SISR OPERATIONS

Preface: a lot of the text in this document is copied (either verbatim or slightly altered for readability) from the following sites and some of their sources:

<https://emcawiki.net/Self-initiated_self-repair>

<https://emcawiki.net/Same-turn_self-repair>

<https://emcawiki.net/Self-repair>

<https://emcawiki.net/Third_turn_repair>

<https://emcawiki.net/Third_position_repair>

<https://emcawiki.net/Self-repair_operation>

Important to remember: practices of SISR aren’t limited to dealing with actual errors, but can also be used to “fine-tune the turn” – to adjust the speakers words to better match their intention. For example, not only can the words be changed to change the meaning, but also emphasis on words, change of tone etc.

SISR can occur:

1. Within the turn containing the trouble source
2. At the TRP, i.e. after the speaker finishes their sentence
3. After next turn: at the third turn
4. After next turn: at the third position

**Operations of self-repair in same-turn**

For English talk-in-interaction, Schegloff (2013) reports on ten repair operations speakers use for dealing with trouble within the current turn, which will be listed below.

He also posits that seven of them - replacing, inserting, deleting, searching, parenthesizing, aborting and recycling – are **first-order operations**. These focus on the immediate task being performed in the ongoing turn.

**Second-order operations** (reformatting, and maybe sequence-jumping?) involve repairs that COULD be explained by first-order operations, but understanding them solely in that way misses the broader context (e.g. is the speaker replacing a word to be clearer in what they mean, or are they reformatting their speech to change the perspective of it? – see reformatting below).

Reordering is the only one (that Schegloff mentions) that can be both a first- and second-order operation.

The first- or second-order doesn’t explicitly matter for coding the interactions, however, they are important to keep in mind - it is VERY important to be aware of the context, and not take a self-repair at face value!

***Replacing*:** speakers substitute the whole trouble-source turn or a part of it with another item

*Example 1*: “we’re supposed to know what it is for Wedn- for **today’s** class”

*Example 2*: “She wasn’t home **by the t-** y’know **when** I left for school today”

*Example 3*: “he was gonna pay **for m-** **for a lot of it**” (either ‘me’ or ‘most’)

* replacing may repeat elements just preceding the trouble source
* the trouble source, in these examples at least, is prematurely terminated, cut off before its finished.
* replacings don’t need to be the same kind of linguistic/grammatical object as the trouble-source being replaced, but they CAN be (e.g. in Example 1 a word is being replaced by a word; ex. 2 a phrase is being replaced by a word; Example 3 a word is replaced by a phrase)
* a way to locate the trouble source is looking for the same kind of “thing” that’s being replaced; e.g. in Example 1, Wednesday is replaced by today – a type of day. In example 2, a temporal reference is replacing another. In example 3, it is an amount, assuming the word is most (however schegloff says “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.” – could be hes thinking the replacement is for the word “me”)

***Inserting*:** speakers add one or more items in their ongoing trouble-source turn (cf. also Wilkinson & Weatherall 2011);

*Example 1*: “and for the hat, I’m looking for something uh a little different. Not fu- **exactly** funky but not a regular type…”

*Example 2*: “hey do you see V- (0.3) **fat ol’** Vivian anymore?”

*Example 3*: “What is the- **in the world is** the matter with you?”

* in each of these, the speaker has articulated the first sound of the element before the insert is to be inserted
* think of it as ALTERING rather than REPAIRING; the speaker stops the TCU-in-progress and repeats it or part of it but incorporates an additional word or phrase. It is POSSIBLE that that the added word was “missing”, but it’s not always the case, e.g in Example 2

***Deleting*:** speakers omit one or more elements they have previously produced within the trouble-source turn-in-progress;

Example 1: “she told me of a place on Madison Avenue on Seventy Ninth Street to go and try there. Because I **als-** I *tried* Barnes n Nobles, n they didn’t have anything…”

Example 2: “That’s **still-** that’s too fast”

Example 3: “Name anything I’ve done it, I can **even** run the:: hhh I *can run* the elevator”

***Searching*:** speakers are recognizably “doing ‘searching for a next word or other item’” (Lerner 2013: 99) that they need for proceeding with their ongoing TCU

Example 1: “Bullocks? Ya mean the one **right um (1.1) tch! (.) right by the: u:m (.) whazit the Plaza?**”

Example 2:

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**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...”

Example 3:

A paper with text and images

Description automatically generated

Three types of searching: **“precises”, “delicates”** and **“resumption searches”.**

Precises are searches where the speaker is searching for a specific, identifiable item, such as a name, place or object. The speaker knows what they are trying to retrieve, such as in Example 1.

Delicates involve searches for something less concrete are more abstract, which I didn’t really understand at all from the source material, supposedly appears in example 2, the fact that it’s a delicate is shown by Ava saying that she was just kidding.

Resumption searches are searches that follow interruptions or side-tracking. There are (can be?) “searching” utterances present, maybe a repeat of the last line before the diversion of the talk. (see ex. 3 – the double arrows mark the original topic and then the repetition after getting sidetracked; the single arrows mark the actual search)

***Parenthesizing*:** adding to the turn-in-progress something other than a next-due element

Unlike insertings, a parenthesizing is typically composed of a clausal TCU.

Example 1:

“… he *wants me*, **I- >I don’t know if I told you this,<** he *wants us* to come out to his house and do, like spend a whole day on putting everything together…”

in example 1, parenthesizing can be interpolated into a TCU and be contained there, e.g. the speaker registers her awareness that she may be repeating something shes already said before, and resumes her telling directly after voicing the concern.

Example 2:

Rub: What do you mean it wove itself once it was set up?

Kat: I mean it’s very simple.

Kat: It’s exac[tly the same in the we]ft as in the=

Dav: [She also means that-]

Kat: =warp. That is if the warp has sixteen greens, two blacks, and two light blues, and so on, .hh **y’know the warp are the long pieces.** then the weft has the same pattern.

Fri: **Mhm.**

Kat: The weft has exactly that

Fri: Yeah.

Parenthesizing can invite or make room for uptake or response by the recipient, as in example 2. Having used the technical term ‘warp’, she stops before completing her account to anticipate and preempt a possible trouble in understanding by explaining a term and waits for them to register the understanding.

Example 3:

“So, when Keegan come in he- **yknow how he’s gotta temper anyway,** he just… wa::::h screamed his damn engine you know,…”

in this example the teller figures his interlocutors already know about the character in the story and uses a parenthetical to articulate it as a point that will heighten the impact of the episode he is describing.

***Aborting:*** speakers interrupt an ongoing TCU and begin a new one related to the abandoned, incomplete TCU;

Example 1:

Sherrie: Who was the girl that was outside the store?

Mark: Debbie

Sherrie: Who’s Debbie.

Mark: **She’s just that girl that uh:**

Mark: **Hh I met her through uhm:**

Mark: I met her in Westwood..

Mark tries to use recognitional descriptors, but since Sherries claimed she does not know who debbie is at all (or implies it , by asking whos Debbie) abandons – aborts – his first TCU-in-progress, as it references a target person, and instead tries again to link Debbie to someone Sherrie knows, but as he arrives at the moment for delivering the reference, he thinks the better of it and again ABORTS the TCU, and launches another one.

Example 2:

Kal: When I used the tweezers, I even did it really hard

Mom: What [happened

Kal: [It’s- It’s just too:, It’s just (.) too uhm buh it’s barely open skin

He tries several times to explain the problem but cannot find the right words, thus he abandons that way of describing it and launches a new TCU – different, but addressing the same issue differently.

Example 3:

Rub: What do you mean it wove itself once it was set up?

Kat: I mean it’s very simple.

Kat: It’s exac[tly the same in the we]ft as in the=

Dav: **[She also means that-]**

Kat: =warp. That is if the warp has sixteen greens, two blacks, and two light blues, and so on, .hh y’know the warp are the long pieces.then the weft has the same pattern.

Fri: Mhm.

Kat: The weft has exactly that

Fri: Yeah.

Dave appears to have been waiting for the 1 s mark that Jefferson (1989) deems the “standard max silence” before adding to Kathys account, but Kathy started 0.2 of a second earlier, and so theyre overlapping. However, Kathy is multiply entitled to the turn position (the question was addressed to her – shes selected next speaker, she is the authority, she was the first started). Still, Dave persists for 5 syllables, and then yields by ABORTING the utterance and simply abandoning it.

Example 4:

Kat: So one I’d set up the warp, it was very simple to just keep- just to weave it.

(1.0)

Kat: You know,= [ ]

**Dav: [But- but listen to how long it ]**

Rub: [In other words, you gotta string up the] you gotta string up the colors, is that it?

Kat: right

[..]

(0.2)

**Dav: But listen to [how long it took to put in the]=**

Kat: [and then each weft]

**Dav: =the- the warps [though]**

Kat: [And ] then each weft, yknow…

When Rubin (who requested the explanation) is slow to register it, Kathy (after the 1s silence) starts again, once again trailed by Dave, but now Dave is competing more with Rubin, and once again yields to the protags of the sequence, ABORTING the turn before reaching completion.

***Sequence-jumping***: speakers interrupt an ongoing TCU and begin a new one that, in contrast to aborting, is unrelated to the abandoned, incomplete TCU

Example 1: “You know what we’re gonna- in fact I’m- she I haven’t seen her since I spoke to you but I’m going to talk to=**what are you making?**”

for context there is a rather uncomfortable awkward situation going on, so the speaker shifts the sequence into a completely different one

Example 2: “And um: it’s not a bad place to be (0.5) becuz it’s real- (.) **ya know I got humming birds now?**”

there has been bad uptake from the interlocutor, who did not take her turn and instead kept feeding continuers to the speaker, so speaker *escapes* similarly to the last example

Example 3:

A paper with text on it

Description automatically generated

Ava jumps from talking about calling Bee to talking about meeting up with her instead, as soon as she hears that Bee might be in the city.

***Recycling*:** speakers repeat one or more items they have previously produced within the ongoing trouble-source turn (cf. Schegloff 1987)

Example 1:

A paper with text and numbers

Description automatically generated with medium confidence

Since Kathy and Rubin are talking in overlap here, Kathy holds back from continuing her own turn and lets Rubin finish, and then she repeats what she said from the beginning; this is meant to clarify her statement, in case there was any confusion or difficulty in hearing or understanding (due to the overlap)

Example 2: (rcl stands for recycling, rpl for replacing)

A black text on a white background

Description automatically generated

Example 3:

A screenshot of a text

Description automatically generated

Recycling seems to be repeating the same thing with no or minimal variation, often for the sake of reinforcing a point, or clarifying (e.g. if there’s overlap and a statement may have not been heard or misheard). This is in opposition to replacing, which can be substituting a word or a phrase with a wholly different one, or with a change in tone/emphasis – to change the focus of the sentence said. (maybe recycling also goes for stuttering?? Idk)

***Reformatting***: speakers change the syntactic design of the trouble-source TCU in progress (cf. Drew, et al. 2013)

It can be grammatical, e.g. Example 1 and Example 2:

Example 1:

A text on a white background

Description automatically generated

In line 12, what starts out as a declarative (e.g. ‘Well Beth [didn’t have to wait…]’) is formatted as a negative interrogative

Example 2: “When’s your uh, wh- you have one day y’only have one course huh?”

what starts as a wh- question is reformatted as a y/n question

But reformatting can also be not grammatical, and can appear to be another form of repair? (or so schegloff says?)

Ex. 3:

A white background with black text

Description automatically generated

Schegloff wants to entertain the idea that this is a *perspectival* reformatting – as Mom would possibly have gone on to say “I would love that” but instead says “that would be great” – she changes the perspective from “Mom’s pleasure” to “Virginia’s suggestion”. However he does assure that this can easily be taken for a replacement of “I” -> “that”

***Reordering***: speakers change the order of items within an ongoing TCU or the order of TCUs within the turn in progress

As a first-order operation, it serves to re-order elements of a TCU-in-progress, as in example 1:

Example 1:

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 …

As a second-order operation, it can serve to re-order TCUs of an entire turn, and the first order operation used to achieve this is replacing:

Example 2:

A text on a piece of paper

Description automatically generated

It would seem like I is being replaced by he, which is being replaced by I again. But the point of the repair is not about who is saying the upcoming statement, but rather what part of the story should be told next. The repair focuses on the best order of TCUs that make up the story.

**Repair at the TRP**

TRP repair seems to use similar repair operations as same-turn repair, e.g. replacing the trouble source or inserting new items into the turn. (as per Kitzinger)

Ex: “... -then more people will show up. Cuz they won't feel obligated tuh sell. tuh buy.”

**Repair after next turn**

The difference between third position repair and third turn repair is the role of the **recipients** talk between the trouble source turn and the self-initiation/repair turn.

**Third-turn repair**

In third-turn repair, the recipient typically doesn’t display misunderstanding – in the case of specifically SELF-INITIATED self-repair, the speaker corrects themselves in case of incorrectly naming something etc.

Schegloff argues that third-turn repairs can actually be seen as transition space repairs that have accidently been displaced from the TRP to the third turn due to the recipient’s intervening talk.

Ex:

01 B: hhh And he's going to make **his own paintings,**

02 A: Mm hmm

03 B: And- **or I mean his own frames.**

04 A: Yeah

**Third-position repair**

Third position repair typically addresses a misunderstanding from the recipient. In the case of SELF-INITIATED self-repair, it’s not that the recipient asks for clarification or anything from the speaker; just that the speaker realizes the recipient misunderstood what they meant.

**A close-up of a computer screen

Description automatically generated**

**A screenshot of a computer program

Description automatically generated**

As can be seen in (2) above, third position repair doesn’t necessarily have to be in the third turn.

Schegloff (1992: 1304-1317) identifies four components of the structure of third position repairs:

1. repair initiation (e.g., no, oh, or well),
2. agreement with/acceptance of the recipient’s response to the trouble-source turn (especially if the recipient has mistakenly treated the trouble-source turn as a complaint and has provided an apology in the next turn) (e.g., I know),
3. a rejection of the recipient’s understanding of the trouble-source turn (“I don’t mean X” for dealing with problematic references; “I’m not X-ing” for dealing with problematic sequential implicativeness; “and I don’t mean that”),
4. the repair proper (operation types described below; often prefaced by “I mean”)

A screenshot of a computer

Description automatically generated

As shown in the table, not every component – sometimes even not the repair proper – can be found in a particular third position repair, but the components that do occur tend to systematically follow the order described above.

**Operations of third position repair**

For self-initiated self-repair in third position, Schegloff distinguishes six types of repair operations:

1. ***repetition***of the – slightly modified – trouble-source turn or a part of it (“doing clearer repeat”)

A screenshot of a text

Description automatically generated

In the example above, although Mike undertakes the third pos repair on behalf of Vic, we focus on Vic’s effort at repair – at the second arrow he displays rejection (component nr 3) and at the last arrow, a **repetition** of the trouble source turn (first arrow), a.k.a. the repair operation proper. This is a more readable version of the transcript as the original is quite dialect- and overlap-heavy, but in the original you could also see that in the repetition Vic is attempting CLEARER repeat – stretched sounds, a stress on you (did YOU get your thing today), and an emphasis on ‘thing’ as well.

Schegloff notes, however, that in his experience this type of repair is infrequent, compared to the other kinds; by far the most common format for the repair proper is “I mean”, followed by one or more of the following operations (2-5). (that is to say, the following operations (2-5) are very commonly prefaced with “I mean”).

1. providing a ***contrast***to the recipient’s incorrect understanding of the prior turn

A paper with text on it

Description automatically generated

Note at the arrowed turns above, that Ken first produces a repair-initiating component (“No”), then begins the repair proper (“I mea-”) (which he then interrupts). I think the contrast here is that, when Ken said “Not to change the subject”, he really meant “Not to interrupt you” – and he is contrasting what he said first with “I mean” + what he actually meant.

1. providing a ***reformulation***of the misunderstood trouble source;

A text on a page

Description automatically generated

Here, instead of “I mean”, “Well” is used as the repair-initiation component. The host is reformulating “What’re you afraid of” to “What kind of fear is it” – not that the caller misheard the host or anything, just misunderstood what he meant by “what are you afraid of”.

1. providing a *specification* of the misunderstood trouble source

A text on a white background

Description automatically generated

After initially “repeating it more clearly”, Lehroff provides specifications of the sort of question he means to ask (“Is it raining? Or windy? Or what?”)

1. providing an *explanation* of the misunderstood trouble source

A text on a white background

Description automatically generated

For context, callers in this sort of program aren’t allowed to introduce themselves. The caller apparently understands the “oh boy” not as the caller remarking about their almost-mistake, but instead as excitement with which the caller is taking up his opportunity. At the arrowed turn, the caller explains his prior turn, and after that the host does offer a different type of response.

1. re-categorization of the mode (serious vs. non-serious) or the action (e.g., a complaint can be re-categorized as a request) of the trouble-source turn/’characterization’ of the trouble-source turn

Again, this one is not prefaced by “I mean” (at least not typically)!

“Characterization” involves forms such as “I was just kidding”