Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

On the Organization of Repair in Multiperson Conversation: The Case of "Other"-Selection in Other-Initiated Repair Sequences

Galina B. Bolden

Department of Communication
Rutgers University

This article examines a previously undocumented way in which the presence of more than two inter-locutors matters for the organization of repair (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977): when the repair initiation is addressed to—and thereby selects as the next speaker—somebody other than the speaker of the trouble-source turn (*"other"-selection,* for short). The speaker of the trouble-source turn is ordinarily the one who is selected to repair it (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). Under what circumstances, then, is "other"-selection used? The analysis shows that, while rare, "other"-selection in other-initiation of repair is a systematically deployed practice. In selecting somebody other than the speaker of the trouble-source turn to provide a repair solution, the repair initiator orients to two broad considerations (sometimes concurrently): *progressivity* and *social epistemics*. The arti-cle examines how these considerations play out in a variety of contexts and considers implications of "other"-selection for our understanding of the repair organization.

This article is concerned with the organization of repair in conversations between more than two participants. Goffman (1981) argued that the view of social interaction as a dyadic exchange between a speaker and a hearer is vastly oversimplified. While much initial work in conversa-tion analysis was based on two-party telephone conversation, research on multiparty conversation over the past three decades provides for a more nuanced examination of talk-in-interaction and its organization. In *Lectures on Conversation*, Sacks (1992) suggested that a multiparty conversation may need to be considered as an analytically distinct phenomenon rather than simply a variant of two-party conversation (p. 523). Along these lines, Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) observed that turn taking is sensitive to the number of participants acting as individuals (*persons*) or as (sometimes multiperson) *parties* (Schegloff, 1995).[1] Subsequent research has analyzed sev-eral aspects of the turn-taking organization of multiparty conversation, such as simultaneous talk

[1]While turn taking is organized by reference to parties, the number of persons in a party and the overall number of participants in a conversation have an impact on various aspects of turn taking, as subsequent studies (referenced in text) have shown.

(Lerner, 1995; Schegloff, 1995), next-speaker selection (Lerner, 2002, 2003; Stivers & Robinson, 2006), and schisming of one conversation into two (Egbert, 1997a). Additionally, researchers have examined how interlocutors organize themselves into collectivities (Lerner, 1993), design their talk to be appropriate for multiple recipients (C. Goodwin, 1979), participate in story-telling as co-tellers or audience members (C. Goodwin, 1986; M. H. Goodwin, 1997; Hayashi, Mori, & Tagaki, 2002; Lerner, 1992; Mandelbaum, 1987), and join a conversation-in-progress (Pillet-Shore, 2008).[2] However, as Schegloff (2009) notes, many issues pertaining to how the participation of multiple interlocutors matters for many (other) conversational organizations and activities remain unexamined.

    This article furthers research into the organization of multiperson[3] conversation by examining a type of other-initiated repair that is unique to it: when somebody other than the speaker of the trouble source is selected to provide a repair solution. As a background, in conversation analy-sis, *repair* refers to practices for dealing with problems of hearing, speaking, and understanding talk (Schegloff et al., 1977). In general, repair is organized by reference to two local identi-ties, ordinarily occupied by two interlocutors: the speaker of the problematic talk (the *trouble source* or the *repairable*) or *self* and its (typically, addressed) recipient or *other* (Schegloff et al., 1977). Based on who initiates repair and who provides the repair solution, distinctions are made between *self-initiated self-repair* (the speaker initiates and resolves the repair, typically in the same turn, e.g., when one word is replaced with another), *self-initiated other-repair* (the speaker initiates repair, but a recipient provides a solution, e.g., when a searched-for word is provided by another participant), *other-initiated self-repair* (a recipient initiates repair, e.g., with *What?*, and the trouble-source turn speaker resolves it), and *other-initiated other-repair* (a recipient initiates and resolves the repair, e.g., by correcting something in the other person's talk).

    Prior research into repair organization (much of which was based on telephone data) has found that an other-initiated repair sequence is a dyadic exchange between the speaker of the trouble source and its recipient (who initiates repair and, in other-repair, provides a repair solu-tion). To date, little research exists into how the presence of additional participants matters for how other-initiated repair is accomplished.[4] One exception is Egbert's (1997b) study of other-initiated self-repair in German conversation, which shows that, first, once repair is initiated (and before a solution is provided), other participants may also initiate repair on the same trouble source. This seconding can be a practice for displaying affiliation with the first repair initiator. Second, in responding to a repair initiation, somebody other than the trouble-source turn speaker may (also) provide a repair solution, though this action is (ordinarily) treated by other interlocu-tors (the trouble source speaker and/or other participants) as inappropriate (but cf. Lerner, 1993,

---

    [2]It should also be noted that a large body of research conducted in a variety of institutional settings (classrooms, courtrooms, media interviews, various workplace contexts, etc.) has explored institution- and activity-specific resources and practices for organizing multiparty interaction (for a few examples, see Asmuß & Svennevig, 2009; Atkinson & Drew, 1979; Clayman & Heritage, 2002; Heath & Luff, 2000; Kangasharju, 1996; Mondada, 2007; Seedhouse, 2004).

    [3]Following Egbert (1997b), the term *multiperson* rather than *multiparty* interaction is used in this article to be able to take into account the fact that in dealing with conversational repair, conversationalists may act collectively as incumbents of a multiperson party (Lerner, 1993) or individually as a single-person party.

    [4]Research into repair in multiperson interaction has primarily focused on collaborative word searches, a form of self-initiated other-repair (e.g., M. H. Goodwin, 1983; Hayashi, 2003). As will be discussed in a later section, other-initiated repair sequences that involve more than two interlocutors have been documented in settings where participants have divergent linguistic competencies (e.g., Bolden, 2011; Egbert, 2004; Ikeda, 2007; Mori, 2003).

pp. 237–238). Third, other-initiated repair may serve as a mechanism for schisming a conversation into two, for merging after a schism, and for joining a conversation in progress. Overall, Egbert's study demonstrates that other interlocutors—besides the speaker of the trouble source and the (first) repair initiator—may actively participate in other-initiated repair sequences.

This article examines a previously undocumented way in which the presence of additional participants matters for the organization of repair: when the repair initiation is addressed to—and thereby selects as the next speaker—somebody other than the speaker of the trouble-source turn (*"other"-selection,* for short). It has been noted that the person who produces the trouble-source turn is, ordinarily, the one who is selected to repair it, at least when the repair is initiated immediately following the repairable (Lerner, 2003; Sacks et al., 1974). The observed tendency to select the trouble-source speaker to resolve repair (and for the trouble-source speaker to provide the repair solution) may be attributed to the conversational maxim to "speak for yourself" (Lerner, 1996, p. 316), which refers to people's special right (and responsibility) to speak on their own behalf (cf. Labov & Fanshel, 1977; Sacks, 1984); it is also consistent with the structural preference for self-correction (over other-correction) in that it allows the trouble-source speaker to repair his/her own talk (Schegloff et al., 1977). Discussing tacit next-speaker selection, Lerner (2003) writes:

> In locating a trouble source in the prior turn, next-turn repair initiators are directed to matters of that turn's production, and therein (*when not addressed elsewhere*) directed to that turn's producer as the one participant ordinarily entitled to complete the repair (though not necessarily the only participant capable of doing so). (p. 195, emphasis added)

This article examines under what circumstances, exactly, repair initiations are addressed elsewhere and what gets accomplished by selecting somebody other than the trouble-source speaker to provide a repair solution (i.e., via "other"-selection).

The most obvious finding of this study is that "other"-selection in other-initiated repair is very rare: In fact, among hundreds of cases of other-initiated repair found in a large database of multiperson conversation (described in the following section), only 30 are instances of "other"-selection. The rarity of this phenomenon confirms that other-initiation of repair is ordinarily (and perhaps normatively) addressed to the trouble-source speaker and attests to the specialness of this action. In fact, we might consider selection of the trouble-source turn speaker to be the default or normative selection both because it is by far the most common selection in other-initiated repair sequences and it does not require the deployment of any explicit addressing techniques, such as gaze or address terms (discussed following).

The analysis will show that, while rare, "other"-selection in other-initiation of repair is a systematically deployed practice. In selecting somebody other than the speaker of the trouble-source turn to provide a repair solution, the repair initiator orients to two very general considerations (sometimes concurrently): (a) maintaining *progressivity* of talk, and (b) respecting or implementing socially distributed rights to knowledge (or *social epistemics*). We will examine how these two considerations reflect interlocutors' understandings of their own and others' entitlements and obligations as participants in interaction—what Goffman (1981) and others (see, e.g., C. Goodwin & M. H. Goodwin, 2003) refer to as *participation status*—and analyze how next-speaker selection in other-initiated repair sequences is used as a device for negotiating these entitlements and obligations. First, however, I will describe the data and method used in the study and give a general introduction to next-speaker selection in other-initiated repair sequences.

DATA AND METHOD

The data for this article come from video-recorded face-to-face everyday multiperson inter-actions between family members and friends. Two corpora are used: One is a collection of recordings of bilingual (Russian and English) conversations in families of Russian American immigrants; the other is a compilation of English-language recordings made in the United States. Overall, 53 recordings of interactions between three to eight participants (each 30 to 90 min in length) are used. Instances of repair sequences that involve multiple participants were identi-fied, transcribed, and analyzed using the methodology of Conversation Analysis (e.g., Heritage, 1984b; Ten Have, 1999). Of these instances, those in which the repair initiation is addressed to somebody other than the speaker of the trouble source have been analyzed for this article. Other types of multiperson repair sequences are being investigated as part of a larger project (Bolden, in press). Note that while the article draws on data in two languages, no attempt is made here to com-pare Russian and English (or bilingual) usages; the analysis suggests a cross-linguistic/cultural uniformity in how the target phenomenon is organized.

NEXT-SPEAKER SELECTION IN OTHER-INITIATION OF REPAIR

Next-speaker selection is one of the ways in which turns at talk get allocated in conversation (Sacks et al., 1974). Selection of a next speaker is accomplished by addressing a sequence-initiating action (a first pair-part, such as a question) to a particular party[5] (Lerner, 2003; Schegloff et al., 1977). The selected party is then accountable for producing a response made rel-evant by the sequence-initiating action. Lerner (2003) describes two types of addressing: *explicit addressing*, accomplished, for example, by an address term or via eye gaze, and *tacit address-ing*, which relies on "the thick particulars" on the interactional moment rather than on a specific addressing technique (p. 190).

How does next-speaker selection get accomplished in other-initiated self-repair sequences? The repair initiation (e.g., *What?* and *Hm?*) is a sequence-initiating action (a first pair-part) that may be addressed explicitly (e.g., via gaze) to, and thereby select as the next speaker, a particular interlocutor (ordinarily, the trouble-source turn speaker). Lerner (2003) shows, however, that the repair initiation does not have to be *explicitly* addressed to select the next speaker. Unless some-thing is done to override the addressing (i.e., when explicitly addressed to another interlocutor), the repair initiation is understood to *tacitly* address—and thereby select as the next speaker—the speaker of the trouble-source turn. This is "at least" true for repair initiations launched in their ordinary position—in the "next turn" after the repairable (Lerner, 2003, p. 195). To my knowl-edge, there is no research that directly examines if late repair initiations are treated as tacitly addressing the speaker of the repairable; however, the analyses and data presented by Egbert (1997b) and Schegloff (2000, pp. 216–219) suggest it may, in fact, be the case. For instance, Egbert (1997b) shows that even if there is talk separating repair initiation from the trouble source (i.e., when the repair initiation is not in the next turn), the interlocutors still orient to the trouble-source speaker's right to provide a repair solution (even if others might do so as well). In other

---

[5]A party may be composed of one or several individuals (e.g., a couple acting as a collectivity) (Schegloff, 1995). For a detailed discussion of addressing a single-person party, see Lerner (2003); for addressing a party composed of several individuals, see Lerner (1993).

words, there is some evidence that both next turn and delayed repair initiations are ordinarily seen as selecting the trouble-source speaker to provide a repair solution, unless explicitly addressed elsewhere.

Since repair initiations that are *not* explicitly addressed to a particular person are apparently understood to be tacitly addressing, and thereby selecting as the next speaker, the speaker of the repairable, in all instances in the core collection of "other"-selection, the addressing is explicit (e.g., accomplished via gaze). We will see that repair is often (but not always) initiated by an unaddressed recipient of the trouble-source turn either immediately following the trouble-source turn (in the next position) or later. Other interlocutors ordinarily (but with important exceptions to be discussed) treat "other"-selection as legitimate: The addressee orients to having been selected by providing a repair solution, and the trouble-source speaker (tacitly or explicitly) accepts it. Repair initiations addressed to "others" are treated as indicative of its speaker's trouble in understanding or hearing what has been said (or both).

We now turn to an examination of circumstances under which "other"-selection is deployed. The following analysis will show that, when selecting somebody other than the speaker of the trouble-source turn, the repair initiator displays (sometimes concurrent) orientations to two organizing features of talk-in-interaction: progressivity and social epistemics. First, an *orientation to progressivity* is evident in situations when the repair initiator deploys "other"-selection to preserve contiguity of the main course of action by subordinating repair activity or to pursue repair resolution after an earlier repair initiation has failed to solicit a response. Second, an *orientation to social epistemics* is evident in contexts when the speaker of the trouble-source turn is seen as lacking interactional competencies to provide an adequate repair solution or when another interlocutor has primary epistemic rights over what is being said. In the following, each of these is taken up in turn, followed by a discussion of contested "other"-selection.

ORIENTATION TO PROGRESSIVITY

As Sacks (1987), Schegloff (2006, 2007), and others (e.g., Heritage, 2007; Stivers & Robinson, 2006) have shown, interactants are pervasively oriented to progressivity in talk-in-interaction, i.e., to "moving from some element to a hearably-next-one with nothing intervening" (Schegloff, 2007, p. 15). Other-initiations of repair halt the progressivity since they stop "the course of action that was in progress to deal with some problem in hearing or understanding talk" (Schegloff, 2006, pp. 86–87). An examination of "other"-selection in other-initiated repair shows that, in choosing to select somebody other than the speaker of the trouble-source turn to provide a repair solution, the repair initiator may (among other considerations) display a commitment to progressivity. In the following instances, the repair initiators attempt to minimize, in various ways, the intrusion of the repair activity into the main course of action.

Subordinating Repair Activity

The person initiating repair may display his/her orientation to progressivity by subordinating the repair initiation so that it does not interfere with the main course of action. Excerpt 1 is a particularly clear case of the interlocutors' orientation to progressivity, as the repair sequence is carried out entirely by the overhearing bystanders in a side conversation (what Goffman [1981]

calls *sideplay*), with no disruption to the conversation targeted by the repair initiation. Irina and Nadia are sitting next to each other at the dining room table having breakfast and talking quietly, while Maria, Luba, and Victor are in the adjacent kitchen (off camera) having their own conversation, which can be easily overheard in the dining room. (All interlocutors are to some degree bilingual in Russian and English.) In lines 2–3, Irina and Nadia close off a topic they have been discussing while the conversion in the kitchen continues. At this point Irina and Nadia are overhearers (Goffman, 1981) whose participation in the kitchen conversation is not ratified. (For a description of the transcription conventions for Russian, see Bolden, 2008. Aspects of participants' nonvocal conduct are glossed in double parentheses; vertical lines (|) are used to indicate the onset of nonvocal actions. TS stands for *trouble source,* RI for *repair initiation,* and RS for *repair solution*. All names and other identifiers have been anonymized.)

Excerpt 1: Brooklyn accent (M3-1; 14:50)

```
01   TS>MAR:  Po:l'ka   gavarit sht[o u    ne:ë: : (0.2)] n[e ru:],sskij acce:nt/=
                         NAME   says    that with her            not Russian  accent
                         Polya  says  that she doesn't have a Russian accent

02        IRI:        ((to Nadia)) [That's so (funny)]   |((bites her sandwich))

03        NAD:                                    [°(Mm)°]

04        MAR:  =a |bruk|linskij/
                    but Brooklyn
                   but a  Brooklyn one

                     |((Nadia bites her sandwich))
                        |((Irina puts her sandwich down; starts chewing))

05        VIC:  Heh-heh-[heh-heh
06        IRI:          [°huh-huh°= ((close-mouthed laugh))
07        LUB:  =huh-huh

08   TS>MAR:  Nu: a eta ser'^ëzna/slushaj v kazhdem zhe etam samam
                         PRT PRT that serious listen  in  each      PRT that  very
                         Seriously/   Listen, in each eh thing

09           gavarjat nemnozhka sa svaim |akce,ntam/
                         say      a-little with own      accent
                         ((people)) speak  with a  bit of their own accent
                                                 |((Nadia puts her sandwich down))

10           (0.2)
11        VI?:  Mm[mm,
12   RI>NAD:       [Who?= ((only loud enough for Irina to hear))

             ((Nadia and Irina are looking ahead towards the kitchen in 12–13))

13        MAR:  =I Pol'ka schita-  gavrit shto u |neë |est' nemnozhka=
                         PRT NAME believ- says that with her is    a-little
                         And  Polya believ- says that she  has a little  bit

                                              |((Nadia turns to look at Irina))
```

```
14        RS>IRI:                                    |((shrugs her shoulder &
                                                         head laterally))
15        MAR:  =Bruklinskij akcent/
                  Brooklyn    accent
                of a Brooklyn accent
```

At line 12, Nadia initiates repair with "Who?," apparently targeting Maria's preceding talk (at line 1 or at lines 8–9). Nadia's repair initiation is produced softly, so as not to interfere with the conversation in the kitchen: In fact, it is only loud enough for Irina, sitting right next to her, to hear. In this way, the repair initiation is addressed to, and selects as the next speaker, Irina rather than the speaker of the trouble-source turn (Maria). Note that Nadia has reason to believe that Irina is able to answer the repair initiation as Irina had earlier claimed understanding by producing a short laughter (line 6), following and, thus apparently, responsive to Maria's talk. However, at line 14, Irina (literally) shrugs off Nadia's repair initiation (while laterally shaking her head) either because she does not know the answer or because Maria has inadvertently just produced the answer Nadia was looking for by mentioning Polya (the protagonist of Maria's telling) again at line 14. In any case, Nadia does not pursue the repair any further. So in this excerpt, the repair activity does not at all interfere with the conversation that was its target. By (quietly) selecting Irina (rather than the speaker of the trouble source) to provide a repair solution, Nadia treats the initiation of repair as subordinate to the other conversation and works to preserve the main conversation's progressivity. In this way, the repair initiator (Nadia) displays a lack of entitlement to participate in (and interfere with) the other conversation; in other words, she is doing being an overhearer.

The repair initiator's orientation to progressivity is also evident in Excerpt 2. Five interlocutors are sitting around the table, discussing a Russian celebrity. At lines 1–3, Zhenya is negatively assessing the celebrity, primarily addressing her assessment to Mira by gazing in her direction. Next to Mira (and directly across the table from Zhenya) is Mira's college-age granddaughter Lena, an unaddressed recipient of Zhenya's talk at lines 1–3 (Zhenya is turned to Mira and away from Lena).

Excerpt 2: Galkin (I16a; 43:30)

Around the table: Lena and Mira (left), Mira's husband (center), Zhenya's husband and Zhenya (right)

```
01        ZHE:  ((to Mira)) On vabsche kakojta stal/
                              he   generally some  became
                              He   became so-so
02                (0.5)
03        TS>ZHE:  Ne takoj kak byl/=On byl zhivo:,j/ prija, t |nyj=
                   not so    how  was  he  was lively  pleasant
                   Not like  he was/ He  was  lively, so  pleasant,

                                                     |((Mira nods))
                                                     |((Lena starts turning
                                                        from Zhenya to Mira))
```

```
04        ZHE:   =[takoj/] abajatel'nyj/=
                   so       charming
                   charming

05   RI>LEN:      [°Kto/°] ((gazing at Mira))
                    Who

06   RS>ZHE:                          =|Galkin/
                                        LAST_NAME
                                       |((Zhenya turns to Lena))
                                       |((Mira turns to Lena))

07               (.)

08        LEN:   |Oh.
                 |((Lena turns to Zhenya))

09        MIR:   Etat  [{boyfr|iend}/
                 this
                 That boyfriend
                               |((Mira turns to Zhenya))

10        ZHE:       [A teper' on (.) prati:vny[j stal/
                       PRT now   he   disgusting became
                     And now he  is disgusting
```

At line 5, Lena initiates repair on what Zhenya is saying and addresses the repair initiation via gaze *not* to the speaker of the trouble source (Zhenya), but to Mira. Observe that the repair initiation is launched while Zhenya is still talking (line 4), at a point where her turn constructional unit (TCU) (Sacks et al., 1974) is not possibly complete.[6] By selecting somebody other than the trouble-source speaker to provide a repair solution and by launching it in a quiet voice while the trouble-source speaker is still talking, Lena subordinates the repair activity to the main course of action, respecting the current speaker's turn space. Rather than requiring Zhenya to halt her ongoing action to respond to the repair initiation, Lena apparently designs her repair initiation so as to have the repair resolved by Mira while Zhenya is still talking and before Mira has to provide an uptake. In effect, Lena's repair initiation is designed to create a momentary conversational schism (Egbert, 1997a): If the selected speaker, Mira, is to resolve repair, Zhenya's telling could perhaps continue uninterrupted. Note also that among the various participants Lena selects the one who is physically most proximate to her, which facilitates a side conversation. Moreover, Mira can be expected to be able to resolve repair given that she has claimed understanding of the repairable (mostly proximately by nodding at line 3). By choosing not to address the repair initiation to the speaker of the trouble source, Lena displays a lack of entitlement to interfere with the main course of action and thereby enacts the role of an overhearer rather than a full-fledged, ratified participant of the conversation. In this case, however, the speaker of the trouble-source turn hears and responds to the repair initiation (line 6), thus foregrounding the repair activity,

---

[6]Two observations point to Zhenya's TCU not being possibly complete when Lena starts speaking. First, Lena does not come in at an intonational unit boundary (i.e., the TCU is not possibly intonationally complete). Second, Zhenya is in the middle of a list production, and, as it has been shown (for English), interlocutors orient to lists as having three parts (Jefferson, 1990).

before the selected addressee, Mira, has a chance to respond (she does at line 9). In doing so Zhenya both ratifies Lena's participation and claims her (i.e., Zhenya's) primary rights to her own talk. (We will return to this point later.)

In the two previous excerpts, an unaddressed (and, in Excerpt 1, an unratified) participant interjects the repair initiation into the ongoing course of action in such a way as to not break its contiguity. In order to do this, they address the repair initiation not to the speaker of the trouble-source turn, but to another participant, choosing in both cases to select one who is physically the most proximate to them and who, thereby, can be more readily engaged in a side conversation. By doing so, the repair initiator displays an orientation to progressivity of the main course of action and claims no entitlement to participating in it. In other words, the repair initiation does *not* serve as a bid for ratified participation in the conversation it targets (cf. Egbert, 1997b), unlike what will be seen in the segments analyzed in the following section.

Pursuing a Response to Repair Initiation

A different sort of orientation to progressivity on the part of the repair initiator is evident in cases where the first repair initiation (addressed to the speaker of the trouble-source turn) fails to elicit a repair solution. Ordinarily, such a situation would result in another round of repair initiation addressed to the trouble-source speaker (Schegloff et al., 1977). However, the data (discussed following) show that the repair initiator may, instead, recruit another interlocutor into the repair activity by selecting him/her to provide a repair solution. This method of repair pursuit appears to be used in situations when the trouble-source speaker shows a lack of orientation to the repair initiation and, at the same time, another participant (now selected by the repair initiation) has displayed understanding of the repairable. By choosing to select another interlocutor when the initial repair initiation (addressed to the trouble-source speaker) has failed, the repair initiator displays an orientation to the progressivity of the repair activity itself (cf. Svennevig, 2008).

This use of "other"-selection is illustrated by Excerpt 3, taken from a conversation between Anna, her brother Sergey, and their Mom (all bilingual in Russian and English). Sergey has been taking online classes while at work, and Mom and Anna have advised him to stop, arguing that taking classes during work hours will have negative consequences for his job (data not shown). At lines 1–4, Sergey reenacts a hypothetical conversation in which he would ask his boss permission to take the classes. Mom and Anna are both addressed recipients of Sergey's reenactment.

Excerpt 3: The boss (O10; 7:45)

Around the table: Mom (left), Sergey (center), Anna (right)

```
01   TS>SER:   *Eh::m  (0.2)  >Anyway<  ah::  (0.8)    ((*looks straight ahead))
02             >so-<  tha::t  >(              )<
03             (0.2)
04      SER:   Boss  (   )      I wantah do this.=Okay with you?
05             (0.2)  ((Mom   takes a spoonful of soup))
06      ANN:   ((slams her hand on the table while looking ahead))
07   RI>MOM:   Hm?=  ((Mom's gaze is low straight ahead))

08      ANN:   =|No::|:.
                |((Anna turns to Sergey))
               |((Mom turns to Sergey))
```

09		(1.2) ((Mom & Olga look at Sergey; Sergey looks at Anna))

10	RI>MOM:	Chë on |skaza?l/
		what he said
		What did he say?
		|((Mom turns to Anna))

11	RS>ANN:	=Maybe I'll talk to my boss
12		and tell'im this's what I wanna do=is that okay with you.
13	MOM:	.h <u>No</u>. ((turns to Sergey))
14	ANN:	Are you-
15		(.) ((Sergey makes a face))

16	MOM:	Ty shto Serëzha/
		you what NAME
		No way Sergey ((or "Are you crazy Sergey"))

At line 6, Anna slams her hand on the table, a gesture that displays her negative stance towards Sergey's plan, and, at line 7, Mom initiates repair on Sergey's talk with an open class repair initiator "Hm?" As soon as she produced the repair initiation, Mom turns her gaze from the bowl of soup in front of her towards Sergey. Thus, the repair initiation selects Sergey as the next speaker, first tacitly and then explicitly via gaze. Immediately following Mom's repair initiation, Anna rejects Sergey's plan with an emphatic "<u>No:::</u>." (line 8), which again displays her understanding of Sergey's talk. Sergey responds to neither Mom nor Anna, and a long silence ensues (line 9). During this silence, Sergey is looking at Anna, thus displaying his engagement with her (and not Mom). Seeing that her repair initiation is not getting answered (possibly due to Anna's intervening action at line 8), Mom redirects it to Anna with "What did he say?" (line 10), thereby selecting her to provide a repair solution. Mom's selection of Anna treats Anna as able to provide a repair solution on Sergey's behalf as a kind of repair consociate (cf. Lerner, 1992). By selecting Anna after Sergey's failure to respond, Mom displays a commitment to progressivity: completing the repair activity and resuming the main course of action. In response to Mom's repair initiation (line 10), Anna repeats Sergey's problematic turn but articulates it more carefully than Sergey did (lines 11–12). Interestingly, Anna uses the first-person pronoun "I" in reference to Sergey (rather than "he") in order to index that the repair solution is produced on Sergey's behalf and that she is simply reanimating what he had said. Immediately following the repair solution, Mom seconds Anna's objection to Sergey's plan (line 13).

In this case, Mom first addresses her repair initiation to the speaker of the trouble-source turn and, thereby, enacts her entitlement to interject into the ongoing course of action and to engage in the conversation as a ratified participant. (Note that, unlike Excerpts 1 and 2, there are only three interlocutors in the conversation, so no schisming is possible.) Furthermore, this entitlement is evident in Mom's insistence on getting a response to her repair initiation, if not from the trouble-source turn speaker, then from the other interlocutor. In other words, in multiperson conversation, the initiation of repair—and the selection of one party over another to provide a repair solution—is a device for negotiating participation and, specifically, for enacting one's status as a fully ratified (or unratified, as in Excerpts 1 and 2) participant (cf. Egbert, 1997b).

The role of other-initiated repair in regulating participation is especially evident in the following case (Excerpt 4). Unlike Excerpt 3, here the repair initiator (Boris) is an unratified participant of the conversation targeted by the repair initiation. Egbert (1997b) and Lerner (1993)

found that an unratified participant may initiate repair as a bid for entering an ongoing conversation. In the following segment, Boris attempts to (re)join the conversation by addressing his repair to the speaker of the trouble source, which is a way of displaying entitlement to participating in the conversation in progress. When the repair initiation fails to elicit a response, Boris reissues it and addresses it to another interlocutor, thus pursuing an entry into the conversation.

This excerpt is taken from a conversation that involves seven participants (all bilingual in Russian and English), four of whom are engaged in this sequence: Tasha, her father Boris, her mother Maria, and another guest, Karina. Tasha has been talking about her husband (Ken, who has just stepped out of the room), jokingly complaining about the mess he makes while brushing his teeth. (Tasha and Ken are newlyweds.) During lines 1–2, Tasha is primarily looking at Maria, who had displayed the most active recipiency by laughing at earlier points in the telling. Boris is in the room, but is at first disengaged and off-camera as he is cleaning his plate at the trashcan.

Excerpt 4: Ken (M2-3; 18:05)

A kitchen counter and a small table are in view. Karina and Boris (when in frame) stand behind the counter. Tasha and Maria are at the table; Tasha is seated facing the kitchen counter (away from the camera). Three more people are present: one at the table, one at the kitchen counter, and one standing to the side.

```
01   TS>TASH:   An' he's like "Oh:, but (it) clea::n it.=After I take it
02              out,=I l'k- jst keep go:ing.

03      MAR:    heh-heh-   ((looking at Tasha))

04   RI>BOR:   *Kto [eta/   ((*Boris appears in frame; gaze to Tasha))
                who this
                Who is this

05      KAR:       [(there-  |there's [      )  ((looks at Tasha))
                            |((Tasha looks towards Karina))

06      TASH:                      [He- (.)
                                   |((Maria turns to look at Boris;
                                      continues looking at Boris throughout))

07   RI>BOR:   |Kto [eta/
                who  this
                Who is this
               |((Boris looks at   Maria; continues looking at her throughout))

08      TASH:       [He ]clea:ns |the  [t o o   [:thbrush.
                                 |((Karina   turns to Boris))

09   RS>MAR:                    [£(Ken)£
10   RS>KAR:                            [(Ken)\(Yeah)
11      BOR:    Ke:n?  ((to Maria))

12      MAR:    Tasha e- >nu a kom/=U neë tol'ka adin muzh</
                NAME  PRT about who with her only one husband
                Tasha- Who else? She only has one husband/

13              Ana tol'ka ab adom paka {complaining}/
                she only about one still
                She is only {complaining} about one for now
```

Boris is not a fully ratified participant at the beginning of this segment, having been preoccupied with another activity. At line 4, he attempts to rejoin the conversation by initiating repair on Tasha's talk, addressing his repair initiation (via gaze) to Tasha. However, Tasha ignores the repair initiation as she continues with her telling of the complaint (lines 6/8; now addressing her talk to Karina). Seeing that Tasha does not orient to the repair initiation as having selected her, Boris moves his gaze from Tasha to Maria (his wife)[7] and immediately relaunches the repair initiation in a louder voice (line 7). This time, his selection is successful, as Maria (and Karina) provide a repair solution (lines 9–10).

By addressing another person with a repair initiation, Boris can be seen as displaying an orientation to progressivity of the main course of action and of the repair activity in that the "other"-selection allows interlocutors to resolve repair while Tasha continues with her telling. At the same time, Boris's insistence on getting a response to his repair initiation results in getting him ratified as a full participant in the conversation—at the cost of (eventually) disrupting Tasha's telling (see lines 12–13).

So far we have seen that "other"-selection in other-initiated repair may be motivated by the repair initiator's orientation to progressivity of the ongoing course of action and/or of the repair activity. First, "other"-selection makes it possible to subordinate repair so that it can be resolved without disruption to the main activity (as in Excerpt 1 and, unsuccessfully, in Excerpt 2). In these cases, the repair initiator shows little entitlement to participating in the targeted conversation, "other"-selection being a method for initiating repair as an overhearer rather than as a ratified participant. Second, "other"-selection may be used in pursuit of repair solution when repair initiation addressed to the trouble-source speaker fails to solicit a response (as in Excerpt 3 and Excerpt 4). While "other"-selection as a method for pursuit can be seen as an attempt on the part of the repair initiator to resolve repair with minimal interference to the main activity, it may nonetheless result in disrupting the course of action targeted by it (as in Excerpt 4). These findings suggest that the initiation of repair—especially by those whose participation is not fully ratified—can be deployed as a method for negotiating one's rights to engage into in the ongoing conversation (cf. Egbert, 1997b). In other words, by choosing to address repair initiation to one or another interlocutor, repair initiators enact their entitlement (or lack thereof) to a ratified participation.

The examples of pursuit discussed previously also offer evidence for the argument that (at least in these cases) the selection of the trouble-source speaker to provide repair solution might be a default or normative selection, while "other"-selection a secondary alternative. We have seen that the repair initiator selected the trouble-source speaker first and redirected the repair initiation to another available and evidently knowledgeable participant only *after* the trouble-source speaker had ignored the repair initiation. It should be noted, however, that considerations of social epistemics (discussed in the next section) have a profound influence on who *should* be selected by the initiation of repair.

ORIENTATION TO SOCIAL EPISTEMICS

Social epistemics—interlocutors' rights and responsibilities to socially distributed knowledge— may be involved in turn allocation and, in particular, in next speaker selection (e.g., Lerner, 2003;

---

[7]Among various other copresent participants, Boris chooses to select Maria perhaps due to the fact that she had displayed understanding of Tasha's talk by laughing at it (line 3) and because she is showing herself available by turning to look at Boris (see line 6).

Raymond & Heritage, 2006). By selecting a particular party as the next speaker, the select*ing* party (i.e., the first pair-part speaker) tacitly claims that the select*ed* party has the rights (and now the obligation) to produce the relevant responding action, which includes the selected party's epistemic rights to speak to the matter at hand. Ordinarily, interlocutors are entitled to speak on their own behalf (e.g., Labov & Fanshel, 1977; Lerner, 1996; Sacks, 1984), and, as Lerner (2003) shows, the right to speak for oneself—i.e., to speak to one's experiences, actions, feelings, etc.—underlies tacit methods for selecting a next speaker.

Repairing one's own talk is, fundamentally, speaking for oneself, which means (as discussed earlier) that a speaker of the trouble-source turn is (ordinarily) entitled to repair it. However, as we have already seen, a repair initiator's orientation to progressivity may motivate "other"-selection. In this section, I demonstrate that "other"-selection may also be used as a method for managing social epistemics. First, I examine repair sequences in which the speaker of the trouble-source turn is treated as lacking interactional competencies to resolve repair (either due to a young age or to a low language proficiency). Then I turn to repair sequences in which the trouble-source speaker speaks on behalf of another copresent party. Finally, I discuss cases where "other"-selection is contested, which offer additional evidence for the role of social epistemics in repair resolution.

Orientation to Interactional (In)competencies

"Other"-selection may display the repair initiator's orientation to interlocutors' divergent interactional competencies. When interacting with individuals who are possibly lacking full interactional competencies—such as young children or language learners/novices—participants may use a range of resources to make interactional competencies relevant and "procedurally consequential" (Schegloff, 1991, p. 52). For example, interlocutors' orientations to divergent interactional competencies may become evident in how repair is initiated and resolved (e.g., Bolden, in press; Egbert, 2004; Hosoda, 2003). Here I show that "other"-selection may convey the repair initiator's claim that the speaker of the trouble-source turn may not be capable of providing an adequate repair solution and that the addressee of the repair initiation is better equipped to do so. Note that in these cases, the orientation to social epistemics works concurrently with an orientation to progressivity: By selecting a more capable person to resolve repair, the repair initiator can be seen as aiming for a swift and unproblematic repair resolution.

Repairing young children's talk.   There appears to be significant cross-cultural (Ochs, 1984; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984) and situational (Stivers, 2001) variation in the extent to which young children (however defined) are treated as capable of competent participation in social interaction. In terms of situational variability, while parents and other caregivers may attempt to engage their children in interaction from a very young age (at least in Anglo-American white middle-class families: Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984), research suggests that other adults (e.g., medical doctors) may choose not to (Cahill, 2010; Stivers, 2001). When "very young children are treated as not yet competent to respond on their own behalf," their parents and other caregivers may act as "omnirelevant consociates" responding in the child's stead (Lerner, 2002). This treatment of young children as lacking interactional expertise may or may not be rooted in the child's actual displayed competencies. For instance, with regards to conversational repair,

child language-development studies show that even very young children (as young as a year and a half) are capable of competent participation in a variety of repair activities, including responding to other-initiation of repair addressed to them (Forrester & Cherington, 2009).

While children may be capable of repairing their talk in response to a repair initiation, they may not be selected to do so. Excerpt 5 shows that repair initiation that targets talk by a child may be addressed not to the child, but to the child's caregiver. In this way, the repair initiator (in my data, an adult who is not the child's caregiver) treats the child as lacking expertise to speak for him/herself and treats the selected caregiver as responsible for speaking on the child's behalf. Additionally, by selecting the child's caregiver to repair the child's talk, the repair initiator may be seen as deferring to the caregiver's rights, responsibilities, and expertise when it comes to his/her child (cf. Raymond & Heritage, 2006 on identity-bound rights to assess others' conduct). In other words, next-speaker selection in other-initiated repair is not simply a matter of expertise but also of socially distributed and identity-bound rights to expertise (i.e., social epistemics).

These observations are illustrated by Excerpt 5 from a dinner conversation involving a boy of approximately 2.5 years of age, his parents, a baby, and two dinner guests (Seva and Kira). In line 1, the boy announces that some of his toy cars "spilled into the cage." This announcement appears to be addressed to the entire table (the boy is off-camera), and at line 2, one of the guests (Kira) initiates repair on it: "Into what cage?" Rather than addressing the repair initiation to the speaker of the trouble source (the boy), Kira turns away from the boy and looks at his mother, thus selecting her to provide a repair solution.

Excerpt 5: Playpen (I9; 31:50)

Around the table: Seva and Mom with the baby (left), Dad and Kira (right),
the boy (off camera, right)

```
01    TS>BOY:    |<U menja prapusypalas' mnoga v kletku mashi|nak>/
                    with me   spilled    many in cage     cars
                  Many of my cars spilled into the cage
                  | ((Kira looks at Boy smiling))                    |((Kira starts
                                                                        turning to Mom))

02    RI>KIRA:   |V kak[uju kle:t[ku/
                   in what    cage
                   Into what cage?
                  |((Kira is looking at Mom))

03    MOM:           [U h- u : [:h/

04    DAD:                     [°( )°

05    RS>MOM:    .h A vot on nazyvaet {pack 'n play,}/ on nazyvaet kletaj/
                    PRT PRT he calls              he calls    cage
                    He calls "pack 'n play" he calls it a cage

06                 <m=pf=no : : [: : :  [: ((to Baby))

07    DAD:                      [Aeh: | : [: : (°eta ja plo[xa°)
                                            PRT I  badly

08    KIRA:                        [A: :      [Etat shtoli- (.)
                                    oh          this what
                                  |((Kira turns to Dad))
```

```
09                    kak on nazyvaeca/ Mane?[zh shtoli/=
                      how it is_called      playpen what
                      Is that –   what is it called – a playpen?

10      MOM:                                    [Da/
                                                 yes

11                    =({Dou[ble} u nas)
                                   with us
                        (We have a double)

12      DAD:                       [°Da da°/
                                     yes   yes

13      KIRA:   A::/
                oh
```

Kira's repair initiation (line 2) targets the boy's problematic usage of the term *kletka* ("cage").
By addressing her repair initiation to the boy's mother, Kira apparently treats her as capable
of providing a repair solution, or more capable than the child. Note that the repair initiation is
launched immediately on the problematic turn's completion before any interlocutors could dis-
play their understanding of the boy's talk. Since Kira has no evidence that Mom has understood
what the boy said, her selection of Mom over the child appears to be guided solely by Mom's
status as the child's "category-bound consociate" (Lerner, 2002). The mother's repair solution
(line 5) conveys her expertise in the child's vocabulary (thus, enacting her identity as a caregiver)
as she explains the usage of the problematic term (*kletka*/"cage") as particular to her son (cf.
Kitzinger & Mandelbaum, 2008).

Note that the father is also at the table and could have been selected to resolve repair. While,
at first glance, one might argue that the selection of the mother (over the father) reflects Kira's
treatment of the mother as a primary caregiver (with primary rights/responsibilities to speak for
her child), the selection appears to be shaped by their physical positioning vis-à-vis Kira and the
boy: Kira sits across the table from the mother and only had to untorque her body to address
her; to face the father (who sits next to Kira), Kira would have to torque her body away from
the child (on her left) to the father (on her right). However, importantly, Kira does *not* select
another copresent interlocutor (her husband Seva), whom her gaze passes by as she turns to face
the mother, which shows that a *caregiver* is a procedurally consequential identity category in the
next-speaker selection.

This example indicates that, in interactions with other adults, caregivers may be cast into
the role of the child's consociate (Cahill, 2010; Lerner, 2002; Stivers, 2001). In this regard,
it is perhaps notable that I have found no instances of one parent selecting another parent to
repair their child's talk. In my—albeit limited—data corpus, even very young children, clearly
incapable of responding with a repair solution, get addressed by a parent's repair initiation. This
may suggest that, when it comes to repairing a child's talk, "other"-selection involves conceding
one's epistemic (and thus custodial) authority to the selected caregiver. So just as caregivers have
primary epistemic rights to assess their charges (Raymond & Heritage, 2006), they appear to
have primary rights to speak for them.

Brokering understanding problems for language novices.   Young children are not the
only category of persons who may, on occasion, be treated as less than full-fledged participants
with rights and responsibilities to repair their own talk. Linguistic novices—individuals treated

as less than competent in a language—may be similarly excluded from repair resolution by the repair initiator. As the following segment shows, a repair initiator may orient to the interlocutors' divergent linguistic expertise by selecting somebody other than the speaker of the trouble-source turn to provide a repair solution. The addressee of the repair initiation then acts as a language broker (Bolden, in press) by providing translation of the problematic turn into another language, a common way of resolving repair in interactions with language novices (e.g., Egbert, 2004).

Excerpt 6 is taken from a conversation between Lena, her grandmother Mira, Aaron (Mira's brother-in-law), and his wife Zhenya. All participants are bilingual Russian and English speakers, though Lena's primary language is English and the other participants' primary language is Russian. Just prior to this excerpt, Mira (the grandmother) says that she wants to go back to doing needlework. At line 1, Lena (the granddaughter) jokingly requests that Mira not embroider any "naked ladies" (presumably, as gifts for Lena and her parents). This utterance, which Lena produces in English, becomes the trouble source when Aaron initiates repair on it and addresses the repair initiation to Mira via gaze (at line 4).

Excerpt 6: Naked ladies (I7a; 39:00)

Around the table: Lena (left), Aaron (center), Mira and Zhenya (right)


```
01   TS> LENA:     No naked ladies Babushka.
                                   grandma

02                 (1.2) ((all look at Lena; Lena looks at Mira))

03        MIRA:    |t!=Xarash|o/ *Kak ty skazhi|sh/ ((*smiling))
                          well      how you say
                        Okay, whatever you   say

                  |((Zhenya turns to Mira))
                          |((Aaron turns to Mira))
                                      |((Mira turns to Aaron))

04    RI> AAR:    |Sht[o?/ ((continues looking at Mira))
                    What?
                  |((Mira & Zhenya are looking at Aaron))

05   RS> MIRA:       [Eta   |shtoby: eh golyx zhenschin ja ne  |vy [ne vyshivala/
                     PRT    that     naked  women     I  not       not embroider
                      That   uh I shouldn't embroider naked women
                            |((Zhenya looks at Mira))         |((Zhe > Lena))

06        ZHE:                                                [Ah hah

07        ZHE:    Ne ljubish/ ((to Lena))
                  not like
                  You don't like that?

08        AAR:    |Ne ljubish [gholyx zhenschi?n/
                    not like    naked  women
                   You don't like naked women?
                  |((Aaron looks at Lena))
```

At line 3, Mira responds to Lena's request with compliance (in Russian), thus displaying her understanding of what Lena has said. Toward the end of her response, Mira turns to Aaron (who is looking at her), and Aaron immediately initiates repair with an open class repair initiator "*shto?*" ("what?"; line 4). Via accompanying gaze, the repair initiation selects as the next speaker not the speaker of the trouble source (Lena), but Mira. Mira then immediately (line 5) provides a repair solution in the form of a Russian-language paraphrase of Lena's trouble-source turn. By selecting Mira (rather than Lena) to provide repair solution, Aaron displays his treatment of Lena as potentially being unable to provide an acceptable repair solution, thus, orienting to her low proficiency in Russian; casts himself as potentially lacking linguistic expertise to understand Lena's repair solution (if it were provided via an English-language paraphrase or repetition, for example); and casts Mira into the role of a language broker to act as an intermediary between him (Aaron) and Lena. Thus, by addressing his repair initiation to a third person, Aaron makes the participants' divergent linguistic expertise procedurally relevant to this moment in interaction. This analysis is supported by Mira's choice to provide a Russian-language paraphrase of Lena's problematic talk in response to Aaron's initiation of repair and not, for instance, repair her own immediately preceding turn (as is ordinarily done in response to an open class repair initiation). Mira's response (line 5) thus demonstrates her understanding that the trouble Aaron experiences has to do with his limited understanding of English.

To summarize, a repair initiator may enlist a third person into the role of a broker between him/herself and the speaker of the repairable and, thereby, convey the expectation that the selected person is better equipped to provide a repair solution than the trouble-source speaker. "Other"-selection then displays the repair initiator's orientation to interlocutors' divergent expertise and treats the speaker of the trouble source as less than a fully competent conversationalist. Further, when the speaker of the trouble source is a young child, the repair initiation addressed to another participant makes relevant that participant's categorical identity as the child's caregiver. Finally, "other"-selection in the previous cases may be concurrently motivated by the repair initiator's orientation to progressivity: Addressing repair initiation to somebody who is seen as capable of providing an adequate repair solution can be a method for forestalling an extended repair sequence and, thus, ensuing a quick resumption of the main activity.

Selecting a Person With Primary Epistemic Rights

Knowledge of one's experiences is firmly bound to the individual who has lived through them (e.g., Labov & Fanshel, 1977; Lerner, 1996; Raymond & Heritage, 2006; Sacks, 1984). When somebody talks about experiences of a copresent participant, that participant retains a privileged access to what is being said: For example, s/he is expected to confirm (deny or elaborate on) what is being said on his/her behalf (Labov & Fanshel, 1977; Lerner, 1992, 1996). The organization of repair sequences—and specifically the selection of who will provide a repair solution—is sensitive to these socially distributed rights. As the following excerpts demonstrate, when the trouble-source turn conveys information to which a copresent party has primary epistemic access, the repair initiation selects that person—and not the speaker of the trouble-source turn—to provide a repair solution. To put it differently, next-speaker selection in repair sequences is sensitive to what Goffman (1981) called the *production format* of the utterance targeted by the

repair initiation. As we will see, the repair initiator selects as the next speaker not the interlocutor who utters the repairable (i.e., the animator) but the person whose views are (claimably) being expressed (the principal) and who, thus, retains primary epistemic rights over what is being said (cf. Lerner, 2002).

Excerpt 7 is a case in point. The conversation is between two couples: Vivian and Shane, Nancy and Michael. Addressing her boyfriend Shane, Vivian begins to formulate a complaint against their classmate Jimmy (lines 1–3 and 6). The complainable is Jimmy's failure to rehearse the scene he and Shane are soon to perform for a theater class. It is, in effect, Shane's rather than Vivian's complaint as it is Shane's experiences with Jimmy that form its basis. By launching this complaint, Vivian provides an opportunity for Shane to elaborate on it (Lerner, 1992); at the least, it makes a confirmation or disconfirmation from Shane relevant (Labov & Fanshel, 1977). Before Vivian's turn is possibly complete, however, Michael initiates repair and addresses it to Shane (line 5):

Excerpt 7: Next week (Chicken Dinner; 7:45)

At the table: Vivian, Shane, and Nancy (left), Michael (center). Shane is
maintaining a "middle distance" look, gazing in front of him through line 11.

```
01    TS>VIV:   ((to Shane)) [Meanwhile yih doing a scene with Jimmy,
02                a rehearsed one,  (0.4)   |en you hav'n ev'n: nex' ↑week=
                                            |((Mic looks towards Shane))
03    VIV:      =en you hav'n even,
04    SHA:      (  [   )
05    RI>MIC:      [Nex' [week yer doin it?   ((to Shane))
06    VIV:             [(spoken to um)
07    RS>SHA:   Yup,
08    MIC:      Should be real (gud).
09                (0.4)   ((Michael looks down at his plate))
10    NAN:      h [nh hnh hnh  ]
11    VIV:        [An'it's reh[ea:rsed it's   su]ppose]a'be  rehea:r [se'.
                  |((Shane looks to Michael))
12    SHA:                   [h_u_h ha ha ha ]  h_u  ]            [
13    MIC:                                                       [It sh'd
14                be ril good.bec'z he's good.
```

With his repair initiator (line 5), Michael news-marks (Heritage, 1984a; Jefferson, 1981) an element of Vivian's turn (the time reference "nex' ↑week," which Vivian inserted in line 2) by requesting confirmation of it. The repair initiation is addressed to Shane both through gaze and the deployment of the second-person reference "yer" (i.e., *you*), making a response relevant from him.[8] With this repair initiation, Michael requests confirmation of Vivian's words from Shane, the protagonist of Vivian's complaint, i.e., the person who has a firsthand knowledge of and thus a privileged access to the situation (or the principal behind the complaint). Shane (and not

---

[8]Note the form of Michael's repair initiation: a partial repeat ("Nex'week") immediately followed by "yer doing it?" (line 5). While the repeat adequately locates the trouble source, the addition of "yer doing it" is designed to explicitly address Shane (with "you"; Lerner, 2003) in a situation where Michael's gaze is likely not seen by Shane, who is looking down at his plate at line 5.

Vivian) immediately responds to the repair initiation (line 7), which displays their orientation to Michael's selection of Shane over Vivian as unproblematic and legitimate.

For another example, see Excerpt 8 from a conversation that involves two married couples: Seva and Kira, Oleg and Mira. (Two young children are also at the table.) Leading up to this segment, the adults are discussing the lack of salary raises at Mira's work. At lines 1–2, Seva describes the situation at Kira's (his wife's) work, addressing his turn to her. Similarly to the preceding segment, here the addressee (Kira) rather than the speaker of this turn (Seva) has primary epistemic rights to the information conveyed by it since it is her workplace that is being discussed.

Excerpt 8: Raise (I9; 42:50)

Around the table: Seva (left), Mira (standing with two children; center),
Oleg and Kira (right). Children's talk overlaps most of this segment.

```
01   TS>SEVA:   Nu tebe dabavljaut pa pjat' eh:: v't pa pjat'
                PRT you  add        on five       PRT on five
                Your raises are at five eh   at five

02              pa shest' pracentaf / (°pa sta |prac[entav° )
                on six    percent        on hundred percent
                or six  percent/ (out of a hundred percent)
                                              |((Oleg turns to Kira))

03   RI>OLEG:                                 [V go↑:?d/ ((to Kira))
                                               in year
                                               A year?

04              (0.3)
05   RS>KIRA:   HH HH ((silent laughter))

06        KIRA: [.h (° Nu:      °)
                      PRT

07        SEVA: [Nu u   neë ty panimaesh [dela v tom shto u   neë
                PRT with her you understand thing in that what with her
                You see she has the thing is that she has . . .

08        KIRA:                          [U nas paluchalas'
                                          with us worked-out
                                          It worked out so that we . . .
```

((Seva attemps to explain, Kira corrects him))

At lines 2–3, Oleg turns to look at Kira as he initiates repair on Seva's turn (line 3), thus selecting Kira (rather than Seva) as the next speaker. The repair initiation is a request for confirmation of a candidate understanding of Seva's turn in the form of an appendor question (Lerner, 2004; Schegloff, 1996). Produced with an exaggerated intonation (see the sharp pitch rise marked by the upward arrow), this repair initiation conveys Oleg's surprise at the (presumably unusually high) raises at Kira's work (Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 2006). While ordinarily appendor questions select the speaker of the turn they target and grammatically extend as the next speaker (Schegloff, 1996), in this case, it is Kira and not Seva who is being selected. Just as in Excerpt 7, here the

addressee and not the speaker of the trouble-source turn has a firsthand knowledge of and, thus, a privileged access to the facts (and can thus be seen as the principal). In response to the repair initiation, Kira begins to challenge Seva's representation of the situation: She first laughs (line 5) apparently at the ridiculousness of what is being said and then contests Seva's explanation (from line 8 on).

Thus, in both cases, a speaker formulates something another copresent party has a primary access to, addressing the turn to this person (so that it can be confirmed, denied, or elaborated on). When another participant initiates repair on this turn, the repair initiation selects the person with the primary rights to speak to the matter at hand rather than the speaker of the repairable. In this way, next-speaker selection organizes participation in the repair activity in accordance with the locally distributed rights to knowledge, which displays the repair initiator's orientation to social epistemics.

"Other"-Selection Contested

Further evidence for the role of social epistemic in the organization of repair comes from cases where "other"-selection is contested, i.e., when interlocutors do not comply with the repair initiator's selection of the next speaker (cf. Lerner, 2002). The following cases are "deviant" (Heritage, 1984b, p. 244) in the sense that the repair initiator employs "other"-selection without respecting the local distribution of the rights to knowledge.

We have already examined Excerpt 2 (shown earlier) for how "other"-selection displays the repair initiator's orientation to progressivity of the main course of action. Focusing now on the response to the repair initiation (line 5), we can see that the speaker of the trouble source (Zhenya) immediately provides a repair solution (line 6), even though she had not been selected. By responding to the repair initiation before the selected interlocutor (Mira) has a chance to do so, Zhenya reclaims her right to speak on her own behalf and to correct her own words. So while Lena's selection of Mira as the next speaker is apparently motivated by the considerations of progressivity, Zhenya's response to it is evidence for her orientation to social epistemics.

Excerpt 9 is another instance of an unsuccessful "other"-selection. Marik and Masha (a married couple) are having tea with Mom and her son, Sergey (all are bilingual). Marik, Masha, and Mom have been watching a videoclip on the computer in front of them. Marik's announcement (in lines 1–2) refers to the video. While the announcement is being discussed, Sergey appears to be reading and not following the conversation. At line 10, however, he initiates repair on the prior talk with "Wa=What happened?"—a type of repair initiation that conveys that its speaker has been disengaged and missed part of the interaction. Toward the end of his turn, Sergey looks up sharply and quickly turns his head to Mom (sitting next to him), thus selecting her to provide a repair solution (lines 10–11).[9]

---

[9]Sergey's selection of Mom here is consistent with the general observation that, when they are several equally plausible candidates for "other"-selection, the repair initiator may be guided by his/her personal relationships with the copresent parties in choosing whom to select. There appears to be a tendency to target the repair initiation at a relational intimate, such as a romantic partner or closest caregiver rather than a more distant relative or friend. Selecting somebody to provide a repair solution is a display of entitlement on the repair initiator's part; it is perhaps for this reason that repair initiators tend to select people they feel most entitled to bother or distract from the ongoing course of action. Furthermore, the selection of the most physically proximate interlocutor is also common.

Excerpt 9: Musician (O21; 35:00)

Around the table: Mom (center; back to camera), Masha and Marik (left), Sergey (right). A laptop computer is open in the middle of the table.

01	MAR:	A etu m<u>u</u>zyku napisal (.)
		PRT this music wrote
		This music was written

02		|mal' chik s katorym my vmeste uchi|lis'/
		boy with whom we together studied
		by a boy who went to school with me
		| ((Masha turns to look at Mom)) |((Marik looks at Mom))

| 03 | | (0.3) |

04	MOM:	D<u>a:</u> |ty shto/
		PRT you what
		Incredible!
		|((Masha nods))

| 05 | MASH: | [Mm mm, |

06	MOM:	[A kto ispalnjae¿t/
		PRT who performs
		And who is performing?

07	MAR:	<u>O</u>n zhe eë [ispalnjaet/
		he PRT it performs
		He himself is performing

08	MASH:	[On i ispalnjaet/
		he PRT performs
		He himself is performing

09		(0.8) ((Mom shakes her head laterally several times;
		Marik turns to the computer screen and continues
		watching the video on the screen throughout))

| 10 | RI>SER: | Wa=What happ\|ened? |
| | | \|((Sergey looks up and then at Mom)) |

| 11 | | (1.0) ((Mom points to the computer after 0.9 silence)) |

12	RS>MASH:	M<u>u</u>zy|ka pot katorae idët kino↑:,/
		music to which goes movie
		The music in the movie
		|((Sergey looks at Masha))

| 13 | SER: | Mm [mm, |

14	MASH:	[napisal p<u>a</u>ren' (.) s katorym Marik uchilsja v adnom klase/
		wrote guy with whom NAME studied in one class
		is written by a guy who went to school with Marik

| 15 | DIM: | Really, |

```
16      MASH:    I    on   sam     i    igraet/
                 and  he   himself PRT  performs
                 And  he   himself is   performing
```

Following Sergey's repair initiation, Mom does not (immediately) respond, and a gap develops (line 11). Given that Mom had actively participated in the prior discussion, she should be *able* to respond to Sergey. The lack of response may, however, be attributed to Mom respecting the others' rights to the topic at hand. Having been disengaged from the prior interaction (lines 1–9), the repair initiator (Sergey) is apparently unaware of who has the epistemic rights to speak to the matter at hand. Yet, it is "Marik's" topic in the sense that it was he who had made the announcement and whose friend is being referred to (lines 1–2). Additionally, Masha (Marik's wife) had been acting as Marik's consociate (Lerner, 1992), actively displaying her knowledge of the situation and her rights to talk about it (see lines 4, 5, and 8). During the gap following Sergey's repair initiation (line 11), Marik is watching a video on the computer and does not visibly orient to the repair initiation. Approximately a second into the silence (i.e., at the "standard maximum" silence: Jefferson, 1989), Mom begins to slightly point to the computer with her finger, possibly gearing up for a response. As soon as Mom's pointing gesture is visible, Masha comes in with a repair solution (line 12), and Mom withdraws her finger. So it appears that Mom has been deferring to the others to provide a repair solution; when she finally gears up to respond herself, Masha (who has more epistemic rights than Mom) starts talking and Mom retreats. Thus, how participants negotiate who will respond to Sergey's repair initiation appears to displays their orientation to the distribution of rights to the topic (cf. Lerner, 2002). While all of them *can* answer, Mom (and Masha initially) defer to Marik. When Marik displays a lack of engagement, Masha, who had also claimed rights to the topic, does.

These two deviant cases thus demonstrate the importance of social epistemics not only for who is addressed by the repair initiation but also how other-initiated repair is resolved (a matter that deserves further research). We have seen that interlocutors may fail to comply with the next-speaker selection implemented by the repair initiator; in the discussed cases it happens when the selection does not respect situation-specific socially distributed rights to knowledge. Overall, it has been shown in this section that considerations of social epistemics figure centrally in the organization of other-initiated repair and, specifically, in who gets selected to provide a repair solution.[10]

CONCLUSIONS

This article has examined one aspect of other-initiated repair in multiperson conversation: when the repair initiation is designed to select somebody other than the speaker of the trouble-source turn to provide a repair solution ("other"-selection for short). We have seen that "other"-selection is sensitive to two broad considerations: progressivity and social epistemics. First, an orientation

---

[10]Furthermore, my data show that when several participants have (near) equal epistemic rights to what is being conveyed by the trouble-source turn, "other"-selection may be deployed strategically to promote or obstruct certain courses of action. Space considerations prevent me from discussing such cases.

to progressivity is evident when the repair initiator attempts to resolve repair with minimal interference into the main activity: either by subordinating repair to the focal course of action (as in Excerpt 1 and Excerpt 2) or by seeking to resolve an initially unsuccessful repair attempt (Excerpt 3 and Excerpt 4). Second, an orientation to social epistemics is evident in situations when next-speaker selection is sensitive to interlocutors' differential epistemic rights to speak to the matter at hand. This includes selecting those with expertise (and rights to expertise) over a trouble-source speaker who is seen as lacking expertise to provide an adequate repair solution (Excerpt 5 and Excerpt 6) and selecting those with primary epistemic access to the events in question (Excerpt 7 and Excerpt 8). The two considerations—progressivity and social epistemics—may operate concurrently: e.g., when an apparently more competent interlocutor is selected over a less competent one (as in Excerpts 5 and 6).

One major—but perhaps unsurprising—finding of this study is that selecting somebody other than the speaker of the trouble-source turn is a rarely deployed alternative in other-initiated repair. In contrast, selecting the speaker of the trouble source to provide repair solution appears to be a default or unmarked option for resolving repair. Several pieces of evidence support the argument for the special status of "other"-selection. In addition to its infrequency, the markedness of "other"-selection is supported by the fact that the selection of the trouble source speaker can be accomplished tacitly while "other"-selection has to be accomplished explicitly (e.g., via gaze). Furthermore, "other"-selection is deployed for cause: i.e., in each case it is warranted by a rather narrowly circumscribed set of circumstances (specifically, for preserving progressivity and/or respecting the distribution of epistemic rights)—and, if seen as unwarranted, it may be contested (Excerpt 2 and Excerpt 9). Finally, in situations where considerations of social epistemics do not specifically warrant "other"-selection, "other"-selection (if used) is deployed *after* the selection of the trouble-source speaker has failed (Excerpt 3 and Excerpt 4). These findings bring further empirical support to the argument that the self (the speaker of the trouble source) is ordinarily or even normatively selected by other-initiation of repair (cf. Lerner, 2003; Sacks et al., 1974).

The finding that "other"-selection is a marked option for resolving other-initiated repair raises the question of whether instances of "other"-selection should be considered as deviant cases for a much larger set of instances of other-initiated self-repair (in multiperson interaction). Deviant cases—i.e., cases where things don't go as expected—are important analytic tools as they can throw new light on the phenomenon under investigation (e.g., Heritage, 1984b). For other-initiated self-repair, the very term—*self*-repair—conveys the empirically grounded expectation that it is *self* (the speaker of the trouble source) who is selected to (and who provides) a repair solution.

What can be learned then about the organization of other-initiated "self"-repair in light of "other"-selection? One issue that has emerged from the foregoing analysis is the role of *entitlement* in repair sequences: both with regards to who is entitled to *initiate* repair (and thereby intervene into and suspend the ongoing activity) and who is entitled to *respond* to the repair initiation. Ordinarily, the repair initiator's entitlement to initiate repair and to address it to the trouble-source speaker is taken for granted. Against the backdrop of "other"-selection cases, however, the selection of the self (i.e., the trouble-source speaker) can be seen an enactment of the repair initiator's entitlement to engage the trouble-source speaker into the repair activity and, thereby, to distract him/her from the ongoing course of action. In other words, addressing the trouble-source turn speaker is a way to enact one's status a ratified participant (as opposed to an overhearer, for example). Relatedly, the distribution of rights and responsibilities to speak for

self and others (specifically, to repair one's own and other's talk) is ordinarily invisible in other-initiated repair sequences (but see Lerner, 2002, 2003). In light of "other"-selection, however, the negotiated nature of these epistemic rights and responsibilities—and the resulting interactional payoffs—can be brought to the analytic scrutiny.

Finally, "other"-selection raises questions about the analytic concept of the self—as the speaker of the trouble source—in repair. Is it analytically accurate to see the self as a person who has produced the repairable or should the self be seen as a party that may be inhabited by several interlocutors acting as a collectivity? So far, repair (unlike the turn-taking organization) has been conceptualized as a sequence of actions organized by reference to individual interlocutors or persons (Schegloff et al., 1977). However, the analysis of "other"-selection suggests that perhaps it should be reconceptualized as organized by reference to parties (see also Bolden, in press; Egbert, 1997b). For instance, in cases where a more competent interlocutor is selected to speak for a less competent one (as in Excerpt 5 and Excerpt 6) or when "other" is selected after the trouble-source speaker has failed to respond (Excerpt 3 and Excerpt 4), the repair initiator appears to be treating the two interlocutors as incumbents of the same party. Similarly, Egbert (1997b) showed that several persons can act as a collectivity of repair initiators. Further research into the organization of repair in multiperson conversation and ways in which various "others" get involved in repair initiation and resolution promises to shed more light on this question.

REFERENCES

Asmuß, B., & Svennevig, J. (2009). Meeting talk: An introduction. *Journal of Business Communication, 46*, 3–22.

Atkinson, J. M., & Drew, P. (1979). *Order in court: The organisation of verbal interaction in judicial settings*. London, England: Macmillan.

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.

Bolden, G. B. (in press). Across languages and cultures: Brokering problems of understanding in conversational repair. *Language in Society, 41*.

Cahill, P. (2010). Children's participation in their primary care consultations. In H. Gardner & M. A. Forrester (Eds.), *Analysing interactions in childhood : Insights from conversation analysis*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Clayman, S. E., & Heritage, J. (2002). *The news interview: Journalists and public figures on the air* (pp. 128–145). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Egbert, M. M. (1997a). Schisming: The collaborative transformation from a single conversation to multiple conversations. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 30*, 1–51.

Egbert, M. M. (1997b). Some interactional achievements of other-initiated repair in multiperson conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 27*, 611–634.

Egbert, M. M. (2004). Other-initiated repair and membership categorization—Some conversational events that trigger linguistic and regional membership categorization. *Journal of Pragmatics, 36*, 1467–1498.

Forrester, M. A., & Cherington, S. M. (2009). The development of other-related conversational skills: A case study of conversational repair during the early years. *First Language, 29*, 166–191.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Goodwin, C. (1979). The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 97–121). New York, NY: Irvington Publishers.

Goodwin, C. (1986). Audience diversity, participation and interpretation. *Text, 6*, 283–316.

Goodwin, C., & Goodwin, M. H. (2003). Participation. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 222–244). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Goodwin, M. H. (1983). Searching for a word as an interactive activity. In J. N. Deely & M. D. Lenhart (Eds.), *Semiotics* (pp. 129–138). New York, NY: Plenum.

Goodwin, M. H. (1997). By-play: Negotiating evaluation in story-telling. In G. R. Guy, C. Feagin, D. Schiffrin, & J. Baugh (Eds.), *Towards a social science of language: Papers in honor of William Labov* (Vol. 2: Social interaction and discourse structures, pp. 77–102). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Hayashi, M. (2003). Language and the body as resources for collaborative action: A study of word searches in Japanese conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 36*, 109–141.

Hayashi, M., Mori, J., & Tagaki, T. (2002). Contingent achievement of co-tellership in a Japanese conversation: An analysis of talk, gaze and gesture. In C. E. Ford, B. A. Fox, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *The language of turn and sequence* (pp. 81–122). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Heath, C., & Luff, P. (2000). *Technology in action*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. (1984a). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299–345). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. (1984b). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. New York, NY: Polity Press.

Heritage, J. (2007). Intersubjectivity and progressivity in references to persons (and places). In T. Stivers & N. J. Enfield (Eds.), *Person reference in interaction: Linguistic, cultural and social perspectives* (pp. 255–280). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Hosoda, Y. (2003). Repair and relevance of differential language expertise in second language conversations. *Applied Linguistics, 27*, 25–50.

Ikeda, T. (2007). *Facilitating participation: Communicative practices in interaction between native and nonnative speakers of Japanese*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin.

Jefferson, G. (1981). *The abominable 'Ne?': A working paper exploring the phenomenon of post-response pursuit of response*. Manchester, England: Department of Sociology, University of Manchester.

Jefferson, G. (1989). Preliminary notes on a possible metric which provides for a "standard maximum" silences of approximately one second in conversation. In D. Roger & P. Bull (Eds.), *Conversation: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 166–196). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Jefferson, G. (1990). List construction as a task and interactional resource. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Interaction competence* (pp. 63–92). Washington, DC: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis and University Press of America.

Kangasharju, H. (1996). Aligning as a team in multiparty conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 26*, 291–319.

Kitzinger, C., & Mandelbaum, J. S. (2008, November). *Word selection and social identities in talk*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the National Communication Association, San Diego, CA.

Labov, W., & Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic discourse: Psychotherapy as conversation*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Lerner, G. H. (1992). Assisted storytelling: Deploying shared knowledge as a practical matter. *Qualitative Sociology, 15*, 247–271.

Lerner, G. H. (1993). Collectivities in action: Establishing the relevance of conjoined participation in conversation. *Text, 13*, 213–245.

Lerner, G. H. (1995). Turn design and the organization of participation in instructional activities. *Discourse Processes, 19*, 111–131.

Lerner, G. H. (1996). Finding "face" in the preference structures of talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 59*, 303–321.

Lerner, G. H. (2002, May). *Practice does not make perfect: Intervening actions in the selection of next speaker*. Plenary address to the Conference on Language, Interaction, and Culture. University of Los Angeles, California.

Lerner, G. H. (2003). Selecting next speaker: The context-sensitive operation of a context-free organization. *Language in Society, 32*, 177–201.

Lerner, G. H. (2004). On the place of linguistic resources in the organization of talk-in-interaction: Grammar as action in prompting a speaker to elaborate. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 37*, 154–184.

Mandelbaum, J. S. (1987). Couples sharing stories. *Communication Quarterly, 35*, 144–170.

Mondada, L. (2007). Multimodal resources for turn-taking: Pointing and the emergence of possible next speakers. *Discourse Studies, 9*, 194–225.

Mori, J. (2003). The construction of interculturality: A study of initial encounters between Japanese and American students. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 36*, 143–184.

Ochs, E. (1984). Clarification and culture. In D. Schiffrin (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table in Languages and Linguistics* (pp. 325–341). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories and their implications. In R. A. Shweder & R. A. LeVine (Eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self and emotion* (pp. 276–320). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Pillet-Shore, D. (2008). *Coming together: Creating and maintaining social relationships through the openings of face-to-face interactions*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Raymond, G., & Heritage, J. (2006). The epistemics of social relations: Owning grandchildren. *Language in Society, 35*, 677–705.

Sacks, H. (1984). On doing "being ordinary." In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 413–429). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

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, PA: Multilingual Matters.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation* (Vol. 1). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50*, 696–735.

Schegloff, E. A. (1991). Reflections on talk and social structure. In D. Boden & D. H. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk and social structure* (pp. 44–70). Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1995). Parties and talking together: Two ways in which numbers are significant for talk-in-interaction. In P. ten Have & G. Psathas (Eds.), *Situated order: Studies in social organization and embodied activities* (pp. 31–42). Washington, DC: University Press of America.

Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 52–133). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (2000). When "others" initiate repair. *Applied Linguistics, 21*, 205–243.

Schegloff, E. A. (2006). Interaction: The infrastructure for social institutions, the natural ecological niche for language, and the arena in which culture is enacted. In N. J. Enfield & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of human sociality: Culture, cognition and interaction* (pp. 70–125). New York, NY: Berg.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (2009). One perspective on *Conversation analysis: Comparative perspectives*. In J. Sidnell (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Comparative perspectives* (pp. 357–406). Cambridge, England: 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.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Stivers, T. (2001). Negotiating who presents the problem: Next speaker selection in pediatric encounters. *Journal of Communication, 51*, 252–282.

Stivers, T., & Robinson, J. D. (2006). A preference for progressivity in interaction. *Language in Society, 35*, 367–392.

Svennevig, J. (2008). Trying the easiest solution first in other-initiation of repair. *Journal of Pragmatics, 40*, 333–348.

Ten Have, P. (1999). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide*. London, England: Sage.

Wilkinson, S., & Kitzinger, C. (2006). Surprise as an interactional achievement: Reaction tokens in conversation. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 69*, 150–182.