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Abstract

The study examines ‘recovery through repetition’, investigating how speakers repeat their own utterances in order to return to prior talk. The phenomenon comprises instances of everyday, casual conversation in which speakers indicate that their utterance was either not taken up at all or not taken up to an adequate degree. By repeating the utterance more or less word-for-word, speakers suggest to their recipients that a (different type of) response is relevant and offer the utterance for re-consideration.

The data consist of American-English and Finnish conversations. The segments come from the Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English and from the Corpus of Conversational Finnish that is maintained by the Department of Finnish Language and Literature at the University of Helsinki (Keskusteluntutkimuksen arkisto). The theoretical and methodological framework of the study is based on interactional linguistics and conversation analysis.

First, the study details the typical composition and position of recovery through repetition and discusses the interactional implications that the repeated utterances may have. The study focuses on the functions of recovery through repetition and their implications for stance taking. Two overall interactional environments are identified: speakers employ recovery through repetition either to seek the attention of recipients and to take a stance towards an activity in progress, or to redirect the attention of recipients and to take a stance towards a recipient response. The different functions of recovery through repetition in the two environments are further examined. Moreover, the study contrasts repetition with other means of recovery and suggests that the different means have divergent implications for stance taking. Finally, the study concludes that recovery through repetition provides speakers with a means of negotiating the input of their utterances and simultaneously taking a stance towards an aspect of the ongoing interaction.
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Tiivistelmä

Tutkimus tarkastee toistoa elvytyskeinona keskustelussa eli sitä, kuinka puhuja toistaa oman lausumansa palatakseen aiempaan puheeseen. Ilmiö muodostuu arista, epämoodollisista keskustelutilanteista, joissa puhuja osoittaa, että jotakin hänen lausumansa ei ole joko otettu lainkaan huomioon tai sitä ei ole käsitelty asianmukaisesti. Toistamalla lausuman lähes sanatarkasti puhuja ilmaisee keskustelukumpanelleen, että jonkinlainen (tai mahdollisesti tietystyppinen) vastaanotto olisi odotuksenmukainen, ja tarjoaa lausumaansa käsiteltäväksi uudelleen.

Tutkimuksen aineisto koostuu amerikanenglannin- ja suomenkielisistä keskusteluista, jotka ovat peräisin Santa Barbaran puhutun amerikanenglannin kokonaisesta (Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English) ja Helsingin yliopiston suomen kielen ja kotimaisen kirjallisuuden laitoksen Keskusteluntutkimuksen arkistosta. Tutkimuksen teoreettisen ja menetelmällisen viitekehyksen muodostavat vuorovaikutuslingvistiikka ja keskustelunanalyysi.
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1 Introduction

Any utterance that we produce—whether an elaborate clause, a simple phrase or a contextually recognizable sound—may position us in relation to what we are talking about and to those with whom we are talking. As we engage in spoken interaction, we constantly define and refine our stances. It is a dynamic process in which not only the content and design but also the sequential placement and timing of our utterances play a consequential role. However, not all our utterances are treated with equal importance: some leave their traces over several subsequent turns, while others make no evident imprint on the course of our conversations. We have ways of negotiating the input of our utterances.

The aim of this thesis is to provide an initial understanding of one means of this negotiation, that is, recovery through repetition. I examine instances of everyday, casual conversation in which speakers’ utterances are not adequately responded to or are not taken up at all by recipients. By repeating their utterances more or less word-for-word, speakers indicate that a (different kind of) response was expected and offer their utterances for (re)consideration. I view repetition as one resource that participants may employ in the practice of recovery.

There are two coinciding themes that I wish to address in this thesis. Firstly, I would like to offer new insights into the study of repetition, a well-recognized but often lightly-studied linguistic phenomenon. Categories have typically been defined in accordance with who repeats, what is repeated, where the repetition occurs and what the repetition does. While these remain relevant categories, attention has increasingly been paid to local uses of repetition in actual talk-in-interaction. Inspired by this new trend, I examine cases of repetition within their sequential contexts and consider them as arising contingently from those contexts.

Secondly, I aim to contribute to a new understanding of stance. It is a long-standing observation that speakers’ utterances may include a display of their attitudes, opinions, positions or perspectives with regard to the matter under discussion or the discussants themselves. This expression of speaker perspective has traditionally been discussed in linguistics under the semantic notion of modality and has typically been studied in connection with certain grammatical elements, such as modal verbs. The introduction of the term stance can be seen as an attempt to better capture the multitude of ways in which language users may display their positions with regard to whatever is under discussion. Moreover, researchers have recently started to shift their focus from individual stances to stance taking, from single-speaker contributions to the joint construction of stance.
at both linguistic and interactional levels. This development towards an understanding of stance taking as an interactive process is strongly supported by an exploration of recovery through repetition.

All in all, linguists have increasingly become interested in analyzing language structure and use in naturally-occurring talk-in-interaction. One indication of this is the currently evolving framework of interactional linguistics, which combines the theoretical aspects of functional linguistics with the methodological viewpoints of conversation analysis. Functional linguistics has as its basic premise the idea that language is used to do things, and conversation analysis provides evidence for this by finding order and social significance even in the most mundane interactions. Thus, working within the framework of interactional linguistics enables researchers to take a highly dialogical and empirically-grounded perspective on language and interaction.

Interactional linguistics also draws on anthropology, especially as it aims to promote a cross-linguistic and cross-cultural understanding of interaction. I contribute to this task by examining casual conversations in two typologically unrelated languages, American English and Finnish. I draw on data from the Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English, Parts I–III (Du Bois, Chafe, Meyer & Thompson 2000; Du Bois, Chafe, Meyer, Thompson & Martey 2003; Du Bois & Englebretson 2004), and from the Corpus of Conversational Finnish maintained by the Department of Finnish Language and Literature at the University of Helsinki (Keskusteluntutkimuksen arkisto). There are approximately nine hours of American-English data, compared with some seven hours and thirty minutes of Finnish data.

I shall approach the data with three main questions in mind.

1. What characterizes the utterances that speakers recover through repetition?
2. What characterizes the interactional environments that make recovery through repetition possible and relevant?
3. How does recovery through repetition contribute to stance taking?

These questions will allow me to examine the brief but potentially significant moments of interaction during which participants negotiate the implications of their talk. Consequently, an enhanced understanding of both repetition and stance taking as meaningful interactional phenomena can be established.

The following two examples will briefly illustrate the questions that I wish to address. In example 1, Joanne assesses George’s physical condition (lines 4–5), but Lenore does not attend to the assessment (as shown by the pause in line 6).
(1) sbc015 Deadly Diseases <T:00:11:09> (this stuff in lines 2–3 refers to dietary supplements)

01 JOANNE: o- le- --
02 ... does George take any of this stuff?
03 LENORE: he won’t take any of this [stuff].
04 JOANNE: [hi] but he’s as healthy
     as an ox,
05 that guy.
06 ...(0.9)
07 (H) that guy is <MRC> healthy [thy as an ox]<MRC>.
08 LENORE: [x]<P> his liver],
09 except for his liver</P>.</X>.

In example 2, Matti assesses the outward appearance of a certain cellular telephone (line 2), but Eki misattends to the assessment, i.e. he focuses on another unsatisfactory quality of the telephone (line 5).

(2) sg121_a Crappy Channel <T:00:10:11>

01 MATTI: nii nii-st puhelim-i-st puhe-en ollen, so telephone-PL-ELA talk-GEN
     so speaking of the telephones
02 tää on ihan paska-n-<P>näkönen. this be:3SG really shit-GEN-looking this is really shit-looking
03 mu-n miele-stä</P>.
     1SG-GEN mind-ELA
     in my opinion
04 ...(0.8)
05 EKI: (TSK) tiä-t sää mikä to-s on kuulemma
     know-2S 2SG what that-INS be:3SG reputedly
     you know what is reputedly shit
     paska-a.
     shit-PTV
     about that
06 ...(0.6)
07 MATTI: [tää on ainsaki ihan paska-n-näkönen].
     this be:3SG at.least really shit-GEN-looking at least this is really shit-looking
08 HARRI: [ei to-s o-lu-kaan mitään au-au]ki [2oloaiko-j-a2].
     NEG that-INS be-PCP-CLI any opening.hour-PL-PTV
     that didn’t have any opening hours after all

Both Joanne in example 1 and Matti in example 2 respond to the conduct of their recipients in the same way: they repeat their prior utterance, using more or less the same words and implementing ultimately the same action as they did before.
In other words, they recover their utterance and make it available for uptake again. I call this phenomenon ‘recovery through repetition’ and consider it to be a means of stance taking. I hope to show that by employing recovery through repetition, speakers take stances toward, i.e. reveal their positions or perspectives on, the ongoing interaction and their co-participants’ contributions to it.

The present study is organized as follows. In chapter 2, I shall introduce the data in some detail. I shall first present the American-English and Finnish corpora and then outline the principles of the transcription system that is used in the data extracts. Furthermore, to be able to discuss extracts from both languages, I have translated the Finnish examples into English and shall therefore also deal with the basic guidelines for interlinear glossing and translation.

Chapter 3 will offer an overview of the theoretical and methodological framework that is used in this study. I shall review the main bases of interactional linguistics and introduce the key concepts of conversation analysis. In chapter 4, I shall first develop an understanding of stance taking as an interactive and intersubjective process and then consider recovery as one of the possible means of returning to prior talk. Finally, I shall report on previous research that has been carried out on repetition: I shall introduce the basic categories of repetition and discuss the four interactional studies of repetition that provide a model for the present investigation.

Chapters 5 and 6 will comprise an extensive analysis of recovery through repetition in the American-English and Finnish data. In chapter 5, I shall examine the linguistic and local sequential aspects of the phenomenon. I shall first discuss the general lexico-semantic, syntactic and prosodic features of the utterances that are repeated, then the potential additions, deletions and replacements that speakers may make and, finally, the diverse implications that the utterances have in their contexts of occurrence.

In the main analytical part of this thesis, chapter 6, I shall explore the interactional environments of the phenomenon. I shall identify two overall environments. First, recovery through repetition may be employed to point out that recipients have not attended to a prior utterance, and to take a stance towards an activity in progress. Second, it may be used to show that recipients have mis-attended to a prior utterance, and to take a stance towards a recipient contribution. I shall further distinguish between the different functions that recovery through repetition serves in the two environments and briefly contrast repetition with other means of recovery. Chapter 7 will discuss the findings and conclude the study.
2 Data and transcription

To be able to take a cross-linguistic perspective on recovery through repetition, I draw on data from the Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English and the Corpus of Conversational Finnish maintained by the Department of Finnish Language and Literature at the University of Helsinki. Before discussing the data sets in more detail in sections 2.1–2.2 and introducing the transcription and translation conventions in sections 2.3–2.4, I would like to make three general notes on the use of the two corpora.

First, there are several ethical issues that need to be taken into consideration when working with data from naturally-occurring interactions. The two most important ones are that participants should know of the recording and that the privacy of anyone who speaks or is spoken about on record should be protected. The corpora that I use have been managed with these concerns in mind: speakers have given their written consent to the use of the recordings for research purposes, and clearly identifiable pieces of information have been changed during transcription (e.g. most names have been replaced with pseudonyms in the transcripts and faded out in the audio files). These and other precautions have been taken in the collection, compilation and distribution of the corpora.1

Second, my analyses are based on the audio channel of the recordings, irrespective of the different modalities of interaction that are in effect available to the conversationalists. In other words, I have access to the same vocal cues as the participants of a conversation, but without the video channel I cannot rely on any nonvocal visual elements that they may have employed. Although the relations between vocal and nonvocal activities have not yet been comprehensively described, it seems safe to argue that the two phenomena are interconnected and worth investigating in association with one another (see, e.g. Kendon 2004; McNeill 2000). For example, in their seminal article on the organization of turn taking in conversation, Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson (1974: 717) note that one way in which the current speaker may select a next speaker is to employ relevant gaze direction while producing a sequence-initiating action. One might therefore ask whether it is sensible to study face-to-face interaction without a video recording. However, if one recognizes the complexities of interaction and the

---

1 It should further be noted that the Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English has been managed in accordance with the policies issued by the Office of Research at the University of California, Santa Barbara, concerning the use of human subjects.
limitations of one’s own approach, one can give a relatively reliable account of a particular phenomenon. In Goodwin’s (2000: 1508) words, “it is possible to adequately come to terms with much, perhaps most, of what is happening in many interactions while leaving some fields opaque and unanalyzed”. For instance, I do not wish to argue that the lack of a vocal response equals the lack of a response altogether. My focus is simply on one modality of interaction that participants are decidedly orienting to at a particular moment, namely language. Verbal conduct may indeed often be seen to override nonverbal conduct (Drew 2005a: 78). What is more, the Finnish data include several telephone conversations, where both participants and researchers have access only to the auditory channel of communication. There are fewer cases of recovery through repetition in the telephone recordings than in the face-to-face materials, but that may also reflect the fact that the phenomenon on the whole is more common in multi-person than in two-person conversations, rather than a difference between the two modalities of interaction. Indeed, only six out of forty cases in the English data and three out of nineteen cases in the Finnish data occur in two-person telephone or face-to-face conversations.

Third, although the corpora have been recorded in a wide range of settings, my data sets do not provide comprehensive representations of the possible varieties within each language (see Kaufmann 2002 for a review of the Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English). Perhaps due to the fact that the corpora have been collected largely by students, both data sets have a disproportionately high number of speakers who are in their twenties or thirties. Similarly, both data sets are unbalanced as regards different dialect areas: for American English it is the western dialects that are in the majority, and for Finnish it is the eastern ones. More importantly to the present study, however, the data sets are compatible as regards the types of speech event that they represent: both sets consist of conversations between intimates in informal, everyday settings. Sections 2.1 and 2.2 will provide more detailed descriptions of the American-English and Finnish data sets, respectively.

2.1 American-English data

The English data come from the Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English (SBCSAE), Parts I–III (Du Bois et al. 2000; Du Bois et al. 2003; Du Bois & Englebretson 2004). These published parts of the corpus comprise forty-six audio segments and their respective transcripts, which represent a variety of
naturally-occurring discourse from both everyday conversations and institutional encounters. Although it may be difficult to determine how institutional a particular interaction is, the corpus can be roughly divided into two groups. I exclude the twenty-three segments that are more or less task-oriented, i.e. lectures, sermons, organized discussions, meetings, a cooking session and a round of computer games. I limit my analysis to the twenty-three segments that were recorded in more casual settings. They include one telephone conversation and twenty-two face-to-face conversations between family, friends and acquaintances. The selected segments typically last around 25 minutes, the English data thus totaling just a little over 9 hours. In these data, there are forty cases of recovery through repetition.

Brief descriptions of the overall conversational settings and participant relationships are provided below. All of the conversations were recorded between 1987 and 1996, mainly in the 1990s. The duration of the corpus segment is given in angle brackets. It is worth noting that the figure does not necessarily equal the duration of the whole recording or the actual speech event.

**SBCSAE, Part I**

*sbc001 Actual Blacksmithing* <D:00:25:15>
Mother and daughter catching up after daughter’s vacation, accompanied by an acquaintance. (3 speakers)

*sbc002 Lambada* <D:00:23:57>
A couple having an after-dinner conversation with two friends. (4 speakers)

*sbc003 Conceptual Pesticides* <D:00:26:07>
A couple preparing dinner with a friend. (3 speakers)

*sbc004 Raging Bureaucracy* <D:00:19:22>
Three sisters having breakfast, their parents and one sister’s fiancé occasionally taking part in the conversation. (6 speakers)

*sbc005 A Book about Death* <D:00:20:28>
A couple chatting before going to sleep. (2 speakers)

*sbc006 Cuz* <D:00:27:15>
Two cousins catching up after not having seen each other for several weeks. (2 speakers)

*sbc007 A Tree’s Life* <D:00:23:05>
Two sisters having a late-night conversation. (2 speakers)
sbc011 This Retirement Bit <D:00:20:30>
Two roommates and their friend chatting before lunch. (3 speakers)

sbc013 Appease the Monster <D:00:27:24>
Mother, father, daughter, son and daughter-in-law celebrating daughter’s birthday. (5 speakers)

SBCSAE, Part II

sbc015 Deadly Diseases <D:00:26:06>
A couple having an after-dinner conversation with a friend. (3 speakers)

sbc017 Wonderful Abstract Notions <D:00:20:18>
Two participants talking, after having been introduced by a common acquaintance, who then left the room. (2 speakers)

sbc019 Doesn’t Work in This Household <D:00:21:49>
Four family members and a visiting relative having an after-dinner conversation. (5 speakers)

sbc028 Hey Cutie Pie <D:00:25:17>
A couple having a telephone conversation, exchanging a few words with a third participant (sister/friend). (3 speakers)

SBCSAE, Part III

sbc031 Tastes Very Special <D:00:24:38>
Mother and two daughters having lunch at a restaurant, occasionally talking with the waitress. (4 speakers)

sbc032 Handshakes All Around <D:00:27:47>
Three friends/acquaintances talking at a party, a wife and a son occasionally taking part in the conversation. (5 speakers)

sbc033 Guilt <D:00:10:46>
Two sisters, their families and a friend talking after dinner at a vacation home. (8 speakers)

sbc034 What Time Is It Now <D:00:24:40>
A couple getting ready to go to sleep after one of them has returned home from work. (2 speakers)

sbc035 Hold My Breath <D:00:19:30>
Two sisters, their families and a friend preparing dinner. (8 speakers)

sbc036 Judgmental on People <D:00:26:50>
Brother and sister visiting a friend and her baby son. (3 speakers)
2.2 Finnish data

As for the Finnish data, I draw on the Corpus of Conversational Finnish (Keskusteluntutkimuksen arkisto, KTA) that is maintained by the Department of Finnish Language and Literature at the University of Helsinki. The corpus has not been published, but researchers may borrow individual recordings and transcribe material in return. Parts of the segments that I have on loan had already been transcribed by students and researchers in Helsinki; other parts I transcribed myself. The data amount to approximately 7 ½ hours of casual conversations: there are five face-to-face conversations, each lasting for about 1 hour, and twenty-eight telephone conversations, ranging in length between 8 seconds and 27 minutes. It should be noted that one of the interactions (sg151 Chat about Something) was originally video-recorded, but for the purpose of comparability, I restrain from examining the video material and restrict my analysis to the audio recording and the written transcript. The Finnish data contain nineteen cases of recovery through repetition.

Below is some information about each corpus segment in the Finnish database. Similar to the segments from the SBSCAE, the majority of the Finnish recordings were made in the 1990s (between 1988 and 1998). I shall give them descriptive English titles, irrespective of their possible original titles. Instead of providing a detailed account of every telephone conversation, I shall first give a short description of the whole corpus segment, and then list the individual calls together with their durations. Here the length of the corpus segment equals that of the entire recording but not necessarily of the speech event. This has one evident
consequence that should be pointed out: the Finnish data contain several stretches of talk in which the participants recognizably orient to the recording, especially at the start and end of a tape. By contrast, many of the published segments in the SBCSAE have been picked out from somewhere in the middle of a recording and thus include only a few references to the process of recording itself. However, it is only natural that conversationalists should orient to whatever is going on in their immediate environment (e.g. the operating of a tape recorder right next to them), which does not prevent participants from employing the very same interactional practices and linguistic resources that are available to them outside the recording situation (see, e.g. Duranti 1997: 118–119). Moreover, such orientations are only momentary in the KTA segments. In sg067_b Conversation Continues, for example, the participants seem to forget the recording device soon after they have actively tried to find a topic, interview each other or sing a song in order to get something on tape.

**KTA**

*sg020_a, sg020_b Abroad <D:01:03:08>*
Two roommates having an evening snack with two friends. (4 speakers)

*sg067_a Lawyer Issues <D:00:59:22>*
Two friends having a conversation, one’s spouse making a few comments at the start and end of the recording. (3 speakers; 2 speakers also on sg067_b)

*sg067_b Conversation Continues <D:01:03:53>*
A couple talking and watching television. (2 speakers; speakers also on sg067_a)

*sg121_a, sg121_b Crappy Channel <D:01:02:33>*
Four friends talking and watching television. (4 speakers)

*sg122_a*
The same speaker making/receiving twenty-one telephone calls to/from his girlfriend and various friends. (10 speakers; 1 speaker also on sg122_b, sg124_a and sg124_b)

  *sg122_a1_1 Beer <D:00:02:03>*
  *sg122_a1_2 Packet of Frankfurters <D:00:00:41>*
  *sg122_a2 Spare Monitor <D:00:03:43>*
  *sg122_a3 Monitor Broke Again <D:00:01:50>*
  *sg122_a4 It Just Died <D:00:02:59>*
  *sg122_a5 I Will Call You <D:00:00:08>*
  *sg122_a6 Is the Woman on Guard <D:00:02:35>*
sg122_a8 Antistatic Bags <D:00:02:26>
sg122_a10 Team Ahma <D:00:04:57>
sg122_a13 Needed the Car <D:00:01:13>
sg122_a14 Pay the Bills <D:00:01:43>
sg122_a15 Change of Address <D:00:00:37>
sg122_a16 You May Talk Anyway <D:00:02:21>
sg122_a17 Photoshop Crashes <D:00:03:50>
sg122_a18_1 Not until Then <D:00:00:51>
sg122_a18_2 Many Records <D:00:01:47>
sg122_a19 You Had Called <D:00:00:38>
sg122_a20 I Had One <D:00:01:05>
sg122_a21 Rum <D:00:02:17>
sg122_a22 Meatballs <D:00:01:41>
sg122_a23 Applauded the Performance <D:00:05:37>

sg122_b
The same speaker making a call to a friend and to her mother (3 speakers; 1 speaker also on sg122_a23, sg124_a and sg124_b)
  sg122_b1 Nice Pressure <D:00:27:17>
  sg122_b2 Possibly <D:00:03:45>

sg124_a, sg124_b
The same speaker making a call to a friend and four calls to her mother. (3 speakers; 1 speaker also on sg122_a23 and sg122_b)
  sg124_a1 Guitarist from Don Huonot <D:00:04:36>
  sg124_a2 Puppy News <D:00:13:55>
  sg124_a3 For the Cruise <D:00:18:24>
  sg124_b1 Sing on the Phone <D:00:04:42>
  sg124_b2 Maybe You Have Asthma <D:00:20:32>

sg151_a, sg151_b Chat about Something <D:01:07:21>
Four friends chatting and having a snack; one of them is picked up by another friend and leaves about 30 minutes into the recording. (5 speakers)

**Total duration: 7 h 34 min 27 sec**

2.3 Discourse transcription

The data extracts presented in this study follow the notation system of discourse transcription (Du Bois, Cumming, Schuetze-Coburn & Paolino 1992; Du Bois,
Schuetze-Coburn, Cumming & Paolino 1993). The SBCSAE transcripts are based on this system, whereas the KTA database uses the conversation-analytic transcription system developed by Gail Jefferson (as laid out in Seppänen 1997b). For the sake of consistency, I retranscribed relevant parts of the Finnish data to comply with the conventions of discourse transcription. Most notably, the modifications involve the division of transcribed talk into intonation units, and the replacement of symbols that are used to mark, for example, special voice quality. Where necessary, I also added some details to both the English and Finnish transcripts (e.g. full speaker labels and length of pauses in seconds). All the transcription symbols that are used in the examples are listed in Appendix 1. I chose to use discourse transcription for two main reasons. One, whereas the SBCSAE transcripts have been published and have therefore already gone through a thorough review, the KTA transcripts have not been cross-checked for publication and had to be revised in any event. Two, the fact that discourse transcription is based on intonation units makes it easier for researchers to identify recurring elements within and across participant turns; in other words, it lightens the task of searching for repeated utterances in data. I shall briefly discuss the use of intonation units below.

The distinguishing feature of discourse transcription is that each line of text represents one intonation unit (IU), which is “a stretch of speech uttered under a single coherent intonation contour” (Du Bois et al. 1993: 47; see also Aho & Yli-Luukko 2005). In other words, the notation system is based on the idea that talk is produced in recognizable prosodic chunks. Du Bois et al. (1992: 100) argue that a prototypical intonation unit is characterized by a coherent intonation contour throughout, a pitch reset (most commonly a rise) at the start of the unit, a pause that separates the unit from the preceding one, prosodic lengthening at the end of the unit and accelerated syllables at the beginning of the unit (occurring consecutively between two units, the last two form the so-called 'lag and rush' phenomenon, Du Bois 2003). Du Bois et al. (1992: 100) caution transcribers that many of these features are not restricted to signaling IU boundaries and that “their presence is neither a necessary nor sufficient criterion of intonation unit status”. Moreover, although intonation units and boundary cues are considered to be universal, there are significant differences across languages in how intonation units are constructed and how different cues are employed (Du Bois 2003). For example, my own observations suggest that the combined lag and rush cue is not as common in Finnish as it is in American English, whereas creaky voice quality frequently occurs at the end of a unit in Finnish (see Ogden 2004).
Originally, intonation units were considered to serve mainly a cognitive purpose. Chafe (1987, 1994, 1998) argues that because only a limited amount of information can be activated in a speaker’s (or listener’s) mind at a given moment, there are evident constraints on any verbalization of thought. He puts forward, in consequence, that an intonation unit reflects the flow of information in discourse by expressing the current focus of a speaker’s consciousness. Later explorations of intonation units have revealed that they are also interactionally motivated: Park J. S.-Y. (2002) points out that speakers may advance or delay the end of an intonation unit in order to invite or stall recipient uptake (see also Kärkkäinen 2003a: 30–33). He thus contributes to the observation that participants construct conversational units with reference to the ongoing interaction by employing various means that are available to them, such as syntax and prosody (see also, e.g. Ford 2004; Ford, Fox & Thompson 1996; Goodwin 1979, 1995). Instead of seeing the cognitive and interactional motivations for intonation units as being mutually exclusive, Park J. S.-Y. (2002: 673) suggests that they are inextricably intertwined: “all IUs are cognitive units in the sense that they represent units of talk that can be readily handled by the speaker and listener; however, what is the appropriate size of that unit is determined not only on the basis of cognitive constraints but also on the basis of the interactional context and needs of the participants” (emphasis in the original). This is the position that I adopt in the present study.

2.4 Interlinear gloss and translation

In order to facilitate a comparison between the two languages, I translated the Finnish examples into English. Thus, each line of transcript in a Finnish example contains three lines of text: the Finnish original, an interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme gloss and a free English translation.

As a basic guideline, I refer to the Leipzig glossing rules. Bickel, Comrie & Haspelmath (2008) provide and define most of the grammatical category labels that are used in the present study (see Appendix 2) and suggest ways of marking morpheme boundaries, which I shall briefly introduce here. First, a hyphen is used to separate segmentable morphemes in the original and in the gloss (e.g. original *tytö-i-lle*, gloss *girl-pl-ALL*). Second, when one morpheme in the original corresponds with two or more in the metalanguage, a full stop is used in the gloss (e.g. original *vaikka*, gloss *for.example*). Third, when an element in the original is formally and semantically segmentable but the segmentation is not shown for the
It should be noted that the glossing is based on the markedness of the items. I treat the following categories as unmarked and leave them unglossed: singular form, nominative case, present tense and active voice. Furthermore, I do not specify the different types of infinitives and participles that are found in Finnish but simply label them INF and PCP, respectively (see ISK 2004: 146–149 for a distinction between the three infinitives and four participles in Finnish).

Whereas glossing is mostly a straightforward task, translating pieces of conversation often proves to be a challenge. The following data extract illustrates this.

(3) sg067_a1 Lawyer Issues <T:00:34:43>

01 KAARINA: se on mun mielesi isti per [see-stä].
   it be:3SG I-GEN mind-DAT really ass-ELA
   in my opinion it is really bollocks

02 REIJA: [väärin].
   wrong
   wrong

It is easy to recognize example 3 as an assessment sequence, but rendering it into English is a more complex process. One possible translation of line 1 would be ‘in my opinion it really sucks’. This would adequately capture the social action that Kaarina accomplishes with the utterance (i.e. an assessment) and would even bear some of the same flavor as Kaarina’s choice of words does. However, it would not cater to the syntactic structure and sequential context of the original. Kaarina’s utterance in line 1 is a complement clause, and Reija makes use of the structure to produce an overlapping, syntactically-fitting assessment term, väärin ‘wrong’, in line 2. Translating line 1 as ‘in my opinion it is really bollocks’ makes this utilization visible also in English.

It is true that utterances, as social actions, are not entirely translatable from one language into another (Moerman 1996: 150). Nonetheless, analysts who are truly competent in the languages they study are able to discern the features that are common to the social practices shared in those languages. Example 3 reflects the efforts that I make throughout the present study to convey in one language the
social actions that conversationalists implement in the other while retaining an accurate representation of the specific linguistic resources that they employ.
3 Theoretical and methodological framework

Having its focus on the structure and use of a particular type of repetition, this thesis contributes to the currently evolving research area of interactional linguistics, exploring the interrelationship between linguistic forms and different ways of organizing social interaction. The theoretical basis and central concerns of interactional linguistics will be discussed in section 3.1. The main tools of analysis in interactional linguistics are provided by the rigorous methodology of conversation analysis (CA). The key analytical concepts of conversation analysis will be introduced in section 3.2.

3.1 Interactional linguistics

During the last decade or so, an increasing amount of research has taken as a premise that language structure and use are inseparable from interaction, that any linguistic phenomenon must be examined in relation to its social-sequential context of occurrence (see, for example, the following edited volumes: Couper-Kuhlen & Ford 2004; Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 1996; Ford, Fox & Thompson 2002b; Ford & Wagner 1996; Hakulinen & Selting 2005; Ochs, Schegloff & Thompson 1996; Selting & Couper-Kuhlen 2001). Individual studies may differ in their objectives and implications but can nonetheless be seen as contributing to the growing new field of research called interactional linguistics.

Aiming at a thorough understanding of language, interactional linguistics draws on functional linguistics, conversation analysis and linguistic anthropology (see Schegloff, Ochs & Thompson 1996: 4–16 for an overview of the emergence of interactional linguistics from the three disciplines). Couper-Kuhlen & Selting (2001: 2) state that functional linguistics, or the discourse-functional approach to grammar, enables researchers to view linguistic forms as functionally motivated and provides them with appropriate tools and terminology for the description of those forms. Such an understanding of language is essential for the adoption of

---

2 Walker (2004: 18–20) points out several problems in the term interactional linguistics: its allusions to atypical data and narrow analysis, its opaqueness with regard to its methodology and its misrepresentation of its research focus. Because of these unclarities, Walker adopts the term linguistics-informed conversation analysis (LCA) to refer to the discipline. I would like to acknowledge the introduction of an alternative term but opt for using the more established and widely recognized “interactional linguistics”.
the conversation-analytic methodology. After all, as Couper-Kuhlen & Selting remark, conversation analysis considers talk-in-interaction to be the primordial site of social organization and obliges researchers to base their analytic arguments on empirical evidence taken from naturally-occurring data. As a result of the convergence between functional linguistics and conversation analysis, an idea of reciprocity has developed: linguistic structures are seen as reusable fragments which are flexibly adapted to meet interactional demands and which, through recurrent use, become routine resources for specific interactional practices (Ford, Fox & Thompson 2003: 119–120). Linguistic anthropology, the third discipline that forms the basis of interactional linguistics, offers an opportunity to widen and deepen descriptions of linguistic resources and interactional practices in cross-cultural and cross-linguistic dimensions (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 2001: 3). Indeed, Moerman (1996: 156) argues that “the palpable correspondences in how diverse languages are actually used for social interaction has something to tell us about how language is designed and learned”. In other words, studies in interactional linguistics provide valuable information not only about individual languages but also about language and social interaction as common human phenomena.

The attained insights into language as social interaction are reflected in the two general strands that can be found in the work of interactional linguists. In what follows, I shall illustrate these two strands with examples from studies that bring together different language varieties, in a similar vein to what I wish to do in this thesis. On the one hand, interactional linguists may select a certain lexical, syntactic or semantic construction and consider its role in different interactional junctures. Topics that have been covered cross-linguistically or cross-dialectally include, for example, *and-uh(m)* as a means of continuing a prior action in British and American English (Local 2004); disaligning ‘yes but’ constructions in Danish and German (Steensig & Asmuß 2005); and the particles *kedo* and *nuntey*, respectively, in the self-identification sequences of telephone conversation openings in Japanese and Korean (Park Y.-Y. 2002). On the other hand, interactional linguists may start out from an aspect of turn design or sequence organization and explore the different linguistic resources that are employed. Among the themes that have also been discussed in cross-linguistic research are the co-construction of turn-constructional units in English and Japanese (Lerner & Takagi 1999); turn construction in Danish and Turkish (Steensig 2001); turn
continuation in English, German and Japanese (Vorreiter 2003); and the syntax of
repair in English and Japanese (Fox, Hayashi & Jaspersen 1996).3

The numerous cross-linguistic studies suggest that irrespective of the
language, all speakers are faced with similar social and interactional tasks. Such
tasks can be considered ‘candidate universals’ (Schegloff 2006); that is, there is
enough evidence to argue that the same organizational issues of (talk-in-)
interaction need to be addressed across languages and cultures. What is more,
varieties of one language, or of closely related languages, may provide corre-
responding lexical, syntactic or prosodic resources for the accomplishment of those
tasks, whereas typologically diverse languages are likely to differ. Issues that are
cross-linguistically relevant for recovery include, for instance, how speakers
signal that their turn is reaching completion, how they pursue uptake that is
relevantly missing and how they negotiate the proper progression of a sequence or
activity. The resources that speakers employ to deal with such challenges may be
of the same or a different kind, but the distributions of those resources most
probably diverge.

In addition to single studies that involve two or more languages, the cross-
linguistic perspective is promoted by collections of articles that bring together
research on different language varieties. The collections may be loosely organized
around lexico-semantics and syntax (as in Ford et al. 2002b; Hakulinen & Selting
2005; Ochs et al. 1996; Selting & Couper-Kuhlen 2001), or prosody (as in
Couper-Kuhlen & Ford 2004; Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 1996). They may also
encompass a more specific theme: for example, they may be restricted to a
particular type of interaction, such as telephone conversations in Luke & Pavlidou
(2002); examine a grammatical phenomenon that occurs in one form or another
across languages, such as person reference in Enfield & Stivers (2007); or share
an interest in a certain feature of interactional organization, such as affiliation and
disaffiliation in the papers that have been published in several venues by the
international project called Language and Social Action (<http://www.uta.fi/
laitokset/sosio/project/affiliation/>; accessed May 7, 2008).

Such enterprises can be seen to reach for the macro-overview through micro-
level studies: single studies may focus on features that are specific to the language
under investigation but, because of shared interests and methodology, they are

3 See also the pre-publication series InLiSt – Interaction and Linguistic Structures, <http://www.uni-
potsdam.de/u/inlist/>; especially for comparative studies on different varieties of German.
able to shed new light on the commonalities and differences between languages. The special issue of *Pragmatics* edited by Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007), for example, illustrates what speakers of different languages do by incrementing, that is, by grammatically extending a turn-constructional unit or turn that they have already brought to a possible completion. Ford et al. (2002a) have earlier established that one purpose for which speakers of English may employ increments is to elicit uptake from a recipient after that uptake has proven to be somehow problematic (i.e. increments work as a kind of recovery; see section 4.2). Seppänen & Laury (2007) argue the same to be true of Finnish; on the other hand, Field (2007) suggests that pursuing uptake is not a relevant function of increments in Navajo, and Kim (2007) points out that increments are used in the pursuit of uptake in Korean, but by foregrounding the speaker’s affective stance rather than by highlighting the lack of response. By integrating these studies into one volume, the authors are able to show that incrementation is a common phenomenon across languages, although the implementation and implications of the phenomenon are not necessarily the same.

The present study contributes squarely to interactional linguistics. It concentrates on a type of sequential slot in which English and Finnish speakers recover a prior utterance, and scrutinizes how speakers manage the recovery by repeating the prior utterance. In other words, it examines one interactional practice and one related linguistic resource that can be found in two languages, English and Finnish. It explores in detail the characteristics of recovery through repetition (chapters 5 and 6) and cursorily discusses other means of recovery (subsections 6.1.4 and 6.2.3). The selected point of view is explained by another general aim of the study, which is to relate the examination of recovery through repetition to the growing area of research that explores stance taking in interaction. Before a discussion of stance taking, however, I would like to introduce the theoretical and methodological underpinnings of conversation analysis.

### 3.2 Conversation analysis

In this section, I shall discuss concepts that figure centrally in conversation analysis and provide apt analytical tools in the present study. They will offer an introduction to the unique vantage point that conversation analysis takes on talk-in-interaction (for more exhaustive accounts, see, e.g. Drew 2005a; Goodwin & Heritage 1990; ten Have 1999; Heritage 1984b: 233–292; Hutchby & Wooffitt...
Conversation analysis rests on the notion of social action, namely the idea that people’s ordinary, everyday conduct is meaningful and orderly (Pomerantz & Fehr 1997: 69). A sigh, for example, is not regarded simply as an audible release of air from the lungs but, depending on its context, may be understood as a display of tiredness, an indication of trouble in speech production or perhaps a qualified acceptance of a request. Instead of making a post-hoc decision and assigning such meanings to talk and other conduct, conversation analysis relies on participant interpretations (Drew 2005a: 86–87). As Pomerantz & Fehr (1997: 69) put it, conversation analysis aims “to explicate the shared methods interactants use to produce and recognize their own and other people’s conduct”. In order to reach that aim, conversation analysis utilizes the so-called next-turn proof procedure (Hutchby & Wooffitt 1998: 15–17; first introduced in Sacks et al. 1974: 728–729): the current speaker’s turn can be seen to display an understanding of the prior speaker’s turn and to be for its part laid open to interpretation, and possible amendment, by a subsequent speaker. To put it differently, participants construct and revise their intersubjective understanding of their mutual interaction as it unfolds turn by turn (Heritage 1984b: 259).

This focus on social action and the analyses of participant conduct have made it possible for conversation analysts to discover fundamental principles that organize any instance of talk-in-interaction. These principles can be roughly described as dealing with: turn taking and turns-at-talk, organization of turns into sequences, the workings of preference and the management of repair. The full significance of the concepts will become clear in the analysis, but short definitions are provided here.

First of all, insights into turn-taking organization are based on the simple observation that interactants take turns at speaking in systematic ways (Sacks et al. 1974). As an indication of this systematic character, Sacks et al. establish that turns are allocated to one speaker at a time through techniques of speaker self-selecting or current speaker selecting next (on the latter point, see also Lerner 2003). What is more, Sacks et al. (1974) indicate that speaker transfer is managed with as little gap or overlap as possible (for explorations of overlap, see Jefferson 1986, 2004; Lerner 1989, 2002; Schegloff 1987a, 2000, 2002a). One example of participant orientation to the rules of turn taking is the occurrence of recovery: by repeating a prior utterance, for instance, speakers may show that another course of
action has competed with their contribution (see, in particular, subsections 6.1.1–6.1.2) or that an unwarranted pause has elapsed (see subsection 6.1.3).

The use of recovery through repetition presupposes that recipients are able to regard the initial utterance as complete and ready for uptake. Generally, interactants are able to time their contributions appropriately because turns at talk are composed of recognizable units. Sacks et al. (1974: 702–703, 720) introduce the term turn-constructional unit (TCU) to refer to sentential, clausal, phrasal and lexical constructions that allow speakers and recipients to approximate the duration of a turn-in-progress and project its possible completion. They argue that a turn minimally consists of one TCU, after which a transition relevance place is reached and speaker change may occur. Although they base the definition of TCUs on syntactic criteria, Sacks et al. (1974: 721–722) remark that aspects of sound production, such as intonation, also play a part in determining the boundaries of a TCU. A more comprehensive understanding of TCUs has gradually developed that takes explicit account of not only syntactic and prosodic but also pragmatic and nonvocal phenomena (Ford 2004; Ford et al. 1996; Ford & Thompson 1996; Schegloff 1996d). The phenomena form intricate combinations that make it possible for interactants to project the completion of a TCU. Ultimately, then, producing and recognizing a chunk of talk as a possible turn is "a members' problem" (Hutchby & Wooffitt 1998: 48; emphasis in the original).

In addition to viewing turns structurally in terms of TCUs, conversation analysts study the overall turn design, namely the kinds of cues that turns-at-talk provide for the projection and interpretation of actions. Drew (2005a: 82–86) distinguishes between two aspects of turn design: firstly, speakers select the action that their turn will implement and, secondly, they select the means through which the action will be carried out. For example, when recipients misattend to a turn, speakers may go along with the alternative and unexpected course of action, confront recipients with an accusation or pursue a different uptake. Whatever move they opt for, speakers have available another range of possibilities. The pursuit of a different uptake, for instance, may be done through adding to, modifying or repeating the misattended turn, by drawing on a repertoire of lexicosyntactic, prosodic, gestural and other such features, as well as by timing the practice appropriately. Every choice that speakers make in designing their turn thus has consequences for the subsequent interaction.

The design of a turn also reflects speakers’ “orientation and sensitivity to the particular other(s) who are the co-participants” (Sacks et al. 1974: 727). Sacks et al. use the term recipient design to refer to the various properties of a turn that
mark it as being directed to certain recipients in a given setting at a particular point in time. The examination of a turn’s design may therefore lead researchers to pin down the participation framework for the moment of talk that is under study: participants in an interactional event occupy a range of positions that include, but are not limited to, ‘speaker’ and ‘recipient’ (Goffman 1981: 124–159; Goodwin 1981, 1984, 1986). Goodwin’s (1979) classic example of a participation framework shows how a speaker modifies his turn, a single sentence in which he states that he has stopped smoking, in the process of production in order to make his telling newsworthy to all possible recipients (i.e. his wife, who can be expected to have some knowledge of the reported issue, and two friends, who cannot). Goodwin explicates that as the speaker pursues the gaze and uptake of knowing and unknowing recipients at appropriate points in the telling, he engages in the dynamic, interactive construction of a single turn-at-talk. The present study cannot provide visual analyses of participation frameworks but does pay due attention to how participants make their contributions available to others. After all, recovery through repetition can be seen as a negotiation of current participant relations: it is used both as a claim to the right of speakership, which was not initially granted, and as a proffering of the role of recipient to the others.

It has already become clear that recovery is only one of the ways in which speakers may respond to recipients’ not attending or misattending to a prior utterance and that repetition is only one of the ways in which they may carry it out. Indeed, the many aspects of turn design provide evidence for the inherent contingency of interaction: the choices that interactants (i.e. different types of speakers and recipients alike) make concerning their participation may be anticipatable but never predetermined. That is why Ford (2004) and Schegloff (1996b), among others, underline the importance of recognizing that resources, practices, units and actions in conversation are flexibly adapted to variable contexts and are used to manage and exploit emerging contingencies.

Another key concern in conversation analysis is to explore features of sequence organization, to examine how individual turns are linked up. The basic form of such linkage is the adjacency pair, which Schegloff & Sacks (1973: 295–296) define as a sequence of two contiguous utterances that are produced by different speakers and that are recognizable as a first pair part and a type-connected second pair part. Some of the most prototypical adjacency pairs include greeting–greeting, summons–answer and question–answer. To facilitate the proper development of a simple sequence, interactants may expand it with additional turns in the beginning, middle or end (for a comprehensive account of pre-, insert,
and post-expansions, see Schegloff 2007: 28–57, 97–168). In any event, the two parts of an adjacency pair are governed by conditional relevance: on the occurrence of a first pair part, a second becomes relevant so that its presence is expectable and its absence noticeable (Schegloff 1968: 1083). In other words, an utterance is sequentially implicative of a relevant next (Schegloff & Sacks 1973: 296). As I shall argue in section 6.3, utterances that get repeated for the purpose of recovery are not necessarily first pair parts but may more subtly indicate that a particular kind of uptake is relevant.

Explorations of sequence organization have also revealed that interactants may choose which next action to implement, and how, from a set of alternatives that are fundamentally asymmetrical in their implications. There is a preference in interaction for actions that maintain social solidarity over ones that bring about social discord (Heritage 1984b: 280). Schegloff (1988: 453–455) distinguishes between two main bases for preference. On the one hand, preference may be grounded in features of turn design; that is, a turn may be constructed as preferred or dispreferred. This practice-based preference can be detected in, for instance, assessments. According to Pomerantz (1984a: 65), second assessments that are produced as preferred are positioned immediately after the first assessment, composed entirely out of agreement components and made explicit, whereas second assessments that are produced as dispreferred are typically delayed, prefaced and mitigated (see also Heritage & Raymond 2005; Raymond & Heritage 2006). On the other hand, preference may be grounded in sequence structure so that a particular first pair part sets up a binary selection of second pair parts: a preferred one that advances the proposed course of action and a dispreferred one that hinders the progress. The so-called structure-based preference operates, for example, in sequences that are initiated with an information question: Stivers & Robinson (2006) show that answers are preferred over non-answer responses (e.g. accounts and counters) to the extent that if a selected next speaker fails to provide an answer, a non-selected recipient may produce one. Recovery through repetition also attests to the general preference for progressivity in interaction. Once an activity has been initiated, actions that further its development, and ultimately promote its closure, are preferred (Schegloff 2007: 59; Stivers & Robinson 2006: 387). That is to say, repetition of a prior utterance points out that it has not yet been appropriately dealt with and that a suggested course of action has not been followed through.

Finally, then, conversation analysis has discovered interactants to have means for managing potential trouble through repair organization. Schegloff, Jefferson
& Sacks (1977: 361) define it as a system that “operates in conversation, addressed to recurrent problems in speaking, hearing and understanding”. Repair organizes interaction in the sense that there are certain sequential places where repair can occur and certain techniques that can be used for doing repair, the set of options varying according to who initiates it and who carries it out. It should be kept in mind that participants may deem any point in their conversation problematic; there are no predetermined criteria for what is considered repairable in a given interaction (Schegloff et al. 1977: 363). Problems may be directly related to aspects of a speaker’s utterance or they may arise from the placement of the troublesome turn within the sequence. Drew (1997) reports on two instances of the latter: participants may employ an open-class repair initiator (e.g. huh, what) to indicate that they detect a topical discontinuity between the preceding talk and the trouble-source turn or to signal that the trouble-source turn is viewed as an inappropriate response to their own prior turn.

In his discussion on boundary cases of other-initiated repair, Schegloff (1997) goes a step further in expanding the notion of repair to include cases in which a participant does not produce a response although one is expected. Schegloff (1997: 508–512) presents examples of what he calls ‘repair of a sequence’s proper development’ or ‘repair of a sequence’s progressivity’, in which the trouble source is the lack of an utterance, i.e. a participant’s non-speaking, and the recipient of the non-speaking initiates repair to pursue a response. Possible ways to initiate repair of a sequence’s proper development include the use of an open-class repair initiator or an incremented appendor question, namely a prepositional phrase that is syntactically coherent with the speaker’s prior utterance and has rising intonation (Schegloff 1997: 510; Sacks 1992a: 652, 660–663, as cited in Schegloff 1997: 510). As has already been argued, repetition provides another means of signaling trouble in the progressivity of a sequence or an activity. Indeed, it is possible to categorize such cases under the general label of repair. However, analysis should by no means stop there; it is more fruitful to consider the cases as implementing the practice of recovery.

This section has presented the basic conversation-analytic concepts that relate to turn taking and turns-at-talk, sequence organization, preference and repair. Analyses of single examples will make use of the concepts to various extents, highlighting some and ignoring others. It is important to note, however, that because the different types of organization are operative during every occasion of talk-interaction, they are always regarded as potentially relevant for the examination. Having discussed the main concerns of interactional linguistics and con-
versation analysis, I shall now move on to consider the notions of stance taking, recovery and repetition.
4 Stance taking, recovery and repetition

This chapter is devoted to an overview of three distinct but coinciding interactional phenomena: stance taking, recovery and repetition. In section 4.1, I shall draw on previous research to promote the idea that stance taking should be regarded as an interactive process, arising from and intertwining with the ongoing sequence or activity. In section 4.2, I shall take a look at recovery and other means of returning to prior talk. I shall report on the return techniques and resources that have previously been identified and argue that the different types of return indicate speakers’ interpretations of, or stances towards, intervening talk or silence by recipients. In section 4.3, I shall explore the kinds of repetition that have been identified in studies on spoken language in order to develop an understanding of repetition as a resource in interaction.

4.1 Stance taking as an interactive process

Stance can be generally understood as participants’ expressions of their personal position or perspective on the issue at hand, typically on an evaluative, epistemic or evidential scale (see, e.g. Barton 1993; Biber & Finegan 1988, 1989; Hunston & Thompson 2000; Macken-Horarik & Martin 2003; Martin & White 2005; Ochs & Schieffelin 1989; see also chapter 12 and section 10.3 of LGSWE 1999 as well as ISK 2004: 1613–1637). The present study draws on this definition but emphasizes the fact that such positions or perspectives are arrived at in talk-in-interaction through collaboration between participants. In other words, stance taking is here considered an inherently interactive and intersubjective process (see, e.g. Englebretson 2007; Haddington 2005; Keisanen 2006; Kärkkäinen 2006; Wu 2004). In Du Bois’s (2007: 163) words, “[s]tance is a public act by a social actor, achieved dialogically through overt communicative means, of simultaneously evaluating objects, positioning subjects (self and others), and aligning with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of the sociocultural field.”

A couple of notes are in order before a discussion about previous research on stance taking. First, seeing stance taking as inseparable from interaction relates it to two other concepts that characterize participant relations, namely alignment and affiliation as well as their counterpoints disalignment and disaffiliation. Alignment and disalignment by most definitions describe the local development of a sequence, that is, whether or not recipients follow the trajectory of talk that
speaker has proposed (in story telling, for example, recipients align by refraining to take extensive turns-at-talk until story completion and disalign by competing for the floor, e.g. Stivers 2008: 34). Affiliation and disaffiliation depict the nature of social actions, that is, whether or not participants show empathy towards one another and thus promote social solidarity between them (in story telling, recipients affiliate by displaying understanding and appreciation of the teller's point of view and disaffiliate by merely acknowledging it, e.g. Stivers 2008: 35–36). Whereas (dis)alignment and (dis)affiliation are polar categories, stance is a continuum: it is not useful to consider stance as being either present or absent in an utterance but as always being present, to some degree. In other words, the concept of stance makes it possible to expand upon the analysis of sequences that have been identified as (dis)aligning and/or (dis)affiliative. Second, stance may sometimes be used in connection with the notion of affect. Indeed, stance and affect may co-exist within a single turn-at-talk, interconnected and intertwined. To distinguish between the two, it may be helpful to consider stance as an overt, or potentially covert and only invoked, expression of ‘attitude’ or ‘opinion’ and affect as that of ‘emotion’. Although I shall focus on stance, I wish to acknowledge that it may not always be analytically separable from affect.

### 4.1.1 Empirical observations on stance taking

Reviewing prior studies that deal with or touch upon stance taking in interaction, Wu (2004: 3–19) and Keisanen (2006: 33–45) outline three major foci that concern different aspects of turn design: lexical choice, syntactic design and prosodic manifestation. Additionally, Wu and Keisanen highlight previous investigations that have paid particularly close attention to stance taking as an interactive and intersubjective enterprise. In what follows, I shall draw on the outline and many of the references that Wu and Keisanen provide in order to introduce work relevant for the definition and examination of stance taking in the present study.

First of all, speakers have been shown to construct stances through a wide variety of lexical items. These include, for example, epistemic and evidential markers that guide recipients in the interpretation of the turn in which they occur. Kärkkäinen (2003a) indicates that the epistemic fragment *I think* serves a starting-point function in American English because it is routinely used either to introduce a personalized speaker perspective in first position or to bring in a new slant on the matter under discussion in second position. Likewise, I argue in a previous report (Rauniomaa 2007) that the Finnish *minun mielestä* ‘in my opinion’ and
minusta ‘I think’ are employed in assessment sequences either to manage transitions to evaluative talk or to project disagreement. Similar framing functions have been suggested by Karlsson (2003) for the Swedish jag tycker/tycker jag and by Keevallik (2003) for the Estonian ma arvan, which are both translatable as ‘I think’. Kärkkäinen (2003a) also notes the high frequency of another epistemic/evidential fragment, I guess, in American English. Kärkkäinen (2007) examines the fragment in detail and concludes that it frames a ‘just discovered stance’, that is, it organizes participants’ stance taking activity as an ongoing process. Fox’s (2001) study on evidential verbs, adjectives and adverbs (e.g. hear, see, apparently, evidently) similarly attests to participant orientation to the current interaction and interactants: speakers employ evidential marking to scale down their authority over, responsibility for and entitlement to a statement, thus defining their social relationship with the present recipients.

In addition to epistemic and evidential elements, speakers may employ evaluative lexis in order to bring in their personalized perspective at a particular point in a conversation. Goodwin & Goodwin (1992: 10–22) argue that the placement of an evaluative adjective in an assessment turn contributes to the overall organization of the assessment activity. For example, they show how a noun phrase that contains an assessment term secures the co-participation of recipients and elicits a reciprocal display of affect even before the speaker has finished the TCU. In relating the findings of Goodwin C. & Goodwin M. H. (1987, 1992) and Pomerantz (1984a) to Finnish, Tainio (1996: 83) remarks that assessments are inherently descriptive or evaluative and thus involve a clear reference to subjective experience.

Lexical choice also encompasses the use of particles that display an epistemic, evidential or evaluative stance toward the matter being addressed either in the current speaker’s or the prior speaker’s talk. An array of research has been carried out that examines different particles in initiating utterances. In their study on the non-temporal use of the Finnish nyt ‘now’ and Finland-Swedish nu ‘now’, Hakulinen & Saari (1995: 494–495) note that the particles are employed in affirmative declaratives that express the speaker’s personal opinion or evaluation, especially in sequences in which a general claim about some state of affairs has been made (see Hakulinen 1998 for a further treatment of nyt). Raevaara (2004) considers Finnish wh-questions that contain the enclitic particle -s on the interrogative (e.g. mitäs kolesteroli näist tykkää ‘what is their effect on cholesterol’) and points out that an aspect of evaluation may also be present in such utterances. One of the environments in which the particle occurs is position-taking questions,
which simultaneously suggest both that the speaker has a preconception or an opinion about the matter at hand and that the speaker seeks confirmation from recipients. That is to say, “the particle seems to imply that the question presenter has certain knowledge about the topic and/or to create a feeling of solidarity in an action” (Raevaara 2004, English abstract). The non-temporal use of the Finnish particle sit(te(n)) ‘then’ also entails an appeal to common ground between participants. Looking at conversational narratives, Halonen (2005) examines negated clauses in the first person singular past tense that include a communication verb (e.g. mä en sit sanonu mitään ‘I didn’t say anything then’) and focuses particularly on the evidential particle sit(te(n)) ‘then’. She argues that the particle invites recipients to recognize the reasoning process that the teller went through when deciding not to speak (although speaking would have been possible or even expectable in the context) and to understand the teller’s actions in the reported situation.

In addition to their use in initiating interactional moves, particles have also been found to convey speaker stance in turns that respond to prior talk. For instance, Hakulinen (2001) looks into the positioning of the Finnish discourse particle kyl(lä) ‘sure, indeed, alright’ in the utterance: in initial position, the particle highlights alignment with the prior turn, typically a request for information, while at the same time marking the matter as the speaker’s independent opinion; in mid position, the particle signals some resistance on the part of the speaker to align or agree with prior contributions; and in final position, the particle suggests that either the speaker or the recipient has caused some interactional trouble. To put it simply, Hakulinen (2001) proposes that the closer kyl(lä) is to the utterance beginning, the clearer the speaker’s alignment with prior talk. Similar to the implications of initially positioned kyl(lä) particles in Finnish are those of oh-prefaces in English. Heritage (2002) argues that oh at the beginning of a second assessment conveys epistemic independence of the first: it suggests that the point of view offered in the second assessment has been arrived at independently although its expression has been occasioned by the first. Moreover, Heritage (2002: 219) observes that oh claims back the speaker’s primary rights to the assessable, rights which have been undermined by the fact that the speaker has to make the assessment in second position, namely in response to or even “in agreement with” the first (see also Clift 2006; Heritage & Raymond 2005; Stivers 2005).

In an earlier investigation of the English oh, Heritage (1984a) has shown that the particle is generally used to acknowledge new information and to mark a
change in the state of the speaker’s knowledge. In a later report, Heritage (1998) adds that the particle may also convey a shift of attention: when prefacing a response to an inquiry, *oh* signals that the speaker is attending to the matter raised by the preceding inquiry and is problematizing the appropriateness or relevance of the inquiry in its sequential or larger interactional context. Wu (2004) makes a similar observation on the Mandarin-Chinese final particle *a*: it is used to mark a question as somehow unexpected or problematic, an informing as something the recipient should know about or a disagreement as entailing a counteractive stance. Wu continues that final *ou*, in turn, marks a realization, i.e. a just occurred change in the speaker’s epistemic state. She maintains that the particles position the participants asymmetrically with regard to knowledge, orientation or expectations about the matter at hand. Wu (2004: 239) concludes that “final *a* serves mainly to reinforce the speaker’s perspective in the face of such a knowledge/orientation/expectation gap, whereas final *ou* serves mainly to alert the recipient to the existence of this gap”.

Besides being embedded in larger turns-at-talk, particles may also form entire utterances, especially when they constitute response tokens. For example, Jefferson (2002) provides an account of the negative polarity marker *no* as it is used in British and American English, suggesting that *no* does not only acknowledge but also affiliates with a prior negatively-framed utterance. Affiliation and disaffiliation may also be at play in the choice between two particles. Sorjonen (2001) shows that the Finnish response particles *nii* and *joo*, which both mark positive polarity, differ in the kind of response that they provide to an affiliation-relevant utterance: *nii* displays affiliation with prior talk, whereas *joo* merely receives it as registered and understood (see also Sorjonen 1996).

A second, somewhat more limited group of studies on stance taking considers syntactic design, the use of a particular construction in a certain sequential slot. Many of the studies concentrate on institutional settings and task-oriented interactions, particularly ones that involve some form of questioning or consultation. Although such investigations offer interesting insights into stance taking, I shall here focus on reports that concern everyday, casual conversation (see, however, Wu 2004: 8–11 and Keisanen 2006: 37–38 for references; see also Haddington 2005, 2007 for discussions on stance taking in news interviews). The potential significance of syntax for stance taking in conversation is highlighted by an observation made by Heritage (1984a). In an extensive note on the use of partial repeats in response to news announcements in English, Heritage (1984a: endnote 13, pp. 339–344) remarks that whereas partial repeats that are formed as inter-
rogatives (e.g. *did you*) simply mark the information as news and advance the completion of the sequence, those that are formed as declaratives (e.g. *you did*) project disagreement and prepare for the contradiction of the presented information.

There are also other types of responsive turn that convey speaker stance through syntax. For example, Kim (1995) argues that English wh-clefts (e.g. *what that amounts to is that they don’t keep comparable books*) and left dislocations (e.g. *my father, he is not a heavy drinker*) first foreground the speaker’s counteractive stance towards prior talk and then explicate the interactional relevance of the locally disjunctive move. An opposite resource is available for speakers of Korean: Kim (2007) shows that by extending a possibly complete TCU with a post-predicate element (e.g. subject, adverbial, locative phrase), the speaker is able to display an orientation to the disjunctiveness of the turn and thus mitigate the level of affect displayed in it. Furthermore, Kim (2007: 599) maintains that “the post-predicate element creates a post-completion space where the recipient can adjust himself/herself to the affectively loaded action of the speaker and respond with a relevant uptake”. In other words, participants orient to stance taking as a joint endeavour.

Although striving for social solidarity, participants may also implement actions and construct stances that are potentially problematic for the interaction. Drawing on both conversational and institutional data, Koshik (2003) provides an account of English wh-questions (e.g. *when have I*) that are used as challenges. She suggests that such challenges entail a negative assertion (in the above example, ‘I have never’) that brings in the speaker’s epistemic stance. Koshik (2003: 68) argues that such wh-questions dispute the grounds for the claims, actions or feelings that were expressed in the previous, challenged turn. Similar observations have been made by Keisanen (2006), who provides a comprehensive review of negative yes/no interrogatives and tag questions in American English (e.g. *isn’t that weird* and *that’s kind of gross, isn’t it*, respectively). She shows that the constructions implement four main types of action which are relevant to stance taking in different ways: assessments bring in an evaluation of the matter under discussion, requests for confirmation and disagreements indicate the current speaker’s epistemic uncertainty (in different degrees) and challenges display doubt towards the prior speaker’s state of knowledge. In a further account of negative yes/no interrogatives and tag questions both used as challenges, Keisanen (2007) points out that in addition to constructing an epistemic stance, such challenges may be prosodically designed so as to display an affective stance.
Keisanen (2006) starts out with a quantitative grammatical examination of the two interrogative constructions and observes that, more often than not, they contain explicitly stance-related linguistic material (i.e. epistemic, evidential or evaluative items). However, through detailed interactional analyses, she shows that the interpretation of the material and of the turn as a whole is entirely dependent on their sequential position. In other words, stance taking is embedded in the actions and activities that the participants are engaged in and cannot therefore be extracted from their context of occurrence.

Finally, speakers may take stances through *prosodic means*. On the one hand, prosody may provide recipients with cues on how to interpret the speaker’s turn. Günthner (1997b), for instance, examines reconstructed complaints in German, i.e. past or hypothetical complaints that speakers relate to their recipients by using animated reported speech. Günthner (1997b: 269) maintains that prosody is used in such sequences to display speaker stance as well as to pursue recipient alignment: whereas the reported stretches of talk that show only a slight increase in volume depict the complaint as justified, those that show a strong increase of volume and a high overall pitch portray the complaint as unreasonable. Speakers may also employ other features of prosody to prepare for appropriate recipient uptake. Selting (1994) shows how speakers of German signal the climax in a story, ‘the peak of involvement’, by using an emphatic speech style that is characterized primarily by the high density of accented syllables and the production of talk in rhythmic, isochronous units. Selting remarks that an emphatic speech style aids recipients to recognize the high point and imminent end of the story and to respond with relevant displays of alignment and affiliation. In sum, speakers take a certain position toward the issue under consideration and invite recipients to share that position with them.

On the other hand, prosody may also be employed to take a stance towards an immediately prior turn. According to Günthner (1996), interrogatives beginning with the interrogatives *warum* ‘why’ and *wieso* ‘why’ in German can be used either as genuine questions or as moralizing reproaches, depending on the
prosody of the utterance. Günthner (1996: 292) argues that why-reproaches are generally characterized by falling terminal pitch, extreme rising–falling or falling–rising pitch movements and verum-focus (i.e. main accent on the finite verb). Günthner (1996: 297) continues that such prosodic features “trigger the impression of affective irritation and thus a negative evaluation of the topic at hand”. In a similar vein, Selting (1996) examines repair initiations in German and argues that certain clusters of prosodic features indicate ‘surprise’ or ‘astonishment’ in such turns. More specifically, Selting shows that combinations of high global pitch and increased loudness signal that the speaker deems the prior talk as somehow unexpected and as requiring special treatment; prosodically unmarked repair initiations are dealt with in more conventional ways. Consequently, recipients should address both the astonishment overtone and the content of the speaker’s repair initiation by offering possible reasons for the speaker’s astonishment as well as clarifying the problem of expectation (Selting 1996: 264–265).

Both Günthner (1996) and Selting (1996) emphasize the importance of sequential analysis: prosodic features do not form independent contextualization cues but can only be interpreted in relation to the utterance and to the sequential position that they occur in. The same view is promoted by Local (1996: 201–206), who redresses the long-standing misconception that the particle oh with rising–falling pitch contour in English displays the speaker’s ‘surprise’. Local offers evidence for the fact that the particle accomplishes such a display only when it is followed by an explicit formulation of misinformation or forgetfulness by the same speaker.

Additionally, it has been shown that speakers and recipients may relevantly draw on different resources in order to construct a shared stance over a larger interactional sequence. The identification of such sequences clearly necessitates that stance taking is regarded as both interactive and intersubjective. For instance, Niemelä (2005) studies the use of voiced direct reported speech in conversational story telling in English. She illustrates that by producing prosodically matching sequences of voiced direct reported speech, co-tellers may display a shared stance
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4 Egbert & Vöge (2008) make a distinction between the two German interrogatives, arguing that warum ‘why’ challenges the prior turn and is thus disaffiliative, whereas wieso ‘why’ requests information and is thus affiliative. Egbert & Vöge further compare warum and wieso with the English why and posit that the German wh-interrogatives are unambiguous in their function but that the English one is ambiguous as to whether it is purely seeking information or serving another function, such as challenging, at the same time.
with the main teller of a story, or, by embedding such a sequence in their second story, recipients may maintain and further contribute to a stance displayed in the first story. Furthermore, Niemelä (2005: 213–216) discusses an example in which the story teller manages a return from a recipient-initiated aside to the main story line by briefly displaying shared stance with the recipient (who employed voiced direct reported speech to evaluate the story teller before the completion of the story). Clift (2000) presents a case in which the recipient of a telling not only takes up the use of direct reported speech but also delivers it as a ‘collaborative completion’ (Lerner 1991). Clift suggests that the recipient’s contribution constitutes a clear display of affiliation and shared stance with the prior speaker. Indeed, Kärkkäinen (2003b) has shown that establishing a shared stance on story completion is relevant for conversational participants and encompasses a variety of resources. Her observations relate to those of Goodwin C. & Goodwin M. H. (1987, 1992), who argue that assessments may be organized as an activity in which participants work together to reach a ‘peak of heightened mutual involvement’ and to withdraw from it. To put it differently, there are points in conversation where participants can be seen to engage actively in joint stance taking. Nevertheless, there may also be less salient, and perhaps more transient, moments in which stance taking is oriented to as a relevant interactive process.

Many of the reports that have been discussed so far focus on a particular lexical item, syntactic construction or prosodic display of stance and examine it in relation to the ongoing sequence or larger interactional context. I wish to discuss one more study on stance taking in interaction which does not fall into any of the three categories and is therefore particularly relevant for the present investigation. Stivers (2004) reports on a certain type of repetition in English: repetition of a lexical item produced under a single intonation contour (e.g. no no no) that is used to target a larger course of action and to mark it as somehow problematic. She argues that speakers may use this sort of repetition to take a stance towards the ongoing talk as having persevered unnecessarily and to indicate that it should properly be halted. The study aptly suggests that stance taking is locatable not only in the use of individual linguistic items but also in the employment of other interactionally structured phenomena, such as lexical repetition. I shall present Stivers’s findings on the composition and position of the repetition in more detail in subsection 4.3.2.

Having discussed a number of studies that examine stance taking as an interactive process, I now wish to raise the concept to a more abstract level. In the
following subsection, I shall discuss Du Bois’s (2007) theoretical model for
stance taking.

4.1.2 A theoretical model for stance taking

Although the range of practices and resources that participants employ to take
stances in interaction is wide and varied, it is possible to describe the overall
stance taking which can be presented in the form of a triangle, as seen in Figure 1.

![Fig. 1. The stance triangle (Du Bois 2007: 163).](image)

The stance triangle comprises two subjects, a common stance object and three
interconnected processes of stance taking. Subject$_1$ and Subject$_2$ represent the two
participants of an interaction, the numbers indicating the temporal or sequential
order of their utterances. Object refers to whatever is under discussion, be it a
person, thing, event or issue. The sides of the triangle reflect the connections that
are established between the Subjects and the Object. To put it differently, when
producing a stance utterance, Subject$_1$ simultaneously evaluates the Object, posi-
tions himself or herself in relation to the Object and evokes an alignment with
Subject$_2$. Consequently, Subject$_2$ produces a stance utterance that also implements
the three acts at once. I would like to point out that the acts of evaluating and
aligning should be understood fairly comprehensively in this context: evaluation essentially means characterizing the Object as “having some specific quality or value” (Du Bois 2007: 143) and alignment profiles the two stance takers and stances against one another.

The stance triangle provides an apt model for describing stance taking that is involved in recovery through repetition. In all the cases to be discussed in this study, the stance object is identifiable as the progression of a sequence or activity: it concerns either the whole activity or a co-participant’s contribution. In other words, speakers pick out the ongoing interaction as an object which they can evaluate and with regard to which they can position themselves. Subsequent contributions show how the recipients align with the speaker, i.e. whether they share the speaker’s stance or not (recipients can either go along with the proposed course of action or continue another). The stance taking process that is involved in recovery through repetition will be discussed in chapter 6.

Central to Du Bois’s (2007) framework for stance taking is the method of dialogic syntax (Du Bois 2001). Dialogic syntax shows how speakers re-use and recycle linguistic elements in order to engage with and build upon prior speakers’ utterances and, simultaneously, their stances (for similar observations, see Anward 2004 on ‘recycling’; see also Goodwin M. H. & Goodwin C. 1987: 215–227 on ‘format tying’). That is to say, “dialogic syntax details the process of mapping resonances between juxtaposed utterances in discourse” (Du Bois 2007: 140). Du Bois argues that structural parallelisms evoke interpretative and interactional consequences that could not otherwise be brought about. Indeed, Kärkkäinen (2006) illustrates the significance that phonological, syntactic and semantic resonances may have for the joint orientation of participants to stance taking and the gradual construction of a shared stance. Similarly, Keisanen (2002) finds resonance in her examination of an extended sequence of conversation that contains laughter and laughables: by re-using and recycling syntactic structures and lexical items, the participants are able to produce jocular interpretations of the matter at hand and simultaneously construct a shared stance towards it. It should be noted that the overall resonance between participants’ utterances, as highlighted by dialogic syntax, constitutes a more general phenomenon than repetition, because repetition provides participants with specific resources for accomplishing particular actions (see section 4.3). Nevertheless, it is remarkable that these different levels of re-using and recycling are relevant for stance taking.

In this section, I have offered an overview of previous research on stance taking. I have shown that the use of certain lexical items, syntactic constructions
or prosodic features in particular positions within the utterance and the overall sequence contribute to the stance taking of participants. In other words, I have promoted an understanding of stance taking as an interactive process. In conclusion, I have suggested that the discussed studies, particularly the ones that advance an intersubjective view of stance taking, can be fitted into Du Bois’s (2007) generic model for stance taking which provides a comprehensive representation of the process. Next, I shall report on how speakers have been shown to return to their own prior talk.

4.2 Recovery as a means of returning to prior talk

As I pointed out in section 3.2, the design of a turn offers recipients cues on how to interpret the turn and how to respond to it accordingly. Turn design reveals the relevance and sequential implications of that particular contribution to the ongoing interaction; or, as Goodwin (1987) shows, it may suggest that the contribution should be treated as irrelevant and non-implicative to participants’ talk (e.g. when a speaker remarks that she will leave the table to get some ice for her drink). In order to secure proper uptake (or non-uptake), speakers may have to manage varying stretches of silence, intervening talk or problematic recipient responses (see, e.g. Mandelbaum 1991/1992 on disattended complaints; Schegloff 1987b on misunderstood references and sequential implications). Speakers may find it necessary to return to their own prior talk and negotiate its import in the current sequence or activity.

It is possible to discern three major means through which speakers return to their prior talk: continuation, resumption and recovery. The three types of return each comprise a variety of techniques and resources which can be grouped together because of their overall implications to the ongoing sequence or activity. According to Jefferson (1972: 318–319), continuation suggests that the speaker’s line of talk has not been abandoned but is still in progress, whereas resumption (or ‘restart’, Local 1992) indicates that a previously considered line of talk will be brought forth again. To put it differently, continuation and resumption are mainly related to the management of returns after intervening talk that may consist of supporting or competing sequences. The cases in this study do not fall directly into either continuation or resumption; rather, they represent instances in which the speaker’s line of talk has not yet been dealt with at all, at least not in the way
the speaker has proposed. I have adopted the term recovery\(^5\) to refer to such
returns which deal specifically with the lack or inadequacy of recipient uptake.

The three types of return, i.e. continuation, resumption and recovery, treat
intervening silence or talk in different ways. Jefferson (1972: 319) argues that
continuation conceals the problem of returning to prior talk but resumption high-
lights the problem. In this regard, recovery is similar to resumption: it points out
either that no response has been received or that the proffered response is deemed
somehow inadequate or inapposite. These interpretations of, or stances towards,
ongoing interaction and contributions of co-participants are constructed through
different but often comparable techniques and resources. In what follows, I shall
introduce previous findings on such techniques and resources, with reference to
the type of return that they manage and to the scope of the return (i.e. where the
return occurs in relation to the speaker’s prior talk, whether within the same turn
or after a series of turns).

To begin with, speakers may manage returns at a very local level, by adding
elements to their own turn in view of emerging silence. Speakers have been found
to manage local returns as either continuation or recovery. On the one hand,
speakers may continue a TCU or a turn by incrementing to it after a possible
completion, i.e. by producing a grammatically structured extension of the imme-
diately prior unit (Schegloff 1996d: 90). Ford et al. (2002a: 30) argue that
incremental extensions (e.g. adverbs, prepositional phrases and relative clauses)
continue the action that is already in progress and their ending provides the proper
point of possible completion, “thereby masking the interactional trouble that the
lack of uptake could represent”. In other words, speakers can transform recipient
silence into an intra-turn pause by treating their own turn as still in progress. Ford
(1993: 102–130) takes a closer look at adverbial clauses as increments in
American English and illustrates how they elaborate on prior talk to manage
emergent disagreement. In a similar vein, Kim (2007) maintains that in Korean,
which is a verb-final language, post-predicate elements can be used to ward off
potential disagreement because they mitigate the affective stance displayed in the
host TCU and to make relevant a certain kind of uptake by recipients. The
possibility of disagreement is not as salient in the Finnish että ‘that’ clauses, but
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\(^5\) I would like to thank Paul Drew for suggesting that I use the term recovery and for otherwise
commenting on my work at a pre-conference course on conversation analysis that was held in
Tampere, Finland, May 23–24, 2005, in connection with the second conference on Text, Interaction
and Communities: Qualitative Approaches to Society and Social Action.
Seppänen & Laury (2007) suggest that such a clause may be produced after a possible completion to open up the participant framework, that is, to invite confirmation that recipients share the speaker’s viewpoint. In sum, increments are employed to secure a response by providing recipients with more material on which to base their interpretations of the turn. To put it differently, speakers help recipients to respond by carrying on their own talk and thereby taking pressure off recipients for another moment.

On the other hand, speakers may recover their turn on finding that no uptake is forthcoming: they add to the turn-in-progress elements that are independent of the immediately prior unit. For instance, Ford et al. (2002a: 30–31) show that free constituents, which in their data are mainly unattached noun phrases, implement a slightly new action that involves a stance display or an assessment, thus defining the type of response that is being pursued. Kärkkäinen (2003a: 165–168) discusses a case of post-positioned I think in which the speaker employs this epistemic fragment to re-complete her turn and thereby to pursue a verifying response from the recipients. That is to say, grammatically independent additions to a turn both highlight the lack of uptake and advise recipients how to interpret the turn. This is particularly clear in Raymond’s (2004) account of the stand-alone so: speakers may produce so as a new, designedly incomplete TCU in order to prompt recipients to acknowledge the import of their prior talk for the larger course of action that is under way. Raymond (2004: 211) argues that so directs the interpretation of the turn by “invoking a connection or upshot that is claimed to be available to a recipient”. In other words, speakers point to the proper interpretation of their turn but leave it for the recipients to make that interpretation explicit.6

The distinction between different types of return is also visible at a slightly more extensive level: speakers may continue or resume talk after a single contribution by a co-participant. Sacks (1992b: 348–357) illustrates that speakers may skip-connect to their own prior talk occurring last but one: they may connect their current turn to their previous turn and skip over the intervening co-participant’s turn. Sacks notes that mutual skip-connecting is typical to stretches of talk in which participants compete over which line of development will be followed. He
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6 Similarly, Koivisto (2006) examines turns ending in the Finnish particle et(tä) in various institutional settings and shows that the particle is used to invite recipients to infer that which is not made explicit in the speaker’s talk and to respond accordingly.
does not detail the exact means of skip-connecting but points out that such turns are continuations rather than resumptions. Although not discussing it in quite those same terms, Lerner (1989) introduces one procedure that could be regarded as skip-connecting, namely delayed completion. He shows that when speakers of English find that a co-participant has cut in on their turn, they may have a short break in their talk but then bring the cut-off TCU to completion. Lerner (1989: 173) points out that delayed completion deems intervening talk to have been interruptive and may even delete the sequential implications of that talk. Mazeland (2007) argues the same to be true of similar continuations in Dutch and goes on to suggest that resumptions, by contrast, display an orientation to how the intervening contributions have developed the sequence. Sometimes the intervening contributions quite clearly have to do with stance taking: Ford (2004: 43–47) presents a case in which a teller of a story responds to his recipient’s dis-affiliative stance displays by expanding the story, thus treating it as unfinished and providing the recipient new opportunities to affiliate. It is possible, then, for speakers either to acknowledge or to disregard a single contribution that occurred between their prior and current turns.

In addition to doing continuation or resumption after an intervening co-participant contribution, speakers may bridge their talk over fairly long stretches of conversation. Such insertions, digressions, ‘parentheses’ (Duvallon & Routarinne 2001) or ‘side sequences’ (Jefferson 1972) can be initiated either by the speakers themselves or by the recipients. The returns are typically marked by the use of various particles. For example, Local (2004) shows that *and-uh(m)* is used in both British and American English to continue a previously initiated action. By contrast, Sutinen (2008) argues that *but* and *anyway* are employed in American English to resume or recapitulate an action, signaling disjunction with immediately prior talk and marking that talk as alternative or possibly subsidiary to the promoted line of development. Duvallon & Routarinne (2005: 56) observe a similar distinction between the Finnish particles *ni* ‘so, then’ and *mut* ‘but’, which are used to return to the main line of talk after a parenthetical sequence: the former simply continues the suspended line of talk whereas the latter points out a contrast between the parenthesis and the frame. In the same way, Mazeland & Huiskes (2001) identify the Dutch *maar* ‘but’ as a resumption marker that indicates contrast at the level of discourse organization.

Continuation and resumption after an intervening sequence can also be distinguished by phonetic characteristics. In a study concerning English, Local (1992) has detected that whereas the pre- and post-insert talk of continuations
match each other in pitch height and loudness, the post-insert talk of resumptions is higher and louder than pre-insert talk. Although the observations seem valid, Local (2004: 383) has more recently called for a more thorough analysis of the interplay between different aspects of doing a return to prior talk, especially of the relevance of recycled lexical material. Indeed, all the above investigations of continuation or resumption after a relatively long stretch of intervening talk include a remark that speakers may repeat elements from their prior talk in their current turn. In her discussion of resumption in story telling, Wong (2000) focuses exclusively on how speakers employ repetition in order to return to the main story line after a parenthetical sequence. I shall consider her study in some detail in section 5.2.

Furthermore, some rather striking means can be employed to recover prior talk after fairly long stretches of conversation. Pomerantz (1984b) identifies three means through which speakers may pursue a missing response: they may attempt to 1) clarify an understanding problem by modifying the choice or order of words in the original utterance, 2) check presumed common knowledge by ensuring that the participants concur in what is established and accepted as fact, and 3) change their position by invalidating an implication of the original utterance (see also Antaki 2002 on how interviewers personalize questions after problematic uptakes in service audits). In a similar vein, Davidson (1984, 1990) argues that speakers may treat rejections to invitations, offers, requests and proposals as non-final (and acceptances as still possible) by producing a modified or revised version of the original action. She does not discuss the exact means of modification and revision but details the turn-design features that lead speakers to interpret an uptake of a recipient as a rejection or pre-rejection. Nevertheless, Davidson (1984: 107) points out that what is common to the modified and revised versions is that they “deal with some trouble with or inadequacy of the initial version”. To put it differently, by modifying their own prior talk, speakers treat that talk as potentially problematic.

Speakers may also recover their prior talk in ways that put the blame on recipients. For example, Schegloff (1997: 508–510) remarks that the English *huh* with upward intonation can be used for pursuing a response, in his data specifically for prompting an answer to a question. Schegloff considers *huh?* as a repair-initiator that deals with the sequence’s proper development, i.e. treats the recipient’s non-speaking as the trouble source (see section 3.2). Speakers may also use similar means to deem a recipient uptake inadequate. Jefferson (1981) gives an account of the upward intoned English *right* and its German equivalent,
ne, as ‘post-response response solicitations’. She suggests that variants of right?
offer speakers a last resort to pursue an adequate response after they have un-
successfully employed other, milder means of pursuit, such as re-completions.
Whereas milder means of pursuit provide recipients with cues on how to interpret
the turn, the variants of right? make the recipient responsible for revising their
uptake (Jefferson 1981: 82). However, Jefferson (1981: 86) points out that when
occurring after recurrent attempts to secure a recipient response, right? may also
fail but that “while in sheer turn-taking terms the device appears to be utterly
ineffective, it may warn a recipient that his activities are disapproved of”. Thus,
whether or not it receives a response, right? serves to display speaker stance
towards the progression of the sequence.

As the present study will show, repetition provides yet another means of
recovery. Sacks (1992b: 349) mentions the possibility that when recipients do not
follow a speaker’s line of talk, “the speaker reintroduces this thing, and re-
introduces it in the same fashion he introduced it in the first place”. Schegloff
(2004: 122–125) examines two instances of the same phenomenon, arguing that
the utterances have been ineffective in their sequential implicativeness and are
therefore repeated later in the conversation. Schegloff’s analysis highlights the
fact that such cases entail not only the repetition of an utterance but also,
specifically, the redoing of an action. Mazeland & Huiskes (2001: 161) point out
that “[a] repeat is a tying technique that is relatively independent from a turn’s
actual position”. They continue to argue, however, that the repetition of an
utterance does not equal the re-implementation of an action. As my analyses will
show, recovery through repetition is fairly independent of the scope of return (i.e.
it can be used after brief silences as well as after long stretches of talk), but it is
otherwise dependent on the sequence. To put it differently, I shall demonstrate
that instances of repetition constitute cases of recovery only in certain inter-
actional environments.

In this section, I have introduced some of the techniques and resources
through which speakers manage returns to their own prior talk in order to deal
with varying stretches of silence, intervening talk or problematic recipient
responses. In the following section, I shall examine the phenomenon of repetition
in more detail. Chapters 5 and 6 will then be devoted to an investigation of
recovery through repetition in the present data, and subsections 6.1.4 and 6.2.3 in
particular will provide comparisons of repetition with the other means of recovery
that have been presented here.
4.3 Repetition as a resource in interaction

Resaying, recycling a unit of talk, producing two utterances that have the same proposition—these are a few of the ways in which repetition can be defined. It is a widespread and multifaceted phenomenon which has long interested researchers within different fields of linguistics, for example, in phonetics, pragmatics, semiotics, stylistics, and psycholinguistics, as well as in studies on language acquisition and learning. Repetition is also well recognized in many neighboring disciplines, such as rhetorics, poetics, literature, anthropology, communications and marketing (see Johnstone 1987 for an overview of work on repetition in linguistics and related fields). Quite clearly, repetition permeates all levels of language use and breaks down into a variety of distinguishable categories. One’s analytical interests determine how one understands and approaches the phenomenon.

In this section, I wish to explore the kinds of repetition that have been identified in studies on spoken interaction. In subsection 4.3.1, I shall introduce the basic categories that are drawn upon in order to define repetition and in this way I wish to develop an understanding of repetition as a resource in interaction. In subsection 4.3.2, I shall enlarge upon the topic by considering four conversation-analytic studies on self-repetition that are in many ways similar to, and thus serve as a preliminary to an examination of, recovery through repetition.

4.3.1 Defining repetition: basic categories

I understand repetition to mean any instance of talk that can be recognized to have occurred before. In principle, repetition can be seen to cover everything from recycled sounds (see, e.g. Sacks 1992b: 305–309, 321–322, 341–344; and the exploratory paper by Jefferson 1996) to reproduced stories (e.g. Norrick 1997, 1998; Polanyi 1981) or sequences of conversation (Schenkein 1980), as long as it is not only visible to analysts but also real for conversationalists. Most work on repetition in talk-in-interaction falls between these extremes, examining fragments of talk that can be seen to entail a proposition. As Schegloff (2004: 119–120) puts it, ‘[t]here are several places in conversation—that is, either sequential contexts or specific practices of talking—in which speakers seem demonstrably oriented to producing talk that “says the same thing” as was said before and does so by saying it “in the same words.” ’
Participants have been shown to employ repetition for a range of purposes in everyday, casual conversations between adult native speakers (Curl 2002, 2004, 2005; Curl, Local & Walker 2004; Norrick 1987, 1993; Rieger 2003; Schegloff 1987a, 1996a, 2004; Sorjonen 1996; Stivers 2004, 2005; Tannen 1987, 1989; Wong 2000; and several contributions in Johnstone 1994b, 1994c). Repetition has also been observed and studied in therapeutic discourse (e.g. Ferrara 1994a, 1994b: 108–127), service encounters (e.g. Merritt 1994; Svennevig 2004), communications between pilots and air traffic controllers (Cushing 1994a, 1994b: 38–48), radio phone-in programmes (Couper-Kuhlen 1996), television shows (Nofsinger 1994), classroom interaction (e.g. Cekaite & Aronsson 2004; Hellermann 2003; Merritt 1994), adult–child and child–child talk (Goodwin 1983; Keller-Cohen 1979; Ochs 1983; Tarplee 1996), as well as in conversations between native and nonnative speakers (e.g. Keller-Cohen 1979; Svennevig 2004; Wong 2000).

Although every interactional setting has its special characteristics, any instance of repetition can be described according to a set of basic categories: 1) who repeats, 2) what is repeated, 3) where the repetition occurs, and 4) what the repetition does. More specifically, researchers usually differentiate between self- and other-repetition, modified and unmodified repetition, contiguous and non-contiguous repetition, as well as between different functions of repetition, that is, the interactional practices or actions that it implements (e.g. Johnstone 1994a; Norrick 1987; Schegloff 1996a, 2004; Tannen 1987, 1989). These categories evidently interconnect: the input of a particular practice is largely determined by who repeats what in a given sequential position. In what follows, I shall discuss each of the four distinctions in turn, relating them to recovery through repetition and reporting on other studies for which they are vital. I shall use the terms source (utterance) and repeat (utterance) to refer to the two individual fragments of talk that form a case of repetition (these terms are also used by, e.g. Mazeland & Huiskes 2001). 7 ‘Repetition’ is an abstract term that refers to the occurrence of a source and a repeat in an extract of conversation.

First of all, it is important to distinguish between repeats that are produced by the speaker of the source utterance and repeats that are produced by a recipient,

---

7 The two fragments of talk have also been referred to as first and second part (Curl et al. 2004), first and second saying (Wong 2000), first and second occurrence (Norrick 1987) and model and copy (Johnstone 1994a).
i.e. between self- and other-repetition.8 The present study focuses solely on cases in which both the source and the repeat are provided by the same speaker. The distinction between self- and other-repetition is so elementary that it may be taken for granted. Wong (2000: 411, referring mainly to Shimanoff & Brunak 1977), however, remarks that previous inquiries have not always recognized such a distinction to be a matter of interactional consequence. More recent, and especially CA-oriented, studies provide evidence for the fact that self- and other-repetition perform fundamentally different actions.

For instance, Schegloff (1996a: 201–203) points out that in a context in which B has given voice to something that was alluded to in A’s previous talk, there are at least two opportunities for A to repeat, both of which have a distinct outcome. A data extract from the present materials illustrates the point. In line 8, Mary offers a ‘candidate answer’ (Pomerantz 1988) or ‘possible understanding’ (Schegloff et al. 1977: 368) of Alice’s proposal-in-progress in lines 1–6.

(4) sbc007 A Tree’s Life <T:00:18:37>

01 ALICE: well isn’t there any way,
02 like we --
03 .. that we could just m-eet him up there, and,
04 (H)
05 ...(2.6)
06 <YWN>maybe</YWN> (Hx) --
07 MARY: what,
08 bring him down?
09 ...(1.3)
10 ALICE: bring him down,

In line 10, Alice is engaged in ‘confirming an allusion’ (Schegloff 1996a): by repeating Mary’s possible understanding (i.e. through other-repetition), Alice confirms the suggested interpretation without reserve. Schegloff (1996a: 201–203) suggests that another kind of repetition would also be possible in such a context: by repeating parts of lines 1–6, on which Mary’s possible understanding is based (i.e. through self-repetition), Alice would reject or only tentatively confirm the proffered understanding. It is therefore possible to argue that the

8 The pair of terms self- and other-repetition originates from CA terminology in general; others include self- and allo-repetition (Tannen 1987) and same- and second-speaker repetition (Norrick 1987).
significance of a repeat is determined first and foremost by who produces it. The identity of the speaker defines not only the action that is accomplished but also the stance that is possibly constructed.

Secondly, cases of repetition are classified as modified or unmodified, based on an examination of the repeat in relation to the source utterance. The type of repetition under study is more or less word-for-word, although different kinds of transformations are possible. It should be kept in mind that no two items in conversation are exactly the same: at the very least, they differ by virtue of their position (i.e. repeats follow sources). Nevertheless, it is possible to observe different degrees of sameness and to approximate the place of a source–repeat pair on the scale that thus emerges. One cue is to see whether the repeat recycles all the elements of the source, and another is to look for possible variation in the use of individual lexical items, syntactic structures and prosodic features. Certain modifications, such as the addition or deletion of ‘sequential conjunctions’ (e.g. but and and, see Mazeland & Huiskes 2001: 142 for a definition) and changes in deictic expressions, can usually be accounted for by the sequential positions of the source and the repeat. However, Schegloff (2004: 143) remarks that ‘[i]t is not simply that some sequential position “shapes” what a speaker will do in an utterance and how they will do it; what they do and how they do it activates the relevance of the sequential position it displays an orientation to’. That is why every variation, or lack thereof, should be recognized as a potentially distinctive feature and examined thoroughly.

It is worth noting that some studies (such as Norrick 1987; Tannen 1987, 1989) consider paraphrase as one form of repetition. They regard the scale of modification to extend from linguistically segmentable, verbatim repetition to unsegmentable, semantic repetition (Johnstone 1994a: 14–15). By contrast, Schegloff (1996a: 179, note 9) advocates an approach which treats repetition and paraphrase as two distinct, albeit related, phenomena that differ in both their design and use. Paraphrase, or formulation, is a resource used mainly by recipients in institutional interactions to display an understanding of the talk-so-far (Drew 2003; Gafaranga & Britten 2004; Garfinkel & Sacks 1970; Heritage 1985; Heritage & Watson 1979). While going through the data sets, I also took note of possible instances of self-paraphrase that might contrast with repetition but found hardly any. Instead, I found that speakers modify or add to their utterances. I touched upon these alternative means of recovery in section 4.2 and shall return to them in subsections 6.1.4 and 6.2.3.
The third category that is typically drawn upon in order to describe instances of repetition is position. At a general level, this means a distinction between *contiguous* and *non-contiguous* repetition, that is, between cases in which the source and the repeat are in immediate succession and cases in which they are separated by a gap or some intervening talk. By definition, cases of recovery through repetition belong to the latter type: speakers repeat in order to seek or redirect the attention of recipients because they evidently have not attended to or have misattended to the source utterance. At a more detailed level, a distinction can also be made between the different sequential positions that repeats occupy: first position, which initiates a sequence; second position, which responds to a first-position utterance; or third position, which receives or registers a second-position utterance (Schegloff 1996a: 177–179). Although the repeats examined in this study are responsive in character (i.e. they suggest that recipients have not attended or have misattended to the source), they typically occupy a first or second position, namely one that makes a recipient response relevant. I shall consider such sequential implications of the sources and repeats in some detail in section 5.3.

Finally, types of repetition are ultimately defined by the *functions* that they perform in conversation. There is now a growing body of research that examines repetition in talk-in-interaction, essentially viewing it as a resource for a specific practice or action. Firstly, repetition has been found to operate in different sequential junctures: in addition to gaining a turn (Schegloff 1987a; see also Schegloff 2004: 120–122; Goodwin 1980), repetition is used to resume story telling after an insertion (Wong 2000), to halt a sequence-in-progress (Stivers 2004) and to close a sequence (Curl et al. 2004). Secondly, repetition is employed at various stages of repair, initiating repair on a previous speaker’s talk (Jefferson 1972; Schegloff et al. 1977: 367–368; see also Schegloff 1997) and carrying out self- or other-initiated self-repair (Curl 2002, 2004, 2005; Rieger 2003; see also Schegloff 2004: 125–128). Thirdly, repetition is deployed to accomplish particular actions: for example, in casual, everyday conversation these include confirmation requests (Sorjonen 1996), confirmations (Schegloff 1996a; Stivers 2005; see also Schegloff 2004: 126–127), receipts of prior talk (Schegloff 1997: 527–531; Sorjonen 1996) and targeting a next action, i.e. making explicit what it is in the

---

9These terms are used, for example, by Ferrara (1994a, 1994b); others include *immediate* and *displaced repeats* (e.g. Johnstone 1994a) and *immediate and delayed repeats* (e.g. Tannen 1989).
previous speaker’s turn that the current speaker’s action will address (Schegloff 1997: 531–536).

The present study focuses on self-repetition that is employed as a resource in the practice of recovery. To date, there are no full-scale analyses of this usage, but it has been commented on in studies whose focus lies elsewhere. For example, Tannen (1987: 589) presents a case that resembles recovery through repetition and claims that self-repetition is a way for the speaker to continue participation in the conversation “even though he has nothing new to say”. Others have been more precise about the nature of participation that involves repetition. Norrick (1987: 259) notes that both self- and other-repetition are used to reintroduce a topic or point of view, but he does not consider the sequential trajectories that may lead to such a reintroduction. In her study of repetition among children, Ochs (1983: 35–36) observes that a speaker may repeat an earlier utterance to solicit a verification from a recipient, in other words, to pursue a receipt that was noticeably absent after the source utterance. Ochs also points out that children may exploit the practice multiple times if necessary, until they do receive a response. Moreover, the occurrence of repetition has been remarked upon in studies that examine some other aspect of returning to prior talk: it has been recognized as a part of the same resource repertoire as prosodic marking (Local 1992, 2004) and certain sequential conjunctions (e.g. Duvallo & Routarinne 2005; Mazeland & Huiskes 2001). The most extensive, yet brief, discussion of the practice can be found in Schegloff (2004: 122–125). He argues that speakers may find their utterances to have been ineffective (i.e. recipients have not displayed any responsiveness to the source utterance) and, by repeating, they may try to re-instate the sequential implicativeness of their utterances. Schegloff points out that there are several reasons for the possible ineffectiveness of an utterance, the most obvious but by no means the only one being overlap, and that the ineffectiveness holds for a varying amount of time, extending from very short stretches up to minutes. My exploration of the present data will confirm and develop these observations.

It should be noted that the two examples of ineffective utterances which Schegloff (2004: 122–125) provides include both complete and truncated TCUs as source utterances. Without examining the matter in detail here, I would like to argue that there is a fundamental difference between the implications of finished and unfinished source utterances: if speakers bring the source to a possible completion, they treat the source as a legitimate contribution in that particular sequential slot; if speakers truncate the source in mid-production (i.e. before they
make its import fully obvious), they deem the source as somehow misplaced or at least as of less concern at that particular moment than a possible competing line of talk. I recognize the evident interconnection between finished and unfinished attempts to say something and encourage further explorations of it, but I shall here concentrate on cases in which both sources and repeats are complete TCUs and, as such, designed to be sequentially implicative (see chapter 5).

I have here introduced the categories that are typically used in the examination of repetition and described recovery through repetition in relation to them: it is self-produced, more or less unmodified, non-contiguous and serves the purpose of recovery. I shall give a full account of these characteristics in chapters 5 and 6, contributing to the field of interaction-oriented research on repetition. Wong (2000: 420) suggests that “[i]f repetition is a relevant part of our language system and behavior, then there must be some orderliness to it and regularity about it.” Indeed, researchers who delve into the details of talk-in-interaction are successfully identifying and locating the various tasks that different types of repetition perform. In the following subsection, I shall discuss in detail four studies that approach repetition from the starting point that I call for here, investigating the practices of self-repetition.

4.3.2 Focusing on sequence: four accounts of self-repetition

In this subsection, I wish to highlight the importance of sequence- and action-based analysis. I shall discuss four interactional accounts of repetition with data extracts from the present materials: recycled turn beginnings (Schegloff 1987a), first and second sayings (Wong 2000), doubles (Curl et al. 2004) and multiple sayings (Stivers 2004). They are similar in many respects: speakers repeat their own utterances using more or less the same words without virtually any intervening talk by recipients. However, the repeats occur in very different sequential environments and are employed to perform distinct conversational moves. The following discussion will therefore provide evidence for how subtly varied a phenomenon repetition is and offer a short review of the specific field that this study contributes to. Additionally, it should help to distinguish recovery through repetition from other types of self-repetition and to set in perspective the observations that are made in the present investigation.

Schegloff (1987a) pins down one particular sequential position for self-repetition: participants may recycle a turn beginning in order to overcome potential trouble at the point of speaker change. After remarking that turn
beginnings are important for signaling the turn’s placement within the current sequence and for projecting the shape that the turn will take, Schegloff (1987a: 71–73) goes on to argue that an overlap may impair the contribution that a turn beginning has for sequence and turn construction. Namely, overlaps typically occur when the current speaker adds a new element to the turn-in-progress after a possible completion, and when a potential next speaker simultaneously attempts to take a turn as early as possible to minimize the gap between the turns (Schegloff 1987a: 73). Recycled turn beginnings address this problem, as can be seen in example 5, in which Lenore is inquiring how Alina and her husband came to identify a car thief as an acquaintance of theirs.

(5) sbc006 Cuz <T:00:01:08>
01 LENORE: nobody came out and told you,
02 guess [what,
03 ALINA: [(TSK) oh,
04 LENORE: I confess].
05 ALINA: we knew.
06 .. we knew.
07 .. we figured it had to be Michael.

In lines 1–2 and 4, Lenore offers an understanding of the events that Alina has just reported, but she has not yet finished her turn when Alina starts to speak in line 3. Alina in effect displays an orientation to the fact that her turn is somewhat premature: the click at the start of line 3 suggests that she is preparing to take a turn and the following oh functions as an ‘interruption marker’ (Schegloff 1987a: 72). In line 5, Alina then produces the actual import of her turn, we knew, which still overlaps Lenore’s talk. In view of the possibility that Lenore did not catch what Alina said because of the overlap, Alina recycles the turn beginning at the first possible point (Schegloff 1987a: 76), namely, once the overlap ends and there has been only a minimal break in the speech rhythm (line 6). It should be noted, however, that Alina does not repeat the interruption marker oh, which she used at the very beginning of her turn in line 3. As Alina has already gained the floor, there is no need for her to mark the turn sequentially (as interruptive); rather, her concern is to keep the floor, which is what she does by repeating (Schegloff 1987a: 82–83). In sum, Schegloff (1987a: 77–78) shows that just as the current speaker has specific resources for extending the turn, a potential next speaker has the means of first gaining and then keeping the floor, one such means being recycled turn beginnings. From a slightly different perspective, recycled
turn beginnings can also be seen as a resource for repair: they address the possible impairment of a turn component that happened initially to be produced in overlap (Schegloff 1987a: 76).

Self-repetition is also used for organizing larger conversational units, such as story-telling sequences. Looking at conversations between native and nonnative speakers of English, Wong (2000) identifies a type of self-repetition that is used exclusively by native speakers in her data: repetition of a lexical item, clause or sentence within the same turn in order to resume story telling after an insertion of some parenthetical information (see Polanyi 1978 for an earlier discussion of the same phenomenon; see also Duvallon & Routarinne 2001, 2005 and ISK 2004: 1019–1021 for overviews on parentheses in Finnish). The following extract provides a case in point. Marilyn has been telling Pete about her parents’ fishing trips; here she recounts what her parents do with their catch.

(6) sbc003 Conceptual Pesticides <T:00:07:25>

01 MARILYN: and they have it canned.
02 .. you know,
03 they eat it,
04 ...(0.5)
05 when they’re up there,
06 .. and [I guess they] have some frozen,
07 PETE: [right].
08 MARILYN: but they have it canned and,
09 PETE: unhunh.
10 MARILYN: .. (TSK) <VOX>put it in our stockings,
11 .. and [I guess they] have some frozen,
12 PETE: [right].

To describe the composition of the repetition, Wong (2000: 413) uses the formula “first saying + insertion + second saying”, and this sort of repetition can also be detected in the above example. In line 1, Marilyn produces the first saying, they have it canned. She then provides some explanatory information in lines 2–6 by saying that her parents have other ways of consuming and preserving the fish in addition to canning it for later use. In line 8, Marilyn produces the second saying, they have it canned, and thus comes back to the point that she made before the insertion. Pete produces a minimal response token in line 9, and Marilyn moves on in lines 10–11.
One characteristic of Wong’s (2000: 412) examples is that the first saying constitutes, or is placed in, a pragmatically incomplete TCU. In example 6, however, the TCU that comprises the first saying is complete syntactically, intonationally and pragmatically: Marilyn’s utterance in line 1 consists of a complete clause, ends in a final intonation contour and does not project more talk from the speaker (see Ford & Thompson 1996). The TCU’s completeness notwithstanding, no speaker change occurs; there is only a brief break in Marilyn’s speech rhythm at the start of line 2. It is also noticeable that Pete does not attempt to take a longer turn-at-talk but produces ‘continuers’ (Schegloff 1982) in lines 7 and 9. Marilyn thus manages a multi-unit turn, during which she makes an insertion (lines 2–6) and then resumes her main line of talk (line 8). Wong (2000: 415) argues that this may not be an easy task but one which speakers can carry out by employing self-repetition that repositions the just-made insertion and re-aligns the talk topically. Wong (2000: 413) points out that the insertion can be reliably interpreted as one only after the production of the second saying; in other words, it is the repeat, and only the repeat, that enables both participants and analysts to identify this particular resource for resuming story telling.

First and second sayings can also be discussed in terms of repair. On the one hand, the insertion between the first and second sayings can be seen as same-turn self-repair (Wong 2000: 413): the insertion carries some information that could, and perhaps should, have been stated before the first saying. On the other hand, the insertion between the first and second sayings can be seen as a potential trouble source and the second saying as the speaker’s way of pre-empting actual repair; they may be seen as a means of unspoken repair or unspoken repair projection (Wong 2000: 416). To put it differently, by producing a second saying, the speaker can point out the relevance of the insertion to the talk-so-far and ward off potential misunderstandings.

First and second sayings as well as recycled turn beginnings convey the close, complex relationship between self-repetition and repair. Repetition may remedy either an evident or a potential problem in prior talk, but, in both cases, the problem relates to how the sequence proceeds (i.e. whose turn it is to talk or which details should relevantly be mentioned in a story). Recovery through repetition is likewise employed to deal with trouble in the progressivity of a sequence or an activity; it is used to pursue an appropriate uptake from recipients (as chapter 6 will demonstrate). Different types of self-repetition also attest to the overall significance that a particular linguistic resource may have in organizing interaction. Schegloff’s (1987a) and Wong’s (2000) analyses show that self-
repetition plays a noteworthy role in such fundamental interactional practices as turn taking and the management of extended turns-at-talk.

Curl et al. (2004) introduce another sequence-specific function for self-repetition: the so-called doubles are used in topic or sequence closings. The sequential pattern that Curl et al. have found can also be seen in the following example. It is from a telephone conversation in which Jill has just pointed out that she should soon attend to her guest, Jeff’s sister, and Jeff has then joked about Jill choosing the guest’s company over his.

(7) sbc028 Hey Cutie Pie <T:00:25:01>
01 JEFF: (H) .. oh, 02 I’m so glad you guys are having a good time. 03 JILL: n_yeah, 04 .. oh it’s so= great. 05 (H) it’s so= great. 06 JEFF: .. (H) (SNIFF) (TSK) aw, 07 [well give] -- 08 JILL: [it’s so] nice. 09 [2it-2] -- 10 JEFF: [2give2] her a hug for me. 11 JILL: (TSK) okay.

In lines 1–3, both participants are still oriented to the topic at hand, but in the lines that follow, they gradually move out of it. Curl et al. (2004: 40–44) identify six steps in the topic- or sequence-closing process. 1) The short gap at the start of line 4 indicates that either of the participants could take an extended turn to continue the current topic, but they mutually pass up on the opportunity to do so. 2) Jill then produces a recognizable move to topical closure, an utterance that does not project more talk but, rather, sums up what they have been talking about in an appraisal, oh it’s so= great. 3) Jill’s inbreath in line 5 provides another opportunity for Jeff to take an extended turn in order to revive the topic, but he remains silent. 4) In repeating what she has just said, it’s so= great, Jill also turns

---

10 Including a longer extract of the conversation here would reveal that the closing of this particular sequence is in effect a more complex process than the present facile analysis suggests. What is more, Walker (personal communication) has pointed out that they would have considered example 7 as a borderline case because of the omission of oh in the repeat. However, the selected section suffices for the purpose of introducing the findings of Curl et al. (2004), and an in-depth analysis would not invalidate the basic observations made about the example.
down her opportunity to develop the topic any further. 5) Both participants withhold talk again at the start of line 6, thus passing up on yet another opportunity for an extended turn. 6) In line 10, Jeff moves on to a new sequence, give her a hug for me, and Jill confirms the transition with okay in line 11. It is worth noting that Jeff attempts to move on to a new sequence in lines 6–7, but, due to Jill’s turn in line 8, step 6 is postponed until line 10. Nonetheless, Jeff’s first attempt in lines 6–7 already shows “participant orientation to the use of doubles to close a sequence” (Curl et al. 2004: 48), and that orientation is soon confirmed by his successful transition to a new sequence in line 10.

In addition to their specific sequential pattern, doubles are distinct in their phonetic design. Although no full phonetic analysis of example 7 will be carried out here, a rudimentary listening suggests that the repetition bears several of the features that Curl et al. (2004: 50–55) list for doubles: simply put, the two parts are similar in their accentual patterning, but the second part is lower in pitch and shorter in duration. These features highlight the fact that the first part is produced as an independent entity whereas the second part is designed with reference to the first in order to actually form the double. What this means is that an appropriately placed and phonetically suited repeat can basically turn any utterance into the first part of a double, if participants adopt such an orientation (Curl et al. 2004: 49).

Whereas example 7 above shows that a repeat may point back to the source, example 8 below suggests that a source may also project forward to the repeat. Here, the speaker produces a multiple saying, which Stivers (2004) defines as the repetition of a word, phrase or sentence within one intonation contour which is produced in order to halt a course of action that the speaker finds somehow problematic. The participants in example 8 are debating what responsibility is and what it is based on. At the start of the extract, Lisbeth questions the existence of responsibility, introducing a line of thought that some of her co-participants evidently have trouble taking in immediately.

(8) sb¢033 Guilt <T:00:05:00>

01 LISBETH: and therefore,
02         if it’s assumed and not delineated,
03         .. does responsibility exist or not.
04         ..(0.9)
05 JENN: it does.
06 LISBETH: .. ah.
07 good.
The 0.9-second pause in line 4 suggests that Lisbeth’s question is problematic to the recipients. After one of them, Jenn, has finally responded to the question in line 5, Lisbeth moves on to use the answer as a basis for a kind of deductive reasoning in line 8, so we have. Lisbeth’s contributions can be seen to develop a complex line of thought which is cut off by Laura’s wait wait in line 9. Rather than being directed only to the just prior utterance (i.e. to Lisbeth’s good in line 7 or, even less likely, to so in line 8), Laura’s turn addresses the entire sequence-in-progress and halts the current course of action until the emergent problem has been solved (Stivers 2004: 269). It is true that even a single wait would have a halting effect, but its scope would be limited only to the immediately prior talk. Indeed, Stivers (2004: 288) argues that multiple sayings provide evidence for the fact that “speakers also understand sequences of talk to comprise larger courses of action and have resources for addressing these larger organizational packages.”

As is characteristic of multiple sayings, a full unit of talk (i.e. the lexical item wait) is here produced multiple times in immediate succession under a single falling intonation contour (Stivers 2004: 261). Stivers (2004: 288) suggests that because multiple sayings are prosodically produced as comprising a single TCU, they are identifiable as multiples from the very beginning. Nonetheless, Stivers (2004: 285–288) also points out that speakers are able to deal with the varying contingencies of interaction: on the one hand, they may abandon a multiple saying in the middle of producing it, or, on the other hand, they may transform a single linguistic item into a multiple saying, as the need arises.

The studies of doubles and multiple sayings contemplate the relationship between sources and repeats. It is axiomatic that any instance of repetition is realized only on the occurrence of a repeat, but there are differences in how the repeat is tied together with the source. In the case of verbatim self-repetition, the
tying is managed mainly through prosody, features of accentuation, intonation, duration and pitch guiding recipients to interpret the repeat in relation to the source. In doubles the repeat is marked to be dependent of the source, and in multiple sayings the source projects forward to the repeat. In cases of recovery through repetition, the prosodic relationship between sources and repeats is vague: a repeat may be relatively independent in terms of prosody but, because of its design and position, can be understood both to redo the same action that was accomplished by the source and simultaneously to add a layer of stance to it. I shall consider this observation in detail in chapters 5 and 6.

With this rather extensive discussion of previous research on self-repetition I have wanted to emphasize the significance of close sequential analysis in the study of such linguistic-interactional phenomena. I hope to have shown that if repetition is to be understood as a resource in social interaction, it should be studied in connection with the practices and actions that it is used to implement. Such an understanding of language also entails an acceptance of the fact that interaction is inherently contingent. Participants may either modify their conversational moves or discard one and take up another in accordance with what others are doing.
It was established in section 4.3 that the type of repetition under study can be described as more or less unmodified, non-contiguous self-repetition that is used for the purpose of recovery. In this and the following chapter, I shall explore the composition, position and function of the phenomenon in detail. The present chapter is concerned with the linguistic and local sequential aspects of recovery through repetition and chapter 6 with its interactional environments and functions. The careful description that I shall provide here sets up and complements the sequential analysis that will follow. It should be noted, however, that the different linguistic and sequential features are in effect only interpretable in relation to one another. I shall take this fact into account even though I shall discuss the features separately.

In section 5.1, I shall focus on the lexico-semantic, syntactic and prosodic features of the sources and examine to what extent those materials are recycled in the repeats in the present data. I shall discuss the kinds of items that are repeated (i.e. lexical, phrasal and clausal) and consider their overall linguistic import. This will allow me to explore what makes the particular utterances, and actions, repeatable in a given context. Although I shall identify cases of recovery through repetition on lexico-syntactic rather than prosodic grounds, I shall also make observations about the latter whenever possible.

In section 5.2, the focus will shift from commonalities to differences. The sources and their respective repeats are not always identical; speakers may make compositional changes to their utterances in order to deal with interactional requirements and to display orientation to the sequence in progress. I shall explore the different lexical and syntactic additions and deletions that occur in the data. I shall also touch upon the prosodic changes that speakers produce.

After having examined the composition of the sources and repeats in detail, I shall turn to the implications that they have in their context of occurrence. Section 5.3 will widen the perspective on recovery through repetition by relating the turn-design features of the sources and repeats to the expectations that they set up for subsequent recipient responses. I shall focus on the sources but argue that the sequential implications of the utterances are reinstated as they are repeated. I shall summarize the chapter in section 5.4 in preparation for a discussion of the interactional environments of recovery through repetition in chapter 6.
I would like to point out that the amount of data in this study, forty cases in English and nineteen in Finnish, is too limited for a reliable compilation of statistics on recovery through repetition. In what follows, I shall refer to the frequencies of the different features that can be found in the data, but they should be taken as only suggestive of the quantification of the phenomenon as a whole (see Schegloff 1993 on quantitative observations in conversation analysis).

5.1 Lexico-semantic, syntactic and prosodic characteristics

In terms of syntax, the sources and repeats in the data take several forms: they range from clausal and phrasal items to single words in both languages. In the majority of cases, the repeated utterances are clauses: twenty-nine out of forty instances in the English data and fourteen out of nineteen in the Finnish data are syntactically constructed as such. Examples 9–12 represent cases in point. For presentational purposes, I shall here leave out as much context as possible and produce only the source utterances. It should be kept in mind that repeats are almost word-for-word with their sources; however, see section 5.2 on possible differences. (Sources are marked with arrows; repeats will be marked with double-shaft arrows.)

(9) sbc017 Wonderful Abstract Notions <T:00:19:35>
01  MICHAEL: [look at what’s on TV].
02    @
03  JIM:     yeah.
04->     [I just put it on].
05  MICHAEL: [(H) Mandelbrot].

(10) sg067_b3 Conversation Continues <T:00:14:28>
01  REIJA: [miks] halogeeni-lampu-i-ssa pitää olla
        why halogen-lamp-PL-INS have.to be:INF
        by the way why do halogen lamps have to
        muuten muuntaja (Hx).
        by.the.way transformer
        have a transformer
02    ...(0.4)
03  TERO:  ilmeise-sti se ei kärsi kah-ta sata-a
        apparent-ADV 3SG NEG take two-PTV hundred-PTV
        apparently the lamp can’t take
        kah-ta-kymmen-tä voltti-a se lamppu.
        two-PTV-ten-PTV volt-PTV 3SG lamp
        two hundred twenty volts
REIJA: (SNIFF)
just just,
PRT PRT
I see
eli se muunta-a se-n sähkō- mää-rä-n
so 3SG transform-3SG 3SG-ACC electricity-amount-ACC
in other words it transforms the amount of electricity
piene-mmä-ks.
small- COMP-TRANS
lower
eli se sää [stä-ä sillon sähkō-ä].
so 3SG save-3SG then electricity-PTV
in other words it saves electricity then
TERO: [jännittee-n].
voltage-ACC
voltage

(11) sbc013 Appease the Monster <T:00:01:22>
KEVIN: Wendy ha=s .. tried her hand,
for the first time at making a clue=.
KEN: (H) oh,
a clue=?
KEVIN: .. a [clue].
WENDY: [oh] [2=,
KEN: [(H)] [2is this the kind of clue that2]
[3goes from room to room3]?
WENDY: stop it.
KENDRA: [3make fun of me3].
KEVIN: [4is it a real one,
or3] is it a,
KENDRA: [4is it a4] Perry one.

(12) sg121_a Crappy Channel <T:00:10:11>
MATTI: niin nii-st puhelim-i-st puhe-en ollen,
so speaking of the telephones
this be:3SG really shit-GEN-looking
mu-n miele-stå</P>.
1SG-GEN mind-ELA
in my opinion
In their context of occurrence, the clauses implement a variety of actions: an explanatory report (example 9), a conclusive formulation (example 10), an evaluative request (example 11) and an assessment (example 12). What they all have in common is that the action can be expressed in a single utterance and does not necessitate the speaker taking an extended turn. That is to say, speakers repeat utterances that are extensive enough to carry meaning but yet compact enough not to require any extra effort for keeping the floor.

It is worth noting that the utterances may or may not in themselves contain elements that could be described as displaying stance. In examples 9 and 10, there are no explicit markers of stance: the lexical items that make up the clause do not carry any evidential, epistemic or evaluative semantic meanings. Examples 11 and 12, by contrast, are clearly evaluative. Example 11 contains the negated idiomatic expression *make fun of* that lexically conveys the speaker’s point of view on the issue at hand, and example 12 is a prototypical assessment that includes the assessment term *paskannäkönen* ‘shit-looking’ (see Goodwin C. & Goodwin M. H. 1987: 22, Tainio 1996: 85) and is further incremented with the stance marker *mun mielestä* ‘in my opinion’ (see Rauniomaa 2007). The amount of explicitly stanced material varies throughout the data, but misattended utterances are more often explicitly stanced than those that have not been attended to at all. What is more important here, however, is that the utterances contribute to stance taking as they are being repeated in a particular sequential slot. Chapter 6 will consider this aspect of the utterances in more detail.

It is striking that most of the clauses in the present data are simple, independent entities; only four clause combinations are repeated in the English data and one in the Finnish data. Here are examples from both languages.

(13) sbe004 Raging Bureaucracy <T:00:06:19> (*they* refers to substitute teachers)

01 CAROLYN: [you know,
02          *they*] come in with that .. attitude,
03          and they go,
04          .. ((THUMP)) <VOX>I’ve always wanted to teach math.
05 SHARON: @@
06 CAROLYN: *(H) now,
07 *(H) [what are we on</VOX>]*?
08 SHARON: *[<VOX>it’s gonna be] .. [2great</VOX>]*.
09 CAROLYN: *[2as2]*
10 *(H) you know,
11 and you’re saying,
.. uh,
we're on,
(H)
...(0.8)
uh=,
KATHY: .. @@@
CAROLYN: <L>square root of pi=</L>?
[uh,
KATHY: [@@@]
CAROLYN: and they look at you and they go,
...(1.5)
<VOX>the what</VOX>?
SHARON: .. @@@@@
CAROLYN: so they don't know what the hell they're doing.
[Vox>uh],
SHARON: [<VOX>pi=]?
CAROLYN: (H) [2why don't we go out and run some laps</VOX>2].
SHARON: [2I didn't bring any pie with me today2].
CAROLYN: you know,
KATHY: [@]
CAROLYN: [they] --
they don't know what they're [2doing2]?
SHARON: [2I don't think2] we can have pie till lunch,
[vox>]
(14) sg151_a Chat about Something <T:00:30:18> (the participants are planning a circuit-training session)
IRA_1: <@> Joni-han vo-is mennä [pitä-ä-n first_name-CLJ can-con go:INF hold-INF-ILL
Joni could go lead nii-lle tytō-lle-ille</@>?
3PL-ALL girl-PL-ALL
JANETTE: [(Hx)= @]
IRA_1: .. ihan oikee-sti.
really real-ADV seriously
EMMA: e-n mie tīa suo [stu-u-ks se].
NEG-ISO iso know agree-ISO-0 3SG
I don’t know if he will agree (to do that)
Traditionally, examples such as 13 and 14 have been understood to consist of a main clause (they don’t know in 13; en mie tiä ‘I don’t know’ in 14) and a subordinate clause (what they’re doing in 13; suostuaks se ‘if he will agree (to do that)’ in 14). Viewed in this way, the main clause contains a complement-taking predicate, here know, and the subordinate clause functions as a complement that constitutes the clausal object. Drawing on naturally-occurring conversations, Thompson (2002) aims to pull away from the traditional categorization which is largely based on constructed or written data. As an alternative, she suggests that the first element in utterances such as 13 and 14 be considered a formulaic epistemic fragment that frames the second element, a finite indicative clause. Such fragments bring in an epistemic, evidential or evaluative perspective, i.e. speaker stance toward the content of the associated clause (Thompson 2002).

Even though Thompson (2002) examines American English, her characterization of the epistemic/evidential/evaluative, or simply e/e/e, fragments holds particularly true for the Finnish instance here: in example 14, a first-person subject co-occurs with a mental verb, and such a combination has been shown to be a frequent collocation in conversational Finnish (see Helasvuo 2001: 32; see also Rauniomaa 2007: 224–225). Example 13 is less formulaic because the epistemic fragment contains a third-person plural subject. Nevertheless, Thompson (2002: 152) argues that such cases have the properties of an e/e/e fragment; they simply do not form the core set of data. It should be noted that other kinds of clauses can also occur with e/e/e fragments, but in both examples 13 and 14 they are interrogative: they are marked as such by the interrogative what in English and the interrogative clitic -kO, which is here reduced to -k- in the verb suostuaks ‘agree’, in Finnish. In sum, the clause combinations are fixed: instead of regarding them as complex clauses consisting of main and subordinate clauses, they are better understood as single units.

I am not familiar with the word läähkä nor is it listed in the standard and dialect dictionaries that I have consulted. In this context, however, the word is interpretable as either ‘exhausted’ or ‘excited’ (or both).
Intonationally, most sources and repeats end in a contour that indicates the completion of some relevant interactional unit. In the English data, this is done mainly through final intonation (indicated by a period in examples 9 and 11), and to a lesser extent through appeal intonation (indicated by a question mark in example 13). In the Finnish data, only final intonation is employed to signal completion (examples 10, 12 and 14). Continuing intonation, which is indicated by a comma, is also used in both languages: it is typically employed in summonses, story prefaces and other preparatory actions; to put it differently, in utterances that are essentially complete but that speakers are likely to supplement with another one (see example 15 below).

Generally, then, the repeated stretches of talk are potentially complete in terms of syntax, intonation and interactional import. Indeed, they can be regarded as turn-constructional units (as defined by Sacks et al. 1974: 702–703; see also Ford 2004; Ford & Thompson 1996; Ford et al. 1996; Schegloff 1996d). In other words, both the sources and repeats constitute single turns-at-talk or could in principle do so. Even if a repeated utterance forms a part of a larger turn, it can be seen to implement a separate action, such as a story preface in a story telling sequence.

The following examples can also be interpreted as TCUs and thus as potential actions. In contrast with the previous ones, the following utterances consist of single lexical items or phrases, and their interpretation is therefore highly dependent on their sequential location. Seven cases can be found in the English data and four cases in the Finnish. Examples 15 and 16 are from the English data set.

(15) sbc013 Appease the Monster <T:00:10:27>
01 WENDY: [we have] grandma='s ... vacuum cleaner.
02 MARCI: (H) <SM><VOX>oh=,
03 and you were gonna give that to her?
04 WENDY: that's fine.
05 MARCI: [oh I n- --
06 WENDY: [then she doesn't have to wait forever,

It is worth noting that the majority of the sources and repeats are also produced in one intonation unit. To put it differently, in these data, IUs and TCUs often overlap. I shall not pursue the matter here, but “there is clearly a need to carefully explore the connection between them”, as Kärkkäinen (2003a: 32) points out. What is more, Chafe (1994: 78) notes that around 60 percent of IUs in English consist of a single clause, which further supports the observations made here.

12 It is worth noting that the majority of the sources and repeats are also produced in one intonation unit. To put it differently, in these data, IUs and TCUs often overlap. I shall not pursue the matter here, but “there is clearly a need to carefully explore the connection between them”, as Kärkkäinen (2003a: 32) points out. What is more, Chafe (1994: 78) notes that around 60 percent of IUs in English consist of a single clause, which further supports the observations made here.
07  MARCI: .. no=].
08  WENDY: for] ou [2=rs2].
10  KENDRA: [3<VOX>cool,
11  KEVIN: [3your fl- --
12  KENDRA: dude</VOX>3].
14  MARCI: [4(H)4]
15  KEN: [5@5] [6@6] [7@7]
16- > MARCI: [Kendie5][6=6],
17  WENDY: [6@6]
18  KENDRA: [7let me7] tell [8you8],
19- > MARCI: [8Kendie8],
20 .. it's a [9used9] vacuu=m,
21  KENDRA: [9XX9]

(16) sbc007 A Tree’s Life <T:00:22:25>

01  MARY: (TSK) I don’t know if Tammy would be too happy with that
        though.
02  ...(3.0)
03  (SWALLOW) seems to me that she’s trying to straighten
        herself out,
04  and,
05  ...(0.9)
06  pursue a family.
07  ...(0.5)
08  ALICE: Tammy?
09  ...(1.0)
10  MARY: (TSK) what do you think.
11  ...(1.2)
12  ALICE: I don’t know (Hx).
13  ...(3.0)
14  MARY: (TSK) or do you think it might be a matter of
        convenience.
15  ...(0.7)
16  ALICE: I think it’s a convenience for both of em.
17  ...(1.9)
18- > MARY: yeah=?

Although the source utterances in examples 15 and 16 consist of single words (a
proper noun and a particle, respectively), they are understandable as possibly
complete units that implement certain actions in the given context. However, the
source utterances occupy very different positions in the ongoing interaction. The source in example 15 is produced as a summons to attract the attention of a particular participant in a multi-person conversation. Summonses are relatively unconstrained in their sequential placement: they are not tied to a prior action but project forward to a recipient response (see Schegloff 1968). By contrast, the source in example 16 is interpretable only in relation to the immediately prior speaking turn. The many variants of items such as yeah, mhm and hm are best described as ‘response tokens’ (Gardner 2001) or ‘response particles’ (Sorjonen 2001). As these terms imply, the items are produced in response, or in reaction, to preceding talk. Although response tokens may be repeated (see, e.g. Jefferson 1981: 69–70), they are typically not repeated for the purpose of recovery because they provide only a minimal uptake in second position and do not project further talk. Furthermore, such tokens are strictly indexical, and as a result they are interpreted as responses to whatever has come before them. In example 16, however, the repeated yeah works not only as a responsive acknowledgement token but, because of its distinct appeal intonation, also as a request for the recipient to expand on or account for her previous assertion. More importantly, the source is followed only by a pause, and the repeat (not presented here) can therefore be heard as being connected to the same co-participant turn as the source. For these reasons the item may be repeated here.

Examples 15 and 16 are clearly grounded in the ongoing conversation but syntactically they are independent of preceding talk. Examples 17 and 18, by contrast, show that it is also possible for a repeated item to build upon the previous utterance more tightly.

(17) sbc019 Doesn’t Work in This Household <T:00:14:28>
01    JAN:   (TSK) (H) [= Ron, di]d you know Annette.
02   (Hx) uh,
03   [Dill].
05-> MELISSA: [Kruger].

(18) sg067_a2 Lawyer Issues <T:00:08:20>
01    TERO: ain [ut mi]tä osa-a tehä [2auto-1le2],
  only what can-3SG do:INF car-ALL
  the only thing Ø knows how to do to a car
02   REIJA: [(SNIFP)]
03  KAARINA: [2@@@2]
Here, the sources continue syntactic structures that another participant has introduced and possibly completed. These sources are designed to fit in with a previous speaker's utterance and provide a new or alternative completion to it in much the same way as co-constructions do (see, e.g. Ono & Thompson 1995; Szczepk 2000b, 2000a). In example 17, Melissa’s suggestion for a sought-for last name builds on Jan’s introduction of a first name: *did you know Annette KRUGER* (lower-case letters and small capitals distinguish between parts of a single syntactic entity that have been produced by different speakers). In example 18, Reija provides the last item to a three-part list that Tero has initiated (see, e.g. Jefferson 1990; Lerner 1994): ‘to change tires, to add water to the washer fluid reservoir AND TO FILL UP (THE GAS TANK)’. The repeats, which are not presented here, are produced soon after the sources and exploit similar contextual elements. Although the sources in examples 17 and 18 are grammatically dependent on prior utterances, they do constitute TCUs; in other words, their design is ‘positionally sensitive’ (Schegloff 1996d: 76–77).

In sum, I have argued that the composition of the sources and repeats in the present data syntactically identifies them as TCUs: they include clauses, phrases, single lexical items and combinations of these. There may also be intonational cues that mark the utterances as finished. Clearly, then, the source utterances do not project repetition (cf. multiple sayings, which Stivers (2004) argues to be generally recognizable as repetition from the outset). Rather, they are possibly complete entities that provide recipients with an opportunity to respond.

Syntactically, the sources and repeats are most commonly clauses: forty-three out of fifty-nine cases in the present data belong to this category. A single clause can be seen to form an ideal interactional unit for recovery through repetition because it is more or less self-contained; clearly, a clause is extensive enough to
carry meaning and yet compact enough to be produced in a single TCU. The present findings thus attest to the observation of Thompson & Couper-Kuhlen (2005) that the clause is the most prominent format for implementing social actions, the locus of interaction. There are also single lexical items and phrases in the data, but they are more infrequent than clauses. Unless they implement certain forward-projecting actions (such as summonses), lexical items and phrases are highly dependent on their immediate environment sequentially and possibly also syntactically. A repeat can only be produced if it can be tied to prior talk in the same way as the source. To put it differently, any fragment of talk that implements an action can in principle be repeated for recovery—within current sequential constraints.

I have already noted that the repeated stretches of talk in the data do not necessarily include any explicitly stanced material, which means that a traditional view of stance would generally not recognize these sources and repeats as contributions to stance taking. As I shall argue in chapter 6, it is the repetition that ultimately involves the participants in stance taking. Furthermore, if the source utterance is already somehow stanced, the repeat will add another layer to the stance taking. In such a case, whereas the source plainly takes a stance toward the object under discussion, the repeat not only re-implements that stance but also introduces an additional stance toward the ongoing interaction or the contributions of recipients. This will become particularly evident in section 6.2.

In terms of the characteristics that are examined in the present section, English and Finnish work in a similar fashion: the same kinds of items are repeated in both languages. The structural differences between the languages will become visible in the following section, in which I shall pay more attention to the subtle modifications that speakers make to the utterances that they repeat.

5.2 Additions, deletions and replacements

In my initial description of recovery through repetition (chapter 4), I argued that the repeats in the present data are more or less identical with the sources. I have used the expression “more or less” to account for the possibility of some added, deleted or replaced elements. Where the sources and repeats are not identical, the alterations do not change the proposition of the utterance nor the action that it accomplishes in any significant way. In twenty-one cases of the English data and in three cases of the Finnish data, the interactional environment allows for verbatim repetition; in the rest of the cases, the sources and repeats differ
primarily in accordance with their position in the sequence. In this section, I wish
to discuss the slight modifications that speakers make to their utterances when
repeating. It should be pointed out that the focus here is on lexico-syntactic
modifications. Prosodic changes in the present data are so varied that I am not
able to detect any general tendencies in their employment.

Schegloff (2004) calls the different modifications ‘dispensables’, i.e.
elements that speakers can do without, dispense with, on either the initial or a
subsequent saying. He provides a list of dispensables that appear across different
loci of repetition in English: TCU-initial operators (e.g. discourse particles,
connectives, tokens), TCU-initial grammatical constituents (e.g. subjects, verbs)
and turn-final elements (e.g. address terms, courtesy terms, ‘or X’ components,
epistemic downgrades, tag questions). Speakers may also simplify a complex
initial utterance that has proven problematic or clarify an indexical expression, for
example, by replacing a pro-term in the source with a full term in the repeat
(Schegloff 2004; see also Schegloff 2002b). Not all of the dispensables are
directly applicable to Finnish, but I shall use Schegloff’s list as a basis for the
following observations.

First, speakers may delete or add TCU-initial items that indicate how the
current utterance relates to the ongoing sequence. Among the omitted items in
English are disagreement tokens (no), prefaces (well) and discourse particles or
connectives (but, and, so). In example 19, the initial but is omitted in the repeat.

(19) sbc015 Deadly Diseases <T:00:11:09> (this stuff in lines 2–3 refers to dietary
supplements)

01 JOANNE: o- 1e- --
02 does George take any of this stuff?
03 LENORE: he won’t take any of this [stuff].
04-> JOANNE:                        [<HI>but] he’s as</HI> healthy
                              as an ox,.
05-> that guy.
06 ...(0.9)
07=> (H) that guy is <MRC>heal [thy as an] o=x</MRC>.
08 LENORE:                        [<X><P>his liver</P></X>],
09 except for his liver</P></X>.

The source utterance, Joanne’s but he’s as healthy as an ox, that guy (lines 4–5),
contrasts with Lenore’s immediately prior turn by giving an explanation for
George’s refusal to take dietary supplements (i.e. he may not need them). The
TCU-initial connective but in line 4 marks the divergence between Lenore’s and Joanne’s turns. The repeat, however, is produced at a position in which such framing is not necessary: Joanne recovers her talk in line 7 after a gap that has followed her own turn.

It should be pointed out that there is also another change in example 19, one that is rooted in the source utterance. The initial subject of the source, the pronoun he, is first incrementally replaced by the lexical noun phrase that guy (lines 4–5). Whereas he recycles the same reference form that Lenore used in her turn and thus ties the participant contributions together, that guy cuts off the connection and introduces Joanne’s turn as independent of the prior. The latter form of reference is then recycled in the repeat.

What is more, example 19 shows that prosodic differences are possible, and perhaps even likely, in cases of recovery through repetition. Firstly, Joanne produces the start of the source utterance with a relatively high pitch, which suggests a new beginning, a slight diversion from the subject matter of the immediately prior talk (see Couper-Kuhlen 2004). The repeat, by contrast, has a more moderate falling contour. Secondly, Joanne uses a regular speech rhythm throughout the source but produces healthy as an ox in the repeat with a marcato rhythm, emphasizing each word and thus highlighting the main element of her argument.

In the Finnish data, dispensables that are omitted from the beginning of a TCU include the particles no ‘well’ and ai ‘oh’. Here is an example of the latter.

(20) sg121_b Crappy Channel <T:00:19:58>

01 IRA: [mut e]i-kse ol-lu kъmminki kъy-ny jo &
      but NEG-Q 3SG be-PCP anyway go-PCP already
      but hadn’t she in any case already been

02-MATTI: ai sie kuu [l-i-t] a [2sia-sta <@> ni/@>2],
         PRT 2SG hear-PST-2SG matter-ELA so
         oh you heard about the matter so

03 IRA: & [test-] [2nois2],
         (test) those-INR

04 EKI: [2ei ollu2].
         NEG be:PCP
         no she hadn’t

05 IRA: .. [3ai3] [4niin4].
         PRT PRT
         oh yes

06 EKI: [3e13] [4ollu4].
         NEG be:PCP
         no she hadn’t
Matti produces the source utterance (line 2) in response to Eki’s report that Eki’s girlfriend recently canceled her participation in a clinical trial. The initial ai ‘oh’ acknowledges the news before Matti moves on to suggest a possible chain of events that led to the girlfriend’s decision (i.e. that Eki allegedly forbade her to participate). When Matti repeats his utterance in line 7, Eki’s report has been under discussion for a while and there is no need for Matti to mark it as news.

The start of a TCU is subject to opposite changes: the same items that can be omitted from a repeat can also be added to it. In the English data, the following TCU-initial additions can be found: no, well, but, and and cause (in the sense of ‘because’). The connective cause is attached to the repeat in example 21.

(21) sbc002 Lambada <T:00:01:15> (they in lines 1–2 refers to children’s bones)

In line 2, Jamie provides a non-serious explanation for why children’s bones heal relatively fast, formulating and exaggerating Harold’s account in line 1. The jocular tone in Jamie’s turn is not taken up by any of the recipients, as the 0.4-second gap in line 3 and Jamie’s affirmation in line 4 show. Instead, Harold continues on a more serious line of talk in lines 5–6. As an opportunity presents itself, Jamie repeats her utterance in line 8, designing it now to fit Harold’s preceding utterance: little kids usually don’t break their legs anyway cause they’re [so X] [2XXX2]. This connective cause at the start of the TCU thus binds Jamie’s utterance to Harold’s turn in lines 5–6. Moreover, it provides a competing alternative to Pete’s contribution in line 7, especially as it exploits the same syntactic structure, cause they’re X.

Similar additions can be found in the Finnish data set: nii ‘yes, so’ is added to the beginning of a repeat. In example 22, the participants are wondering how a celebrity has attained her looks.
(22) sg121_a Crappy Channel <T:00:27:58>

01 EKI: [on viisiiin solariumi-s istu-ttu
be:3SG apparently sunbed-INE sit-PCP
Ø has apparently sat on a sunbed
</P>
<\P>
apari kerta-a-</P>
<\P>
couple time-PTV
<\P>
a couple of times

02 ...

03-> IRA: mut on sitä kyl leikel-ty-ki.
but be:3SG3 SO:PTV PRT cut-PCP-CLI
but she has been cut alright too

04 MATTI: XX

05 HARRI: mi-st koha-st.
what-ELA part-ELA
from which part

06 ...

07 IRA: se=-
3SG
she/it

08 no se ol-i jossain,
PRT 3SG be-PST:3SG somewhere
well she was in some

09 ...

10 ohjelma-s mi-s ol-i toi &
program-INE which-INE be-PST:3SG that
program in which they had a

11 EKI: no se [ol-i],
PRT 3SG be-PST:3SG
well she was

plastic-surgeon
plastic surgeon

13 EKI: [2se ol-i2] to-ssa,
3SG be-PST:3SG that-INE
she was in that

16 sec/25 lines omitted, regarding a television show)

14 HARRI: se Hurja joukko ei oikein vakuutta-nu,
3SG talk_show_title NEG really convince-PCP
the Wild Bunch didn't really convince (me)

15 IRA: nii,
PRT
yes

16 ni [si-3] --
PRT
so

17 MATTI: [se] on [2ihan hanuri-sta2].
3SG be:3SG really ass-ELA
it is really crab
Ira claims in line 3 that the celebrity has had plastic surgery: *mut on sitä kyl leikel-tyki* ‘but she has been cut alright too’. Harri challenges the claim in line 5, and the participants start to pin down and assess Ira’s source of knowledge, a television show. When Ira repeats her claim in line 23, she begins it with the particle *nii* ‘yes’, which acknowledges the outcome of the just preceding activity (see Sorjonen 2001) and signals that a return to prior talk will follow (see Heinonen 2002). Ira thus displays orientation to the fact that she produces the repeat in a different sequential position than the source: whereas the source contributes to an ongoing sequence or activity, the repeat re-initiates it at a point when the participants have already become involved in something else.

Whereas TCU- and turn-initial additions and deletions are relatively common in the present data, turn-final dispensables are infrequent: only one can be found in each data set. In example 23, a TCU-initial *but* in the source is replaced with a turn-final *though* in the repeat.

(23) sbc013 Appease the Monster <T:00:03:09>

01 WENDY: I was gonna ask the doctor,
02 I’m like,
03 .. wh=at is wr=ong with me,
04 that I am sleeping so much.
05 KENDRA: .. no [<X>thanks</X> XX].
06-> WENDY: [but Kevin’s] been sleeping a lot,
07-> too.
08 KENDRA: you pregnant?
09 ...{(0.4)
10 WENDY: no.
Here, Wendy extends an ongoing troubles-talk sequence by asserting that not only have she and Kendra been unusually tired recently but so has Kevin as well. The source in lines 6–7 is introduced with the connective but and positioned so that it contrasts with prior talk, highlighting the uncommonness of the situation. The repeat, however, is placed in lines 23–24 after a sequence during which the participants establish and assess a certain state of affairs that could account for the tiredness of Wendy and Kendra (i.e. possible pregnancy). Rather than repeating the TCU-initial but, which could be interpreted as contrasting with the immediately preceding talk, Wendy uses the turn-final though, which here evokes a more far-reaching contrast.

In the Finnish case of a turn-final dispensable, the element is omitted in the repeat.

(24) sg121_a Crappy Channel <T:00:10:11>

01 MATTI: niin nii-st puhe-imen ollen,
         so speaking of the telephones
02->   tää on ihan paska-n-<P>näkönen.
       this be:3SG really shit-GEN-looking
03->   mu-n miele-stä</P>.
       1SG-GEN mind-ELA in my opinion
04        ...(0.8)
05 EKI: (TSK) tiää-t sää mikää to-s on kuulemma paska-a.
       you know what is reputedly shit in that
06        ...(0.6)
Matti produces an assessment in line 2 ("tää on ihan paskannäkönen ‘this is really shit-looking’) and, after a possible completion, adds the epistemic stance marker *mun mielestä ‘in my opinion’ in line 3. The phrase is rarely positioned in a separate intonation unit after the evaluative element in an assessment; when it is, it serves to highlight the possible disputability of the assessment and to emphasize the relevance of a recipient response (Rauniomaa 2007: 227, 232). In example 24, *mun mielestä ‘in my opinion’ is deleted on repetition in a similar fashion to epistemic downgrades in English (e.g. *I guess; see Schegloff 1996d: 90–92, 2004: 115–117). By the time that Matti repeats his assessment in line 7, it has become apparent that the recipients may indeed have divergent views on the matter under discussion, as indicated by the delay in the uptake in line 4 and Eki’s ‘pre-announcement’ (Schegloff 2007: 37–44) in line 5 which attempts to shift the focus of the activity. The stance marker would thus be superfluous in the repeat. The possibility, or indeed the likelihood, of divergent views is also reflected in the addition of the particle *ainaki ‘at least’ in the repeat: the particle takes into account Eki’s turn and acknowledges that in addition to its exterior features, other qualities of the telephone may also be considered unsatisfactory. The repeat corrects the recipient’s interpretation of the source but nonetheless takes notice of the recipient’s response.

Dispensables also include references that speakers may define and clarify by simplifying potentially problematic expressions and by replacing pro-terms. In example 25, an indefinite expression is replaced with an elaborate one.

(25) sg121_b Crappy Channel <T:00:20:34>

01 MATTI: [ei usko-is].
  NEG believe-COM
  Ø wouldn’t believe
02 ...(0.5)
For a while already, Eki and Matti have playfully been producing the names of two football players, Paul Gascoigne and Steve McManaman. In this extract, Harri inquires where the soundplay originates. In line 9, Harri refers to his co-participants’ activity as *toi homma* ‘that thing’, but replaces it in line 17 with a
more explicit reference, *toi paul gascoigne* ‘that paul gascoigne’.\textsuperscript{13} The demonstrative determiner *toi* ‘that’ in both the source and the repeat displays that the speaker is referring to something that is outside of his current sphere but available to his recipients (see Laury 1997: 74). However, by changing the head noun from *homma* ‘thing’ to *paul gascoigne*, Harri signals that he is referring to the activity that his recipients are presently engaged in and, in a sense, that he is also participating in the activity (see Goodwin 2003; Haakana & Visapää 2005 on ‘unattributed reported speech’). To put it differently, the chosen noun phrase ‘does more than just referring’ (Stivers 2007); it can be seen to activate and highlight the relationship between the speaker and the recipients.

It is also possible that a full term is replaced with a pro-term, as example 26 shows.

(26) sg020_a2 Abroad <T:00:02:04>

```
01-\text{+} ANNI: kene-s mõopeli tuo on.  
  who-GEN piece.of.equipment that be:3SG  
  whose piece of equipment is that  
  ...(1.0)
02 TAINA: se on hyv\-n-n\-kõnen.  
  3SG be:3SG good-GEN-looking  
  it is good-looking
03 \text{<X>ei-ks } [oo-ki</X>].  
  NEG-\text{-Q } be-\text{-CLI }  
  isn’t it
04-\text{=} ANNI: \text{[kene-n } s\text{]}e on.  
  who-GEN 3SG be:3SG  
  whose is it
05 TAINA: .. se on Kirsi-n.  
  3SG be:3SG first_name-GEN  
  it is Kirsi’s
```

In line 1, Anni asks who owns a particular ‘piece of equipment’, the tape recorder. Taina’s turn in line 2 clearly indicates that she misattends to Anni’s question: she produces an assessment rather than an answer. Nonetheless, Taina’s use of the demonstrative pronoun *se* ‘it’ shows that the referent has been successfully established. That is why it is also possible for Anni to use the pronoun *se* ‘it’ in

\textsuperscript{13} I use lower case throughout the name to reflect the fact that it is produced as a soundplay rather than an actual reference. Another option would be to distance the spelling from standard orthography in favor of pronunciational detail. However, such a spelling would not make it clear that the participants demonstrably recognize the phrase as a name.
the repeat (line 4) rather than the full reference term mööpeli ‘piece of equipment’.

In general, the Finnish cases seem to host more changes in the repeats than the English cases. I shall reproduce the source and repeat from example 22 here to discuss some of the more extensive modifications.

(27) sg121_a Crappy Channel

First, clitics such as -ki(n) ‘also, too’ and particles such as kyl(lä) ‘sure, indeed, alright’ can be used in various syntactic positions, reflecting sometimes quite subtle sequential changes (see Hakulinen 2001 for a discussion of kyl(lä)). Second, it is possible to vary certain grammatical cases without seriously affecting the input of an utterance but refocusing it slightly. Here Ira replaces the partitive sitä in line 3 with the nominative se in line 23 to refer to the celebrity, thus shifting the focus from the process to the end result that is conveyed in the clause (see Helasvuo 1996). Third, the change in tense, from the present perfect on leikelty ‘has been cut’ to the past perfect oli leikelty ‘had been cut’, reflects the same adjustment in emphasis, with a shift away from the speech situation (see Seppänen 1997a). Fourth, the word order changes from verb+object in the source into object+verb in the repeat. The last two modifications (tense and word order) may be directly motivated by the sequential position of the utterances: whereas the source recycles the syntactic structure of a previous speaker’s utterance, the repeat is relatively independent. It is worth noting that the changes in case and tense can in effect be seen to constitute a general change in clause structure: a transitive clause vs. a copular one. In sum, the utterance undergoes several modifications due to its sequential position; nonetheless, its proposition remains the same, as does the action that it implements.

I wish to discuss one more element that can be added to the repeat, namely a repetition preface, a phrase that lexically expresses the speaker’s engagement in repeating a prior utterance. There is one case in both the English and Finnish data. In example 28, Wendy prefices the repeat with I said.
(28) sbc013 Appease the Monster <T:00:07:54>
01 KENDRA: cause I’ve got a [2big yellow duck for my
<@> kit2] [3chen</@>].
02—> WENDY: [2you can use this for your muffins=2].
03 KEVIN: [3go
     ahead,
04 open it up.
05 we-3] --
06 KENDRA: <@>too</@>3].
07 KEVIN: we all want to play with them.
08 WENDY: @@@
09 MARCI: .. [@@@@]
10 WENDY: [XXX] --
11 KENDRA: [<VOX>it looks like you] ha=ve
     [2<<been</@></VOX>2].
12 WENDY: [2@2]
((1 min 19 sec/123 lines omitted, regarding Kendra’s presents))
13 KENDRA: [look at] this.
14 .. da=ng,
15 oh=.
16 big [bow=l here,
17 WENDY: [you’re se=t].
18 KENDRA: k[i]=ds.
19 WENDY: .. you’re set--
20—> % I [said you can use this for your] muffins.
21 KENDRA: [wow=].
22 WENDY: .. you can brea [2k it i=n2].
24 KENDRA: oh=.

Wendy repeats her utterance over a minute after its first occurrence and prefaces it with I said. It would be entirely possible for Wendy simply to repeat her utterance verbatim, without the preface, and thus manage the recovery. By using the preface, however, Wendy makes the repetition explicit and points out that her recipients have not attended to the source utterance. Such an interpretation of
recipient conduct is usually achieved by the proximity of the source and the repeat.\footnote{In the corpus transcript Wendy’s utterance in line 10 has been transcribed as $<$X$>$it needs a$</X>$ --, whereas I tend to hear it as $<$X$>$you can use$</X>$ --. Because of this discrepancy, I have marked the utterance as consisting of three indecipherable syllables. I am well aware that my interpretation may be influenced by the present analytical focus (i.e. lines 2 and 20), but it is worth noting that line 10 is an appropriate, and typical, position for a repeat. Notice that the truncated $<$X$>$you can use$</X>$ -- does not include a repetition preface.} 

In example 29, the speaker uses another type of preface to refer to the fact that she repeats.

(29) sg020_a1 Abroad $<$T:00:04:22$>$

01 KIRSI: [hei Tep][2po ja Anni2],

\begin{verbatim}
prf first_name and first_name
hey Teppo and Anni
\end{verbatim}

02 TEppo: [@@]

03 ANNI: [2@@

04 TEppo: [3paremmin ei vois olla3].

\begin{verbatim}
better NEG could be:INF
couldn’t be better
\end{verbatim}

05-> KIRSI: [3halua-tte-ks te kah3vi-i vai tee-tä.

\begin{verbatim}
want-2PL-Q 2PL coffee-PTV or tea-PTV
do you want coffee or tea
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
((6 sec/10 lines omitted))
\end{verbatim}

06 ANNI: [kau][2hee-2][3ta3].

\begin{verbatim}
awful-PTV
awful
\end{verbatim}

07 TEppo: [2@2

08 [3X3]

09 KIRSI: [hei, prf

\begin{verbatim}
hey
\end{verbatim}

10 kuul-i-][2tte-ks te2],

\begin{verbatim}
hear-PST-2PL-Q 2PL
did you hear (me)
\end{verbatim}

11 [4X4]

12=> KIRSI: [4halu4a-tte-ks te kahvi-i vai [5tee-tä5].

\begin{verbatim}
want-2PL-Q 2PL coffee-PTV or tea-PTV
do you want coffee or tea
\end{verbatim}

13 ANNI:

\begin{verbatim}
[5mie ota-n

1SG take-1SG
I will
\end{verbatim}
Here, Kirsi employs the repetition preface "kuulitteks te ‘did you hear (me)’ (line 10). In this way, she indicates that she has not received a response although one was expected. What is more, she is able to prevent a potential situation in which she would compromise herself: it may turn out that the recipients have registered Kirsi’s question but postpone their responses until they have finished dealing with a more pressing matter (i.e. bringing their story telling to completion). The repetition preface leaves open this option of interpretation. In contrast with example 28, the preface is here produced in a separate intonation unit rather than in the same intonation unit with the repeat. Initially, Kirsi produces two separate but related actions; a summons (line 1) and an offer (line 5). Because her recipients do not attend to either of them, she recovers both (lines 9 and 12). The repetition preface is positioned between the two TCUs to direct the focus of the recipients on the upcoming repeat.

I shall finish this section with a brief discussion of two examples in which the source and repeat are identical. In example 30, the participants are talking about an event at Melissa’s school. Some 25 seconds earlier, Frank has inquired what time the event starts (“what time is that at”).

(30) sbc019 Doesn’t Work in This Household <T:00:08:52>

01 MELISSA: (H) I think I’ll wear my .. white .. dress with the black= .. diamonds.
02 ...(3.6)
03 FRANK: it's okay with me.
04 ...(3.2)
05 MELISSA: um, 06 not to be= [critical, 07-> JAN: [seven thirty=], 08 MELISSA: but isn’t that] awfully thin?
09 ...(0.4)
10 FRANK: Melissa [2sa.]
11 BRETT: [2no2].
12 FRANK: just2] ...(0.4) bug [3off XX3].
13 MELISSA: [3alright3],
14 forget it.
BRETT: .. it's a small cello.
   it's not regular size.
   .. <VOX>duh [=/VOX].
MELISSA:  [@@]@@@ (SNIFF)
...(1.9)
JAN:     (H) seven thirty=,
...(1.8)
FRANK:   (TSK) <P> at the high school</P>.

Jan’s turns in lines 7 and 20 are interpretable only in relation to Frank’s earlier turn: seven thirty= provides a stripped-down answer to the prior inquiry, the exact time of the event. The turn is designed to form a part of an earlier sequence that has been suspended for some reason, rather than to form a part of the present sequence. The expectation of an answer that was set up by the question and the minimal format of the answer allow participants to interpret the answer as a contribution to the prior sequence. Neither the source nor the repeat need therefore be tied to their present context; that is, the utterances do not have to claim their position in the present sequence.

In the second example, example 31, it is possible for the repeat to be identical with the source not because of its independence from the present sequence but because of the way the repeat fits into it. The participants are listing the different car-related tasks that Tero masters.

(31) sg067_a2 Lawyer Issues <T:00:08:19>

TERO:  sii-nä-hän se on-ki,
   3SG-INE-CLI 3SG be:3SG-CLI
   well that’s it
   .. ain[ut mi]tä osa-a tehä [2auto-1le2],
   only what can-3SG do:INF car-ALL
   the only thing Ø knows how to do to a car
REIJA:  [(SNIFF)]
KAARINA:  [2@@@2]
TERO:  on vaihta-a ren [3kaa-t3].
   be:3SG change-INF tire-PL
   is to change tires
REIJA:   [3<@>(Hx)</@>3] (H)
... (0.3)
TERO:  lisä-tä pissapojan-säiliö-önn vet-tä (Hx).
   add-INF windshield:container-ILL water-PTV
   to add water to the washer fluid reservoir
REIJA:  nii just.
   PRT PRT
   exactly
As I pointed out in section 5.1 (example 18), the source utterance fits in the syntax of previous contributions and provides a new item to an emerging list (see, e.g. Jefferson 1990; Lerner 1994). The source (here in line 10) is highly dependent on its sequential location and any intervening talk might render an exact repeat impossible. However, in overlap with the source and just prior to the repeat (line 11), Kaarina takes a turn that offers an alternative item to the list and initiates a new syntactic structure. The co-participant turns that precede both the source and the repeat are similar in that they open up a slot for an infinitive or a series of infinitives. Reija exploits the slot in the source, *lisätä pissapojansäiliöön vettä JA TANKATA* ‘to add water to the washer fluid reservoir AND TO FILL UP (THE GAS TANK)’, and in the repeat, *osaat sä kattoo öljyt JA TANKATA* ‘you know how to check the oil AND TO FILL UP (THE GAS TANK)’. In a sense, then, the sequence allows for the repeat to be structurally identical with the source. Although the justifications are different, verbatim repetition is sequentially possible in both example 30 and example 31.

In this section, I have showed that the sources and their respective repeats in the data may or may not be identical. The added, deleted and replaced elements do not change the import of the utterance but display an orientation to its position in the ongoing sequence. In other words, speakers exploit various means to adjust their talk to sequential constraints: sometimes speakers may omit or add an element; sometimes they may produce an exact repeat. Having laid out some of the ways in which speakers adapt their source and repeat utterances to an ongoing sequence, I would like to widen the focus to include the overall design of the utterances and their potential significance in the interaction.
5.3 Sequential implicativeness

I have argued in the previous sections that sources and repeats typically serve as turn-constructional units that implement actions, initiating or expanding a conversational sequence. This does not necessarily mean that they are designed to receive an extensive response; in fact, the cases under study vary greatly in their complexity and consequence. In this section, I wish to bring in the notion of sequential implicativeness and consider the projections that the sources and repeats in the present data set up for potential next actions. This is a somewhat problematic starting point in the sense that recovery through repetition occurs precisely because the source utterance has not been sequentially implicative, or has somehow been ineffective (see Schegloff 2004: 122–125). However, through an examination of the sequence so far and an identification of the action that is being implemented, it is possible to contemplate the projective qualities of a specific turn. Subsequent recipient turns show how the speaker’s utterance fails in its sequential implicativeness. In the following discussion, I shall start with sources and repeats that strongly project a particular type of response (i.e. first pair parts of adjacency pairs) and gradually proceed to ones that do not limit the following contributions in any specific way. The data suggest that recovery through repetition is used not only to reinstate the implications of utterances that have strong projection but also to strengthen the effects of utterances that have weak projection.

I shall introduce four examples from the SBCSAE only but make observations that pertain to both the English and Finnish data sets. Three of the examples come from the same tape, sbc013 Appease the Monster, which was recorded at a family gathering: Kendra is celebrating her birthday with her parents Marci and Ken, brother Kevin and sister-in-law Wendy. Example 32 is part of an exchange in which Kendra and Wendy are complaining about and trying to find reasons for their recent sleepiness. Marci joins in, whereas the two remaining participants, Kevin and Ken, do not actively contribute to the conversation at this point. Kendra offers a possible explanation for Wendy’s tiredness by asking her a question in line 1.

(32) sbc013 Appease the Monster <T:00:03:16>
01 KENDRA: you pregnant?
02 ... (0.4) 
03 WENDY: no.
04 ... (0.7)
After Wendy has denied being pregnant (line 3) and has thus rejected pregnancy as a possible reason for her tiredness, Marci extends the sequence in line 5 with are you. Marci’s turn sets up certain constraints as to what action is due next and who can undertake that action. Firstly, line 5 is recognizable as a question, a first pair part that strongly projects an answer as a relevant second pair part. It is composed of an interrogative clause with a reversed word order, ends in an appeal intonation and contextually builds upon the previous question–answer sequence. It should be noted that the turn also accomplishes a tease, but its design as a question makes a particular kind of uptake relevant. Secondly, everyone except for Kendra is ruled out as a potential recipient by the situational context: Wendy is ruled out because she has already answered the question and the two men because the question cannot apply to them. What is more, the primary accent in Marci’s utterance is on you, which marks a clear indexical shift and indicates Kendra as being the primary recipient; in other words, the pronoun is used as a ‘known recipient indicator’ (Lerner 2003: 192–193). In short, Marci’s turn-around question is sequentially implicative of Kendra’s answer (see Schegloff & Sacks 1973: 296); or to put it another way, Kendra’s answer is conditionally relevant here as its presence after Marci’s question is expectable and its absence noticeable (see Schegloff 1968: 1083).

Some adjacency pairs are more conditional on contiguousness than others. For example, Schegloff (1968: 1084) remarks that summons–answer sequences depend on immediate juxtaposition: an item is heard as an answer to a summons only if it is positioned adjacent to the summons. Other pairs, such as questions and their respective answers, do not necessarily occur in immediate succession. The two parts of an adjacency pair may be separated by an ‘insertion sequence’ (Schegloff 1972) that clarifies some point about the first pair part in preparation for an appropriate second pair part. Nonetheless, the sequential implicativeness of the question, or the conditional relevance of an answer to the question, is
maintained: either the insertion sequence is followed by an answer to the initial question, or, if an answer is never produced, an account for its absence is given instead (see Heritage 1984b: 250). In other words, even if a recipient fails to produce a relevant second pair part, interactants can be seen to orient to the constraints that are set up by a first pair part.

In example 32, Marci’s question in line 5 is followed by neither an answer nor an account. In fact, there is no vocal activity that could be taken as a potential response to Marci’s turn. When a fair amount of time (0.8 seconds, to be exact) has passed and Kendra has not attended to Marci’s question, Marci repeats the question in line 8. The repetition can be seen as an indication of the underlying constraints inasmuch as it serves to remind the recipient about them.

In total, twenty-one instances in the English data and nine instances in the Finnish data constitute first pair parts. In addition to questions, there are other types of first pair part in the data, such as first assessments, summonses and directives. The latter two in particular can project not only vocal but also nonvocal gestural or physical responses. A full account of such activities would require a video analysis, but they are often reflected indirectly in the audio material well enough to be added into the collection. For instance, I have included directives such as “get your feet off of there” (sbc042 Stay Out of It <T:00:00:28>) and “push it down again” (sbc013 Appease the Monster <T:00:11:06>) in the data. It should also be pointed out that some initial actions may make recipient silence relevant. These include, for example, such distinct actions as story prefaces and explicit requests to end an activity (see examples 36 and 38 in subsection 6.1.1).

Adjacency pairs represent the strongest form of sequential implicativeness, but there are other, less critical ways in which a particular turn can project a next. In the present data, there are three cases of English and four cases of Finnish in which certain second pair parts, namely answers, rejections/acceptances and news receipts, project a response. One of them can be found in example 33. Throughout the recording, Sharon is talking about the problems that she has encountered as a substitute teacher, seeking advice from Carolyn and especially Kathy, who is more experienced as a teacher.

(33) sbc004 Raging Bureaucracy <T:00:02:04>

01  KATHY:    [well did you gi]ve candy to the ones that got
... <L2>exelentes</L2>?
02  ... (0.7)
In line 1, Kathy offers one possible remedy for Sharon’s problems by asking her whether she gives sweets to students who have behaved well. Kathy’s turn is the first pair part of an adjacency pair which is sequentially implicative of Sharon’s response. In lines 3 and 5, Sharon provides an answer: she negates part of the proposition in Kathy’s utterance by pointing out that she does reward her students, but with stickers not sweets. Sharon’s answer is a second pair part and, as such, a responsive turn. However, it also projects forward, making Kathy’s response relevant. After all, Sharon does not treat Kathy’s turn in line 1 as providing a remedy for her problems but as seeking information about how she deals with her class. What is under way can be considered a ‘three-part exchange’, which Tsui (1989) suggests is the most basic organizational unit in conversation. She argues that many conversational sequences in effect consist of an initiating move, a responding move and a (potential) follow-up move. The purpose of the follow-up move is “to acknowledge the outcome of the interaction in an exchange” (Tsui 1989: 556). Here, Sharon’s answer projects an evaluation from Kathy, a display of understanding that would cater to the consequences of the answer.

In contrast with the sequential implications of Sharon’s utterance, it is not Kathy but Pam who evaluates the answer in lines 8 and 12 (stickers. I love it). Pam provides her comment as a layperson, not as an experienced teacher, and thus her comment does not contribute to the main focus of the sequence (i.e. problem solving). The conversation changes its course even further by the fact that Carolyn overlaps Sharon’s answer with a challenge in lines 4 and 6. Carolyn undermines Kathy’s suggestion by criticizing the practice of giving sweets to students. Negotiating whether the practice is allowed at school becomes a more pressing matter for Kathy than providing a follow-up to Sharon’s answer.
Tsui (1989: 561) argues that although participants may orient to the non-occurrence of a follow-up move, three-part exchanges are not as constrained as adjacency pairs. Another description of such loose sequence trajectories has been introduced by Pomerantz (1978). In her discussion of compliment responses, Pomerantz (1978: 82, note 6) argues that some responsive actions are “not a should but a may for recipient, that is, an option among several specifiable options” (emphasis in the original). For example, a compliment makes available two interrelated sets of responses (i.e. acceptance/rejection and agreement/disagreement) and thus opens up two possible action-chain trajectories (Pomerantz 1978: 82–83). It is the recipient response that ultimately determines the import of the sequence.

Recognizing a potential action chain is difficult with a limited set of pertinent data, but I consider example 34 to include one. Here Kendra has just opened a birthday present, a cookie baking set, that she has received from Kevin and Wendy. The participants have commented on the present, and Kevin in particular has pointed out several qualities of the set (e.g. that it does not break easily and that it has twelve pieces), providing reasons for their having selected this particular present. Kendra, Marci and Ken (i.e. participants other than the present givers) have responded with displays of appreciation. Marci has then remarked that the set is blue, to which Kendra has added “that’s not my color”. At the start of example 34, the participants continue talking about the color.

(34) sbc013 Appease the Monster <T:00:07:49>

|   | KENDRA: that’s okay,          |   | MARCI: .. she’s gonna do blue a-nd green.       |   | KENDRA: [well in the k-] --
|   | my plates are blue.          |   | .. she doesn’t [P>need green</P>].           |   | cause I’ve got a [2big yellow duck for my
|   |                               |   |                                              |   |  kit2] [3chen</@>,
| 07-→| WENDY: [2you can use this for your
|   |                               |   | muffins=2].                                  |   |        muffins=2].
|   | KEVIN: [3go ahead,           |   | open it up.                                   |   |        "too</@>3].
| 10  | we-3] --                    |   | KEVIN: we all want to play with them.         |   |        "too</@>3].
| 12  | WENDY: @@@
In lines 1–2, Kendra makes amends for claiming that the color of the cookie baking set would not fit in the color scheme of her new kitchen. There is a possible sequence juncture after lines 1–2, but both Marci’s and Kendra’s following turns (lines 3–6 and 11) add to the ongoing sequence. It is in this context, in overlap with Kendra’s turn, that Wendy clearly disengages from the present sequence and initiates a new one in line 7. *You can use this for your muffins* can be seen as an attempt to direct the participants’ focus back to other, perhaps less disputable, qualities of the present. Wendy’s turn is similar to the giving of advice and pursuit of appreciation that the participants were engaged in a moment earlier. Although Wendy’s turn in line 7 does not set up any strict constraints as to what type of turn should follow, some turn types, such as an acceptance/rejection of advice or a display of appreciation, would be more in line with the proposed sequence than others. A co-participant’s response would define the input of Wendy’s turn.

It should be pointed out that Wendy’s turn in line 7 overlaps considerably with Kendra’s turn in line 6, but I have not treated the overlap as a conclusive explanation for the repetition that occurs after the extract presented here. I do not wish to make any claims about what the participants do or do not hear in this extract, but it seems worth keeping in mind that in principle either one of the overlapping turns could be taken up by the recipients. However, Kevin’s subsequent turn is not responsive to either Kendra’s or Wendy’s turn. Instead, it initiates an alternative new sequence: in lines 8–10 and 12, Kevin prompts Kendra to unwrap the present completely. The other participants accept this line of development in the turns that follow. In short, the recipients do not attend to Wendy’s utterance and, in consequence, she repeats it later in the conversation. I have not included the repeat in the extract presented here but will discuss it in some detail in section 6.1.1 (example 37). It is worth noting at this point, however, that after the repeat Wendy’s co-participants join in to suggest ways in which Kendra can use her new cookie baking set.

In addition to example 34, I have not been able to identify other potential action chains in the data. On the one hand, this is because action chains have not been discussed beyond Pomerantz’s (1978) study on compliment responses and
only limited information is available on the kinds of turn that typically occur in such sequences. On the other hand, the identification of action chains may also be complicated by the fact that, in the case of recovery through repetition, the sequential implicativeness of an utterance sometimes also fails on its second occurrence and the repeat does not necessarily introduce any evidence as to what kinds of turn could follow the utterance. However, I hope to have shown that action chains constitute one type of projection that can be found in conversation and in the present data.

Adjacency pairs, three-part exchanges and action chains are clearly characterized by certain constraints, but, as example 35 illustrates, sequential implicativeness operates in more loosely connected sequences as well. In line 1, Wendy introduces the issue of tiredness by offering an explanation for the jocular behavior of the participants a moment earlier. (Example 32 is embedded in example 35, lines 34–46.)

(35) sbc013 Appease the Monster <T:00:02:52>

01 WENDY: we're all tired.
02 ... (0.6)
03 MARCI: that [must] be it.
04 KENDRA: [SNIPP]
05 ... (0.5)
06 WENDY: yeah.
07 .. simple %- --
08 simple ex[planation],
09 KENDRA: [(THROAT)]
10 WENDY: [2is we're all exhausted2].
11 KENDRA: [2I mean when Mary2] tells me to get sleep over the weekend,
12 you know= I need to get sleep over the weeeke=nd.
13 ... (0.5)
14 WENDY: that's good you're getting r- good rest.
15 .. I [=’ve been s] [2leeping about2] [3ten hours3].
16 MARCI: [no=],
17 [2Mary’s2] [3just lying3].
18 KEVIN: [2XX2]?
19 WENDY: no thanks.
20 KENDRA: .. I know=,
21 I’ve been sleeping about ten hou=rs,
22 every nigh=t.
23 .. and I’m sti=ll,
The introduction of tiredness opens up a cumulative ‘troubles-talk’ sequence (Jefferson 1988): in lines 11–30, Kendra and Wendy build upon each other’s
contributions to update and upgrade the description of their weariness. The speakers focus exclusively on themselves until in lines 32–33 Wendy extends the troubles telling to include Kevin, her husband (but Kevin’s been sleeping a lot, too). In comparison with Marci’s utterance in example 32, Sharon’s in 33 and Wendy’s in 34, Wendy’s assertion here is relatively unconstrained in its sequential implicativeness. The turn does not require any specific type of response, and there is no audio evidence that would suggest that it is directed exclusively to any particular recipient.

Stivers & Rossano (2007) suggest that when considering the projective qualities of a specific turn, attention should be paid not only to the action that the turn implements but also to various features of the turn’s design. They propose a model in which a speaker’s gaze toward recipients, interrogative lexico-morphosyntax, interrogative prosody and reference to issues that belong primarily to the recipients’ epistemic domain define the response relevance of a turn. Together with the selected action, any one of these features (or a combination of them) may mobilize a recipient to respond, even when the speaker’s turn does not represent a canonical first pair part. Indeed, Stivers & Rossano argue that turns are best viewed on a scale of response relevance, rather than as simply requiring or not requiring uptake.

Without video material of example 35, it is impossible to determine the direction of Wendy’s gaze, but it is worth noting that the utterance does not have any of the other features that would heighten its response relevance. The turn is thus weak in its projection. Nevertheless, Wendy’s turn introduces a new piece of information that may be consequential for the conversation. By providing information about the recent sleeping routines of a co-participant, Wendy argues for the point that she made in line 1 about the prevalence of tiredness among the participants and prepares ground for uptake that takes it into account.

None of the recipients align with Wendy’s turn in lines 32–33. In line 34, Kendra poses a question, bringing in an issue that can be used for teasing Wendy and proposing a possible reason for Wendy’s sleepiness (i.e. pregnancy). It can be seen as an unexpected proposition, given that Wendy has just referred to a participant to whom such an account cannot apply. The pauses around Wendy’s answer in line 36 reflect the interactional trouble that Kendra’s turn entails: the 0.4-second pause in line 35 implies that Kendra’s question is somehow problematic, and the 0.7-second pause in line 37 may be induced by a difficulty to resume relevant talk after the question–answer sequence. The pauses also reflect the fact that Kendra has not marked her turn to be a diversion from the proposed sequence.
trajectory. In other words, the unmarkedness of Kendra’s turn implies that it should be heard as a contribution to the ongoing conversational sequence (see Sacks et al. 1974: 728), but the recipient does not immediately treat it as such.

In lines 49–50, Wendy repeats the statement, *Kevin’s been sleeping a lot, too though*. The repetition reinstates the existent albeit subtle sequential implications of the utterance and strengthens its projection for a recipient response. In other words, the repeat highlights the response relevance of the turn. It is worth noting that Wendy does not use any vocal means to modify, clarify or redirect her utterance (e.g. she does not select a recipient by using an address term; see Lerner 2003). In this case, however, the repeat also fails to secure a recipient response. Wendy still attempts a recovery, first by prompting recipients to acknowledge the import of her prior talk through the use of the ‘stand-alone so’ (Raymond 2004) in line 51, and then by beginning to make explicit the upshot of her contribution in line 54, before cutting off and dropping the pursued line altogether.

Fifteen cases in the English data and six cases in the Finnish data are similar to example 35: the source is not constrained in its sequential implicativeness, but its relevance to the sequence is visible in the composition and position of the utterance. In other words, the source is designed so as to imply that it should be responded to and perhaps responded to in a particular way. However, the best piece of evidence for arguing that a response is expected is the repeat. By repeating, speakers are basically able to point out any utterance in their prior talk and negotiate its input to the ongoing interaction. The repeat renews and potentially reinforces the implications that the source was meant to have. In that sense, repetition may be particularly useful in the recovery of utterances that are relatively weak in their projection for subsequent recipient contributions.

### 5.4 Summary

In this chapter, I have considered the linguistic and local sequential aspects of recovery through repetition. Whether single lexical items, phrases, clauses or combinations of these, the sources and repeats in the present data are complete in that they constitute turn-constructional units and implement actions. They may be structurally independent of prior talk or hinge on a previous speaker’s turn. Nonetheless, the sources and repeats are always tied to their relevant sequential location. Clauses are the most common syntactic type, possibly because they may entail a great deal of meaning in a relatively compact form.
Regardless of their length, the utterances are repeated more or less word-for-word. Variation is brought in by elements that deal with the position of the utterance in the sequence. These include additions and deletions in the beginning or end of the turn-constructional unit or turn and, especially in the Finnish data, modifications to other items within the utterance.

The sources and repeats can be seen to initiate or expand a conversational sequence, having either strong or weak projection for a response. The data include utterances that set up an expectation of a particular kind of uptake as well as utterances that do not limit the following contributions in any specific way. In the former case the repeat renews the sequential implications of the utterance, and in the latter case it strengthens the projection.

A source utterance and its respective repeat are best viewed with reference to each other, but it should be noted that they are produced as independent entities. In other words, the two utterances do not build upon each other to the extent that they would acquire their meaning only when put together or that they would then develop an entirely new meaning, as is the case with some other types of repetition (cf. Curl et al. 2004). Rather, the repeat adds to the meaning of the utterance by constructing a stance toward either an ongoing sequence in general or a co-participant contribution in particular. I shall carefully explore this observation in the following chapter.
6 Interactional environments of recovery through repetition and stance taking

The remainder of this study will be devoted to an exploration of the larger sequential contexts in which recovery through repetition occurs in the present data. Rather than associating the phenomenon with particular types of action or specific kinds of sequence, it is best viewed with reference to ‘interactional environments’, certain “places or positions in conversation” (Drew 2005b: 163). I shall carefully examine the sequence or activity that provides the setting for an instance of recovery through repetition, considering the circumstances that make it relevant and the implications that it entails. In other words, I shall pay attention to rather extensive fragments of talk around both the source and the repeat utterances.

I will identify two general environments for recovery through repetition: places where speakers suggest that recipients have not attended to the source and places where speakers suggest that recipients have misattended to the source. The concept of not attending refers to the vocal conduct of recipients that does not seem to take the source utterance into account in any way. Recipients may produce a ‘topically disjunctive’ turn (Drew 1997), follow a ‘competing line of topic development’ (Mazeland & Huiskes 2001) or simply stay silent when they are expected to talk. In such instances, speakers may employ recovery through repetition to seek the attention of recipients; in other words, speakers make the utterance available for uptake again. Misattending, on the other hand, refers to recipient responses that offer a different interpretation of the source than the speaker evidently laid the ground for (see Mandelbaum 1991/1992 for an examination of ‘disattended complaints’ which are similar to the cases discussed here). The recipient responses are deemed inapposite, inappropriate or inadequate; in other words, recipients seem to have misunderstood the source (see Schegloff 1987b). In such cases, speakers may use recovery through repetition in order to redirect the attention of recipients to a relevant element in the misattended utterance. It should be noted that ‘attention’ is not meant as a cognitive concept here; I do not wish to make any claims as to whether recipients in actual fact hear, recognize or take note of the source utterance. Recovery through repetition reveals that speakers interpret the conduct of recipients as not attending or misattending.

By recovering prior talk through repetition in the two interactional environments, speakers take a stance towards an activity in progress or a recipient
response: they deem the recipient uptake or non-uptake as somehow problematic to the development of the activity. In addition to re-implementing a prior action, repetition thus brings in a critical point of view. As Stivers (2004: 269) puts it, although a fragment of talk is in itself significant to the interaction, repetition gives it an additional import. This point will be made clear by the following sections. Section 6.1 will examine cases of recovery through repetition that seek the attention of repetition, and section 6.2 focuses on cases that redirect the attention of recipients. The subsections will detail the different functions of recovery through repetition in the two interactional environments.

6.1 Seeking the attention of recipients and taking a stance towards an activity in progress

In this section, I shall discuss cases of recovery through repetition that seek the attention of recipients after their failure to attend to a source utterance. The development of such an environment can be generally outlined as follows. First, the speaker produces the source utterance which implements an action that makes uptake relevant. The source is produced in an attempt to either initiate something new or contribute to something that is already going on: participants may orient to it as departing from or keeping to an activity, “a relatively sustained topically coherent and/or goal-coherent course of action” (Heritage & Sorjonen 1994: 4; see also Schegloff 1990). It turns out, however, that the source utterance is produced at a position in which recipients also have available another line of development (except for the cases that are presented in subsection 6.1.3, in which recipients stay silent). Subsequent recipient contributions can then be seen to address the alternative line of development and fail to attend to the source utterance. To put it differently, recipients do not align with the source utterance. Finally, the speaker produces a repeat in order to reinstate the action that the source implemented and thus takes a stance toward the current activity and its progression.

The cases that will be presented in this section have in common the interpretation of recipient conduct as not attending to the source utterance and the stance taking that the repetition involves. What sets the cases apart is the way in which the source and especially the repeat relate to and affect the ongoing interaction. The following subsections will provide descriptions of three different functions: repeats may advance a change of course (6.1.1), provide an alternative contribution to an ongoing activity (6.1.2) or prepare for potential disalignment
(6.1.3). In subsection 6.1.4, I shall briefly compare recovery through repetition with some other ways in which speakers may seek the attention of recipients, and, in subsection 6.1.5, I shall summarize the findings of the whole section.

6.1.1 Advancing a change of course

The first set of cases consists of attempts at a change of course. In these cases, the source implements an action that is taking an ongoing activity in a direction which is either loosely related to or wholly unrelated to what has gone on before. Recipients, however, do not display any recognition of the source utterance and the change of course it entails; instead, they continue another line of development that is available to them in the interaction. In effect, the source utterance may either initially or in retrospect be deemed interruptive, to have cut in on an activity in a manner that is potentially complainable (see Schegloff 2000, 2002a). The speaker then seeks the attention of recipients by repeating the prior utterance and in this way advances the change of course that was introduced by the source. These changes of course may be designed to end a current activity that is somehow unfavorable for the speaker (examples 36–37), to redirect an activity that is not proceeding appropriately from the speaker’s point of view (examples 38–39) or simply to initiate a new activity at a seemingly opportune moment (examples 40–42).

In example 36, the speaker produces first the source and then the repeat in an attempt to end an activity in progress that is unfavorable for the speaker. During the conversation, Kendra receives several birthday presents that are introduced with a clue. Here the participants are evaluating the clue-giving skills of Wendy, who has married into the family and may not yet be as experienced in the practice as the others. Prior to this extract, Wendy has stated that “well I have, f- a fun present. I’m excited about it”, and has in this way engaged in a bit of self-praise.

(36) sbc013 Appease the Monster <T:00:01:22>
01 KEVIN: Wendy ha-s .. tried her hand,
02 for the first time at making a clue=.
03 KEN: (H) oh,
04 a clue=?
05 KEVIN: .. a [clue].
06 WENDY: [oh] [2=,
07 KEN: (H)] [2is this the kind of clue that2]
    [3goes from room to room]?
08 WENDY: stop it.
09-> don’t2 [3make fun of me3].
10 KENDRA: [3is it a real one, or3 is it a, 11 KEVIN: it’s 4a r-4 -- 12 KENDRA: 4is it a4] Perry one.
13 KEVIN: well [5it’s definitely a5] Perry one. 14 KEN: [5(THROAT)5]
15 KEVIN: she [6has fit6] into the mold.
16 KENDRA: [6o-kay6].
17 WENDY: ...(0.3)
18 ...=(Hx)
19 WENDY: (Hx)
20 KEN: mm [=].
21 KEVIN: [she] [2has2] ...(0.3) fit in [3to the groove3].
22 WENDY: [2(SNIFF)2]
23 MARCI: [3@@@3] (H)
24 WENDY: I don’t know about [4that4].
25 X: [4(SIGH)4]
26-> WENDY: .. [5but don’t make fun of me5].
28 WENDY: .. <VOX>we=ll,
29 I’m a little proud,
30 except if you [think it’s stupid</VOX> @].
31 KEVIN: [@=]

In lines 1–2, Kevin announces that they are about to hear the first clue that Wendy has composed. The way in which Kevin first lengthens the word clue at the end of line 2 and the way in which Ken then recycles it with a distinctive fall-rise intonation in line 4 develop the activity into a tease. Teasing is potentially problematic for its target because it points to minor conversational transgressions, such as bragging (Drew 1987). Wendy requests that the activity be ended in lines 6 and 8 (oh=, stop it) and displays in line 9 her interpretation of it as a tease (don’t make fun of me). Wendy’s turn is designed to be interruptive: it is produced in heavy overlap and includes the ‘interruption marker’ oh (Schegloff 1987a: 72) as well as explicit requests to end the activity. In the lines that follow, Wendy’s co-participants do not attend to the request but extend the tease.

The teasing activity reaches a possible completion and a gap ensues in line 18. Kevin, however, further adds to the tease in line 21, she has fit into the groove. By extending the tease, the recipients continue not to attend to Wendy’s
talk. Wendy provides a twofold response. First, she takes up Kevin’s immediately prior turn in line 24 by producing a ‘po-faced receipt of tease’ (Drew 1987) and by momentarily going along with the activity. *I don’t know about that* acknowledges the implication in Kevin’s tease that it is not for Wendy to appraise the present and the accompanying clue that she is about to give to Kendra (as she has done a moment earlier). Second, Wendy responds to the teasing activity as a whole by renewing her request that it be ended, *but don’t make fun of me* (line 26). The lexically disjunctive *but* that Wendy adds to the repeat marks a departure from the teasing activity, that is, from both the co-participants’ actual teasing and Wendy’s receipt of it. In addition to reinstating the action that was first implemented by the source, the repeat can be seen to take a stance towards the ongoing activity and its progression: the teasing activity has been continued despite Wendy’s request to the contrary. In other words, the activity has not progressed properly because it has not been brought to completion.

In the following example, an issue attributable to the speaker is discussed in a less than favorable light, and the speaker proposes that the current activity be ended by offering a new topic. The participants have talked about the possibly unsatisfactory characteristics of a present that Wendy and Kevin have given to Kendra. In line 2, Wendy cuts in on the activity and attempts to initiate a new one by focusing on other, more favorable qualities of (a part of) the present. (I have already discussed the source utterance in some detail in section 5.3, example 34).

(37) sbc013 Appease the Monster <T:00:07:54>
01 KENDRA: cause I’ve got a [2big yellow duck for my <@> kit2] [3chen</@>,
02-> WENDY: [2you can use this for your muffins=2].
03 KEVIN: [3go ahead,
04 open it up.
05 we-3] --
06 KENDRA: <@>too</@>.
07 KEVIN: we all want to play with them.
08 WENDY: @@@
09 MARCI: .. [@@@@]
10 WENDY: [XXX] --
11 KENDRA: [<VOX>it looks like you] ha-ve
[2@><been</>@>/VOX>2].
12 WENDY: [2@>]
((1 min 7 sec/111 lines omitted, regarding Kendra’s presents))
WENDY: eight-ounce measuring cup.
.. is virtually unbreakable.
KEVIN: .. virtually.
WENDY: .. that’s for you.
KEVIN: let’s find.
KENDRA: 2out2.
MARCI: 3let’s check it out3.
KENDRA: is that what you were doing in here?
MARCI: (H) don’t drop it on my kitchen floor.
KENDRA: (VOX)it’s not gonna break.
MARCI: .. everything breaks on my kitchen floor.
WENDY: .. does it?
KENDRA: [look at2] this.
WENDY: [you’re set].
KENDRA: [ki]=ds.
WENDY: .. you’re set--
% I [said you can use this for your] muffins.
KENDRA: [wow=].
WENDY: .. you can break [2k it i=n2].
KEVIN: [put your Nestle2 Morsels in there.
KENDRA: oh=.

By suggesting that you can use this for your muffins, Wendy attempts to override the emerging view that the present which she and Kevin have given to Kendra is somehow inadequate. Neither Kendra, the primary recipient, nor the others attend to Wendy’s utterance. Instead, they take up an alternative activity that Kevin initiates in lines 3–4, regarding presents that Kendra has not yet unwrapped. About a minute later, the participants gradually return to the prior topic, the cookie baking set that Kendra has received. In lines 15–24, the participants take up Wendy’s description of the set as being virtually unbreakable and use that as a basis for their jocular remarks. Similarly to the very start of the extract, talk about the cookie baking set has again spun off to its debatable qualities.

When Kendra shifts the focus to another part of the present (lines 25–28 and 30), Wendy seizes the opportunity to sum up the advantages that Kendra has gained by receiving the present, you’re set (line 29). Wendy first produces her utterance in overlap with Kendra’s and then begins to repeat it in the clear (line 31). However, she cuts off and uses the turn space that she now holds to repeat
her earlier turn, I said you can use this for your muffins. Especially without video, it is impossible to determine for certain which objects the participants refer to on each occasion. However, it seems plausible that Kendra’s big bowl here (line 28) and Wendy’s this (line 32) refer to the same object and that Kendra’s mention of the dish triggers Wendy to use a repeat at this particular point in the conversation.

In any case, instead of pursuing the closure that is implicated by the repetition of you’re set, Wendy opts for a return to a point that has not yet been followed through and thus suggests a clear change of course for the conversation. By repeating her utterance and explicitly marking it as a repeat with I said (line 32), Wendy highlights the potential problem that the lack of a response entails. What is more, the high pitch and accelerated tempo with which the repetition preface is produced imply mild annoyance with the fact that the recipients have not attended to her talk. As I argued in section 5.2 (example 28), the preface compensates for the distance between the source and the repeat.

It is worth noting that the repeat does not as such succeed in the recovery; some extra effort is required from the speaker and a co-participant before the primary recipient takes up the suggested change of course. First, Wendy continues to specify the combined giving of advice and pursuit of appreciation in line 34, suggesting that by using the dish for muffins, Kendra is able to adapt it for later use. Kevin then joins in with a similar suggestion in line 35, building directly on Wendy’s turn: you can PUT YOUR NESTLE MORSELS IN THERE. In line 36, Kendra finally displays orientation to the activity with the lengthened ‘change-of-state token’ oh (Heritage 1984a).

In examples 36 and 37, the speaker advances a change of course by cutting in on an ongoing activity and suggesting that it should be brought to a close. The extracts differ slightly in the explicitness of the change. In example 36, Wendy attempts to halt the teasing activity by directly requesting her recipients to end it. In example 37, the activity that is unfavorable for the speaker, again Wendy, is carried out more subtly: in assessing a birthday present that Wendy and Kevin have picked out for Kendra, the participants also comment on its debatable characteristics. The throwaway remarks can also be heard as criticism of Wendy’s and Kevin’s skills in selecting appropriate presents. By talking about other, more favorable qualities of the present, Wendy aims to end the current activity that has a complaining overtone.

In example 38, too, the speaker’s source utterance cuts in on an ongoing activity and a co-participant’s turn. However, rather than attempting to end it entirely, the speaker tries to redirect the activity for the purpose of her telling a
relevant story. The repeat can be seen as an attempt at a change of course because it implies that the proposed story may influence how the activity in general and the current sequence in particular proceed.

The excerpt has six speakers: two sisters (Lisbeth and Laura), their husbands (Bill and Don) and their adult daughters (Jennifer and Leanne). The participants are engaged in a lively discussion about responsibility, especially as it manifests itself among family members. Lisbeth has raised the question of what responsibilities her daughter, Jennifer, might have towards her. Evidently in relation to the disputed issue, Leanne repeatedly attempts to recount a past incident involving Jennifer.

(38) sbc033 Guilt <T:00:06:18>

01 LISBETH: but do you n- .. don't [think she has a res]ponsibility to be good to me?
02 JENN: [fu=ck you=].
03 ... (0.3)
04 BILL: .. [no],
05 LEANNE: [wait a] minute wait [2wait wait2].
06 BILL: [2the impli2] [3cation is3] [4she’s not4].
07 LAURA: [3oh= no3] [4no4],
09 wait a second.
11 LISBETH: [<%=>(Hx)</%>
12 BILL: [2@ @@ @ (H)2]
13 the implication is that,
14 she’s no=t [good to you],
15 LISBETH: [that’s right],
16 BILL: [2but not every2] [3body has3] agreed with [4that impli4] [5cation5].
17 LEANNE: [2wait Lisbeth2].
18 LISBETH: [3you didn’t3] --
19 LEANNE: [4Lisbeth4].
20 LISBETH: [5yeah but you5] were not in the s- --
21 in the,
22 JENN: [<%=>(Hx)</%>
23 LISBETH: [in] --
Before this extract, Bill has explicitly concurred with Jennifer’s assertion that family members may have different understandings of their responsibilities. In line 1, Lisbeth challenges the position that Bill has taken with but do you n- don’t think she has a responsibility to be good to me? (she refers to Jennifer). Lisbeth’s challenge makes relevant a response by Bill, who specifies his position in lines 5 and 7. The exchange between Lisbeth and Bill forms the current focal point of the interaction and constrains the participation of the others. When Leanne produces
her turn in lines 6 and 9–10, she addresses these constraints by using the ‘interruption marker’ *wait a minute* (Schegloff 1987a: 72, 2002a: 305) and a ‘multiple saying’, *wait wait wait*, that responds to the current course of action as a whole (Stivers 2004). In a sense, the two resources provide a legitimate means of interruption: they indicate that although Leanne’s contribution is misplaced in relation to the unfolding activity, it is relevant at this particular point in the conversation, to the extent that the current course of action should be put on hold.

Once Leanne seems to have secured the attention of her co-participants and to be able to produce talk in the clear, she proffers a ‘story preface’ (Sacks 1992b: 10–11, 222–228), *apropos something Jennifer said in May* (line 12). It provides the recipients with an opportunity to assess the tellability of the intended story: the adverb *apropos* implies that the story is motivated by and related to the ongoing talk, and the following noun phrase reveals some particulars about the past event that Leanne is about to narrate. The turn is produced with rising intonation that seeks validation from the recipients; it makes relevant a response that either grants or denies the intending story teller an extended turn.

However, Leanne’s co-participants do not align themselves as story recipients. Instead, as lines 15–18 indicate, Bill and Lisbeth still attend to the line of development that they have been engaged in. If Leanne were now to produce an extended turn without a go-ahead from her co-participants, the actual telling and reception of the story might not succeed. That is possibly why Leanne adopts another approach: she seeks the attention of the recipients by directly addressing Lisbeth (lines 19, 21 and 38) and by producing another multiple saying (line 28) that again stalls the current course of action. She then makes a new attempt at a story preface in line 39 but cuts off in the face of persistent overlap, displaying disapproval of the overlap with *whoa* in line 43. The repeat in line 44, *apropos something Jennifer said in May*, finally renews the sequential implication of the story preface as well as the continued relevance of the intended story. At this point, Leanne has secured the attention of Bill, who assists her in attracting Lisbeth’s attention, *will you let Leanne finish* (line 51).

In sum, Leanne displays two kinds of orientation. On the one hand, by employing the interruption marker she acknowledges that her contribution is sequentially ill-timed and by using direct terms of address she indicates that she will not relate the intended story without a sign of alignment from her co-participants. On the other hand, Leanne orients to the fact that her co-participants do not attend to her contribution and decline any alignment as story recipients. This dual orientation is made visible by the fact that Leanne repeats her prior action, the
story preface, and thus renews the impact that it may have on the ongoing interaction. Simultaneously, Leanne can be seen to construct a stance toward the current activity: she indicates that the activity is heading in a problematic direction and that the story which she intends to tell will make a relevant contribution, advancing the proper progression of the activity.

As example 38 shows, participants may also employ other means of stance taking in a stretch of talk that contains recovery through repetition. Here stance taking is also conveyed through the use of multiple sayings which suggest that the recipients have needlessly continued a course of action (Stivers 2004), and the use of the interjection whoa which marks disapproval of the incessant competition for the floor. The repeat adds to and develops the stance taking: recovering an utterance that advances the telling of a story not only evaluates the progression of the ongoing activity but also proposes a related, relevant course of action.

In example 38, the source utterance is designed to be interruptive, but speakers may also produce the source at a sequential location that does not on the face of it cut in on anything. In example 39 from the Finnish data set, Matti and Eki are engaged in banter, the source of which Harri in line 9 shows he has not recognized.

(39) sg121_b Crappy Channel <T:00:20:34>

01 MATTI: [ei usko-is].
   NEG believe-CON
   Ø wouldn’t believe
02 ...(0.5)
03 EKI:  pau [1] &
   first_name
   paul
04 MATTI:  [ø]=
05 EKI: & gascoigne.
   last_name
   gascoigne
06 MATTI: <@>paul</@>  [<@SM> gascoigne</@SM>].
   first_name
   paul
gascoigne
07 IRA:   [XXXXX],
08 pari  [2päi2][3vå-a aikasem-3] --
   couple  day-stv  (earlier)
   a couple of days earlier
09-> HARRI:  [2mist2] [3ä toi3] [4tule-e4]
   where  that come-3sg
   where does that thing
It may not always be easy to detect where an exchange of banter ends; participants who are engaged in the activity will negotiate its completion. Here, for example, the interaction between Matti and Eki proceeds as successive rounds of soundplay that are interspersed with pauses (e.g. line 2) and bursts of laughter (e.g. lines 10–11). Therefore, Harri’s question in line 9, *mistä toi tulee toi homma*
where does that thing in fact come from’, is not interruptive in the same sense as the source utterances in the previous examples were. With regard to the activity that Matti and Eki are involved in, Harri’s question is positioned after a round of soundplay and can be interpreted as having cut in on an activity only in retrospect, when Matti and Eki overlap the question with substantial laughter in lines 10–11 and continue the soundplay in lines 12–13. A sense of urgency is present, however, because Harri’s question overlaps and cuts off a turn by Ira, who is in effect addressing Harri (lines 7–8). It is worth noting that Ira’s turn is lost, and there is no evidence in the data that she recovered it later.

Admitting that one does not identify the source of banter is a potentially sensitive issue. After all, friends may be expected to have some common ground, shared experiences and points of view that they can draw on in their interactions. The further the exchange of banter develops, the riskier it is to express one’s ignorance: because more material is continuously being provided for fathoming out the source of banter, it becomes increasingly embarrassing for one to admit that one fails to identify it. That may be one reason why Harri both poses the question and repeats it at the earliest possible point.

Before repeating, Harri produces a summons hei ‘hey’ (line 15) and seems to secure the floor as a 0.4-second pause follows. In line 17, he repeats the question: mistä toi tulee toi paul gascoigne ‘where does that paul gascoigne come from’. As I argued in section 5.2 (example 25), the repeat in effect contributes to the soundplay because of the replacement of homma ‘thing’ with paul gascoigne. Rather than displaying lack of access to the source of banter, as he did in the source utterance, Harri now displays partial access to it. Harri can be seen to construct a stance toward the activity: the activity should properly be halted to give him the opportunity to understand it and possibly participate in it, too.

Although the repeat is also overlapped, Matti displays recognition of it by producing in line 21 the ‘open-class repair initiator’ hä ‘huh’ (Sorjonen 1997: 124; Drew 1997). After Harri has responded to the elicitation with another repeat in line 22, Matti finally makes the source of banter explicit in lines 24–25. The repair initiation (line 21), the 1.1-second delay in Matti’s answer (line 23) and the presentation of the answer as more or less self-evident (siis, kai sää sen futis-pelaajan tiität ‘well, surely you know the football player’, lines 24–25) suggest that Matti deems Harri’s question unexpected and deviant with respect to their assumed common knowledge. That is to say, Harri’s concern about displaying his ignorance of his friends’ activity was warranted.
In examples 38 and 39, the speakers attempt to advance a change of course away from the current activity that they consider as not progressing appropriately. In example 38, Leanne suggests that she could provide an additional piece of information, a story about a past incident, that would be relevant for the activity in progress. In example 39, Harri requests more information to be able to understand and contribute to ongoing banter.

The last three examples in this subsection present cases in which the speaker initiates a new course of action at a seemingly opportune moment but ends up cutting in on another one. In other words, over the course of the talk that follows the source, it turns out that the recipients are in effect attending to another line of development. Example 40 is from the start of a recording. Speaker X, whose talk is indecipherable, seems to have set up the equipment and to be now on her way out, already some distance away from the microphone but still within earshot. The remaining participants orient to having a conversation: Harri suggests a topic for discussion in line 1.

(40) sg121_a Crappy Channel <T:00:00:21>

01 HARRI: [mie halu-si-n .. kysy-y [2siit puhelime-st2],
     1SG want-PST-1SG ask-INF 3SG:ELA telephone-ELA
     I wanted to ask about that telephone
02 EKI: [2XXXXXX2]
03-> HARRI: miten se [3toimi-i3].
     how 3SG work-3SG
     how does it work
04 X: [3XX3]XX [4XX4]
05 MATTI: [4(H)4] [5-5]
06 HARRI: [5 E5]ki.
           first_name
           Eki
07 X: [6X6]
08 EKI: [606]ta ota,
       take:2SG:IMP take:2SG:IMP
       have some have some
09 X: [7XXX7]
10 EKI: [7ota ots7],
       take:2SG:IMP take:2SG:IMP
       have some have some
11 HARRI: [8eki8].
       first_name
       Eki
12 MATTI: [8mikä p8] [9uhelin9].
           which telephone
           which telephone
HARRI: how 3SG telephone work-3SG how does that telephone work

EKI: oh the internet

IRA: well it is just a little more expensive

HARRI: a little more expensive

EKI: I don’t know

The topic initiation, *mie halusin kysyy siitä puhelimest* ‘I wanted to ask about that telephone’, is clearly addressed to some knowledgeable recipient(s). The past-tense verb *halusin* ‘I wanted to’ suggests that the matter has already been touched upon, and *siitä*, glossed here as 3SG-ELA, marks the referent identifiable (and can thus be regarded as a definite article, as Laury 1997 proposes). The initial announcement prepares ground for Harri’s next action, the question that he poses in line 3, *miten se toimii* ‘how does it work’. The question makes an answer relevant.

When no reply follows, Harri uses the vocative expression *Eki* (line 6) as a summons that identifies the intended recipient who is not yet attending to Harri’s talk. Moreover, the summons singles Eki out as an expert on the matter, making his response the most relevant and authoritative at this point in the interaction. However, Eki can be heard to be involved in an exchange with speaker X (lines 7–10) and so not to attend to the summons. In lines 11 and 13, Harri repeats first the summons and then the question. At the same time, Harri in turn fails to attend to Matti’s specifying question (*mikä puhelin* ‘which telephone’, line 12). By repeating his own question and consequently ignoring a co-participant’s question, Harri constructs a stance towards the ongoing interaction. He proposes that a change of course is relevant and selects a particular recipient as the next speaker. In a sense, Harri appoints Eki as an expert on the issue under discussion. In line 14, Eki can be seen to attend to Harri’s question: *ai se internet* ‘oh the internet’ is a request for confirmation about the referent. After receiving a confirmation from
Harri, *mm* (line 16), Eki accounts for not providing an answer, *en mie tiitä ‘I don’t know’* (line 18). In this way, Eki seems to refuse the expert position that Harri offers him.

In the examples that have been discussed so far, the source utterance is not elicited but implements an initiating action. In example 41, the source is a second pair part: it is an answer to a co-participant’s question and could therefore be expected to receive attention. However, possibly because the answer is delayed, the recipient does not attend to the source utterance but responds to another activity that has emerged. Here, too, the source utterance is produced at a position in which it ends up cutting in on another activity.

In lines 1–2, Jan initiates talk about an event at the school that Melissa goes to. (I have divided the example into two fragments for ease of reference and reading. The source and repeat occur in the second fragment.)

(41a) *sbc019 Doesn’t Work in This Household* <T:00:08:18>

01 JAN:   [do you know that Melissa gets a-] --
02       .. something tomorrow night?
03       ...(0.6)
04 MELISSA:  aca [demic letter] [2award2].
05 JAN:        [academic] --
06 FRANK:                  [2oh2] [3=3].
07 JAN:                           [3academic] letter.
08       ...(0.7)
09 FRANK:     are we going to that?
10       ...(0.6)
11 JAN:        yes (Hx).
12 FRANK:  (TSK) what time is <X>that at</X>?
13 MELISSA:   .. I have no idea.
14       I [don't even know] <@>what I'm supposed to wear</@>.
15 BRETT:    [<<X>@</X>]

((20 sec/29 lines omitted; regarding an event at Melissa’s school))

The use of a proper noun (*Melissa*, line 1) in reference to a person who is present indicates that the telling is primarily directed at someone other than the referent. Indeed, the sequence develops as an exchange between Jan and Frank, the parents, albeit with their daughter Melissa’s assistance (line 4). Frank’s question in line 12, *what time is that at*, further expands the sequence. In lines 13–14, however, Melissa uses the opportunity to take a more active part in the interaction: she produces a ‘non-answer response’ (Stivers & Robinson 2006: 372), a
‘claim of insufficient knowledge’ with which she transitions to bring forth her concerns about the exact nature of the event (Beach & Metzger 1997). Talk on the topic follows, and Frank’s question is left unanswered.

(41b)

16 MELISSA: (H) I think I'll wear my .. white .. dress with the black= .. diamonds.
17 ...(3.6)
18 FRANK: it's okay with me.
19 ...(3.2)
20 MELISSA: um,
21 not to be= [critical,
22-> JAN:               [seven thirty=],
23 MELISSA: but isn't that] awfully thin?
24 ...(0.4)
26 BRETT:        [2no2].
27 FRANK: just2] ...(0.4) bug [3off XX3].
28 MELISSA:                   [3alright3],
29 forget it.
30 BRETT: .. it's a small cello.
31 it's not regular size.
32 .. <VOX>duh [=</VOX>].
33 MELISSA:           [@@]@@@ (SNIFF)
34 ...(1.9)
35=> JAN:     (H) seven thirty=,
36 ...(1.8)
37 FRANK:   (TSK) <P>at the high school</P>.
38 ...(1.9)
39 JAN:     % there's even a guest speaker.

Melissa and Frank bring the topic to a close in lines 16–18. Melissa then moves on to produce what turns out to be a remark on a drawing that Brett, Melissa’s brother, is working on (lines 20–21 and 23), and Jan soon overlaps to provide an answer to Frank’s question (line 22, seven thirty=). Although the input of Melissa’s turn may not yet be inferrable at the moment Jan comes in, the turn is already recognizable as proceeding to a new activity and possibly as being directed to a new recipient. The overlap thus alludes to the possibility of ‘schisming’ (Sacks et al. 1974: 713–714; Egbert 1997): the conversation may
break into two coinciding exchanges, one between Melissa and Brett and another between Frank and Jan.

It is worth noting that the answer to the question is greatly delayed, possibly because Jan looks the information up somewhere. Nonetheless, the answer is structured as a simple time expression, as a second pair part that is not interpretable without the first pair part. The turn’s design attests to the continued relevance of the question to which it responds. To put it differently, Frank’s question has created such a strong projection for an answer that Jan may expect her turn to be understood even if delayed, and there is no reason for her to tie it more intricately to its present sequential slot.

Because Frank is the primary recipient (having elicited the answer in the first place) and because he is evidently no longer engaged in talking to Melissa (note the 3.2-second gap in line 19), there is enough reason to assume that he might attend to Jan’s answer, seven thirty. However, lines 25 and 27 reveal that Frank attends to Melissa’s comment instead, to pre-empt a potential dispute that it might induce between Melissa and Brett. In this way, it turns out that Jan has cut in on a contribution that her recipient deems important to address at this point, and that she has made it more likely that the recipients will not attend to her contribution.

Once the dispute between Melissa and Brett is curtailed (lines 28–33) and a 1.9-second gap has elapsed (line 34), Jan repeats her answer in the clear, seven thirty. The repetition renews the input of the utterance and makes it available for uptake again. The return is particularly salient because Frank himself has originally initiated the course of action, a question–answer sequence, that Jan advances. Furthermore, it adds new significance to the utterance: by recovering her answer, Jan takes a stance toward the ongoing interaction. In response to the failure of the recipients to attend to the source, the repeat provides an evaluation of preceding talk, pointing out that a certain trajectory was ignored at the expense of another. The recovery is successful: in line 37, Frank returns to the activity by requesting confirmation about another detail of the event.

From Jan’s point of view, the sequential location in which she produces her source utterance seems like a safe one with regard to the attention of her primary recipient, Frank. However, Frank has available for uptake not only the contribu-

---

15 It is possible that, during the long interval between Frank’s question and Jan’s answer, Jan consults a document for the starting time of the event. A rustle of papers can in effect be heard in the segment, but its source cannot be determined for certain without video, especially because Brett is drawing and also causing papers to rustle.
tion to an unfinished sequence that Jan provides but also an alternative line of development that Melissa offers. It is possible to speculate about the grounds on which Frank bases his choice of one available activity over another (in this case, for example, it may be meaningful that Frank, as a parent, uses the opportunity to pre-empt a dispute between the children), but what is immediately relevant for Jan is seeking Frank’s attention. Jan’s repeat advances a change of course at a fairly local level: it returns to a sequence that Frank has initiated but abandoned, at least temporarily, in favor of another.

I shall discuss one more example in this subsection to ponder the possible consequences of recovery through repetition and stance taking. At this point in the recording, the participants are paired off in two coinciding conversations (i.e. there is ‘schisiming’; Sacks et al. 1974: 713–714; Egbert 1997): Teppo is telling Anni a story, while Kirsi and Taina, who are the hosts, are preparing something in the kitchen. I shall present only a minimal amount of prior context here because the talk is for the most part indecipherable. It is clear, however, that up to this extract the participants have been engaged in their respective conversations. A momentary gap occurs (line 1), after which Kirsi directs her talk to Teppo and Anni. (Both the source and the repeat are included in the following fragment, but I shall mark it as 42a because I shall later raise a few points about subsequent talk in the conversation.)

(42a) sg020_a1 Abroad <T:00:04:22>

01 ...(0.3)
02 KIRSI: [hei Tep] [2po ja Anni2],
  pret first_name and first_name
  hey Teppo and Anni
03 TEPO: [@@]
04 ANNI: [@@]
05 TEPO: [paremmin ei vois olla3].
  better NEG could be:INF
  couldn’t be better
  want-2PL-Q 2PL coffee-PTV or tea-PTV
  do you want coffee or tea
07 TEPO: ei kukaan vois XX <X> tykönä <@> käy [4dâ</@</X>].
  NEG anyone could by visit:INF
  couldn’t anyone visit X
08 TAINA: [4<X>jos</X> X --
  if
  if
09 TEPO: @@@@@@4]
The gap in line 1 signals that a possible turn completion has been reached in both conversations, and Kirsi uses the opportunity to address new recipients. She takes the potentially problematic nature of the shift between conversations into
consideration by starting with a summons that identifies the recipients, *hei Teppo ja Anni* ‘hey Teppo and Anni’ (line 2). Rather than marking the turn as interruptive, the summons seems here to orient to the fact that Teppo and Anni are some distance away from Kirsi and that they may have heard Kirsi talk to Taina a moment earlier. Immediately after the summons, Kirsi makes an offer in line 6, *haluatteks te kahvii vai teetä* ‘do you want coffee or tea’. Whereas the summons overlaps only with Teppo’s and Anni’s laughter (lines 3–4), the offer is produced simultaneously with a more substantial bit of talk by Teppo (line 5). It now becomes apparent that although Teppo possibly completed a TCU before the extract presented here, he did not yet reach the end of the story. To put it differently, two participants self-select at the same moment: Teppo with full, acquired rights to the floor as a story teller and Kirsi with presumed access to it.

Teppo and Anni do not attend to Kirsi’s offer; instead, Teppo continues telling the story in line 7. What is more, the conversation splits into two again as Taina addresses Kirsi (line 8 onward, regarding laundry). In line 16, another gap ensues in both conversations. Registering a possible transition relevance place, Kirsi makes a new attempt at a summons and an offer in lines 21–22 and 24: *hei, kuulitteks te, haluatteks te kahvii vai teetä* ‘hey, did you hear (me), do you want coffee or tea’. As I argued in section 5.2 (example 29), the repetition preface *kuulitteks te* ‘did you hear (me)’ in line 22 marks the utterance as a repeat while leaving open the option that the recipients in effect only delay their responses until they have finished the story-telling sequence. The recovery of the offer makes replies by Teppo and Anni immediately relevant, and they both accept the offer by informing Kirsi of their preferences (lines 25–27).

The source utterance in fragment 42a may not seem significant in terms of stance taking: a host is plainly asking the guests if they would prefer coffee or tea. Nonetheless, the offer does initiate a sequence that could be regarded as involving stance taking and that could possibly contain explicitly evaluative material. After all, subsequent responses by the guests reveal their likes and dislikes at that particular moment in time. What I am concerned with here, however, is a slightly more complex process. By repeating, the speaker involves herself in stance taking, for which she is held accountable a while later in the conversation. Fragment 42b, which follows directly after fragment 42a, makes the consequences of Kirsi’s repeated offer visible.
(42b)

28 KIRSI: [7 joo,  
  yes
29 no7] tee-tä täääl on tulo-ssa-ki mut,  
  but tea-PTV here be:3SG come:INF-INE-CLI
30 [8 <X> toi8] [9vottavasti</X> X9] --  
  hopefully
31 TEPOPO: [8 no n8] [9i,  
  well well
32 ANNI: [9 <X> tääl on9] tulo-ss [a-ki</X>],  
  here be:3SG come:INF-INE-CLI
33 TEPOPO: @@9]  
34 [@@@@]  
35 TAINA: @@2@  @@  @@22]  
36 TEPOPO: [2(H) @@2]  
37 KIRSI: [2XXXXXX2]  
38 TEPOPO: [3@@@3]  
39 TAINA: [3###3]  
40 KIRSI: [1valinnanvara-a a on et3],  
  choice-PTV be:3SG that
41 ANNI: [4tee-4] [stää vai kahvi-i vai kaakao-ta5],  
  tea-PTV or coffee-PTV or chocolate-PTV
42 TAINA: [4@@4] [5@@@@5]  
43 TEPOPO: [5@@@@5]  
44 ANNI: [6tee-tää6] [7täääl on tulo-s7].  
  tea-PTV here be:3SG come:INF-INE
45 TEPOPO: [6@@6]  
46 KIRSI: [7 <X> oikeestaan7] [8niinku semmonen</X> 88],  
  actually PRT a.kind
47 TEPOPO: [8@@8]  
48 KIRSI: [9 <X> täätä on kai9]kki yh-te [-st] [2i-i</X>2].  
  this be:3SG all one-PTV test-PTV
49 TEPOPO: [9@ (H)9]  
50 [HH]  
51 TAINA: [2joo2].  
  yes
The recovery has marked Kirsi’s offer as a matter of some urgency and importance. However, once Anni and Teppo have accepted the offer and informed Kirsi of their preferences, Kirsi reveals that there is a problem with the offer, *no teetä tääl on tulossaki mut* ‘well tea is in the making here but’ (line 29). The initial *no* ‘well’ implies that what follows is not entirely in line with the previous turns but introduces an unexpected point of view, a qualification (see Raevaara 1989: 157–158), and the final *mut* ‘but’ projects contrast, a problem that relates to the preparation of tea (see Sorjonen 1989 on *mut(ta)* ‘but’ as a contrastive turn-initial connector). Teppo and Anni take Kirsi’s turn to imply that tea, their choice of a drink, is in effect the only available one. Anni repeats Kirsi’s announcement laughingly in line 32, *tääl on tulossaki* ‘is in the making here’, to highlight the contrast that the announcement makes with Kirsi’s initial offer which presented the guests with options. Teppo and Taina respond with laughter, and Kirsi also ‘goes along’ with the tease by providing further quips (Drew 1987: 225).

The stance that Kirsi has taken by recovering her prior utterance through repetition plays a central role in the teasing and bantering activity. Kirsi has presented the offer “coffee or tea” as important and urgent, to the extent that she has cut in on the telling of a story. When it becomes apparent that there is a problem with the offer, Kirsi is held accountable for giving her guests false options, albeit this is done in a jocular manner. In other words, Kirsi is responsible for the stance that she has taken (see Du Bois 2007: 173).

The examples that have been discussed in this subsection can be understood to involve the cutting in on an ongoing activity. Either the source utterance is
designed to stall or end an ongoing activity or it proves in retrospect to have done so. From the recipients’ point of view, then, both kinds of cases may seem interrup-
tive, and both receive the same recipient reaction, namely, that the recipients
do not attend to the source utterance. It is worth pointing out, however, that
speakers may deem it necessary or worthwhile to take the risk of not being
attended to in order to be able to affect the ongoing activity. In other words,
speakers may deem their own contribution to be of substance and consequence, as
is evidenced by the repetition that seeks the attention of the recipients. At the
same time, speakers take a stance toward the ongoing interaction in which their
source utterance has not been appropriately acknowledged.

6.1.2 Providing an alternative contribution to an ongoing activity

The second set of cases in the data is similar to the first in the sense that the
source utterance is not attended to but another line of development is taken up by
recipients. In these instances, however, the sources and repeats do not initiate a
new activity but contribute to an ongoing one. The source utterance is made
vulnerable to recipients’ failure to attend by the fact that the source coincides with
a more or less similar contribution by a co-participant and that recipients thus
have available two alternative lines of development which they can address in
their subsequent turns. In principle, this also applies to exchanges between just
two participants: the recipients may follow the line proposed by the speaker or
continue their own. I have arranged the examples according to how the speaker’s
utterance relates to the competing contribution. The speaker’s utterance may
contribute to an ongoing sequence or activity with an equivalent action (examples
43–44), an alternative but comparable action (examples 45–47) or an action that
differs from the competing contribution mainly because it disaffiliates, rather than
affiliates, with a prior turn (examples 48–49).

Example 43 represents a simple case in point, in which the speaker can be
seen to contribute to the current activity with an equivalent action as a co-partici-
pant, even drawing on the same grammatical category.

(43) sbc019 Doesn’t Work in This Household <T:00:14:28>

01  JAN:   (TSK) (H) [= Ron,
02     did you know Annette.
03     (Hx) uh,
Jan selects Ron as her main recipient in line 1 and initiates talk about an acquaintance that Ron may know in line 2. Jan refers to the acquaintance with a ‘basic recognitional’ (Sacks & Schegloff 1979: 17), the first name Annette, but Ron does not immediately display recognition of it. Jan’s uh in line 3 is interpretable as a ‘word search’ (Schegloff et al. 1977: 363) and, more specifically, as a search for the referent’s surname. The repair initiation opens up the activity to others: at the same time as Jan provides her own repair solution (Dill, line 4), Melissa comes in to offer one as well (Kruger, line 5). Jan and Melissa thus introduce two alternatives for the recipient to take up at the same sequential juncture. It is true that the two may not be entirely equal options because Jan is the primary teller and the reference that she suggests may be regarded as being more cogent. Nevertheless, Melissa’s suggestion may also represent an accurate reference to the acquaintance if, for example, Dill and Kruger are the maiden and married names of the same person.

Ron’s confirmation request in line 6 (Annette Dill) displays orientation to Jan’s repair solution and does not attend to Melissa’s. In this way, Dill is treated as the proper solution for the word search. Melissa, however, does not yet withdraw: in line 8, she repeats her suggestion and offers it for reconsideration. A layer of stance taking is added to the repeated utterance. Melissa takes a stance which indicates that her contribution was not attended to and that it should be recognized as being relevant for the activity, albeit not necessarily deemed correct.

After a 1.1-second pause (line 9), which signals that the recipients do not attend to Melissa’s recovery through repetition, Brett highlights it with his...
singly produced it’s *Kru*-ge*r* (line 10). Brett’s contribution suggests that Melissa has made an ally, but even their joint efforts fail to secure uptake from the rest of the participants. The conversation clearly divides into two; there is ‘schisming’ (Sacks et al. 1974: 713–714; Egbert 1997). It is possible that Jan’s turn in line 13, *no*, is directed at Melissa and Brett as a rejection of their attempts to affect the ongoing activity. More likely, however, it is addressed to Ron as a candidate of his pending answer (see Pomerantz 1988), which Ron seems to confirm in line 16. Simply put, the recipient goes along with a repair solution provided by one speaker and thus ignores a contribution that was presented as an equal alternative by another.

In example 44, too, the speaker makes a relevant contribution to an ongoing activity, but the recipients take up another alternative. Tero has been outside, changing the tires of a car. When he returns, his partner, Reija, and their friend Kaarina comment on the speed at which he has completed the task. Tero initially responds to the compliment by admitting to be dexterous but then, at the start of the extract presented here, downgrades his skills.

(44) sg067_a2 Lawyer Issues <T:00:08:19>

01 TERO: sii-nä-hän se on-ki,  
3SG-INE-CLI 3SG be:3SG-CLI  
well that’s it
02 .. ain[ut mi]tä osa-a tehä [2 auto-lle2],  
only what can-3SG do:INF car-ALL  
the only thing Ø knows how to do to a car
03 REIJA: [(SNIFF)]
04 KAARINA: [2@@@2]
05 TERO: on vaihta-a ren [3kaa-t3].  
be:3SG change-INF tire-PL  
is to change tires
06 REIJA: [3<@>(Hx)</@>3] (H)  
...(0.3)
07 TERO: lisä-tä pissapojan-säiliö-ön vet-tä (Hx).  
add-INF windshield:washer-container-ILL water-PTV  
to add water to the washer fluid reservoir
08 REIJA: nii just.  
PRT PRT  
exactly
09 REIJA: ja [tanka-ta].  
and fill:up-INF  
and to fill up (the gas tank)
10-}  
11 KAARINA: [osaa-t så katt]o-o öljy-t,  
can-2SG 2SG see-INF oil-PL  
you know how to check the oil
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In lines 1–2 and 5, Tero displays disagreement with his co-participants’ compliment by qualifying it (see Pomerantz 1978: 98–101): he may be skilful in changing tires, but that is the only car-related task that he masters. In line 8, however, Tero also claims to be able ‘to add water to the washer fluid reservoir’. The addition of a new item inspires Reija and Kaarina to contribute to the list that now emerges: Reija tags on ja tankata ‘and to fill up (the gas tank)’ in line 10 and, in partial overlap, Kaarina adds that osaat sä kattoo öljyt ‘you know how to check the oil’ in line 11. Because both advance the activity in much the same way, Reija’s and Kaarina’s turns can be seen to compete for the position of next item on the list.16

16 The inverted word order (osaat sä, glossed as can-2SG 2SG; rather than sä osaat, 2SG can-2SG) might suggest that Kaarina’s contribution is interpretable as a question. In this context, however, the word order signals strong affirmation that Tero should dismiss any doubts about his skills. Such an interpretation is supported by the fact that Kaarina produces her contribution as an item on an ongoing list: it ends in continuing, rather than appeal, intonation.
There is, however, a slight difference between these two contributions, which potentially makes them unequal. Whereas Reija’s *ja tankata* ‘and to fill up (the gas tank)’ is structurally dependent on the prior turn and seems to close the three-part list, Kaarina’s *osaat sä kattoo öljyt* ‘you know how to check the oil’ is structurally more independent and not only looks backward but also projects forward. The new frame *osaat sä* ‘you know’ suggests that what follows will emphasize and possibly compliment Tero’s skills; it makes Tero’s uptake relevant. Moreover, the skill that Reija claims Tero to have represents a different level of difficulty than the other ones: everyone who owns and drives a car may be expected to know how to fill up the gas tank, but checking the oil, changing tires and adding water to the washer fluid reservoir requires some more experience and knowledge about cars. Thus, Reija’s contribution highlights the humorous aspect of the list: Reija banter about her partner’s skills in a stereotypically masculine field.

Neither Reija’s nor Kaarina’s contribution is acknowledged immediately, and Reija repeats *ja tankata* ‘and to fill up (the gas tank)’ in line 12. The design of the turn (i.e. verbatim repetition) makes it possible to consider Reija’s turn a renewed contribution to the list, on the one hand, and yet another expansion of it, on the other. To put it differently, the repeat can be recognized not only as doing a recovery and displaying a stance towards how the activity has progressed after the source utterance, but also as advancing the activity in its updated state. The repeat can be considered both to acknowledge and to build on Kaarina’s contribution: *osaat sä kattoo öljyt JA TANKATA* ‘you know how to check the oil AND TO FILL UP (THE GAS TANK)*.

In line 13, Tero overlaps with Reija’s repeat by producing the acknowledgement token *joo* ‘yes’. Rather than addressing Reija, Tero directs his turn at Kaarina: the overlap is premature in signaling alignment with Reija’s repeat in line 12, and, what is more, Tero continues in line 16 with a syntactic structure that builds on Kaarina’s turn, ‘you know how to check the oil AND AIR PRESSURE IN THE TIRES’. Kaarina’s laughter in line 14, however, seems to acknowledge both contributions to the activity and a moment later, in lines 20 and 22, Tero sums them up by claiming to be *monitoimimies* ‘a multi-tasking man, a jack-of-all-trades’.

Examples 43 and 44 represent cases in which speakers seek the attention of recipients because the speaker and a co-participant produce alternative contributions to an ongoing sequence and only one of the contributions is subsequently addressed by the recipients. On the face of it, the two alternatives are comparable:
they advance the sequence in similar ways and occupy the same position, possibly overlapping each other. Moreover, the sources and repeats are fitted into a structurally identifiable sequence, i.e. a repair in example 43 and a list construction in example 44.

The rest of the examples in this subsection will show that coinciding, competing lines of development do not necessarily perform the same action nor belong to the same grammatical category. Nevertheless, the speaker can be seen to contribute to the same activity with an alternative action. It should be noted that because of a greater number of participants who may contribute to an activity, different degrees of not attending in general and recovery as a response to it in particular occur more frequently in multi-speaker than in two-speaker conversations. The following two examples, however, will provide evidence that making alternative contributions is also possible when only two speakers are involved.

At the start of example 45, Mika initiates a new topic by announcing that he has started looking for a job (lines 1–2). After some apparent trouble (lines 3–8), the topic is finally taken up by Harri in line 9. (The fact that the participants are simultaneously engaged in other activities, such as watching television and reading newspapers, may at least partly explain some of the lengthy gaps in the extract.)

(45) sg121_b Crappy Channel <T:00:01:17>

01 MIKA: joo, yes
02 mie oo-n vähä katel-lu työpaikko-j-a. I have looked a little at vacancies
03 X: .. XX
04 ...(0.9)
05 MIKA: ois</X></P> siisti-i lähte-e tö-i-hin. it would be neat to get a job
06 ...(0.6)
07 (Hx)
08 ...(0.7)
09 HARRI: siis niinku tommos-ta, you mean like
10 ...(0.6)
11 MIKA: ihan oike-i-t tö-i-tâ. really real-PL-PTV work-PL-PTV
real work
HARRI: väliaikas-ta. temporary temporary

HARRI: nii just,

MIKA: joo, yes

MIKA: jotain something optics-PTV and

MIKA: elektroniikka-a electronics-PTV electronics
In lines 9–21, Harri and Mika attempt to specify the type of employment that Mika seeks. In line 22, a 2.4-second gap occurs, after which both Harri and Mika self-select to take the next turn. Although contributing to the same activity, the overlapping turns propose two different lines of development: Harri is still engaged in the specification in line 23, *ihan niinku alaa vastaavaa* ‘like within the field’, whereas Mika now downplays the seriousness of his job search in lines 24–25, *en mie oo nyt menos kuitenkaan mihinkään mut, ihan vaan alustavasti ruvennu katteleen* ‘I’m not really going anywhere but, just tentatively started looking’. Once the overlap has become evident at the very beginning of his turn, Mika raises his voice and lowers it only when he has secured the floor and is able to talk in the clear. By contrast, Harri brings his utterance to completion at the end of line 23 and then ceases to compete for the floor.

Mika simply carries on producing his own contribution and does not attend to Harri’s confirmation request. What is significant here, however, is that Harri also withholds a response to Mika and a 1.2-second gap occurs in line 26. Instead of taking up the line that Mika proposed about the seriousness of the job hunt and the projected closure of the topic, Harri repeats his confirmation request in line 27, *alaa vastaavaa* ‘within the field’, to invite more talk on the topic. The turn is produced in a louder voice, which suggests that Harri orients to potential overlap, on the one hand, and the loss of his previous contribution, on the other. He takes a stance suggesting that the ongoing activity is not progressing appropriately: Mika should recognize Harri’s turn as a relevant contribution to the activity. Mika finally responds in line 28 with a minimal confirmation token, *mm*, and elaborates the confirmation later in lines 31–32.

The significance of Mika’s uptake becomes clear at the very end of the extract and beyond it. Harri tells Mika that he is also looking for a job but that he will settle for “*ihan mitä vaan*” ‘anything at all’. It is established during the corpus segment that the participants are students, but their fields of study do not come up any more explicitly than here. It is therefore difficult to judge in what way Mika’s confirmation constitutes positive news for Harri. Nevertheless, the confirmation is a positive piece of news because it reveals that the participants are not competing for the same jobs. If Harri and Mika are studying the same or related subjects, they are not competing because only Mika is looking for a job within the field. If they are studying different subjects, they are still not
competing because Harri is the only one who is looking for any odd job. The con-
firmation sequence thus serves as a transition to talk that contrasts the situations
of the two friends and establishes that there is no rivalry between them.

The following exchange also includes only two participants. Prior to and at
the very start of the example 46, Jim and Michael discuss the relationship of
humans to technology.

(46) sbc017 Wonderful Abstract Notions <T:00:19:31>

01 JIM:     (H) is our creation going to uh,
02 (H) destroy us?
03 or are we [going to continue].
04 MICHAEL:     [yeah uh,
05 look at what’s on TV].
06 @@
07 JIM:     yeah.
08-> [I just put it on].
10=> JIM:     .. [2I just put it2] on.
11 MICHAEL:     [2oh,
12     okay2].
13 JIM:     ..[3yeah3].
14 MICHAEL:     [3I see3].
15 ...(0.5)
16     (TSK) I thought they were showing that on the uh
17     .. ads,
18     for some reason.
19 JIM:     @@
20 MICHAEL:     .. (H)
21 JIM:     (H) [?]=
22 MICHAEL:     [a little too hip] for TV.
23 JIM:     (H) little too hip,
24 yeah.

In lines 5–6, Michael changes the subject by directing Jim’s attention to their im-
mediate environment, a program on the television, and by providing an evaluation
of his observation with laughter. Michael’s addition of Mandelbrot in line 9
makes the source of potential humor explicit: coincidentally, they have talked
about the mathematician Mandelbrot’s fractal theory only a moment earlier, and
now it appears to be the topic of discussion on the television. Michael produces
his turn in partial overlap with Jim’s turn in line 8, I just put it on, which denies
the implied coincidence by explaining that the program is in effect on a video tape that Jim has put on. Both participants can be seen to be contributing to the same activity with their overlapping turns: Michael advances talk about the program by pointing out its contents and Jim by explaining its origins.

From Michael’s perspective, it is relevant to make explicit the source of humor that he has alluded to, and it may be problematic to shift orientation to another contribution all of a sudden. From Jim’s perspective, however, Michael does not attend to the source. First, Michael starts to produce the word Mandelbrot in overlap with Jim and continues to do so even in the clear (line 9). Second, he does not take up Jim’s explanation immediately after finishing his utterance but lets a gap develop (at the beginning of line 10). In line 10, Jim repeats: I just put it on. The repeat makes the explanation available for acknowledgement again and constructs a stance towards how the activity is proceeding. Here the recovery is done for the benefit of the recipient: unless he bases his observations on corrected information about the source of the program, the recipient runs the risk of making a fool of himself. The significance of the recovery, or the importance of having more or less factual grounds for one’s observations, is shown by lines 16–17, in which Michael accounts for his misunderstanding (I thought they were showing that on the uh ads, for some reason).

It should be pointed out that lines 11–12 deem the recovery unnecessary: Michael’s oh, okay overlaps Jim’s repeat and acknowledges the information that was provided in the source utterance. Nevertheless, instead of cutting off the repeat at the point where the input of Michael’s utterance has become clear, Jim brings his turn to completion, finishing it past the end of the overlap. On a somewhat speculative note, it could be argued that Jim does so because the repeat not only reinstates the action but now also involves stance taking. The repeat suggests that the activity is not progressing appropriately and highlights the efforts that the speaker has taken to direct it to its proper course, for the benefit of his recipient.

In all the examples that have been discussed so far, the source utterance has been produced either in partial or in complete overlap with another participant’s contribution and it seems reasonable to argue that the recipients do not attend to the source because they have not heard it. However, overlap should not be offered as a quick and easy explanation for any occurrence of not attending. Overlap is an orderly phenomenon that participants orient to, employing, managing and resolving it for various purposes and through various means (see, e.g. Jefferson 2004; Schegloff 2000). Examples such as 46, in which the source utterance is overlapped but nonetheless acknowledged by the recipient, bear evidence to
Schegloff’s (1987a: 75–76) observation that “[s]imultaneous talk does not necessarily impair the hearing or understanding of any of its components” (emphasis in the original). That is to say, while overlap may sometimes hinder recipients from hearing the source utterance and divert their attention, such a rationalization should not be established without reasonable evidence from the data.

Example 47 provides further evidence for the observation that overlap is only one possible explanation for why recipients fail to attend to an utterance. Here, two turns can be understood as contributions to the same sequential slot even though they do not overlap. The interactants have been talking about clinical trials in which their friends have participated and for which they might sign up themselves. In lines 6–8, Eki reports that his girlfriend, Neea, did not participate in one trial although she had planned to do so. The recipients react to the news in different ways.

(47) sg121_b Crappy Channel <T:00:19:52>

01 IRA: ei-ks Neea hyväksy-tty,  
NEG-Q first_name accept-PCP  
wasn’t Neea accepted
02 ..  -ki sinne jo kerran,  
CLI there already once  
there once already
03 ...(0.4)
04 ta[i siis si]llai et se ol-i meno-ssa,  
or PET that.way that 3SG be-PST:3SG go:INF-INE  
I mean so that she was going
05 EKI:  
first_name
Neea
06 ..  joo ol-i se meno-sa,  
PRT be-PST:3SG 3SG go:INF-INE  
yes she was going
07 mut mie peru-i-n se-n,  
but 1SG cancel-PST-1SG 3SG-GEN  
but I cancelled it
08 koska se ei pâãs-sy X.  
because 3SG NEG make.it-PCP  
because she couldn’t make it
09 IRA: joo,  
PRT  
yes
10 ...(0.3)
11 EKI:  
[as-] --
12 IRA: [mut e]i-ks se ol-lu kumminki kây-ny jo &  
but NEG-Q 3SG be-PCP anyway go-PCP already  
but hadn’t she in any case already been
Ira first produces a news receipt in line 9, *joo ‘yes’*, and then requests confirmation of whether Neea had already participated in some preliminary arrangements (possibly to see if she qualifies the trials) in lines 12 and 14. Syntactically, Ira’s turn reaches a possible completion at the end of line 12. However, the intonation unit continues past the end of the line with the addition of the repaired adverbial *test-nois ‘(test) in those’* (line 14). Matti thus comes in with an alternative receipt of the news at a point when Ira has not yet finished her turn and when Eki’s piece of news, rather than just Ira’s confirmation request, is still available for uptake. Matti’s utterance, *ai sie kuulit asiasta ni ‘oh you heard about the matter so’*, plays with the information that Eki allegedly canceled Neea’s participation on her
behalf, suggesting that Eki has some authority over his girlfriend. In this way, the tease relies heavily on Eki’s turn in lines 6–7, which at least partly explains the urgency of Matti’s contribution.

It is arguable whether *ai sie kuulit asiasta ni* ‘oh you heard about the matter so’ projects more to come from the same speaker. On the one hand, the utterance is syntactically incomplete, as signaled especially by the utterance particle *ni* ‘so’ that invokes a causal projection (see ISK 2004: 783), and it ends in level intonation. On the other hand, the utterance may be designed as incomplete so as to leave the upshot of the tease for the recipients to infer (i.e. recipients are encouraged to conclude that Eki had a say in Neea’s planned participation). The latter interpretation is supported by the fact that the particle is produced laughingly so as to guide recipients to interpret the turn as a jocular tease and to draw their conclusions accordingly.

In line 15, Eki addresses Ira’s confirmation request (by disconfirming it) and does not attend to Matti’s tease. Once the confirmation sequence by Ira and Eki is brought to a close, Matti repeats the tease in line 18, *sie kuulit asiasta ni* ‘you heard about the matter so’. Here, too, Matti first leaves the upshot of the tease for the recipients to infer: he lets a short gap develop in line 19 before supplementing the repeat with a line of direct reported speech, an enactment of how Eki might have forbidden his girlfriend to participate in the trials, *ei no* (line 20). Matti produces the particle with a deep and rough voice quality that implies authority. Eki now ‘goes along’ with the tease (Drew 1987: 223) by recycling the segment of reported speech that Matti produced, *ei no*, and adopting the same voice quality (lines 22–23). By recovering his prior utterance through repetition, Matti treats the tease as worthy of appreciation and succeeds in bringing a jocular tone to the events, a tone which is eventually taken up by the protagonist himself.

It is true that recipients may be motivated to follow one line of development rather than another for reasons that are not necessarily visible to analysts. Example 47, however, allows for some speculation about why the speaker’s source utterance is not attended to, because overlap cannot be offered as an explanation. First of all, the recipient may operate on a first come, first served basis: he takes up the turn that was initiated first. Second, a confirmation request, particularly in the form of a question, may have stronger sequential implications than a tease, and the recipient may rank the response-relevant contributions accordingly. Third, a confirmation request may pose less of a threat to social solidarity between the participants because it does not contain the same kind of implications for social control as a tease may do.
The last two examples in this subsection show that the not-attending of recipients may also be more clearly associated with affiliation: speakers can be seen to provide a contribution that disaffiliates with a prior turn, in contrast with a competing contribution that affiliates with it. In example 48, the recipient goes along with a line of development that seems more favorable to her own interests of the moment. Stephanie has expressed her intention to retake the SAT (Scholastic Aptitude Test), and her co-participants have discouraged her from doing so. In the following example, Stephanie compares her score with those of her friends and classmates in order to justify her plan.

(48) sbc035 Hold My Breath <T:00:01:17>

01  STEPHANIE:  <%>I</%> .. I mean,  
02        .. yeah,  
03       people in my school when I told em my score were  
04         .. <VOX>oh,  
05        you won’t need to take it again</VOX>,  
06       but then like,  
07      my friends who have like thirteen fifty on their  
08       S[AT] [2’s2],  
09  ERIKA:    [who’s that].  
10-> PATTY:      [2but2] [3Stephanie,  
11        [3yeah,  
12         but I mean you can- you can’t compare yourself3].  
13-> PATTY:      you cannot compare yourself,  
14      you3] [4are unique4] [5ly you5],  
15  STEPHANIE:       [4Mar=k4],  
16  ERIKA:                      [5XXX5] --  
17      PATTY:    [6you can’t6] [7do that7].  
18  STEPHANIE:       [6Jo=hn6],  
19  ERIKA:                        [7Glen7],  
20      STEPHANIE: Glen got s=- what.  
21      (H) Glen got f=fifteen s=eventy [or something <@>like  
22      that,  
23  PATTY:                    [Stephanie,  
24        you cannot com-] --  
25      STEPHANIE: I was like you] make me sick</@>.  
26-> PATTY:      [2Stephanie,  
27      ERIKA:    [2<X>but don’t you be like</X> Glen is2].  
28-> PATTY:      you can’t compare your2] [3self3].  
29  STEPHANIE:                      [3I know3],
In lines 1–7, Stephanie reports on her friends’ and classmates’ reactions to her SAT score, building a case for her plan to raise it. Erika requests that Stephanie specify who she is talking about in line 8, *who’s that*. It should be noted that Stephanie has not yet finished her turn: *but then like my friends who have like thirteen fifty on their SAT’s*. Projects a predicate and a description of the reactions, possibly in the form of reported speech. That is to say, Erika cuts in on Stephanie’s turn and requests Stephanie to deal with a detail of it before continuing. At this point, Patty also comes in by initiating an objection, *but Stephanie, you cannot compare yourself* (lines 9 and 12), and Gail chimes in with the resonating *yeah, but I mean you can- you can’t compare yourself* (lines 10–11). Stephanie’s plan to retake the SAT has been under discussion for a while now, and it has become clear that the participants’ views on the matter differ considerably. Patty and Gail in particular oppose Stephanie’s plan, and their objections to Stephanie’s comparisons further strengthen their position.

Stephanie does not attend to the contributions by Patty and Gail; instead, in line 14, she goes along with Erika’s contribution. It is worth pointing out that in its sequential position, Erika’s *who’s that* can be interpreted as a challenge, a display of doubt towards the relatively high scores that Stephanie claims her
friends to have gained. However, the turn can also be treated as a genuine request for information, which is how Stephanie treats it in her subsequent turn. Erika’s question provides a more neutral line of development for Stephanie to address than Patty’s disaffiliative objection.

Patty does not give up the floor and withdraw to wait for a more opportune moment to recover her objection. Instead, she continues to account for it in overlap with the exchange between Erika and Stephanie. Patty’s you’re uniquely you (line 13) and you can’t do that (line 16) provide reasons for why Stephanie should dismiss the activity that she is currently involved in. The initial objection can now be interpreted as having been an introduction to a series of claims that Stephanie will have to take into account in her defensive responses. As none of the points are taken up by Stephanie, Patty eventually accepts her loss and remains silent.

When Stephanie’s turn seems to be reaching a possible completion (line 20), Patty comes in with a repeat but cuts off because of persistent overlap (lines 21–22). Another transition relevance place presents itself at the end of line 23, which enables Patty to ‘recycle the turn beginning’ (Schegloff 1987a) and produce a full repeat, Stephanie, you can’t compare yourself (lines 24 and 26). The repeat reinstates the objection and adds a new aspect to it: Stephanie should appropriately take up and deal with Patty’s contribution. Furthermore, by recovering the very beginning of her turn, rather than the last TCU that advances her argument, Patty indicates the exact location at which she understands her recipient not to have attended to her talk anymore. In a sense, Patty is able to point out to Stephanie that “you failed to attend to my talk from this point forward”. Indeed, the initial objection is not the only utterance that Patty recovers: in lines 30–32, she offers more justifications for her objection, partly recycling some of her earlier ones. From line 33 onward, Stephanie takes up Patty’s objection. She maintains the disagreement that has been established between them by employing the phrases no=, I mean (lines 33–34) and but Mom (line 37) and finally by stating her reasons for the comparison (lines 39–44). Although Stephanie was at first able to take up an affiliative line of talk, she is later made to deal with the disaffiliative alternative as well.

Example 49 provides another case in point of a recipient attending to a more affiliative line of development and ignoring the speaker’s source utterance. Emma, Ira_1 and Janette are planning a circuit training session that Emma and Ira_1 have promised to hold. In search of ideas, Emma reports on her friend Joni’s experience in circuit training and on his way of organizing the exercises. This
spurs Ira_1 to suggest that Joni hold the session on their behalf, *he, Joni, vais mennä pitää niiille työölle* ‘hey Joni could go lead the girls’ (lines 7 and 9). Ira_1’s recipients respond to the suggestion in markedly distinct ways, which has important consequences for how the sequence proceeds. (Both the source and the repeat can be found in fragment 49a; the example is divided into three to facilitate later discussion.)

(49a) sg151_a Chat about Something <T:00:30:14>

01 EMMA: ko Joni-han on pitä-ny hirvee-st
because first_name-CLI be:3SG hold-PP awful-ADV
because Joni has held an awful lot of
circu [itti-a].
circuit.training-PTV
circuit training

02 IRA_1: [{CRUNCH}]

03 ...(0.3)

04 JANETTE: [m]…

05 EMMA: [s]i-l ol-i jockus,
3SG-ADE be-PST:3SG once
he once had

06 yhe-s vaihee-s si-l ol-i nii-t
one-INE stage-INE 3SG-ADE be-PST:3SG 3PL-PTV
at one point he had
[2sem2]mos-i-i lappu-j-a,
that.kind-PL-PTV slip-PL-PTV
these slips

07 IRA_1: [2<VOX> hei</VOX>2],
PET
hey

08 EMMA: mit- mi-l merki-tä-än ne tekopaika-t,
3SG-ADE mark-PASS-4 3PL spot-PL
which are used to mark the training spots

09 IRA_1: <@>Joni-han vo-is mennä [pitä-ä-n
first_name-CLI can-CON go:INF hold-INF-ILL
Joni could go lead
nii-lle ty]tô-i-lle</@>?
3PL-ALL girl-PL-ALL
the girls

10 JANETTE: [(Rx)= @]

11 IRA_1: .. ihan oikee-sti.
really real-ADV

12–> EMMA: e-n mie tiä suo [stu-u-ks se].
NEG-1SG love agree-3SG-Q 3SG
I don’t know if he will agree (to do that)
13 JANETTE: [ne o-is] ihan
3PL be-CON really
they would be totally
läähkä.
exhausted/excited
exhausted/excited
14 IRA_1: mm?

In line 12, Emma voices a reservation about one necessary condition of the plan, namely Joni’s acceptance: en mie tiä suostuuks se ‘I don’t know if he will agree (to do that)’. It is not an outright dismissal but does cast doubt on Ira_1’s suggestion. Emma produces her turn as a second pair part to a proposal, but the turn also projects forward to a receipt of some kind. Although Emma’s turn has not yet reached possible completion, its start (en mie tiä ‘I don’t know’) has already signaled disaffiliation when Janette overlaps with an assessment, ne ois ihan läähkä ‘they would be totally exhausted/excited’ (line 13). Janette gives her support to Ira_1’s suggestion by positively evaluating the possible outcome; Janette suspects that Joni, a male instructor, would provide a group of female circuit trainers a challenging workout. A competing line of development is thus introduced: Emma’s disaffiliative (near-)rejection is juxtaposed with Janette’s affiliative assessment. It is the latter that Ira_1 takes up in line 14 by producing the response token mm with an upward intonation, which works as a second assessment and displays agreement with the first (see Tainio 1993: 153–154, as reported in Tainio 1996: 108). By making a second assessment, Ira_1 is able to follow a course of action that is more favorable to her initial suggestion. In other words, Janette and Ira_1 engage in an assessment sequence and ignore the import of Emma’s turn.

Emma seeks the attention of the recipients with a repeat in line 15, ni en mie tiä suostuuks se ‘so I don’t know if he will agree (to do that)’. The turn-initial utterance particle ni ‘so’ ties the turn together with her previous one, treating the intervening talk as a side sequence (see ISK 2004: 783). In other words, Emma recognizes the contribution of her co-participants but marks it as not having taken her turn sufficiently into consideration. She produces the verb suostuuks ‘will agree’ at a slower pace, highlighting the reason for her reservation, and she further implies that she does not deny the potential exhaustion or excitement of the girls but is concerned about Joni’s response. At the same time, she is able to renew the import of her utterance and pursue better recognition of it. By recovering her
utterance through repetition, Emma constructs a stance towards the ongoing sequence in which her original contribution does not seem to have played any role.

The repeat that Emma produces in line 15 is not taken up either, and Emma employs another means of pursuing a response from her co-participants. Fragment 49b follows directly after fragment 49a.

(49b)

16  EMMA:  ..  voi-n mie kysy-y si-lt,
    can-1SG 1SG ask-INF 3SG-ABL
    I can ask him
17  IRA_1:  [mm].
18  EMMA:  [mut mie] e-n tiä us- suostu-u-ks se
    but 1SG NEG-1SG know (believe) agree-3SG-Q 3SG
    but I don’t know if he will necessarily
    välttämättä.
    necessarily
    agree (to do that)
19  IRA_1:  ..  no,
    PST
    well
20    se o-is satanen,
    3SG be-CON hundred
    it would make a hundred (marks)
21    ..  kaheksa-st yheksä-ân.
    eight-ELA nine-ILL
    from eight to nine
22    ...(0.5)
23  EMMA:  mm.

Emma’s repeat in line 15 is followed by a short gap at the start of line 16, which would allow for a response by Ira_1 or Janette. As neither of them takes a turn, Emma continues by employing another means of recovery: she tones down her reservation in line 16 with *voin mie kysyy silt* ‘I can ask him’. It is immediately acknowledged by Ira_1 in line 17. Emma’s offer in line 16 can be seen as a slight ‘change of position’, which Pomerantz (1984b) has identified as one possible type of remedy-pursuit. By changing their position and thus making a concession to their recipients, speakers deem the source utterance to have been in need of modification or correction. In contrast, by repeating, speakers offer their utterance for reconsideration in its original form. Speakers thus treat the recipient response, or non-response, that followed the source utterance as problematic. Recovery through repetition attributes the lack of response (i.e. failure to attend) to the
recipients but nonetheless offers them a new opportunity to address the speaker’s utterance.

As fragment 49b shows, different types of recovery may cluster together. Emma’s temporary change of position in line 16 is complemented by another repeat in line 18. By repeating her reservation again, Emma implies that her position still holds. Nonetheless, the addition of the adverb välttämättä ‘necessarily’ in the repeat highlights Emma’s co-operativeness on the matter. The second repeat is more successful than the first: from line 19 onward, Ira_1 addresses Emma’s (near-)rejection by providing a reason for why it would be beneficial for Joni to accept the proposal, i.e. he would be paid well. The point that Emma has been trying to make is finally dealt with appropriately.

Fragment 49c offers evidence for the possible consequences of recovery. Some 53 seconds elapse between fragments 49b and 49c, during which the participants talk about the pay. They then continue:

(49c)
((53 sec/47 lines omitted, regarding the pay))

24 IRA_1: ja [nii-ten] iskä hoita-a ne. and 3PL-GEN father take.care-3SG 3PL and their father takes care of those
25 JANETTE: [mm],
26 .. ni[2i2]. yes
27 IRA_1: [2<P> ra2]ha-asia-t</P>.. money-matter-PL finances
28 JANETTE: .. mm,
29 ...(0.4)
30 IRA_1: (H) [mut] [2 se o2]-is-ki<@SM> muuten but 3SG be-CON-CLI for.that.matter but for that matter it would be
   hyvä</@SM> jos t- Joni suostu-s. good if first_name agree-CON:3SG good if Joni agreed (to do that)
31 JANETTE: [mm].
32 EMMA: [2mm2].
33 ..@[3= a3]
34 IRA_1: [1koska se3] o-is varmaan niille tytö-i-lle because 3SG be-CON certainly 3PL-ADE girl-PL-ADE because it would certainly be a change
In line 30, Ira_1 returns to her idea of having Joni hold the circuit training session on Emma’s and Ira_1’s behalf: *mut se oiski muuten hyvä jos t- Joni suostus* ‘but for that matter it would be good if Joni agreed (to do that)’. The utterance particles *mut* ‘but’ and *muuten* ‘for that matter’ mark the utterance as a return to an earlier topic rather than as a contribution to the just previous one (see ISK 2004: 782, 985). The assessment takes both Ira_1’s and Emma’s concerns into account. On the one hand, Ira_1 clearly holds on to her proposal and seeks support from her co-participants. On the other hand, Ira_1 now incorporates Emma’s reservation into her turn: *jos Joni suostus* ‘if Joni agreed (to do that)’.

It may be difficult to pinpoint the exact causal connections between different items in a lengthy extract, but it does seem that the consequences of Emma’s recovery through repetition are visible here. After all, Ira_1 makes an assessment that is conditional on Emma’s reservation and does not, for example, explicitly press Emma to follow through her offer to ask Joni. To put it simply, recovery through repetition in particular and stance taking in general may have far-reaching consequences in conversation.

This subsection has discussed cases in which the source utterance is lost to an alternative line of development that is provided by a co-interactant. The contributions that compete for the uptake of recipients may be equal in terms of the form that they take and the action that they implement, or they may both advance the same activity but in slightly different ways. Participant motivations for taking up one line of development rather than another may not be made explicit in the interaction. Sometimes, however, there is clear evidence in the data that recipients follow a line of development that is more affiliative with their prior turns and do not attend to a line of development that does not advance their own interactional goals. Recovery through repetition gives recipients another opportunity to address the speaker’s contribution as an equal alternative. That is to say, it does not offer
any interpretations as to why the source utterance may not have been attended to but simply renews its sequential implications. At the same time, speakers are able to take a stance that their contribution was at least equally important to the activity as the one that was taken up in its stead.

6.1.3 Preparing for potential disalignment

Subsections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 have discussed cases in which the source utterance represents only one possible line of development because it overlaps, interrupts or otherwise competes with a co-participant’s contribution. I wish to discuss one more function of recovery through repetition that seeks the attention of recipients and prompts vocal uptake. In these cases, the source utterance contributes to an ongoing activity without any explicit competition; it is produced more or less in the clear. It is possible that recipients provide a visual response, such as a nod or headshake, but they do not produce any vocal response. There is an evident difference between the English and Finnish data sets with regard to this function: three instances can be found in the English data but none in the Finnish. I shall examine two of the cases.

In example 50, Mary and Alice discuss their mutual acquaintances and their plans for starting a family. Throughout the extract, Mary has apparent trouble in engaging Alice in talk about the topic. (It is worth noting that the participants do allow relatively long gaps to occur within and between turns all through the corpus segment.)

(50) sbc007 A Tree’s Life <T:00:22:25>
01 MARY: (TSK) I don’t know if Tammy would be too happy with that though.
02 ...(3.8)
03 (SWALLOW) seems to me that she’s trying to straighten herself out, and,
04 ...(0.9)
05 pursue a family.
06 ...(0.5)
08 ALICE: Tammy?
09 ...(1.8)
10 MARY: (TSK) what do you think.
11 ...(1.2)
12 ALICE: I don’t know (Hx).
Mary: (TSK) or do you think it might be a matter of convenience.

Alice: I think it’s a convenience for both of em.

Mary: yeah=?

Alice: it’s also a convenience for Cookie.

Mary: oh yeah=.

Talk about Tammy’s situation proceeds somewhat asymmetrically: Mary is mainly responsible for advancing the activity and Alice for slowing it down. For example, when Mary provides an evaluation of Tammy’s situation (lines 1–6), Alice responds, after a gap (line 7), with a request for confirmation about the referent (line 8). Furthermore, when Mary explicitly elicits an opinion from her co-participant with what do you think (line 10), Alice responds with a delayed, non-committal I don’t know (lines 11–12). A more extensive uptake by Alice becomes increasingly relevant and markedly absent.

After another long gap (line 13), Mary offers an alternative interpretation of Tammy’s situation in the form of a yes/no interrogative, or do you think it might be a matter of convenience (line 14), which Alice could in principle simply confirm or disconfirm. In line 16, Alice provides the most extensive and straightforward response so far: I think it’s a convenience for both of em. The turn-initial I think suggests that what follows will bring in a new perspective, something that was not asked for in the elicitation (Kärkkäinen 2003a: 131). This new point of view (i.e. that starting a family would be a convenience not only for Tammy but also for her partner) calls for elaboration, which Mary requests with yeah=? in line 18. The lengthening of the acknowledgement token and the quite distinctive rising intonation with which it is produced imply that Mary has already formed an opinion on Tammy’s situation. However, the minimal form of the acknowledgement token signals that Mary does not (yet) reveal what her opinion is.

Alice does not vocally attend to Mary’s request for elaboration and a 1.9-second pause occurs (line 19). It should be kept in mind that delays in uptake do not necessarily project a dispreferred response (Couper-Kuhlen 1993: 254–255) and that, in this extract, the participants have already allowed several long gaps to
occur. However, silence may be heard to prefigure a dispreferred response (Davidson 1984: 103–107, 1990: 151–155), and silence that follows a question is typically taken to indicate disalignment (Stivers & Robinson 2006: 373). Furthermore, taking into account that Alice’s involvement in the topic has been problematic, the pause in line 19 implies that she may again choose not to follow the proposed line of development. In this context, Alice’s silence does suggest potential disalignment.

It should be kept in mind that the participants are engaged in a face-to-face conversation, but no visual cues are available for analysis. During the pause in line 19, Alice may, for example, nod for confirmation. If that is the case, Mary’s subsequent repeat shows that she treats Alice’s contribution as insufficient. Instead of facilitating Alice’s participation by a reformulation, for example, Mary repeats the request for elaboration, yeah=?, in line 20. The repeat is more or less identical with the source and provides Alice with a new opportunity to elaborate. By repeating, Mary also takes a stance: the activity cannot proceed appropriately without sufficient input from Alice. The repeat does not receive an immediate response, but eventually Alice expands on her prior view (line 22).

Treating a pause as an instance of recipients not attending has clear advantages for the participants in example 50. It enables the speaker to employ recovery through repetition and consequently prepare for potential disalignment. Whereas a revision or modification of the source utterance would signal a slight change of position by the speaker (see Pomerantz 1984b), the repetition enables her to keep her ground. Nonetheless, although the repetition points out that the sequence or activity is not progressing as it should be and thus marks a clear stance, it simultaneously offers the recipient a chance to make a corrective move, to direct the sequence back to its proper track.

In example 51, the disalignment that is implied by a pause turns into explicit disagreement later. Lenore has been telling Ken and Joanne about the different kinds of dietary supplements that she has a good stock of, showing and giving them out to her co-participants. At the start of the extract, Joanne inquires whether George, Lenore’s husband, also consumes such supplements.

(51) sbc015 Deadly Diseases <T:00:11:09>

01  JOANNE: o- le- --
02  does George take any of this stuff?
03  LENORE: he won’t take any of this [stuff].
04-> JOANNE: [<?hi>but] he’s as</hi> healthy
as an ox,
05-> that guy.
06 ... (0.9)
07=> (H) that guy is <MRC>heal [thy as an] o=x</MRC>.
08 LENORE: [X]<P>his liver,
09 except for his liver</P></X>.
10 ... (0.9)
11 JOANNE: yeah,
12 but I’m saying,
13 is like,
14 %= you know,
15 as much as he’s abu-sed his liver,
16 and <@>all</@> other .. other things in his life,
17 he’s still as healthy as an ox.
18 the guy is just,
19 (H) you know,
20 he wor=ks ha=rd,
21 ... (0.9)
22 he plays hard,
23 as they say @[@]@@@.
24 KEN: [0]

Immediately after Lenore has answered that he won’t take any of this stuff (line 3), Joanne goes on to proffer a possible explanation for George’s conduct, an assessment of his physical state (line 4). Joanne suggests that George does not take dietary supplements because he does not need them, but he’s as healthy as an ox. There is a clear contrast between Lenore’s and Joanne’s turns, projected by the connective but with which Joanne begins her turn. The contrast is further strengthened by the fact that, whereas Lenore’s won’t take implies that George refuses to take dietary supplements although he might need them, Joanne’s assessment is based entirely on the assumption that he is healthy enough not to need them.

Joanne’s assessment makes relevant a response by Lenore, who clearly has more knowledge about the referent (being George’s wife and having just provided information about his diet), but a 0.9-second pause ensues in line 6. Lenore’s silence can be interpreted as not attending: she does not explicitly align or disalign with Joanne’s assessment. In this context, however, the pause implies possible disalignment or disagreement because the contrast between Lenore’s and Joanne’s views on George’s health has already been established (see Pomerantz 1984a). Similarly to example 50, the participants may here be employing inter-
actional resources that cannot be accessed through an audio recording. For instance, Lenore may be shaking her head in disagreement during the pause in line 6. Nonetheless, such a response would only support Joanne’s subsequent treatment of Lenore’s contribution.

In line 7, Joanne repeats the assessment, *that guy is healthy as an o=x* (see section 5.2, example 19, for a discussion of the modifications in the repeat). Rather than treating Lenore’s silence as disalignment, the repeat deals with it as potential disalignment. That is to say, the repeat indicates that the speaker has registered the possibility of disalignment but offers the recipient a second opportunity to take up the assessment and address its implications. Joanne neither confronts Lenore nor concedes to her (e.g. by directly asking for her opinion). Thus, the repetition also brings in an aspect of evaluation: the speaker takes a stance toward the slight disruption in the development of the activity.

The disalignment that was implied by the silence turns into explicit disagreement in lines 8–9: Lenore corrects Joanne’s assessment of George with *his liver, except for his liver*. After a lengthy gap in line 10, Joanne produces the agreement token *yeah*, which turns out only to preface further disagreement, *but I’m saying* (see Pomerantz 1984a; Sacks 1987 [1973]). Joanne then accounts for her assessment in lines 13–23, and despite the jocular remarks with which she lightens the activity, the disagreement continues past the extract that is presented here. What the repeat succeeds in doing, then, is to delay the surfacing of the disagreement by simply pointing out the lack of uptake, rather than explicitly treating the silence as disagreement.

In the two cases that have been discussed in this subsection, the failure of recipients to attend to the source utterance, which manifests itself as silence, has fairly strong implications for disalignment or disagreement. By employing recovery through repetition, speakers are able to prepare for it: rather than giving up their position, they give the recipients a fresh opportunity to respond to their contribution. Stance taking is nonetheless involved because the repeat marks a response as being relevantly missing and the activity as not progressing appropriately.

Intuitively, it seems possible that speakers of Finnish may also use recovery through repetition to prepare for disalignment. In the present data, however, no such instances can be found. Due to the limited number of cases altogether, I am not able to provide an explanation for the difference. However, the fact that only three cases can be found in the English data suggests that the function is not very
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common on the whole. Moreover, a video analysis of such cases might reveal the operation of more complex interactional processes than have been suggested here.

6.1.4 Recovery through repetition vs. other means of seeking the attention of recipients

In section 4.2, I argued that recovery constitutes one practice of returning to prior talk and repetition one resource of recovery. Furthermore, throughout the analyses, I have intimated that the speakers’ choices among the sets of practices and resources are significant to the kind of stance that they take through their talk. In this section, I wish to investigate the matter in a little more detail by briefly discussing two cases of returning to prior talk in which the speakers employ other resources than repetition to suggest that recipients have not attended to their prior utterance and, thus, to seek the attention of recipients.

Example 52 comes from a recording in which the participants talk about the educational and occupational options of Stephanie, who has recently taken the SAT. At the start of the extract, Erika, a coeval friend of Stephanie’s, divulges her career plans, and Stephanie’s relatives proffer their views on the choice. (The arrow sign $\Rightarrow$ indicates lines that host other means of returning to prior talk than recovery through repetition.)

(52) sbc035 Hold My Breath <T:00:07:10>

01 ERIKA: I wanna be a social worker.
02 ...(0.7)
03 MAUREEN: [oh what an!] [2excellent choice.
04 STEPHANIE: [I have to] [2<X>determine my minor</X>2].
05 PATTY: [2probably be good at that2].
06 MAUREEN: @@@2]@@ [3@@@@3]
07 PATTY: [3I kept telling Stephanie3],
08 that's what she should be,
09 and she loves to talk to people,
10 that's where she should be,
11 [and she’s] --
12 STEPHANIE: [but if I] [2am a2] --
13$\Rightarrow$ GAIL: [2hey you could2] be in
    [3human resources like me3].
14 PATTY: [3hey,
15 pour me some more of that,
I'm not going any place tonight.

--

.. you can be like,

in [human resources] like me.

[not driving]

[that's right,

taking the car later].

[I don't have to drive] home.

[I have the] best job on earth.

so [if you wanna get into something good],

[no,

I didn't bring your set of keys].

[I have] keys.

get into [what] I'm getting [I drove here],

[oh that]'s right,

you did drive here.

it's it's,

[you know],

[I could've drank] anything.

Soon after Erika has introduced the field of social services into the discussion, Patty relates it to Stephanie's skills and choices, arguing that the field would suit Stephanie as well (lines 7–11). Gail contributes to the activity by suggesting a related occupation for Stephanie, and possibly Erika, to consider: hey you could be in human resources like me (line 13). The partial overlap with Stephanie's talk and the initial summons, hey, imply recency and urgency; the design of the turn presents the idea as something that was just arrived at and calls for recipient uptake. However, Patty cuts in on Gail's turn to ask for a drink (lines 14–16), which may be an even more urgent matter in the given context (e.g. if the beverage is about to be finished or taken away). Thus, in much the same way as the source utterances in section 6.1.1, Gail's suggestion here is not attended to by the recipients. Moreover, Gail responds to her recipients' conduct in the same way: she recovers her prior talk through repetition in lines 18–19, you can be like, in human resources like me. The repeat advances a local change of course,
redirecting talk from an evident aside back to an activity that the source originally contributed to. The recipients do not attend to the repeat either but, instead, negotiate whether they can still drink alcohol or not (lines 21–23).

In order to further seek the attention of her recipients, Gail employs another means of recovery: she changes her position slightly (see Pomerantz 1984b: 159–161). She first makes a pre-announcement (hey you know what, line 25), then assesses her job (I have the best job on earth, line 28) and finally redesigns the suggestion that Stephanie and Erika should consider the occupation (so if you wanna get into something good, get into what I’m getting into, lines 29 and 33). Rather than simply presenting human resources as a career option, Gail presents it in an especially positive, attractive light. In a sense, then, the suggestion turns into a recommendation. Thus, Gail’s change of position evokes a different kind of stance than her repeat did earlier. Whereas recovery through repetition points out the failure of recipients to follow the course of action proposed by the speaker, a change of position treats the speaker’s own contribution as amendable and upgradable. Gail starts her turn in line 25 at a point when a previous speaker has come to a possible completion, but Patty self-selects at the same moment. Gail produces the rest of her turn in overlap with Stephanie’s, Erika’s as well as Patty’s turns. Her contribution is thus lost altogether.

It is worth noting that Gail first employs recovery through repetition before changing her position slightly. In previous examples, I have also noted that speakers may first employ another means of recovery and later repeat their prior utterance. Because my focus in this study is on recovery through repetition and I have not thoroughly searched the data for other kinds of recovery, I am not able to detect any potential regularities in shifts from one means to another. What the shifts do reveal, however, is that stance taking is a fluctuating process: once they have taken a stance, participants do not have to stick to it, but they may revise and redefine it, or discard and possibly later re-take it.

Another type of recovery can be found in example 53. Prior to the extract, Lynne has told Lenore about her plans for the rest of the day and mentioned that she might go to what she calls a seasonal dance. Here she ponders the origins of the name and introduces a mutual acquaintance into their talk. The use of the pronoun he (line 2) implies that the referent has been talked about earlier although mentioned neither in the immediately prior talk nor elsewhere in the corpus segment.
After talk about the seasonal dance has been brought to a close and a considerable, 4.0-second interval has occurred (line 16), Lynne moves on to assess the referent, he’s a pretty neat guy (line 17). Because the referent has been established as being accessible to both participants (i.e. Lynne has talked about him and Lenore has not displayed any trouble in understanding who is being referred to), it seems possible that Lenore would be able to make a second assessment, even if displaying different epistemic rights to assess (see Heritage & Raymond 2005). In other words, Lynne’s first assessment makes a second assessment relevant. However, Lenore does not attend to the utterance and a 0.5-second pause occurs (line 18). As in the cases that were discussed in section 6.1.3, the pause here
would seem to indicate potential disalignment or disagreement with the assessment (see Pomerantz 1984a).

Rather than repeating, Lynne deals with the emerging silence by employing another means of recovery: in line 19, she adds to her prior utterance by producing the epistemic fragment *I thought* (see Kärkkäinen 2003a: 161–170). In this position, the fragment seems to anticipate and in a sense pre-empt disagreement. It guides the recipient to interpreting the assessment as a matter of personal opinion and as one that can be disagreed with. Here, too, the speaker can be seen to construct a stance suggesting that her contribution is amendable and, in this case, disputable. By contrast, recovery through repetition would here acknowledge the possibility of disagreement but leave it for the recipient to make the disagreement explicit.

The addition of the epistemic fragment does not immediately secure uptake, either; a 2.3-second pause occurs (line 20). The pause further signals potential disalignment and disagreement. Finally, Lenore breaks the silence in lines 21–22 by producing an agreement token and a second assessment that is downgraded by means of laughter and a characterization of one specific quality of the referent as being merely *okay*. From line 27 onward, Lynne focuses on a particular incident that has led her to evaluate the referent in positive terms, and Lenore assists her in re-constructing the past event (data not shown).

It is arguable whether Lynne could repeat her source utterance in the position in which she produces the epistemic fragment. In the transcript and in the audio recording, the situation seems nearly identical with the cases discussed in section 6.1.3. However, a video analysis might reveal that gaze, for example, plays a significant role in when and where speakers may repeat. Therefore, I do not wish to argue that the different resources would be interchangeable but only that they bring about different stances.

Examples 52 and 53 complement the cases that have been discussed in earlier subsections and show that speakers can draw on a variety of resources to recover an utterance in similar interactional environments. When recipients fail to attend to an utterance, speakers may repeat, change their position, add an epistemic fragment or possibly employ another resource to pursue a response. Different resources construct different kinds of stance: whereas recovery through repetition orients to the lack of uptake and its significance to the ongoing activity, the other means presented here focus on the source utterance and on the ways in which it can be amended in the pursuit of uptake. However, I am only able to make this general observation here; further explorations of different means of recovery are
necessary. A more comprehensive account would also illustrate how the different means may relate to each other.

6.1.5 Summary

In this section, I have discussed instances in which recipients do not attend to the source utterance (i.e. they do not display any recognition of it) and speakers respond by recovery through repetition. I have identified three different functions for these instances of recovery on the basis of the relationship between the repeat and the current activity. First, the repeat advances a change of course: it takes the interaction in a direction that diverges from the one that the participants are currently engaged in. Second, the repeat provides an alternative contribution to an ongoing activity, competing with another one mainly in terms of its implications. Third, the repeat prepares for potential disalignment that is implicated by silence after the source utterance.

In the first two types, recipients have available another line of development in addition to the one that the source and repeat promote. That is because the source utterance cuts in on, overlaps or otherwise competes with a co-participant’s contribution. To put it differently, the source utterance may be sequentially vulnerable and facilitate the failure of recipients to attend to it. In contrast with the source, the repeat is often produced at a position which seems more secure: a sequence or an activity has come to a possible completion, a gap may have occurred and overlap is less probable. The repeat is produced as soon as an opportune moment presents itself or, in some cases, later when a topical and sequential context develops that is similar to the one in which the source occurs. Nonetheless, the repeat advances a change of course, away from immediately prior talk.

The third type, in which the repeat can be seen to prepare for potential disalignment, attests to the fact that recovery through repetition does not necessarily co-occur with overlap and other such potential distractions. That is to say, the speaker suggests that recipients have not attended to the source utterance even if there are no competing lines of development or other apparent explanations for their doing so. Overall, participant motivations for not attending may remain out of the reach of analysts. Likewise, the suggested failure of recipients to attend to the source utterance provides a possible reason for recovery through repetition but does not exhaustively explain it because contributions that are not attended to are not necessarily repeated.
In discussing the examples of this section, I have suggested that repetition gives the utterance extra import, adding a layer of stance to it. Figure 2 illustrates the point.

![Fig. 2. The addition of a stance layer to an utterance.](image)

On its first occurrence, the utterance may be relatively neutral, not containing any stance-related linguistic items and implementing a fairly impartial action, such as a request for confirmation or an answer to an information question. When it is repeated for the purpose of recovery, however, the utterance evokes a stance, one that specifically concerns the ongoing activity and its progressivity.

In this section, I have also presented examples of other means of recovery: one in which the speaker changes her position slightly and one in which the speaker adds an epistemic fragment to her prior utterance. I have argued that the different resources for recovery bring about different stances. Recovery through repetition is clearly oriented to pointing out the failure of recipients to follow the course of action proposed by the speaker.

Interaction is characterized by dynamically developing sequences and unexpected contingencies. Recovery through repetition provides speakers one way of dealing with them. It points out that recipients have not attended to a prior utterance and gives them another opportunity to align with the proposed line of development. In this way, speakers take a stance towards the ongoing activity, its progressivity and co-participant contributions to it. On the one hand, speakers treat recipient contributions as problematic with regard to the course of action that they pursue, as hindering the progress of an activity. On the other hand, speakers deem their own contributions to be relevant and important enough to require recipient uptake. Participants generally orient to the progressivity of an activity by promoting its closure (Stivers & Robinson 2006). Recovery through repetition reveals the occasional conflicts of interest when participants may not concur on which activity to advance and how; it presents instances in which participants
negotiate the significance of their contributions and the relevance of their activities. Such moments touch on the issue of who has a say in conversation, and their social consequences may thus be considerable.

6.2 Redirecting the attention of recipients and taking a stance towards a recipient response

In this section, I shall focus on cases in which an utterance is recovered through repetition in order to redirect the attention of recipients. Such an environment typically develops in the following way. First, the speaker produces the source utterance, which either constitutes a turn or is part of a larger turn but necessarily implements an action in its sequential slot. Second, recipients respond to the speaker’s turn. Their contributions typically contain features that clearly show an orientation to the speaker’s talk, but the turns can be heard to misattend to the source utterance. In other words, recipients are shown to have taken up elements in the source that allow for its interpretation as one action rather than another, usually opting for the less salient alternative (see Mandelbaum 1991/1992: 133). The misattention of recipients is made explicit in the third step, in which the speaker repeats the utterance and makes it available for re-interpretation. By recovering prior talk through repetition, the speaker negotiates the input of the source and takes a stance towards the recipient response that followed it.

I shall identify two functions for the use of recovery through repetition to redirect the attention of recipients. They differ in the nature of the misattention and, consequently, in that of the recovery. Subsection 6.2.1 will discuss cases in which the speaker recovers through repetition in order to correct recipients’ interpretation of the source, and subsection 6.2.2 will deal with cases in which the speaker directs recipients’ focus on a relevant part of the source. I will then compare repetition with other ways of responding to misattention in subsection 6.2.3, before a summary of the whole section in subsection 6.2.4.

6.2.1 Correcting recipients’ interpretation

One function of recovery through repetition in response to misattention is to correct recipients’ interpretation of the source utterance, to redress uptake that is deemed somehow problematic, unexpected or inapposite. Cases in this category can be divided into two groups according to the kinds of problems that they address: recipient responses may indicate either that recipients have not re-
cognized the sequential implications of the source utterance (examples 54–56) or that they have disaligned with the source utterance (examples 57–58). The two functions are certainly interconnected, and the division serves a mainly presentational purpose here. Nevertheless, the latter cases deal more explicitly with potential disagreement between the participants, and there may thus be more at stake for them socially.

The following three examples represent cases in which the speaker repeats because recipients have failed to recognize the sequential implications of the source utterance. In example 54, the source utterance is produced, and later repeated, in order to bring an activity to a close. The participants have talked about substitute teachers who are either indifferent to their duties or eager to teach even when they have no knowledge of the subject. Here Carolyn and Sharon characterize the latter type.

(54) sbc004 Raging Bureaucracy <T:00:06:19>

01 CAROLYN: [you know,  
02 they] come in with that .. attitude,  
03 and they go,  
04 .. ({THUMP}) <VOX>I’ve always wanted to teach math.  
05 SHARON: @@  
06 CAROLYN: (H) now,  
07 (H) [what are we on</VOX>]?  
08 SHARON: [<VOX>it’s gonna be] .. [2great</VOX>2].  
09 CAROLYN: [2@2]  
10 (H) you know,  
11 and you’re saying,  
12 .. uh,  
13 we’re on,  
14 (H)  
15 ...(0.8)  
16 uh=,  
17 KATHY: .. @@  
18 CAROLYN: <L>square root of pi=</L>?  
19 [uh,  
20 KATHY: [@@]  
21 CAROLYN: and they look at] you and they go,  
22 ...(1.5)  
23 <VOX>the what</VOX>?  
24 SHARON: .. @@@@@  
25 CAROLYN: so they don’t know what the hell they’re doing.
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26          [<VOX>uh],
27  SHARON:  [<VOX>p=}]
28  CAROLYN:  (H) [why don’t we go out and run some laps</VOX>2].
29  SHARON:  [I didn’t bring any pie with me today2].
30  CAROLYN:  you know,
31  KATHY:   @
32  CAROLYN:  [they] --
33->  they don’t know what they’re doing2?
34  SHARON:   [I don’t think2] we can
35   have pie till lunch,
36  KATHY:   @@@
37  CAROLYN:  [yeah.
38    s]ee?
39   it’s like,
40   ... (0.6)
41   distorted.
42   ... (0.6)
43->  they don’t know what they’re doing [ing].
44  SHARON:  [well],
45  this .. lady is apparently,
46  an ol=d sub,

Before the selected segment, Carolyn has already started depicting a hypothetical case of a new substitute teacher coming into class to teach mathematics although she only has training in physical education. In lines 4 and 6–7, Carolyn produces a fragment of direct reported speech and adopts “exaggerated perky and enthusiastic voicing” to portray such a substitute teacher as unintelligent (Niemelä 2005: 202, in an analysis of the same extract). Others contribute to the activity: Sharon joins Carolyn in the portrayal by similarly employing voiced direct reported speech (e.g. line 8), and Kathy’s laughter (e.g. line 17) can be heard as an appreciation of what the other two are doing. The participants thus jointly characterize and criticize unqualified substitute teachers.

In line 25, Carolyn provides an explicit evaluation of the kind of substitute teachers that they are talking about: so they don’t know what the hell they’re doing. Carolyn’s return to her natural speaking voice marks a departure from the immediately prior activity and her use of the TCU-initial so indicates that the turn-in-progress should be taken to articulate the upshot of preceding talk (see Raymond 2004: 188). The evaluation serves as an intermediate summary, after which Carolyn produces another fragment of voiced direct reported speech (lines
26 and 28) and her co-participants join in again. In line 33, Carolyn provides the summary again, *they don't know what they're doing*, suggesting that all the previous contributions amount to the same claim, that substitute teachers can be ignorant. The utterance ends in a rising intonation that seeks validation of and alignment with the evaluative summary from the recipients. It should be noted that although Carolyn’s line 33 is essentially a repeat of line 25, I do not regard the two lines to constitute a case of recovery. Rather, it is the repetition that turns the utterance into a closing-implicative summary that can later be recovered (i.e. line 33 constitutes the source and line 43 the repeat under examination). In other words, the second move from descriptive talk, which has been managed through voiced direct reported speech, to an explicit evaluation reinforces the proposal for topic or activity closure (see Goodwin & Goodwin 1992: 170–173; see also Drew & Holt 1998 on the use of figurative expressions in summarizing and closing topics).

Sharon and Kathy misattend to Carolyn’s source utterance and continue the jocular characterization instead (lines 34–36). Sharon in particular clearly orients to the critical tone that Carolyn’s summary entails (i.e. Sharon further depicts substitute teachers as ignorant) but does not participate in the closing of the activity. In other words, the recipients fail to take up the implication that the speaker’s turn has for the organization of the activity. Lines 37–41 can be seen as another attempt by Carolyn to bring the activity to a close: first she acknowledges her co-participants’ contributions (*yeah*), then seeks their attention (*see*) and finally produces an assessment of the depicted situation (*it’s like distorted*). The recipients’ silence in line 42 is ambiguous. On the one hand, Sharon and Kathy do not carry on with the prior activity; on the other hand, they do not assist Carolyn in transitioning to a new one either. Carolyn finally repeats the closing-implicative summary, *they don't know what they're doing* (line 43). Whereas the assessment (*it’s like distorted*, lines 39 and 41) simply provides an alternative final evaluation, the repeated evaluative summary (*they don't know what they’re doing*, line 43) offers an ultimate closure to the activity. It does so because the repeat renews an action that was already closing implicit on its first occurrence. What is more, the repeat shows that the recipients have not aided the speaker in her attempts at bringing the activity to a close.

At the very end of the extract and beyond it, Sharon eventually responds to the shift that Carolyn has initiated. Sharon begins her turn in line 44 with the discourse marker *well* which prefaces disagreement (see Pomerantz 1984a: 72) or basically marks that what follows may not be fully coherent with what has just
been said (see Schiffrin 1987: 116). It projects the upcoming contrast: Sharon has been recently covered for by a substitute teacher who is generally considered reliable, so not all substitute teachers are incompetent. The participants thus move on to a new, related activity in discussing substitute teachers.

Example 54 shows how conversational participants can negotiate the development of a sequence or an activity, in other words, when a stretch of conversation reaches completion and another one may be initiated or, relatedly, when a stretch of conversation is still in progress. Here one of the participants advances the closing of an activity, whereas the others promote its continuation. By recovering her prior stanced utterance, Carolyn urges the recipients to re-interpret her utterance as closing implicative. In addition to constructing a stance toward substitute teachers in various ways, Carolyn takes a stance toward the recipients’ treatment of the source utterance and thereby toward the development of the activity.

In example 55, too, after receiving a rather critical response to the source utterance, the speaker provides her recipients with another opportunity to interpret her contribution to the activity. The interactants are watching a television program and commenting on the outward appearance of a guest celebrity. (I shall present the example in two parts for ease of reference and reading.)

(55a) sg121_a Crappy Channel <T:00:27:45>

01 HARRI: tois on aika iso tätä.
that be:3SG quite big lady
02 ...(0.5)
03 MATTI: nii o.
yes she is
04 HARRI: .. tosi pitkä ja,
really tall and
05 ...(0.6)
06 EKI: aika niinku tälleen- [ki iso].
quite this.way-CLI big
07 IRA: [no k]yl se on aika &
3SG be:3SG quite
08 ...(0.3)
09 HARRI: ja [paina-a-ki aika] paljon.
and weigh-3SG-CLI quite a.lot
and weights quite a lot too
IRA: [rehevä].
opulent
...{(0.3)}

...(0.6)

EKI: nii on,
yes she is

siis ei se mikään tällanen,
yes not any this
I mean she is by no means like this

[(WHISTLE)].

IRA: [ei niin],
no she isn’t

 ...(0.4)

MATTI: oho,
wow

 ...(1.0)

nyt joutu-u juo-ma-an [kalja-a],
now have to drink beer

EKI: [on viisii]
has apparently

solariumi-s istu-ttu pari kerta-a,
sunbed sat couple times

...(0.9)

IRA: mut on sitä kyl leikel-ty-ki.
but she has been cut alright too

MATTI: XX

HARRI: mi-st koh-a-st.
from what part

IRA: se--
3SG

no se ol-i jossain,
well she was in some

...(0.4)
At the start of the extract, all the participants contribute to a description and evaluation of a fitness star who is currently on television. They comment on her height, weight and complexion, constructing a typical image of a bodybuilder. In line 24, Ira adds to the description by claiming that the celebrity has in effect had plastic surgery, *mut on sitää kyläleikeltyki* ‘but she has been cut alright too’. The lexico-syntactic design of Ira’s turn implies a contrast with previous contributions: the utterance particle *mut* ‘but’ marks the introduction of a new viewpoint (see ISK 2004: 985), and the particle *kyl* ‘sure, indeed, alright’ and the clitic *-ki* ‘too’ together make the previous observations seem obvious and take a stance towards those observations (see ISK 2004: 807 on *-ki*). To put it differently, according to Ira, it is no wonder that the celebrity looks the way she does because she has had plastic surgery. Additionally, the frequentative verb *leikellä* ‘cut’ (with the implication of “several times” or “from here and there”) brings in an evaluation of the fitness star as someone who has had, and indeed needed, several operations in order to attain her present looks. Prosodically, however, Ira’s turn is not contrastive but simply produced as another addition to the description: neither of the elements that could be stressed for contrast, *mut* ‘but’ and *leikeltyki* ‘cut alright’, are not highlighted. In other words, Ira’s turn can be heard to contribute to the ongoing sequence, summing up and partly explaining the comments that have been made so far.

The response that Ira’s turn receives does not treat it as straightforward. Without acknowledging it in any way (for example, by marking it as news with the particle *ai* ‘oh’), Harri immediately challenges the claim in line 26, *mist kohast* ‘from which part’. The following lines show that Ira interprets Harri’s turn as challenging and therefore problematic, inapposite to the ongoing sequence: the start of her turn is filled with pauses (lines 27 and 30) and self-repair (lines 28–
Furthermore, the dialogue particle no ‘well’ signals that the prior turn was unexpected (see Raevaara 1989: 154–160). The fact that Ira responds to Harri’s challenge, however, indicates that dealing with it is treated as urgent. Ira accounts for her prior claim by trying to identify another television program in which the celebrity has appeared and presumably talked about the surgical operations that have been performed on her. Identifying and assessing the earlier program, which is called Hurja joukko ‘The Wild Bunch’, becomes the participants’ main concern for the next 30 seconds or so, before they return to talk about the present television show.

(55b)

35 HARRI: [se Hurja] joukko ei oikein vakuutta-nu,
3SG talk show title NEG really convince-PCP
The Wild Bunch didn’t really convince (me)

36 IRA: nii,
PET
yes

37 ni [si-3] --
PET
so

38 MATTI: [se] on [2ihan hanuri-sta2].
3SG be:3SG really ass-ELA
it is really crap

39 EKI: [2mu-n miele-st tås --
1SG-GEN mind-ELA this-INE
in my opinion this

40 minu-n2] miele-st tås ei kuvata mitåän,
1SG-GEN mind-ELA this-INE NEG depict anything
in my opinion this does not depict anything

41 IRA: .. <%>eh=</%> @
VOC

42 MATTI: wa
VOC
wah

43 ...(1.0)

44=> IRA: (H) nii mut kyl se ol-i leikel-ty.
PET but PET 3SG want-PST:3SG cut-PCP
yes but she had been cut alright

45 sit se halu-s vissiin våhän
then 3SG want-PST:3SG presumably a.little
then she presumably wanted to have a little more
pakaro-i-[sta
buttock-PL-ELA
off the buttocks
MATTI: where's those titties I like so well,

IRA: [XXX]

MATTI: and my [goddamn] titties.

IRA: [XXX]XXX

(TSK) (H) aa, ah

ei si-l oo se-n kummepi-i laitet-tu,
NEG 3SG-ADE be 3SG-GEN special-PL-PTV put-PCP

she hasn’t had more done than

ku vatsa-lihakse-t si-l ol-i reven-ny.
than stomach-muscle-PL 3SG-ADE be-PST:3SG rupture-PCP
just that she had ruptured her abdominals

nii [ol-i-ki].
that was it

EKI: [nii joo se] synnytt-i ni si-l,
PRT PRT 3SG give.birth-PST:3SG so 3SG-ADE

oh yeah she gave birth and so ruptured

vatsalihakse-t.
rupture-PST:3SG stomach-muscle-PL
her abdominals

IRA: [joo2], yes

Once talk about the television show Hurja joukko ‘The Wild Bunch’ comes to a possible completion in line 35, Ira attempts a recovery in lines 36–37 (nii, ni si-yes, so). However, her co-participants continue assessing the show, and Ira cuts off her utterance. Ira’s and Matti’s vocal reactions to what is currently shown on television (lines 41–42) and the 1.0-second gap that follows (line 43) mark a more explicit end of the previous sequence and renewed participant orientation to the present television program. At this sequential slot, in line 44, Ira repeats her utterance: nii mut kyl se oli leikelty ‘yes but she had been cut alright’. In comparison with the source, the repeat hosts several modifications (as discussed in section 5.2, examples 22 and 27), which are at least partly explained by the sequential position: whereas the source is produced as a continuation of an ongoing activity, the repeat re-initiates a prior activity after another has been brought to a possible completion. The repeat brings back under discussion a claim about the celebrity that has not yet been adequately covered. The challenge with
which Harri responded to Ira’s source utterance took up the credibility of the claim, not its input to the characterization that was under way. By repeating, Ira points out that her contribution was misinterpreted and takes a stance toward her co-participants’ treatment of it.

Rather than giving her recipients an extended opportunity to respond, Ira continues her turn in lines 45–46 by providing a reply to the question incorporated in Harri’s challenge: the celebrity has reportedly considered having an operation on her buttocks. Ira further continues her turn (lines 48 and 50), but the talk overlaps with Matti’s singing and remains indecipherable. Nevertheless, by continuing to talk after the repeat, Ira is able to guide her recipients to the appropriate interpretation of the utterance as simply another contribution to the activity of describing and evaluating the celebrity. In line 51, Ira produces a vocalism, *aa ‘ah’, which displays a realization or a discovery of something new. It is possible that Ira is browsing through the material that the participants have available and finds some relevant information about the celebrity in a program guide, for example. An updated piece of information thus becomes available: the fitness star has only had her ruptured abdominals restored. Ira corrects her prior claim (lines 52–54), and Eki confirms the correction (lines 55–56). The participants then continue talking about the looks of the celebrity for a while longer.

Example 55 serves to illustrate an important point about recovery: recovery enables participants to negotiate the sequential implications of their prior actions. Thus, there are certain lexico-syntactic features in Ira’s source utterance (line 24) that may motivate recipients to interpret it as contrasting with their turns. In other words, it is possible to find grounds for Harri’s subsequent challenge in the design of Ira’s source utterance. Ira’s response to the challenge and the evident trouble that she has in producing it suggest that she was prepared for another kind of uptake. By recovering her utterance through repetition, Ira is able to refute its ambiguity and correct her recipients’ interpretations of it. It is arguable to what extent claims of misinterpretation carry conviction, but it seems that speakers may produce more or less ambiguous utterances and, based on recipient responses, later return to define their import to the ongoing sequence or activity.

In example 56, the sequential implications of the source are quite obvious, but the recipient evidently mishears the source and provides an inapposite response. A moment before this extract, the participants’ attention has been drawn to the fact that they are being recorded.
TAINA: <@SM> kai [kki on laitet-]<@/SM>]<@> tu
everything be:3SG set up-PCP
ja sitten</@>, everything has been set up
and then
and then

TEPPO: [@@@@]

TAINA: .. [2(H) <@>tossa</@>/2].
there

ANNI: [2@@ <@> joo</@>/2],
yes

TAINA: @@@

ANNI: .. [mankka päällå].
tape deck on
the tape deck (is) on

TAINA: [(H) it] [2se],
self
no less than

TEPPO: [2mhm2],

TAINA: .. i=tse tota mõõpeli.
self PRT piece of equipment
no less than this piece of equipment

... (0.6)

ANNI: kene-s mõõpeli tuo on.
whose piece of equipment that be:3SG
who-gen piece of equipment that

... (1.0)

TAINA: se on hyvä-n-näkönen.
3SG be:3SG good-gen looking
it is good looking

<X>ei-ks [oo-ki</X>].
NEG-Q be-CLI isn’t it

ANNI: [kene-n se] on.
whose is 3SG be:3SG
who-gen 3SG be:3SG

TAINA: .. se on Kirsi-n.
3SG be:3SG first name-gen
it is Kirsi’s

... (0.8)

ANNI: ai on-ks Kirsi-l tommonen-ki.
PRT be:3SG-Q first name-ADE that.kind-CLI
oh does Kirsi have one of those as well

KIRSI: mi-st te puhut-te.
what-ELA 2PL talk-2PL
what are you talking about
In lines 1–9, Taina, Anni and Teppo characterize the setting of their get-together as comical: an otherwise common, casual event is set apart by the tape recorder that catches their attention as well as their talk. The noun mööpeli ‘piece of equipment’, with which Taina refers to the recorder (line 9), can be used for any relatively large piece of equipment or furniture and here highlights the prominence of the device. When Anni asks about the owner of the recorder, *kenes mööpeli tuo on* ‘whose piece of equipment is that’ (line 11), she employs the same term to move from an evaluation of the setting to a request for information about the setting.

The recipient, Taina, has apparent trouble in taking up the transition that Anni initiates. First, a 1.0-second pause occurs (line 12). Then, rather than providing a relevant, simple answer (e.g. by producing a proper name), Taina makes an assessment in the form of a full clause, *se on hyvännäkönen* ‘it is good-looking’ (line 13), and adds an increment that explicitly seeks an aligning second assessment, *eiks ooki* ‘isn’t it’ (line 14). The delay in response and the elicitation of alignment suggest that Taina may have doubts about her interpretation of Anni’s turn, but the assessment and the turn overall imply that Taina attempts to fulfill her part as the main recipient. In consequence, she misattends to the information question by responding to it with an assessment.

Anni overlaps the elicitation of a second assessment with a repeat of the question, *kenen se on* ‘whose is it’ (line 15). I argued in section 5.2 (example 26) that Anni is able to replace the full term mööpeli ‘piece of equipment’ in the source with the pro-term *se* ‘it’ in the repeat because Taina has already displayed correct understanding of the referent by similarly using the demonstrative pronoun. It is also possible to argue that in order to acknowledge the accurate reference and prevent further confusion, Anni avoids a referential mismatch and employs a ‘locally subsequent reference form in a locally subsequent position’ (Schegloff 1996c: 450–451). That is to say, Anni displays orientation to the fact...
that the referent has already been successfully established.\textsuperscript{17} Furthermore, the accent on the interrogative word \textit{kenes} ‘whose’ changes from secondary in the source into primary in the repeat, emphasizing the input of the turn and its correct interpretation as a question. In other words, the repeat shares enough characteristics with the source to be recognized as implementing the same action anew, but the two utterances differ in terms of their sequential location, which is acknowledged through modifications in the repeat. Soon after the repeat, in line 16, Taina provides an answer to the question.

Example 56 can also be regarded as a case of repair. The recipient’s response (line 13) reveals a problem in the hearing or understanding of the speaker’s utterance, now the trouble-source turn (line 11), and the speaker initiates and carries out self-repair in the following turn (line 15) by repeating (see Schegloff et al. 1977: 366). It is also possible to view the extract as repair of a sequence’s progressivity (see section 3.1 for a discussion of Schegloff 1997: 508–512): the repeat (line 15) works as a repair initiation and the subsequent recipient response (line 16) as its solution, which together form an appropriate question–answer sequence. This latter view comes very close to the analysis that I have just provided in terms of recovery, so the similarity of the analyses acts as evidence of the interface between recovery and repair. It is worth keeping in mind, then, that conversational phenomena overlap and a single instance of talk-in-interaction can be examined from different points of view. What is particularly relevant about example 56 for the present study is that the speaker uses repetition to recover a question that was misattended to: in this way, the speaker takes a stance to signal that her contribution was not interpreted correctly and puts the blame on the recipient.

In the following examples, the speaker repeats because \textit{recipients have disaligned with the source utterance}. To put it differently, recipients display orientation to the source utterance but reject the trajectory of talk that it promotes. What is more, the prospect of disagreement, or actual disagreement, is present in these pieces of conversation. In example 57, the participants discuss cellular telephones. (I shall divide the example into two to facilitate later discussions, although both the source and the repeat occur in the first fragment.)

\textsuperscript{17} Taina’s and Anni’s consensus on the referent is highlighted by the way in which they later respond to Kirsi’s query ‘what are you talking about’: they both reply ‘about that tapedeck’, almost in unison (lines 21–22).
tää on ihan paska-n-päkönen.
this be:3SG really shit-looking
this is really shit-looking
mu-n miele-stä</P>.
in my opinion
EKI: (TSK) tiä-t sâ mikä to-s on kuulemma
know-2S 2SG what that-INE be:3SG reputedly
you know what is reputedly shit
paska-a.
shit-TV
about that
...{0.6}
MATTI: [tää on ainaki ihan paska-n-päkönen].
this be:3SG at.least really shit-GEN-looking
at least this is really shit-looking
HARRI: [ei to-s ol-lu-kaan mitään au-au]ki [2oloaiko-j-a2].
NEG that-INE be-PCP-CLI any opening.hour-PL-PTV
that didn’t have any opening hours after all
EKI:
ja se et2 tota ni,
and 3SG that PRT PRT
and the fact that
...{0.6}
55, voc
uhm
et jos sie puhu-t jonku kaa,
that if 2SG talk-2SG someone:GEN with
that if you are talking with someone
ni sie e-t. voi katto-o jotain,
so 2SG NNG-2SG can look-INF some
you cannot look for some
sela-ta jotain numero-o sie-ltä.
browse-INF some number-PTV there-ABL
browse for some number from there
.. et se katkase-e se-n puhelu-n.
that 3SG disconnect-3SG 3SG-ACC call-ACC
that it disconnects the call
...{0.8}
In line 1, Matti initiates new talk about a topic that at least some of the present participants have evidently discussed earlier: the introductory phrase *puheen ollen* ‘speaking of’ signals that what follows has been triggered by prior talk (see Jefferson 1978: 221), and the demonstrative determiner *niist*, which best translates into the definite article in English, marks cellular telephones as an identifiable group of referents (see Laury 1997). In line 2, Matti focuses on a particular telephone that belongs to the group of referents, *tää on ihan paskannäkönen* ‘this is really shit-looking’. Matti’s utterance is a prototypical first assessment, taking the following syntactic format (slightly modified from Goodwin C. & Goodwin M. H. 1987: 22; Tainio 1996: 85).18

\[
[\text{third-person pronoun}] + [\text{copula}] + [\text{adverbial intensifier}] + [\text{assessment term}]
\]

In other words, the pronoun locates the assessable referent, the pre-positioned adverbial intensifier defines the ongoing utterance as an assessment and, finally, the assessment term conveys the nature of the evaluation (Goodwin C. & Goodwin M. H. 1987: 22–23). As a first assessment, Matti’s turn makes relevant a type-connected response, a second assessment (see Pomerantz 1984a). By using the demonstrative pronoun *tää* ‘this’, Matti proposes that the referent is accessible to both him and his recipients (see Laury 1997: 66). To put it differently, the pronoun implies that it is possible for the recipients also to assess the exterior features of the telephone. In line 3, Matti increments his turn with the stance marker *mun mielestä* ‘in my opinion’. As I argued in section 5.2 (example 24), the stance marker highlights the possible disputability of the assessment and further emphasizes the relevance of a recipient response (see Rauniomaa 2007).

Matti’s first assessment is followed by a 0.8-second pause (line 4), which signals that the recipients may disagree (see Pomerantz 1984a: 70; Tainio 1996: 94). When Eki finally responds (line 5), he does not produce a second assessment but a ‘pre-announcement’ (Schegloff 2007: 37–44), *tät sä mikä tos on kuulemma paskaa* ‘you know what is reputedly shit about that’. The turn contains elements that tie it together with the previous one: *tos* ‘about that’ clearly refers to the same object, a certain cellular telephone, and the evaluative *paskaa* ‘shit’ acknowledges that an assessment activity is under way (i.e. the two turns resonate lexico-

---

18 Goodwin C. & Goodwin M. H. (1987: 22) suggest that the first element in the format is simply the third-person pronoun *it*. By including all third person referents, it is possible to describe a great number of assessments that also follow the format.
semantically, see Kärkkäinen 2006: 718–723). Nevertheless, Eki’s pre-announcement averts the focus of the participants from the appearance of the telephone and suggests that something else might be considered unsatisfactory about it. Eki also distances himself from the activity by locating the referent outside of his current sphere with the demonstrative pronoun *tos* ‘about that’ (see Laury 1997: 71) and by framing the projected assessment as hearsay with the particle *kuulemma* ‘reputedly’ (see ISK 2004: 1425–1426). Eki can be seen to misattend to Matti’s source utterance: although the pre-announcement takes the prior assessment into account, it does not provide the kind of uptake that was sought. Disagreement is not expressed overtly but made evident with more implicit means.

In reaction to Eki’s misattention, Matti first withholds a response to the pre-announcement (as indicated by the 0.6-second pause in line 6) and then repeats his utterance, *tää on ainaki ihan paskannäkönen* ‘at least this is really shit-looking’ (line 7). The repeat essentially recovers the assessment and renews its implications but also accommodates to the sequential slot that the utterance now occupies. Matti modifies the design of the turn so as to display orientation to the preceding one: the particle *ainaki* ‘at least’ and the shift of primary accent from *hyvän* ‘good’ to *näkönen* ‘looking’ in the compound put emphasis back on the exterior features of the telephone, while admitting that it may also have other unsatisfactory qualities. As I pointed out in section 5.2 (example 24), the stance marker *mun mielestä* ‘in my opinion’ that Matti incrementally added to the source is unnecessary in the repeat because potential disagreement between the participants has already been established (see Rauniomaa 2007). The repeat corrects the recipients’ interpretation of the source by proposing that they focus on evaluating the appearance of the telephone rather than describing just any characteristic of it. In other words, by repeating, Matti takes a stance suggesting that his contribution has not been appropriately acknowledged.

The repeat receives a minimal uptake. In lines 9–10, Eki claims agreement with the repeated assessment by employing the response particle *nii* and moves on to introduce the new aspect that he alluded to in the pre-announcement, *ja se et tota ni* ‘and the fact that’ (see Sorjonen 2001: 185). He then argues that the usability of the telephone is poor (lines 12–16). This aspect of the telephone becomes the participants’ main focus for a while, as is shown by fragment 57b, which continues directly after fragment 57a.
MATTI: ai niin ku tä-s on [tää erikois-t] yhmä,

because this-IN be:3SG this special-stupid

oh yes because this has this especially stupid

EKI:

[mut,

but

but

nii].

yes

.. ja mont k[2erta-a-han joku kây silleen2] et,

and many time-PTV-CLI some happen:3SG that.way that

and it happens many times that

MATTI:

[2na- navigator</L2>2].

EKI: <X> hei jackson .. s[3ano-o sen <L2>action</L2></X>

hey name say-3SG 3SG-ACC

hey jackson says the action

numero-n3],

number-ACC

number

HARRI:

[3mie e-n kyl ym-

1SG NEG-1SG PRT (understand)

I don’t really

usko et ne o-is niin3] tyhm-i-ä,

believe that 3PL be-CON so stupid-PL-PTV

believe that they would be so stupid

et ne o-is [4teh-ny <X>semmose-n</X>

that 3PL be-CON make-PCP a.kind-ACC

that they would have made such a

button-ACC 3SG:ILL

button on it

EKI:

[4sit joutu-u sela-a

then have.to-3SG browse-INF

then Ø has to browse

puhelin-t tälleen4],

telephone-ACC like.this

the telephone like this

MATTI: no e-n mie tiä,

NEG-1SG 1SG know

well I don’t know

mut se on aina tosi tyhmä-n-nääkönen,

but 3SG be:3SG at.least really stupid-GEN-looking

but at least it is really stupid-looking

EKI:

to puhelin.

that telephone

that telephone

...(1.0)
In fragment 57b, the participants continue assessing the cellular telephone. Matti makes a ‘formulation’ (Heritage & Watson 1979) of Eki’s prior talk in order to define the current assessable, the navigator button on the telephone (lines 18 and 22), and Eki illustrates his negative evaluation of it with a concrete example (lines 21, 23 and 26). However, Harri challenges the basis of the current assessment activity, undermining the claim that the navigator button would work deficiently (lines 24–25). It is clear that the participants have divergent views on the matter. In his following turn, Matti shifts talk away from the disputed navigator button back to the appearance of the telephone. He starts by marking prior talk as inessential, no en mie tiä ‘well I don’t know’ (line 27), and then once more assesses the exterior features of the telephone, mut se on ainaki iosi tyhmän-näkönen ‘but at least it is really stupid-looking’ (line 28). Line 29, toi puhelin ‘that telephone’, clarifies a potential reference problem: Matti refers to the tele-
phone as a whole, rather than just the navigator button. The last assessment is slightly different from the previous ones. Whereas the assessment term *paskan-näkönen* ‘shit-looking’ refers simply to aesthetic characteristics, *tyhmännäkönen* ‘stupid-looking’ draws on the term *tyhmiä* ‘stupid’ that Harri used and thus also alludes to the illogical design of the telephone. The last assessment is therefore concessive compared with the repeated one.

In lines 30–32, Harri produces a clear-cut disagreement (see Pomerantz 1984a: 70–77; Tainio 1996: 93–95): it is delayed by a pause as well as the dialogue particle *no* ‘well’, contains a generalized defense (*puhelin mikä puhelin* ‘a telephone is a telephone’) and finally brings in a second assessment that negates the first assessment, *eihän se nyt mitenkään niin älyttömän tyhmännäkönen* ‘it is not in any way so insanely stupid-looking’. The participants account for their assessments (lines 33–38) before Matti discards the activity all at once by initiating a new one (line 39).

Example 57 shows the development of an assessment activity in which the participants gradually make their disagreement explicit. Matti initiates the activity by making an assessment about the appearance of a particular cellular telephone that his co-participants arguably also have access to. The co-participants, however, first respond with silence and then by directing talk to other qualities of the telephone, thus misattending to the source utterance. By repeating, Matti takes a stance toward the recipient response, marking it as an inadequate uptake of the assessment. The repeated assessment is then acknowledged but not taken up more extensively, and Matti goes along with the course of action proposed by Eki. Later, when an opportunity presents itself, Matti makes a concessive first assessment that finally elicits second assessments from the recipients. The responses display marked disagreement. The forthright manner in which Matti makes the assessments and the evident reluctance of his co-participants to display disagreement may reflect the expectations that these young men have of sharing similar views on issues relevant to them (e.g. latest technology). To put it differently, the significance of this fragment of talk for the participants is highlighted by Matti’s repeated attempts to engage his recipients in the assessment activity, on the one hand, and by the recipients’ disengagement from it, on the other hand.

In example 58, disagreement has already been well established, and misattention seems to provide the recipient with one means of sustaining the disagreement. The extract is from a recording in which Kitty and Kendra, mother and daughter, argue whether Kendra has spent the night at a friend’s house
without permission. Kendra is trying to prove that she has been at home and has suggested just prior to this extract that Kitty call her friend’s mother to confirm. Kitty responds by referring to a past argument.

(58) sbc042 Stay Out of It <T:00:01:48>

01 KITTY: <VOX>I thought Melanie didn’t have a phone.
02 ...(1.3)
03 but I’m supposed [to call] Mel Anie’s mo- [2=m/VOX>2].
04 KENDRA: [(SIGH)]
05 ...(2.6)
06 KITTY: yeah,
07 another lie.
08 remem [ber]?
09 KENDRA: [(TSK) that was a] long time [2ago2].
10 KITTY: 2now I’m2 supposed
to re- <%>a</%>- --
11 (H) and I’m supposed [3to <HI>tr3]ust</HI> you every
time you tell the truth,
12 KENDRA: [3(THROAT)3]
13 [4that was a joke4].
14 KITTY: [4(H) <VOX>but how am I supposed to know when4] you’re
telling the [Struth5].
15-> KENDRA: [5that was a5] joke.
16 KITTY: <F>yeah=,
17 and I’m supposed to read your mind and know what you’re
joking about</F>/VOX>.
18 KENDRA: .. no= but,
19-> it was a joke.
20 KITTY: you know Kendra,
21 ...(0.4)
22 <%>y</%/>- --
23 I don’t know how many times I gotta tell you,
24 once you lie=,
25 ...(0.9)
26 once you [<F>lie</F>],
27 KENDRA: [XXX
28 .. (TSK) are they having a carwash]?
29 KITTY: you lose th- .. complete] trust.
Instead of alleviating the present argument, Kendra’s suggestion develops it a step further, harking back to an occasion when Kendra has indeed lied to Kitty. As a way of defense, Kendra characterizes the incident first as outdated (line 10) and then simply as a joke (lines 14 and 16). That was a joke is clearly designed to dismiss the relevance of the past event in the current context. It is first produced immediately after Kitty’s turn has come to a possible completion and then recycled due to extensive overlap with Kitty’s continued turn (see Schegloff 1987a). Kendra’s defensive turn suggests that Kitty’s argument is based on false premises, that bantering should not be confused with lying. Similar to the beginning of the extract, Kendra’s turn only adds fuel to the flames: Kitty acknowledges Kendra’s contribution with yeah= (line 17) and then takes up Kendra’s point about joking in order to expand her argument, and I’m supposed to read your mind and know what you’re joking about (line 18). In other words, Kitty misattends to Kendra’s turn, taking it as a provocation rather than as an attempt to end further treatment of the topic. Kitty’s turn ‘maintains the opposition’ that Kendra’s turn tries to override (Goodwin & Goodwin 1990: 95–97).

Kendra’s turn in lines 19–20 shows that she expected another type of uptake. In line 19, she refutes Kitty’s latest argument (no= but) and, in line 20, repeats her prior utterance in pursuit of proper termination of (this part of) the argument activity, it was a joke. The change of the demonstrative that (lines 14 and 16) into the personal pronoun it (line 20) reflects contextual adjustment: the event that Kendra refers to is no longer available in the immediately prior context, as it was earlier. By repeating, Kendra takes a stance indicating that the source utterance was misattended to and corrects Kitty’s interpretation of the sequential import of the utterance. In her following turn, Kitty addresses Kendra’s defensiveness directly by appealing to her morality. Although the argument does not end here, Kendra is able to discard one moot point by recovering her prior utterance.

Example 58 shows that speakers may have a lot at stake when they recover a prior utterance through repetition. Here, Kendra is already in trouble, being accused of not obeying her mother. As Kendra and Kitty argue for their views, an old dispute is brought out. Kitty uses it as another example of Kendra’s disobedience, which Kendra immediately tries to refute. Indeed, it is important for

---

19 Haddington (in preparation) discusses the Finnish reduplication vitsi vitsi ‘joke joke’ as a means of withdrawing from a prior action for which the speaker is held accountable. Although the accountable action has occurred in the past rather than in immediately preceding talk, Kendra’s that was a joke seems to work in a similar fashion here.
Kendra to keep Kitty’s sources of argument to the minimum. Characterizing an earlier event as an example of jocular pranking, rather than of bad behavior, provides Kendra with one means of doing so. That is why a correct interpretation of the utterance and of its import in the interaction is of great concern for Kendra.

In this subsection, I have examined cases in which speakers recover their prior talk through repetition in order to suggest that recipients have misattended to the source utterance and to give recipients a chance to correct their interpretation of it. The source is designed so as to implement a particular action, but it may also contain elements that make another, typically less apparent, interpretation possible. Recovery through repetition enables speakers to return to a prior utterance and negotiate its import to the ongoing sequence or activity. Although the cases that have been presented in this subsection are essentially similar, they can be grouped with regard to their implications for disalignment and disagreement: by repeating, speakers can point out that recipients have not recognized the sequential implications of the source or that they have disaligned with the source. Example 58 in particular has shown that dealing with potential disalignment may have important social consequences.

### 6.2.2 Directing the focus of recipients

Another function of recovery through repetition in response to misattention is to direct the focus of recipients to a relevant part of the source utterance and to its sequential implications. To put it differently, by employing recovery through repetition, a speaker treats the contributions of recipients as having attended to the speaker’s prior talk in general but misattended to some of its elements. The speaker may provide two kinds of interpretation for such misattention: the repeat treats the recipient uptake either as being inadequate (examples 59–60) or as missing the upshot of the speaker’s turn (examples 61–63). In the latter case, the sources are typically overlapped by recipient responses.

In the following two examples, the speaker’s repeat shows that the recipients’ uptake of the source utterance has been inadequate. Example 59 is from a telephone conversation between a couple, Jeff and Jill. Here they are involved in a sequence of banter that originates in a special word search: Jeff has asked Jill “what’s the word that goes before proof” and Jill has immediately answered “irrefutable”. Here the participants are joking about having complete understanding between them.
(59) sbc028 Hey Cutie Pie <T:00:15:26>

01 JEFF: [(H)] I could just see myself like lecturing to a bunch of people and,
02 (SNIFF) like,
03 (H) oh honey,
04 by the way.
05 .. what's that word that,
06 [@@@@@@ (H)]
07 JILL: [@@@@ (H)]
08 that goes [2befo=re .. honor=,
09 JEFF: [2<MRC>irrefutable</MRC> Jeff,
10 I'm like2],
11 JILL: [@@@@]
12 JEFF: <VOX>oh yes yes yes,
13 thank you very much.
14 what would I b=e without her</VOX>.
15 .. [@@]
16 JILL: [@@]@@
17 JEFF: (H)=
18 JILL: (H) [=]
19 JEFF: [um, 20-> .. wouldn't that be funny]? 
21 JILL: ¶=]=
22 ...(0.7)
23 <t>yeha</t>.
24 JEFF: <@@aw=<@@ honey. 25>> (H) wouldn't that be funny? 
26 JILL: <@SM>that would [be</@SM>].
27 JEFF: [like if] someone was lecturing?

At the start of the extract, Jeff and Jill bring the word search into a hypothetical public context and sketch in the amusement that such an incident would entail. They construct an imaginary dialogue (lines 1–14) and display appreciation of it with laughter (lines 15–16). When the sequence comes to a possible completion, Jeff makes an explicit evaluation of the depicted situation, wouldn't that be funny (line 20). The negative yes/no interrogative implements an assessment of the participants’ joint telling (see Keisanen 2006: 148–150) and makes a second assessment relevant. Jill takes in line 18 a long, deep breath and begins in line 21, in overlap with Jeff’s assessment, a loud and creaky exhalation. Despite its timing, the exhalation is not an outright response to the assessment but can be heard as an overall display of tiredness. In line 23, Jill indicates agreement with
the assessment by producing the response token *yeah* which is also characterized by creaky quality.

Jeff responds to Jill’s loud and creaky exhalation with a display of sympathy, *aw= honey* (line 24), but then repeats the assessment, *wouldn’t that be funny* (line 25). The repeat shows Jill’s uptake as having been inadequate, too minimal with reference to the first assessment. It redirects the focus of the recipient to the assessment activity and to the relevance of the participants’ joint involvement in the activity. In line 26, Jill responds to the repeat with an agreeing second assessment, *that would be*. She produces it with a smiley voice quality that emphasizes the evaluation of the depicted scenario as amusing. Having secured his recipient’s alignment, Jeff goes on to depict another hypothetical event which involves not the present participants but any close couple (line 27).

Example 59 shows that participants together determine the adequacy of their individual contributions to a sequence. Jill’s response token constitutes a relevant reply to Jeff’s source utterance; it is an explicit agreement with a first assessment. The repeat, however, renews the relevance of a second assessment and offers the recipient another opportunity to respond. In this way, the speaker takes a stance toward the recipient’s initial response, treating it as insufficient with regard to the ongoing assessment activity.

When more than two participants are involved in a conversation, negotiations about the relevance and adequacy of a particular contribution may be more complex. Example 60 comes from a segment in which Jamie and her husband Harold complain to their guests, Pete and Miles, about their neighbors, particularly the children. At the start of the extract, they extend the telling by relating yet another incident. (The example is divided into two for ease of reference and reading.)

(60a) sbc002 Lambada <T:00:05:14>

01 JAMIE:  (H) and they were banging their .. their soccer ball up against our --
          .. below the bedroom .. th- the study window?
02 HAROLD: so Jamie the old lady went and yelled at em.
03 JAMIE:  [I opened %] --
04 PETE:   [mhm],
05 JAMIE:  (H) <VOX>ah=,
06        you mind moving,
07        getting away from there,
08        thank you</VOX>.
Jamie and Harold bring the complaint to a close in lines 10 and 12–14: they assess the incident by describing the negative feelings it evoked in them (see Drew 1998: 309–311). Jamie, who is the main protagonist and teller of the story, produces a first-person assessment in line 10, *I felt like such an old lady*, building on a characterization that Harold has introduced in line 3 (*Jamie the old lady*). Harold’s second assessment starts off as a generalized one in line 12 (*it’s so bad*) but turns into a shared, first-person one in line 14 (*they make us feel so old*). The closing of the complaint is thus clearly stanced, with explicit expressions of the complainants’ emotional reactions to a past incident. This sequential slot provides the recipients, Pete and Miles, with an opportunity to display affiliation ‘through a reciprocal expression of indignation’ (Drew 1998: 311). However, Pete misattends to the complaint and steers clear of affiliative talk in line 15 by asking a question about the details of the setting (*how many of them are there*). Pete’s question initiates a minute-long sequence during which the participants jocularly define the exact number of the children. As one result of the activity, it becomes evident that the neighbor is pregnant with another child, which inspires Jamie to envisage a new complainable (line 16).

(60b)

16 JAMIE: we’re gonna have babies crying.  
    ...(0.4)  
18 [in the middle of the night].  
19 HAROLD: *[GROAN]*)  
    ...(1.2)  
21 well it’s no worse than her screaming at em,  
22 is it?  
23 ...(1.0)  
24 PETE: yeah but now you’ll have both.  
    ...(0.6)  
26 JAMIE: yeah right.  
27 ...(0.4)
probably be like,
<VOX>shut up you ki-</VOX>,
you know,
XX?
oh= Go=d.
...(2.8)
I feel --

**35=>** I s- feel like such an old lady.
but I --
they just really annoy me.
...(2.5)
(SIGH) [kay],

MILES: [hunh].
JAMIE: new subject,
@@
PETE: hm.
JAMIE: @@ (H)

HAROLD: well it’s cause they have no respect.
JAMIE: <P>yeah,
I guess so</P>.

In lines 16–31, the participants reflect on the possible effects that the growth of
the neighbor’s family might have. In line 32, Jamie produces a negative assess-
ment of the scenario, *oh= Go=d*. This provides the recipients with an opportu-
nity to affiliate, but none of them respond, as the 2.8-second gap in line 33 indicates.
In line 35, Jamie then repeats her earlier assessment, *I s- feel like such an old
lady*. The repeat redirects the focus back to Jamie’s emotional reactions to the
neighbor’s children and highlights those reactions as a major aspect of the
complaint. What is more, the repeat treats the responses of the recipients as
inadequate: the source was only taken up by Harold, a co-complainant, but not by
Pete and Miles, for whose benefit the telling was done. A more comprehensive
treatment of the assessment is called for.

The repeat does not receive any immediate uptake, and bringing the activity
to a close proves to be problematic overall (see Kärkkäinen 2003b: 52–54 for an
analysis of the same extract). In line 37, Jamie provides another assessment, *they
just really annoy me*, which is again met with silence (line 38). Eventually, Miles
and Pete produce minimal acknowledgement tokens (*hunh* in line 40 and *hm* in
line 43, respectively), but they do not provide nor project any affiliation with
Jamie. Interlocking with the minimal recipient responses, Jamie begins an explicit
transition between activities (lines 39, 41–42 and 44): she heaves a sigh of
resignation, signals closure of the current activity with *kay*, suggests a move on to another with *new subject* and, by laughing, displays slight embarrassment of the fact that there has been no uptake. It is only in line 45 that Harold takes up Jamie’s assessments by providing a second assessment and offering a possible reason for the children’s behavior, *well it’s cause they have no respect*. Harold’s assessment clearly orients to the trouble that the participants have in taking up Jamie’s assessments and facilitates the closing of the activity. In lines 46–47, Jamie marks the activity as closed and refrains from continuing it by briefly displaying her downgraded agreement, *yeah I guess so*.

The repeat also fails to secure a recipient response, and the recovery in general is unsuccessful. This may be partly explained by the fact that Jamie’s repeated assessment (*I felt like such an old lady; I s- feel like such an old lady*) brings ‘the subjective side of complaining’ (Edwards 2005) into the activity: in addition to presenting the neighbor’s children as being responsible for Jamie’s negative feelings, the assessment also reveals something about Jamie as a complainer (i.e. it implies that Jamie moans for nothing, just as old ladies allegedly do). Because of the invoked self-criticism, it may be difficult for Pete and Miles to align with the assessment without aligning with the deprecating comment. Indeed, Harold only comes to Jamie’s rescue at a point when she is explicitly bringing the activity to a close. Nevertheless, Kärkkäinen (2003b: 54) takes the extract as evidence for the fact that “it is of relevance for participants in interaction that they get their ‘co-participants to co-participate’ in offering opinions, evaluations, and assessments, and eventually to align with their own positions and the stances that they are in the process of taking”. Moreover, example 60 shows that in seeking each other’s involvement and alignment, interactants may take stances toward the activity in progress and co-participant contributions to it.

It is worth noting that the repeat in example 60 occurs in a very similar environment to the source, in the evaluation sequence following a ‘complaint story’ (Günthner 1997a) and, more specifically, after a direct reported speech sequence in the complaint story. In lines 6–9, Jamie recounts a past event and uses direct reported speech to illustrate how she reprimanded the neighbor’s children. In line 29, she depicts a possible future scenario and employs direct reported speech to depict how the neighbor might shout at the children. In both cases, the lines of reported speech are followed by a more explicit evaluation, a first-person assessment. Moreover, on both occasions the assessment accounts for the speaker’s own behavior in the depicted situation. It appears, then, that recovery
through repetition can be used even after an extensive stretch of talk, but that a
repeat is properly recognizable as an instance of recovery only if it is placed in a
similar sequential slot to the source. That is to say, speakers who find that their
utterance was misattended to or not attended to at all may have various but
limited opportunities to recover it.

In examples 59 and 60, repetition is used to recover an utterance that is inade-
quately dealt with in order to direct the recipients’ focus back to it. In the
remaining three examples, recipients can be seen to take up a part of the speaker’s
turn but not all the elements that it contains. By repeating, the speaker pursues a
response that is wider in focus. The examples represent cases in which recipients
have missed the upshot of the speaker’s turn. In example 61, Pamela and Darryl
discuss existential issues (the term spacesuit in line 1 refers to the physical make-
up of human beings).

(61) sbc005 A Book about Death <T:00:15:56>
01 PAMELA: what if you took the same ...(0.9) spacesuit?
02 ...
03 and you put another spirit into it.
04 ...
05-> (TSK) it would be [a different person,
06 DARRYL: [@<>it’d say,
07 let me out</@>].
08 PAMELA: @
09 DARRYL: @
10 PAMELA: @
11 DARRYL: @
12=> PAMELA: [it would be,
13=> a different person.
14 ...
15 DARRYL: <X>you’re</X> [right].
16 PAMELA: [I] wouldn’t [2be2] me.
17 DARRYL: [2right2].
18 that’s right.
19 it’d be a different [personality].

In lines 1–3, Pamela produces a (rhetorical) question in order to ponder the
possible connection between the spiritual and the corporeal, I mean what if you
took the same spacesuit and you put another spirit into it. In line 5, she presents
one possible outcome of such a scheme of things, it would be a different person. It
lays the foundation for further discussion about the topic. However, Darryl overlaps with the utterance in lines 6–7 to suggest another outcome, *it’d say let me out*, building on the question–answer sequence that Pamela initiated (see Lerner 1991 on co-constructed *if X—then Y* formats). Darryl engages in banter by dealing with an abstract idea in concrete terms. Furthermore, he produces his turn with a laughing voice quality in order to invite laughter from Pamela, who accepts the invitation in lines 8 and 10 (see Jefferson 1979).

However, after displaying appreciation of Darryl’s quip, Pamela recovers the more serious line of development in lines 12–13 (see Drew 1987 on po-faced receipts of teases): she repeats her utterance, *it would be a different person*. Whereas the source consisted of one intonation unit, the repeat is divided into two. By introducing an intonational break before the part of the utterance that was overlapped in the source, *a different person*, Pamela is able to highlight the exact element that was misattended to. The repeat brings into focus the upshot of Pamela’s turn and makes relevant a different type of uptake.

In lines 15 and 17–19, Darryl aligns with the line of development that Pamela has proposed and displays agreement with the possible outcome that she has suggested. Beyond the extract, both Pamela and Darryl elaborate on their contributions. In short, Pamela’s repeat succeeds both in showing that the source utterance was not adequately dealt with and in directing the talk in a more serious direction than Darryl’s jocular remark was taking it.

Example 62 also involves banter; here the speaker repeats to recover a quip. Wendy has been playfully accused of going through Kendra’s presents and leaving behind strands of her hair. Here Wendy is giving reasons for why she took a present out of its original package before wrapping it and giving it to Kendra.

*(62) sbc013 Appease the Monster <T:00:15:32>*

```
01 WENDY: [<X>I was just like</X>,
02        I’ve got]ta check this stuff out,
03        <X>and if-</X> --
04        cause if it’s,
05        .. like,
06        gonna be junk,
07        .. I’m not gonna give it to [Kendra,
08 KENDRA:                           [(SNEEZE)]]
09 WENDY:  because],
10        ...(.4)
11 KEN:    <P>bless you</P>.
```
WENDY: [she’ll break it].
KENDRA: [(Hx)]
... (0.4)
MARCI: [2@@@@2]
WENDY: [2and then she’ll cut2] herself, and blame it on me.
.. [so=],
X: [(THROAT)]
KEVIN: [2@=@2]
MARCI: [2X2]
KENDRA: [2yeah, <@>real2] [3l3] [4y</@>4].
KEN: [3@3] [4=4] [5@@5]
MARCI: [4tha4] [5t’s righ5] [6t6].
26-> WENDY: [6sh6]e’ll [7sue me7].
27 MARCI: [7she does that all7] the time.
... (0.3)
29-> WENDY: she’ll [8sue me8].
30 MARCI: [8brea=ks8] stuff, and .. cuts <@>herself</@>, [and blames it] on us.
33 KEVIN: [(THROAT)]
34 WENDY: and there --
35 KEVIN: [(THROAT)]
36 KENDRA: [yeah,]
37 WENDY: [do you have a] [2dishwa2] sher in your ...(0.3)
apartment,
38 KENDRA: I [2know2].

Wendy accounts for her actions by saying how Kendra would probably react if the present is faulty in line 12, she’ll break it. The quip does not receive an immediate response but only delayed laughter by Marci (lines 14–15). There being a possibility that no display of appreciation is forthcoming, Wendy continues at the very same moment that Marci begins to laugh. Lines 16–17, and then she’ll cut herself, and blame it on me, are designed to continue from where Wendy left off in line 12 and mark it as not having been the end of the turn. However, the increment also fails to secure recipient uptake; again, there is no immediate response and Wendy produces a ‘stand-alone so’ to prompt appreciation or acknowledgment in line 18 (Raymond 2004). Finally, in lines 20–25, Wendy’s co-participants display appreciation of the extended quip by laughing and showing agreement. Now that her
recipients clearly attend to the quip, Wendy escalates it into *she’ll sue me* in line 26. The rather exaggerated proposition now constitutes the climax of the quip and sets up expectations for further displays of appreciation by the recipients.

However, Wendy’s turn is overlapped by Marci’s extended display of agreement, *she does that all the time* (line 27). A gap ensues in line 28, during which any of the participants could take a turn. Wendy uses the opportunity to repeat her escalated quip in line 29, *she’ll sue me*. The repeat is also overlapped: Marci further extends her appreciation of the original quip in lines 30–32. She recycles the quip that Wendy produced but generalizes it by using the present tense, rather than the future, and the plural personal pronoun *us*, rather than the singular *me*. Although the escalated quip does not receive any direct response from the recipients, the quip in general is now well attended to. This seems to be enough for Wendy, who in lines 34 and 37 moves on to a new activity.

Whereas in example 61 Pamela recovers the source in order to shift the focus away from banter, in example 62 Wendy does so in order to pursue appreciation of an escalated quip in an ongoing sequence of banter. What the two examples have in common is that the sources are misattended to and the repeats redirect the focus of the recipients to the upshot of the utterances. Because an exchange of banter can be regarded as an affective activity, the source utterances in examples 61 and 62 are already stanced. By recovering their prior talk through repetition, the speakers add another layer to the stance taking: they evaluate recipient responses with reference to the ongoing activity. It should be noted, however, that speakers may at first go along with the alternative line of development, as Pamela does in example 61, or that they may deem recipient responses sufficient enough after all, as Wendy does in example 62.

The cases that have been presented so far form a varied set of cases, and the last one will further diversify the set. In example 63, the recipient repairs a term in the speaker’s turn and misattends to the source utterance. Earlier in the conversation, Tero and Reija have talked about different ways of saving energy at the workplace, such as energy-efficient lighting. Here Reija comes back to the topic by asking Tero a technical detail about halogen lamps. (The long pauses in the extract are at least partly explained by the fact that the participants are watching television.)

(63) sg067_b3 Conversation Continues <T:00:14:28>

01 REIJA: [miks] halogeeni-lampu-i-ossa pitää ollawhy halogen-lamp-PL-INE have.to be:INF
by the way why do halogen lamps have to
muuten muuntaja (Hx).
by.the.way transformer
have a transformer

02   ...(0.4)

03 TERO: ilmeise-sti se ei kärsti kah-ta sata-a
apparent-ADV 3SG NEG take two-PTV hundred-PTV
apparently the lamp can’t take
kah-ta-kymmen-tä volttil-a se lamppu.
two-PTV-ten-PTV volt-PTV 3SG lamp
two hundred twenty volts

04   ...(0.7)

05 REIJA: (SNIFF)

06   ...(1.1)

07 just just,
just, just,

08   eli se muunta-a se-n sähkö-mää-rä-n
so 3SG transform-3SG 3SG-ACC electricity-amount-ACC
in other words it transforms the amount of electricity
piene-mmä-ks.
small-COMP-TRANS
lower

09-> eli se sää [stä-ä sillon sähkö-ä].
so 3SG save-3SG then electricity-PTV
in other words it saves electricity then

10 TERO: [jännittee-n].
         voltage-ACC
         voltage

11 jännittee-n.
         voltage-ACC
         voltage

12   ...(0.5)

13 REIJA: no se-n mikä sie-ltä nyt ...(0.5) tule-e-ki.
         PRT 3SG-ACC what there-ABL now come-3SG-CLI
well whatever it is that comes out of there

14   ...(0.4)

15   (SNIFF) [+]

16 TERO: [<(H)> jo]<>/(H)>>,
         PRT
         yes

17   ...(0.6)

18-> REIJA: eli se säästää sähkö-ä (Hx).
so 3SG save-3SG electricity-PTV
in other words it saves electricity

19 tuo-han on ihan amphia-pestä-n nääkön-
that-CLI be:3SG really wasp-hive-GEN looking
that looks just like a wasp hive

20   ...(4.3)

21 X: (Hx)
Tero replies to Reija’s question about halogen lamps in line 3, and Reija acknowledges the answer in line 7. Reija then goes on to display her understanding of the talk-so-far, and of Tero’s turn in particular, by producing two consecutive ‘formulations’ (Heritage & Watson 1979), *eli se muuntaa sen sähkömäärän pienemmäksi* ‘in other words it transforms the amount of electricity lower’ (line 8) and *eli se säistää sillon sähköä* ‘in other words it saves electricity then’ (line 9). Both formulations are clearly marked as such with the utterance particle *eli* ‘in other words, so’ (see ISK 2004: 983). Whereas the first formulation makes reference only to its immediate environment, the second one is linked to the larger context, to the prior talk about different ways of saving energy. The utterance *eli se säistää sillon sähköä* ‘in other words it saves electricity then’ is a formulation of a formulation, so to speak: it provides a re-interpretation of the first formulation in order to make it relevant for the overall theme of the conversation. Tero cuts in on the second formulation to initiate and carry out repair on a term that Reija used in the first one; he replaces the expression *sähkömäärän* ‘amount of electricity’ with *jännitteen* ‘voltage’ (first in overlap and then in the clear, lines 10–11). Tero clearly attends to Reija’s talk but focuses only on a detail of it, a choice of wording.

In line 13, Reija acknowledges the repair but treats it as irrelevant for her current course of action, *no sen mikä sieltä nyt tuleeksi* ‘well whatever it is that comes out of there’. Once Tero has given her the go-ahead to continue in line 16, Reija repeats the second formulation in line 18, *eli se säistää sähköä* ‘in other words it saves electricity’. In this way, Reija treats Tero’s contribution as having misattended to the source utterance and provides him with an opportunity to address her turn in its entirety. Immediately after the repeat, however, Reija makes a swift digression by directing Tero’s attention to something that is
currently being shown on the television (line 19, *tuohan on ihan ampiaispesän näkönen* ‘that looks just like a wasp hive’). The participants apparently concentrate on watching television for the next few seconds. In lines 22–24, Tero returns to the main activity and addresses Reija’s argument that lower voltage would equal less electricity.

Reija’s stance taking is made consequential much later in the conversation. Example 64 is part of a sequence in which Reija and Tero list the ideas that they have come up with for saving energy at the workplace. Tero is planning to present the list to his colleagues.

(64) sg067_b4 Conversation Continues <T:00:13:45>

01 TERO: kierrätys, recycling
02  kaks ro[skis-ta ja valo-j-a pie-ne-mmää-ksi.  
     two litter.basket-PTV and light-PL-PTV small-COMP-TRANS
     two litter baskets and lights lower
03 REIJA:  [(THROAT)]
04     .. niin (Hx),  
     yes
05 TERO: [tai sit] --  
     or then
06 REIJA: [piene-mpi]-<F>tehoi</F>si-mm-ksi.  
     small-COMP-wattage-COMP-PL-TRANS
     lower in wattage
07 nimen [2omaan,  
     specifically
08 TERO: [2nii2],  
     yes
09 REIJA: s2]å voi-t mainita siinä et,  
     2SG can-2SG mention 3SG-INE that
     you can mention in it that
10 jännitte-en vähentäminen ei  
     voltage-GEN reduction NEG
     the reduction of voltage has
     [3 vaikuta asi<@>a-an</@>3],  
     affect matter-ILL
     no effect on the matter
11 TERO: [3ei auta <@>vaan</@>3],  
     NEG help but
     doesn’t help but
As the participants go through their suggestions, they touch upon the claim that initiated the discussion about the connection between amounts of electricity and voltage. Reija makes fun of her incorrect understanding of the connection and the attention that her confusion received: she emphatically displays a correct, and corrected, understanding of the connection by remarking ‘lower in wattage specifically’ (lines 6–7). She further jocularly prompts Tero to make the point clear to his colleagues. The sequence of banter in example 64 originates in the recovery that Reija does in example 63. Reija’s mistake about equaling lower voltage with less electricity is first made salient by the fact that she treats Tero’s repair as irrelevant or beside the point and insists on another focus for the activity. The quip that Reija makes later shows her to be aware of the possible consequences of her stance taking and, in a sense, gets there first. To put it differently, Reija’s mistake could, for example, brand her as not knowledgeable, but the quip undermines such allegations. What is more, the quip serves as a tease: it implies that Tero shows off his knowledge by repairing a point in Reija’s talk that is irrelevant for her overall course of action.

The cases in this subsection have shown that speakers may recover prior talk through repetition in order to direct their recipients’ focus to a relevant part of their prior turn and its sequential implications. Although the speakers often first go along with the responses of the recipients, they later return to their own prior talk and invite an alternative uptake. In examples 59–60, the speakers deem the recipient responses to have been somehow inadequate and pursue a more elaborate uptake. In examples 61–63, the speakers show that recipients have missed the upshot of the prior talk by misattending to the source utterance and that another kind of uptake is relevant. By repeating, the speakers attempt to widen or redirect the focus of their recipients and, simultaneously, take a stance toward the contributions of the recipients.
6.2.3 Recovery through repetition vs. other means of redirecting the attention of recipients

As I did at the end of section 6.1, I wish here to relate recovery through repetition to other means that speakers may employ to redirect the attention of recipients. I shall present two examples in which the speakers suggest that recipients have misattended to the source utterance, not by repeating but by adding to or modifying their own contributions. I shall argue that the resources construct different kinds of stances.

The following example resembles the cases that were discussed in section 6.2.1. At the start of the extract, Marci suggests a somewhat uncommon use for one of the kitchen dishes that Kendra has received for her birthday. Kendra’s response to the suggestion reveals that she plans to get a cat once she moves into her own apartment (many of the presents are in effect given to her in preparation for the move).

(65) sbc013 Appease the Monster <T:00:08:44>

01 MARCI: [and just think],
02 [2you can use the bowl2] [3for a wash3]tub.
03 KEN:
04 KEVIN: [2@@@2]
05 WENDY: @$ .. @$
06 MARCI: @$[2@@@2] [3@@@3]@ [4@@@@4]
07 KENDRA: @$[
08 [2for2] [3my ca=t3].
09 KEVIN: [3well,
10 if you’re lucky3].
11 KENDRA: [4what are you talking ab4] [5out5].
12-> KEVIN: [5can you5] have
a [6cat in your6] apartment?
13 MARCI: [6(H)6]
14 KENDRA: .. I’m gonna have a cat in my apartment.
15-> KEVIN: .. can you.
16-> .. by law.
17-> [have a c]at in your apartment.
18 KENDRA: [yeah].
19 .. yeah.
20 KEVIN: .. well that’s helpful.
In line 12, Kevin requests Kendra to confirm a detail of her plan, *can you have a cat in your apartment*. The request focuses not on what Kendra wishes to do but on what she is allowed to do (e.g. by the owner of the apartment or other residents). Kendra’s reply in line 14, *I’m gonna have a cat in my apartment*, presents the plan as definite, rather than as dependent on any outside regulations. Kendra recycles a major part of Kevin’s turn and thus clearly orients to it; nonetheless, she misattends to the aspect of whether pets are in effect allowed in the new apartment or not.

Instead of repeating his utterance verbatim, Kevin makes a significant addition to it: *can you, by law, have a cat in your apartment* (lines 15–17). The addition of the phrase *by law*, which is emphasized by its placement in a separate intonation unit, clarifies an apparent understanding problem (see Pomerantz 1984b: 153–156). Kevin’s redesigned confirmation request marks the modal verb *can* as a potential trouble source and carries out a repair by restricting its meaning to legal accountability. Immediately after Kevin has produced the addition, Kendra confirms (line 18).

Example 65 differs from previous cases in this section because the speaker significantly modifies his prior contribution in order to pursue an adequate response. The fact that Kevin recycles most of his turn implies that Kendra could probably have interpreted it appropriately in the first place. Nevertheless, the fact that he highlights the addition of a clarification suggests that he could have designed the confirmation request more clearly in the first place. To put it differently, Kevin treats his own contribution as modifiable and repairable. A verbatim repeat in the same position would make the recipient responsible for the proper interpretation of the turn.

Similar stance-taking developments can be found in example 66. I have divided it into five fragments (a–e) because it forms a relatively extensive sequence in which one of the participants employs various means to pursue adequate uptake. The extract is from the after-dinner conversation between the married couple, Jamie and Harold, and their guests, Miles and Pete. Miles has noticed some masks on the wall and remarks that one of them resembles a certain person whom he has seen performing at a dance club.

(66a) sbc002 Lambada <T:00:07:05>

01 MILES:  those two top ma=sks,
02        . . . there.
03        ...(1.8)
As lines 1–21 show, the introduction of the topic does not proceed in a straightforward manner. It is only in lines 23–24 and 27 that Miles manages to formulate the gist of his contribution: but the thing is, that second one looks like the guy who was in one of the Oba Oba skits. The remark makes relevant recipient uptake, minimally an acknowledgement or a request for elaboration. Miles’s turn is overlapped by a brief exchange between Jamie and Pete (lines 25–26 and 28–
so the recipients may have trouble hearing Miles’s turn. Harold’s repair initiation, *the little what* (line 32), also reveals a problematic reference as well as an apparent mishearing (i.e. *the little what* attempts to locate a referent that has not been introduced). In his following turn, Miles addresses the trouble in various ways: he first repeats the expression that might be the source of Harold’s mishearing (*looks like*, line 34), then specifies the referent in the present context (*that second one*, line 24 → *that second one from the top*, lines 35 and 37) and finally marks the referent in the reported context as unknown to the recipients (*the guy*, line 24 → *a guy*, line 37). Miles thus clarifies several potential understanding problems in his prior turn and renews the relevance of uptake (see Pomerantz 1984b: 153–156).

Despite the clarifications, the recipients have trouble in identifying what Miles is referring to.

(66b)

38 HAROLD: .. what’s an Oba Oba [skit].
39 JAMIE: [Oba Oba,
40 oh the Brazilian troop that was here,
41 [dancing]?  
42 MILES: [yeah].
43 PETE: oh yeah?
44 ...(1.0)
45 JAMIE: I never [saw that].
46 PETE: [look like] --
47 .. % a real- --
48 an actual person doing it,
49 or some kind of masks they had,
50 or,
51 MILES: no=.
52 uh=,
53\#> the guy [looked like that].
54 PETE: [or there’s a guy looked] like that.
55 JAMIE: @[2@2]
56 HAROLD: [2yeah2],
57 PETE: @@
58 [(H) that’s pretty] good,
59 MILES: [X just like him].
60 JAMIE: (H)
The problematic reference term *Oba Oba* and the unclear distinction between actual performers and their possible masks are clarified relatively easily, and Miles reformulates his remark into *the guy looked like that* (line 53). The recipients respond with laughter and brief acknowledgements but do not provide any extensive uptake. Miles again reformulates his remark.

(66c)

61  HAROLD:  [<X>with the right</X>] --
62## MILES:  *[I mean] that looks kinda like a black person.*
63  HAROLD:  <@SM>with red eyes,
64  and everything</@SM>?
65  MILES:  so where is this fro-m.
66  .. this isn’t from Africa,
67  is it?
68  HAROLD:  .. no=.
69  .. from Indonesia.
70  ...(0.5)
71## MILES:  % but that person looks bla=ck.
72  ...(0.8)
73  PETE:    which one [is it]?
74  MILES:   [or do] Indonesian [2people look black2].
75  JAMIE:   [2looks pink to me2].
76  PETE:    the- --
77  which one.
78  .. the= --
79  MILES:   .. I [figure the second] [2one from the to2] [3p3].
80  HAROLD:  [Tumenggung].
81  JAMIE:   [2the second from the2]
82            [3top3],
83  PETE:    [3Tumeng3]gung?
84  ...(0.6)
85  hunh.
86  ...(0.7)

Miles’s utterance in line 62, *I mean that looks kinda like a black person*, can be regarded as a ‘change of position’ (Pomerantz 1984b: 159–161): the remark no longer refers to a particular person at a dance club (whom the recipients are evidently unable to identify) but to people of African origin in general. This change of position could facilitate the uptake of the recipients but instead only elicits an incredulous, jocular comment from Harold (*with red eyes, and*
everything, lines 63–64). Miles then goes on to give more weight to his remark by contrasting the Asian origin of the mask with its African appearance.

In line 75, Jamie adopts the jocular line of talk that Harold initiated earlier, looks pink to me. Indeed, Harold’s and Jamie’s contributions suggest that the mask is fanciful and not an accurate representation of a person at all. Their reluctance to assess the mask with reference to real people is partly explained by Miles’s following turn.

(66d)

86 MILES: I look at that and think,
87 yeah,
88 that looks like a brother.
89 ...(0.4)
90 PETE: that’s interesting,
91 JAMIE: ☹ ☹
92 PETE: .. cause I think Indo-Indonesians],
93 JAMIE: think (H)]?
94 PETE: or,
95 .. people who’ve been to Indonesia,
96 .. think that those guys,
97 like the two top ones,
98 .. have really European characteristics.
99 .. [compared] to Indonesians.
100 JAMIE: [uh],
101 ...(0.5)
102 PETE: just cause their eyes are real
103 [2big and their noses are big2].
104 HAROLD: [2their eyes are rou=nd2].
105 ...(0.4)
106 JAMIE: oh [3really=3]?
107 PETE: [land Indonesians3] have real thin eyes,
108 and,
109 .. and flat noses and stuff.
110 ...(2.9)
111 <P>I don’t know</P>.
112 ...(1.1)
113 HAROLD: except those,
114 .. well=,
115 .. I don’t know,
116 the- --
.. the bottom ones [don’t have flat noses either].

PETE: [that’s <X>true</X> they all have b- -- they all have big] noses.
.. but they get bigger as you go up anyway.

In lines 86–88, Miles not only reports on how he ended up making his remark in the first place but also marks it as a personal one: I look at that and think, yeah, that looks like a brother. By the use of the word brother, Miles, who is the only African American among the present interactants, identifies himself as one. The personalized remark constitutes another change of position. On the one hand, it would now be easier for the others to evaluate the mask from their individual points of view. On the other hand, Miles’s co-participants may find it problematic to evaluate the mask, which they have deemed unrealistic, with reference to a friend of theirs. Pete’s solution to the potentially problematic situation is to draw on reported opinions: people who have been to Indonesia claim that such masks look European rather African. The participants then focus on detailing the characteristics that might support the interpretation, and eventually Harold asks Miles to give similar grounds for his remark.

(66c)

...(3.3)

JAMIE: their mustaches?
...(0.8)

HAROLD: is it the % --
...(1.7)

the way their little beard goes?
...(0.5)

JAMIE: @[@@]

MILES: [oh no].

that’s not even relevant.
...(0.4)

I- d- --

I just glanced at that,

PETE: [hunh].

MILES: and I [2immediate2]ly saw this guy’s face in Oba Oba.

PETE: [2yeah2].

hunh.
Miles disregards Harold’s inquiry as irrelevant (line 131) and returns to his remark about an Oba Oba dancer looking like one of the masks (first in lines 134 and 136; then in line 140). The subsequent recipient responses are very similar to earlier ones: Jamie’s poor guy (line 142) continues to focus on the fanciful characteristics of the mask, and Pete’s that’s interesting (line 139) and Harold’s that is really interesting (line 143) keep up the contrast between Miles’s view and the reported opinions. Miles does not pursue the matter further. In lines 151–152, he initiates a story about the dancer but makes no reference to the mask again.

Throughout the sequence, Miles employs the syntactic structure NP look (like) NP which identifies his utterances as contributions to essentially the same activity. Otherwise, however, Miles makes considerable modifications to his utterances. The first modifications are elicited by Miles’s co-participants in order to clarify unclear referents and to address understanding problems (e.g. which one of the masks is Miles talking about; what is an Oba Oba skit; fragments 66a–b). In a sense, then, Miles can be seen to “try an easy solution first” (Pomerantz 1984b: 156, emphasis in the original): he orients to the recipients’ misattention in the way that they suggest, as a problem of reference. In doing so, he treats his own utterances as problematic and repairable.

When the recipients continue to misattend to the evaluative remark that he has made and modified, Miles goes on to employ some other means of recovery. He changes his position in an attempt to pursue more extensive responses (fragments 66c–e), first by generalizing and then by personalizing the remark. The changes provide the recipients with various possibilities to engage themselves in the activity. Miles treats his own utterances as modifiable: he is able to
shift his focus and change his position for the benefit of the recipients. The changes elicit evaluations of the mask as fanciful or clarifications of reported opinions about it, but they do not correspond to Miles’s personal, evaluative remark. Finally, Miles gives up the pursuit.

Examples 65 and 66 contrast with the other cases in this section because recipient misattention is here dealt with by employing another resource than repetition. The examples also reveal a difference in stance: whereas recovery through repetition orients to the recipient responses as problematic, clarifications and changes in position orient to the speaker’s own utterance as modifiable and repairable. The last two examples also raise interesting questions about the interchangeability of the different means of recovery, but the data do not allow me to address them in any detail here. Let me simply note that in example 65, it seems possible that the speaker could produce a verbatim repeat instead of modifying his utterance, and this would have different implications for stance taking. Example 66, however, comprises such a long and complex sequence that recovery through repetition could probably not be credibly used in place of the clarifications and changes in position. The different interactional environments and functions of the various means of recovery would be worth investigating: more work needs to be done in this area.

6.2.4 Summary

This section has dealt with cases in which recipients misattend to the source utterance: recipients take up elements in the source, or the larger turn of which the source is a part, to provide a response which evidently takes the speaker’s talk into consideration but which is not entirely in line with what the speaker prepared for. I have discussed two functions for making a misattended utterance available for new uptake. First, speakers may correct the recipients’ interpretation of the source utterance, and second, they may direct the recipients’ focus to a relevant part in their prior talk.

In subsection 6.2.1, I looked at the former function. In such instances, there is clear evidence that the source utterance is designed to implement a particular action in its sequential slot, such as the closing of an activity or a first assessment. However, the source also contains other, perhaps less salient, elements that make another interpretation possible. The recipient responses vary mainly in their implications for disalignment. The repeat shows how drastic the implications are deemed to be: the speaker points out either that the recipients have not recognized
the sequential implications of the source or that the recipients have disaligned with the source.

In subsection 6.2.2, I examined the latter function. In these cases, too, recipients evidently attend to the speaker’s talk in general but misattend to relevant parts of it or its sequential implications. The speaker often acknowledges and even elaborates on the recipient responses but later returns to prior talk in order to seek another kind of uptake. By recovering the prior talk through repetition, the speaker deems the recipient responses to have been somehow inadequate or to have missed the upshot of the speaker’s prior talk. In this way, the speaker attempts to widen or redirect the focus of recipients.

Finally, in subsection 6.2.3, I noted that recovery through repetition differs from other means of dealing with misattention in that it evokes another kind of stance. Different modifications to the initial contribution, such as clarifications and changes in position, treat the contribution as problematic and, in a sense, suggest that the speaker is ready to take the blame for the recipients’ misinterpretations or misunderstandings. Recovery through repetition, by contrast, focuses on the recipients and their failure to take in the implications of the source utterance.

Most of the source and repeat utterances that have been analyzed in this section consist of assessments and other evaluations about the people, things, events or issues that are under discussion; in other words, they contain linguistic materials that have traditionally been identified as conveying speaker stance (as discussed in section 4.1). The explicitly stanced elements can thus be seen to lay the basic layer of stance taking, as is shown in Figure 3. When the utterance is repeated, that basic layer is activated again.

![Fig. 3. The addition of a second stance layer to an utterance.](image)
Kärkkäinen (2003b) points out that it may be of great concern to participants to construct a shared understanding and joint evaluation of matters that are relevant to them. That concern may motivate the speaker to repeat a stanced utterance that has been misattended to and to invite the recipients to deal with it differently. As Figure 3 illustrates, recovery through repetition brings in another layer of stance taking: it specifically concerns the recipient response that follows the source utterance and, consequently, the activity in progress. It enables the speaker to return to a prior utterance and negotiate its import to the ongoing sequence or activity.

6.3 Summary: recovery through repetition and stance taking

In this chapter, I have examined the interactional environments and functions of recovery through repetition. I have analyzed in detail how conversational sequences or activities develop to provide a relevant context for recovery through repetition and how the recovery, in turn, prepares ground for subsequent talk. More specifically, I have viewed recovery through repetition as a means of taking a stance towards an activity in progress or a co-participant’s contribution to the activity. Such a view is possible only if stance taking is understood as a contingent, interactive process between participants.

Section 6.1 discussed one general environment of recovery through repetition: a place where speakers may be suggesting that recipients have not attended to a prior utterance, i.e. that recipients have failed to follow the course of action that has been proposed. In this environment, recovery through repetition serves three kinds of purpose that highlight the lack of response and seek the attention of recipients. One, speakers may be advancing a change of course away from an activity that is, from their point of view, somehow problematic or simply finished. Two, speakers may be providing an alternative contribution to an ongoing sequence or activity, competing with another one mainly in terms of its sequential implications or affiliative potential. Three, speakers may be preparing for possible disalignment when recipients stay silent and do not evidently follow any other line of development.

I have shown that when speakers seek the attention of recipients, they simultaneously take a stance towards the ongoing activity and its development. Recovery through repetition thus points out that recipients have neglected a contribution that is relevant and important for the current interaction. What is more, it provides recipients with a new opportunity to attend to and align with the
proposed course of action. Stance taking manifests itself as an interactive process: on the one hand, the stance taking of speakers is made possible and relevant by the recipients’ failure to take up the source utterance; on the other hand, recipient contributions that follow the repeat utterance, whatever they may be, are inevitably heard as contributions to the stance taking.

Section 6.2 focused on another general environment of recovery through repetition: places where speakers may be suggesting that recipients have misattended to a prior utterance; in other words, recipient responses are shown to take up some less salient elements in the source utterance, rather than its main import. Two kinds of function can be found in this environment. One, speakers may be correcting the recipients’ interpretations of the source utterance because its sequential implications and expectations for alignment have not been fully recognized. Two, speakers may be directing the focus of the recipients because relevant parts of the speakers’ talk have not been addressed. In other words, speakers deem the recipient responses somehow inapposite, inappropriate or inadequate.

Many of the misattended source utterances in the present data contain explicitly stanced materials; they typically implement evaluative actions, such as assessments. The utterances are thus evidently significant for the current interaction and interactants in terms of stance taking. In such cases, recovery through repetition gives the utterance additional import: the repeat specifically evokes a stance towards the recipient response that follows the source utterance and, consequently, of the sequence or activity to which the response contributes. To put it differently, recovery through repetition brings in another layer of stance taking, one that is not dependent on any epistemic, evidential or evaluative lexical or grammatical items but on the position of the repeat with regard to the source utterance and, especially, to recipient responses.

Figure 4 summarizes how utterances gain an (additional) layer of stance taking when they are repeated for the purpose of recovery.
On the one hand, if the source does not contain any explicitly stanced materials, a stance layer is added to the repeat. On the other hand, if the source does contain such materials, the repeat is supplemented with another stance layer. In both cases, the added layer concerns the ongoing activity.

In addition to examining instances of repetition, I briefly discussed other means of recovery that speakers may employ to seek or redirect the attention of recipients (sections 6.1.4 and 6.2.3, respectively). These included different types of clarification and changes in position as well as the addition of an epistemic fragment. In contrast with recovery through repetition, such modifications seem to suggest that the source utterance is possibly problematic and therefore amendable. There is thus a clear difference in stance between the various resources: recovery through repetition focuses on the recipients and their failure to provide an appropriate response; but the other resources focus on the source utterance and its failure to elicit an appropriate response.
Recovery through repetition gives insight into a particular kind of stance-taking moment. In such instances, the stance object is specifically identifiable as the progression of a sequence or activity (with a focus either on the activity itself or on a co-participant’s contribution to it). The three processes of stance taking that Du Bois (2007) identifies, namely evaluation, positioning and alignment, can also be described in more specific terms. By recovering prior talk through repetition, speakers evaluate the activity as not developing in the way that they have proposed and as requiring a retake. At the same time, speakers position themselves with regard to the activity and indicate that they have a relevant contribution to make. Furthermore, by recovering prior talk through repetition, speakers seek recipient alignment with their actions as well as with their stances. Significantly, if recipients go along with the proposed course of action, they also align with the stance. However, if they continue to not attend or to misattend to the speakers’ contributions, they resist the stance. Recovery through repetition renders these moments of stance taking clearly identifiable.
7 Conclusion

The aim of this study was to shed new light on two well-known interactional phenomena, repetition and stance taking. By examining instances of everyday casual conversations in American English and Finnish, I have been able to view the two as arising from and contributing to interaction. Moreover, I have been able to develop an understanding that stance taking is in effect an integral part of recovery through repetition. In what follows, I shall reflect on the findings and consider their potential merits and weak points.

Firstly, I studied the linguistic and local sequential aspects of recovery through repetition. I found that most of the repeated utterances in the data are clauses, although single lexical items, phrases and clause combinations can also be repeated. Clauses entail a great deal of meaning in a relatively compact form and thus constitute ideal repeatables for recovery. Irrespective of their syntactic form, all the cases make up turn-constructional units, i.e. possibly complete entities that implement actions in their specific contexts of occurrence. Thus, the findings show that in addition to a strictly grammatical categorization (here, especially in terms of syntax), it is useful to take into consideration the effects of interaction on what kinds of items are repeated. Such a consideration will also define the distinction between unmodified and modified repetition. In other words, sources and repeats may contain elements that indicate their distinct sequential positions; additions, deletions and replacements may occur mainly at the beginnings and ends of otherwise identical turn-constructional units or turns.

Secondly, I examined the interactional environments and functions of recovery through repetition. I noted that the phenomenon is not restricted to any particular type of action or sequence and can therefore be regarded as a relatively unrestricted practice. Depending on the projective qualities of the source utterance, repetition either renews or strengthens its sequential implications. In a sense, then, even if the source utterance does not very strongly project a recipient response, the repeat makes one relevant. I identified two general environments in which recovery through repetition is employed: speakers either seek or redirect the attention of recipients, pointing out the complete lack of a response or the inappropriateness, inappropriateness or inadequacy of a response. I further distinguished between the different functions that recovery through repetition serves in the two interactional environments. A detailed investigation of the functions revealed how a sequence or an activity may develop to occasion the use of the practice and how it, in turn, may affect subsequent developments. Thus, the
present study falls into the line of research that promotes an integrated examination of the composition, position and function of different types of repetition in talk-in-interaction.

Thirdly, I related recovery through repetition to stance taking which can be loosely defined as the collaborative construction of participants’ positions or perspectives on the issue at hand. I illustrated that in addition to re-implementing an action and renewing or strengthening its implications, recovery through repetition adds to the meaning of the utterance by displaying a stance towards the ongoing activity or a co-participant contribution. The present study thus shows that stance taking is not restricted to the use of explicitly epistemic, evidential or evaluative linguistic items but may be constructed out of relatively neutral materials by strategically positioning repeats in the ongoing sequence or activity. However, it seems that stance taking in its many forms tends to cluster: in the current data, most of the misattended utterances were also found to contain evaluative elements.

I have suggested that recovery through repetition represents a particular kind of stance-taking moment. It specifically concerns the ongoing sequence or activity which speakers evaluate as not developing in the way that they have proposed and with regard to which speakers position themselves as relevant contributors. The recipients are inevitably involved in the stance taking: their subsequent turns will either align with both the proposed course of action and the stance that is taken, or disalign with both.

I have also shown that recovery through repetition differs from other means of seeking or redirecting the attention of recipients, especially in terms of stance taking. By repeating, speakers offer their utterances for reconsideration in their original form; by adding to or otherwise modifying their utterances, speakers deem their utterances to have been somehow problematic. In other words, recovery through repetition focuses on the failure of recipients to provide an appropriate response; other resources, in principle at least, focus on the failure of speakers to elicit an appropriate response.

The different practices of returning to prior talk and the different resources for accomplishing such returns are worth studying in more width and depth. In this study, I focused on one practice only, recovery, and on one resource only, repetition; I discussed some other means cursorily. However, these brief explorations already suggest that participants have available a range of practices and resources that may have significantly different implications. A comprehensive review of them is necessary. Moreover, the relations between the different
practices and resources would be worth investigating. A more extensive data set might reveal, for example, regularities in the order in which the different practices and resources are employed over the course of one conversational sequence. Additionally, video data is necessary for determining how gaze, gestures and other means of embodiment potentially contribute to the development of interactional environments in which participants manage returns to prior talk.

The narrow focus of this study prevented me from drawing definite conclusions about how recovery through repetition generally figures in American-English as opposed to Finnish conversations. Indeed, in addition to the expected differences in the composition of the repeated utterances and the non-occurrence of one of the functions in the Finnish data (i.e. ‘preparing for potential disalignment’), I was not able to detect any language-specific features in the use of recovery through repetition. However, there is a difference in the frequency of the phenomenon: there are two times as many cases in the American-English data as in the Finnish data (i.e. forty and nineteen, respectively). I suspect that Finnish speakers may in fact frequently employ means of recovery that have not been discussed here. It should be noted that the majority of the Finnish recordings are telephone conversations between two people only, whereas most of the American-English recordings are multi-person face-to-face interactions. Although recovery through repetition is possible when only two participants are present, the phenomenon is more common in interactions with a greater number of participants and possible lines of activity development.

All in all, this study shows that two typologically different languages provide their speakers with the same resource for accomplishing the same practice. It attests to the fact that, whatever the language, we are faced with similar social and interactional tasks. Involved in the dynamics of conversation, we may sometimes find that our interlocutors have not attended to or have misattended to our contributions, the input of which has to be (re)negotiated. Recovery through repetition aids us to get our points across and at the same time to indicate the efforts that we have made in order to do so.
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Appendix 1 Symbols used in transcription

Based on Du Bois et al. (1992) and Du Bois et al. (1993).

\{carriage return\}  Intonation unit\(^*\)
--  Truncated intonation unit
-  Truncated word\(^**\)
&  Intonation unit continued
.  Transitional continuity: final
,  Transitional continuity: continuing
?  Transitional continuity: appeal
..  Short pause (brief break in speech rhythm)
…(N)  Medium or long pause (duration in parentheses; marked in a separate line if not within an intonation unit)
[ ] [2 2]  Speech overlap (numbers inside brackets index overlaps)
=  Lengthening of sound
(Hx)  Exhalation
(H)  Inhalation
(SNIFF), (THROAT)  Vocal noises
(TSK)  Click
@  Laughter (one pulse)
%  Creak
<@> </@>  Laughter during speech
<@SM> </@SM>  Smiley voice quality
<%> </%>  Creaky voice quality
<VOX> </VOX>  Special voice quality
<YWN> </YWN>  Yawning during speech
<F> </F>  Loud (forte)
<P> </P>  Soft (piano)
<HI> </HI>  High pitch level
<L> </L>  Slow speech (lento)
<MRC> </MRC>  Each word distinct and emphasized (marcato)

\(^*\) Due to limitations of space, some intonation units have been divided into two lines. In such a case, only one line number is used to refer to the whole intonation unit.

\(^**\) It is worth keeping in mind that hyphens are also used to indicate morpheme boundaries. The two uses can easily be distinguished by the fact that a hyphen at the end of a word indicates truncation, whereas a hyphen in the middle of a word marks a morpheme boundary.
<L2> </L2> Code switching
X Indecipherable syllable
<X> </X> Uncertain hearing
(( )) Researcher’s comment
Appendix 2 Abbreviations used in glossing

Based on Bickel et al. (2008).

1SG, 2SG, 3SG first person singular (ending or personal pronoun), etc.
1PL, 2PL, 3PL first person plural (ending or personal pronoun), etc.
4 passive person ending
ABL ablative (‘from’)
ACC accusative
ADE adessive (‘at, on’)
ADV adverbial
ALL allative (‘to’)
CLI clitic
COMP comparative
CON conditional mood
ELA elative (‘out of, from’)
GEN genitive
ILL illative (‘into, to’)
IMP imperative
INE inessive (‘in’)
INF infinitive
NEG negation
PASS passive
PCP participle
PL plural
PRT particle
PST past tense
PTV partitive (‘part of’)
Q question clitic
TRANS transitive (‘into, ‘for’)
VOC vocalism
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