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What is This?
The development of other-related conversational skills: A case study of conversational repair during the early years

Michael A. Forrester, University of Kent
Sarah M. Cherington, Lassell College, Massachusetts

ABSTRACT
The analysis of conversational repair provides one route into understanding how young children learn the skills required for participating in talk. One key aspect of repair is the ability to respond appropriately to other participants. Employing a longitudinal case study approach, this article examines in detail the conversational repair skills of one child during the period where she is acquiring core conversational abilities and competencies (from 1;0 to 3;10). Focusing on the development of other-related conversational repair skills, 163 instances of other-related repair were examined and analysed. Extracts highlight the skills the child employed in self-repairs in response to others, as well as when repairing or correcting other people's conversation. The findings indicate that during the early years other-initiated self-repair is a more common occurrence than repairing others' talk. The findings provide insights into the significance of conversational repair for language development during the preschool years.
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The organization of conversational repair addresses recurrent problems of speaking, hearing and misunderstanding for participants (Schegloff, 1992). Within
developmental pragmatics there has been an increasing interest in young children’s conversational repair skills for at least three reasons. First of all, mapping out how conversational skills develop is central to understanding the interdependence between conversational participation and language development (Budwig, 1999; Craig & Gallagher, 1983; Dunn, 1993; McTear, 1985; Pan & Snow, 1999). Learning how to talk is part and parcel of cultural socialization. Schieffelin and Ochs (1981) note that the notion of language socialization rests on the observation that ‘language is seen as a source for children to acquire the ways and world views of their culture’ (p. 252).

A second reason why conversational repair engenders research interest derives from the debate within language acquisition over the role of negative evidence in child-directed speech. Gallaway and Richards (1994) provide a summary of features of such talk, i.e., it is simple, often concerns clarification (which may involve modification through timing, intonation and associated devices that emphasize constituent boundaries of words), contains expressive features, provides feedback and modelling, and can involve specific teaching of social routines. Most significant is the role that procedures of feedback, specifically repair and correction, might have with regard to the manner in which children acquire grammatical competence, itself a topic of some debate within child language (e.g., Baker & Nelson, 1984; Gold, 1967; Nelson, 1996; Pinker, 1984; Saxton, 1997, 2000).

A third reason for the interest is that analysis of repair may provide insight into how children themselves understand participating in ‘talk-in-interaction’. Wootton (1994), for example, documents some of the skills involved in the child producing and monitoring talk, noting that even very young children show sensitivity to the significance of sequence during ongoing interaction. Similarly, Tarplee (1989, 1996) describes how children orient towards adult repair during interaction. One recent theme in this literature is the focus on repair organization (Corrin, 2006; Ridley, Radford & Mahon, 2002; Wootton, 2007).

The background to the work reported here derives from this last theme, and the question of the child’s own understanding and orientation to repair phenomenon in talk, particularly adult–child and child–child correction and repair (Goodwin, 1983; Jefferson, 1987; Norrick, 1991). A well-established body of work has documented the prevalence of, and preference for, self-repair in adults (Schegloff, 2000a; Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks, 1977; Wong, 2000). In other words, during naturally occurring talk, speakers and listeners display an orientation towards providing opportunities for speakers to repair their own talk as opposed to being explicitly corrected. In their earlier work on repair organization, Schegloff et al. (1977) suggested that one possible exception to the prevalence of self-over other-correction/repair might be found in adult–child interaction, and Goodwin (1983) subsequently outlined examples of the prevalence of other-correction/repair in child–child talk with children in the 4–7 age range. Norrick (1991), in contrast, suggests that what influences the prevalence of self- or other-repair is the participants’ orientation to competence, and in situations such as a non-native-to-native speaker, and in adult–child talk, other-repair does not exhibit the modulated forms described by Schegloff et al. (1977), such as the prevalence of uncertainty markers.
It is important to recognize that self-repair essentially takes two forms: the first where it is spontaneously produced or initiated by an ongoing speaker; the second, described as ‘other-initiated’ self-repair, where a speaker repairs what he or she has just said as a result of something said or done by the listener or addressee. In this article, we use the term SISR to denote the first, and OISR the second. Often, in cases of OISR, the self-repair occurs in the ‘third-turn’ (speaker–addressee–speaker). Where the self-repair occurs even later, this is known as ‘third-position’ repair. Both of these forms of self-repair can be directly contrasted with other-repair/correction, i.e., where a listener explicitly repairs or corrects the talk of the speaker (we denote the latter as OR/C repair).

The question of the role of the other person or addressee during the production of self-repair is of potential significance to child language researchers in that insights into how children understand the ongoing sequence of a conversation might be gained by examining both third-turn and third-position repair, as well as situations where a child explicitly corrects or repairs another speaker. In a detailed study of third-position repair, Wootton (1994) examined the rerequest activities of a child between the age of 1;0 and 1;6. Initially, rerequesting and outright rejections (say of the offer on an object) were undifferentiated, followed by a period where brief gestures were employed alongside a rerequest, and by 1;6, acts of rejection were clearly differentiated from rerequesting. In other words, by the middle of the second year a child will not continue to reject an unwanted object where she or he can recognize that the parent’s object selection is an outcome of, and a fitted response to, the child’s own request action.

The aim of this article is to examine in detail the conversational repair skills of one child during the period where she is acquiring core conversational abilities and competencies (1;0–3;10). The focus is specifically on the contexts and circumstances surrounding repair involving other people (either OISR or OR/C).

Our concern is to highlight the developing understanding of the pragmatics of conversation, as well as to shed light on this child’s understanding of the purpose of particular conversational resources such as repair organization. The following research questions are addressed:

**RQ1:** How pervasive is other-related repair in a child’s conversation during the early years?
**RQ2:** What function does other-related conversational repair have in talk for this child?
**RQ3:** What is repaired and under what circumstances?
**RQ4:** To what extent are the skills involved with conversational repair based on the young child’s ability to monitor her own and other people’s conversation?
**RQ5:** Is it possible to provide an overall picture of the development of other-related conversational repair?

**METHOD**

**Design**

Employing a longitudinal single case study design, the principal data resource for the analysis reported come from a series of video-recordings (31) of the first author’s
daughter, Ella. This child was filmed during meal-times as she was interacting with her father, mother, and older sibling, Eva (aged 8 at the beginning of the recordings) and for the most part was positioned in a high-chair in view of the camera (as in Quay, 2008). The recordings of the target child were collected from age 1;0 to 3;10. The length of the recordings range from 10 to 45 min (average 35) with the total recording amounting to around 11 h. Following completion of the recordings, transcriptions using conversation analytic conventions were produced (following Psathas, 1995). Additional transcription notations relevant for child language analysis were also produced (MacWhinney, 2000) and the resulting data corpus can be viewed through the web-data feature of the CLAN software (CHILDES, 2008). The extracts discussed here can also be viewed at www.kent.ac.uk/psychology/department/people/forresterm/ORqtmov.htm

Other-related repair: Note on analysis and selection

According to Schegloff et al. (1977), the organization of repair is ‘the set of practices by which parties of talk-in-interaction can address problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding the talk’ (p. 361). A brief review of summary definitions will serve as background to what follows. In conversation analysis the trouble source (TS – see extracts) describes an identifiable problem in talk that is in need of repair. The speaker of the TS is referred to as ‘self’, and the participant other than the speaker of the trouble is referred to as ‘other’. When the speaker of the TS repairs his or her own utterance spontaneously, it is referred to as self-repair (SISR). When somebody other than the speaker of the TS performs a repair of the trouble, it is referred to as other-repair (OR/C). As noted earlier, where an addressee indicates or initiates talk or action that signals that the immediately prior speaker’s talk requires repair and the first speaker then repairs, such repair is best defined as other-initiated self-repair (OISR). When trouble occurs, there exists what Schegloff et al. (1977) call ‘multiple repair spaces’ for the trouble to be dealt with. The repair and repair-initiators can occur in different places in the sequence of the talk (same turn, transition-space, next turn, third turn, and third-position) and take more than one attempt to be accomplished, adding to the complexity of the organization.

Given this background, all 31 recordings were viewed repeatedly in order to isolate all instances in which there appeared to be trouble in the talk highlighted by repair. Considered and detailed repetitive analysis indicated that there were 163 cases of other-related repair in the data corpus, 139 examples of OISR, and 24 examples of OR/C. There were a number of examples where the researchers could not say with an acceptable degree of participant-oriented certainty that the child was producing or responding to an act that led to repair. For instance, there are examples in which the child seems distracted, or is not obviously directing her speech to the other participants. Others are simply too ambiguous to ascertain that other-related repair has in fact occurred. Throughout, we adopted the ethnomethodological stricture of conversation analysis, i.e., selection and analysis should rest on demonstrable evidence that the participants themselves orient towards the events in a manner indicative of, and consistent with, the analytic focus of the research.
Research participation and ethics

Care was taken with the video-recordings to ensure issues of participation were dealt with in line with the British Psychological Society’s *Code of conduct, ethical principles and guidelines* (particularly clauses 3.5; 3.6; 4.5 – see BPS, 2006). However, in recent years within both developmental psychology (Burman, 1994) and the sociology of childhood (James & Prout, 1996) questions regarding the status, rights, morality, and ethics of asking children to participate in research have been raised, and in line with these developments appropriate ethical procedures regarding the submission and use of the data corpus for CHILDES and the TALKBANK facilities were also followed.

RESULTS

The results are summarized in two parts, with an initial overview of incidence and function of other-related repair followed by a conversation-analytic informed examination of extract examples representing different instances of the development of the target child’s repair skills exhibited in her talk.

Incidence and function of other-related conversational repair

With regard to the incidence of forms of repair, although overall frequency may appear relatively low, in terms of ‘repairs per minute’ recorded in this child’s talk, a repair can occur between every half-minute to a minute (mean = 0.71). This would seem to indicate that from the second year self-monitoring of her own and others’ talk may be relatively well established. An examination of Table 1 indicates that throughout the age period the incidence of OISR is higher than OR/C, and both forms are much less frequent then self-initiated self-repair (see also Appendix 1, Table A1). Such a picture is in line with Schegloff et al.’s (1977) suggestion of a preference for self-repair in repair organization. Keeping our focus on other-related conversational repair, when we consider the contexts within which other-repairs occur we find a higher incidence of third-turn over third-position repair in OIS and OR/C repair, which again concurs with expectation that the skills required to produce a repair in third-position are more complex than third-turn repair skills (Schegloff, 1997a). Developmentally, there may be some indication that the frequency of OISR initially rises and then falls, and that the ability to produce a third-turn position repair (and repair that takes place later than in the next available turn) does not begin until the beginning of the third year – which may implicate memory constraints regarding the child’s monitoring of the originating trouble source.

With regard to the precise manner in which an OISR is carried out, and keeping in mind that incidence precludes statistically-informed conclusions, a reformulation of the originating trouble source is more common overall than a simple repeat of what she had said, with very few instances of reformulations involving partial repetitions. As for the function of OR/C, it can be seen in Table 2 that most examples involved instances where the child was correcting the other’s talk.
Table 1 Incidence of other-repair forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (months)</th>
<th>Second year</th>
<th>Third year</th>
<th>Fourth year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 16 17 18 20 21 22 23</td>
<td>24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 35</td>
<td>37 39 41 42 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording length (min)</td>
<td>18 25 27 25 29 14 26 21</td>
<td>30 44 18 19 27 20 25 20 29 43 18</td>
<td>19 23 24 24 22 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-initiated self-repair (OISR)</td>
<td>5 3 2 4 8 10 10 3 9 8 5 3 8 5 7 6 10 11 3 1 2 6 3 2 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn-context</td>
<td>SATCU</td>
<td>1 5 2 6 1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTCU (TTR)</td>
<td>5 3 4 2 8 9 8 3 6 5 4 1 7 3 4 5 1 9 3 2 4 1 2 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNTCU (TRP)</td>
<td>1 3 1 1 1 2 2 1 3 2 1 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of repair</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>1 3 5 3 6 1 3 2 4 1 2 2 3 5 6 1 2 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 3 7 3 2 6 6 1 2 5 5 5 3 5 4 3 1 1 4 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP +RF</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-repair/correction (OR/C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 2 1 2 5 1</td>
<td>3 3 3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn-context</td>
<td>WTCU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTCU (TTR)</td>
<td>1 2 1 1 2 3 2 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNTCU (TRP)</td>
<td>1 2 2 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of repair</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>2 1 2 5 1 1 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Form of repair (OR/C): CT: correction of talk; CA: correction of action; CM: correction of misunderstanding. Turn-context: TCU: turn constructional unit; TTR: third turn repair; TRP: transition relevant pause; NTCU: next TCU; WTCU: within TCU; SATCU: space after TCU; LNTCU: later than next TCU. Form of repair (OISR): RP: repeat; RF: reformulation; RP + RF: reformulation with repeat or partial repeat.
Table 2  Other-repair/correction: summary of function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Age (weeks)</th>
<th>Turn-context</th>
<th>Talk or action correction</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>NTCU</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Non-verbal head movement plus noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>NTCU</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Non-verbal repair using head and body movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>NTCU</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Word replacement while in role of third party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>NTCU</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Word correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>LNTCU</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Repair of misunderstanding in sequence of the talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>LNTCU</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Correction of deictic term/substitution of name used pronominally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>LNTCU</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Correction of misunderstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>LNTCU</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Correction of misunderstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>NTCU</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Correction – use of negation plus emphatic display of disagreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>NTCU</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Correction using opposite term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>LNTCU</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Correction using negation plus reformulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>WTCU</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Extended reformulation plus use of marked emphasis to challenge the other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>LNTCU</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Correction using marked emphasis and while in the role of third party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>NTCU</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Repetition and marked repair of other’s pronunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>NTCU</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Repair following annoyance at other for calling child to account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>NTCU</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Repair in response to other not providing second pair-part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>LNTCU</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Repair oriented to convention and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>NTCU</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Repair oriented to accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>NTCU</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Repair of inappropriate offer by other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>LNTCU</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Repair of inappropriate offer by other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>LNTCU</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Aggravated correction using opposite terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>NTCU</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Correction using reformulation and marked emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>LNTCU</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Correction using opposite terms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: CT: correction of talk; CA: correction of action; CM: correction of misunderstanding; NTCU: next TCU; WTCU: within TCU; SATCU: space after TCU; LNTCU: later than next TCU.

There may be indications in this overview that during the latter part of the third and into the fourth year, there is an increasing tendency for other-repairs/corrections to arise as a result of the child correcting not so much the details of what somebody
else was saying but correcting his or her talk where it might implicate an action or event or state of affairs particular to the child (e.g., pointing out to a speaker that they are doing something incorrectly). However, in order to gain a fuller picture of the development and function of other-related repair, the remainder of this analysis section employs the micro-detailed focus of conversation analysis so as to highlight the development of the child’s emerging other-related conversational repair skills.

Extract analysis

For clarity, the extract examples considered are divided into three time periods: (1) from 15 to 24 months (under 2), (2) from 25 to 36 months (the third year) and (3) from 37 to 46 months (3 and above). Within each section, we look first at OISR, instances where the child repairs her talk or activities as a result of another person’s response to what she first said. We then turn to examples of OR/C, that is examples where the child herself repairs the talk of another person (either an adult/parent or older sibling). Each extract is preceded by notes on the particular context the extract is taken from and a summary statement of the analytic point of interest.

Early forms of other-related repair (under 2 years)

Other-initiated self-repair (OISR)

One of the earliest examples of OISR can be found when the target child is approximately 18 months old. In this data set there are many examples where OISR is triggered by a clarification request, in line with Wootton (1994). Here, we find an example which involves a repetition of a response, again following a clarification request, accompanied with a specific pitch change for emphasis.

Extract 16 – child age: 1;6

Context: Immediately prior to beginning to eat a meal together, the father is moving around the kitchen so as to get a spoon for the child to use.

Summary exposition of extract: In this extract what the child originally says occurs during overlapped speech (line 6 – the trouble source) and she then produces three separate repair repetitions to clarify her response to the father’s question.

1  (0.3)
2  F: .hhh would you like a s↑ilver ↓spoon?
3  (0.6)
4  E: soo way
5  (1.0)  (father opens cutlery drawer)
6  E: TS ↑no ↑↓ (accompanied by shaking head)
7  F: ↓sil ↓
8  (.)
9  F: silve↓r one↓?
10 E: → ↓n:o:: ↓j
11  (0.5)
12 F: "alright" (continues searching for spoon)

Downloaded from fla.sagepub.com at SAGE Publications on November 28, 2012
The interaction begins with the father moving across the kitchen towards a cutlery drawer and while doing so, asking the child if she would like a silver spoon. There is some indication that Ella’s initial response (line 4) is a partial response of his utterance, however as she watches him open the drawer she says ‘no’ shaking her head while doing so (line 6). As she speaks her father also begins talking, so that her utterance may have been misheard. We then observe a clarification request at line 9, to which, before the father has fully completed his turn, the child responds again with ‘no’. This time her repetition is also a repair indicated in the noticeable alteration of the pitch (upwards initially at line 6 – downwards in line 10). Between lines 11 and 18 we then have a sequence of increasing interactional trouble related to her appearing to be ignored. Notice that at line 12, the father responds to her pitch-change repair by saying, relatively quietly, ‘alright’ but at the same time, continues to take some spoons out of the drawer. The child, watching him, repeats her assertion (line 14) and then in a somewhat plaintive manner repeats ‘no’ with an increasingly stretched sound (16). Here, the child has produced a repair in response to the other’s request for clarification at line 9, and again twice, when the father appears to ignore her replies.

In the next example we observe this child employing repair where her initial utterance has been misunderstood.

Extract 2 – child age: 1;11

Context: Interaction occurs towards the end of breakfast meal – the child is often given something to play with so the adult can finish eating.

Summary exposition of extract: The child makes a request which appears to be treated as simply a statement by the father. His response engenders a self-repair by the child at line 4.

1   (21.8)
2 E: TS cup tea:::= (arm gesture towards other room)
3 F: = cuppa tea =
4 E: → = a want ‘it’ (splayed hand gesture)
5 F: >oh will I bring< will I bring some in?
6 E: ((nod))
7 (0.8)
8 F: all right
9 (0.7)

At the beginning of the extract the father is eating and the child is drinking. Just prior to his finishing she looks towards him and he stops drinking, places the cup
on the table and turns towards her. She then simultaneously turns towards a door behind the father, points and says ‘cup tea’ with a noticeable stretching on the final syllable (line 2). The moment she finishes speaking, the father both begins nodding and repeats what she has just said – in effect as if agreeing ‘yes, this is a cup of tea I’m drinking’. Immediately she produces an OISR, this time with an utterance that reformulates her request for one of her own tea-cups.7 Note that here her repair is initiated not by the father indicating that there is something wrong with what she has just said, but instead his response, which indicates to her that he is not responding to her request in an appropriate way. As she makes this OISR, it is also noteworthy that she lifts both her arms off the table and splays out her hands – one might say indicating non-verbally that she wishes to go and collect it.

In response, and interestingly before she has finished speaking, the father produces both an ‘oh-response’, described elsewhere as an index of ongoing misrecognition (Heritage, 1998), alongside a question about her request. Immediately on hearing this response, the child nods, puts her arms down, her body relaxing down into the chair. What is evident here in terms of the child’s conversational skills is (1) she can recognize where something she has said has been misunderstood, that is, displays an orientation to what is presupposed by the father’s initial agreement to a statement about a referent; (2) has the ability to produce a repair that makes clear that her utterance is a request, and does so by way of a reformulation of the original trouble source; and (3) appears to have some recognition of the appropriateness of the other’s response to this OISR evident in the head-nodding agreement and the changed body movement. The child can use repair as a resource so as to overcome a misunderstanding.

Other-repair/correction (OR/C)

For this particular child, OR/C repair appears around 2 years (99 weeks) and in the first instance is expressed both in her talk and accompanying non-verbal expressions. In the next extract, the repair/correction is of a ‘third party’, in this case the father.

Extract 3 – child age: 1;11

Context: While preparing food the father is moving around the kitchen and engaging the child by talking to her about the toy animals sitting on the table.

Summary exposition of extract: The child repairs or corrects a word used by the father, and appears to do so while directing her talk towards some toy animals in front of her.

1 (E looking at toy animals on the table)
2 F: do kangaroo and ti·gger like their breakfast?
3 (0.3)
4 E: (nods in reply, then looks at F)
5 (0.4)
6 F: they watchin yo::u ↑
7 (6.1)
The extract begins with the father asking Ella a question while she is eating. In response, and keeping in mind that he is not looking at her or interacting with her directly, she nods repeatedly and begins to look at the toy animals he has referred to. During the pause between lines 2 and 6 Ella turns towards the father and while doing so, he comments that the toy animals are watching her. The father’s utterance at line 10 is interesting in that although he is walking around the kitchen and engaged in other activities, his talk is ‘as if’ directed towards the toys pointing out that what Ella is referring to in line 8 is, indeed, not ‘for them’, but instead is his own. Ella’s repair of his statement takes place while she is looking directly at the toys, her arm remaining on the table and with her shaking her head as she speaks. The child’s talk is directed at the toys and, one might surmise, is simultaneously clarifying more precisely that the object in question is in fact a bowl, not a plate. To what extent this sequence of events derives from the father’s initial comment that the toys are watching Ella is unclear, but certainly her utterance and the accompanying behaviour indicate that this repair amounts to a repair of the father’s talk produced while addressing her toys.

Similarly, we find – a month later – the child exhibiting a concern with correct naming or reference during an imitation/repetition sequence, as in extract 4:

**Extract 4 – child age: 2;0**

**Context:** The father and child are eating dinner, the father has just returned to the table and the child is naming what she is eating (ice-cream with chocolate sauce).

**Summary exposition of extract:** Throughout the interaction often when the child names something such as an item of food, the father repeats or imitates her utterance. In this extract, he repeats her utterance at line 1 twice, the second time incorrectly as, in line 5, the child has used a different word.
Identification of potential trouble follows on from an examination of Ella’s utterance in line 9 (which amounts to a correction). Here her repetition of what she has previously referred to in line 5 is marked prosodically with stretching on the sound in a ‘rise-fall’ intonational pattern. This follows on immediately from the father’s utterance in line 7, where it would seem, instead of repeating ‘sauce’ he instead repeats ‘ice-cream’ for a second time. The contextual relevance of this is that adult and child had been playing this repeating imitation-naming game for some time during the interaction. Following on from Ella’s utterance in line 9, the father responds to this other correction, by now (in line 11) repeating her original utterance and, possibly by way of mitigation or some indication of being called to account, echoes her statement and extends the referent by marking out what kind of sauce it is (yes, indeed, it is sauce, and in fact chocolate sauce). This and the earlier extract highlight the child’s interest in literalness – increasingly correcting inappropriate naming and reference.

Other-related repair during the third year (2;1–3;0)

*Other-initiated self-repair (OISR)*

While a concern with appropriate naming and overcoming misunderstandings are evident in the previous extracts, in the third year we can observe instances of other-related repair employed so as to rectify a possible misunderstanding even where the misunderstanding has no apparent import for the ongoing interaction.

*Extract 5 – child age: 2;2*

*Context:* The interaction takes place towards the end of breakfast meal. The father is reading a newspaper at a table facing away from the child. Prior to the beginning of the extract, the father has given the child milk to drink from her bowl.

*Summary exposition of extract:* In this ‘third position’ repair the child’s original attempt at a repair (line 7) is initially treated as unproblematic, however after further extension and/or clarification of the topic by the father, the child produces a second self-repair (line 13).

1 F: alright you don’t have to
2 (25.6) *(F turning pages of newspaper – E drinking from bowl)*
3 E: **TS** that ↑ cow bought
4 (1.0)
5 F: was it?
6 (0.3)
7 E: → that (. ) ye:::a *(F turns towards child at ‘yea’)*
During this interaction the father is turned away from the child, who is seated in a high-chair. Towards the end of a lengthy pause in the interaction (25 s), Ella lifts her bowl, drinks and on finishing produces an utterance (line 3) which, it transpires, means something like ‘this is milk the cow brought’. The father responds to this with an utterance produced while continuing to turn the newspaper pages (line 5), but without turning towards the child. At this point, Ella begins (line 7) by responding with a phrase that initially looks like a repeat of her original statement (i.e., as if responding to being asked ‘what’?), pauses for a second, and then produces a marked agreement ‘yes’, that is, treating what the father has said as something appropriate.

However, there are a number of elements bearing on this utterance sequence that indicate interactional trouble of some form. First, precisely at the moment Ella pauses, the father turns towards her, and while she produces ‘ye:::a’, continues to look towards her. This looking begins as she talks, and continues throughout the following pause and is then followed by him turning his attention away (line 9) and producing a somewhat stretched hedge or filler item (‘hm:::::m’). He then produces a clarification request (line 11), to which she responds with a repair of the original trouble source (line 13 for line 3). Here, she produces a upward pitched sustained sound which marks out the essential referent indicated in the original utterance, doing so in a clearly pronounced fashion. Interestingly, immediately after doing so, she returns to the task at hand – drinking – putting her hands down to lift up the bowl. And precisely at this moment of her disengaging with participating, the father turns around, looks at Ella, nods and produces an agreement marker in line 15. Immediately on finishing eating, he then produces an extended utterance displaying agreement and his recognition of his understanding. The father displays some orientation to her third-position repair as he explicitly marks out that her ‘topic’ was something interesting and ‘clever’. In this instance, it would seem that the child displays the ability to monitor the ongoing conversation with regard to whether she is being understood or not, beyond the immediacy of the next turn.

Other-repair/correction (OR/C)

Turning to OR/C repair in the third year, in the next extract the child displays some concern or at least interest in pointing out an incorrect comment or assertion made about her explicitly.
Extract 6 – child age: 2;4

Context: This extract occurs towards the end of breakfast and begins as the child is finishing what she has been drinking. As she speaks, the father is approaching her with a cloth so as to wash her hands – prior to lifting her out of her high-chair.

Summary exposition of extract: As the father is about to wash the child’s hands and face on her finishing eating, he makes a comment about her face. The child corrects (line 10) this comment and the father quickly repeats her correction.

1 E: I don’t want it=
2 F: =you don’t want ‘do you ↓’
3 E: [n::o] (0.8)
4 E: I ↑weal don’t want it=
5 F: =you really don’t ‘want it’
6 E: [ha] hew ‘ma::h’ (1.0)
7 F: TS [wo::w oh] ooo::: that °the little face°
8 E: → not a little fa::ce () big fa::ce=
9 F: =a big fa::ce not a little face↓ (0.2)

Noting in passing that the child produces a self-repair in service of emphasizing something she does not want (line 5), it is at this point that her father, focused on washing the child, interrupts and makes a somewhat stretched sound, followed immediately, and quite quietly, by referring, as he begins to wipe her, to her face as a ‘little face’ (line 10). As soon as the cloth is removed from her face, Ella then repairs or rather corrects what he has just said. With this correction, she makes clear that what he has just said is ‘not the case’, emphasizes the contrasting category (little/big) by a slight pause before saying ‘big’ and with an increased volume/stress. The father’s reply echoes the manner in which she makes the correction, again with stress on ‘big’ and additionally with falling prosody towards the end of the utterance.

Some account of why we might consider this a repair of a factual error is warranted. This repair may occur for obvious reasons; the child believes her face to be big (i.e., because she is a ‘big’ girl) and her father said something contrary to that. This is essentially a disagreement, as earlier in the interaction Ella and her father have discussed what it is to be a ‘big girl’, and thus his comment could be viewed as a ‘slip’ or error in need of correction. In other words, this repair actually has nothing to do with the actual objective size of her face, but is a result of an ongoing effort by Ella to maintain an earlier alignment and agreement to her status as an older child.

We can also note that this repair takes the form of ‘not X, Y’, as described by Schegloff et al. (1977), which includes locating the trouble source and then providing an alternative. The child performs this repair quickly, hampered only by the logistical problem of being washed. She stretches the word ‘face’ in both the first half of her utterance (communicating the cause of the trouble to her
co-participant) and in the second (providing the alternative), and provides a marked pause between them (i.e., is using marking devices in the repair (sound stretching, emphasis, pause, and intonation). The pause contributes towards highlighting the difference between the terms ‘little/big’. She is identifying what should and should not be used when describing her, not merely replacing a ‘wrong’ word.

Other-related repair from the fourth year on (3;1–3;10)

Other-initiated self-repair (OISR)

During the next year we find the child’s use of repair serving more complex conversational actions – as in the following extract during a sequence where she is asking her parent for an explanation of his inconsistent behaviour.

Extract 7 – child age: 3;5

Context: Interaction occurs at the breakfast table. The child has recently put a number of straws into her cup. The father, sitting beside her, is eating food.

Summary exposition of extract: During a stretch of talk where the child is asking the father to explain his behaviour (allowing straws in a cup one day but not the next), the child repairs her utterance in service of her argument/assertion (line 10).

1  (9.5) (child drinking out of cup).
2 E: ↑ why don’t dike me (. ) emm::a (. ) emm::a put in four straw::s in::?
3  (1.4)
4 F: mmhh::
5  (2.4)
6 F: an I think it’s too many
7  (1.1)
8 E: u::h
9  (0.4)
10 E: but you put (. ) fours:: (. ) you put five straws in
11  (0.5)
12 E: yesterday↑ =
13 F: = e::h I was just playing a game (. ) we don’t do it everyday
14  (0.7)

Immediately prior to the interaction, the child and father have disagreed over the number of straws she wishes to have in her cup (this discussion took place in another part of the kitchen). Having returned to the table, and used the four straws while drinking (line 1), the child then asks the father a question about his disapproval evident in the disagreement, and on being provided with an explanation (line 6), then goes on to point out to him that the day before he put many straws in her drink. Notice that in producing her repair in a turn at talk engendered by the, for her, inconsistent or indefensible nature of his response, she appears not only to be calling him to account (the use of the word ‘but’ here as a contrastive conjunction highlights this observation), but also the child works to repair her initial straw figure (four) so as to indicate that his offence is of greater magnitude.
than her own. Indications that the father recognizes his being called to account is evident in the fast-uptake across lines 12–13 (no break between the end of turn-at-talk and the next9) and the content of his utterance – what happened previously was acceptable because that was simply game-playing. In passing, we can also note that the child displays no orientation to repairing the grammatical form of her utterances in this extract (e.g., put in four straws in – line 2; ‘dike’ for ‘you like’ in line 2), the emphasis is on using repair as a resource so as to challenge the adult’s inconsistent behaviour.

Other-repair/correction (OR/C)

By the time this child is over 3 years the manner and form of the other-repair she produces appears to be in line with those found in adult–adult talk (Schegloff, 1997b). Consider extract 8, where the child draws attention to a mistake her father has made commenting on the factual error he makes, at the same time displaying her development in locating and providing what is necessary to perform the repair.

Extract 8 – child age: 3;10
Context: Father and child painting at the kitchen table.

Summary exposition of extract: In this extract the child corrects the adult’s suggestion that white paint is difficult to see when painting. In doing so, she not only corrects the adult but also produces a self-repair on her utterance making clear her assertion.

1 F: I’m gonna use these tiny paints as well
2 (0.1)
3 E: °that one°
4 (1.3)
5 F: I’ve not tried them before
6 (0.3)
7 F: I don’t want to use white:
8 (1.3)
9 F: TS cause you can’t see it=
10 E: → =no::: ↓ °green° you ’CA::N’ (looking closely at painting)
11 F: [xxxx]
12 (0.4)
13 E: YOU CA::N:
14 (0.6)
15 E: → you can see white ↓
16 (4.3)

Following the father’s comments regarding difficulties in being able to see white paint, in line 10, Ella begins her turn with an agreement of the father’s previous statement with ‘no::: ↓ ’ (that you cannot see white) and proceeds to begin a soft utterance regarding ‘green’10 and then produces a correction, ‘you CA::N’. Her father begins to speak after her low-volume articulation of ‘green’, overlaps E’s
utterance ‘you’ but stops speaking as she raises her voice at ‘CA::N’. She then repeats this utterance in line 13, which may be an invitation for her father to agree, disagree, or produce some sort of next turn, indicated by the (0.6) second gap Ella provides. When there is no agreement, she completes this sequence in line 15 with a definitive ‘you can see white ↓’. Her father does not respond with an agreement or rejection (or facial/body language).

The subtle nature of the repair skills germane to each of Ella’s utterances (‘you CAN’, ‘you CAN’, and ‘you can see white’) warrants discussion. Although similar, they each perform a distinct task. This repetition is needed to address three interactional-trouble events in the talk. The first trouble event is her father’s assertion that you cannot ‘see white’; the second is the child’s mistake in agreeing to something that she does not believe to be true; and the third is her father’s overlapping talk (see lines 10–11).

In the first instance, and pragmatically, she needs to repair her father’s overlap and regain the floor in order to prevent the conversation from progressing, given two unaddressed trouble sources. She accomplishes this with the intonation and loudness of her utterance in line 10. The overlapping talk appears to be caused by the father taking a premature turn, possibly initiated by what seems to be a turn-completion by the child. Here, Ella uses a perturbation (an ‘overlap resolution device’ [Schegloff, 2000b]), which is a marked change in the volume or pitch of the utterance from earlier in the turn to signal. The change in Ella’s prosody in line 10 is a repair of the overlapping talk of the father (note ‘you’ has normal volume, and ‘CAN’ increases in volume as the father interrupts). This increase in volume seems to work, as the father stops talking rather abruptly and hands the floor back over to the child.

Second, the trouble-event occurs when Ella agrees with her father (that you cannot see white). Suddenly she begins to produce a new vocalization to refute what she has just said, transforming an agreement to a disagreement. Described elsewhere as a delayed-initiation (Schegloff, 2000b), this is characterized by the initial reciprocation of the prior turn followed by the interruption of this continuation with a repair-initiator. The next turn after the overlap (line 13), a recycled turn beginning, readdresses the trouble of her having initially agreed with her father with a repetition of ‘you can’. This utterance is double-barreled, however; although it is serving as a recycled repair, it also appears to be a challenge (evidenced by the change in volume and the 0.6 gap provided for a response).

The third and final trouble-talk-event is directed to the original trouble source, her father’s claim that you cannot see white. This is evidenced by the child’s identification of the trouble source in the original statement. The tone of this statement is markedly different from the previous, and has a normal volume. This concluding statement asserting that you can see white follows on from the non-response by the father.

**DISCUSSION**

The work reported in this article rests on the view that repair organization, as a structural feature of conversation, offers particular opportunities for child
language researchers and developmental psychologists to look carefully at how children produce repair practices. Doing so can provide insights into how children themselves understand the ongoing sequences of conversations they themselves are party to, that is, leaving aside the potential significance of clarification request practices for language development itself (Chapman, 2000; Golinkoff & Gordon, 1988). Keeping in mind the constraints, challenges, and opportunities specific to the methodology of the longitudinal single case study, the detailed picture of this one child’s conversational repair skills has provided a number of clues into how children might learn the skills and attributes central to acquiring the ability to fully engage in conversation practices.

Turning to the first of the initial questions outlined in the introduction, while the pervasiveness of other-related repair might not seem particularly high it is nonetheless frequent enough, approximately one every 45 s, to warrant our attention, and corresponds with the observation by Ninio (1986) that around 20% of adult-directed child utterances were responded to with parental clarification requests. Unsurprisingly, most of these OIS repairs occur in the ‘third-turn’ position, rather than later in the talk, indicative of the child’s slowly emerging conversational monitoring skills.

Our second question centred on the function of these other-related repair practices, the two main ones being either to draw attention to an incorrect name use or to overcome a misunderstanding in the ongoing conversation. Object naming and acquiring a lexicon during this period is of course a well-documented acquisition phenomenon (e.g., Berko Gleason, 2001). However, it is interesting to observe a child’s own interest in highlighting appropriate naming through other-repair practices. Correcting potential misunderstandings will, one suspects, be interdependent with monitoring not just the talk of another participant, but also his or her actions – and it was evident that this child began to exhibit such a concern from around 2 years of age (ext. 2). There may also be indications that this function of OR/C increases during the early years (Table 2).

Looking more carefully at extract examples allows us to address the third question, what exactly is repaired and under what circumstances. From an early age, we found the child exhibiting a concern for correcting naming (ext. 3), using repair so as to overcome being misunderstood (ext. 2), pointing out an inappropriate answer in an imitation game (ext. 4), and correcting comments made about the child herself (ext. 6). The relatively subtle nature of employing repair as a resource in calling the parent to account was highlighted in extract 7, where it is evident that the child can monitor an ongoing conversation for an extended sequence of turns by the fourth year.

This bears on our fourth initial question – the issue of whether the skills involved with conversational repair rest on the young child’s ability to monitor their own and other people’s conversation. The observation that third-turn repair is more frequent than ‘third-position’ repair in this profile may be indicative of gradually emerging conversational repair skills, although caution is warranted given the low overall frequency. Without the ability to monitor conversation, children are not sensitive to trouble that might indicate that their own utterances have not been sufficient or have been misunderstood. Because so much interaction in the first two years
involves requests and fulfilments of those requests, the only indication the child has that she has been misunderstood may be when she is given something she does not want after a request. Whether or not the repair that ensues is recognition of self-error is debatable; children may be simply rejecting, not making the connection between their own action and the result. As others have pointed out (e.g., Wootton, 1994), conversation monitoring may not be well developed in the early years, that is, evidenced by retroactive repair, but by the second year (e.g., ext. 1), the child is more proactive (and efficient) at making attempts at pre-empting an incorrect course of action being undertaken. The child in later years is able to recognize the parent’s response and anticipate the outcome based on watching the other’s actions, and by monitoring tone, intonation, lack of verbal acknowledgement of the child’s request, and other structurally-relevant elements of conversational interaction.

Finally, this work sought to provide an overall picture of the development of other-related conversational repair. In extract 1 (during the second year) we noted this child’s orientation to the potential trouble of overlapping talk, and by extract 2, indications of understanding the course of a future action. Around the same time (ext. 3), the ability to repair others appears – both correcting their inappropriate use of a referent, and for mistaken repetitions (ext. 4). By 26 months, this child can employ pause length and stretching to gain the attention of the other (ext. 5) and, by 28 months (ext. 6), can display the skills involved in using contrasting terms and emphasis to mark out a repair. And during the fourth year, it would seem that this child can employ repair as a conversational resource when calling someone to account (ext. 7) or indicating to them that they misunderstand something that the child herself has knowledge of (ext. 8 – ‘white paint’). We might note, however, that in this data set there were no clear instances of modulated repair or clear other-initiators (i.e., initiating others to repair themselves). The extent to which each of these skills related to conversational repair might build one upon the other awaits further examination and analysis. A description of the resources a child (children) uses when learning about, and how to participate in, the procedures and practices of talk is essential if we aim to understand how the ‘work done’ becomes in a sense ‘invisible’ – i.e., unnoticeable and unremarkable when fully fledged conversational participants. Notwithstanding the constraints of the single case study, these findings highlight key elements of this child’s developing understanding of what is involved in learning how to participate in conversation. The display of other-repair skills and competencies highlights the child’s emerging recognition of what is required of him or her by others during conversation. The profile outlined here indicates something of the subtleties involved and reminds us that repair organization, while implicated with reference to emerging grammatical competence, itself serves disparate and significant social interactional ends.

NOTES

1. This child’s self-repair skills have been documented elsewhere (Forrester, 2008). Two examples of this child’s spontaneous self-repair are provided in Appendix 2.
2. Details of recording length are provided in Appendix 1, Table A1.
3. See Appendix 3 for an outline of conversation analytic (CA) orthography.
4. Appendix 4 outlines the terminology employed regarding turn-taking in conversation analysis.
5. OISR is most likely to occur in the ‘third turn’ – that is in the first speaker’s next available turn-constructional unit following on from a second speaker indicating trouble of some sort (see Appendix 4 for CA based turn-taking definitions).
6. Interested readers can view the digitized recording of the extracts on the CHILDES database. Extract details are itemized within the ‘web-data’ menu of the most recent (CHILDES, 2008) CLAN software:

CLANX (Mac) WebData/childes/English-uk/Forrester:
Extract 1: lines: 1261–1280 file/77.cha
Extract 2: lines: 392–401 file/99.cha
Extract 4: lines: 272–283 file/104.cha
Extract 5: lines: 454–469 file/112.cha
Extract 6: lines: 1245–1257 file/120.cha
Extract 7: lines: 609–622 file/178.cha
Extract 8: lines: 374–389 file/198.cha

7. It transpires that in the adjoining room she has a toy tea-set and this is what she is requesting.
8. Schegloff et al. (1977), however, were describing self-repair, not other-repair:

‘Not X, Y’ format, in which the ‘not X’ component locates the repairable, and the ‘Y’ component supplies a candidate repair:
A: that store has terra cotta floors. ((pause))
A: → not terra cotta. Terrazzo. (p. 376)

9. See CA orthography in Appendix 3 for details.
10. The video shows that her visual focus is in fact on the paints that her father is hovering over with his brush.
12. However, Schegloff (2000b) describes this phenomenon as occurring in other-initiated repair, but in this example at least, it is seen as also occurring in self-repair. This is an interesting observation regarding the interrelatedness of self- and other-repair. Although Schegloff describes this delayed initiation as other-repair initiation, this phenomenon could also be described as self-repair. The speaker utters something contrary to what they mean to say, recognizes this error, and then repairs it by offering the ‘correct’ response (a challenge or repair-initiator), which can essentially be described as self-repair. It seems that this phenomenon is a double-barrelled utterance, both a self-repair and an initiator. For the purposes of this article, this will not be discussed further, but is a point worth investigating.
13. When overlapping talk is resolved, Schegloff (1987) notes that very often there is a repetition of the talk that was overlapped in the next turn by the speaker who gains speaker’s rights. He refers to this as a ‘recycled turn beginning’, possibly occurring to ensure that the utterance that was overlapped was heard and understood, and to re-establish a neatly sequenced exchange.
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## APPENDIX 1

### Table A1 Overall incidence of repair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (months)</th>
<th>Second year</th>
<th>Third year</th>
<th>Fourth year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 16 17 18 20 21 22 23</td>
<td>24 25 26 27 28 29 29.5 31 32 33 35</td>
<td>37 39 41 41 41.5 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording (min)</td>
<td>18 25 27 25 29 14 26 21</td>
<td>30 44 18 19 27 20 25 20 29 43 18</td>
<td>19 23 24 24 22 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All repair forms</td>
<td>6 9 7 9 21 21 37 5</td>
<td>39 33 12 9 28 15 29 15 22 27 13</td>
<td>11 19 11 15 14 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*repair per min</td>
<td>0.33 0.36 0.26 0.36 0.72 1.5 1.42 0.24</td>
<td>1.3 0.75 0.67 0.47 1.04 0.75 1.16 0.76 0.63 0.72</td>
<td>0.58 0.83 0.46 0.63 0.64 0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-repair (SISR)</td>
<td>1 6 4 5 13 11 27 0</td>
<td>28 24 7 4 15 9 22 9 12 16 10</td>
<td>10 14 5 9 9 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OISR</td>
<td>5 3 2 4 8 10 10 3</td>
<td>9 8 5 3 8 5 7 6 10 11 3</td>
<td>1 2 6 3 2 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR/C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2

Extract A (week 104) (lines 543–542 of 104.cha)
Context: Father and Ella are sitting eating an evening meal and discussing what happened to the child earlier in the day at her nursery. The child is age 2;0.

1 F: who was she saying no to?
2 (0.6)
3 E: m saying no Ella
4 (0.4)
5 F: to Ella?
6 (0.7)
7 F: why?
8 (3.2)
9 F: why did she do that?
10 (0.4)
11 E: TS Rosa hug
12 (0.3)
13 E: cuddle
14 (0.2)
15 E: e
16 (0.2)
17 E: cuddle (. ) Ella =
18 F: = o:h yeah Rosa did cuddle Ella that’s right didn’t she?
19 (1.6)

At line 11 we have an example of self-repair where in answer to a clarification request from the father, Ella begins by describing what her nursery teacher did by beginning with ‘hug’, then subsequently, line 13, changing this word to ‘cuddle’, then moving, in the following utterance to being saying ‘e’ (for Ella), and at line 17 repairs this sound combining it with a repetition of line 13 finally using the phrase ‘cuddle Ella’. This not-untypical example of ‘self-initiated’ self-repair was more common than other forms of repair in this data set (see Forrester, 2008).

Extract B (week 126) (lines 596–602 of 126.cha) (child age 2;5)
Context: Here the child is sitting at the breakfast table with her sibling (EV) and discussing what she will eat next. As she speaks at line 1 she is looking directly at EV, and her father is out of camera moving around the kitchen.

1 E: TS ↑ Then have some cumpet l::ater (nodding as speaks to EV)
2 (0.3)
3 F: (cough noise)
4 (0.2)
5 E: then I have my cumpet [l::ater] (turns and looks at F)
6 (0.3)
7 EV: (laugh)
8 (0.3)
9 E: naw
In this example, across lines 1–5 the child self-repairs her early statement regarding what she will have to eat next, by inserting the pronoun ‘I’ and altering ‘some’ [crumpet] to ‘my’. One might surmise that she was seeking an agreement from her sister at line 1 and may have wished to clarify who exactly was going to eat some crumpet; however, this suggestion remains speculative, particularly as her sister replies to the repair simply by laughing.

**APPENDIX 3: CONVERSATION ANALYSIS ORTHOGRAPHY**

The conventions employed represent a reduced set of those developed by Atkinson and Heritage (1984).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription element</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Transcription element</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>↑ or ↓</td>
<td>Marked rise (or fall) in intonation</td>
<td>:::</td>
<td>Sounds that are stretched or drawn out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>:::</td>
<td>(number of :: indicates the length of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stretching)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underlining</td>
<td>Used for emphasis (parts of the utterance</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>Overlaps, cases of simultaneous speech or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that are stressed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>interruptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPPER-CASE</td>
<td>Indicate increased volume (note this can be</td>
<td>° word °</td>
<td>Shown when a passage of talk is noticeably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LETTERS</td>
<td>combined with underlining)</td>
<td></td>
<td>quieter than the surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.hhh</td>
<td>A row of h’s with a dot in front of it</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>When there is nearly no gap at all between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indicates an inbreath. Without the dot</td>
<td></td>
<td>one utterance and another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>an outbreak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(comment)</td>
<td>Analyst’s comment about something going on</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>Small pauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the talk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; word&lt;</td>
<td>Noticeably faster speech</td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
<td>Silences (time in s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;word&gt;</td>
<td>Noticeably slower speech</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>Untranscribed talk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4: CONVERSATION ANALYTIC TURN-TAKING TERMINOLOGY

In conversation analytic terminology a ‘turn’ is composed of a turn-constructional unit that can be of any length. A transition relevant pause defines the gap between one speaker and a next speaker. The talk in line 4 contains a self-repair.

---

1. Sp1: it’s lovely down here
2. (0.4)
3. Sp2: yea[:]
4. Sp1: TS [ sure it’s] going to rain again in a min::: [xxx minute]
5. Sp2: [it’s very bright]
6. (0.6)

TRP = transition relevant pause
TCU = turn construction unit
TS = trouble source

---
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