

## Third-Position Repeats in German: The Case of Repair- and Request-for-Information Sequences<sup>1</sup>

Emma Betz / Carmen Taleghani-Nikazm  
Veronika Drake / Andrea Golato

### *English abstract*

Using conversation analysis, this paper describes the function of repeats in spoken German. Its analytic focus is repeats in third position to two-part sequences. Such sequence-expanding repeats do not (primarily) initiate repair; instead, they present and explicitly register just-retrieved, new, or corrected information. We discuss two sequential environments: information request sequences and repair sequences. Each is associated with a different sequence-initiating and sequence-expanding turn format: (1) Third-position repeats in repair sequences are typically followed by additional elements, either in the same or in the next turn. Specifically, word searches formatted as *wh*-questions receive repeats in third position, typically accompanied by additional claims of understanding. Repair sequences that include corrections typically receive free-standing repeats in third position, but these require co-participant's confirmation and thus engender a minimal expansion *sequence*. (2) All repeats after information request sequences engender more than minimal expansions, either because they include corrections or because speakers combine repeats with stance displays. We suggest that such repeats constitute practices at the boundary of information receipt and repair initiation. In both sequential environments, repeats register information, but do not claim understanding or show commitment to that information. Repeats are *presentations* of a change of state rather than merely a claim to it and thus make specific information available for subsequent use. This distinguishes them from German change-of-state *tokens*, notably *ach* and *achso*.

*Keywords:* conversation analysis, repeats, German, third position, sequence expansion, change-of-state token, shared knowledge, word search, repair, correction, stance.

### *German abstract*

Diese konversationsanalytische Studie beschreibt Wiederholungen in dritter Position in deutschen Interaktionen. Sequenzerweiternde Wiederholungen dieser Art dienen nicht (primär) der Reparaturinitiierung, sondern präsentieren und registrieren explizit Information. Zwei sequenzielle Kontexte werden diskutiert: Bitten um Information (Frage-Antwort-Sequenzen) und Reparatursequenzen. Es finden sich jeweils unterschiedliche sequenzinitiierende Formate und sequenzerweiternde Redebeiträge: (1) In Reparatursequenzen folgen der Wiederholung weitere Elemente, und zwar entweder im gleichen oder im nächsten Turn. Im Besonderen bedeutet dies: Bei Wortsuchsequenzen werden Wiederholungen in dritter Position von anderen Markern begleitet, die explizit Verstehen anzeigen. In Reparaturse-

---

<sup>1</sup> In this co-authored study, data collection and analysis were done collaboratively, and all authors contributed equally to both tasks. Write-up of the findings was done by the first author, with several rounds of feedback provided by the other authors. We are grateful to Amanda Huensch and two anonymous reviewers for valuable feedback on earlier drafts. All remaining errors are our own.

quenzen, in denen Verstehensversuche korrigiert werden, stehen Wiederholungen in dritter Position zwar alleine, machen aber eine weitere Bestätigung seitens des Gesprächspartners relevant. Dies führt zu einer minimalen Expansionssequenz. (2) In Bitten um Information führen in unserem Korpus Wiederholungen in dritter Position immer zu weiteren Erweiterungen, entweder weil sie Korrekturen folgen oder weil Sprecher solche Wiederholungen mit weiteren Elementen verbinden. Diese weiteren Elemente zeigen eine epistemische oder affektive Positionierung des Sprechers an. Wiederholungen dieser Art kann man in ihrer interaktionalen Funktion an der Grenze zwischen Informationsregistrierung und Reparaturinitiierung ansiedeln. Dieser Aufsatz zeigt, dass Wiederholungen in beiden sequentiellen Kontexten Information registrieren, nicht aber Verstehen oder Übernahme dieser Information signalisieren. Wiederholungen sind aber nicht nur 'Behauptungen', sondern *präsentieren* (durch die Reproduktion neuer/korrigierter Information) einen Erkenntnisprozess und unterscheiden sich damit von Erkenntnisprozessmarkern im Deutschen, insbesondere von *ach* and *achso*.

*Keywords:* Konversationsanalyse, Wiederholungen, Deutsch, dritte Position, Sequenzerweiterung, Erkenntnisprozessmarker, geteiltes Wissen, Wortsuche, Reparatur, Korrektur, epistemische und affektive Positionierung (des Sprechers).

1. Introduction
2. Repeats in repair sequences
  - 2.1 Word searches
  - 2.2 Other repair sequences
  - 2.3 A preliminary summary: repeats and other third-position tokens
3. Repeats in information request sequences
  - 3.1 Sequences involving corrections
  - 3.2 Topic-expanding repeat turns
  - 3.3 An intermediate practice between information receipt and repair initiation?
4. Summary and conclusion
5. References
6. Appendix: Transcription conventions and category abbreviations used

## 1. Introduction

Many sequences in talk-in-interaction are closed when the co-participant provides a fitted second pair part (SPP; Schegloff 2007) to a first pair part (FPP) turn, e.g., when an answer is given to an information question or when a request for an action is granted. However, a base adjacency pair of this kind can also be minimally expanded through a sequence closing third turn (Schegloff 2007). With the production of a sequence closing third, speakers may explicitly register prior information, indicate that or how they have understood a prior turn, and/or express their stance on the prior information. For instance, in American English the change-of-state token *oh* in third position is used for registering information, that is, a speaker indicates that they have moved from an uninformed to an informed state (Heritage 1984). The confirmation token *okay* is used to register prior information while also accepting the responsive action (Beach 1993; 1995), while assessments in third position communicate the stance of the speaker toward the second pair part (Schegloff 2007). This can license the start of a new sequence (Sacks 1975; Schegloff 2007).

Recent research (Betz/Golato 2008; Golato/Betz 2008; Golato 2010) has indicated that speakers of German also routinely distinguish the action of receipting/registering information provided in the SPP from receipting/claiming understanding of an action done in said SPP. Two different response tokens are used for these actions, *ach* and *achso*, respectively. Additionally, speakers of German employ different tokens for cognitive and emotional changes-of-state, *ach* and *oh* respectively (Golato 2012). An examination of naturally occurring interaction shows that in addition to various response tokens and assessments in third position, speakers also regularly produce (partial) repeats of a SPP in third position in German. A concrete example of this practice can be found in extract 1. The topic is birthdays. Martina (M) has shared her boyfriend's day of birth but is not forthcoming about his year of birth. In line 1, Oma (O) attempts to derive the year in question by relating the boyfriend's age to Martina's. This is information that is in Martina's domain of knowledge.

Extract 1: *vier jahre jünger* [12] M&O\_03:05<sup>2</sup>

- 1 FPP O: hm. >dea is Zwoa joa jinga wey du.<  
hm. >he-DEM is Two years younger than you.<  
hm. >he is Two years younger than you.<
- 2 (0.5)
- 3 SPP M: a:hm vier joa jinger.  
u:hm four years younger.
- 4 (0.3)
- 5 => O: Vie:r joa: jinger.  
Fou:r yea:rs younger.

In line 3, Martina disconfirms Oma's proffered understanding by producing a correction. Oma subsequently produces a full repeat of this correction in line 5. Such third-position repeats – their sequential placement and interactional function both in repair sequences and in information requests – are the focus of this paper.

Repeats and partial repeats have been described in interactional linguistic and conversation analytic research for different interactional positions and a range of action contexts. The action accomplished by a repeat turn also depends on the prosodic shape of repeats (e.g., rising or falling intonation; see Curl 2005; Robinson/Kevoe-Feldman 2010; Svennevig 2004). Repeats in different languages are used to initiate repair (Benjamin/Walker 2013; Goodwin 1983a:659; Keel 2011; Kim 2002, 2003; Schegloff 1996; Schegloff/Jefferson/Sacks 1977; Robinson 2012; Robinson/Kevoe-Feldman 2010; Selting 1996; Sorjonen 1996; Wu 2006) as well as complete repair sequences (Curl 2005; Schegloff et al. 1977; Sorjonen 1996), and they can sidestep or resist the constraints of a sequence-initiating action (e.g., Bolden 2009; Keel 2011; Jefferson 1972; Stivers/Hayashi 2010). There-

<sup>2</sup> Transcription conventions are in the appendix. The data are typically presented with two lines of translation. However, where gloss and idiomatic translation do not differ, only the latter is given. In addition to indicating the turn that is the focus of analysis with "=>", we also mark the preceding first and second pair parts with "FPP" and "SPP", respectively. These additional analytic markings should ease the reader's access to more complex sequences (e.g., example 4).

fore, repeats play a role in directing and establishing a topic in conversation (e.g., Brown 1998; Keenan 1977; Kim 2002; Tannen 1989). Repeats are implicated in the explicit management of knowledge: They receipt information given in a prior turn (Brown 1998; Goldberg 1975; Keenan 1977; Kim 2002; Schegloff 1997; Sorjonen 1996; Svennevig 2004; Taleghani-Nikazm/Vlatten 1997; Tannen 1989), confirm (e.g., Heritage/Raymond in press:9; Hakulinen 2001; Kim 2002; Mellinger 1995:402; Schegloff 1996; Stivers 2005; Sorjonen 2001), and mark surprise and disbelief (Heritage 1984; Jefferson 1980; Keel 2011; Kim 2002; Sorjonen 1996; Wu 2006). Additionally, repeats display a speaker's (dis)affiliation with a prior speaker: They can be used for (pre)disagreement (Goodwin 1983a:659; Schegloff et al. 1977; Wu 2006), complaints (Schegloff 1997), or challenges (Goodwin 1983a:659; Keel 2011).

Repeats in German talk-in-interaction also occur in different sequential positions and reflect the breadth of interactional functions that has emerged in research on other languages. Preliminary findings from research in progress show that speakers regularly repeat assessments (Golato 2012) and accounts (Taleghani-Nikazm 2012), and they also repeat *wh*-questions in second position prior to responding to the question (Drake 2012). The present paper focuses on repeats of information after repair sequences (including word searches) and information request sequences. Speakers repeat just-retrieved, new, or corrected information, and they do so in third position. Thus, while Drake (2012), Golato (2012), and Taleghani-Nikazm (2012) focus on repeats that constitute or precede responses in second position, the present study describes repeats that minimally expand a two-part sequence in third position. Such repeats in German do not *primarily* serve to initiate a repair sequence (in contrast to, for example, the repeats described by Selting 1987, 1988). However, they are regularly found in repair sequences (as is the case for the repeats described in this paper) and in sequences in which speakers negotiate multiple constraints (e.g., the repeat turn indicates a problem with the preceding action, but the speaker agrees with its proposition; Golato 2012). It will be shown that, in certain contexts, third-position repeats make a minimal response relevant; thus, while not primarily a practice for initiating repair, they are related to repair initiations. We will argue that by using repeats rather than epistemic response tokens (e.g., *achso*), speakers display (through presentation) rather than merely claim what is new or unexpected. They thereby make interactional material available for simultaneous embedded stance displays, and for subsequent use.

This paper reports the findings from a conversation analytic (CA) study of repeats in sequentially third position in everyday conversation. Repeats in this position are analytically interesting, because they are not projected by the preceding turn, and have been described as (Schegloff 2007:127; cf. Schegloff 1997)

equivocal between use as a sequence-closing third on the one hand and its use as a form of repair initiation on the other - a use which is specifically extending the sequence.

In our collection of repeats in third position, we did not include repeats that were clearly and primarily (that is, through rising intonation; Selting 1987, 1988) marked as repair initiators and understood as such by co-participants. Example 2, taken from a phone conversation, contains an instance of the type of repeats we included as well as one of the types of repeats we excluded. Markus, a graduate

student in the US, is about to leave for a theater event that requires car travel. He just announced this to his mother Paula, who is in Germany.

Extract 2: *jetzt, zehn* [3] Oregon1A\_24.10

- 1 P: >jesses. wann< fährsten da fort,=  
>jeez. so< when are you leaving,=
- 2 M: =ha jetzt. deswegen.  
=(well) now. that's why.
- 3 M: .h und [morgen-  
.h and [tomorrow-  
[
- 4 => P: [jetzt?  
[now?
- 5 M: ja.  
yes.
- 6 P: ach so:. es is- w↑as hast du gsacht.  
oh I see:. it is- wh↑at did you say.
- 7 M: zehn uhr, .hh  
ten o'clock, .hh
- 8 => P: zehn uhr\_=[h  
ten o'clock\_=[h  
[
- 9 M: [und dann äh: dann muss- bis- ja  
[and then uh: then (you) have to- a bi-
- 10 bisschen früher da: sein, damit äh: .h also drei  
to be there a bit ea:rly, so that uh: .h so three

In line 2, Markus responds to Paula's information request (line 1), and Paula repeats his response (*jetzt* / 'now') in line 4. The strong final rise suggest a problem in hearing or expectation on Paula's part (Selting 1996; for English, see Curl 2005; Robinson/Kevoe-Feldman 2010). Markus's turns in lines 3 and 5 show that he understands her turn as response-relevant: He abandons a projected continuation (*und morgen-* / 'and tomorrow-') and instead provides a confirmation in line 5. Paula's (*ach so:* / 'oh I see:') in line 6 provides a token of understanding, thus potentially closing a repair sequence that was initiated in line 4 (Golato/Betz 2008). Examples such as this were not included in our analysis. Consider the continuation of this conversation, however. In line 6, Paula continues her turn after the change-of-state token: She projects a proffering of the time at Markus's location (*es is-* / 'it is'). It should be noted that Paula had already asked Markus the local US time about five minutes earlier in the conversation. This information, however, seems inaccessible to her at this point in the interaction, and she requests it in line 6, formulating the action as a repair on hearing or remembering. Following Markus's response in line 7, Paula again repeats the new information. This repeat carries level intonation, and it is not treated as a repair initiation by Markus. In his next turn, he does not confirm the repeat or provide an explanation of the time difference between Germany and the US, but instead responds to the stance expres-

sed by Paula's turn in line 4: He accounts for why now (*jetzt*, lines 2, 4) is the appropriate time to leave. These are the types of examples we included in our collection. We also included examples of repeats with level or falling intonation that lead to further sequence expansions and thus show relatedness to repair initiations. We will address this relatedness in the analysis section (see section 3.3) and in our conclusion.

This paper is part of a larger project investigating the actions that can be accomplished through repetition of the talk of others. The data for the project are 22 hours of video-taped face-to-face and audio-taped telephone interactions between speakers from different varieties of German; a total of 54 speakers were recorded from a variety of geographical areas in German. The data were transcribed using the conversation analytic notation developed by Gail Jefferson (see appendix) and analyzed according to the methods of CA (see Sacks/Schegloff/Jefferson 1974).<sup>3</sup> The analysis is based on 35 examples of the phenomenon. In the sequences that are minimally expanded with a third-position repeat (as in extract 1, line 5 and extract 2, line 8), speakers show their orientation towards new information (person, time, and thing references, descriptions of states and events) through a repeat. These are typically full repeats of phrases (*Vie:r joa: jinger. / 'Fou:r year:rs younger.'* in example 1), but may be repeats of clauses as well. We defined as repeats those instances in which a next speaker repeats all or part of the immediately preceding turn, allowing for deixis shifts, other changes related to speaker change (e.g., the addition of turn-initial markers of stance), and changes in prosody. Speakers typically repeat the whole preceding turn, without particles marking sequential fit and stance of the prior speaker. Speakers may also drop determiners or prepositions preceding nouns (if the preceding turn consisted of a noun phrase, see extract 6 below). We did not include examples of paraphrase and other rewording of the repeated turn (see Schegloff 1996:179).

In the remainder of the paper, we show that third-position repeats are used in two types of sequences in which new information is negotiated:

(a) Following repair sequences: These include word searches initiated by the repeat speaker, and other types of repair sequences (place, person, time reference negotiations). They are typically insertion sequences that halt the current sequence/topic development.

(b) Following information request sequences, in which repeat-speakers had requested information using *wh*-questions or confirmables<sup>4</sup> in first position (e.g., extract 1). These sequences typically begin new topics or new topical directions.

In both contexts, the turn that is subsequently repeated (that is, the SPP turn) may correct the premise of the FPP or a candidate formulation offered in the FPP (Schegloff et al. 1977; Pomerantz 1988, 2011, 2012), as is the case in example 1, line 3. Whether or not a correction is explicitly done (or embedded) in second position substantially influences the shape of the remaining sequence. We show that

<sup>3</sup> For a further description of CA, see, e.g., Atkinson/Heritage (1984), Drew/Heritage (1992), and Peräkylä (2004).

<sup>4</sup> We use the term "confirmables" to refer to turns that make relevant confirmation or disconfirmation. In many cases, these confirmables are, in the broadest sense, yes/no-questions. The term "confirmable" allows us to include all turns that make relevant (dis)confirmation, regardless of their syntactic or grammatical composition.

*all* repeats in our collection display receipt of information. However, although the repeats are all produced in third position, their local function is sensitive to the overall composition of the third turn, and to the action carried out in the base sequence expanded by a repeat. Next actions and topical trajectories *after* the repeat reflect systematic differences between and within the two environments we identify and describe. Moreover, the shapes of the repeat turns themselves and the trajectories of the sequences expanded by a third-position repeat are responsive to the distribution of participants' knowledge and rights to knowledge. For example, within repair sequences, we can note that repeat turns after corrections require co-participant confirmation, while repeat *turns* after word searches typically contain additional claims of understanding and thus close a sequence. In addition to outlining the systematic use of repeats in third position in our data (sections 2.1, 2.2 and 3.1, 3.2), we will highlight differences between repeats and other third-position tokens involved in managing knowledge states in German (see section 2.3), and we will compare receipts and repair initiations in third position (see section 3.3).

## 2. Repeats in repair sequences

Of 35 examples in our collection, 18 are repair-initiated sequences. These include word searches (section 2.1) and place, time, person reference negotiations (section 2.2). In section 2.2, we present both responses/repair solutions that include corrections and those that do not. The word search sequences in our collection are more compact and thus clearly illustrate the focal practice and its basic shape. These sequences also allow us to zoom in on the turn *following* third-position repeats.

### 2.1. Word searches

The corpus yielded six instances in which repeats occurred in word searches. The example below is taken from a co-present interaction. Victoria, who is recording the interaction, is explaining to Fred how she would modify the video image in order to protect the identity of the participants. In line 1, she displays trouble with retrieving the precise technical term for the technique she is suggesting. She abandons and restarts the TCU after *zerrn* / 'tort' and in line 2 engages her primary recipient in the search with mutual gaze (Goodwin 1983b; Streeck 1993), *weißtscho* / 'you know', and a gestural representation of the word for which she is searching. Fred, however, does not provide any help, and Victoria subsequently turns her gaze to another participant, Martina, to solicit help (line 4). She uses a *wh*-question.

Extract 3: *verpixeln* [10] LunchRgb\_C1\_10.10/C2\_9:33

\*gaze down to hands, which make  
horizontal stretching gesture\*

1 Vic: ja ich ma-k- ich kann dich auch ve:r-\* zerrn\*=also  
yes i mea-c- I can you also di:s-\* tort\*=so  
yes I mea-c- I can also dis:- tort=so

- \*Vic starts vertical circular motion  
w/hands ("blurring"); gaze to Fre
- 2            ich kann \*dich auch weißt scho mm=  
I can \*you also know you PRT mm=  
I can also            you know mm=
- \*Vic continues circular hand motion\*
- 3        Fre:    =\*khhhu[°hu\*hu°  
                  [            \*Vic: gaze to Mar
- 4    FPP    Vic:            [wie s\*agt [man da.    blur]ren,=  
                  [how s\*ays [one PRT.    blu]r,=  
                  [how do you[say that.    blu]r,=  
                                  [            \*Mar: 2 slight had nods\*
- 5    SPP    Mar:            [verpi\*xeln;\*    ]  
                                  [pixelate;            ]
- \*Vic: gaze back to Fre
- 6    =>    Vic:    =na genau verp\*xeln,  
                  =PRT exactly p\*xelate,  
                  =(yes) exactly pixelate (you),<sup>5</sup>
- \*Vic: hands fold back; gaze up\*
- 7        Fre:    \*°ja,\* (ah j[a hm m)°  
                  \*°yes, (oh y[es mh hm)°  
                                  [
- 8        Vic:            [äh: oder ich kann,  
                                  [uh: or I (can/could),

Martina offers a candidate solution (and SPP to Victoria's *wh*-question) in line 5, in overlap with Victoria's question and as soon as Victoria turns her gaze to her. Martina's candidate is immediately accepted by Victoria as a solution, and it thus replaces a candidate solution Victoria had herself provided following Martina's solution (transcribed in line 4): *blurren*, an ad hoc borrowing from English. Victoria accepts the offered solution *verpixeln* / 'pixelate' with an acknowledgement (line 6: *na*) and a confirmation token (*genau*), followed by a repeat of Martina's *verpixeln* (line 6). *Genau* marks the item provided by Martina as the one sought after (Betz 2012) and thus the search as successful and closed. The subsequent repeat not only displays what has been accepted as the solution but also marks a return to the main sequence: With *verpixeln*, Victoria completes the TCU that had been put on hold, and this makes relevant Fred's answer, which he produces in line 7. Note that in this turn following Victoria's repeat, Fred is not confirming the repeat with *ja* / 'yes'; instead, he receipts with *ja* a suggestion or solution (begun in lines 1-2) for a problem related to the recording. This is a problem that directly concerns Fred, and the suggestion thus makes his response relevant. A note on prosody: The repeat in this extract repeat carries slightly rising final intonation and at first seemed to be an exception in our data. However, rising intonation on *verpixeln* contextualizes an action different from repair initiation. It marks the verb as the (syntactic) completion of the main sequence (an offer or suggestion)

<sup>5</sup> The turn begun by Victoria in line 1 is syntactically completed with *verpixeln*, in line 6. '(you)', the translation of *dich* in line 1 is added to the translation to convey this, as German and English differ in this case in where the object pronoun and infinitive are placed.

and thus the relevance of a response. After *verpixeln* is not accepted more forcefully or fully by Fred, Victoria adds another option (line 8).<sup>6</sup>

In word search sequences, FPP speakers put the current sequence on hold to search for a name or technical term. FPPs are formatted as *wh*-questions, and third-position repeats are accompanied by additional claims of understanding, notably *genau* ('exactly', claiming equal access, and thus confirming the searched-for solution; Betz 2012). Repeat turns are followed by a return to the main sequence. Thus, the repeat ratifies the solution, while confirmation tokens and returns to the prior action close the search. Extract 4 is taken from a telephone conversation in which Xaver and Ingo are discussing the (developing) careers of Xaver's brothers. In line 2, Ingo puts the current action on hold to establish a reference form: the name of Xaver's younger brother. *Noch* / 'again' (line 3) marks a temporary inability to access the name. Xaver's answer (line 4) does not receive any uptake and engenders a further repair sequence (lines 6-7). In line 8, Ingo initiates a third-position repair (Egbert 2009; Schegloff 1987). This leads to a revised response by Xaver (line 9) to the original question (lines 2-3). This solution to the name search is then repeated by Ingo in third position (line 10).

Extract 4: *kleiner bruder* [8] Ingo1A\_2.00

- 1 X: ja genau. [o:-  
yes exactly. [o:-  
[
- 2 FPP I: [aber weil dein anderer b- wie ↑heisst  
[but because your other b- ↑what is named  
[but since your other b- ↑what was
- 3 FPP dein kleiner bruder noch?  
cont. your little brother again?  
your little brother's name again?
- 4 SPP X: thor.  
((first name))  
thor.
- 5 (0.8)
- 6 I: ähm  
uhm
- 7 X: tee ha oh er.<sup>7</sup>  
t h o r.

<sup>6</sup> There is an alternative explanation for the use of rising intonation on *verpixeln*: It may mark the completion of one component of a complex action and thus the relevance of an acknowledgement. Specifically, *verpixeln* may complete a first/non-final item in a list of suggestions Victoria makes for modifying the video image to protect Fred's identity (on list construction in German, see Selting 2007). Rising intonation then projects more possibilities. With *oder ich kann* / 'or I could' (line 7) and after Fred's acknowledgement of this first option, Victoria introduces a next item.

<sup>7</sup> Xaver effectively expands and 'unpacks' his answer (from line 4): He spells his brother's name, thus providing a solution to what he takes as a hearing or name recognition problem on Ingo's side.

- 8 I: ne↑ne. der (.) du hast doch ↑noch einen.=  
 no↑no. the (.) you have PRT ↑another one.=  
 no↑no. the (.) you have ↑another one. (don't you)=
- 9 SPP X: =du meinst rudi. (.) rü[diger.]  
 rev. =you mean ((name, short)). (.) ((name, full form)).  
 =you mean rudi. (.) rü[diger.]  
 [ ]
- 10 => I: [Rudi; ]  
 [Rudi; ]
- 11 I: der w:usste doch überhaupt noch nicht  
he-DEM kne:w PRT absolutely not yet  
he had absolutely no idea yet
- 12 was er macht. oder?  
 what he does. right?  
 what to do (professionally). right?

Ingo's repeat in line 10 does not receipt new knowledge. In his rejection of the first name Xaver initially provides as a solution (*thor*, lines 4 and 7), Ingo shows that he has some knowledge of the sought-after reference. Instead, the repeat confirms knowledge constructed as temporarily inaccessible; that is, Ingo confirms in third position to an other-completed search that Rudi (not Thor) is the brother he had in mind. Ingo immediately returns to the main sequence by resuming the talk abandoned in line 1: The name *Rudi* now replaces *dein anderer b-* / 'your other b-' (line 1) in a syntactic left-dislocation and *der wu:sste doch* / 'he had' (line 11) introduces further talk about this brother and presents Ingo's knowledge about Rudi for confirmation. Thus, in contexts in which the repeat speaker has epistemic authority (in this case: access to one's own experience and memories), third-position turns are sufficient as sequence closings: The repeat confirms (recognition of) the supplied information, and the subsequent integration of the confirmed information into the main sequence displays understanding.

We can note for all word search sequences in our collection that third-position turns serve to confirm the retrieved information as well as the action of the second position turn and thus close the repair sequence. The information is confirmed by way of a repeat; the action is accepted through the integration of the retrieved information into the continuation of the main sequence by the same speaker (extracts 3, 4) and in many cases through additional pre- or post-positioned tokens that mark understanding (extract 3). Thus, repeats can serve as (sequential) pivot elements between insertion sequence and main sequence in that they manage information that is (a) the outcome of a search sequence and (b) necessary for the continuation of the main sequence. The repeat *turn* 'records' the information established by a word search, proposing it as now shared. Thus, the repeat makes this information available for use in subsequent, topically related, talk that furthers the progress of the interaction: in the case of word searches, the integration of the retrieved word into the main sequence establishes it as the one that was indeed targeted by the repair. It can be noted that repeats in third position to word searches carry falling intonation, unless the repeat is integrated into the resumption of the main sequence in a way that makes rising intonation necessary as part of the action carried out in the main sequence (as in example 3).

## 2.2. Other repair sequences

Speakers also regularly produce repeats in third position in other types of repair-initiated sequences. These negotiate person and time references and descriptions of objects or events, and they target problems in understanding or attention. For example, the repair may target previously non-attended-to or insufficiently attended-to information that is now relevant. In contrast to word search sequences, SPP speakers in these sequences are constructed as having epistemic authority over the information: Initiating actions are formatted as confirmables (yes/no-interrogatives or declaratives, often with tags), *wh*-questions, or a combination of these formats. Responding turns provide the repair solution and may include corrections of the understanding offered in the FPP. The resulting three-part sequence is an insertion sequences or a sequence that reopens a potentially closed topic. These sequences do not initiate new topics. The analysis in this section is based on 12 examples; five of them include corrections in second position.

Extract 2 above provides a first instance. It is reprinted below as example 5 for convenience. Recall that Markus and his mother Paula live in different time zones, Markus in the US and Paula in Germany. Paula had already asked Markus the local time approximately five minutes earlier in the conversation. As Markus is about to leave to drive a significant distance (as assessed by Paula with *jesses* / 'jeez', line 1) to a theater performance, knowing the current time is relevant for understanding when Markus has to leave, or rather why he has to leave now (*jetzt*, line 2). This information, however, is no longer available to Paula, as evidenced by her requesting that Markus repeat it (line 6). Her request is clearly marked as a request for non-attended to information and thus constitutes a repair initiation.

### Extract 5: *zehn* [3] Oregon1A\_24.10

- 1 P: >jesses. wann< fährsten da fort,=  
>jeez. so< when are you leaving,=
- 2 M: =ha jetzt. deswegen.  
=(well) now. that's why.
- 3 M: .h und [morgen-  
.h and [tomorrow-  
[
- 4 P: [jetzt?  
[now?
- 5 M: ja.  
yes.
- 6 FPP P: ach so:. es is- was hast du gsacht.  
oh I see:. it is- what did you say.
- 7 SPP M: zehn uhr, .hh  
ten o'clock, .hh
- 8 => P: zehn uhr\_=[h  
ten o'clock\_=[h  
[

- 9 M: [und dann äh: dann muss- bis- ja  
[and then uh: then (you) have to- a bi-
- 10 bisschen früher da: sein, damit äh: .h also drei  
to be there a bit ea:rly, so that uh: .h so three

Paula's repeat of the repair solution is not taken by Markus as indicating a problem: Markus neither confirms the repeat nor does he provide an explanation of the time difference between Germany and the US. Instead, he responds to the stance expressed by Paula in line 4: He accounts for why now is the appropriate time to leave (lines 9-10). The repair sequence begun in line 6 seems closed after line 8, with Paula's repeat of the time and completion of the account begun in line 6 (*es is-* / 'it is'), and Markus's return to the main sequence.

The next example illustrates a repair sequence that targets a person rather than a time reference, and the FPP speaker offers a candidate formulation, thus indicating that he has some independent knowledge of the person in question. This example also differs from *zehn* (extract 5) in that the SPP acknowledges the repair but also embeds a correction of the candidate offered in the FPP. Oma<sup>8</sup> and Markus are discussing large-scale fires in Florida. Markus, who lives in the US, has just described the typical vegetation and landscape of Florida to Oma, who lives in Germany. Oma then inquires whether then-president Bill Clinton has already returned from a state visit to China (thus displaying the expectation that the president would visit the site of the disaster). Her turn in line 1 displays a formal preference for a confirming answer.<sup>9</sup> When this is not forthcoming, Oma extends her turn with a phrasal increment (*von china.* / 'from china.', line 3), and this receives a disconfirmation and correction from Markus (line 4). In overlap with Markus's continuation in lines 6-8, Oma initiates a reference repair (*wer is das* / 'who is that', line 9).

Extract 6: *vizepräsident* [1] Oregon1A\_5.00

- 1 O: is der clinton schon zurück?  
is ART ((last name)) already back?  
*has clinton returned yet?*
- 2 (0.5)
- 3 O: von china.  
*from china.*

<sup>8</sup> Note that this interactant is different from 'Oma' ('grandma') in extract 1. We are incidentally drawing on several grandparent-grandchild phone interactions. Additionally, the two interactants labelled 'Oma' in examples 1 and 6 are from different regions in Germany.

<sup>9</sup> Polar questions are built for agreement (Sacks 1987), or, put differently, "advance a hypothesis for confirmation, in any degree, not just in terms of polar opposites" (Bolinger 1978:104). They do this to differing degrees (Heritage/Raymond 2012; Raymond 2003; Schegloff 1996, 2007): The polar question in excerpt 6 (line 1) embodies a small degree of certainty of or commitment to the matter advanced in the question (Heritage/Raymond 2012), but still more than a *wh*-question would. These findings are based mainly on English and must remain tentative; to our knowledge, no studies exist that systematically describe the preference organization for polar questions in German. However, since both German and English are yes/no-languages (Sadock/Zwicky 1985), some of the existing findings on polar questions likely hold for German as well.

- 4 M: nee: clinton is noch in china.  
no: clinton is still in china.
- 5 (1.1)
- 6 M: der GO:re war da. und hat das angeguckt. h  
ART ((last name)) was there. and has it looked at. h  
GO:re was there. and had a look at it. h
- 7 (0.5)
- 8 M: .h <d[a: hat der- ]  
.h <the:[re has (the/he)- ]  
[ ]
- 9 FPP O: [(wer) is das der] t-vertreder oder wie=  
[(who) is that the] t-representative or what=  
[(who) is that his] t-representative or what=
- 10 SPP M: =der- ahJA de:r der vizepräsident.  
=the- PRT the: the vice president.  
=the- well(YES) the: the vice president.
- 11 => O: vizepräsident. [°mhm,°]  
vice president. [°mhm,°]  
[ ]
- 12 M: [ja:. ]  
[ye:s. ]
- 13 M: der ist da hingeflo:gen und hat das halt mal besucht,  
he is there flo:wn and has that PRT PRT visited,  
he flew out there and visited (the place),
- 14 .hh naja, geholfen hat das den leuten  
.hh well, helped has that the people  
.hh well, that didn't really do anything
- 15 auch nix. kh[hehe  
also nothing. kh[hehe  
for the people (either).kh[hehe  
[ ]
- 16 O: [naja: ...  
[we:ll ...

In line 9, Oma appends a candidate solution (Pomerantz 1988) to a *wh*-question, as well as the response pursuit *oder wie*. By adding *oder wie*, Oma turns the declaratively formed candidate solution *der vertreder* into an interrogative and thus makes conditionally relevant a response (Schegloff/Sacks 1973). Even though the candidate solution already asks for confirmation or disconfirmation from Markus, turn-final *oder wie* creates the specific constraints of a yes/no-interrogative (Raymond 2003). Additionally, *oder wie* further downgrades the just-produced candidate solution epistemically by projecting possible candidate solutions other than the one produced prior to *oder wie* and thus indexing Oma's uncertainty (Drake 2011). Markus responds to the repair initiation in line 10, and his response reflects the complexity of Oma's turn: He abandons the response to her *wh*-question (*der-* / 'the'), inserts a confirmation token (*ahJA*), and then offers a

person reference formulation. Markus provides an answer to Oma's *wh*-question and simultaneously an alternative formulation: *vertreder* becomes *vizepräsident*.

By replacing Oma's lexical item *vertreder* (line 9) with *vizepräsident* (line 10), Markus effectively provides an embedded correction: He confirms the function Oma attributed to the person in question, but corrects the reference formulation she chose. In third position, Oma repeats the new form (the noun *vizepräsident*), thus acknowledging the repair. This third position repeat (line 11), which reproduces lexis and prosody, displays her revised state of knowledge, that is, it proposes a new common ground or shared knowledge for the co-participants. No further reference repair is carried out; thus, Oma accepts Markus's epistemic authority on the matter. Additionally, Oma produces the token *mhm* (with slightly rising intonation) after the repeat, thus either tentatively acknowledging the correction or proposing, with a continuer, a return to the main telling.

Repeats after repairs that involve some type of corrections serve as receipts for information (specifically, revised knowledge states) and thus claim a change of state. We see repeats as providing more than a *claim* to an epistemic change of state, however. By repeating information from the previous turn, speakers display which features of this new information they have attended to, that is, they indicate what exactly is new to them. In presenting the new/revised epistemic state, repeats differ from change-of-state tokens used in third position, such as English *oh* (Heritage 1984) or German *ach* (Golato/Betz 2008; Golato 2010). In the remainder of this paper, we try to capture this difference by labeling third-position repeats 'presentations' of a change of state.

Similar to the epistemic change-of-state token *ach*, repeats do not claim understanding of the SPP action or its import. This is evidenced in the turns following third-position repeats in our data: In extract 6, the repeat receives confirmation from the SPP speaker (that is, the speaker with greater epistemic rights to the knowledge). Only then do speakers resume the progressivity of the talk. In all examples of correction repeats in our data, speaker change, and specifically a ratification of the repeat (the 'presentation' of revised knowledge) is relevant, and this action takes the shape of a confirmation tokens (*ja* / 'yes' in extract 6, *genau* / 'exactly' in extract 1/8) or second modifying repeats (e.g., a correction of pronunciation in the repeat).<sup>10</sup> There are two environments in which such 4<sup>th</sup> position confirmations are not produced after repeats that present a corrected epistemic stance:

(1) Repeat speakers themselves produce additional claims of remembering after the repeat, thus recasting the problem as a matter of temporary inaccessibility rather than as uninformedness (and the SPP action as reminding them rather than informing them). These repeat turns are similar in composition to those in word search sequences (see section 2.1).

(2) The repeat turn displays some trouble in how it is produced (e.g., delayed placement), and instead closing the sequence, speakers deal with this trouble after the repeat turn. In other words, where a ratification/confirmation in 4<sup>th</sup> position is not produced, something special is done: Repeat speakers orient to the confirmation as relevantly absent and add accounts for their lack of knowledge, or SPP

<sup>10</sup> This also holds for corrections of presuppositions in responses to requests for information (section 3).

speakers expand the SPP to address potential problems the repeat speaker may have with the repair solution they provided.

Extract 7, which includes an explicit correction in second position, illustrates the latter case: An SPP speaker displays an orientation to a potential problem. This keeps them from ratifying the repeat and thus closing the repair sequence. SPP continuations typically take the shape of accounts justifying or supporting the information provided in the correction. Jonas has called his friend Andi's house and has been informed by Andi's sister Erna that her brother is not at home. After a lengthy exchange of information and some misunderstanding about Andi's typical schedule, Jonas requests (line 3) that Erna repeat a piece of information she had provided at the beginning of the call. A lack of attention to this information when it was provided motivates his request (compare extract 5 *zehn*); it can thus be considered a repair initiation. Similar to Oma's turn in example 6 (line 9), Jonas appends a candidate solution to a *wh*-question (line 4), thus making a repair solution and co-participant confirmation relevant.

Extract 7: *um neun* [31] tape M 05-A-148

- 1 E: [es ]passiert bei mir auch öfter. hhh ä::[m ]  
 [it ]happens with me also sometimes.hhh u::[m ]  
 [it ]happens to me sometimes too. hhh u::[m ]  
 [ ] [ ]
- 2 JO: [ä HÄ ] [ok]ee.  
 [u HUM] [ok]ay.
- 3 FPP JO: Ä:H ÄH w:ann haste gemeint, kommt er.  
 U:H UH wh:en did+you say, comes he.  
 U:H UH whe:n did you say, he'll be back.
- 4 FPP [(achtzehn uhr o-)]  
 cont. [(six o'clock o-)]  
 [ ]
- 5 SPP E: [.hhh i]ch glaub,u-nee=ich glaub um<neun.>  
 [.hhh ]I think, a-no=I think at <nine.>
- 6 (0.7)
- 7 => JO: um neu[n].  
 at ni[ne].  
 [ ]
- 8 E: [also >wenn ich mich recht erinnere dann<  
 [so >if i RFL right remember then<  
 [so >if I remember right then<
- 9 holt ihn glaub=ich h .hhh irgend- immer irgendjemand  
 gets him think=i h .hhh some- always someone  
 some- always one of us I think picks him up
- 10 von uns um neun in- in=ä:m (.) in kronstadt  
 of us at nine in- in=u:hm (.) in ((city name))  
 at nine in- in u:hm (.) in kronstadt
- 11 vom bahnhof ab.  
 from+the trainstation.  
 at the trainstation.

- 12 JO:    <sup>^</sup>ah ja [okee: .  
           <sup>^</sup>ah ja [okay: .  
                   [
- 13 E:                           [.hhhmp hh [hh  
   [
- 14 JO:   [ja gut.  
   [yeah good.  
   [okay good.

Erna disconfirms and corrects Jonas's proffered candidate understanding in line 5. The shape of her turn (specifically the self-repair and insertion of *nee* / 'no') shows a responsiveness to Jonas's change in question format in lines 3-4. This shows that Erna formulates her turn as an answer and thus displays that she heard Jonas's turn as confirmation-relevant.<sup>11</sup> Jonas receives Erna's correction with a third-position repeat in line 7, after a significant delay. This delay may indicate a problem in understanding or agreement on Jonas's part, and it is oriented to as such by Erna: In line 8, she does not provide a confirmation token, but instead adds an elaboration to her SPP. Prior work on preference organization (Auer/Uhmann 1982; Pomerantz 1984; Sacks 1987) and on question design (Weber 1993) has shown that dis-preferred responses make elaboration relevant, for example in the shape of accounts that work towards alignment or agreement. This relevance of elaboration seems to be a basic conversational tendency, and it also holds for disaligning negation turns (in English; Ford 2001). In the present example, Jonas does not make a problem with Erna's turn in line 5 explicit (but see footnote 12); instead of expanding the correction sequence, he simply receipts the new information with a repeat. Erna, however, does respond to the delay in line 6 as projecting a problem. *She* then provides an elaboration that includes an account. Again (as in line 5), the information Erna provides is epistemically downgraded, but she grounds her knowledge and thus provides a warrant for the correction done in line 5. In response to this account, Jonas initially withholds the next relevant action (an information receipt) with <sup>^</sup>ah ja (Betz/Golato 2008), but then immediately revises this stance by providing a sequence-closing action receipt (*okee:*, line 12; cf. Beach 1993; Barske 2009). It should be noted at this point that, although Jonas seems to have accepted Erna's correction and account, the problem foreshadowed in the delay in line 6 (and also through <sup>^</sup>ah ja in line 12) is indeed one of agreement with or acceptance of the import of Erna's correction: About 20 lines later in the interaction, Jonas explicitly states that he does not actually believe the information provided by Erna to be correct and her grounds for knowledge to be reliable.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup> This can be shown for other examples in our collection as well. Compare extract 6, line 10, in which the self-repair in Markus's turn (*der- ahJA de:r vizepräsident*) is responsive to the change in question format in Oma's prior turn. Our classification of such first pair parts as extract 6, line 10, and extract 7, lines 3-4, as making confirmation relevant is based on the participants' orientation.

<sup>12</sup> Thus, Jonas's <sup>^</sup>ah ja *okee:*. (line 12) conveys something like "I now understand and accept why you think this is the case" rather than a commitment to a revised state of knowledge and an acceptance of E's epistemic authority on the matter. The exchange, which includes an explicit negotiation of epistemic authority, unfolds as follows (only an idiomatic translation is provided):

This last example shows that a third-position repeat in response to a corrected understanding may engender more than a minimal confirmation. If a third-position repeat is produced and confirmed with an acknowledgement token, the repair sequence is closed and the revised information is available to and accepted by all participants. If a repeat of corrected information is produced, is not accompanied by additional claims of understanding/knowledge, and does not receive a minimal confirmation, the next turn continues the correcting SPP rather than initiating a new sequence. Such more-than-minimal next turns are responsive to problems in alignment with the correction or the information provided in the correction (indicated, for example, through a delay in uptake). It is important to note that the repeat itself does not communicate this problem; example 7 shows that a speaker does not have to be committed to the modified/corrected information in order to repeat it in third position (see Sevennevig (2004:494-5), who makes a similar case for certain types of repeats in Norwegian). Thus, we can note that third-position repeats receipt information but not actions.

### 2.3. A preliminary summary: repeats and other third-position tokens

A repeat confirms an epistemic change of state but it does not commit to or endorse the information, or claim an understanding of its import. In this respect, a repeat is similar to third-position *ach* in German (or *oh* in English), which claims a change of epistemic state when used as an information receipt (Golato/Betz 2008; Golato 2010). However, a third-position repeat is different from a change-of-state token such as *ach* in that the repeat itself displays its specific orientation towards the prior talk: By (re)producing the lexical material of, for instance, a correction (and by sometimes including features such as contrastive stress on new information or by integrating new and old information), repeats are presentations of, rather than merely claims to, a change of state. In other words, they show what

---

Extract 7.1: um neun, continuation, tape M 05-A-148

34 JO: ä[::m:::  
u[::hm:::  
[ ]

35 E: [soll ich em en zettel †dalass]en,  
[should I leave him a †note,

36 => JO: nee; äh=s- .hh des einzige is:- dass ich im moment zweifel,  
no; uh=ts- .hh it's just tha:t- that I doubt right now,

37 => <ob> er wirklich erst um neun kommt;  
<if> he's really only coming (back) at nine;

38 >weil (wenn ich/ nämlich)< (0.7) <eigentlich> (0.3) hab ich gedacht  
>because (if I/ it's just)< (0.7) <actually> (0.3) I thought

39 dass wir uns heute um halb sechs <irgendwo> treffen wollten.  
that we had agreed to meet <somewhere> at half past five today.

40 => E:.HH [dann (.)] wird des schon stimmen.=denn=äh=b- du bist=  
. HH [then (.)] I'm sure that's right.=<since/then>=äh=y- you are=  
[ ]

41 JO: [aber- ]  
[but- ]

42 => E: =wahrscheinlich besser informiert als ich.=  
=likely better informed than me.=

has been attended to. This may explain why, in contrast to *ach* (Golato/Betz 2008; Golato 2010), repeats in third position can (and often do) stand alone, and why they do not engender substantial post-expansion talk. In the context in which they systematically make more talk relevant (after SPP corrections), they engender a confirmation turn by the speaker with primary epistemic rights.<sup>13</sup>

Repeats of corrections can also be contrasted with other tokens that regularly appear in sequentially third position, and specifically in repair sequences. When comparing repeats with *achso*, for example, a token that is an overt marker of understanding in German (Golato/Betz 2008; Golato 2010; Imo 2009), we can note that repeats convey 'more than' *ach* but 'less than' *achso*. *Achso* marks new information as received *and* as processed and understood. It typically closes the current sequence; no confirmation by the co-participant follows. Repeats of corrections, by contrast, do not mark information as understood or endorsed (see example 7; see also Taleghani-Nikazm 2012). We argue that the knowledge that is negotiated is still in the domain of the SPP speaker when the repeat is uttered, and only after an acknowledgement of the repeat by the SPP speaker is the sequence treated as closed (and information as now shared) by both participants.

That repeats present new or revised knowledge without accepting or endorsing it holds for all context discussed so far, not only corrections: We can note that in word searches, repeats are usually paired with a confirmation token that identifies the repeated item as the solution to the search and thus ratifies it. (Syntactic) integration of the retrieved item into the main sequence seems to serve the same function. In other repair sequences it is also not the repeat itself but other tokens (*achso*, *na gut*), attendant activities, or next actions that mark a revised knowledge state as now shared. Another piece of evidence comes from repair sequences that include corrections in second position and a delay between second and third turn. In such sequences, next speakers treat repeat turns explicitly as withholding acceptance of new/revised information and they produce accounts rather than confirmations, thus expanding rather than closing the sequence. Co-participants share a revised knowledge state when (a) a repeat is ratified by a confirmation and speakers move to the next or return to a pending sequence, or (b) the repeat speaker makes an explicit claim of understanding.

Repeats in repair-initiated sequences account for about half of our collection of third-position repeats. Third-position repeats, however, are not limited to repair environments. The remaining instances were produced in information request sequences, some of which (but not all) also involve corrections in second position. In both repair sequences and information request sequences, repeats are used to present just-retrieved, revised, or new knowledge.

### 3. Repeats in information request sequences

In our corpus, 17 instances of repeats in third position were used in request-for-information sequences. These are sequences typically initiated by *wh*-questions, but FPPs may also be declarative questions and yes/no-interrogatives (i.e., confirma-

---

<sup>13</sup> Further examples of post-correction repeats are discussed in section 3, in the context of requests for information. A more explicit discussion of how these confirmation-engendering repeats are similar to and different from repair initiations can be found in section 3.3.

bles). Most of these FPPs initiate new topics or take the current topic in a new direction. We will present two different contexts: (1) Information requests in which the FPP presents a confirmable and in which the FPP speaker's understanding is corrected. These sequences are similar to the ones discussed in section 2.2 and will thus be presented first. (2) Information requests in which the repeat arguably does more than displaying what has been attended to: It conveys the repeat speaker's stance toward the new information. Such repeats are a strategy for shaping the topical trajectory of the talk.

### 3.1. Sequences involving corrections

In these sequences a speaker requests information and at the same time presents a candidate understanding or assumption for confirmation in first position (using a *wh*- or a declarative question). The requested information is provided in second position, which also includes a correction of the FPP speaker's understanding or the premise of her question. In third position, the FPP speaker then repeats the new material. Thus, the third-position repeat displays what has been attended to and proposes a new interactional common ground or shared understanding. The following example, which is taken from a telephone conversation between Oma ('grandmother') and Martina, illustrates this. Recall (from extract 1) that Oma offers a guess at Martina's boyfriend's age, expressed in relation to Martina's age (line 1). After a delay (line 2), Martina disconfirms Oma's candidate understanding by correcting it: The age difference between Martina and her boyfriend is four rather than two years.

Extract 8: *vier jahre jünger* [12] M&O\_03:05, expanded

- 1 FPP O: hm. >dea is ZWoa joa jinga wey du.<  
 hm. >he-DEM is Two years younger than you.<  
 hm. >he is Two years younger than you.<
- 2 (0.5)
- 3 SPP M: a:hm vier joa jinger.  
 u:hm four years younger.
- 4 (0.3)
- 5 => O: Vie:r joa: jinge[r. ]  
Fou:r yea:rs young[e]r. ]  
 [ ]
- 6 M: [ ge]nau.  
 [ ex]actly.
- 7 O: ja nao is a:- du bist a siema: ...  
 yes then is he:- you are a seven:  
 yes so he: is- you (were born) seven:

Following a silence in line 2, Oma produces a full repeat of the correction (line 5).<sup>14</sup> Via the repeat she displays receipt of the new information and possibly also accepts Martina's primary epistemic rights to it. There is a further display of unequal epistemic rights to the negotiated information: In terminal overlap with the repeat, Martina confirms Oma's repeat with *genau*. Following Martina's confirmation, Oma uses this knowledge in a new sequence (in which she aims to retrieve Martina's year of birth based on the now established difference of four years between the ages of Martina and her boyfriend). By using a revised state of knowledge as the basis for a next action, Oma displays in line 7 that she has accepted the information and is treating the previous repair sequence as closed.

It has been suggested that some initiating actions in ordinary conversation, e.g., solicitations of a time/date in arrangement making sequences, set in motion "essentially three-turn courses of action" (Kevoe-Feldman/Robinson 2012:237-238). The existence of such sequences has been documented for one specific type of information request in an institutional context: status solicitations over the phone by customers of an electronics repair facility in the US. In these sequences, an initial status solicitation is answered by a status update by a customer service representative, and by a third-turn acceptance or rejection of the update by the customer/caller. This third turn is "accountably necessary" to complete the sequence (Kevoe-Feldman/Robinson 2012:234), rather than being contingent upon the development of the base sequence (cf. Schegloff 2007 on *minimal expansions*) or being in any other way taken as doing something special. The German examples we present in this section are all information request sequences that have a three-turn structure. We are not arguing, however, that a third turn is an essential feature of information request sequences in German, although an argument could be made that a fourth position is necessary to close such a sequence if it includes other correction. We are arguing that third turns appear systematically in certain environments, and these include post-correction contexts. In these contexts, they propose a revised knowledge state for confirmation (see extract 8). In information request sequences involving corrections, the FPP speaker may or may not have some independent knowledge of the information requested. When repeats appear in third position, the sequence is closed with a fourth-position confirmation. Similar to corrections in repair sequences, this fourth-position turn is necessary and its absence is accountable.

---

<sup>14</sup> This delay in line 4 is not heard by Martina as projecting a disagreement or other problem. It stands to reason that the delay at this specific point in the interaction is a processing delay: Oma (re)calculates the age difference between Martina and her boyfriend, and the 0.3 second delay is a result of a cognitive effort on Oma's part (and the lengthenings in her repeat in line 5 a possible further manifestation). Note also line 7, in which Oma begins to externalize her calculation. The goal of both participants in the larger sequence in which this is embedded is the retrieval of the boyfriend's year of birth; extract 9 below shows the beginning of that larger sequence. Delays before third-position repeats occur in other examples in our collection, and while some are processing delays, others are disagreement-implicative and thus interactionally significant (see extract 7, line 6).



- 10 T: eh ja das glaub ich.=  
uh yes that believe I.=  
uh yes I believe that.=
- 11 M: =ja:.  
=yes:.

Through laugh tokens in line 3, Tina displays her understanding that the topic she has initiated may be a delicate one for Markus (cf. Jefferson 1984; Haakana 2001). This laughter is reciprocated by Markus at the end of his response in line 4, and his answer displays how the topic may be delicate: Markus's turn-initial response token *a ja:*, which seems to convey that the answer is self-evident and thus downplays the newsworthiness of the topic, and the generic formulation of the family's stance (*des üblich(h)e* / 'the us(h)ual thing') indicate that his long stay abroad may be a recurrent source of conflict between Markus and his family in Germany. It may, at the least, be a topic of recurrent discussion, and one that is tiresome for Markus. This characterization of his family's stance is received with a repeat by Tina. We have already seen that a repeat in itself does not convey whether new information has been understood. In order to understand a relative formulation such as *das üblich(h)e*, Tina must have some knowledge of Markus's family (and of what is 'usual' for them). Her orientation towards the delicateness of the topic (line 3) suggests that she has this knowledge, but she provides a further demonstration: In line 6, latched onto her repeat, Tina produces an address term, and this address term is recognizable (through prosodic features as well as its placement) as a quote: She (re)constructs an element of the 'usual' discourse between Markus and his family, and therefore demonstrates her knowledge of Markus's family and her independent access to a core feature of their discourse: a complaining tone. This demonstration and its appropriateness is confirmed by Markus in line 7, both through lexical choice (the acknowledgement token *ja*) and prosodic alignment (*ma::rkus* in line 6 is reflected in *ja:a* in line 7). It is important to note that Markus's confirmation targets the additional demonstration in Tina's turn, *not* the initial repeat. It is thus functionally different from the tokens used by SPP speakers to confirm repeats after corrections (as described in sections 2.2 and 3.1).<sup>15</sup> The two speakers have reached common ground with an aligning characterization of the discourse in question (lines 6-7) and with the integration of this common ground into talk that furthers the topical progress of the interaction. In lines 7-9, Markus announces a newsworthy item about his family by describing their current emotional state – arguably an alternative/more specific response to the question asked in lines 1-2 by Tina.

<sup>15</sup> The address term in line 6, and Tina's turn in lines 5-6, could alternatively be a repeat followed by a reprimand that targets Markus's dismissal of his family's concerns (rather than a constructed reenactment of their typical reaction). Address terms, including stand-alones, are regularly used in dispreferred and disaligning actions, including challenging (Clayman 2010; Rendle-Short 2007), reprimanding, and scolding (Betz 2011). Such a move by Tina would also display a certain amount of familiarity with the (history of the) matter at hand and could thus serve to display understanding of Markus's stance in line 4. Markus's drawn-out confirmation in line 7 would then target Tina's scolding vocative by accepting the action and the criticism conveyed. Lines 7-9 would show that Markus is aware of the feelings of his relatives. Moreover, they could serve as 'self-defense' as they show that Markus is still visiting his family and has not broken off contact.

Tina's third-position repeat in line 4 displays what she has attended to. The turn does more than receipting Markus's response, however. It displays, in its composition and delivery, a stance towards it: The repeat itself is preceded by laughter and followed by an unpacking of Markus's response. With the address term, and the particularization of his generic (evasive) response, Tina not only displays her independent knowledge but potentially takes issue with Markus's reluctance/resistance to engage with the proffered topic (line 4). She effectively pursues uptake of the topic.

This use of repeat turns to combine a presentation of what has been attended to with a display of stance in order to manage topic development can also be seen in example 11. Again, the repeat turn is used in contexts in which there is resistance to a just-initiated topic. The practice is even clearer in example 11, because it is used twice: once after the SPP response to an information request and once after a lack of uptake of the third-position turn. Volker has just told Eva about a recent science research finding concerning body temperature regulation in humans. In line 1, Eva assesses this finding as intuitively making sense. *P. M.* (transcribed as "pee em") is a popular science magazine in Germany; its full title is *P. M. Fragen and Antworten* ('P. M. Questions and Answers').

Extract 11: *'türlich* [23] EH\_Call2\_21.10

- 1 E: ja. das klingt doch aber ganz vernünftig,=oder?  
yes. but that sounds pretty sensible,=doesn't it?
- 2 V: JA. das stand auch in der PEE EM drinne.  
YEAH. it was also reported in PM (magazine).
- 3 (0.1)
- 4 V: also muss das auch richtich sein.  
so it has to be right.
- 5 FPP E: hm hm hm ((clears throat)) du liest die pee em?  
hm hm hm you read PM?
- 6 (0.7)
- 7 SPP V: 'türlich;  
'cou:rse (I do);
- 8 => E: kh! 'türlich; ((mimics V's response in line 7))  
kh! 'cou:rse;
- 9 (0.4)
- 10 E: [°(kh/na)[türlich°ch°°  
[°(kh/of)[cou:rse°°  
[ [
- 11 V: [ na [FRAGEN und antworten heißt das.  
[ PRT [QUESTions and answers is named that.  
[ (well)[it's called questions and answers.

- 12 E: höhöhöhöhöhö  
hahahahaha
- 13 V: DA stand auch drinne dass... ((another piece of news  
THERE it also said that reported in PM follows))

In line 7, Volker's treats Eva's inference about his reading habits as self-evident. He thereby resists the implication conveyed in her FPP that this is an unexpected or surprising fact, that is, that his reading P. M. magazine is newsworthy. In line 8, Eva produces a repeat of Volker's response. This repeat (1) preserves Volker's voice and his treatment of the fact confirmed by *'türlich* as self-evident (see Heritage 1984:310-11 for a discussion of a similar example in English), (2) withholds a claim of understanding (for example *achso* / 'oh I see', Golato/Betz 2008; Golato 2010), that is, a claim to have been informed. By withholding such a marker, Eva withholds a closing of the sequence and thus invites Volker to say more (compare Heritage 1984 on the use of *oh* in response to informings in English). Eva also prefaces her repeat of Volker's response with a reponse cry (Goffman 1978), which seems to mimic Volker's stance of self-evidence expressed in line 7, possibly providing a 'comment' on the prior turn (disbelief or ridicule). This, in turn, contributes to making more talk by Volker – specifically an uptake of the topic proffered in line 5 – relevant. No response is forthcoming by Volker in line 9, and in line 10, Eva reissues the repeat from line 8 (again maintaining Volker's voice in her prosodic delivery). Volker then provides an account for reading P. M. (line 11) as well as a second news item from the magazine (line 13).

That Eva repeats her turn after a lack of uptake provides support for our observation – across contexts of use – that repeats themselves do not commit to or endorse the repeated information and thus are themselves not sequence-closing. Because of this, they can propose that the recipient has not been fully informed or, more generally, that an answer is insufficient. Repeat turns in third position in question-elicited information request sequences in particular can thus serve as a strategy for topic management. In contrast to other third-position repeat turns, the repeat turns discussed in this section include stance displays and are followed by more-than-minimal expansions of the sequence (e.g., a display of independent access followed by a confirmation, or an account sequence) and of the topic.

### 3.3. An intermediate practice between information receipt and repair initiation?

In our analysis of information request sequences, we argued that third-position repeats appear systematically in two specific contexts, and in both, this expansion is more than minimal: (1) They follow corrections and are backward-looking (see extract 8). Repeats in these turns propose a revised knowledge state for confirmation, and the sequence is closed with a fourth-position confirmation. (2) They receipt new information and additionally convey the speaker's stance towards it (see extracts 10-11). Repeats in these turns combine with laughter, other non-verbal features, and attendant activities that contextualize them differently. In these contexts, third turns seem forward-looking: They are sequence- and topic-expanding

and thus take on topic-structuring function. In both environments, a basic function of repeats (displaying what has been attended to) is particularized.

Svennevig (2004) finds that in interactions between native-speaker clerks and non-native-speaker clients in Norwegian institutional encounters, repeats serve as displays of hearing and understanding. These are repeats that occur after answers to questions (in third position) and informing statements (second position). Specifically, he finds that, while simple downward-intoned (=falling) repeats claim hearing, repeats that are combined with falling final response particles claim acceptance or understanding (Svennevig 2004:513). This corresponds broadly to our findings for German in repair sequences and information requests involving corrections. Additionally, however, Svennevig (Svennevig 2004:505) notes that repeats in Norwegian may also be accompanied by high-tone (=rising) repeats, and that these display affective stance (e.g., surprise, approval, interest). Rather than primarily managing information receipt, these repeat turns manage topic organization. Our analysis of question-elicited information request sequences in everyday interactions parallels some of Svennevig's (2004) findings: We also find that repeats that are accompanied by stance displays in third position turns are implicated in topic management. However, we did not find that such stance marking is necessarily done through final particles, or that final intonation is used in German to distinguish epistemic stance display from affective stance display, that is, to distinguish information receipt and understanding from, e.g., surprise or approval.

Repeat turns in our corpus of information request sequences either manage asymmetries in epistemic states (see section 3.1) or a problem in proper uptake of a new topic (see section 3.2). In both contexts, our repeats are not rising, and in both contexts, they are not sequence closing. They require an other-confirmation or further claim of understanding in the first context; they engender a more substantial expansion of the sequence and topic in the second context. For both contexts, we can thus note that – although not produced with rising intonation – repeats are functionally related to repair initiations. In post-correction contexts, a repeat makes some form of alignment relevant and with an aligning response, as speaker thus at least "displays an inclination to treat the repeat as response-worthy" (Schegloff 1997:527). In repeats that follow responses to new topic proffers, repeats withhold understanding claims (that is, sequence-closing moves) and combine with stance displays to pursue a new topic. Thus, falling repeats in information request sequences in German seem to constitute as an intermediate practice between information receipt and repair initiation.

#### **4. Conclusion**

Our analyses in sections 2 and 3 have shown that speakers of German use third-position repeats in information request sequences and repair sequences. In such contexts, third-position repeats are involved in managing topic trajectories or asymmetries in knowledge and expectations. Repeats explicitly register information (including just-retrieved, new, and corrected information) in two different types of sequences: repair and question-elicited information request sequences. Third-position repeats have a core function that holds across sequential environments, but we also observed differences in their particularized functions in the two sequential environments we distinguished. Repeats in all environments dis-

cussed in this paper register information by presenting (through lexical reproduction of prior elements) what has been attended to. We can also observe that, in both repair and information request sequences, corrections of candidate formulations, formatted as confirmation-relevant statements or yes/no-interrogatives, receive free-standing repeats in third position. These repeats make co-participant confirmation relevant and thus engender an expansion *sequence* (repeat + confirmation). Information request sequences that do not include corrections, and word searches – both typically formatted as *wh*-questions (Fox/Thompson 2010) – receive repeats in third position that combine with other components. These composition and interactional function of these turns are systematically different in the two environments. In word searches, these additional elements claim or demonstrate understanding and thereby close the sequence. The next turn typically resumes a pending sequence or initiates a new, topically-related, sequence. In information request sequences, the additional elements (e.g., laughter) convey a speaker's stance and make more talk relevant. Repeat turns in this context expand the sequence and topic and thus deal with potential problems in topic uptake. Because falling repeats in information request sequences and in repair sequences containing other-corrections engender more than minimal expansions, they can be seen as an intermediate practice between information receipt and repair initiation.

We have described a connection between the trajectory of the expanded sequence and, on the one hand, the action carried out in the base sequence, and, on the other, the knowledge states and rights of participants. It is interactionally significant whether the participant with inferior or superior rights to the information in question produces a repeat: Repeat turns after word searches typically contain additional claims of understanding by the repeat speaker (who holds superior epistemic rights) and thus close a sequence. Repeat turns after corrections, by contrast, require co-participant confirmation in next turn. Repeat turns after information requests may contain stance displays, and these are sometimes explicitly grounded in claims of independent access (see example 10). Thus, they support a repeat speaker's pursuit of sequence and topic expansion.

Our findings concerning the negotiation of knowledge asymmetries contribute to research that traces changes in cognition and affect in interactive, observable displays (see, e.g., Goodwin 2007; Peräkylä/Sorjonen 2012; Sidnell 2005; Te Molder/Potter 2005; the 2006 special issue on 'Discourse, Interaction and Cognition' in *Discourse Studies*; relevant discussions that focus on German can be found in Deppermann 2008, 2009; Deppermann/Schmitt 2009; Deppermann/Reitemeier/Schmitt/Spranz-Fogasy 2010; Drescher 2003; Fiehler 1990; 2002; Golato 2010, in press; Golato/Betz 2008; Günthner 1997; Niemeier/Dirven 1997; Pudlinski 2005; Selting 1994, 2010). Such work provides insight into how speakers make cognitive processes visible to each other in the interactional space between them, and it allows us to uncover which dimensions of knowledge are significant to interactants. For example, the present study, along existing research on epistemic response tokens (e.g., *oh* and *okay* in English; *ach*, *achso*, *achja* in German) shows that interactants regularly distinguish between claims and displays and between markers that receipt information and markers that receipt an action (see discussion in Golato/Betz 2008). That is, speakers regularly distinguish through their choice of formulations the action of claiming a change in the "current state of

knowledge, information, orientation or awareness" (Heritage, 1984:299) and the action of displaying understanding of a preceding action and its impact.

Repeats in both sequence types discussed in this paper register information by reproducing it, but they do not claim understanding or show commitment to that information (revisit extract 7 as a particularly clear example). They are thus functionally related to epistemic change-of-state tokens (such as German *ach* or English *oh*; see Golato 2010; Heritage 1984). However, by employing a repeat rather than a change-of-state token (such as German *ach*), that is, by reproducing and displaying the outcome of the preceding correction, informing, or word search, speakers show what exactly has been attended to. Thus, repeats are presentations of a change of state rather than merely claims to it, and these presentations make revised/new/retrieved information available for use in subsequent interaction, or for stance displays in the same turn. Because repeats themselves do not claim understanding or show commitment to information, they may be used/interpreted as explicitly withholding sequence closing. Repeat turn can thus be sequence-closing or sequence-expanding, depending on the turn composition. The present study, and the study of repeats in general, expands our understanding of sequential alignment, the management of topic, and the display and negotiation of knowledge in interaction.

## 5. References

- Atkinson, John / Heritage, John (eds.) (1984): Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis. Cambridge: CUP.
- Auer, Peter / Uhmann, Susanne (1982): Aspekte der konversationellen Organisation von Bewertungen. In: Deutsche Sprache 10, 1-32.
- Barske, Tobias (2009): Same token, different actions: A conversation analytic study of social roles, embodied actions, and ok in German business meetings. In: Journal for Business Communication 46 (1), 120-149.
- Beach, Wayne (1993): Transitional regularities for 'casual' 'okay' usages. In: Journal of Pragmatics 19, 325-352.
- Beach, Wayne (1995): Conversation analysis: 'okay' as a clue for understanding consequentiality. In: Sigman, Stuart (ed.), The Consequentiality of Communication. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 121-162.
- Benjamin, Trevor / Walker, Tracy (2013): Managing problems of acceptability through high rise-fall repetitions. In: Discourse Processes 50, 107-138.
- Betz, Emma (2011): Managing relationships in conversation: Two uses of names in every-day German interaction. Paper presented at IEMCA, Fribourg, Switzerland.
- Betz, Emma (2012): The scope of confirmation: (Dis)aligning with responsive *stimmt, richtig, eben, or genau* in German. Paper presented at the symposium "Reference in Interaction from a Cross-Cultural Perspective," Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- Betz, Emma / Golato, Andrea (2008): Remembering relevant information and withholding relevant next actions: The German token *achja*. In: Research on Language and Social Interaction 41(1), 58-98.
- Bolden, Galina (2009): Beyond answering: Repeat-prefaced responses in conversation. In: Communication Monographs 76(2), 121-143.

- Bolinger, Dwight (1978): Yes-no questions are not alternative questions. In: Hiz, Henry (ed.), Questions. Dordrecht: Reidel, 87-105.
- Brown, Penelope (1998): Conversational structure and language acquisition: The role of repetition in Tzeltal adult and child speech. In: Journal of Linguistic Anthropology 8, 197-221.
- Clayman, Steven (2010): Address terms in the service of other actions: The case of news interview discourse. In: Discourse and Communication 4(2), 1-22.
- Curl, Tracy (2005): Practices in other-initiated repair resolution: The phonetic differentiation of 'repetitions'. In: Discourse Processes 39(1), 1-43.
- Deppermann, Arnulf (2008): Verstehen im Gespräch. In: Kämper, Heidrun / Eichinger, Ludwig (eds.): Sprache - Kognition - Kultur. Sprache zwischen mentaler Struktur und kultureller Prägung. Berlin: de Gruyter, 225-261.
- Deppermann, Arnulf (2009): Verstehensdefizit als Antwortverpflichtung: Interaktionale Eigenschaften der Modalpartikel denn in Fragen. In: Günthner, Susanne / Bückler, Jörg (eds.): Grammatik im Gespräch. Konstruktionen der Selbst- und Fremdpositionierung. Berlin: de Gruyter, 23-56.
- Deppermann, Arnulf / Reitemeier, Ulrich / Schmitt, Reinhold / Spranz-Fogasy, Thomas (2010): Verstehen in professionellen Handlungsfeldern. Tübingen: Narr.
- Deppermann, Arnulf / Schmitt, Reinhold (2009): Verstehensdokumentation: Zur Phänomenologie von Verstehen in der Interaktion. In: Deutsche Sprache 3/08, 220-245.
- Drake, Veronika (2011): English and German turn-final polarity markers: displays of uncertainty. Paper presented at LANSI, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, NY.
- Drake, Veronika (2012): Pre-answer repeats in German. Paper presented at the 98th Annual Convention of the National Communication Association, Orlando, FL.
- Drescher, Martina (2003): Sprachliche Affektivität. Darstellung emotionaler Beteiligung am Beispiel von Gesprächen im Französischen. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Drew, Paul / Heritage, John (eds.) (1992): Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Egbert, Maria (2009): Der Reparatur-Mechanismus in deutschen und interkulturellen Gesprächen. Mannheim: Verlag für Gesprächsforschung.
- Fiehler, Reinhard (1990): Kommunikation und Emotion. Theoretische und empirische Untersuchungen zur Rolle von Emotionen in der verbalen Interaktion. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Fiehler, Reinhard (2002): How to do emotions with words: emotionality in conversation. In: Fussell, Susan (ed.), The Verbal Communication of Emotions. Interdisciplinary Perspectives. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 79-106.
- Ford, Cecilia (2001): At the intersection of turn and sequence: Negation and what comes next. In: Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth / Selting, Margret (eds.), Studies in Interactional Linguistics. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 51-79.
- Fox, Barbara / Thompson, Sandra (2010): Responses to wh-questions in English conversation. In: Research on Language and Social Interaction 43(2), 133-156.
- Goffman, Erving (1978): Response Cries. In: Language, 54(4), 787-815.

- Golato, Andrea (2010): Marking understanding versus receipting information in talk: *Achso*. and *ach* in German interaction. In: *Discourse Studies* 12(2), 147-176.
- Golato, Andrea (2012): German *oh*: Marking an emotional change-of-state. In: *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45(3), 1-24.
- Golato, Andrea / Betz, Emma (2008): German *ach* and *achso* in repair uptake: A resource to sustain or remove epistemic asymmetry. In: *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 27, 7-37.
- Golato, Andrea (2012): Repeats in Assessment Sequences. Paper presented at the 98th Annual Convention of the National Communication Association, Orlando, FL.
- Goldberg, Jo Ann (1975): A system for the transfer of instructions in natural settings. In: *Semiotica* 14(3), 269-296.
- Goodwin, Charles (2007): Participation, stance and affect in the organization of activities. In: *Discourse & Society* 18, 53-73.
- Goodwin, Marjorie (1983a): Aggravated correction and disagreement in children's conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics* 7, 657-677.
- Goodwin, Marjorie (1983b): Searching for a word as an interactive activity. In: Deely, John / Lenhart, Margot (eds.), *Semiotics 1981*. New York: Plenum, 129-138.
- Günthner, Susanne (1997): The contextualization of affect in reported dialogues. In: Niemeier, Susanne / Dirven, René (eds.), *The Language of Emotions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 247-275.
- Haakana, Markku (2001): Laughter as a patient's resource: Dealing with delicate aspects of medical interaction. In: *Text* 21, 187-219.
- Hakulinen, Anssi (2001): Minimal and non-minimal answers to yes-no questions. In: *Pragmatics* 11(1), 1-15.
- Hepburn, Alexa / Bolden, Galina (2013). The conversation analytic approach to transcription. In Stivers, Tanya / Sidnell, Jack (eds.). *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell, 57-76.
- Heritage, John (1984): A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In: Atkinson, John / Heritage, John (eds.), *Structures of Social Action*. Studies in Conversation Analysis. Cambridge: CUP, 299-345.
- Heritage, John / Raymond, Geoffrey (2012): Navigating epistemic landscapes: Acquiescence, agency and resistance in responses to polar questions. In: De Ruiter, Jan (ed.), *Questions: Formal, Functional and Interactional Perspectives*. Cambridge: CUP, 179-192.
- Imo, Wolfgang (2009): Konstruktion oder Funktion? Erkenntnisprozessmarker ("change-of-state-token") im Deutschen. In: Günthner, Susanne / Bückler, Jörg (eds.): *Grammatik im Gespräch*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 57-86.
- Jefferson, Gail (1972): Side sequences. In: Sudnow, David (ed.), *Studies in Social Interaction*. New York: The Free Press, 294-338.
- Jefferson, Gail (1980): The abominable *Ne?*. An exploration of post-response pursuit of response. In: Schröder, Peter / Steger, Hugo (eds.), *Dialogforschung. Jahrbuch 1980 des Instituts für deutsche Sprache*. Düsseldorf: Pädagogischer Verlag Schwann, 53-88.

- Jefferson, Gail (1984): On the organization of laughter in talk about troubles. In: Atkinson, John / Heritage, John (eds.) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: CUP, 346-369.
- Jefferson, Gail (1985): An exercise in the transcription and analysis of laughter. In: Van Dijk, Teun A. (ed.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. London: Academic, 25-34.
- Keel, Sara (2011): The parents' questioning repeats in response to young children's evaluative turns. In: *Gesprächsforschung* 12, 52-94.
- Keenan (Ochs), Elinor (1977): Making it last: Repetition in children's discourse. In: Ervin-Tripp, Susan / Mitchell-Kernan, Claudia (eds.), *Child Discourse*. New York: Academic, 125-138.
- Kevoe-Feldman, Heidi / Robinson, Jeffrey D. (2012): Exploring essentially three-turn courses of action: An institutional case study with implications for ordinary talk. In: *Discourse Studies* 14, 217-241.
- Kim, Haeyeon (2002): The form and function of next-turn repetition in English conversation. In: *Language Research* 38(1), 51-81.
- Kim, Haeyeon (2003): Functions of single full NP turns with rising intonation in English conversation. In: *Discourse and Cognition* 10(1), 49-77.
- Mellinger, Wayne (1995): Talk, power and professionals: Partial repeats as challenges in the psychiatric interview. In: Siegfried, Jurg (ed.), *Therapeutic and Everyday Discourse as Behavior Change: Toward a Microanalysis in Psychotherapy Process Research*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 391-418.
- Niemeier, Susanne / Dirven, René (1997): *The Language of Emotions: Conceptualization, Expression, and Theoretical Foundation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Peräkylä, Anssi (2004): *Conversation Analysis*. In: Seale, Clive / Silverman, David / Gubrium, Jaber / Gobo, Giampietro (eds.), *Qualitative Research Practice*. London: Sage, 165-179.
- Peräkylä, Anssi / Sorjonen, Marja-Leena (2012): *Emotion in Interaction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pomerantz, Anita (1984): Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In: Atkinson, John / Heritage, John (eds.), *Structures of Social Action*. Cambridge: CUP, 225-246.
- Pomerantz, Anita (1988): Offering a candidate answer: An information-seeking strategy. In: *Communication Monographs* 55, 360-373.
- Pomerantz, Anita (2011): Using candidate answer queries to perform mitigated versions of potentially offensive actions. Plenary talk given at the Language and Social Interaction Conference (LANSI), Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, NY.
- Pomerantz, A. (2012): Fragen mit Antwortangebot, soziales Handeln und moralische Ordnung. In: Ayass, Ruth / Meyer, Christian (eds.), *Sozialität in Slow Motion: Theoretische und empirische Perspektiven*. Festschrift für Jörg Bergmann. Wiesbaden, Germany: Springer, 333-352.
- Pudlinski, Christopher (2005): Doing empathy and sympathy: Caring responses to troubles tellings on a peer support line. In: *Discourse Studies* 7, 267-288.
- Raymond, Geoffrey (2003): Grammar and social organization: Yes/no type interrogatives and the structure of responding. In: *American Sociological Review* 68, 939-967.

- Robinson, Jeffrey D. (2012): Epistemics, action formation, and other-initiation of repair: The case of partial questioning repeats. In: Sidnell, Jack / Hayashi, Makoto / Raymond, Geoffrey (eds.), *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 261-292.
- Robinson, Jeffrey D. / Kevoe-Feldman, Heidi (2010): Using full repeats to initiate repair on others' questions. In: *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 43, 232-259.
- Rendle-Short, Johanna (2007): "Catherine, you're wasting your time": Address terms within the Australian political interview. In: *Journal of Pragmatics* 39, 1503-1525.
- Sacks, Harvey (1975): Everyone has to lie. In: Blount, Ben / Sanches, Mary (eds.), *Sociocultural Dimensions of Language Use*. New York, NY: Academic Press, 57-80.
- Sacks, Harvey (1987): On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In: Button, Graham / Lee, John R. E. (eds.), *Talk and Social Organisation*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 54-69.
- Sacks, Harvey / Schegloff, Emanuel A. / Jefferson, Gail (1974): A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50(4), 696-735.
- Sadock, Jerrold / Zwicky, Arnold (1985): Speech act distinctions in syntax. In: Shopen, Timothy (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, Volume 1, Clause Structure*. Cambridge: CUP, 155-196.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1987): Some sources of misunderstanding in talk-in-interaction. In: *Linguistics* 25, 201-18.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1996): Confirming allusions: Toward an empirical account of action. In: *American Journal of Sociology* 104, 161-216.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1997): Practices and actions: Boundary cases of other-initiated repair. In: *Discourse Processes* 23, 499-545.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (2007): *Sequence Organization in Interaction. A Primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. / Jefferson, Gail / Sacks, Harvey (1977): The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. In: *Language* 53, 361-382.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. / Sacks, Harvey (1973): Opening up closings. In: *Semiotica* 8, 289-327.
- Selting, Margret (1987): *Verständigungsprobleme. Eine empirische Analyse am Beispiel der Bürger-Verwaltungs-Kommunikation*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Selting, Margret (1988): The role of intonation in the organization of repair and problem handling sequences in conversation. In: *Journal of Pragmatics* 12, 293-322.
- Selting, Margret (1994): Emphatic speech style - with special focus on the prosodic signaling of heightened emotive involvement in conversation. In: *Journal of Pragmatics* 22, 375-408.
- Selting, Margret (1996): Prosody as an activity-type distinctive signaling cue in conversation. The case of so-called 'astonished questions' in repair-initiation. In: Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth / Selting, Margret (eds.), *Prosody in Conversation: Interactional Studies*. Cambridge: CUP, 231-270.

- Selting, Margret (2007). Lists as embedded structures and the prosody of list construction as an interactional resource. In: *Journal of Pragmatics* 39(3), 483-526.
- Selting, Margret (2010): Affectivity in conversational storytelling: An analysis of displays of anger or indignation in complaint stories. In: *Pragmatics* 20(2), 229-277.
- Sidnell, Jack (2005): *Talk and Practical Epistemology: The Social Life of Knowledge in a Caribbean Community*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sorjonen, Marja-Leena (1996): Repeats and responses in Finnish conversations. In: Ochs, Elinor / Schegloff, Emanuel A. / Thompson, Sandra (eds.), *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: CUP, 277-327.
- Sorjonen, Marja-Leena (2001): Simple answers to polar questions. In: Selting, Margret / Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth (eds.), *Studies in Interactional Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 405-431.
- Stivers, Tanya (2005): Modified repeats: One method for asserting primary rights from second position. In: *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 38(2), 131-58.
- Stivers, Tanya / Hayashi, Makoto (2010): Transformative answers: One way to resist a question's constraints. In: *Language in Society* 39, 1-38.
- Streeck, Jürgen (1993): Gesture as communication I: Its coordination with gaze and speech. In: *Communication Monographs* 60(4), 275-299.
- Svennevig, Jan (2004): Other-repetition as display of hearing, understanding and emotional stance. In: *Discourse Studies* 6(4), 589-516.
- Taleghani-Nikazm, Carmen / Vlatten (Golato), Andrea (1997): Instruction-receipt in face-to-face interaction. In: *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 8(2), 119-131.
- Taleghani-Nikazm, Carmen (2012): Repeats as responses to accounts in German. Paper presented at the 98th Annual Convention of the National Communication Association, Orlando, FL.
- Tannen, Deborah (1989): *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Te Molder, Hedwig / Potter, Jonathan (eds.) (2005): *Conversation and Cognition*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Weber, Elizabeth G. (1993): *Varieties of Questions in English Conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wu, Ruey-Juan Regina (2006): Initiating repair and beyond: The use of two repeat-formatted repair initiations in Mandarin conversation. In: *Discourse Processes* 41(1), 67-109.

## **6. Appendix: Transcription conventions and category abbreviations used**

Transcription conventions, based on the Jeffersonian transcription system (Hepburn/Bolden 2013; Jefferson 1984, 1985; Schegloff 2007:265-269):

[	start of overlap (simultaneous talk by two/more speakers)
]	end of overlap
=	latching (no intervening beat of silence) between TCUs or between turns by different speakers; or: continuation of a speaker's turn across transcript lines

(0.5)	silence; length of silence timed relative to the delivery of the surrounding talk
(.)	micro-pause (less than 1/10 of a second)
.h .hh	audible inbreath; longer aspiration is expressed with double/triple letters
h hh	audible outbreath; longer aspiration is expressed with double/triple letters
haha	laughter; different vowels (i.e., e, i, a) indicate the quality of laugh tokens
(h) (hh)	laughter within a word
<u>word</u> ,	if the syllable-initial consonant, consonant cluster, or vowel is underlined: there is emphasis, usually higher amplitude and/or pitch, on the syllable
before, <u>in</u>	
WORD	much higher volume relative to the surrounding talk
°word°	enclosed passage quieter in delivery than the surrounding talk
°°word°°	double degree signs indicate a particularly quiet voice (e.g., in whispering)
↑ (or ^)	(sharply) rising pitch / pitch peak on following syllable
↓	(sharply) falling pitch on following syllable
↑word↑	if a word or passage is enclosed by arrows/sets of arrows:
↑↑word↑↑	whole word or passage is higher/much higher in pitch than surrounding talk
(word)	transcriber's uncertain hearing
( )	unintelligible stretch of talk
(( ))	transcriber's additional comments/ transcription of events
>word<	rushed/compressed talk: increase in tempo relative to surrounding talk
<word>	stretched-out talk: slowing down in tempo relative to surrounding talk
:	lengthening of the sound before the colon
-	abrupt ending or cut-off (glottal closure)
.	TCU-final falling intonation
;	TCU-final intonation, falling to mid
,	TCU-final continuing, slightly rising intonation
?	TCU-final rising ('question') intonation
wo*rd	asterisks mark location of or the beginnings and ends of non-
*words*	verbal or embodied actions (described above speech)

Category abbreviations used:

ART	article
PRT	particle
DEM	demonstrative pronoun
RFL	reflexive pronoun

Emma Betz, PhD, embetz@uwaterloo.ca  
Department of Germanic and Slavic Studies  
University of Waterloo  
Modern Languages 220, 200 University Ave. West  
Waterloo, Ontario, N2L 3G1 Canada

Carmen Taleghani-Nikazm, PhD, taleghani-nikazm.1@osu.edu  
Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures  
The Ohio State University  
425 Hagerty Hall, 1775 College Road  
Columbus, OH 43210 USA

Veronika Drake, PhD, avdrake@svsu.edu  
Department of English  
Saginaw Valley State University  
Science West 355, 7400 Bay Road  
University Center, MI 48710 USA

Andrea Golato, PhD, agolato@txstate.edu  
The Graduate College  
Texas State University  
Centennial Hall 214, 601 University Drive  
San Marcos, TX 78666 USA

Veröffentlicht am 23.10.2013

© Copyright by GESPRÄCHSFORSCHUNG. Alle Rechte vorbehalten.