2   Ten operations in self-initiated, same-turn repair

Emanuel A. Schegloff

As part of a larger-scale effort to provide an analytic and descriptive account of the organization of repair in conversational talk-in-interaction,[1] this installment is addressed to a sharply demarcated, albeit substantial, domain, and one facet of the repair undertaken there. The domain is "self-initiated, same-turn repair"; the facet is the sorts of *operations* that get implemented there. What this leaves out is even more substantial: first, *other* loci of s*elf-initiated* repair (i.e., transition-place, third turn and third position) and the domains of *other-initiated repair*; second, within the self-imposed domain to be treated here, only the repair *operations* are to be taken up, and not other facets of these repairs, such as the *components* of the repair segments through which the operations are prosecuted, the *techniques* employed in accomplishing those operations, and the *systemic or interactional import* that may be understood to inform the doing of a same-turn repair in any given instance. These will be addressed in the larger work of which this contribution is but a part. Given the focus on "same-turn" repair, it may be useful to say a bit about what is meant by that phrase here.

2.1   The setting

It's a virtually automatic reflex to refer to the setting of our target phenomenon as "same turn" and to figure that we know what we mean by that. But I'd like to take a few paragraphs to sketch some of the main features it would be useful to have made explicit.

In common with many of the types of units employed by parties to talk-in-interaction, turns at talk have an *overall structural* organization and a *local* organization. In past writing on conversation analysis, the term "the overall structural organization" has ordinarily been followed by the phrase "of the unit 'a single conversation,'" but little has been said of other units to which "overall structural organization" might apply, which made it relevant to specify "a single conversation" as one such unit. The turn at talk is, I think, another such unit.

The most commonly realized overall structural organization for the turn in ordinary talk-in-interaction is a single turn-constructional unit (or TCU). This is so in large measure because of the way the turn-taking organization is made to

41

work by the parties to the talk – in particular, because of the transition-relevance of possible turn completion which is encountered as the first TCU is coming to possible completion. But we know that transition does not *always* occur there, that both the current speaker and potential next speakers can contribute to the outcome (whether actual transition or not), and that those contributions to the outcome can occur at various places in the developing course of that first TCU. We also know that the several TCUs that can come to occupy a multi-unit turn can be related to each other in various ways: they can constitute a story-telling, a list, an argument, an extended description, components of distinct sequences, and many others. And we know that which of these multi-unit, intra-turn relationships a current turn is the site of can be projected from its outset, can develop over its course, or both. These are instances of what I am calling the overall structural organization of the unit "a single turn," but so is the single TCU turn an instance of a turn's overall structural organization, and it too can be signaled or projected from its outset, at least in English.

The analytical contrast with "overall structural organization" is "local organization," which can apply at various levels of granularity in the composition of a turn. Applied to traditional, familiar, almost vernacular units like words, phrases, and clauses, or to other construction types that appear to set the terms for speakers' production and recipients' on-line analysis, grammar is one local organization of TCUs, whatever form that grammar takes – whether Asian, Indo-European, Romance, Semitic, Slavic, etc. Applied to sub-lexical units, local organization can relate syllables, components sounds, components of those components, and so forth. This is not simply a *pro forma* recognition of different specializations in a sister discipline; it will bear directly on the understanding of same turn repair in the text to follow.

So, to sum up, a turn at talk can in principle have an *overall structural organization*, expandable to include a number of TCUs of various sorts or limited to a single TCU, and a *local organization* that operates from sub-unit to sub-unit as the TCU or the turn progresses. Speakers and recipients are closely oriented to both of these orders of organization, and continuously project from what has transpired so far to what the alternatives are for what might be coming up next. That is to say, the talk implicates for its participants both *macro*-projection and *micro*-projection:

- macro-projection concerns what sort of TCU this is and where in it we now are; and, if a multi-unit turn, what sort of multi-unit turn this is, what shape or trajectory such a project takes, and where in that shape or trajectory we now are;
- micro-projection concerns what kind of construction this is, and what it makes relevant next; what kind of word and what that projects for next word; what kind of sound and what that projects for what might follow.

I do not mean to suggest that local organization is exclusively grammatical, phonological, or in other ways linguistic-y; it can include how places or persons should be referred to or re-referred to, how story-tellings should be constructed, and all the other things that get done in TCUs and their turns.

As I understand it, the basic dynamic of talk and other conduct in talk-in-interaction is directional and progressional toward possible completion of whatever units compose the several orders of organization in play at any given moment. What is due next is some possibly relevant next sound, next syllable, next word, next action, etc., and the parties' orientation to progressivity is organized by reference both to macro-projection of the overall structural organization of the turn and any given TCU in it and at the same time by reference to the local organizations that move the talk and other conduct forward bit by bit by reference to their order of granularity. The macro-projections are always realized by progress at the local, bit-by-bit organization; the local organizations and micro-projections are tailored, shaped and interpreted by reference to the developing project of the overall structural organization currently in the works.

This is how I understand the TCUs and turns that are the environment for same-turn repair. The first thing to be said about same-turn repairs is that they are overwhelmingly (but not exclusively) same-*TCU* repairs. The second thing to be said is that, in one way or another, they intervene to *interrupt the progressivity of the talk*. And now on to the limited focal topic on the agenda of this chapter: same-turn repair *operations*, where these assertions can be grounded in some data.

2.2   Operations

As far as I can now make out, there are ten main types of operation which speakers employ to deal with some putative trouble-source in an ongoing turn-at-talk in conversation or to alter it in some interactionally consequential way. Instead of the conventional use of nouns like "replacement," "insertion," and the like, I have opted for action terms like "replacing," "inserting" and the like to emphasize that these are *operations* that speakers carry through – that they *do*, not pre-packaged products that they select. The downside is awkward neologisms when referring to more than one instance of such an operation – "replacings," "insertings," and the like, for which I beg your tolerance and forgiveness. Here they are, with a few exemplars of each:

2.2.1   *Replacing*

The term "replacing" is meant to refer to a speaker's substituting for a wholly or partially articulated element of a TCU-in-progress another, different element, while retaining the sense that "this is the same utterance," as in examples 1–3:[2]

(01)   TG, 7

```
01    Bee:        .hh Yihknow buh when we walk outta the cla:ss.=
02    Ava:        =nobuddy knows wh't [wen' on, ]
03    Bee:                            [Wid– .hh]  h=
04    Bee:        =Li (hh) ke wu– .hh Didju n–  Didju know what he wz=
05                talking about didju know wh't [structural paralysis=
06    Ava:                                       [dahhhhhh !
07    Bee:        =was I sid no I sid but we're supposetuh know what it
08         –>     is (fuh Weh–) .hh yihknow fuh  tihday's [class.  'n,
09    Ava:                                               [.hhh Mmm.
10    Bee:        He nevuh wen' o:ver it 'n, t!  .hhhh
```

(02)   TG, 3

```
01    Bee:        Becuz they're gonna do the operation on the teeuh
02                duct.  f [ f i :   r s ] t. Before they c'n do=
03    Ava:                 [Mm–hm,]
04    Bee:         =t [he cata] ract  ]s.
05    Ava:            [Right. ]Yeah,]
06    Bee:        .hhh So I don'know I haven:'t yihknow, she wasn' home
07         –>     by the t– yihknow when I lef'fer school tihday.=
08    Ava:        =Mm hm,
09    Bee:        Tch! .hh So uh I don't kno:w,
```

(03) Debbie and Shelley, 3

```
01    Deb:        =you go,becu:z »I mean« that's what Jay Tee told me
02                you told hi:m¿
03    Shl:        w'll that's what– when I called him I told him that I
04                didn't have the money ar that ((he–/kee–)) Mark can't
05                go becu:z o:f work.
06    Deb:        mmh[m
07    Shl:           [that's why he can't go: , . hh an I said b–to be
08                real honest with you: I have to decide do I wanna
09                spend this money becuz if Mark was goin .hh he was
10         –>     gonna pay fer- fer m– alot of it, cause he won money
11                playing footba:ll.
12    Deb:        uhuh
13    Shl:        So: it w's like awright fi:ne, I'll let you: buy my–
14                my plane ticket, that's not a problem
```

So in example 1 at line 8, what was starting to be "We[dnesday's] class" is replaced by "today's class"; in example 2 at line 7, what was well on the way to "by the t[ime]" is replaced by "when;" and in example 3 at line 10, what was on the way to "for m[e]" (or "for m[ost of it]") is replaced by "for a lot of it."

Let me use these three exemplars to make several points:

(1) Replacings need not be the same sort of linguistic or grammatical object as the trouble-source being replaced, but they *can* be. In example 1, incipient "Wednesday" is replaced by "today" – word for word; in example 2, an incipient phrase is replaced by a word; in example 3, an incipient word is replaced by a phrase.

(2) The replacing may repeat elements of the turn-so-far just preceding the trouble-source (as with the "for" in example 1) or not, as examples 2 and 3; it may also repeat elements *following* the trouble-source (if any). Such repeats can serve recipients as one sort of resource for locating what is being treated as a trouble-source or alterable by "framing" it.

(3) Another such resource for locating the trouble-source is the "sort of thing" the replacement is, which can indicate "that sort of thing" as what is being replaced. So in example 1, where we already have a frame to serve as resource, we have one term for naming a day replacing another; in example 2 we have one temporal reference replacing another; in example 3 … we *do not*! Here, the replacement is a quite different object than what it is replacing; it is also not framed by preceding or following elements of the turn-so-far.

(4) Finally, we can note that in each of these exemplars, the trouble-source or alterable (or some part of it) has been prematurely terminated – in each case by a cut-off, that is, some version of a stop.

With these initial four observations, we have temporarily abandoned the topic of this chapter – *operations* of same-turn repair, in order to register (however informally) at least a sense of other, equally important aspects, to be addressed elsewhere. These include several components of the *technology* for doing same-turn repair – the cut-off as one way of initiating repair, and "framing" as a component of the repair segment usable to locate the trouble-source or alterable; and we have alluded to some *systemic or interactional issues* which the repair can be understood to deal with – in example 1 that one refers to "the day one is in" not by its name but as "today" (this is one sort of "systemic" issue – a word-selectional one), and in example 3 mitigating the potential crassness of the economic motivation of Shelley's withdrawing from the outing because the boy friend, in not going, was the loss of her meal ticket (this is one sort of interactional issue).

So now we return to the other nine operations, with only occasional excursions from that commitment.

2.2.2   *Inserting*

A second operation is as straightforwardly named as the first: a speaker inserts one or more new elements into the turn-so-far, recognizable as other than what was on tap to be said next, as in examples 4–6:

(04)   Joyce & Stan, 4

```
01    Sta:        And fer the ha:t, I'm lookin fer somethi:ng uh a
02          –>   little different.   Na– uh:f: not f : : exactly funky but
03               not (.)  a  r-regular   type'a .hhh >well yihknow I  I<
04               have that other hat I wear.  yihknow?
05    Joy:        Yeah,
```

(05)   TG, 10

```
01                 (0.5)
02    Bee :  –>   °(I 'unno   ) /° (So anyway) .hh Hey do you see v– (0.3)
03          –>   fat ol' Vivian anymouh?
04    Ava :       No, hardly, en if we do:, y'know, I jus' say hello
05               quick'n,
```

(06)   Virginia, 31

```
01    Wes:        (Momma) / (Mom ha') you been readin' her mail ag'in?
02               (0.2)
03    Wes:        hhhhhhh! [huh huh| huh (huh [huh]
04    Pr?:               [e  h  hh!| huh hah  [(hah)
05    Mom:                                [^We:sley?
06               (0.5)
07    Mom: –>   What is thuh  [m:– in thuh wo:rlds's 'uh matter with=
08    ???:                    [((sniff))
09    Mom:        =[you?I don't read her ma:il¿
10    ???:          [mt
11    Wes:        Oh you don't?
12               (.)
```

In example 4, Stan inserts "exactly" before "funky"; in example 5, Bee inserts "fat ol'" before "Vivian"; and in example 6, Mom inserts "in the world" before "is the matter." In each case the speaker has articulated the first sound of the element before which the insert is to be inserted, and has then initiated repair – by a cut-off on that sound as in example 5, by a sound stretch on it as in example 4, or both as in example 6.

Excursus: The domain to which this volume and its several chapters are addressed is, as the title announces, "repair." In vernacular English, something in need of (or the object of) "repair" is defective – broken, inadequate, ill-suited, the source of trouble (hence "trouble-source"), or, most generally, "repairable," that is, subject to being fixed.

On the whole, this terminology has served us well. But in undertaking an overview of work in this area, the terminology seemed to me to under-represent a whole domain of objects and operations of repair. If I may invoke an analogy from the craft of tailoring clothing, a suit that someone tries on may be torn at the underarm; this is a trouble-source and is in need of repair.

But it happens as well that there is nothing "wrong" with the outfit, but the tailor remarks that it would be more flattering to the wearer if the lapel was a tad narrower. If agreed, the undertaking would be termed an "alteration"; it is not that something was wrong and had to be fixed, but it could be better realized by an "alteration."

And so it is in talk-in-interaction: a speaker may find that saying the thing they are in the course of saying could be better realized by this-or-that change, and when they undertake it, they are not so much "repairing" as they are "altering." The operation of "inserting" is one environment in which "altering" is found (as is the operation of "parenthesizing" taken up below): a speaker stops the TCU-in-progress and repeats it or part of it, but incorporates an additional word or phrase. To be sure, it is possible that the added word was in fact "missing," and the turn was on the way to being defective. But not always. Consider, for example, the exchange in example 5 just examined (and reproduced below) between two college young women who live in the same neighborhood but have apparently drifted apart. At one point, Bee asks Ava about another girl whom they both knew in the past:

(05) TG, 10

```
01               (0.5)
02   Bee:  ->  °(I 'unno   )/°(So anyway)  .hh Hey do you see v– (0.3)
03         ->  fat ol' Vivian anymouh?
04   Ava:      No, hardly, en if we do: , y'know, I jus' say hello
05             quick'n,
```

Here, Bee is on the way to asking "Hey do you see Vivian anymore?" – a perfectly well-formed inquiry of the sort she uses in other inquiries. In stopping to insert "fat old," Bee is not necessarily addressing a trouble with her turn-in-progress – a "repairable." She could well be incorporating the reference form that she and Ava always used to refer to Vivian in days gone by, and thereby be invoking – and inviting Ava to participate in reviving – the camaraderie of the past. Not then a tear in the underarm, but a narrowing of the lapel; not fixing a trouble, but using the turn to invoke a past intimacy; not a repairing of a trouble-source, but an enhancing with an alteration. In the text that follows, where appropriate, I will gradually incorporate the terms "alteration" and "altering" for what some "repairs" are being addressed to.

2.2.3   Deleting

A third operation is as straightforwardly named as the first two: a speaker deletes one or more elements already articulated in part or fully in the turn-so-far. Deletings are far less common than most of the repair operations we have so far encountered. All of the ones that I have collected involve deleting one word (if "it's" is treated as one word), as in examples 7–9:

(07) TG, 9

```
01    Bee:       Ih wz, I don'know what I'm gunnuh do. hEn all the
02               reading is from this one book so f(h)ar the(h)t I
03               haven' go(h)t!
04    Ava:       hhhhhhhh!
05    Bee:       ˙hhhh So she tol' me of a place on Madison Avenue 'n
06               Sevendy Ninth Street.=
07    Ava:       =M[mm.
08    Bee:  –>      [tuh go en try the:re. Because I als– I tried Barnes
09               'n Nobles 'n, (0.6) they didn' have any'ing they don'
10               have any art books she tol' me,
11    Ava:       Mmm
```


(08) Auto Discussion, 25

```
01    Cur:                       [No in a little snowmobile that's
02               a little bit too fast.
03    Gar:       No well that's nothin. They're duhposetuh go a hunnerd
04               'n twunny a hunnerd'n[twunny five miles'n hour. (   ),
05    Car:                            [°(Scuze me),
06    Cur :  –>  That's still That's too fas[t.
07    Gar :                                 [That['s too fast.
08    Mik :                                      [Ain' no way I'd get
09               inna snowmobile going that fast.
```


(09) Coffee Chat, 8

```
01    Ric:       This lady's been in ruh– –real –estate– (0.3) uh she's
02               been a teacher–  (1.1) an' what else?
03               (.)
04    Ric:       You've been a number uh things,
05               (0.2)
06    Bet:       °.p° Insurance agent,
07    Ric:       Insurance?
08               (0.3)
09    Bet:       Store manager,
10               (.)
11    Bet:  –>   [Name anything I've done it, I can even run=
12    Tom:       [Kuh–
13    Bet:  –>   =thee:: ˙hhh/(1.1)
14    Bet:  –>   I can run thuh– –elevator. hh heh heh [heh heh
15    Tom:                                             [Hav–
16    Tom:   [Ever been in newspaper business?=
17    Bet :  [heh heh
```

In example 7 an almost completed "also" is deleted; in example 8, it is "still" that is deleted.[3] And in example 9, the "even" is deleted, perhaps because it treats the activity being named as of lesser standing.

2.2.4   Searching

Then there is searching. Past CA literature referred to "word searches," but that turns out to be too restrictive. Sacks noticed that a great many search-ings fell into two types, which he termed "precises" and "delicates," both of which Gene Lerner has been collecting and working on as an offshoot of his work on joint production (Lerner, 1991, 1996, 2004). Names are particularly common targets of "precise"-type searches, however transient – names of people (even close relatives, even ones sitting at the same table), places, businesses, and the like, as in example 10's search for the name of the Plaza Theater.

(10)   Joyce & Stan, 5

```
01    Joy:         Why don'tchoo: go into Westwoo:d, (0.4) and go to
02                 Bullocks.
03                 (1.2)
04    Stn:   –>    Bullocks? ya mean that one right u:m (1.1) tch! (.)
05           –>    right by thee: u:m (.) whazit the Plaza? theatre::=
06    Joy:         =Uh huh,
07                 (0.4)
08    Stn:         °(memf::)o
09    Joy:         °Yeah,
```

But the characteristic features of searching – its technology – may be employed when the source of the problem is quite unclear, as in example 11, where the search is for the very thing which has prompted its speaker to preempt first topic from the caller.

(11)   TG, 01

```
01    Ava:         H'llo:?
02    Bee:         hHi:,
03    Ava:         Hi:?
04    Bee:         hHowuh you:?
05    Ava:         Oka:::y?hh=
06    Bee:         =Good.=Yihs[ou:nd  ]  hh
07    Ava:   –>              [<I wan]'dih know if yih got a–uh:m
08           –>    wutchimicawllit. A:: pah(hh)khing place °th's
09                 mornin'.˙hh
10    Bee:         A pa:rking place,
11    Ava:         Mm hm,
12                 (0.4)
13    Bee:         Whe:re.
14    Ava:         t! Oh: just anypla (h) ce?  I wz jus' kidding yuh.
15    Bee:         Nno…
```

More often than not, if the target is not a recognizable "precise," it is a "delicate," as it is shown to be in example 11 when the searcher eventually allows that she was "just kidding."

And there are searches that follow interruptions or side-tracking – what I will call "resumption searches, or searchings," as in example 12, which allows us to see and hear how precise can be the retrieval of exactly where the side-tracking had intervened.

(12)   TG, 17-18

```
01      Ava:              [Maybe you wanna come downtuh school] see what the
02                        new place looks like,
03                        (0.5)
04      Bee:      Yih may:be. (N)a::[h,  b't I  hadn'─ ]
05      Ava:  ─>>                    [You c'n come innoo] a cla:ss with
06            ─>> m[e.
07      Bee:          [I haven' thought about that la(h)tely hh huh eh─
08                    [huh!
09      Ava:      [Why donch[a I mean you won' haftuh do any]thing,
10      Bee:                   [.hh    You    know   I   wu-u-u ] I wonder
11                    if Do:nna went back tuh school, i'z=
12                    =[I wz curious tuh  know, ]
13      Ava :      [ I n─ Y'know─ Fridays is] a funny day. mMost a' the
14                    people in schoo:l, ˙hh that's why I only have classes
15                    on Tuesday en Fri:day ˙hh (0.3) °u─ one cla:ss, because
16                    most a' them have o:ff those days. Yih kno[w like if=
17      Bee :                                               [Ye::h,
18      Ava :      =yih kuh work yer schedule out that [way=I cuutn't.
19      Bee :                                            [Right.
20                    (0.7)
21      Ava :      Tch! But if you wanna-uh:m (0.2) come in en see.
22      Bee :      Tch! I wouldn' know wheretuh look fuh her(hh) hnhh─
23                    hnh [h!˙hh
24      Ava :  ─>      [Well you know, you know, come along with me,
25                    (0.7)
26      Ava :  ─>  A:nd uh:m,
27                    (0.7)
28      Ava :  ─>  °Wuhwz I gonnuh say.
29                    (0.7)
30      Ava :  ─>> You c'n come in the class with me, it's a logic class=
31                    =I think yih gonna see a pitcher o:n on something good
32                    tomorruh in that class anyway so it's n[o ha:ssle,
33      Bee :                                               [°Nnh,
34      Ava :      ˙hh 'T's only f'f'fty minutes anyway,
35                    (0.6)
```

Here we can see that Bee can access at least roughly (line 24) the last thing she said (line 5) before the diversion of the talk (lines 10–23), but cannot then resume what that earlier utterance was leading up to, yielding the overt "searching" utterances (lines 26 and 28), then retrieves what preceded the diversion more precisely (line 30, redoing the earlier line 24).

2.2.5   *Parenthesizing*

Not all parentheticals are engaged in dealing with possible trouble in the talk, but they *can* be deployed for such use (Mazeland, 2007). Like insertings, they add to the turn-in-progress something other than a next-due element; *unlike* insertings, they are ordinarily composed of clausal TCUs, and are implemented by different practices – by a different "technology" – than is found with insertings. Parenthesizing can be interpolated into a turn-constructional unit and be contained there, as in example 13, where Shelley registers her awareness that she may be telling something she has already told to her interlocutor, and resumes the telling directly after having done so (by returning to the pre-parenthetical talk).

(13)   Debbie and Shelley, 1

```
01    Deb:                          <it's not causeuh:m (0.5) Mark's
02                      no*t going*.
03    Shl:        no– well that wuz initially and then I'm like no:
04                      I'll just go and then uhm yaknow this- this tow
05                      bandit (·) thing that I have, that were doing,
06          ->    [he w]a:nts me: I– >I don't know if I tol' you this, <
07    Deb:              [mmhm]
08    Shl:   ->   he wants us to come out to his house and do:, ˙hh like
09                      spend a whole day o:n putting everything together
10                      cause we don't get the shit done while were at work=
```

Or it can invite – or at least make room for – uptake or response by the recipient, as in example 14, in which Kathy explains to friends Rubin and Frieda what she meant by saying of a weaving of hers that it "wove itself once it was set up."

(14)   KC–4, 16

```
01    Rub:        Whaddyou mean it wove itself once it w's set up.=
02                      =[What d's that] mean.=
03    Kat:        =[ O h   i –  ]
04    Kat:        =Well I mean it's ve:ry simple, (˙hhh)
05                      (0.8)
06    Kat:   ->   It's exac[tly the same in the we]:ft as it is in the=
07    Dav:                      [ She also means th't–]
08    Kat:   ->   =warp.
```

```
09                    (0.2)
10    Kat:   –>    That is if the warp has sixteen greens an two blacks
11                    an two light blues and two blacks an sixteen greens
12           –>    an: sixteen blacks on sixteen blues an so on, ˙hh
13           –>    y'know the warp are the long pieces.
14                    (0.5)
15    Fri:   –>    Mhhm
16    Kat:          The weft has exactly tha:t.
17    Fri:          Yah.
18                    (0.5)
```

Having used the technical weaving term "warp" (at lines 6/8 and 10), she stops before completing her account to anticipate and preempt a possible trouble in understanding by explaining what the term means, and waits for them to register their understanding before continuing and completing her account.

And in example 15, the teller of the story, Mike, figures his interlocutors already know about the character in the story he is telling (or, at least, treats them as already knowing it), and uses a parenthetical (at lines 4–5) to articulate it as a point that will heighten the impact of the episode he is describing.

(15) Auto Discussion, 7

```
01    Mik:          [But in ne meantime it'd cost Keegan three spo:ts'nnuh
02                    feature.
03    Cur:          Yeah¿
04    Mik:   –>    So, boy when Keeg'n come in he– yihknow how he's gotta
05           –>    temper anyway, he js::: °wa:::::h sc[reamed iz damn
06                    e:ngine yihknow,                      [
07    Cur:                                                [Mm
08                    (0.5)
09    Mik:          settin there en'e takes iz helmet off'n clunk it goes
10                    on top a' the car he gets out'n goes up t'the trailer…
```

2.2.6   Aborting

I use this term in its contemporary senses, which I quote from the Encarta World English Dictionary: "to bring something to an end at an early stage; to end a space flight or similar mission before it is completed; to abandon a computer program, command, or operation before it has finished." There are two different orientations to a TCU which is left uncompleted: one takes the form of abandoning what was being said altogether, at least for the time being; the other takes the form of abandoning the way in which the TCU-so-far was saying or doing the turn's project in favor of another

way of getting the same undertaking done. Examples 16 and 17 provide instances of the second of these practices; examples 18 and 19 provide instances of the first.

In example 16, Sherrie has asked Mark (at line 1) about the identity of a girl she had seen in their dormitory, and Mark's first try (at line 4) is a canonical recognitional reference form, recipient-designed for someone taken to already know *about* this person who simply did not recognize her (Sacks and Schegloff, 1979; Schegloff, 1996). Sherrie's response (at line 6) disclaims such knowledge, or, at least, the adequacy of that reference form in activating it.

(16)   SN-4, 08

```
01    Shr:        Who w's the girl that was outside
02                   (his door¿)/(the store¿)
03                   (0.8)
04    Mrk:        Debbie.
05                   (0.8)
06    Shr:        Who's Debbie.
07    Mrk:        °(Katz.)
08                   (0.7)
09    Mrk:  ->a₁  She's jus' that girl thet: uh:, (0.2)
10          ->a₂  ˙hh I met her through uh:m::, (1.0)
11                I met 'er in Westwood.=I (caught that–) (•)
12                'Member I wenttuh see the premie:r of (0.3)
13                Lost Horizon¿ [(            )
14    Shr:                      [I DID'N KNOW YOU did,=
```

So at line 9, Mark launches another try, still a recognitional – on the way to being a recognitional descriptor (Schegloff, 1996), but part of the way into it, he thinks the better of that mode of approach as well, and he *abandons* it, aborting that TCU-in-progress, marked as "a₁" in the transcript. Then he launches another try, one which gives up on a recognitional reference to the target person, but tries to link her to someone Sherrie knows, still trying to incorporate an element of recognitiality in the person reference; but as he arrives at the moment for delivering that intervening person reference, he again thinks the better of it, and again *abandons* the effort, again aborting the TCU-so-far at "a₂" in the margin, and launches yet another effort, this time apparently not a recognitional reference.

In example 17, ten-year-old Kalin calls to his mother (who is engaged with her daughter Beth on something else) about a splinter he has been trying to remove, with no success.

(17)   Fish Dinner, 29

```
01    Kal:        Hey mo::m, ((from the stairs))
02                (.)
03    Mom:        Aloe an' [vitamin E an' whatever.
04    Kal:                 [I (      uh ) splinter (in)
05    Bet:        Which one [should I have.
06    Kal:                    [but .hh
07    Kal:        when I used thuh tweezers, I even did it really ha:rd¿
08    Mom:        What [happened.
09    Kal:  –>          [It's- It's just (.) too:, It's just (.) too:
10          –> uhm (buh [it's) barely op[en skin.
11    Be:                 [Kalin.      [Kalin.
```

At line 9, he tries several times to explain the problem but apparently cannot find the right word(s) to describe it (perhaps "deeply embedded"?), abandons that way of describing it and launches a new TCU – clearly different, but, as clearly, addressing the same undertaking in a different way.

On the other hand, there is example 18, previously examined for another issue as example 14.

(18)   KC–4, 16

```
01    Kat:        It wove itself once it was set up.=
02    Fre:        =It's woo:l?
03    Kat:        It's wool.
04                (0.8)
05    Rub:        Whaddyou mean it wove itself once it w's set up.=
06                =[What d's that] mean.=
07    Kat:        =[ O h  i –     ]
08    Kat:        =Well I mean it's ve:ry simple, (ˑhhh)
09                (0.8)
10    Kat:        It's  exac[tly the same in the we]:ft as it is in the=
11    Dav:  –>              [ She also means th't–]
12    Kat:        =warp.
13                (0.2)
14    Kat:        That is if the warp has sixteen greens an two blacks
15                an two light blues and two blacks an sixteen greens
16                an: sixteen blacks on sixteen blues an so on, ˑhh
17                y'know the warp are the long pieces.
18                (0.5)
19    Fre:        Mhhm
20    Kat:        The weft has exactly tha:t.
21    Fre:        Yah.
```

Now we are focused on lines 8–12. Rubin, you will recall, had asked Kathy what she meant by saying of her weaving that "it wove itself once it was set up." At line 8, Kathy delivers what will turn out to be a "topic sentence," to be

unpacked in what follows, but a long silence of (0.8) at line 9 ensues at what is a possible completion point of a TCU and, therefore, transition-relevant. Her husband Dave appears to have been waiting for the silence to reach the (1.0) second mark that Gail Jefferson (1989) found to be the "standard maximum silence" in conversation before starting to add to Kathy's account, but Kathy had just started (0.2) of a second earlier, and so they find themselves in overlap. Kathy is multiply entitled to this turn position because (1) the question being responded to was addressed to her, so she is the selected next speaker, (2) she is the authority on the matter at hand, and (3) she was the first starter. Still, Dave persists for five syllables, and then yields by *abandoning* the utterance he had begun, aborting the turn-so-far before possible completion. Here, then, the TCU is simply abandoned, with no effort to try it again or try it differently.

Example 19 should, by now, be recognizable as yet another installment of this exchange – just after Kathy has completed her explanation in lines 1–2.

(19) KC–4, 17

```
01   Kat:          =˙hhh So once I'd set up the wa:rp,  (0.8) it was very
02                 simple to jus keep– jis to weave it.
03                  (1.0)
04   Kat:          You know,=
05                 =[(                    )]
06   Dav:   ->     [B u t– (·)  b u t] listen tuh how  long  it  ]
07   Rub:          [In other words,] you gotta string up thee:–]
08                 you gotta string up thee: colors, is that it?=
09   Kat:          =Ri[ght.]
10   Rub:             [ I  n][ thee:] in thee: [warp. ]
11   Dav:               [°yeh°]        [      ]
12   Kat:                               [Right.]  Right.
13                  (0.2)
14   Dav:   ->     Buh listen tuh [how lo:ng it took to put in the–]=
15   Kat:                         [A n d  th e  e a c h  w e f t–]
16   Dav:   ->     =the:– the wa:rps. [(though)]
17   Kat:                            [ A n d  ] then each we:ft, y'know
18                 then I did– I s– my warp was strung up. so that  [I had
19                 (each colors.)
```

When Rubin (who had requested the explanation) is slow to register it at line 3, Kathy (after the one-second silence) starts up again, once again trailed by Dave at line 6, but now Dave's competition is not so much Kathy as it is Rubin, the asker of the question who now wants to check his understanding of the answer (at line 7), and once again Dave yields to the protagonists of the sequence, *abandoning* the line he is taking and aborting the turn before reaching possible completion. (We return to this exchange following example 23 below.)

2.2.7   *Sequence-jumping*

Although similar in several respects to aborting, sequence-jumping invites separate treatment. As we have seen, in aborting, the abandonings are followed by a different effort or tack to achieve the same result, and may pause before doing so, or give up the production of the turn with no further ado. By contrast, the specimens examined here follow abandonment of the TCU-so-far by turning sharply to something unrelated to the turn and sequence in progress, and do so with either no break or hardly any break at all. In fact, the shift to an altogether different matter marks this repair practice as quite distinctive; although the repair is initiated and carried through in a single turn by its speaker, what is getting repaired is the sequence to which the turn is contributing. The TCU which is cut-off by the repair-initiator belonged to the sequence in progress at the turn's start; the repair that follows the initiator either launches a new sequence (as in examples 20 and 21) or addresses something said by an interlocutor in the just prior turn which is thereby treated as the start of a new sequence (as in example 22).

Example 20 is drawn from the KC-4 materials drawn upon previously. Rubin and Frieda who are dinner guests at Kathy and Dave's (the women are long-time friends) have in the past given Kathy and Dave access to their country home outside the city; Frieda has just been explaining that they have recently also given access to the home to other friends with an invalid mother, but hastens to reassure them that they (Kathy and Dave) can still use the house.

```
(20)   KC–4, 14

01     Rub:         They don mind honey they're jus not gonna talk to us
02                  ever again.=
03     Dav:         =(hehem)/(ri:(h)ight)
04                   (0.8)
05     Kat:         We don mind <[we jus ne:ver gonna talk to you e:ver=
06     Dav:                     [(No, b't )
07     Kat:         =(hh heh)
08     Rub:         heheheheh
09     Kat:         [No::] that's awright
10     Fre:         [So::]
11     Dav:         [(                              )]
12     Fre:         [You know what we're gonna–] in fact I'm– she I
13          –>      haven't seen her since I spoke to you but I'm going to
14          –>      talk to=*what a you making¿*
15                   (0.2)
16     Kat:         It's a –bla:nket.
17     Fre:         Did yu weave tha[t yourse:lf]
18     Kat:                         [ I  w o  : : ]ve this myself.=
```

A longish silence sets in, broken by Rubin's intendedly ironic (we must assume) turn at lines 1–2, addressed to his wife Frieda but meant for Kathy and Dave. Kathy registers the joking/ironic intent by repeating Rubin's utterance with an upgrade (from "not … ever" to "never … ever"), and then (at line 9), with a joke-to-serious "no" (Schegloff, 2001), offers an unconvincing assurance, "That's all right." So here they are in this uncomfortably sticky situation, with Frieda finding herself extending it further still at lines 13–14, when she notices a piece of woven goods. And then, she escapes by running the TCU-in-progress from "but I'm going to talk to" (with the next words most likely projectable as "her" or "them") directly into "What are you making," thereby shifting from one sequence to an altogether different one.

In example 21, Arthur and Rebecca are two twenty–thirty-year-olds looking to "make it" in Hollywood; Arthur has called to record a conversation for his friend at UCLA who is taking this course on conversation. Once they get past that, they talk respective careers. Arthur has tentatively accepted a job offer from the entertainment company and TV network ABC and is looking it over to make a final decision, and has been describing what he has seen at ABC.

(21) Arthur and Rebecca, 3

```
01    Art:        =A:nd uhm: .hhh an then there's all these editing
02                ro:oms for (.) thirty-five millimeter an' seventy
03                millimeter stuff?
04    Reb:        °Hmm
05                   (0.8)
06    Art:        s– big (0.2) you know w– (0.6) all these ro:oms,
07                   (0.6) and um so: it's jus kinda interesting.
08                   (1.0)
09    Art:        Um:: (0.4) so I c'n certainly lea:rn from it.
10                   (0.3)
11    Reb:        Eh::ye:ah,
12    Art:        A:nd um: it's not a bad place to be (0.5) becuz
13       ->       it's real– (.) ya know I got humming birds no:w?
14                   (0.2)
15    Reb:        What?
16    Art:        I(h) .hh I have hu:mming birds.
17    Reb:        Oh::: gre:at, [You should get a fee:der.
18    Art:                      [°Yeah,
```

The uptake from Rebecca has been desultory at best, and ironic when not at its best. Arthur has made a number of tries to show he's done, but Rebecca does not pick up the clues, and keeps on feeding him continuers (for example, at lines 4, 11), not to mention the silences in between them. And

then, at line 13, the *escaping* here (as in the previous instance) via doing a noticing where otherwise the next element of a TCU-in-progress was due, but was aborted.

Finally, in example 22, after about thirteen minutes of conversation about school, and mutual acquaintances, Bee launches what could be an invitation or arrangements-making sequence with the query, "So yih gonna be arou:n this weeken'?" (it is a long "Presidents' Day" four-day weekend – at least for Bee). To this possible pre-invitation Ava replies with a problematic response – almost a minute full of commitments and possible involvements, and hardly encouraging a pursuit of a get-together, though not precluding it. On its completion, Bee responds (lines 1–2) by mentioning the possibility of "seeing" Ava if she's around:

(22)   TG, 16

```
01   Bee:                              [Well if yer arou:nd
02              I'll probably see y(hh)ou hn[hh! ˙hh
03   Ava:                              [Why, whuts (Bob doing)
04   Bee:       Uh–u–uh:: goin o:ff::
05   Ava:       Where's he goin.
06   Bee:       To Wa:shin'ton,
07   Ava:       Oh.
08                (0.7)
09   Bee:       He asn' been there sih-since Christmas  [so:. hHe's
10   Ava:                                               [Mm.
11   Bee:       going.
12                (0.5)
13   Ava:       Yeh w'l I'll give you a call then tomorrow.when I get
14              in 'r sumn.
15                (0.5)
16   Bee:       Wha:t,
17   Ava:       <I'll give yih call tomo[rrow.]
18   Bee:                               [Yeh: ]
19   Bee:       'n [I'll be  ho:me  t'mor]row.
20   Ava:          [When I–I get home.]
21   Ava:       I don't kno–w– I could be home by–˙hh three, I c'd be
22              home by two [I don't] know.]
23   Bee:                   [ Well ] when ]ever. I'll poh I-I might
24              go t'the city in the mo:rning any[way,
25   Ava:                                        [It depends on how
26        –>   (tough the)=*So what time y'leaving f'the city,*
```

After hearing that Bee's boyfriend will be away, Ava makes a responsive gesture to the prospect of getting together, offering to call Bee when she gets back from school, and alerting her to the indeterminacy of that call (lines 13–14), and then again at 20–22, with an incipient account for the

indeterminacy due (very likely) to the traffic, at line 25 when her hearing/ parsing of what Bee has just said about going into "the city" (New York) in the morning registers, and she jumps from the sequence she was adding to (about when she would call Bee upon returning from school) to a new possibility that has just materialized for meeting with Bee in the morning, and at lines 25–26 Ava jumps from the one sequence to pursue the other.

2.2.8   Recycling

The term "recycling" refers to a speaker's saying again some stretch of talk – almost always less than a full TCU – that they have previously said, ordinarily *just* previously said. Recycling has various uses, of which I'm sure I understand only a few.

One that we have already encountered is the use of recycling to frame a repair: a replacing framed by a recycled "for" in example 01; an inserting framed by a recycled "is the" in example 06; a deleting framed by a recycled "I" in example 07, and another framed by a recycled "That's" in example 08; a solution to a search framed by a recycled "a" in example 10, and so on. In these instances, the recycled element(s) *figure* in the repair segment but *not* as the repair *itself*; they are resources, but not the product, and there are other such applications.

But recycling can be a repair operation in its own right. One site in which recycling regularly serves as the repair operation itself is at the emergence of a "surviving turn" from overlap with another, as in example 23.

(23)   KC–4, 07

```
01    Rbn:        Well thee uhm (·) (a paz) they must have grown a
02                culture.
03                  (0.5)
04    Rbn:        You know, (·) they must've  I mean how lo– he's been
05                in the hospital for a few day:s, right?
06                {(1.0)/˙hhh}
07    Rbn:        Takes a[bout a week to grow a culture,]
08    Kay:  –>          [ I don think  they  grow  a    ] I don think
09          –>    they –grow a culture to do a biopsy.
10    Rbn:        No::. (·) They did the biopsy while he was on the
11                –table.
12    Kay:        Nononono. They did a frozen section. when he
13                [was on the tab[le.
14    Rbn:        [Right,        [( )
15    Kay:        But they didn't do the– it takes a while to do a
16                complete biopsy.
17                  (0.8)
```

Here Kathy and Rubin are talking in overlap, and just as Rubin comes to the possible completion of his turn (at "culture"), Kathy withholds production of the next element due in *her* turn-so-far, and instead recycles the turn-so-far from its beginning. Getting it said "in the clear" is designed to deal with whatever trouble in hearing or understanding accompanied its involvement with simultaneous, and potentially competing, talk by another, including in particular trouble in hearing or understanding *by that other* (cf. Schegloff, 1987 [1973]).

But how is this different from the exchange in example 19, where Dave says "But listen to how long it" at line 6 in overlap with Rubin, and then a moment later, at lines 14–16 recycles it and brings it to possible completion (this time in overlap with Kathy)? It was offered in our earlier discussion as an instance of *abandoning*; why not of *recycling*? Or why is the first saying here in example 23 *not* said to be an instance of abandoning? Timing is all! When Dave withdraws from the competition in example 19, it is without any assurance that he will get a chance to say it again; who knows what direction the talk will take in the aftermath of the turn to which he is yielding? At that point, he is abandoning that saying. When the opportunity presents itself later to try again, he does so, and his doing so can be heard by the other parties to the interaction as his recycling of something that he had abandoned earlier. But in example 23, Kathy can be heard to be stopping the advancement of her TCU *by virtue of* the ending of the competing talk, and so she can be heard, *not* as *abandoning* that talk, but as gearing up to get it said in the clear. It is, then, a *recycling* from the get-go, and the recycling is here the *star* of the repair show, not a secondary supporting role.

When previously articulated talk is recycled, the second saying may diverge from the first in various respects. Note, for example, that in example 23, "grow" is produced at markedly higher pitch in the recycle that in the first saying. It is a judgment call whether such variance is the designed point of the resaying or not – a judgment call in the first instance for the recipient(s), and in the second instance for the external analyst. In including this data extract in the set of exemplars for recycling, I reveal, and rely on, my judgment that the variance is not the point of the repeat; if it were, it should be included in the data set for replacings. I will return to this point in a moment.

Before that, I want to register the resistance of many occurrences of recyclings to analysis – at least so far, at least for me.[4] I've included some instances below to share my frustration with readers ("rcl" indicates "recycling;" "rpl" indicates "replacing").

(24)   TG, 09

```
01    Bee:          B't I still have one more book tuh buy I can't
02                  get it,
03                  (0.8)
04    Bee:          °So uh,
05                  (0.6)
```

```
06    Bee:   –> rcl   I don'know.The school– school uh, (1.0) bookstore
07                    doesn' carry anything anymo (h) uh,
08    Ava:            Mno?hh
09    Bee:            No, I don'know I guess (inna) spring term they don'
10           –> rcl   order ez– y'know many books ez they–they– really are
11                    suppo:se   to.
```

(25)   Concert Tickets, 5

```
01    Al:    –> rcl   Okay. I'll– I'll find out: what I can tomorrow when
02           –> rpl   I go to the– (.) thee uh (.) office et UCLA:: and
03                    I'll give you a call if I:– know anything mo:re.
```

(26)   Automobile Discussion, 21

```
01    Cur:   –>       Well? see I don't know any, I wouldn'know what–
02           –> rcl   (0.4) what dimensions t'even start tuh give'em.
03                    (0.4)
04    Cur:            Wouldn'know what t'hell eed want.
05    Gar:            Go down nere'n measure hi:s. ˙hh
06                    (1.0)
07    Mik:   –>       They use to u[ h  :  ,      ]
08    ???:                         [(C'mmere.)]/((clears throat))
09                    (3.0)
10    Mik:   –> rcl   They use to uh, (0.4) ˙hh make'm any way y'know they
11           –> rcl   use to go up'n get'em fer the (0.5) fer the stock
12                    cars out there.
13                    (0.4)
```

So, in example 24 I have nothing cogent to say about the recycling of "school" at line 6 or of "they" at line 10, and the same for the recycling of "I'll" in line 1 of example 25, or of "what" at lines 1–2 in example 26, of "They use to uh" at lines 7 and 10 in example 26 (including the "uh"!), or of the "fer the" at line 11.

On the other hand, we have example 27. Notice that at line 01 there are virtually identical productions of "he's," followed by a recycling of the entire run-up to that word issuing in a heavy stress of "he's."

(27)   Debbie & Shelley, 4

```
01    Shl:   –> rcl   So: I mean it's not becuz he's– he's– I mean it's
02           –> rpl   not becuz he:'s not going, it's becuz (0.5) his
03                    money's not: (0.5) funding me.
04    Deb:            okay,
```

This is no passing variance; this has been an effortful, and initially failed, commitment to give "he's" the heightened stress that will make of it the point of reference for a subsequent contrast ("not HIM, his money!"). So this re-production is *not* a recycling; it is a *replacing* – no less so because it is in the *prosody* rather than in the *lexicon* that the replacing is to be found.

With this explication in hand, we might return to example 25, where we previously registered the recycling of "I'll" in line 1, and focus for a moment on line 2. Here we have the article "the" recycled, or *do* we? The second saying is not "the," it is "thee"; and we can recall the beginning of Jefferson's "Error correction" paper of 1974, and wonder what was going to be the consonant-initial next word after "the," that got replaced by the vowel-initial "office," and the vowel-initial "uh" before it (perhaps nothing more than "box-office"!). Is this, then, an opaque recycling, or a potentially consequential (and mostly hidden) replacement?

2.2.9   Reformatting

The starting point for the operation of reformatting is grammatical. In example 28 at line 12, what starts out as a declarative ("Well Beth [got to work …]" or "Well Beth [didn't have to wait …]") is reformatted as a negative interrogative ("Didn't Beth get to work …"), the shift being accomplished by using "didn't" as a pivot – the next word of the initially started TCU, the first word of the reformatted TCU.

(28)   Virginia, 5

```
01    Vir:       ˙hh Beth gets all the clo:thes.
02               (.)
03    Mom:       Well: –Beth (.) spends her own money on her clothes.
04               (0.7)
05    Vir:       <Well if I got more money °I could spend my own
06               mon[ey.
07    Mom:          [But Beth works.
08    Vir:       Wull why can't I::?
09    Mom:       Beh– oh:, Vuhginia, we've been through this. When
10               you're old enough you ca:n work in the store.
11               (0.2)
12    Vir:   –>  ˙hh Well Beth didn' Beth get tih work b'fore she was
13               sixteen?=
14    Mom:       =No::! I'd– (0.2) I would let her wrap presents an'
15               packages et Christmus an:'– °times we needed
16               somebady.° ˙hh >But people just don't want< (0.4)
17               chu:ldren (0.2) waiting on[('um).
```

In example 29 at lines 5–6, what starts as a WH-question is reformatted as a Y/N question done as an assertion plus tag.

(29)   TG, 04

```
01    Bee:       So, <I got some lousy cou(h)rses th(hh)is te(h)e(h)rm
02               too.
03    Ava:       Kehh huh!
04    Bee:       ˙hhh[h  m–   ]
```

```
05    Ava:   ->       [W–whe]n's yer uh, weh– you have one day y'only
06           ->    have one course uh?
07    Bee:          mMo[nday en Wednesday:[s right.] That's ] my=
08    Ava:             [˙hhhh              [ O  h.  ] that's– ]
09    Bee:          =linguistics course [hh
```

And in example 30, at lines 9–12, a simple declarative ("I hope X") is reformatted into a cleft- or pseudo-cleft construction ("What I hope happens is …"), a reformatting that is promptly reversed by reformatting back to the simple declarative – "I hope that they announce …"

(30)   Concert tickets, 3

```
01    Jim:          Well I dunno: –I ̄ ordered two: sea:ts.
02    Al:           You did,
03    Jim:          Ye:s.
04    Al:           Did you order rese:rved seats?
05    Jim:          I just said give me two seats plea:se and he said
06                      ̄well the computer will pick them out for you
07                  si:r–  ((mimicking voice)) ['n (heh heh)
08    Al:                                [And it'll mail it to you
09                  and even if it–
10    Jim:   ->    Right. Now see– .hhh I– I wwhut I ho:pe happens is
11           ->    that [I hope=
12    Al:                [(    )
13    Jim:          =that they announce another sho:w like at (.) the
14                  universal amphitheater or something,
```

The reversal does not blunt the relevance of addressing as an issue what such a reformatting can be understood to have been about in the first place.

But there are other forms of reformatting that are not grammatical, and may appear to be some other form of repair. Example 31 comes after a fair amount of bickering at the dinner table about Virginia's insistent request for an increase in her allowance, parried by Mom's insistent queries about what she needs it for, as in line 1 of the extract.

(31)   Virginia, 22

```
01    Mom:       If I could see what you did with your money,
02                 (0.3)
03    Vir:       You want me to write you a: a little list¿every
04                w[eek(?)
05    Mom: ->      [I: would– (.) that would be great.
06                 (0.5)
```

This elicits from Virginia an offer to keep written track of how she spends her money – an offer that exceeds Mom's wildest dreams. She can barely contain herself as she begins to respond, "I would …" almost certainly on the way to "I

would LOVE THAT!" But she stops and initiates what could be taken for a replacement of "I" by "that," framed by the recycle of "would." Might we entertain the possibility that this too is a reformatting, not grammatical but *perspectival* – making the focus not "Mom's pleasure" but "Virginia's suggestion"?

Whatever we make of that particular possibility, it is the tip of a larger issue, and that is the need to distinguish between what I will call *first- and second-order operations*.

First-order operations are the basic operations a speaker may bring to bear on the TCU-in-production at any moment in its development: There are, as far as I can make out, seven of them: replacing, inserting, deleting, searching, parenthesizing, aborting, and recycling. These are what I am calling "first-order" operations: they name the basic, *prima facie* job being done on the TCU-or-turn-in-progress.

By "second-order operations," I mean repairs which *could* be understood in the terminology of the first-order operations, but whose analysis would have missed the point if left at that. Even without getting into the interactional import of the repair, we need to see (as the *co-participants* need to see in the first instance) that the basic or first-order repair operations are being used to bring off a *different* repair operation altogether. Sometimes the interactional import is grounded in the first-order repair operation; sometimes we (and the recipient, in the first instance) will miss the point without grasping the second-order operation, which is the proximate source of the interactional upshot. Reformatting is one such second-order operation, and taking the repair in example 30 to be nothing other than the replacement apparent on the surface would miss the perspectival reformatting that is being implemented by it.

In example 30, we could see only that there has been an inserting of "what" before the "I," and there has. But here the inserted object serves to reformat the turn from what had started as a straightforward statement of hope – "I [hope that they announce another show …]" to the "cleft" or "pseudo-cleft" construction – "What I hope happens is …" To stop at seeing it as an *inserting* will miss the point, as would treating the repair in example 31 as a simple replacement: the replacement is the vehicle for another, second-order operation. The tenth and final operation that I am aware of – which I am calling "reordering" – also gets used both as a first-order and as a *second-order* operation.

2.2.10   Reordering

Reordering is an operation speakers can use when trying to work out the order in which elements of a turn-in-progress should be arrayed.

As a first-order operation, it serves to re-order elements of a TCU-in-progress. In example 32, at line 8, Bea is on her way to saying "you just never saw such devotion" when she hears coming out of her mouth "you never just"; what follows is a resaying with the out-of-order elements reordered.

(32)   SBL 1:1:10:R

```
01    Rse:         An'it– (0.3)   An'it left'er (0.4) quite permanently
02                  damaged °I s[uppose°
03    Bea:                       [˙tk
04    Bea:         Uh:pparently,
05                  (·)
06    Bea:         Uh –he is still hopeful
07    Rse:         The husb'n.
08    Bea:  –>     Ah hah end yih never jus' (·) eh yih js' never saw
09                 such devotion in your li:fe …
```

And in example 33, at line 4, an interviewer talking on the telephone to a "guest" on a radio talk show asks the guest, "But do you get alway-," catches the problem and redoes the TCU with the elements reordered.

(33)   Sidnell, 2006: 8

```
01    Ans:         if you: w:–watch any of the briefings
02                 you'll see that:– ahm: usually one of
03                 the la:st people to get called on,
04    Que:  –>     But do you get alway– d'you always get
05                 called on?
06    Ans:         not always, no.
```

But the second-order operation of reordering operates not on words in a TCU, but on TCUs in a turn, and the first-order operation by which it is brought off is not reordering but replacing.

In example 34, Vic, who is a janitor in an apartment building in New York, is recounting his confrontation with a tenant who has admitted that his son broke a window in a neighboring building, the glass of which Vic has cleaned up for his friend, James – the janitor of that building. Vic has just finished reporting the confession and his (Vic's) asking whether the kid got hurt.

(34)   Upholstery Shop, 1

```
01    Vic:         ˙hh I caught the gu::y, I said wo:w the son'vabitch
02                 who did this=So dih gu:y says tuh me, – –th' guy says
03                 tuh me–˙hh my son [didid.
04    Ric:                          [Wuh/(jeh)/(de ) do:.=
05    Vic:         =I said did, he, get, hurtch.  He said no, only a li'l
06                 bid'v a cut.  ˙hh So I sez, ˙hh wa:l whuddiyou goin do
07                 about this 'e sez oh dih soopuh ul clean it up,
08                  (0.3)
09    ???:         hhheh
10    Vic:  –>     So I sez. I zez–˙hh he sez– ˙hh I sez well haddidih
11                 happen.
12                 He says tuh me:, …
```

Inspection of the talk on line 10 of example 34 might suggest that we have here two replacings – "I" replaced by "he" and then "he" replaced by "I" – both replacings being framed by the recycling of "sez." But the issue here is not who said the utterance about to be reported; it is, rather, what should be the next thing told in the recounting – what the tenant/perpetrator said or what Vic said. The repair operation is, then, concerned not with replacing one word with another, or one TCU with another, but with the optimum ordering of the TCUs that compose the telling. Although the first-order operation is replacement, it is there to implement the second-order operation – reordering the tellables that compose the storytelling.

Example 35 offers another case in point. At line 1 we find Bee apparently doing two consecutive replacements.

(35) TG, 07

```
01    Bee:   ->   =Oh he–he's too much.He doesn't– en he put– they put
02           ->   us in this gigantic lectchuh hall.
03    Ava:        Mmm.
04    Bee:   ->   Tch! An::! (0.2) He doesn't speak- (0.2) very lou:d
05                anyway.=
06    Ava:        =Mm hm,
07    Bee:        Tch! An:', bo:y oh boy hhhhihhhnh! ˙hhhh!
```

First, she cuts off the turn-so-far "He doesn't-" and apparently replaces the "doesn't" with "put," framing the replacement by recycling the "he." Second, she cuts off the "put" and apparently replaces the subject of the predicate "he" with "they," framing the replacement with a recycling of the "put." Now it appears she figures that she's got it right, and runs the TCU-as-now-reconstituted to possible completion.

The account I have given so far is meant to approximate what a recipient could make of this in real time. The initial "he doesn't" has been buried under two rounds of replacings – first targeting the verb, then targeting the subject or agent. But then, at line 4, the "He doesn't" re-appears, and the TCU that starts that way now goes to possible completion.

Here again what appear at first to be replacings end up being what I am calling reorderings, and what is getting re-ordered are the TCUs that compose the turn. Bee finds that making her point will be well served if her account of the instructor's soft voice is delivered into an already-characterized very large lecture hall, and her repair is designed to re-order the several TCUs that will have composed her turn. The payoff is the "anyway," which serves to underscore the total upshot of what is now a gestalt.

And in example 36, what might appear initially to be the inserting of a "This" before the "is" that had started to be said after the initial "hello" also turns out to be a *reordering* – in this case of sequences and sequence types.

(36)   ID,   Openings, 233

```
01   Irn:          Hello:
02   JM:    ->     Hello. Ih– This is Jan's mother.
03   Irn:          Oh yes.
04   JM:    ->     Is Jan there by any chance?
```

Irene is the mother of a fourteen-year-old daughter whose friend Jan is visiting in their home. The caller is Jan's mother, who was apparently starting to ask to speak to her daughter; I take the "Ih-"in line 2 to be the start of the "Is" at line 4. Jan's Mom has decided to first identify herself so as to ground the legitimacy of her request before making it, and the consequence is a *reordering* of the two sequences.

A final observation on re-ordering: as noted earlier, unlike most of the other operations we have examined, reordering can be a repair operation on the *turn*, not the TCU. It is, of course, initiated within a TCU, but, by the time it is done, what has been repaired is not the TCU in which it was launched, but the ordering of the several TCUs that compose the turn. And, once registered explicitly with respect to *reordering*, we can be alerted to the possible relevance of other of the operations to repair of a *turn*, as well as repair on a *TCU*. For example, searching can also be a repair operation on the turn, as is the case for the "resumption searches," as in example 12.

And a final observation on first- and second-order operations: having been introduced in the context of the last two operations discussed here (reformatting and reordering), it is worth making explicit that it applies to more than these two operations. Whatever gets done by some repair operation addressed as a first-order operation, the result invites inspection (by co-participants, and therefore by us as analysts) for what second-order operation it may implicate. One exemplar will have to suffice.

Mark has dropped in on fellow students Sherrie, Ruthie and Karen in their dormitory room. Some question has been raised about his contact with reality in light of recent drinking binges – in the turn just before example 37 concerning what day of the week it is; Sherrie has just pointed out that it is Monday.

(37)   SN-4, 15

```
01   Shr:     As in we had cla:sses tuhday?
02            (0.2)
03   Mrk:     Oh well I was si:ck.
04            (0.2)
05   Shr:     [Oh. ]
06   Mrk:     [Y'kn]ow.
07            (·)
08   Mrk:     (t's) whu I told the lady thet I work– (0.2) yihknow
09            up on campus.
```

```
10                  (0.8)
11    Mrk:  ->   Called 'er 'n I t– well a:ckshilly I told 'er thet– my
12                 best friend hed gotten: the measles.
13                  (0.4)
14    Mrk:        Sh' s'd– "Oh that's TE:rrible. (·) W'l you better stay
15                 in an' re:st." So I said "Yeah I [sure better,"
16    (?):                                         [hhh
17                  (·)
18    Mrk:        I didn't tell'er I wz sick I jus' said my best friend
19                 [had the mea:sles.=
20    (?):        [hunh
21    Shr:        =˙HHH Djiju tell'er you 'ad symph athih– sympathy
22                 pai[ns for'm?
23    (?):           [(°heh)
24    Mrk:        h(h)h No. I din' tell'er anyth(h)ing. ˙hhh
25                  (0.8)
26    Mrk:        S'I got outta w:orking anyway. hhh
27                  (1.4)
```

At line 11, Mark appears to be doing an inserting of "actually" before the incipient "I t-[old her …]" which was destined to be "I was sick," as is shown at line 18. But "actually" has, among its diverse usages (Clift, 2001, 2003), an alert that a replacement is possibly upcoming, and this is in fact what it is being used to do here. So, in this case, the cut-off is used to launch an inserting, and the insert is being used to launch (and announce the launching of) a replacement of what had been about to be said (and is later reported) by what was in fact the case.

The upshot, then, is that the second-order operation being implemented by a first-order repair operation need not be either reformatting or reordering; it can itself be one of the operations introduced earlier as first-order operation.

2.3   Closure (for now)

These, then, are ten recognizable and recurrent repair operations initiated in the same turn, and almost always in the same TCU, as the talk they show themselves to be addressed to. There may well be others awaiting recognition and inviting description. But the account provided in these pages addresses but one aspect of same-turn, self-initiated repair – the operation(s) being performed. It is incomplete without an account of the resources that bring these operations into recognizable form – what speakers do to provide for recipients the recognizability of a repair operation of type X. And it is incomplete without an account of the interactional work any given instance of any of these repair operations can be understood to be doing in context. The

first of these is striking for how a very few practices of talking make possible such a range of operations. The second of these is striking for how diverse are the environments and interactional outcomes which these very few operations achieve. Both of these missing parts will have to be found elsewhere.[5]

REFERENCES

Clark, H. H. and Fox Tree, J. E. (2002). Using *uh* and *um* in spontaneous speaking. *Cognition* 84: 73–111.

Clift, R. (2001). Meaning in interaction: the case of "actually." *Language*, 77(2), 245–291.
    (2003). Synonyms in action: a case study. *International Journal of English Studies* 3(1), 167–187.

Drew, P., Walker, T. and Ogden, R. (this volume). Self-repair and action construction.

Fox, B., Wouk, F., Hayashi, M., Fincke, S., Tao, L., Sorjonen, M. -L., Laakso, M. and Hernandez, W. F. (2009). A cross-linguistic investigation of the site of initiation in same-turn self-repair. In J. Sidnell, ed., *Conversation Analysis: Comparative Perspectives*, pp. 60–103. Cambridge University Press.

Jefferson, G. (1974). Error correction as an interactional resource. *Language in Society* 2: 181–199.
    (1989). Preliminary notes on a possible metric which provides for a "standard maximum" silences of approximately one second in conversation. In D. Roger and P. Bull, eds., *Conversation: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*, pp. 166–196. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Lerner, G. H. (1991). On the syntax of sentences-in-progress. *Language in Society* 20: 441–458.
    (1996). On the 'semi-permeable' character of grammatical units in conversation: conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff and S. A. Thompson, eds., *Interaction and Grammar*, pp. 238–276. Cambridge University Press.
    (2004). The collaborative turn sequence. In G. H. Lerner, eds., *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*, pp. 225–256. Washington, DC: University Press of America.

Mazeland, H. (2007). Parenthetical sequences. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 1816–1869.

Raymond, G. and Heritage, J. (this volume). One question after another: same-turn repair in the formation of yes/no type initiating actions.

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

Schegloff, E. A. (1987[1973]). Recycled turn beginnings: a precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organisation. In G. Button and J. R. E. Lee, eds., *Talk and Social Organisation*, pp. 70–85. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
    (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*, pp. 437–485. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

(2001). Getting serious: joke -> serious "no" *Journal of Pragmatics* 33:12, 1947–1955.

(2009). One perspective on *Conversation Analysis: Comparative perspectives*. In J. Sidnell, ed., *Conversation Analysis: Comparative perspectives*, pp. 357–406. Cambridge University Press.

(2010). Some other "uh(m)"s. *Discourse Processes* 47: 130–174.

Sidnell, Jack (2006). Repair. In Jan-Ola Ostman and Jef Verschueren, eds., *Handbook of Pragmatics 2006*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Wilkinson, S. and Weatherall, A. (2011). Insertion repair. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 44(1): 65–91.

NOTES

1 A volume in preparation to be published by Cambridge University Press with the title *Repair Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis II*, to appear. A version of the material included in the document you are reading was presented at a conference on repair organized by Jack Sidnell at the University of Toronto, March 2008; I am grateful to its participants for their comments, questions, and suggestions, as I am, as well, to Geoff Raymond and Tanya Romaniuk for helpful suggestions for greater clarity in the penultimate version of the text.

2 The arrows point to the relevant lines in the extracts, where italics and bold face will take over. The thirty-seven data extracts that appear in the text are drawn from sixteen different sources, including both audio and video recordings and involving forty-one different participants. Digitized files of audio and/or video data can be accessed at: www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/schegloff/sound-clips.html.

3 For good reason – it makes no sense. Having said about a snowmobile going 80 mph that it's "a little bit too fast" (lines 1–2), he's then told it can go 125 mph, so *of course* that will be too fast; it would only be "*still* too fast" if the second number was *lower* than the first! Here again, then, we can take note of the interactional job being done.

4 Fox et al. (2009) propose that recycling may serve to provide a beat of delay in coping with some production problem, a proposal which I call into question in the same volume (Schegloff, 2009) on various grounds, among them: a) the failure to differentiate recycling as a frame for another type of repair operation and recycling as itself the repair operation, and b) the absence of any account of the difference between recycling and other practices of delaying such as silence and "uh(m)" which regularly occur in the same environments (Clark and Fox Tree, 2002; Schegloff, 2010), as can be seen in examples 24–26.

5 See, for example, Wilkinson and Weatherall (2011), Drew, Walker and Ogden (this volume), Raymond and Heritage (this volume) and perhaps others in this volume, as well as the volume promised in note 1.