louise:        I think that –
06                   (0.2)
07    (Dan):         heh heh
08    Louise:        heh Anything you say that you don't think is
09                   wrong, that you fee- that you aren't embarrassed-
10                   that you aren't ashamed of having said, that you
11                   don't feel guilty about saying, is not wrong.
12                   No matter what it is.
13                   (0.4)
14    Ken:           Hm,
15                   (0.2)
16    Ken:           I dunno
17    Dan:           I don't think thatchu were wrong, in- in this
18                   a'tall. I don't
```

```
19   Ken:              Well he- he started saying something an' I
20                     brought your name up once, just so that, you know,
21                     I said 'As far as- as far as he's concerned,
22                     uh when I talk to him, he didn't think this
23                     was a good idea.' you know, because you-that
24         TS→        one time I was talking to you, you didn't think
25         TS→        it was too good an idea. He sez 'Well I've
26                     talked to him' I sez 'Well I don't give a damn'
27                     (0.4)
28   Ken:              And uh then things started happening an' I (   )
29   Dan:   OI→        Uhh well what wasn't too good of an idea?
30   Ken:              You know, coming to the family thing? Because
31                     it didn't- it just didn't work out. [It-
32   Dan:                                                  [Oh you
33                     mean together.
34   Ken:              Yeah. I mean if- if it were single, I wouldn't
35                     mind coming to you, but to him I w-I wouldn't go
36                     back to him for anything in the world.
```

Note here that there is a position at line 27 at which repair could have been initiated on what turns out at line 29 to be treated as a trouble-source (at lines 24–5), but repair is initiated only after evidence is given that the telling is moving on to a next episode (line 28). Thereupon, 'next-turn' position to an episode of the larger discursive unit is exploited to initiate the repair.

The upshot here is that an apparent 'distance' between the OI and the trouble-source which it targets is not necessarily the product of a delay, nor of some canonical alternative practice for positioning OIs; it can rather reflect an ambiguity for recipients on the proper way to assess the turn organization and turn-taking organization in effect at the moment in locating what will most properly count as 'next-turn' position when alternative structures are simultaneously in progress—larger units like stories or lists, intermediate units like episodes or list-items, and the turn-constructional units whose possible completion otherwise can occasion the start of a next-turn position. On second thought, then, perhaps it must be said that such cases may indeed in one sense involve delay, as recipients of the ongoing talk may pass more local opportunities to initiate repair (Schegloff 1982) as part of registering and co-constructing a larger discourse unit in progress, whose prospective completion affords an alternative topography for locating a next-turn position if relevant.

Addressed other goes first

One environment in which OIs do indeed appear to be withheld from next-turn position involves repair initiators who are not the addressed recipients of the trouble-source turn. Extract 6 offers a clear instance of this circumstance.

```
(6)   GTS, 2:2:11 (311g)
01    Al:              [What time is it?
02    Roger:           [Turn the tape recorder on.
03    Ther:            Ten thirty.
04    Al:              What happened to Looey. Is she not coming this week?
05    Ther:            She-nn she won't be coming in.
06    Al:      TS→     Where's Jim Reed? Somebody (   )-
07    Ther:            Jim Reed will be late.
08    Roger: OI→       Who's Jim Reed.
09    Al:              New guy is coming.
10    Roger:           Aaaghooh ehah huh hah heh heh
```

In this exchange before the 'official' start of a group therapy session with adolescents, Al is inquiring about those who are 'not there'. Among them he inquires about a new patient—Jim Reed—who is to join the group that session. Note that the turn in which the trouble-source first figures (at line 6) is a question, ostensibly addressed to the therapist. (We lack video for this material, but both by distribution of knowledge and by observable response, the therapist appears to have been addressed by the question and takes himself to have been selected as next speaker.) It is notable then that Roger, who does not know who the person referred to is, and who means to initiate repair on the matter, does *not* do so in next turn, but respects the allocation of that turn to another.[8] After the therapist has taken the next turn for which he was selected, Roger proceeds with his OI. A similar trajectory is played out in Extract 7, from the same body of material, but not involving the therapist.

```
(7)   GTS 2:11-12 (311b)
01    Ken:     TS→     . . . How has Fido across the street been treating you.
02    Al:              Oh you mean Bitch Hazel?
03    Ken:             Yeah heh
04    Roger: OI→       Who's Fido.
05    Ken:             's Hazel.
06    Al:              Bitch Hazel across the street a waitress. And I-and
07                     I-I go back and forth with her uhm she's always kiddin
08                     me I'm always kiddin her. She wasn't there today.
```

Here again the trouble-source ('Fido' in line 1) first appears in an addressed question (addressed by Ken to Al). Roger, for whom this recognitional reference form (Sacks and Schegloff 1979; Schegloff 1996) is opaque, withholds his OI until the selected next speaker, Al, responds—himself with an OI as it happens (line 2), which itself re-selects Ken as next speaker, which Roger also respects (at line 3), only initiating repair on the trouble-source after Ken's reply to Al.

Although addressing *per se* does not invariably select its addressee as next speaker (doing so largely when the addressed utterance is a first pair part; cf. Sacks *et al.* 1974: 716–18), OIs may be held off in deference to addressees of utterances with weaker sequential implicativeness. In Extract 8, for example, Jay's placement of his OI at line 8 accommodates not only George's answer (line 6) to Sy's question (lines 4–5), but Sy's receipt of that answer as well (line 7).[9]

```
(8)   Adato, 1:12 (93)
01    Sy:                This was issued in New Mexico.
02    Geo:               This one yuh don't have.
03                       (pause)
04    Sy:                Temple (recommend.) What's that for. So you
05          TS→          c'n [get intuh the temple?
06    Geo:  TS→              [(I need it tuh- get in the door) of the temple.
07    Sy:                (hOhhh yeh?)
08    Jay:  OI→          What temple.
09    Geo:               Th'Mormon temple.
10    Jay:               Where's that at.
11    Geo:               In Sanna Monica. Havenchu seen it?
12    Sy:                That big white one up on [(   )- (   )-
13    Jay:                                        [You don't belong t'the Morman church
14                       do you? I thoughtchu [were with the, (another) uh, (belonged=
15    Geo:                                    [Sure.
16    Jay:               =tuh some)- [some other-
17    Sy:                            [Church of Christ.
```

In Extracts 6–8, the participant initiating repair has not been party to the sequence in progress, and the turns intervening between the trouble-source turn and the OI turn are enabled by the OI speaker's allowing the parties prosecuting the sequence to realize a 'well-formed' one, with opportunities for answers to questions and receipts of those answers.[10] Extract 9 displays another circumstance in which an OI may appear deferred from next-turn position. Rubin and Frieda have just arrived for dinner at the home of long-time friends Kathy and David. After an initial round of greetings, as he comes into the living room, Rubin remarks:

```
(9)   KC-4:2 (337)
01    Rubin: TS→   Hey : the place looks different
02    Frieda:      Yyyeahhh
03    Kathy:       Ya have to see [all our new
04    David: OI→                  [It does?
05    Rubin:       Oh yeah (?) s-
06    Kathy:       all our new things
07    Rubin:       Since we were here you rearranged things
08    Rubin:       How are you all?
```

Here what intervenes between the trouble-source turn and the OI is an utterance by a co-incumbent of a single party (here the 'guests' *vis-à-vis* the 'hosts') adding to (and here aligning with) the utterance of the prior speaker. (Another instance may be found in Extract B in Note 10, at line 8.) When Kathy's response in next-turn position appears to be grounded in and pursuing the observation of her guests and thereby to align with it, David intervenes with an OI, which thereby competes with Kathy's talk for next-turn position, and, showing itself to be repair-implicated, wins the competition despite its later start (cf. Note 8). Next-turn position appears here to be composed in part by the 'party-affiliation' of the speakers, and not only by individuals' speaking turns; that is, Frieda's line 2 endorses or signs on to Rubin's preceding turn, making it in effect their party's turn; so also with

the David/Kathy party, except that, in this case, one speaker for the party displaces the other in the turn position, rather than signing on to what the other has said (cf. Schegloff 1995a).

Post-response

Finally, and perhaps most curiously, there are OIs whose separation from the trouble-source to which they are addressed is composed of a response to the trouble-source turn. That is, a recipient of a turn first responds to it, and then initiates repair on it or some component of it.[11] For example, in Extract 10, Madeline has been invited to have home made fried chicken dinner with a family with whom she is friendly. Eating at the table, she asks:

```
(10) Oolie, 5:20 (637)
01   Mad:           Did you ever eat-uh do you ever eat- uhm, you know
02         TS→      fried chicken from those stands?
03   Dad: R→        Try not (to but),
04   Mad:           I mean I don't see how you could
05                  (1.2)
06   ( ):           (     )
07   Dad: OI→       You talkin (a)bout Colonel Sanders or something like that?
08   Mad:           Yeah. Kentucky fried chicken [(or something like that)
09   Dad:                                         [Yeah we get desperate an we . . .
```

The father in the host family responds to Madeline's question with an answer (line 3), only later to initiate repair (line 7) on the question he has just answered, and with answer accepted and ratified by the questioner (which is not to say that the OI might not be prompted by the development following his initial response). Similarly, in Extract 11, Alan has called Marilyn to invite her to a surprise birthday party for a mutual friend. Marilyn is soliciting advice on what to bring as a birthday present for the friend and Alan is suggesting a sort of plant.

```
(11) Kamunsky 3:7–8 (207j)
01   Alan:          =Well you could give im he does have a, a liddle piece a'
02         TS→      Charlie. Y'know Wandering umm Creeping Charlie?
03                  (0.2)
04   Alan:          Bud it's kinda kicking it.
05   Mryn: R1→      Oh we(h)ell hhhh!
06   Alan:          You c'd always get im a new (h)o(h)huh
07   Mryn: R2→      hmhhh Is it rilly?
08   Alan:          hh Yeah. [hh
09   Mryn:                   [Ah Piggyba- That's hardtuh grow though,=
10   Alan:          =What Wah-uh- ah-Charlie?
11   Mryn:          No Piggyback,
12   Alan:          Oh [Piggyback.
13   Mryn: OI→         [Creeping Charlie I've nev- What's a Creeping Charlie.
14   Alan:          Y'd'know what a Creeping Charlie i:s?=
15   Mryn:          =No:,
```

At lines 1–2 Alan is suggesting a plant called 'Creeping Charlie'. Eventually (line 13) Marilyn initiates repair on that reference as a trouble-source, but before doing so she responds twice to the suggestion and its aftermath—at lines 5 and 7, giving no hint that there may be a problem in understanding it. (At line 9 Marilyn appears to be (re-) instituting another possible suggestion for a gift which is not directly a response to Alan's turn at lines 1–2.) Exchanges like these often appear counter-intuitive: the item being responded to should be 'secured' or 'grounded' (Clark 1996; Clark and Brennan 1991) before a response to it is done; or alternatively one may be led to enquire what about the uptake of the response might have prompted in its wake efforts to clarify what the question has been in the first place. Placing an OI after a response to the trouble-source which the OI locates appears to depart from the proper order and the natural positioning of these items. And yet, there they are.

There are, however, social settings in which responding first and initiating repair afterwards may well be the *canonical* ordering. In institutional settings offering services on an emergency basis, institutional respondents may pursue a request sequence a bit before initiating repair to ensure that they have the basic request data correct.[12] Extract 12 is taken from a call to the police in the 1960s (D = Dispatcher, C = Caller).

```
(12) IND PD, 59 (213)
01   D:          Radio,
02   C:  TS→     One six nine South Hampton Road, on the east side,
03   D:          What's the trouble lady,
04   C:          I don't know my husband's sitting in his chair I don't know
05               what's wrong with him jhe can't talk or move or anything.
06   D:  OI→     Four six nine South Hampton?
07   C:          One six nine South Hampton.
08   D:          That's one six nine,
09   C:          Yes.
10   D:          Alright. We'll be right [out.
11   C:                               [Please hurry,
```

The Dispatcher understands the caller's giving of her address (at line 2) as a request that a car or ambulance be sent to help. He responds first by undertaking to establish whether proper grounds exist for dispatching a 'unit', that is, by furthering the sequence; and then, having established that, undertakes to check the address by initiating repair (line 6) preparatory to delivering a favorable response to the request (line 10). For many such institutionalized service contexts, this ordering of elements appears to be canonical, rather than unusual.[13]

One particularly recurrent response to a turn later targeted by an OI as a trouble-source turn is laughter (at least in the corpus I examined for this report). There appears to be a deep relationship between laughter and repair, the same occurrence serving both as trouble-source and as laugh-source—perhaps by way of a design to depart from the readily projectable. Such a relationship is nicely exemplified in a comedy routine from the 1960s, set in

an imagined exchange between an astronaut readying for launch and the control tower.

```
(13)  Manna's Overboard (66)
      Astronaut goes through list in final check:
01    astronaut:          Yes, everything is all se- Wait a minute.
02                        Wait just a minute
03    control:            Is there anything wrong sir?
04    astronaut:  TST→    Yes I can't find my crayons.
05    audience:           ((laughter))
06    control:    OI→     Can't find your what sir?
07    astronaut:          My crayons, somebody took my crayons
08    control:            HaHa for a minute I thought you said
09                        somebody took your crayons sir
10    astronaut:          That's what I said. Who the heck's been in here
11    control:            Oh just the ground crew sir, but I dont think-
12    astronaut:          But nothing. Why should a guy take another guy's crayons?
```

What is being noticed in this construction is the (here exploitable) status of 'crayons' as both a laugh-source (elicited from the audience at line 5, and then put in the mouth of a character at line 8) and as trouble-source (via the OI at line 6, here, of course, occurring in next-turn position within the dramatized 'interaction').

Returning to more ordinary data, here we display just two specimens of this convergence of laughter and repair initiation. In Extract 14, several of the teenagers in the group therapy sessions are 'ragging on' (or teasing) another, Ken, who is regularly an object of derision—projecting images of his institutionalization.

```
(14)  GTS 2:2:93 (65)
01    Roger:          . . . They putcha inna tuck and roll cell,
02                    an' all that [ good stuff.
03    Ken:                        [ Mhh hmh hmh
04    Al:             hhh hhh hh! hhh!
05                    (0.2)
06    Al:             Four speed [doors,
07    Roger:                     [An' they don't letchahhave any
08                    sharp objects hah hah! hh hh
09    Al:             Hmh- Four speed door an' [all that stuff heh
10    Roger:                                  [Y'eat with yer fingers,
11    Ken:            heh ((whispered)) (It's a good cigar,   )
12    Al:     TS→     Blown water faucets,
13    Ken:            heh heh
14    Jim:            heh heh
15    (  ):           heh
16    (Al):           (   )
17    (  ):           [(  )-
18    Ken:    OI→     [Blown what. hhh
19    Roger:          Blown [up.
20    Al:                   [Well y- Figure it out buddy, [an' when=
21    Ken:                                               [ehh heh heh
```

```
22   Al:          =we give all these questions, you don'wanna answer,
23                we want chu [t'answer some (of 'em ) from now on,
24   Ken:                    [hhh
25   Ken:        Yes Father,
26   Al:          Yes Mommy dear,
```

As in earlier exemplars of responses followed later by repair initiated by the previous responder, we have Ken (at line 13) laughing at Al's remark (together with other participants, who also laugh at it), followed by Ken's initiating repair on the laugh source he had just responded to. But this succession of responses—laughter followed by repair initiation—is arguably particularly problematic, for the laughter may be taken to be retroactively rendered illegitimate because it registers a claimed grasp of the preceding talk which the OI subsequently belies.[14]

The relevance of laughter and repair can converge not only in the trouble-source, but in the OI as well. Extract 15 reports an exchange among a group of employees in a college book store.

```
(15)  Bookstore, 15 (575)
01   Karen:       Leslie I haven' seen you all day:.
02   Leslie:  TS→  What a pity.
03   Cathy:       Huh huh [huh huh huh.
04   (Les):               [Hhh, hhh, [hhh.
05   (Loren):                      [Huh hn hn hn.
06   Karen:       (Huh hhh)=
07   Cathy:       (Fer her- ).
08   Karen:  OI→  =Fer me er fer you?
09   Leslie:      I don' know, what am I supposed tuh answer tuh that.
10                Huh hhh I haven' seen you much either anybody want
11                some uh- (1.0) Putatuh chips? From my lunch?
12   (Cathy):     Nuh thanks.
```

Leslie's reply scores as a quick and witty comeback, and evokes a round of laughter. In finding her own riposte, Karen opts for an OI format which aims to cast in doubt the proper understanding of Leslie's retort—either as overly self-congratulatory on Leslie's part ('For me') on the one hand, or improbably complimentary of Karen, on the other. Leslie, it turns out, is hoist with her own petard (line 9), and the OI is a laugh source too (line 10), even if not to the same degree as the 'trouble-source turn'. In any case, the import of the relationship between the laughter and the repair initiation in both Extracts 14 and 15 turns centrally on the displacement of the OI from next-turn position and its positioning after a robust response to what is subsequently cast as an imperfectly grasped utterance.

Retrieval of trouble-source by quotation

One other matter is worth commenting on here, in connection with the displacement of OI from next-turn position after the trouble-source. As noted earlier, much of the power of a repair-initiator to locate and target the

trouble-source can turn on its positioning adjacent to the trouble-source turn. This operates most clearly with such constructional forms as 'huh?', 'what?', 'pardon me?', 'what do you mean?', 'are you serious?', and the like. These forms are regularly taken to locate prior turn as their trouble-source locus. What happens when they are displaced from next-turn position?

First, it may be noted that none of the extracts reproduced in this discussion has as its OI one of these constructional forms of repair initiation. Nor is this the product of careful selection of data displays—at least not for this outcome! Where the OI is displaced from next-turn position, it takes a form which uses other resources to locate the trouble-source—repetition of the trouble-source, repetition of words which frame the trouble-source in the trouble-source turn, use of category-specific question words, and the like.

Second, where one of these 'open-class' forms of repair-initiation (Drew 1997) is used at a substantial remove from the trouble-source, it is accompanied by a retrieval of the trouble-source by quotation, as for example in Extract 16, taken from a conversation in a student dormitory room in the mid-1970s.

```
(16)  SN-4, (375)
01                 (0.4)
02    Karen:       Y'know in Los Altos: the:::y were tryin' t'sue the city
03          TS→    becuz- () ih- some women were, becuz- ( hh) all the street
04          TS→    lights 'er an ugly colored yellow, en et n i:ght, (0.4) they
05          TS→    make women look really u:gly.
06    (??):        {°(mmh-hmh)/(1.0)}
07    Karen:       An' they wanted t'sue:.
08    Sher:        Cuz it hur[ts business?]
09    Karen:                 [( Cuz ) NO] WOM[EN WOULD GO O]U:T- () at-,
10                 ni:ght.                  [              ]
11    Ruth:                                 [uh   huh   huh!]
12    Sher:        Compensation fer bad business.=
13    Karen:       =Ye[ah(h)hh]
14    Ruth:           [mm hmh¿]
15                 (0.2)
16    Karen:       I d'know whut it-
17                 (0.5)
18    Mark:   OI→  Are you serious¿ [becuss there was] yellow li:ght?
19    Karen:                        [   I'm serious.   ]
20                 (0.4)
21    Karen:       This really strange light.<Yihknow, like [old fashioned
22                 lights?
```

Note that the OI at line 18 is not the first in this sequence. At line 8, Sherrie proffers a candidate understanding of the story Karen has just told, an OI which is hearable as edging on a joke as well: Ruth treats it as a laugh source, Sherrie insists on a revised version of it (at line 12) when Karen does not confirm it, and the revised version draws a confirmation from Karen (line 13), one infiltrated by laugh tokens and overlapped by further laughter from Ruth (line 14). The 'are you serious¿' from Mark (at line 18) in this environment

can be taken to locate the just preceding as its target; it is hearable as asking whether the proposal that the women were suing as 'compensation for bad business' is to be taken seriously. To have his OI target a more remote trouble-source Mark adds to this OI 'because there was a yellow light', a phrase whose construction echoes the earlier (lines 3–4) 'becuz- (.hh) all the street lights 'er an ugly colored yellow', and locates that as the trouble-source to which his OI is addressed.

The basic design of the class of constructional forms used to implement other-initiation of repair is suited to next-turn position. When deferred to some remove from the trouble-source, the OI may require additional resources to identify the trouble-source to which it is addressed. But overwhelmingly OIs in fact are articulated in the next-turn position after the trouble-source turn, and most variances from this placement are adaptations to local features of the sequential context—successive tries at already initiated repair sequences, extended turns in progress, supervening rights of another to talk next, and the like. The remaining instances are focused on a single practice—doing some form of response to what will turn out to be the trouble-source turn before in fact initiating repair on it.

The preceding discussion has been addressed to one sense of 'delayed NTRI'—namely the delay of other-initiated repair to a position later than next turn. But there is another sense of 'delay' which invites inquiry, and that is the delay of other-initiation of repair while still placing it in next-turn position.

DELAYED OI WITHIN NEXT TURN

At the heart of the characterization of some OIs as 'delayed' is the observation of relevant events—including silence—intervening between an OI and its target, that is, what it locates as its trouble-source. When inquiry in this area takes as its point of departure the claim that the natural position for OI is the next-turn position after the trouble-source turn, then 'turns' are made the focal unit of analysis, and the 'delay' of an OI is characterized by reference to *turns* which intervene between the trouble-source and the OI, whose consequence is that the OI is not in next-turn position, and is in that sense 'delayed'.

But occurrences can intervene between an OI and the trouble-source which it locates which arguably defer it, but which do not displace it from next-turn position. Because 'delays' of this sort can illuminate the interactional dynamic at work around the edges of turns, the practices of hearing and understanding which mediate turns and their responses, and the interface between turns at talk and the sequential and interactional projects which they implement, they merit examination here, even though they may not initially appear relevant to the occasioning of this report.[15]

Strictly speaking, it might be thought, the only OI that is not 'delayed' is one articulated by a turn's recipient after a 'normal' transition space (that is, a

beat of silence) or less following the first possible completion of the turn-constructional unit in which the OI-targeted trouble-source occurred. And there are in fact a great many such OIs.

However, a deep connection between OI and 'delay' was remarked on in the initial claims about the basic positioning of OI in next turn. In contrasting OIs positioned in 'next turn' not only with the many turn positions following *later*, but also with the possibility of OI *earlier*, we remarked on the absence of interruption by 'other' to initiate repair:

> Rather, others 'withhold' repair initiations from placement while trouble-source turn is in progress. . . . Indeed, other-initiations regularly are withheld a bit *past* the possible completion of trouble-source turn; not only does a withhold get them specifically positioned in next turn, but it can get 'next turn' itself delayed a bit. In such cases, other-initiations occur after a slight gap, the gap evidencing a withhold beyond the completion of trouble-source turn—providing an 'extra' opportunity, in an expanded transition space, for speaker of trouble-source to self-initiate repair. (Schegloff *et al.* 1977: 373–4)

There are surely many such OIs as well—OIs which are delayed *within* next turn, and they are part and parcel of the underlying organization of repair. The nearly invariable withhold of other-initiation until trouble-source turn's possible completion, with the frequent withhold for a bit after that possible completion, is an organized positioning of other-initiation relative not only to trouble-source but also relative to same-turn post-trouble-source positions for self-initiation, and to transition-space position for self-initiation. It provides clear evidence that self- and other-initiation are related *to each other*, that the relatedness is *organized*, and that the organization is in *repair-specific terms* (ibid.: 374). The possibility of some such 'delay', then, is part of the normative, natural positioning of other-initiation of repair; it shows up as a bit of silence following the trouble-source turn's possible completion, silence then followed by an OI (or, alternatively and preferably, by self-initiation of transition space repair). There is, however, more to add to this story.

OI—focusing now only on OIs positioned in next turn—can be 'delayed' by intervening events other than silence. Most notably, OIs can be separated from the trouble-sources which they locate *by other talk*. This talk can occur in two main locations. One is in the trouble-source turn *after* the trouble-source; the other is in the OI turn *before* the OI. In what follows, these are taken up in turn.

Post-trouble-source turn extension

The discussion cited above concerning the withholding of OI '. . . past the possible completion of the trouble-source turn' (and related discussions in SJS 1977: 374) appears to have been referring to possible completion of the trouble-source turn *at the possible completion of the turn-constructional unit in which the trouble-source occurred*. The configuration sketched by that text is of a

turn-constructional unit—whether first or subsequent in its turn—which is problematic (or contains something which is problematic), on whose completion a gap of silence is allowed to develop by withholding of a next turn start, a gap which is ended either by the same speaker talking further by initiating a transition space repair or by a recipient of that turn talking and initiating repair in next-turn position. What is not entertained in that account is the possibility of same speaker talking after the possible completion of the trouble-implicated turn-constructional unit (with or without a gap of silence), *not* with a transition space repair, but with one or more further (on-topic or action-relevant) turn-constructional units extending the turn. Then, if an OI is done in a next turn, its 'reach' in locating the trouble-source may have to extend past (or 'jump over') the just prior talk to an earlier portion of the preceding turn. The OI will, in effect, have been delayed by the extended, post-trouble-source talk of the trouble-source turn's speaker (a possibility which may have been grounded in the first place by the previously discussed withholding of OI). Extracts 17–20 offer exemplars of this sort of trajectory of talk.

In Extract 17, early in the interaction of the two couples previously introduced in Extract 9, notice is being taken of various new additions to the hosts' home since the last visit, and at line 1 Frieda appreciates one such object.

```
(17) KC-4, 2:18-42 (62b)
01   Frieda:          =This is nice did you make this?
02   Kathy:           No Samu made that
03   Frieda:          Who?
04   Kathy:           Samu
05                    (1.0)
06   Kathy:           (Sh) You remember my [aunt? ]
07   Dave:                                [Aunt S]amu
08   Kathy:           [From Czechoslovakia?
09   Frieda:          [Yyeeah
10   Frieda:          Oh she's really something
11   Kathy:           Yeah
12   Frieda:          This is so[me woman ]
13   Kathy:                     [She teaches] she teaches a
14                    course at City College in needle crafts
15   Frieda:          Really
16   Kathy:           Yeah
17                    (0.2)
18   Kathy:           Uhm, (·) this is a rug a- this is
19        TS→         uhm (0.2) a punched rug.
20        gap         (0.8)
21   Kathy: +TCU      But she teaches all kinds of things
22   Rubin: OI→       A what rug?
23   Kathy:           It's punched.W'a lil punching machine.=
24   Frieda:          =Yah
```

At lines 18–19 Kathy identifies the object which Frieda has appreciated and, after having given a generic identification (as 'a rug', line 18), she gives a

more specialized identification (and a potentially problematic one, as is marked by her 'uhm' and pause before delivering it)—'a punched rug'. Although it will turn out that Rubin (at least) does not recognize or understand this term, he withholds initiating repair on it (perhaps encouraged to anticipate self-repair on Kathy's part by the hesitation preceding the term's deployment). This is the sort of gap remarked on in the passage from Schegloff *et al.* 1977 cited earlier, which remains unfilled here by transition-space repair. But if Rubin finds Kathy not to be supplying self-repair, we may note that Kathy may be finding her recipients not to be resorting to other-initiated repair, and may be concluding that her misgivings about using the term were ill-founded. When she self-selects as next speaker to end the gap of silence, it is with differently aimed talk; the additional TCU which she produces is addressed to inferences that might be drawn about the craftsperson from this piece of work. Some 'distance' is thereby introduced between the OI which is subsequently produced by Rubin and the trouble-source which it targets. Although the OI is still in next turn, there is a sense in which its 'adjacency' to the trouble-source has been attenuated or compromised. We may note, then, that the OI form that he uses is designed to locate quite precisely what trouble-source it is targeting, by repeating both the preceding and following words to frame the item that is the trouble-source. Although a general preference seems to obtain in constructing OIs to use 'the strongest one' possible (i.e., the one indicating as much grasp of the trouble-source as the repair initiator can muster and specifying as closely as possible the source of the trouble; cf. Schegloff *et al.* 1977: 369, n. 15), such a design is especially relevant when there is other talk intervening between OI and TS. In any case, it should be apparent that Extract 17 exemplifies just the configuration sketched more abstractly in the text preceding it.

So also does Extract 18. Sharon is a young girl whose family has gone off to a nearby beach community; she is calling to invite her friend Stephanie to come stay with her. Stephanie's mother, Fran, answers the phone.

```
(18)  NB III:1:1 (282b)
01    Fran:          Hello
02    Sharon:        Is Stephie there?
03    Fran:          No Stephie's over et'er gramma's fer a couple da:ys.=
04    Sharon:        =hh .hh A'ri[ght thankyou,
05    ( ):                       [( )
06    Fran:          Yer welcome, Sh[aro]n?
07    Sharon:                       [Ba,]
08    Sharon:        Yeah?
09    Fran:          Oh:: I thought that wz you:,.hhh wuh s he's over et Gramma
10                   Peggy's fer a couple da:ys.
11    Sharon:        Oh:okay,=
12    Fran:=         'R you up et yer Gramma:'s?
13    Sharon: TS→    No:: I'm et (.) the bea:ch.
14            gap    (.)
15    Sharon: +TCU   En I[wunnid'er tuh come down fer a few days,
16    ( ):               [( )
```

```
17   Fran:    OI→   (f)) Yer et the bea::ch,=
18   Sharon:        =Yea:h.
19   Fran:          ((f)) Wha:t bea::ch.
20                  (.)
21   Sharon:        Balboa?
22                  (.)
23   Fran:          ((f))Oh yuh lucky thi:ng.
```

Sharon's response at line 13 is not unproblematic, for there are beaches in the big city where she lives as well, though she is not at one of them but rather at a nearby beach community at which both families regularly vacation. So 'the beach' can be an ambiguous reference here, as Sharon may have anticipated at the mini-pause which just precedes her deployment of it.[16] Here, as in the previous extract, there is a momentary silence in which some clarification has a chance to be articulated, but that silence is filled by the prior speaker (again as in Extract 17 and in the recurrent configuration being exemplified in these data extracts when it includes a silence following trouble-source TCU) not with repair work but with an additional TCU which takes a next step in the course of action being realized through the turn. In this instance too, then, when repair is initiated by 'Other' in next turn, there is intervening talk between it and the trouble-source which it locates, and locates with a powerful resource—repetition. Here as in Extract 17 and others involving such additions to the trouble-source turn, an OI implemented through a 'huh?' or 'what?' or 'pardon me?' would be vulnerable to being heard as directed to the most recent talk, which is not the trouble-source but the TCU added after it—an issue already raised in connection with the earlier discussion of OIs delayed to *next turn*.

The 'bit of business' exemplified in the preceding two extracts is not rare, and little is to be gained from multiplying exemplars.[17] Still, examining two other extracts will be useful in understanding an otherwise anomalous additional observation.

Although the claim had been made earlier that there 'are rarely interruptions by other-initiation' (SJS 1977: 373), work on the OI project did turn up a number of such interruptive OIs. Some 16 of them turned up in the sub-set of 350 instances which I examined for this report—more than might comfortably coexist with the claim that they are 'rare'. On inspection, however, it turns out that of those 16 interruptive OIs, 14 involve incursions not into the TCU in which the trouble-source occurred (hence in keeping with what I suggested above was the tacit premise of SJS), but into the TCU added by the trouble-source speaker after that trouble-source TCU. These 'interruptions', then, appear to involve a move by the OI speaker to get the OI positioned in maximum adjacency to the trouble-source, to avoid having the OI be 'delayed' even though in next-turn position. Extracts 19 and 20 provide exemplars of this occurrence.

In Extract 19, Fred is a college senior who is telling his older sister and her

husband about one of his close friends who is apparently being recruited to graduate or professional school by Rice University.

```
(19)  Post-Party 9:1-16 (simplified) (245)
01    Fred:          He's been invited t'come down tuh Rice University
02    Deb:           Fer wha:t,
03    Fred:          et their expense tuh look over the biochemistry facilities.
04                   (0.7)
05    Deb:           Is he going into biochemistry?
06    Fred: TS→      Uh:: he might. It's more likely thet 'e'll go intuh pharmacy.
07         +TCU      Buh Rice is so intrestid
08    Deb:  OI→      Pharmacy?
09    Fred:          Y:[yeah. Cos he-
10    Deb:             [But what happen 'tuh medicine.
11    Fred:          Think that fell by the wayside when 'e started getting
12                   intuh inorganic- chemistry.
```

Note first that Deb's OI at line 8 is interruptive of a TCU of sentential form begun by Fred at line 7 but not yet grammatically or prosodically possibly complete. Then note that the OI targets 'pharmacy' as its trouble-source, that 'pharmacy' was the final component of the second TCU in this turn, at which the turn was possibly complete, and that the TCU which the OI intersects is occupying the position in which the OI would otherwise 'naturally' be placed.

A similar configuration can be observed in Extract 20, drawn from the group therapy with teenager materials drawn upon elsewhere in this report. The talk has turned to (day)dreaming.

```
(20)  GTS, 5:14 (542)
01    Roger:         Bu' -eh- the day dreaming, hell go hog-wild.
02                   (0.2)
03    Roger:         You c'n be anywhere why be in the bea(hh)ch.
04    Ken:           I always- Lately I've been dreaming of-
05                   (0.2) I dunno i-i-it's it's a funny thing
06         TS→       I'm always dreaming about walking down the aisle.
07         +TCU      An' I can't stand [thinking about gettin-
08    Roger: OI→                       [Getting hitched?
09    Ken:           Gettin hitched. I can't stand thinkin about it . . .
```

At line 4 Ken starts telling about a recent recurrent dream, and refers to its theme or topic metonymically rather than literally (line 6)—'walking down the aisle' rather than 'getting married'. Although not enough is known about such deployments of figurative language, it does appear that they are often taken to be doing something special (cf. Drew and Holt 1988a, b; Schegloff and Sacks 1973: 306–7; Schegloff 1995b, *inter alia*), something which therefore needs to be specially figured out by recipients, and which therefore may have an enhanced chance to be a trouble-source. It is here treated as a trouble-source by Roger, whose OI at line 8 offers as a candidate understanding another figurative usage—an idiom. Here again, the talk on which this OI makes an incursion is a new TCU following the trouble-source TCU, and one which appears to be advancing the topical and action trajectory being implemented through the turn.

The upshot of this brief excursus is to reinforce the claim that the organization of repair is independent of the organization of turn-taking, and may supercede it. Schegloff *et al.* 1977 considered the claim that the infrequency of interruptions by 'others' to initiate repair is a consequence of the turn-taking organization and of the right it gives the current speaker to speak to possible completion, including repair (374, n. 20). Various grounds were put forward for asserting repair-specific grounds for this observation of the infrequency of interruption by OI, including the point that the organization of repair entails the occurrence of gaps, which turn-taking organization is also designed to minimize. But it did not directly address the interruptions themselves which *do* occur. What has emerged in this last discussion speaks to this issue. Were the centrally relevant constraint here a turn-taking constraint, then interruptions ought to be no more tolerated in some TCUs than in others. If the strong asymmetry observed in the interruptions by OI in the 350 specimens examined here continues to be found in other bodies of material, then the turn-taking constraints 'protect' only the remainder of the TCU in which a trouble-source occurred. Thereafter, the constraints of repair organization may underwrite a super-cession of turn-taking organization in the interests of timely resolution of problems of hearing or understanding by recipient before the talk goes any further.

If then there can be some delay of OI compatible with its occurrence in next-turn position, and one source of such delay is added talk in additional TCUs after the trouble-source TCU in the same turn, then there are resources ready for deployment to counteract such delay.

Pre-OI talk in next turn

The other locus of 'delay' between trouble-source and OI is the occurrence of talk by the OI speaker before the OI itself. When OI speakers come to the OI only after something prior in their turn, what precedes the OI is one of a very few classes of action or practice. Here I offer brief discussions of only two.

Third position receipts of prior

In these exchanges, one party to the interaction has asked a question or otherwise initiated some exchange with a 'first pair part' (F). When a recipient responds (second position, or 'S'), the initiator of the sequence first registers receipt of the response in 'third position' (T) and then, often abruptly or precipitously, backs off and goes on to intitiate repair on it. Most often, the initial receipt of the response accepts or aligns with it. For example, in Extract 21,

```
(21)  TG. 14:2-15 (562)
01   Bee:        Dihyuh have any-cl- You have a class with Billy this te:rm?
02   Ava:        Yeh he's in my abnormal class.
03   Bee:        mnYeh [how-
```

```
04   Ava:                 [Abnormal psy[ch.
05   Bee: F                            [Still not gettin married,
06   Ava: S      hhh Oh no. Definitely not    [married.
07   Bee: T+OI                                [No he's decided [defin[itely?]
08   Ava:                                                      [hhh [ Oh ] no.
09   Bee:        hh Bec'z [las' time you told me he said no: but he wasn't su:re,
10   Ava:                 [No.
11   Ava:        n:No definitely not.
```

At line 5, Bee pursues her line of inquiry about 'Billy' with a question about his current stance toward marriage, to which Ava responds at line 6 in the negative. At line 7 Bee first receipts this response (with a 'no' because it was formatted as a negative, in agreement with the form of the question), and then goes on to clarify the import of the upgrade in Ava's response, the upgrade to a 'definitely', with an OI which asks whether the 'definitely' represents Billy's stance (or Ava's confidence in her report). But on occasion the receipt of the response may display (incipient) non-alignment with it, as in Extract 22, taken from a call to a Suicide Prevention Center; B is the Caller, A the answerer at the Suicide Center.

```
(22)  SPC, NYE, 10 (113b )
01   A:        Yes, why uh why do you have to be something other than
02        F     what you are in order to love yourself? Why can't you love
03        F     yourself just as you are.
04   B: S      Cuz they didnt, I guess
05   A: T+OI   Well- Pardon me?
06   B:        Cause they didnt
07   A:        Ok why then why change yourself for them?
```

At lines 1–3, the Suicide Center's hot line agent appears to be urging a higher degree of self-regard on the caller, but, having formatted the turn as a question asking for an account ('Why can't you . . . '), it is vulnerable to getting a response which delivers an account. And that is what B delivers at line 4, invoking (it would appear) parental attitudes as the source of current despair. At line 5, A appears to be registering that a response has been delivered, and is beginning to take up an oppositional stance toward it (line 5's 'Well'), but then aborts that reaction and, in effect, does a 'double-take' on B's response, asking for a repeat of it with an OI.

In these instances, an unproblematic sequel begins a next turn—some sort of receipt of prior turn or stance toward it—but either after its completion or aborting it, it is followed by an other-initiation of repair. (I omit here variants on this theme, such as, for example, registering receipt of what interlocutor said by repeating it while writing it, having that confirmed, then registering that confirmation as a preface to initiating repair on parts of the message which have been forgotten or were never fully grasped; see Extract 3 above, at line 28.)

(Incipient) compliant responses before OI

Another juncture at which OIs may be delayed by other turn starts is at the response (or second) position to such sequence-initiating actions as requests, questions, and the like. Here, in keeping with the predominant occurrences in third position described in the preceding paragraphs, complying or agreeing responses may be initiated, only to be immediately followed by—or even self-interrupted by—OIs as the effective action of the turn. For example, in Extract 23, the answerer of the phone is asked to put someone else on the line (line 3) and launches a compliant response (cf. the later line 7, 'Oh, just a minute',) before registering uncertainty about who is wanted (line 4).

```
(23) NB 1:1:1 (178a)
01   A:        Hello?
02   B:        'Lo,
03   B:  F     Is Shorty there,
04   A:  S→    Ooo jest- Who?
05   B:        Eddy?
06   B:        Wood [ward?
07   A:             [Oo jesta minnit.
```

So also in Extract 24, a visitor to a rural, 'backcountry' canyon (B) is musing about it with a local resident (A).

```
(24) HS:FN
01   A:        Yeah Maybe you could build yourself a little house there
02   B:        Well you know first you have to find if you like it
03   A:  F     You don't like it
04   B:  S→    Yeah and, huh?
05   A:        (You) dont like it, I take it.
06   B:        What do you mean
07   A:        Build(ing) a house
08   B:        Oh No I mean first you have to find if you like (this) place
09   A:        Oh oh oh oh
10   B:        (   ) if you really like the place that would be
11             obviously the thing to do
```

A's suggestion about building a little house (line 1) is met with a cautious response (line 2) which A takes to convey a rejection of the possibility, which he offers as his understanding (line 3) for confirmation. B's immediate response is affirmation and confirmation (start of line 4), followed almost immediately by a double-take in search of exactly what A has proposed for confirmation.

It is worth noting that in all the instances which came to notice within the database examined for this report, the initial response form which is abandoned as premature is an agreeing or complying response, not a disagreeing or resistant one, in keeping with the preference for agreement (Sacks 1987 [1973]).[18, 19]

Although there are exceptions, in about three-quarters of the instances of OI preceded by some other response form, no gap of silence intervenes

between the trouble-source and the start of the next turn. It is as if the recipient of the trouble-source turn had begun a next turn prematurely, without sufficient time to complete a proper analysis of prior turn. Recipients then start to respond before doing a double-take, and deploying an OI to re-open and extend the opportunity to re-analyze what prior turn was doing. These instances appear to be of a piece with those treated earlier in which OIs deployed later than next turn follow a next turn in which some other response to the trouble-source turn is done first (cf. above, pp. 219–22). The instances examined in this section appear to involve OI speakers 'catching' earlier than the production of a full next turn that their initial take and response may require re-analysis and revision.

CONCLUSION

Most OI which appears to have been positioned in other than the next turn after the trouble-source which it locates can be understood by reference to the organization of repair itself (for example, multiples), the organization of turns (for example, the organization of extended turns which may leave it equivocal where and when 'next-turn position' occurs), or the organization of turn-taking (for example, when the party initiating repair defers to a selected next speaker before doing the initiation). A small residue of instances embodies a tack in which the recipient of a turn whose grasp of it turns out to be problematic proceeds to respond in a sequentially implicated or appropriate fashion, either setting aside the understanding problem (as in Extract 11) or not assessing it properly until after the sequel to their initial response (as in Extract 10).

   Most OI which appears to be delayed while nonetheless occurring in next turn also can be understood by reference to the organization of repair itself (as with 'withholds' which provide an expanded transition space in which prior speaker can self-initiate repair), the organization of turns (as with the option for 'current speakers' to add to turns-so-far, including adding further TCUs, if an otherwise-entitled next speaker does not start a next turn), or the organization of sequences (and, in particular, the organization of preferred and dispreferred next turns, as when recipients of turns embody the preference for alignment and agreement by accepting or complying with prior turns before registering that they have not yet—or correctly—analyzed and grasped them).

   It is the instances described as the last elements of the preceding two paragraphs which emerge as the most apt exemplars of 'delayed NTRIs', and they appear to involve not-yet-fully-achieved understandings of the turns to which their speakers are responding. As this is a matter arguably specially relevant to the participation of non-native speakers—and, in particular, not-yet-fluent speakers—of the language being used in the interaction, so-called N/NN conversation seems an apt environment in which to examine it. Once in the presence of such materials, of course, altogether different contingencies

of talk-in-interaction, and repair-related responses to them, may come to invite description and analysis.[20]

POSTSCRIPT

The topic and particulars of this inquiry aside, its stance may provide one—more generally applicable—way of approaching the study of 'non-native speaker' conduct in interaction, and NN/N interaction as a distinctive domain more generally still (once the proper grounding of these characterizations has been established). The stance presupposes that the study of non-native-speaker participation in interaction is not separable from the study of talk-in-interaction more generally. Although the practical exigencies of the fields of applied linguistics and non-native language instruction incline workers in those areas to draw the lines of inquiry in as tightly focused a fashion as possible, once such practical constraints are set aside, it seems more promising to begin with the recognition that non-native speakers bring a special set of characteristics, capacities, vulnerabilities, and practices of speaking, hearing, and understanding to a socio-interactional site already shaped by a range of structures of practice which seem to transcend cultural and linguistic boundaries in a relatively robust way.[21] If this is so, then understanding how non-native-speaking participants make their way in interaction needs to start with what is generally the case with talk and other conduct in interaction, what is made problematic both for non-native-speakers and for native-speaker-cointeractants by the participation of the former, what special forms that participation takes, and what special forms and practices characterize the conduct of the native-speaker co-participants. This report has proceeded in a manner informed by this stance. I have examined the apparently general practice for initiation of repair by recipients of problematic talk and the interactional constraints that underlie it, so as to provide a background for the description and assessment of the conduct of non-native speakers. For now, the latter part of the inquiry falls to someone else. In the future, we can hope that it will become possible for both parts of such juxtapositions to be implemented by the same investigator.

(Revised version received September 1999)

TRANSCRIPT SYMBOLS

(Adapted from Ochs *et al.* 1996: 461–5)

1. Temporal and sequential relationships

A. Overlapping or simultaneous talk

[Separate left square brackets, one above the other on two successive lines with
[utterances by different speakers, indicates a point of overlap onset, whether at
    the start of an utterance or later.
]   Separate right square brackets, one above the other on two successive lines
]   with utterances by different speakers, indicates a point at which two
    overlapping utterances both end, where one ends while the other continues,
    or simultaneous moments in overlaps which continue.

B. Continuous utterances

=   Equal signs ordinarily come in pairs—one at the end of a line and another at
    the start of the next line or one shortly thereafter. They are used to indicate
    two things:
    1 If the two lines connected by the equal signs are by the same speaker, then
       there was a single, continuous utterance with no break or pause, which was
       broken up in order to accommodate the placement of overlapping talk
    2 If the lines connected by two equal signs are by different speakers, then the
       second followed the first with no discernible silence between them, or was
       'latched on' to it.

C. Silence

(0.5) Numbers in parentheses indicate silence: (0/5) indicates 5/10 seconds of
       silence. Silences may be marked either within an utterance or between
       utterances.
(·)   A dot in parentheses indicates a 'micropause,' hearable but not readily
       measurable without instrumentation; ordinarily less than 2/10 of a second.

2. Aspects of speech delivery, including aspects of intonation

Punctuation marks are *not* used grammatically, but to indicate intonation.

.   The period indicates a falling, or final, intonation contour, not necessarily the
      end of a sentence.
?   Similarly, a question mark indicates rising intonation, not necessarily a
      question.
,   A comma indicates 'continuing' intonation, not necessarily a clause boundary.
¿   The inverted question mark is used to indicate a rise stronger than a comma
      but weaker than a question mark.
: :   Colons are used to indicate the prolongation or stretching of the sound just
      preceding them. The more colons, the longer the stretching. On the other
      hand, graphically stretching a word on the page by inserting blank spaces
      between the letters does *not* necessarily indicate how it was pronounced; it is
      used to allow alignment with overlapping talk.
-     A hyphen after a word or part of a word indicates a cut-off or self-interruption,
      often done with a glottal or dental stop.
<u>word</u> Underlining is used to indicate some form of stress or emphasis, either by

	increased loudness or higher pitch. The more underlining, the greater the emphasis.
word	Therefore, underlining is sometimes placed under the first letter or two of a word, rather than under the letters which are actually raised in pitch or volume.
WOrd	Especially loud talk may be indicated by upper case; again, the louder, the more letters in upper case.
WOrd	And in extreme cases, upper case may be underlined.
°	The degree sign indicates that the talk following it was markedly quiet or soft.
°°	When there are two degree signs, the talk between them is markedly softer than the talk around it.

Combinations of underlining and colons are used to indicate intonation contours, as follows:

_:	If the letter(s) preceding a colon is underlined, then there is an 'inflected' *falling* intonation contour on the vowel (you can hear the pitch turn downward).
:	If a colon is itself underlined, then there is an inflected *rising* intonation contour on the vowel (i.e. you can hear the pitch turn upward).
> < >	The combination of 'more than' and 'less than' symbols indicates that the talk between them is compressed or rushed. Used in the reverse order, they can indicate that a stretch of talk is markedly slowed or drawn out.
<	The 'less than' symbol by itself indicates that the talk immediately following is 'jump-started,' i.e. sounds like it starts with a rush.
hhh	Hearable aspiration is shown where it occurs in the talk by the letter 'h'—the more h's, the more aspiration. The aspiration may represent breathing, laughter, etc.
(hh)	If it occurs inside the boundaries of a word, it may be enclosed in parentheses in order to set it apart from the sounds of the word.
·hh	If the aspiration is an inhalation, it is shown with a dot before it (usually a raised dot).

3. Other markings

(( ))	Double parentheses are used to mark transcriber's descriptions of events, rather than representations of them. Thus ((cough)), ((sniff)), ((telephone rings)), ((footsteps)), ((whispered)), ((pause)), and the like.
(word)	When all or part of an utterance is in parentheses, or the speaker identification is, this indicates uncertainty on the transcriber's part, but represents a likely possibility.
( )	Empty parentheses indicate that something is being said, but it cannot be heard (or, in some cases, the speaker cannot be identified).
(try 1)/ (try 2)	In some transcript excerpts, two parentheses may be printed, separated by a single oblique or slash; these represent alternative hearings of the same strip of talk.

The core of this set of notational conventions was first developed by Gail Jefferson. It continues to evolve and adapt both to the work of analysis, the developing skill of transcribers, and changes in technology. Not all symbols have been included here, and some symbols in some data sources are not used systematically or consistently.

NOTES

1 In fourth position repair, an utterance (T1) by some speaker A is treated as adequately grasped by its recipient B who responds with an appropriate next turn (T2); that is, T2 is taken as appropriate by A who produces a next turn in the sequence—one positioned to be built on T2—which we will call T3. Upon hearing T3, B 'realizes' that T2 had been predicated on a problematic understanding of T1, and in the next position—T4—B offers a reanalysis of T1 or a new response to it based on such an analysis. A compact instance of this trajectory—compact in the sense that the four components occur in consecutive turns—accompanied the account of fourth position repair in Schegloff 1992: 1320–4:

(A) Schegloff 1992: 1321
M: T1→ Loes, do you have a calendar,
L: T2→ Yeah ((reaches for her desk calendar))
M: T3→ Do you have one that hangs on the wall?
L: T4→ Oh, you want one.
M: Yeah

But the components that make for fourth position repair need not occur in consecutive turns, and, as other turns intervene between these key ones, the distance between the repair initiation and what it targets as the trouble-source may grow and appear similar to something which might be termed 'delayed NTRI'. The incorporation of fourth position repair itself does not undermine the Schegloff *et al.* claim in 1977. Fourth position repair, while theoretically important, is so infrequent (and next-turn initiated repair so common) as to not seriously qualify the claim that virtually all other-initiated repair is initiated in next turn.

2 That is, since the time of her dissertation (Wong 1994).

3 Here is one potential interest of the possibility that non-native speakers (or any other category of speaker or situation, for that matter) recurrently produce the constructional forms for other-initiated repair in sequential positions other than next turn. Namely, that they thereby are at risk of being heard to target as the trouble-source something other than the problematic occurrence; specifically, that they are vulnerable to being heard to target something in the turn immediately preceding the one in which repair was actually initiated. If non-native speakers are in fact liable to such 'delayed' repair initiation, they are at risk of compounding the trouble in and by the very effort to address it.

4 The qualification 'in most instances' is meant to allow for those occurrences in which a second consecutive OI is designed to show that it targets as the trouble-source not the utterance targeted by the first OI but the utterance produced in response to that OI. In that case, of course, the M2 *is* in next turn after the trouble-source turn.

5 A distinct, though superficially similar, type of occurrence may be mentioned here, and that is the exchanges described in Egbert 1997, in which one recipient's initiation of repair is followed by, or partially overlapped by, other recipients' aligning initiation of repair on the same trouble-source. In such circumstances the subsequent repair initiations are not done as follow-ups to a prior one which did not adequately deal with the trouble, and are therefore not 'multiples'. They are rather echoes of, and alignments with, the first of the OIs, and are positioned in what might be termed 'second ''next turns'''. In another variant found in the database consulted for this report (216a), two OIs are articulated by different recipients targeting different aspects of the trouble-source turn. After the trouble-source turn speaker responds to one of these, the initiator of the unanswered OI repeats it, again obviously not in next-turn position, but again by reference to sequential considerations unrelated to the basic positioning of OI. And so also with another variant in which a similar course is pursued by a single interlocutor. In this exchange (76, 80), a new party has joined a conversation already in progress, and confronts turns filled with 'locally subsequent reference forms' (Schegloff 1996), largely anaphoric in character. The first utterance she hears after joining the conversation has

a number of such references (the utterance is, 'you'd fly off of it, at that speed'), and she directs OIs to two of them, one after the other. The second of these OIs is not in next-turn position, nor is it following up on an OI which *was* in next position. Still, a course of initiating repair on an utterance which was multiply problematic has been initiated in next-turn position, and its second OI is continuing an activity already launched.

6 Compare the special affinity of transition-space and third-turn initiated repairs with trouble-sources occurring at the *ends* of the turns in which they occur (Schegloff 1997a).

7 One anonymous referee wondered (as may some readers) 'why no mention is made here of Sue's repair initiation in line 7, which occurs before the target OI in line 9'. The main reason is because the OI at line 9 occurs later and targets a trouble-source which occurs earlier, thereby composing a clearer exemplar of the environment being explicated here. Were the OI at line 9 a subsequent OI in a multiple of which line 7 was an earlier component, then the exchange would belong in the preceding sub-section, concerned with multiples. But the OI at line 9 is addressed to a different trouble-source than is the one at line 7— the former locating 'these people that are reporting' (at line 1) as its trouble-source, the latter locating 'Canal Boulevard' at line 3 as its trouble-source, in both instances by incorporating resayings of the trouble-source in the repair initiator.

Because of the substantial 'distance' between TS and OI, Extracts 3 and 4 may resonate to some readers the possibility of analysis as fourth position repair. But a re-examination of Extracts 3 and 4 in conjunction with the account of fourth position repair in note 1 will show that there are not four turns present which stand in the relationship to each other which is constitutive of fourth position repair.

8 Here then there are incompatible demands on next turn—one grounded in turn-taking organization (mandating next turn to be taken by the selected next speaker), the other in repair organization (which locates next turn as the position for initiating repair by a recipient of the trouble-source). In this incompatibilty, the con-

straints of repair organization yield to those of turn-taking organization. Elsewhere, the opposite reconciliation has been described (Sacks *et al.* 1974: 720), in which the practice of a first-starting claimant for next turn getting the turn is superceded if the later-starting self-selecting claimant shows that the turn they mean to produce is a repair initiation—an OI being placed in NT position (cf. Extract 9 below for an exemplar). On reconciling competing claims of distinct organizations of practice, cf. Sacks and Schegloff 1979.

9 Jefferson and Schenkein (1978) treat such receipts as having sequential relevance comparable (if not equivalent) to second pair parts, though this may be restricted to particular sequential environments, of which the exchange in Extract 8 may not be an instance.

10 It should be noted that not all OI speakers do accomodate the contingencies of the sequence-in-progress. Consider, for example, Extract B, drawn from the therapy session with teenagers.

```
(B)      GTS 3:12 (222a)
01 Ken:        What's uh- what's-what' is his name
02     TS→     the-the- the new guy [(  )
03 Lou: OI→                         [Oh you got a
04             new guy?
05 Ken:        Ye[ah
06 Dan: TS→      [Jim Reed. Yes he came in last
07             week.
08 Ken:        Came in late,  [too.
09 Dan:                       [(  ).
10 Lou: OI→    LAST week? You weren't
11             supposed to have a [session-
12 Dan:                           [Two wee[ks ago
13 Ken:                                    [Two
14             weeks ago two weeks two weeks two
15              weeks.
16 Dan         I'm sorry,- Last time we met.
17             (You're very efficient this
18             morning.)
```

Note then that the trouble-source appears in a question (lines 1–2) addressed by Ken to Dan (the therapist), but Louise does not withhold the OI to allow the question to be answered. On the other hand, another trouble-source ('last week' at lines 6–7) which occurs in the reply to her first OI (note that Dan's 'yes' at line 6 marks his shift from answering Ken's 'WH-' question to answering Louise's 'yes/no' question) is

targetted by an OI (at line 10) which has been withheld to accomodate a second answer to her question (Ken's, at line 8), in effect treating Dan and Ken as co-members of a same party—a possibility treated briefly in the text which follows.

11 This occurs also in some instances of third-position repair (cf. Schegloff 1992: 1305–6).

12 See for example Zimmerman (1984) on what he terms the 'interrogative sequence'.

13 It represents as well one systematic inversion of the ordering of types of insert sequences in adjacency pairs. If one distinguishes 'post-firsts' (insert sequences directed to clarifying the preceding first pair part) from 'pre-seconds' (insert sequences directed to establishing information or conditions relevant to selecting or implementing one among alternative second pair part responses), then canonically post-firsts come before pre-seconds (Schegloff 1995b: 93–110). The practice described in the text here reverses that ordering.

14 Cf. Sacks' (1974) discussion of the relevance of laughing quickly after a joke's punch line to display a claimed grasp of its import and laughability, and the vulnerability of such claims to skepticism about a laugher's actual understanding of the laugh source.

15 A similar logic—relating talk which appears to be in the same turn to similar talk which appears to be in a next turn—is described in Schegloff 1997a, which examines transition-space repair and third turn repair.

16 Although both of these extracts have such a momentary hesitation before the articulation of what will turn out to be a trouble-source, this does not appear to be an invariant feature of this configuration, but happens to have occurred in two extracts which were convenient to use as exemplars for unrelated reasons.

17 It may, however, be worth calling attention to one constructional form for OI which especially highlights the dynamic described in the text. This is the constructional form which Sacks (1992: I: 652, 660–3) called 'appendor questions'. Its characteristic form is a single word or phrase, constructed to be grammatically continuous with the trouble-source (turn) after which it is placed. To cite as an example the one initially introduced by Sacks:

(C) GTS 4:3 (460)
```
01  Roger:  TS→  They make miserable coffee.
02  Ken:         hhhh hhh
03  Ther:   OI→  Across the street?
04  Roger:       Yeh
05  Ken:         Miserable food hhhh
                 (0.4)
```

'Across the street' is constructed as a possible continuation of 'They make miserable coffee'; by requiring reference to the latter for its analysis, it locates the latter as its target, and the latter's speaker as the selected next speaker. However, when further talk has been added to the trouble-source turn after the trouble-source TCU, then OIs constructed as appendor questions do not readily 'attach themselves' to the end of the trouble-source turn. Both participants and external analysts must then search out the place in the trouble-source turn where the appendor *does* attach itself, and seek there the trouble-source. For example, in Extract D, Mark has been asking Sherrie about preparations for her upcoming wedding.

(D) SN-4, 2:10:22 (547)
```
01  Mark:    ·hh So what've y'called any
02           other hotels 'r anything?
03           (0.2)
04  Sher:    Y:eah, I called the Embassader
05      TS→  'n stuff. I've got so much work
06      TS→  (that) I don't believe it. so I'm
07           j'st not even thinking about that
08           [°now.
09  Mark: OI→[In school yih me[:an?
10  Sher:                     [Yeah,
11           (0.2)
12  Mark:    Y'haven't been in school in five
13           weeks doesn' matter.
14  Sher:    hhmh hmh[hmh
15  Ruth:            [heh he[h heh heh
16  Mark:                   [mmh heh heh hi:h
```

'In school you mean' clearly is not grammatically fitted to the end of the turn at line 8. Rather, a search of the turn 'backward' finds as a first candidate trouble-source to which the appendor is appended 'I've got so much work'. The very recruitment of additional analysis mobilized by this form (in contrast, for example, to recognizing what has been repeated, or what elements in prior turn are instances of the category whose question word has been used) may underscore the talk added after the trouble-source's occurrence.

18 These occurrences are in keeping with observations in which initial responses are replaced not by OIs but by opposite responses, as in Extract E.

(E) TG, 4:12-16
```
01 Ava:        Oh I have thee- I have one
02             class in the e:vening.
03 Bee:   →   On Mondays?
04 Ava:   →   Y-uh::: Wednesdays.=
05 Bee:       =Uh-Wednesday,=
```

Note Ava's incipient agreement token at line 4, before shifting to a correction. Here too such precipitous problematic responses are agreeing or compliant, changed to disagreeing and resistant, rather than the other way around.

19 On the other hand, where disagreement is already in progress, continuing disagreement may occupy the early part of a turn which ends with an OI. In Extract F, Clara has recommended a certain lotion for Agnes' problem toe, and Agnes is rejecting it.

(F) NB 1:6:15 (260a)
```
01 Agnes:        W'l that's not therepeutic Clara
02               really, It says on the (0.4)
03               -thing, uh-theh-when yih- Uh this
04               proxide is uh kind of a- (0.2)
05               ·hhhhh
06 Clara: TS→   Whaddiyuh mean uh-th-uh doctors
07               use it,
08               (0.8)
09 Agnes:        ·hh W'l on the little jar it
10               says not therapeutic so,
11               (0.7)
12 Agnes:        Yih know what I mean? Ih doesn'
13               kill any::infection if I'm not
14               mistaken, I don' know.
15 Agnes: OI→   The doctors use it?
16 Clara:        Wul uh Doctor Hathaway gave it
17               to me,
18 Agnes:        ·hh This Revlon?
19 Clara:        Sure. Nail builder.
20 Agnes:        ·hhh
21 Clara:        [It's in that little-
22 Agnes:        [W'l at's wh't I ha:ve.
23 Clara:        -that little cream ja[:r.
24 Agnes:                              [Yeah.
```

Clara challenges Agnes' rejection at line 6 (on the use of this form of 'Whuddiyuh mean+X' as a challenge rather than as an OI, cf. Schegloff 1997b: 520–4). In the following turn, Agnes defends the position which Clara has challenged, but after four TCUs of defense, she shifts to an OI directed at Clara's challenge. Extract 22, which initially appears to be an exception to the claim in the text, may be understood by reference to such a continuing disagreement, apparent in the first turn in the extract.

20 Examining Jean Wong's data (Wong 2000) in light of these findings and their discussion, how shall we assess the claim of a commentator that what Wong was describing was common in 'native speaker's' speech as well? For the most part, what occurs in her materials is that the non-native speaker produces a receipt token ('Oh', 'uh huh') or assessment expression ('Wow') with turn-final intonation in the turn immediately following what is later treated as a trouble-source turn, and after some delay initiates repair on that trouble-source turn (see the example provided in the first paragraph of the present paper). In the roughly 350 specimens which I examined in preparing the present report (a substantially larger corpus than Wong's), only one would be correctly described by this account—if we understand the receipt token to be free-standing, that is, with 'final' prosody and with a silence after it, and with no intervening turns by others. In Extract G, two young women are talking on the telephone, one of them 6–7 months pregnant.

(G) Queen's College, 1:3
```
01 M:       So how much didjih gain altog[ther.
02 F:                                     [About
03          twenny or twenny one.
04 M:       Oh. That's not that ba:d.=
05 F: TS→   =Well I wz only supposetuh gain
06          twenny tw:o
07 M:       Oh.
08     (0.2)
09 F:       [But I-
10 M: OI→   [Altuhgether?=
11 F:       Yeah. hhhh
12 M:       O(h)(h)h [hhhh huh huh hhh
13 F:                [huh huh huh [huh
14 M:                             [Yih got a
15          couple 'a months t'g:o . . .
```

M's conduct at lines 7–10 is quite like the data which Wong describes (for example, like Chen's conduct in the exchange reproduced at the start of this paper). No other instances are. On the face of it, this

observation is at variance with the commentator's claim.

The fact that only one case from my corpus looks like Wong's data does not, of course, mean that this occurrence is 'infrequent' in any statistically rigorous sense; only that it occurred rarely in the subset of 350 exemplars which I examined out of the 1300 or so in my database, which itself has an unknown (and perhaps unknowable) relationship to whatever universe of occurrences would be the relevant one in understanding other-initiated repair. Until some rigorous notion of the relevant universe can be specified, and techniques developed for drawing serious random (or other specified) samples from it, we will need to limp along on the grounds of mere cogency. On such grounds, it appears that OIs following some receipt token as a prior turn unit are extremely rare in my corpus, and at least somewhat recurrent in Wong's. My corpus involves almost entirely native speakers; Wong's involves native English speakers talking with non-native speakers whose native language is Mandarin Chinese. Whether these categorical descriptions of the parties are demonstrably relevant to the parties and procedurally consequential for this phenomenon (Schegloff 1991) remains to be shown, but it underlies the claims for the interest of the candidate phenomenon.

Several other observations about the two corpora may be mentioned. In the database that I examined there are instances in which there are full-blown turns with responsive sequels between the trouble-source turn and the OI, and the OIs are thus 'delayed to a later turn' in a sense in which Wong's are not. On the other hand, Wong's materials include a number of instances in which turn-initial receipt markers are followed later in the same turn by OI, and this is one of the more common forms of 'delayed' OIs within next-turn position; however, in the native speaker materials these receipt markers are not ordinarily delivered prosodically as turn-final—as is the case in line 7 above, whereas in Wong's materials they are. Indeed, as Wong points out, in the native speaker materials (except for the instance reproduced above), the initial response to the trouble-source turn is self-interrupted in order to initiate repair, in contrast with their full realization in her corpus.

In my corpus and in Wong's as well, the OIs which follow some other initial (or incipient) response to the trouble-source turn are most likely to be candidate understandings (or 'understanding checks') of the trouble-source turn, that is, among the 'strongest' forms of OI, and are not likely to be such weak forms as 'huh?' or 'What?' or 'pardon me'. In both corpora, then, it appears that a problem of understanding in effect when a next turn is 'due' to be launched is overcome—whether a not-fully-achieved understanding (in her corpus) or an understanding later thought the better of (in mine), and an initial response 'tack' is replaced by an understanding check for the subsequently achieved understanding. It is the timing and form of the initial tacks and what transpires between them and their successors that invites further examination on a more substantial database and with more detailed and interactionally contexted analysis.

21 Though an uneven one. Whereas the organization of turn-taking or of repair, for example, appear so far to be stable across linguistic and cultural boundaries while being adapted to their specificities, practices for referring to persons (for example, Levinson 1988; Sacks 1972a, 1972b; Sacks and Schegloff 1979; Schegloff 1996) appear to be far more variable.

REFERENCES

Clark, H. H. 1996. *Using Language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, H. H. and S. E. Brennan. 1991. 'Grounding in Communication' in L. B. Resnick, J. Levine, and S. Teasley (eds.): *Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. 127–49.

Drew, P. 1997. '''Open'' class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation.' *Journal of Pragmatics* 28: 69–101.

Drew, P. and E. Holt. 1988a. 'Complainable matters: The use of idiomatic expressions in making complaints.' *Social Problems* 35: 398–417.

Drew, P. and E. Holt. 1998b. 'Figures of speech: Idiomatic expressions and the management of topic transition in conversation.' *Language in Society* 27.

Egbert, M. 1997. 'Some interactional achievements of other-initiated repair in multi-person conversation.' *Journal of Pragmatics* 27: 611–34.

Goffman, E. 1971. *Relations in Public: Microstudies of the Public Order*. New York: Harper and Row.

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

Jefferson, G. 1987. 'Exposed and embedded corrections' in G. Button and J. R. E. Lee (eds.): *Talk and Social Organisation*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd. 86–100.

Jefferson, G. and J. Schenkein. 1978. 'Some sequential negotiations in conversation: Unexpanded and expanded versions of projected action sequences' in J. Schenkein (ed.): *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction*. New York: Academic Press. 155–72.

Levinson, S. C. 1988. 'Putting linguistics on a proper footing: Explorations in Goffman's concepts of participation' in P. Drew and A. J. Wootton (eds.): *Goffman: An Interdisciplinary Appreciation*. Oxford: Polity Press. 161–227.

Ochs, E., E. A. Schegloff, and S. A. Thompson. (eds.) 1996. *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. 1972a. 'An initial investigation of the usability of conversational materials for doing sociology' in D. N. Sudnow (eds.): *Studies in Social Interaction*. New York: Free Press. 31–74.

Sacks, H. 1972b. 'On the analyzability of stories by children' in J. J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.): *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 325–45.

Sacks, H. 1974. 'An analysis of the course of a joke's telling in conversation' in R. Bauman and J. Sherzer (eds.): *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 337–53.

Sacks, H. 1987 [1973]. 'On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation' in G. Button and J. R. E. Lee (eds.): *Talk and Social Organisation*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters. 54–69.

Sacks, H. 1992. *Lectures on Conversation*. Two volumes. G. Jefferson (ed.), with Introductions by E. A. Schegloff. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks, H. and E. A. Schegloff. 1979. 'Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons and their interaction' in G. Psathas (ed.): *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington Publishers. 15–21.

Sacks, H., E. A. Schegloff, and G. Jefferson. 1974. 'A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation.' *Language* 50: 696–735.

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*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. 71–93.

Schegloff, E. A. 1991. 'Reflections on talk and social structure' in D. Boden and D. H. Zimmerman (eds.): *Talk and Social Structure*. Cambridge: Polity Press. 44–70.

Schegloff, E. A. 1992. 'Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided place for the defence of intersubjectivity in conversation.' *American Journal of Sociology* 95/5: 1295–1345.

Schegloff, E. A. 1993. 'Reflections on quantification in the study of conversation.' *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 26/1: 99–128.

Schegloff, E. A. 1995a. 'Parties and talking together: Two ways in which numbers are significant for talk-in-interaction' in P. ten Have and G. Psathas (eds.): *Situated Order: Studies in Social Organization and Embodied Activities*. Washington, DC: University Press of America. 31–42.

Schegloff, E. A. 1995b. *Sequence Organization*. Department of Sociology. UCLA: ms.

Schegloff, E. A. 1996. 'Some practices for referring to persons in talk-in-interaction: A partial sketch of a systematics' in B. A. Fox

(ed.): *Studies in Anaphora*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 437–85.

Schegloff, E. A. 1997a. 'Third turn repair' in G. R. Guy, C. Feagin, D. Schiffrin, and J. Baugh (eds.): *Towards a Social Science of Language: Papers in Honor of William Labov. Volume 2: Social Interaction and Discourse Structures*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 31–40.

Schegloff, E. A. 1997b. 'Practices and actions: Boundary cases of other-initiated repair.' *Discourse Processes* 23: 499–545.

Schegloff, E. A. and H. Sacks. 1973. 'Opening up closings.' *Semiotica* 8: 289–327. Reprinted in J. Baugh and J. Sherzer (eds.): *Language in Use: Readings in Sociolinguistics*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1984.

Schegloff, E. A., G. Jefferson, and H. Sacks. 1977. 'The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation.' *Language* 53/2: 361–82.

Wong, J. 1994. 'A conversation analytic approach to the study of repair in native-nonnative speaker English conversation: The element ''yeah'' in same turn repair and delayed next turn repair initiation.' Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Wong, J. 2000. 'Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/non-native speaker English conversation.' *Applied Linguistics* 21/2: 244–67.

Zimmerman, D. H. 1984. 'Talk and its occasion: The case of calling the police' in D. Schiffrin (ed.): *Meaning, Form, and Use in Context: Linguistic Applications*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. 210–28.