

# Beyond Answering: Repeat-Prefaced Responses in Conversation

Galina B. Bolden

*The article presents a conversation analytic investigation of one technique for responding to questions in naturally occurring social interactions: repeating the question verbatim in part or as a whole before providing a required response. A close examination of production features of repeat prefacing in Russian demonstrates that it is used by conversationalists to resist agendas and presuppositions generated by questions and other sequence initiating actions. The study shows that some repeat prefaces characterize questions as problematic by contesting or outright rejecting its presuppositions or implications. Depending on how precisely repeat prefaces are articulated, they may also display the speaker's difficulty in retrieving requested information. The study extends our understanding of devices conversationalists can deploy to resist, sidestep, or curtail the constraints imposed by questioners' interactional agendas, thereby providing an insight into how communicative goals are discerned, responded to, and negotiated in social interaction.*

*Keywords:* Questions and Answers; Conversation Analysis; Russian Language; Intonation

This article examines a communicative strategy for resisting goals or agendas in conversation. The focus is on a discursive move a respondent can make to tacitly characterize the action to which they are responding (e.g., a question, a request, or an offer) as in some way problematic, inapposite, or inaccurate. The practice, referred to as “repeat prefacing,” consists of repeating verbatim (part of) the initiating action prior to responding to it. The article shows that repeat prefacing is used in

---

Galina B. Bolden (PhD, University of California-Los Angeles) is an Assistant Professor at the Department of Communication, Rutgers University. Her research focuses on studying everyday talk-in-interaction in English and Russian languages, both in ordinary and institutional settings. Correspondence to: Dr. Galina B. Bolden, Rutgers University, Communication, 4 Huntington Street, New Brunswick, NJ 08901, USA. E-mail: [gbolden@rci.rutgers.edu](mailto:gbolden@rci.rutgers.edu). I would like to thank Jeffrey Robinson and Jenny Mandelbaum for their insightful comments on earlier versions of this manuscript.

conversation to (subtly) challenge the “definition of the situation” (Goffman, 1959) implied or directly conveyed by the question.

Questions and answers are among the most readily recognizable and pervasive ways through which participants achieve and negotiate their communicative goals. Prior research in the conversation analytic tradition has described how questions and answers serve as vehicles for accomplishing social actions and displaying alignments (e.g., Schegloff, 2007). As a first pair part in an adjacency pair, a question imposes constraints on what can—and should—be relevantly done in a responding turn (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, 2007). Boyd and Heritage (2006) and Heritage (2003) summarize these constraints as follows. First, questions (and other first pair parts) set topical and action *agendas* by requesting the addressee to engage with a specific topic and/or perform a particular responsive action. Second, questions embody *presuppositions* about aspects of the addressee’s life circumstances, beliefs, knowledge, etc. For example, the question “what car do you drive?” conveys the speaker’s presumption that the addressee owns and drives a car—a presupposition that can be either confirmed or disconfirmed by the response. Third, questions incorporate *preferences* that designate some responses as “preferred” (aligning, agreeing with, or advancing the initiated course of action) and others as “dispreferred” (disaligning, disagreeing, or blocking the action) (Heritage, 1984; Sacks, 1987; Schegloff, 2007).

Conversation analytic research has demonstrated that interlocutors design their paired actions (adjacency pairs) in ways that convey their orientation towards these constraints. Here, grammatical features of turn design are closely tied to the organization of social action. One major realization of this relationship is in the difference between the formats of preferred or dispreferred responses. Overwhelmingly, preferred responses—those that comply with the initiated course of action (such as, acceptances or agreements)—are immediate, straightforward, and brief, whereas dispreferred responses (rejections and disagreements) are delayed, mitigated, and extended (Heritage, 1984; Sacks, 1987; Schegloff, 2007). This correlation between action and answer design is so strong that even momentary delays after a sequence-initiating action are heard by participants as projecting a dispreferred response (Davidson, 1984; Heritage, 1984).

Questions constrain what can be done next, but respondents are active agents who can marshal a range of resources for resisting, problematizing, or evading agendas and presuppositions put forth by sequence-initiating actions. For example, Raymond (2003) has demonstrated that *yes/no* interrogatives impose specific grammatical constraints on answers and that respondents design their answers so as to either conform (“type-conforming responses”) or avoid conforming with these constraints (“nonconforming responses”). Type-conforming responses start with a *yes* or *no* response token and convey the unproblematic treatment of the question’s action agenda and presuppositions. On the other hand, nonconforming responses (those that lack a *yes* or *no*) in some way problematize the action the first speaker is attempting to implement. Raymond shows that this seemingly minute difference in answer designs allows respondents to display their stance towards the action

implemented by the question or towards the presuppositions embodied by the question format.

There are other ways for respondents to display their less than full compliance or alignment with a question. For example, Heritage (1998) found that, in English, a question's recipient can mark it as in some way inapposite (e.g., inappropriate, irrelevant, or misplaced) by prefacing the response with the discourse marker *oh*. Answerers may also defer responding to the sequence-initiating action by initiating repair on it, a practice for indicating incipient disalignment (Schegloff, 1997, 2007; Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977; Wu, 2006). Other forms of resistance may involve various ways of reformulating the question to avoid answering what was actually asked—a practice commonly deployed by interviewees in news-interview contexts (Clayman, 1993). These and other findings into the organization of sequences demonstrate that respondents have a range of practices available to them for resisting the interactional constraints put forth by questions and other sequence-initiating actions. Notably, these practices involve breaking the contiguity of the unfolding course of action by, in some way, delaying (and sometimes evading) the searched-for response.

This article builds upon and extends this research by examining a previously unanalyzed practice for responding to sequence-initiating actions<sup>1</sup> in ways that show active resistance to the question's agendas and presuppositions. As stated above, the specific practice under investigation is a turn-initial repeat of (part of) a question (or another first pair part) deployed as a preface to the required response. Focusing on its usage in Russian<sup>2</sup> mundane conversations, I show that repeat prefacing indicates “a problem” with (and a nonaligning stance towards) the sequence-initiating action. This intentionally vague initial characterization is meant to suggest that repeat prefacing, as a practice of speaking, is a rather general resource that can be used for a variety of related interactional ends. The analysis will demonstrate that interlocutors are oriented to subtle differences in composition and articulation of repeat prefaces, and that these differences help disambiguate the nature of the problem being indexed and how it is to be dealt with.

### Data and Method

The article takes a conversation analytic approach to analyze casual, naturally occurring, recorded interactions in Russian (for a review, see Heritage, 1984). A conversation analytic inquiry proceeds by examining recordings of naturally occurring interactions in order to uncover systematic practices (i.e., ways of talking and other conduct) by which social actions are brought about or, alternatively, to describe social actions a particular interactional practice aims to accomplish (Schegloff, 1997). Following the latter route, the article seeks to explicate what action, or actions, a specific way of responding accomplishes and to ground the analysis in participants' own observable conduct. To this end, approximately 60 hours of recorded conversations between native Russian speakers were examined, yielding 94 candidate instances of repeat-prefaced responses. Traditional conversation analytic

methods of data transcription<sup>3</sup> and analysis were supplemented by a computerized phonetic analysis of pitch contours using the *Praat* program.<sup>4</sup>

### Description of the Practice

Repetition is extremely common and multifunctional in conversation and other forms of talk-in-interaction (for a review, see Stivers, 2005). It is, therefore, necessary to specify what kinds of repetitions are to be considered. Schegloff (1996, pp. 177–179) differentiates between repeats that initiate a sequence of actions (such as, initiating repair on the other's talk), repeats placed in responsive positions (second position repeats), and repeats that receive or register a response in the third position (see also Schegloff, 1997, pp. 527–536). The differentiation is important because sequential placement is crucial in determining what action is being accomplished (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). This investigation is limited to “second position” repeats: those that occur after a question has been issued, by the person from whom the response is due.

Importantly, repeat prefaces under investigation are articulated in such a way as to project further talk by the same speaker. This articulation contrasts sharply with that of repeats designed to initiate repair (in this and other positions). By using repetition to initiate repair on another person's talk, the speaker indicates that s/he has trouble hearing or understanding what was said or that the other person misspoke in some way, while, at the same time, offering evidence of a good grasp of the trouble source (Schegloff, 2000; Schegloff et al., 1977). In response to the repair initiation, the trouble-source speaker may confirm or correct the candidate hearing or provide clarification of the trouble-source (Wu, 2006). The distinguishing feature of other-initiated repair initiators is that that they are articulated in such a way as to elicit recipient response. In Russian this is accomplished through intonation: Unlike other repeats, repair initiators are produced with a markedly rising final pitch contour that signals to the addressee that a response is required.<sup>5</sup> Here is one example of a partial repeat that accomplishes repair initiation and elicits a response that clarifies the trouble source:

Excerpt 1: [70] GM17

- |   |       |   |     |
|---|-------|---|-----|
| 1 | ROS:  | Ty xadila <b>v senagogu</b> sevodnja?/<br>you went to synagogue today<br>Did you go to the synagogue today? | <-  |
| 2 | (0.2) |   |     |
| 3 | MAS:  | <b>V senagogu:?!/</b><br>to synagogue<br>To the synagogue?  | <<- |
| 4 | (0.2) |   |     |

- 5 ROS: Na uchëbu,/na [uchëbu/  
for study for study  
To study, to study
- 6 MAS: [.hh Ne::t/ Vabsche za:vtra uchëba/  
no generally tomorrow study  
No in fact the classes are tomorrow
- 7 [.h
- 8 ROS: [A za[:vtra  
oh tomorrow
- 9 MAS: [Nda no ja:: h ne znaju ja/  
yes but I no know I  
Yes but I don't know
- 10 MAS: Ja:: uzhe paltara mesjaca ne xadila/  
I already 1.5 months not went  
I haven't gone for a month and a half

Masha's repair initiator at line 3 is produced with a dramatically rising pitch contour on the repeated phrase (represented by the question mark). In response to this repair initiator, Rosa clarifies what she meant by her question (line 5), which allows Masha to respond to it (line 6). In cases like this, recipients treat the repeat as a sequence-initiating action that requires a response (by providing a clarification or confirmation of the trouble source). Placed after the first pair part, these repeats initiate an "insert sequence" (Schegloff, 2007): Once the repair is dealt with, the initial question is responded to.

Although there may be an affinity between the practice of repeat-formatted repair initiation and repeat prefacing (as will be discussed at the end of the article), the focus of this investigation is *not* on the repeats that initiate repair, but on those that are not produced to (and do not) elicit a response. The primary difference between repeats that require a response and those that do not is in the intonation: Repair initiators are articulated with a sharply rising pitch, whereas repeat prefaces are commonly produced with a downward ("final"), slightly rising or slightly rising-falling ("continuous"), or flat ("nonfinal") pitch contour at the end of the repeat. For example, in the following segment the repeat is produced with a final intonation:

Excerpt 2: [19] NAD1

Natasha has just attempted to walk into a locked room.

- 1 NAT: A **pachemu** zaperta,/ <-  
why locked  
Why is it locked?
- 2 (0.2)
- 3 MIS: **Pachemu**:/ <<-  
Why

- 4 (0.2)
- 5 MIS: Pereadiva(h)[::eca/  
changes  
She's changing
- 6 GRE: [(Dagadajsja) s trëx raz/  
guess with three times  
Take three guesses

Misha's repeat in line 3 does not have the dramatic pitch rise associated with questioning intonation. Instead it carries a slightly downward intonation on the final syllable (indicated by the slash<sup>6</sup> on the transcript), a common way of ending a turn without requesting a response in Russian. As will be shown below, how exactly a repeat preface is articulated conveys what action the speaker means to accomplish—i.e., what stance is being taken with regards to the prior talk.

Second position, turn-initial repeats (the target phenomenon) can either consist of a partial repeat of the sequence-initiating action or a full repeat. An example of a partial repeat can be seen in Excerpt 3, where the speaker repeats a key phrase from the preceding turn before responding to it.

Excerpt 3: [6] RP18

Vitya and Dina are on the phone, discussing restaurant choices for a celebration. Vitya has been passing Dina's questions on to his girlfriend (GF) off the line

- 1 DIN: .hSlu:shaj a sprasj mozhet byt' pajdëm v **Gasti?nus** tagda/ <-  
listen PRT ask may be will-go to NAME then  
Listen ask her maybe we'll go to Gastinus ((restaurant)) then?
- 2 (0.2)
- 3 VIT: ((to GF)) Mozhet- ((to RIT)) **V Ga:sti,nus/** Ty shto/= <<-  
maybe- to NAME you what  
Maybe- To Gastinus,/ That's crazy
- 4 DIN: =N[e,  
not  
No?
- 5 VIT: [Eta neverajatnijshie den'gi/  
that unbelievable money  
The cost is out of this world
- 6 (0.2)
- 7 DIN: Du:?'maesh/  
think  
You think?
- 8 (.)
- 9 VIT: Hm-mmm,/

- 10 (.)
- 11 DIN: .hhh Nu xarasho=nu pashli tagda::em v Metrapol'/ja ne znaju/  
 PRT good PRT go then to NAME I not know  
 Okay then let's go to Metrapol' I don't know

At line 1, Dina suggests a restaurant and asks to pass the suggestion on to Vitya's girlfriend, who is in the room with him. Vitya starts to pass on the suggestion but then cuts himself off and responds to the suggestion himself. His response starts with a partial repeat of Dina's sequence-initiating action (*V Ga:sti,nus* "to Gastinus" at line 3) produced with a continuing intonation (indicated by the comma). The repeat is then followed by Vitya's reaction to the suggestion.

The next extract shows that the first pair part in its entirety may also get repeated before a response is provided:

Excerpt 4: [20] RP30

Dina and Grisha (on two telephone receivers) are talking to Misha, their son

- 1 MIS: [Nu ladna/ My uxodim v Kantri Bufet /  
 PRT okay we leave to Country Buffet  
 Okay then/ We are going to the Country Buffet ((restaurant))
- 2 GRI: e-Ty idësh v Kantri Bufet?/  
 you go to Country Buffet  
 You are going to the Country Buffet?
- 3 (0.2)
- 4 MIS: Hm
- 5 GRI: Why so:/ ((in English))
- 6 (1.5)
- 7 MIS: [(Shto shto)  
 what what  
 What?
- 8 DIN: [A pachmu n-.h a pachmu ne v Perki,ns/ < -  
 PRT why PRT why not to Perkins  
 Why not to the Perkins?
- 9 (1.5)
- 10 MIS: A pachemu ne v Pe,rkins/ << -  
 PRT why not to Perkins  
 Why not to the Perkins/
- 11 Nu my xatim v Kantri Bu[fet/  
 PRT we want to Country Buffet  
 We want the Country Buffet





most common marker of delay is silence, but disaligning responses may also be postponed by expressions of hesitation, appreciation, and the like. Prefacing an answer with a repeat of the question is, of course, a form of delay that breaks the contiguity of the action sequence. It is not surprising, then, that repeat prefaced responses typically disalign from the first pair part action (Schegloff, 1997, argues this point for English). How does repeat prefacing differ from other ways of showing disalignment? What is particular about the recipient's stance conveyed by this prefacing? To answer these questions, let's first very briefly consider two general forms of nonalignment.

### *Forms of disalignment*

First, nonalignment may be conveyed by "dispreferred" second pair parts, i.e., those responses that fail to align with the first pair part action, such as rejections or disagreements. My research shows that, similarly to English, dispreferred responses in Russian are commonly delayed and mitigated in a variety of ways. Dispreferred responses disalign with the first pair part action, yet they typically engage with its agenda and do not contest its presuppositions. Second, speakers may convey a different kind of nonaligning stance by giving an answer that does not conform to the constraints imposed by the format of the question. For example, in response to a first pair part in the form of a *yes/no* interrogative, the recipient may withhold the grammatically required response token (*yes* or *no*) to show that s/he does not accept the question's underlying premise (Raymond, 2003). This practice, documented for English and some other languages (e.g., Sorjonen, 2001), appears to work for Russian as well, as the following segment suggests:

Excerpt 5: HM10-3

- 1 DUS: Vse zdaro,vy/  
everybody healthy  
Everybody is healthy?
- 2 OLG: Nu: Alechka nemnozhka prasty,fshaja/  
PRT NAME a-little caught-cold  
Well Alla caught a bit of a cold
- 3 no tak [nichevo/  
but so nothing  
but otherwise it's fine

To conform with the question as posed (*Vse zdaro,vy* "everybody is healthy?") is to provide a categorical response: either everybody is healthy or somebody is ill. Olga, however, straddles a finer line: one family member has a slight cold, but otherwise things are well (lines 2–3). By packaging this as a nonconforming answer, the speaker is able to sidestep the constraints of the question's form while still engaging with its topical agenda.

Preference and type-conformity are ubiquitous conversational organizations available to interlocutors for displaying stance towards the interactional project

underway. Dispreferred and nonconforming responses can be packaged in a variety of ways, however, and particular turn shapes may be reserved to display certain kinds of nonaligning stances. My analysis demonstrates that by starting a response with a repeat the speaker problematizes the underlying assumptions of the sequence-initiating action. The repeat locates the problematic part of the first pair part (or identifies the whole action as problematic) and the subsequent talk unpacks—often explicitly—the problem with the action. So if nonconforming responses, in general, may simply sidestep the problematic premises of the question, repeat prefacing is used to bring the problems to light. Moreover, repeat prefacing is a practice that can be applied more widely to differently formatted first pair parts. In fact, some questions—such as informational inquiries in the form of a *wh*-interrogative—may not incorporate clearcut preferences (other than the general preference for a conditionally relevant response; Stivers & Robinson, 2006); however, repeat prefacing is still available to respondents as a way to contest the questions' presuppositions (as in: "What time is your flight?—My flight? I am driving.").

My study shows that differences in how repeated segments are articulated and what they are composed of are indicative of the kind and the extent of the problem with the sequence-initiating action. First, by repeating only a part of the first pair part, the speaker identifies the specific target of the problem without problematizing the action as a whole. On the other hand, a full repeat questions the relevance or the appropriateness of the entire action. Second, prosody may be used to differentiate the severity of the problem. Continuing intonation is reserved for relatively minor issues. The speaker projects further talk within the turn where the problem is explicated, exposed, or otherwise dealt with. Repeat prefaces may also be produced with a final intonation, sometimes accompanied by lowered pitch or volume. This intonation indicates a stronger stance towards the initial action as massively incongruent, even though the speaker typically continues beyond the repeat to deal with the action in some way.

#### *Exposing problematic assumptions (continuing intonation)*

The following discussion illustrates the use of turn-initial repeats to expose the problematic assumptions behind the sequence-initiating action. These repeats, typically articulated with continuing intonation, show the speaker's willingness to engage with the action, while indexing some problem in complying with the constraints set forth by it.

*Partial* repeats of the first pair part locate the problem without problematizing the appropriateness of the entire interactional project. In the following conversation, two friends, Natasha and Tanya are making plans for getting together. Tanya's question at line 1 inquires into Natasha's plans for the next day, the assumption being that some plans have already been made.

Excerpt 6: [16] HM14-15

- 1 TAN: Okej,/ A::m (0.2) .hh a:: ladna **chevo zavtra** delaete?/ <-  
 okay okay what tomorrow do  
 Okay Okay what are you doing tomorrow?
- 2 NAT: **Shto za,vt`a**/*<eta-da etava >* my esch-my< eschë da sevodnja <<-  
 what tomorrow that to that we yet we yet to today  
 Tomorrow,/ For that- We haven't even figured
- 3 ne d(h)abr(h)alis' [sh(h)to m(h)y d(h)elaem/.hA zavtra=  
 not got what we do PRT tomorrow  
 out what what we are doing today/ Tomorrow
- 4 TAN: [Nu okej/  
 PRT okay
- 5 NAT: =skarej vsevo:: v: Geti v kakojta mament/ili pa krajnej  
 most likely to Getty at some point or at least  
 most likely we'll go to the Getty at some point/ or at least
- 6 mere [chast' nas paedet tuda/  
 least part us will-go there  
 some of us will go there

A response that would conform to the assumptions set forth by Tanya's question would have involved a listing of (possible) activities arranged for the next day. Natasha, however, starts responding by repeating part of the question (*Shto za,vt`a* "tomorrow") with continuing intonation (marked by the comma), thereby indicating a problem with the inquiry. Natasha then proceeds to state that plans haven't even been made for that night, so the assumption that something has been arranged for the next day is rather incongruous (see laugh tokens at line 3). After Tanya accepts the point ("okay" in line 4), Natasha continues to indicate that some tentative plans had actually been made (lines 5–6) and the two proceed to arrange for a get-together (not shown). So in this case, the partial repeat locates the source of trouble (tomorrow's plans) and the subsequent talk within the turn explicates the speaker's problem in complying with the first pair part. However, the overall interactional project is not subverted.

While partial repeat prefaces indicate a problem with one specific aspect of the sequence-initiating action, *full* repeats (which are much less common) are used to problematize the action as a whole (cf. Robinson & Kevoe-Feldman, 2006). Excerpts 3 and 4 (shown earlier) highlight this difference. In Excerpt 3, Vitya responds to a suggestion of a restaurant by strongly rejecting the suggested location. As noted above, Vitya's response starts with a partial repeat of Dina's suggestion produced with a continuing intonation (*V Ga:sti,nus* "to Gastinus" at line 3). Immediately following the repeat, Vitya characterizes the suggestion as out of bounds and not in line with the kind of event he had in mind (with *Ty shto*, roughly translatable as "what are you thinking" or "that's crazy"). After an acknowledgement from Dina (line 4), Vitya explains his reasons for dismissing the suggestion (the restaurant is too expensive; line 5). Thus, the partial repeat preface is used to locate the problematic aspect of the

suggestion; however, the activity of choosing the restaurant continues as the two discuss another option (from line 11).

Unlike partial repeats, full repeats are used to preface responses that reject the appropriateness of the entire action. Excerpt 4 (seen earlier) is a good parallel case: here, a suggestion of a restaurant is also dismissed. However, rather than rejecting a specific restaurant, the speaker characterizes the entire action of making a suggestion as inappropriate, foreclosing any further discussion. The segment starts as the phone call is being closed. Misha's informing of his plans to go out (line 1) is first challenged by his father (lines 2 and 5). At line 8, his mother (Dina) also contests Misha's restaurant choice by offering an alternative ("Why not to the Perkins?"). After silence, Misha responds to this first pair part by repeating Dina's question in its entirety (without the turn-initial restart due to the overlapping talk at lines 7 and 8). This repeat (produced with continuing intonation) indicates a problem with the question and the action put forward by it. Dina's suggestion is presented as a "why" type question, inviting Misha to account for, or defend, his restaurant choice. An answer that complies with this action would list some reasons for why the choice was made (e.g., the food is better, it's cheaper, etc.). The repeat, however, challenges the appropriateness of such an explanation, and the subsequent utterance gives a "personal desire" account by stating that they "want" to go to the particular restaurant they had chosen (line 11). This is met by Dina's joking command to go to the restaurant of *her* choice (lines 12–13), no further explanation is pursued, the matter is dropped, and the conversation is soon closed (not shown). Thus, we can see that by repeating the entire first pair part, the speaker dismisses the action and refuses to deal with it on the suggested terms. Here, the issue is not the specific suggestion being made but the action of suggesting itself.

Thus, repeat prefaces articulated with continuing intonation contours are used in responses that characterize the sequence-initiating action as problematic. Repeat prefaces identify the trouble source (which may be a specific part of the first pair part or the entire action), and subsequent talk exposes or explicates the problem in some way. Repeat prefacing is used when the sequence-initiating action embodies problematic assumptions about the recipient and his/her life, conveying the respondent's stance towards the action as inappropriate or inapt.

#### *Dismissing massively incongruent actions (final intonation)*

Occasionally turn-initial repeats are used in responses that ridicule or strongly reject the course of action the other is trying to accomplish. In such cases, repeats (either partial or full) are produced with downward final intonation and may be articulated in a prosodically marked way (e.g., with a significant downward shift in pitch or volume). In spite of a final intonation contour, such repeats are treated by participants as incomplete second pair parts since they do not provide a conditionally relevant response. First pair part speakers do not come in on their completion, leaving time for the other to continue the response.

In Excerpt 7, for example, a partial repeat is used to suggest that the assumption embedded in the question is completely out of line with the facts. The three participants are talking about a tree that grew on Tina's backyard.

## Excerpt 7: [5] OlympLN

- 1 TINA: A u menja okala kryl'ca<sub>3</sub>/ (1.0)((eating sounds))  
PRT with me near porch  
Near my porch
- 2 topal' vyras/  
poplar grew  
grew a poplar tree
- 3 (.)
- 4 TINA: Vy<sub>2</sub>ras/  
grew
- 5 (0.2)
- 6 TINA: >Ja evo< pasa[di,la/  
I it planted  
I planted it,
- 7 OLGA: [Prutik tam kakojta:/ byl u te`ja/=  
twig there some was with you  
A little twig you had there
- 8 TINA: =O<sub>1</sub>'ga:/  
NAME
- 9 (.)
- 10 TINA: On v-dva chelavecheskix ro:sta/=  
it two human height  
It's twice the human height
- 11 OLGA: =Heh-[heh
- 12 VIC: [Da?/  
yes  
Really?
- 13 (.)
- 14 VIC: Eta ty sp-s-sama **sazha?la**/  
that you yourself planted <-  
You planted it yourself?
- 15 (0.2)
- 16 OLGA: (O[n prosta tak)  
it just so  
It just
- 17 TINA: [↓**S a z h a l a**/  
planted <<-
- 18 (.)/(.h)

- 19 TINA:   ↑On zaletel v garshok v s'čmechkax/  
 it flew in pot in seeds  
 It flew into the pot as a seed

At line 14, Victor asks if Tina planted the tree herself, which presupposes that the poplar tree was, in fact, planted. This is not an unreasonable assumption given Tina's prior telling (see line 6). However, it turns out that "planting" is hardly what happened—that the seeds simply flew into the pot (line 19). Tina's repeat of the word *Sazhala* "planted" (line 17) locates the problematic aspect of the question, and the subsequent talk unpacks it. The partial repeat is articulated with a markedly lowered pitch (indicated by the down arrow) and downward intonation, and is used as a preface to an answer that dismisses the question as grossly misrepresenting the situation.

In Excerpt 7, the preface is used as an emphatic rejection of the question's presuppositions, whereas in Excerpt 2 (shown above), it is deployed to ridicule the questioner. The recording is of a largish group of friends getting ready to go out to dinner. While the preparations are taking place, Natasha, a houseguest, wants to show the others some of her photographs, but they are in a bedroom. Just prior to this excerpt, Misha (Natasha's husband) indicates that the hostess is changing in that room, and he, therefore, cannot go there to get the photographs. Natasha then decides to go get the pictures herself, but the door is locked and she can't get in. Returning from her failed attempt to get into the room, Natasha asks "Why is it locked?" (at line 1). In its design, this question is a request for an explanation. However, given that she had been previously told that the hostess is changing in that room, the explanation is obvious to her and to everybody else present. In effect, the question is more of a complaint that conveys her displeasure at the situation. Yet Misha chooses to treat this sequence-initiating action as a request for an account (see lines 3–5). However, the account cannot be provided seriously, as it is already known. So first Misha repeats part of the first pair part (*Pachemu*: "why") with downward intonation, thereby indicating that it is the question form that is problematic (request for an account), and not the entire action (complaint). He then continues to state the obvious explanation, interlacing it with laughter, and thereby ridiculing Natasha's question.<sup>7</sup> Another party chimes in to give his teasing response as well (line 6), and the matter is dropped.

A tinge of resentment is also evident in the next example. Here, the entire action is dismissed with a full repeat preface. Olga, who has been on a rather long vacation visiting with family, is speaking with a friend from home who called to wish a Happy New Year.

Excerpt 8: [64] HM10-8

- 1 FAN:   £S nastupajusch[im novym [godam£]/=  
 to upcoming new year  
 Happy New Year
- 2 OLGA:           [.hh           [hh (n)] =

- 3 OLGA: =£Spasi:ba£/ Vas tozhe,/h£  
 thank you too  
 Thank you/ You too
- 4 FAN: **Nu sh`o sly:shna**/rasskazhi/ <-  
 PRT what heard tell  
 What's new/ tell me
- 5 OLGA: ↓**Nu sh`o sly:shna**/gul↑ja:,em/ i[vsë:/ <<-  
 PRT what heard walking and all  
 What's new/ Hanging out/ and that's it
- 6 FAN: [Nu: tam tak uzhe zaguljalisja  
 PRT there so already over-walking  
 You are doing so much entertaining
- 7 shto uzhe i damo?j ne tjanet/  
 that already PRT home not attract  
 that you don't want to go home any more?

At line 4, Fanya asks a type of a “how are you” question, translatable as “what’s new.” The design of the question, Fanya’s enthusiastic tone, as well as the following *rasskazhi* “tell me” strongly imply that there should be something interesting for the addressee to tell. The question projects the speaker’s view of the addressee’s life as full of excitement. Olga’s response (line 5) starts with an almost exact repeat of the question (the turn final “tell me” from line 4 is omitted). Intonationally, Olga’s repeat contrasts with Fanya’s excited enunciation of the question as well as with Olga’s own prior talk (line 3) which was produced with higher pitch and a smile voice. The final downward intonation on the repeat (and the added emphasis on *sh`o* “what”) is suggestive of Olga’s resistance to provide the requested account of the exciting events in her life. In fact, in the rest of the turn, Olga downplays the excitement. The Russian *gul↑ja:,em* can be understood in “hanging out,” “taking it easy,” or “resting,” and the turn final “and that’s it” further emphasizes the lack of thrilling news. In other words, the design of Olga’s answer (including its prosodic features) serves to reject the assumptions that drive Fanya’s inquiry as completely unfounded. (Note that in response, Fanya chooses to put a positive spin on the answer, going with a more favorable interpretation of *guljaem* as “entertaining ourselves.”)

We have seen then that downward-intoned repeat-prefaces take a stronger stance towards the action they respond to, characterizing it as unfounded or grossly off base in its assumptions. As with other repeat prefaces, partial repeats locate the problematic aspect of the inquiry while full repeats serve to dismiss the entire first pair part. Thus, both the composition and the prosodic features of the repeat prefaces are important in understanding the stance the respondent takes towards the sequence-initiating action. Overall, the stance is that of disalignment and disaffiliation. What comes after the preface helps flesh out the respondent’s problem with the first pair part.

### Indicating Information Retrieval Problems

Repeat prefaces are a common design feature of responses to inquiries that ask for specific pieces of information. Ordinarily, repeats in this environment are articulated with either nonfinal (level) or continuing (slightly rising or rising-falling) intonation contours that project further talk within the turn. They typically occur after extended silences, may contain sound stretches, and be followed by other temporizing components typical of word searches (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986). The function of repeat prefaces implicated in these kinds of searches is quite different from what we saw in the previous section. Rather than indicating the speaker's problem with the first pair part action, these repeats signal the speaker's difficulty in retrieving the requested information. These repeats indicate that the response is upcoming yet not immediately available. By repeating (part of) the question in this way, the speaker shows his/her willingness to engage with the question's agenda (i.e., to "do answering"), thereby legitimizing the question, in spite of apparent difficulties in providing the answer.<sup>8</sup>

The respondent may, after repeating part of the question, inform the other person that a search for the requested information is under way. For example, in Excerpt 9, Olga is calling Tanya to find out whether Tanya has a book of Anderson's fairytales (before placing her book order). The answer to this question is not immediately available, and Tanya is apparently undergoing a physical search in an attempt to provide a response.

Excerpt 9: [33] HM7-20

- |   |       |   |      |
|---|-------|---|------|
| 1 | OLGA: | Slušaj (.) u vas e?st' skaski Andersana,<br>listen with you have fairytales LAST_NAME<br>Listen do you have fairytales by Anderson? | < -  |
| 2 |       | (1.0)   |      |
| 3 | TAN:  | .hhhh hSkaski Andersanah=padazhdi<br>fairytales LAST_NAME wait<br>Anderson's fairytales wait  | << - |
| 4 |       | kavota u nas tut est' skaski,<br>somebody's with us here have fairytales<br>we have somebody's fairytales here                      |      |
| 5 |       | (.)   |      |
| 6 | OLGA: | Nvabsche slushaj u menja zhe sva'ja est'/<br>generally listen with me PRT own have<br>Listen actually I have my own (book)          |      |
| 7 |       | (1.0)   |      |
| 8 | OLGA: | Ja uzh dumala zakazat'/(xarash)<br>I PRT thought to-order<br>I was going to order it  |      |



- 9 TAN: [Da u nas est' skaski #Andersana#/]  
yes with us have fairytales LAST\_NAME  
Yes we do have fairytales by Anderson
- 10 (0.2)
- 11 OLGA: E?st' u te`ja/  
have with you  
You do?
- 12 TAN: N:da,  
yes

The repeat (line 3) follows a silence and a long in-breath, both of which delay the provision of a conditionally relevant answer, thereby indicating that an aligning response may not be provided (Sacks, 1987). After repeating the key phrase from the question with a level intonation, Tanya informs Olga that she needs time to come up with a response (*padazhdi* “wait” plus an explanation). This further postpones the provision of the requested information (finally provided in line 9) and indicates that even a longer search is required. Note that Olga’s inquiry (line 1) is in the form of a *yes/no* question. A response that would conform to the constraints imposed by grammatical shape of the question would contain a “yes” or a “no” (Raymond, 2003). By starting her response with the repeat, Tanya indicates that a type-conforming response is currently unavailable. However, after the search is completed, a type-conforming token is provided (*da* “yes” in line 9). The eventual provision of a type-conforming response differentiates cases like this, where a search is underway, from those where the speaker rejects the premise of the sequence-initiating action.

In the following segment, a *wh*-type question is used to request an account of the addressee’s activities:

Excerpt 10: [34] HM12-15

- 1 OLGA: Chë v vyxadnye delali?/ <-  
what on weekend did  
What did you do on the weekend?
- 2 (1.5)
- 3 TAN: .hV vyxadny,e/ a::m hh ↓chë my delali h/ <<-  
on weekend what we did  
On the weekend,/ What did we do/
- 4 Vchera my xadili u nas () mōl novyj pastroili kakojta  
yesterday we went with us mall new built some  
Yesterday we went to- there was a new mall built here

Tanya’s turn-initial repeat follows a long pause and is produced with continuing intonation (indicated by the comma in line 3). Following this repeat, the speaker further postpones the answer with *a::m* and then another partial repeat of the question (↓*chë my delali* “what did we do”), which has a quality of self-addressed

speech (see especially the lowered pitch level indicated by the down arrow). All of these temporizing elements indicate the speaker's orientation to providing a requested answer (cf. Stivers & Robinson, 2006), while, at the same time, conveying difficulty in formulating the response. Subsequently, the requested account of activities is produced (starting from line 4), so that the response is again conforming to what the inquiry was looking for.

To summarize, turn-initial repeats in response to inquiries may be used to indicate that the speaker has difficulty in retrieving the requested information and is searching for it (either "mentally" or physically). Such repeats are produced with nonfinal or continuing intonation, both of which project further talk within the turn. Other temporizing elements typical of word searches may also be presented, either from the outset or immediately following the repeat, contributing to the distinct function of these repeats as indexing the speaker's retrieval problems.

### Repairing Inaccurate Formulations

Earlier it was observed that the practice of repeating a part of the preceding utterance before responding to it should be distinguished from a related practice through which repair on prior talk is initiated (other-initiated repair or OIR). As we saw, repeats that initiate repair are produced in such a way as to elicit a response from the speaker of the trouble source (with sharply rising intonation), whereas repeat prefaces project further talk by the same speaker. Yet the two practices are related: Both consist of repeating a part of another person's talk and both index the speaker's difficulty in responding to the preceding utterance. Additionally, similarly to repeat prefacing, repair initiation may function as a vehicle for showing the speaker's disalignment from the sequence-initiating action (Schegloff, 1997, 2007; Schegloff et al., 1977; Wu, 2006). This close affinity between the two actions raises the question of their relative deployment: Why choose one over the other? Can we differentiate contexts in which one or the other is deployed, and if so how? Is there a difference in the interactional jobs they are supposed to fulfill?

As it turns out, repeat-formatted repair initiators in this sequential environment are reserved for dealing with inaccuracies in the first pair part. In my collection, the inaccuracies are typically incorrect or unclear person, place, or time references.<sup>9</sup> By initiating repair via a question-intoned repeat of the trouble source, the speaker gives the first-pair-part speaker a chance to correct, clarify, or confirm the problematic reference. So, whereas repeat prefacing is used to display a problem with the *action* being implemented, repeat-formatted repair initiators are reserved for more "genuine" referential problems.

In Excerpt 1 (considered earlier), the recipient of the question initiates repair (line 3) on a part of the question that formulates a location. The first-pair-part speaker (Rosa) treats Masha's repair initiator (line 3) as indicating a problem with understanding the place reference ("the synagogue") and clarifies its meaning (line 5 is a possible syntactic continuation of line 1 and is meant to clarify that the inquiry was about the (English) classes conducted at the synagogue). Once the clarification is

received, the requested answer is unproblematically provided (line 6). Note that the answer immediately follows the clarification and starts with a type-conforming response token (“no”). Masha then continues with a correction of Rosa’s position (“In fact the classes are tomorrow” at line 6)—a correction that illuminates the cause of Masha’s initial difficulty with the question.

Let’s return for a moment to Excerpt 3 (shown earlier) where a place reference is also what gets repeated in the preface. The repeat preface there was used as vehicle for rejecting the sequence-initiating action (the suggestion of the specific restaurant), but did not display any problem in understanding the place reference in itself. By contrast, repeat-formatted repair initiation in Excerpt 1 marks the place formulation as problematic. In other words, the repair initiation deals with problems in how the sequence-initiating action is formulated, whereas repeat prefacing suggests that the action implemented by the first-pair-part speaker is problematic.

This is further illustrated by the following example, where a person reference is repaired:

Excerpt 11: [72] RP14

((discussing their friends’ plans for an upcoming trip))

- |   |       |  |         |
|---|-------|--|---------|
| 1 | ZHEN: | [(A) ty ne znaesh ani s <u>Edikam</u> ne by?dut<br>PRT you not know they with NAME not will<br>Do you know if they will be meeting with Edik | <-      |
| 2 |       | vstrechaca sluchajna v Izraele/<br>meet accidentally in Israel<br>in Israel by any chance?   |         |
| 3 |       | (0.5)  |         |
| 4 | DINA: | <S: <u>Edika?m</u> >/= ((sounds surprised))<br>with NAME<br>With Edik?   | <<<-OIR |
| 5 | ZHEN: | =Da/<br>yes  | <<<-    |
| 6 |       | (.)  |         |
| 7 | ZHEN: | Geterem/<br>LAST NAME  | <<<-    |
| 8 |       | (.)  |         |
| 9 | DINA: | Pamojm^u <u>ne::t</u> /<br>my-view no<br>Not as far as I know  |         |

Dina’s problem in recognizing the person reference is marked by a delayed initiation of repair on it (line 4). Zhenya initially just confirms the reference (line 5), but then provides additional information (last name) that clarifies who she is referring to (line 7). Having received the clarification, Dina is now able to respond to the initial question (line 9). As in Excerpt 1, Dina’s answer provides the requested information and conforms to the grammatical form of the question.

This brief examination of repeat-formatted repairs launched after a sequence-initiating action suggests that (in Russian) they are reserved for dealing with inaccurate or insufficient formulations (e.g., place or person references) and used to request clarification of the reference. This finding suggests that while both repeat prefaces and repair initiators indicate a problem with the initiating action, the types of problems addressed by these two actions are quite different. Repair initiations deal with issues of intersubjectivity or understanding while repeat prefacing is reserved for problematizing actions (that are quite clearly understood).

### Conclusions

This article has examined one strategy for resisting interactional agendas implemented through questions and other initiating actions—repeat prefacing. Generally speaking, the function of repeat prefacing is to indicate the speaker's disaligning stance towards the preceding action. First, repeat prefaces that are articulated with continuing or final intonation indicate the speaker's inability (or refusal) to deal with the first pair part action due to its inappropriate or massively incongruent assumptions. The target of the problem is revealed by what specifically is being repeated. Partial repeats indicate a problem with a particular aspect of the action, and full repeats suggest the speaker's refusal to participate in the interactional project as a whole. Second, repeat prefaces may be articulated with nonfinal intonation contours and/or be accompanied by a variety of search indicators. Such repeat prefaces convey the speaker's difficulty in retrieving the requested information, which is, eventually, provided after a search. Finally, repeat prefaces were compared with repeat-formatted repair initiators, distinguishable by their sharply rising intonation contours. The usage of repeat-formatted repair initiators in this sequential environment is apparently limited to repairing inaccurate or unclear formulations.

Repeat prefacing is thus one strategy a respondent can use to problematize what the other sets out to accomplish. A responsive position is often viewed as a position of weakness or even powerlessness where little can be achieved beyond simply abiding by the question. Undoubtedly, answerers are constrained by agendas, presuppositions, and design preferences of sequence-initial actions; yet, there are ways to subvert the constraints. The practice documented here adds to the growing literature on devices participants can deploy to resist, sidestep, or curtail the constraints imposed by questions and other sequence-initiating actions (e.g., Heritage, 1998, 2007; Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Raymond, 2003; Schegloff, 1996; Stivers, 2005). Repeat prefacing, as we saw, is a broadly implemented resource that can be very finely tuned—through variations in prosody and lexical composition—to convey the “just right” stance towards the initiating action and, thereby, its speaker. In the discussed examples, respondents used repeat prefaces to convey stances ranging from mild misalignment to massive incongruity and implicit criticism.

This investigation presented a detailed examination of the interplay between different modalities in talk-in-interaction. We saw that the action implemented by a particular turn shape (repeat preface) in a particular sequential context (in a second,

responsive position) is modulated by the prosodic features of its production. Traditional communication research has investigated the role of various paralinguistic cues in regulating talk and by reference to speaker characteristics and perceived message effectiveness, but the role of prosody in forming conversational actions has been largely overlooked. Moreover, particular aspects of speech production (tempo, pitch, loudness, etc.) are typically examined in isolation from other cues and from contexts of their occurrence (for a review, see for example, Burgoon & Bacue, 2003). However, recent work in conversation analysis and interactional linguistics (see, e.g., Couper-Kuhlen & Ford, 2004) has demonstrated the importance of analyzing prosody in the context of actual, recorded interactions, as one resource interlocutors use to form recognizable social actions and to make sense of each other's conduct. The relationships between lexical, sequential, and prosodic resources documented here attest to the importance of examining these resources together, as they are concurrently deployed by participants to carry out their everyday interactional work.

The study also contributes to communication research on how communicative goals are accomplished and resisted in social interaction. We saw that repeat prefacing is used to point to the preceding action's problematic assumptions—assumptions that preclude the speaker from fully complying with what has been asked. Repeat prefacing may thus be used to postpone (and sometimes avoid) overt rejection or criticism, which is one way of dealing with the face threatening nature of such responses (see Heritage, 1984; Lerner, 1996, on the importance of timing for doing facework). This study thus contributes to the recent move in communication research to look at communicative goals as a process thoroughly grounded in the give-and-take of social interaction (Berger, 2007; Sanders & Fitch, 2001; Wilson, 2002). By focusing on details of actual recorded conversations we can get a front-seat view of how interactional agendas are made visible, discerned, and negotiated on a moment-by-moment basis.

### Notes

- [1] First pair part informings (such as, announcements, or tellings) were excluded from the investigation as they implicate different kinds of constraints on the responsive actions, some of which are prototypically accomplished by questioning repeats or prorepeats that demonstrate “ritualized disbelief,” “surprise,” or “newsworthiness” of the prior talk (Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 2006). Additionally, so far I have been unable to find nonquestioning repeats after first position informings in my data set.
- [2] This investigation is limited to Russian, but preliminary work suggests that repeat prefacing may operate somewhat similarly in English (and perhaps other languages).
- [3] Russian transcription conventions are described in Bolden (2008).
- [4] This software can be accessed at [www.praat.org](http://www.praat.org). For space considerations, pitch contour graphs are not included but are available at [www.scils.rutgers.edu/directory/gbolden/index.html](http://www.scils.rutgers.edu/directory/gbolden/index.html)
- [5] This is apparently different from English repeat prefaced responses. According to Schegloff (1997), English repeat prefaced responses may be produced with rising intonation and yet still not be treated as repair. I haven't found any such instances in Russian.

- [6] In the transcription conventions used here, a comma and a question mark are placed after the syllable carrying the distinct intonation contour that will be actualized at the unit boundary. A slash (/) marks the unit boundary. When not preceded by other intonation marks, the slash shows default, somewhat falling pitch contour. A period followed by a slash (./) indicates a final pitch fall that is larger than the default one. For more information on transcription conventions, see Bolden (2008).
- [7] Given the silence at line 4, an argument might be made that Misha's "why" (line 3) was designed as a complete turn rather than a preface. However, the repeat does not provide a conditionally relevant response to Natasha's action (as either a request for an explanation or as a complaint), and given its articulation, does not invite further talk from the recipient.
- [8] On some occasions, the status of the repeat preface as "marking a problem with the question" versus "marking information search" changes on a moment-by-moment basis as the turn unfolds. In other words, some repeats are, from the outset, hearable as initiating a search, whereas others may initially sound very similar to the repeat prefaces that problematize the first pair part. However, the latter may be immediately followed by other search indicators (*uhms*, overt search formulations, etc.). So, what is initially presented as a disaligning response may a moment later be recharacterized as a search. Such cases highlight the flexibility of this practice.
- [9] This does not seem to be the case for other languages (such as English or Mandarin) where repeat-formatted repair is used for a variety of different interactional jobs (see, e.g., Schegloff, 1997; Wu, 2006). The difference might be attributable to a wider usage of repeat *prefacing* in Russian.

## References

- Berger, C. R. (2007). Communication: A goal-directed, plan-guided process. In D. R. Roskos-Ewoldsen & J. L. Monahan (Eds.), *Communication and social cognition: Theories and methods* (pp. 47–70). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Bolden, G. B. (2008). Reopening Russian conversations: The discourse particle *-to* and the negotiation of interpersonal accountability in closings. *Human Communication Research*, 34, 99–136.
- Boyd, E., & Heritage, J. (2006). Taking the patient's medical history: Questioning during comprehensive history taking. In J. Heritage & D. W. Maynard (Eds.), *Communication in medical care: Interactions between primary care physicians and patients* (pp. 151–184). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Burgoon, J. K., & Bacue, A. (2003). Nonverbal communication skills. In J. O. Greene & B. R. Burlison (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and social interaction skills* (pp. 179–219). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Clayman, S. E. (1993). Reformulating the question: A device for answering/not answering questions in news interviews and press conferences. *Text*, 13, 159–188.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E., & Ford, C. E. (Eds.). (2004). *Sound patterns in interaction: Cross-linguistic studies from conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Davidson, J. (1984). Subsequent versions of invitations, offers, requests, and proposals dealing with potential or actual rejection. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 102–128). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Goodwin, M. H., & Goodwin, C. (1986). Gesture and coparticipation in the activity of searching for a word. *Semiotica*, 62, 51–75.
- Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. New York: Polity Press.
- Heritage, J. (1998). Oh-prefaced responses to inquiry. *Language in Society*, 27, 291–334.

- Heritage, J. (2003). Designing questions and setting agendas in the news interview. In P. J. Glenn, C. D. LeBaron, & J. S. Mandelbaum (Eds.), *Studies in language and social interaction: In honor of Robert Hopper* (pp. 57–90). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Heritage, J. (2007). *Constructing and navigating epistemic landscapes: Progressivity, agency and resistance in initial elements of responses to yes/no questions*. Paper presented at the International Pragmatics Association conference, Göteborg, Sweden.
- Heritage, J., & Raymond, G. (2005). The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68, 15–38.
- Lerner, G. H. (1996). Finding “face” in the preference structures of talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 59, 303–321.
- Raymond, G. (2003). Grammar and social organization: Yes/no type interrogatives and the structure of responding. *American Sociological Review*, 68, 939–967.
- Robinson, J. D., & Kevoe-Feldman, H. (2006). “Understanding” other-initiated repair: *The full, patterned, questioning repeat*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Sacks, H. (1987). On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organization* (pp. 54–69). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696–735.
- Sanders, R. E., & Fitch, K. L. (2001). The actual practice of compliance seeking. *Communication Theory*, 11, 263–289.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Confirming allusions: toward an empirical account of action. *American Journal of Sociology*, 104, 161–216.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Practices and actions: Boundary cases of other-initiated repair. *Discourse Processes*, 23, 499–545.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2000). When “others” initiate repair. *Applied Linguistics*, 21, 205–243.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53, 361–382.
- Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8, 289–327.
- Sorjonen, M.-L. (2001). Simple answers to polar questions. In M. Selting & E. Couper-Kuhlen (Eds.), *Studies in interactional linguistics* (pp. 405–431). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Stivers, T. (2005). Modified repeats: One method for asserting primary rights from second position. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 38, 131–158.
- Stivers, T., & Robinson, J. D. (2006). A preference for progressivity in interaction. *Language in Society*, 35, 367–392.
- Wilkinson, S., & Kitzinger, C. (2006). Surprise as an interactional achievement: Reaction tokens in conversation. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 69, 150–182.
- Wilson, S. R. (2002). *Seeking and resisting compliance: Why people say what they do when trying to influence others*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wu, R.-J. R. (2006). Initiating repair and beyond: The use of two repeat-formatted repair initiations in Mandarin conversation. *Discourse Processes*, 41, 67–109.