InLiSt No. 26

Interaction and Linguistic Structures

The Logic of Clarification. Some observations about word-clarification repairs in Finnish-as-a-lingua-fanca interactions*

Harrie Mazeland and Minna Zaman-Zadeh

Groningen / San Diego

August 2001

In recognition of the enthusiasm he has brought to all aspects of the study of spoken verbal interaction, we dedicate this series to Professor Dr. Aldo di Luzio, University of Konstanz.

EDITORS

Prof. Dr. Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen
Universität Konstanz
FB Sprachwissenschaft
PB D 180
D-78457 Konstanz

PD Dr. Susanne Günthner
Universität Konstanz
FB Sprachwissenschaft
PB D 180
D-78457 Konstanz

Prof. Dr. Margret Selting
Universität Potsdam
Institut für Germanistik
Postfach 60 15 53
D-14415 Potsdam

Prof. Dr. John Local
University of York
Dept. of Language and Linguistic Science
Heslington
GB-YORK YO 10 5DD

Prof. Dr. Peter Auer
Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg
Deutsches Seminar I
Postfach
D-79085 Freiburg i. Br.

Prof. Dr. Auli Hakulinen
University of Helsinki
Dept. of Finnish Language
FIN-00014 HELSINKI

http://ling.sprachwiss.uni-konstanz.de/pages/anglistik/

1 Introduction

In the spring of 1996, Minna Zaman-Zadeh collected the recordings of 12 conversations between adult learners of Finnish in an immigrant-education school (the Adult Education Center of Oulu, Finland). Pairs of students were asked to talk Finnish with each other during a break between lessons and to record this interaction. The participants had lived in Finland from 2.5 months to 3 years. The teachers characterized their students' command of Finnish as still very elementary; they were 'real beginners'.[1] It indeed turned out to be a rather laborious task for the students to speak in Finnish to each other. The interaction was frequently formatted as a kind of interview with one party asking questions and the other one answering them. Both the introduction of topics and their elaboration turned out to be hard work. There were many long silences within and between turns and many forms of repair could be observed.[2]

In this paper, we analyse one such class of repairs: the clarification of a word or an expression that causes trouble for the interlocutor. We focus on *word-clarification repairs* that are initiated by the recipient. Fragment 1 is an example:

(1) **where-your-capital?** *[Abdul is a Kurdish man who has already been in Finland for 3 years; Juan is from Guatemala and has only been in Finland for 3 months at the time of the recording (his wife is Finnish).]*

```
03   Abdul:    missä sinun pääkaupunki?*
               where your  capital?
04             0.8
05   ( ):      ((smacks))
06             0.8
07   Abdul:    pääkaupun°ki°?
               capital?
08             0.4
09   Juan:     pääkaupunk[i     ]
               capital
10   Abdul:              [°joo↑:°]
                            yes
12   Juan?:    (°ko°)
13             0.5
14   Juan:     >en tiedä.<
               I don't know.
15             0.3
```

---

* pääkaupunki: 'head' (*pää*) - city.

```
16   Abdul:    miksi en teeä,
               why  I don't know,
17             0.6
18   Abdul?:   ·hh
19             0.4
20   Abdul:®   minun pääkaupunki Bagdad.
               my    capital       Bagdad.
21             0.4
22   Abdul:    m[issä sin]un pääka[u°punki°? ]
               where  your   capital?
23   Juan:      [A:=jaa. ]         [>joo joo<]=
                oh yes              yes yes
24             =>ymmärrän. ymmärän.<
               I understand. I understand
25             (.)
26   Abdul:    °j[o(o)°  ]
                 yes
27   Juan:       [jah-, ] (>°ö°<) Guattemaala, (0.3)
                  and     (uh)   Guattemala
28             on sama ↓nimi< >kaupunki. sama,
               is same  name   city.     same,
```

Abdul is literally asking *'where (is) your capital'* (line 03). Note first that this question eventually is dealt with as an inquiry after the name of the capital of the addressee's home country *(«what is your capital?»)* and this is the perspective from which we will deal with it as well.[3]

Juan does not immediately provide an answer to Abdul's question. Instead, a trouble source is identified in Abdul's turn. After several attempts to repair the trouble in another way (lines 05-16), Abdul eventually tries to solve the problem by exemplifying the word 'capital': *'my capital (is) Bagdad'* (line 20). The repair is *initiated* by the recipient - see the *other-initiations* in line 09 (a repeat of the trouble-source "pääkaupunki") and in line 14 ("en tiedä", *'I don't know'*). However, the repair *proper* is done by the speaker of the trouble-source turn himself (lines 10, 16 and finally the clarification in lines 20-22).

All the word-clarification repairs we will discuss in this paper display this pattern: they are initiated by the recipient in next turn and subsequently repaired by the speaker of the trouble-source turn him- or herself. From a sequential perspective, this type of repair can be characterized as *other-initiated self repair* (*cf.* Schegloff *et al.* 1977).

We will discuss three aspects of word-clarification repairs: its *conceptual*, its *interactional* and its *semantic* logic*.* At the level of the *conceptual logic*, the focus is on the mode of problem solving. In fragment 1, for example, the clarification is done by *exemplifying* the word "pääkaupunki" (*'my capital Bagdad'*). But exemplification

is just one of the ways in which a word may be explained. In theory, Juan could have used other methods, *e.g.*, by *circumscribing* the meaning of "pääkaupunki" as 'the main city of your home country'. A speaker can explain the meaning of a word in different ways, - *e.g.*, by exemplification, by specification or by contrast. Each method that is used to clarify the meaning of an expression displays a specific type of reasoning of how a word could be explained in the easiest, most effective and/or most appropriate way.

The second aspect has to do with the *interactional logic* of the repair. It is investigated by looking at its sequential trajectory. Word clarifications may be done as a one-step move that is implemented in a single turn (as in line 20 of fragment 1) or as a multi-step project that is interactionalized in a series of turns. The number of steps, their order ánd the way they are packaged mark the path along which the speaker tries to guide the recipient towards recognition of the word in question.

The conceptual and interactional design of clarification repairs are not independent from each other. There is a finely tuned interdependency. A primary level at which they meet is the semantics that is built into an expression through the process of clarifying it. This is the *semantic logic* of the repair. We explore this aspect by examining the clarification of *state-modifying categories* (expressions such as *divorce*, *repair*, *restore, recover, etcetera*). We describe how a state-modifying category is clarified by locating its position in a little semantic system of categorically organized knowledge. The way the system is ordered for the purpose of clarification even figures in the sequential design of the repair.

The conceptual logic of the design of word-clarification repairs is discussed in section 4, its interactional logic in section 5 and its semantic logic in section 6. In the concluding section we will briefly reflect upon our results and our methodology. In the sections 2 and 3, some preliminary observations are made. In section 2, we underline - perhaps unnecessarily - that clarifying a word implies more than just demonstrating its reference or explicating some informative representational aspect of the meaning of the problematic expression. In section 3, we will describe the environment of use of clarification repairs. Our students did not engage in clarification work after just any type of repair initiation. They never do word-clarification as a first attempt to solve a recipient problem with prior turn. All word-clarification repairs in our data are next attempts to solve the problem. We wil refer to this feature as the *non-firstness property*.

2 Clarifying: more than explicating representation

A first preliminary observation pertains to the type of rationality that is taken as a resource in doing a specific type of clarification. A speaker is not only exploiting declarative, world describing knowledge when (s)he is clarifying the meaning of a word. The participants in our corpus heavily rely upon pragmatic aspects of language use in the design of word-clarification repairs. They attend to such features as what the word to be explained is doing in the utterance, how the utterance is related to its speaker or to the social situation and what the utterance as a whole is doing in its sequential context. Look again at fragment 1:

(1) **where-your-capital?** *[details]*

```
03   Abdul:    missä sinun pääkaupunki?
               where your  capital?
                  (...)
14   Juan:     >en tiedä.<
               I don't know.
                  (...)
20   Abdul:®   minun pääkaupunki Bagdad.
               my    capital      Bagdad.
```

When Abdul is clarifying the meaning of the word "pääkaupunki" (*'capital'*) with *'my capital (is) Bagdad'*, he does not just exemplify the class of capital names by mentioning a member of that class. The utterance as a whole exemplifies the *type* of answer Juan should give to Abdul's question (*'where your capital'*). Abdul demonstrates the kind of utterance that would do in this particular environment of use.

Clarification is not just accomplished at the propositional, descriptive level of utterances: it is primarily achieved through and via pragmatic exemplification at the sequential level. Understanding a word amounts to more than knowing what it represents: the recipient should be able to understand what the word is *used* for and what *action* is implemented by the utterance in which it is used.[4]

3   The non-firstness of word-clarification repairs

Before discussing the clarification repair itself, we want to point at a remarkable sequential feature of this type of repair in our data. Our word-clarification repairs are not done as a first option for doing repair. The speaker of the trouble-source turn first tries to solve the problem by other types of remedies. In the *where-your-capital?* fragment, for example, the trouble is first dealt with as a hearing or recognition problem. Abdul tries to solve the problem by simply repeating a segment from the trouble-source turn (see his "pääkaupunki" in line 7) and by confirming its correctness when it is subsequently repeated one more time by the recipient (lines 9-10). In fragment 2 below, we see this *non-firstness* property of word-clarification repairs one more time:

(2) **he-repairs-car.** *[Asha is a 19 year old woman from the Somalian minority in Ethiopia. Melbi is a 25 year old Thai woman who is married to a Finn. Each of them has stayed in Finland about one year at the time of the first recording round.]*

```
09   Asha:     sinun mies on suoma[lain  ]
                your husband is Finnish
10   Melbi:                        [minun-]
                                    my
11             0.6
12   Melbi:    ↓joo↑o,
                yes,
13             0.3
14   Melbi:    suomalainen.
                Finnish.
15   Asha:     hy:vä.
                good.
16             0.3
17   Melbi:    joo. hän:(0.9) kollejaa* (0.3) autoh.
                yes. he  (0.9) repairs (0.3) car.
18             1.5
19   Asha:  →  [>°mi ]täh?
                 what?
```

---

* A 'correct' pronunciation of "kollejaa" would sound like *korjaa*. Melbi does not always pronounce the *r*-sound as native Finnish speakers are assumed to do. So for a Finnish recipient, Melbi's pronunciation of the word may sound like *'repails'*. Note that Asha repeats this pronunciation in line 23 and that Melbi herself produces a more correct form later on in line 30.

```
20   Melbi:    [kol-]
               re-
21   Melbi:    <kollejaa.>
               repails.
22             0.5
23   Asha: →  kolle[↑jaa?]
               repairs?
24   Melbi:        [joo, ]
                    yes,
25             0.2
26   Melbi:→  (jos:.) sinää o a: (1.2) auto rikki (0.4)
               (if) you uh u:h (1.2) car broken (0.4)
27             ja hän °tämä°
               and he this
28             1.1
29   Asha:     (°m:h:n:°°)
30             0.4
31   Melbi:    korjaa,
               repairs,
32             1.6
33   Asha:     °joh°
               yes
34             0.5
35   Melbi:    °autoh,°
               car,
36             0.6
```

When Melbi tries to tell Asha that her husband works as a car mechanic, Asha indicates that she is having a problem ("mitäh?": ´what?´, line 19). Again, the speaker of the trouble-source turn at first deals with the trouble as just a hearing problem. Melbi merely repeats a specific segment of her turn, perhaps in a more carefully pronounced mode ("kollejaa.", line 21). Only after her recipient has signalled this does not solve the problem (see the questioning repeat in line 23: "kollejaa?"), she deals with the trouble as something that can be solved by doing a word-clarification repair (lines 26-31).

As in fragment 1, word clarification is dealt with as a *non-first* option. Other methods of doing the repair are tried first. In our data, almost all cases of other-initiated word-clarification repair have this feature of *non-firstness*. The clarifications we will look at thus occur in a sequentially specifiable environment: after a next other-initiation of repair indicating that a prior, less strong method of doing the repair was not successful.

It is tempting to explain the non-firstness of word-clarification repairs in terms of a kind of communicative trust even beginning foreign language users rely upon. As

long as no counter-evidence is given, the speaker assumes that his/her recipient is able to develop a working understanding of the words and constructions that are being used.

This account is even compatible with the possibility that the non-firstness of our clarification-repairs is an artefact of the recording situation. Our conversations are recorded in a foreign-language learning setting. The students may have seen the recording situation as an assignment, or perhaps even as a test. They wanted to give a good impression, not only of themselves but also of their interlocutors. They did work to avoid the impression that their first analysis of the recipient's trouble located the problem in his or her incompetence. They preferred to first attend to alternative, more courteous explanations. The trouble first was dealt with as a hearing or recognition problem that can be solved by repeating the repairable in a slightly ameliorated way, - *e.g.*, by articulating it more carefully, or producing it more loudly in the clear. The trouble with prior turn is not at first hand ascribed to the recipient's incompetence. The conclusion that s/he does not know something first has to be established as a reasonable inference that is warranted by the interaction itself.

Other types of accounts might be worth considering, however. The non-firstness of word clarification may be a side effect of an orientation to a problem-solving strategy that favors easy solutions first (*cf.* Pomerantz 1984). The speaker of the trouble-source turn first deals with the trouble as just a hearing or recognition problem. This kind of problem can be readily solved by repeating the trouble source (as in lines 19-21 of fragment 2), or by treating the recipient's repeat of the trouble source as a candidate understanding that only needs to be confirmed (as in lines 9-10 of fragment 1). The possibility that the recipient does not know the word in question is overridden, at least at this stage of problem solving. S/he just has a hearing problem (s/he did not hear the word correctly), or an easy-to-solve recognition problem (the recipient knows the word in question but his/her image of it does not match with the expression as it is perceived in the talk).

The remedy that is proposed by a speaker does not have to reflect his analysis of the problem (Pomerantz 1984). The 'easiness' of the solution that is actually proffered is not necessarily equivalent with it being the most obvious or the most likely one. When a speaker treats a trouble as a hearing problem, s/he still can be aware of the possibility that the expression in question is not known by the recipient. The speaker just tries to avoid less preferred interactional trajectories.[5] Repair

outside the borders of the trouble-source turn causes discontinuities in the sequence that is in progress. It may even become the primary activity for a longer stretch of talk. The repair temporarily suspends the current business at hand, even at the risk of losing it wholly (*cf.* Jefferson 1987). The participants may anticipate by trying to minimize this type of discontinuity. Particularly in the kind of interaction that is examined here, solving the problem as only a hearing problem might be weighed as an alternative that is less discontinuous than the laborious difficulties a beginning foreign-language learner might foresee when forced to clarify the meaning of a word to another beginner.

But whatever the origins of its initial dispreferredness may be, it suffices for our current purpose to observe that the word-clarification repairs in our data are *nonfirst*, *next* attempts to accomplish repair. At least one previous attempt to solve the problem in a different way has been unsuccessful.

4   The conceptual logic of the design of word clarification repairs

All clarifications in our data explain world-describing words ('content words', which are sometimes contrasted with 'function words'). When a speaker tries to clarify a word, he has to solve the problem how to give information about it in such a way that the recipient is able to get a grasp of what it is doing. The speakers in our data use various methods to achieve this.

In fragment 1 - the 'where-your-capital' fragment -, Abdul solves the problem by giving an example from the set of capital names. The example should do the work of enabling the recipient to develop a working understanding of the problematic expression. We already referred to this type of solution as *clarification-by-exemplification*.

In fragment 2 - the 'he-repairs-car' fragment -, Melbi solves the problem by describing the kind of work her husband does: 'when a car is broken, he repairs it ' (line 26-30). We call the conceptual logic of this type of repair *clarification-by-description*.

Fragment 3 illustrates a third type of conceptual logic. We call this type *clarification-by-script-link*. Juan is saying that his wife is in hospital and when his recipient does not understand, he says 'doctor' (line 48). The reference to the professional category (*'doctor'*) somehow should do the work of enabling the recipient to identify the setting he is talking about (*'hospital'*) :

(3) **where-your-wife?** *[Juan and Abdul]*

```
44   Juan:     e: nyt, ↓minun vaimoo↓ on, (0.2) *hospital*.
               uh now    my    wife   is (0.2) *hospital*.
45             0.8
46   Abdul:    (m-) missä- (.) missä sinun vaimo?
               (m-) where- (.) where your  wife?
47             0.5
48   Juan: →   °*hospital*.°
49             0.5
50   Abdul:    [(ei-)]
                (no-)
51   Juan: ®   [LÄÄ ]käri,
               physician,
```

The types of clarification we have seen until now - by exemplification, by description or by script-link - have in common that they all resort to encyclopedic knowledge. In fragment 1, the recipient not only has to know that Bagdad is a city but also that it is the *main* city of a country in some relevant respect. In 2, the recipient is assumed to know that broken cars are repaired by a professionally specialized category of persons: 'car mechanics'. And in 3, the recipient should be able to make a link with one type of setting in which doctors relevantly act. In all these examples, the clarifier relies upon the recipient's ability to make a *knowledge link* from familiar knowledge to the target knowledge.

The procedure for locating knowledge for constructing meaning may rely more heavily upon linguistic means, however. See, for example, fragment 4, - particularly lines 36-48. Hanna explains the Finnish word for *'be free'* ("vapa", here: *'have a holiday'*) as *'does not study'*. "Vapa" is made to a member of the contrast pair <(be) free, study>. The negation of the other member should enable the recipient to locate the contrast category:

(4) **is-your-husband-december-free?** *[Hanna is a 27 year old Iraqu woman who had lived in Finland as a refugee for 13 months at the time of the first recordings. Gudrun is a 28 year old German woman who is married to a Finn; at the time of the first recordings, she had been in Finland for 2,5 months.]*

```
29   hanna:    onko sinu mies (1.1) on joulukuu vapaa°:: (0.3) vii↑ko
               is your husband (1.1) is december free    (0.3) week?
30             4.2
31   gudrun:   on↑ko (.) minun- minun mi↑es:  (0.5) on: jou↑lu=
               is    (.) my     my    husband (0.5) is christmas=
```

```
32   hanna:    =>joulukuu vapa,<
               =december free,
33             0.5
34   hanna:    viiko?
               week?
35             1.7
36   gudrun:   >°vapa?°<
                free?
37             1.7
38   gudrun:   °m:.° (.) (°en ymmärä,°)
                m:. (.) (I don't understand,)
39             0.3
40   gudrun:   e:he:mf!
41             0.4
42   hanna:    °m:.°
43             0.6
44   gudrun:   °a:h
45             1.7
46   gudrun?:  (•h)
47             1.9
48   hanna: ®  ei opiskeeleh?
               doesn't study?
49             0.8
50   gudrun:   minun:: (0.3) mies: °ö:h-° (2.5) opiskelee (1.0)
               my      (0.3) husband u:h (2.5) studies   (1.0)
51             hän[en]
               his
52   hanna:       [jo]o >minä ymmärän,<
                   yes  I    understand,
```

The meaning of a word is explained by exploiting the contrastive, *antonymic* relation it has with another word. So, apart from knowledge links, word clarifications can also make use of *linguistic practices* for locating relevant cultural knowledge.[6] Another example of a linguistic practice is giving synonyms. However, a more frequent type of using substitutes in our data is the use of intermediate language equivalents, - *e.g.*, the mentioning of the English equivalent of the word to be explained.

5 The interactional design of clarification repairs

Most of the clarification repairs in our corpus are designed as one-step moves. The repair proper is done in a single turn. In fragment 1 - *'my capital Bagdad'* -, the clarification is packaged into a single turn constructional unit. This is also the case in the clarification in fragment 3 (*'doctor'*) and in 4 (*'doesn't study'*). The speaker of the trouble-source turn assumes that the clarification can be done as a one-step procedure. However, if we look at fragment 5 - which is an instance of clarification-

by-description -, we see that the clarification is delivered as a series of successive steps:

(5) **divorce** *[Abdul and Juan]*

```
08   Abdul:    ·h onko me em onkö onko m m: ihi- ihimine- nen
               ·hh is  we  uhm is   is  m m: m-   man- nen*
09             pää: (0.5) (·h) sinun kotimaa?
               head (0.5) (·h) your home country?
10             0.5
11             ·hh onko mies: ero eroja nainen ja nainen eroja mies?
               is man divorce divorces woman and woman divorces man?
12             1.6
13             onko?=
               is?
14   Juan:     =erro,
               divvorce,
15             0.3
16   Abdul:    ero,
               divorce,
17             0.5
18   Juan:     ero?
               divorce?
19             0.3
20   Abdul:    joo.
               yes.
21             0.9
22   Juan:     >mitä se on< (.) ero?
               >what is it< (.) divorce?
23             1.0
24   Abdul:→   e:: sinä nyt naimisissa.
               uh:: you now married.
25             0.6
26   Juan:     jo, (0.4)[minä (naimisissa,)]
               yes,(0.4) I     married,
27   Abdul:             [nyt naimisissa.   ]
                         now married.
28             (.)
29   Abdul:→   ja milloi sinä haluat, (0.7)
               and when you want,    (0.7)
30             sinä sano ö sanon nä:: sinun vaimoo (·h) e: e
               you  say uh say   nu::h your wife (·h) u:h uh
31             minä en (0.2)halua sinun e e e:: (0.5) mene °e:°
               I don't (0.2)want your uh uh u::h (0.5) go °u:h°
32             sinun eroja.
               your divorces**
33             0.4
```

---

* "nen": probably a correction of the last part of the previous word "ihimine-": "ihminen", human being / man.

** Taken literally, the form 'sinun' in "sinun eroja" is a possessive pronoun. We take it here to do primarily the work of the "dedicated term" for doing recipient reference, the personal pronoun you ("sinä"). (Cf. Schegloff 1996) The morpheme 'ja' in "eroja" marks the noun as a plural and partitive case (as in «some divorces»). Abdul might use "eroja" as a kind of verb predicate (as in «you divorce»). A similar use can be observed in line 11.

```
34    Abdul:    onko sinun paikka sama suomia?
                is   your  place same finland?
35              1.7
36    Abdul:    onko°: (0.7) eroja?
                is    (0.7) divorces?
37              0.3
38    Juan:     >anteksi en ymmärä.< erro
                sorry I don't understand. div(v)orce
```

After a few rounds in which he tried to solve the problem in other ways (lines 11-20), Abdul begins to clarify the meaning of "ero" (*'divorce'*) in order to enable Juan to answer the question about marital law in his home country. Unlike the clarifications we have seen before, the clarification is now delivered in a series of turns. Abdul first makes an assertion about Juan's marital state (*'you now married'*, line 24) and he does not continue before Juan has confirmed it explicitly (*'yes, (0.4) I (married)'*, line 26). Abdul even repeats a part of the assertion about Juan's married state one more time (we will come back to this repeat in the next section), before he goes on with a next step of the clarification, a description of the kind of event that occasions a divorce in a marriage (*'and when ... you say your wife ... I don't want your ... go'*, lines 29-32).[7]

The progress of the clarification project is made dependent on the active collaboration of the recipient. Its trajectory includes a slot where the recipient can show that he can go along so far. The clarification is interactionalized by distributing it over a series of turns. The recipient contributes to the way it is unfolding. Unlike one-step clarifications, the trouble is not treated as a problem that can be solved by simply handing over a one-way ticket with which the recipient should arrive at a solution all by himself. Instead, the clarifier works towards a solution of the problem by stepwise guiding his recipient towards recognition of the kind of situation the word "ero" applies to.

Multi-step clarifications are delivered as a series of ordered moves that can be characterized both structurally and functionally. In our data, the contours of the following positions become visible: the *clarification basis*, the *clarification path* and the *clarification target*.

In the first step, the *clarification basis* is established. It locates the starting point from which a joint path can be followed until the clarification is complete. In fragment 5, the *clarification basis* is created by asserting knowledge that is evidently familiar to the recipient (*'you now married'*, line 24). The first person to know about his

marriage is Juan himself. He is the one who is assumed to confirm the correctness of Abdul's assertion:

(5a) detail of fragment 5 (divorce): *clarification basis*

```
22   Juan:     >mitä se on< (.) ero?
               >what is it< (.) divorce?
23             1.0
24   Abdul:→   e:: sinä nyt naimisissa.
               uh:: you now married.
25             0.6
26   Juan: →   jo, (0.4)[minä (naimisissa,)]
               yes,(0.4) I      married,
27   Abdul:            [nyt naimisissa.   ]
                        now married.
28             (.)
29   Abdul:    ja milloi sinä haluat, ...
               and when you want,
```

The turn in line 24 with the assertion about Juan's married state is not yet completing the repair, however. It is observably oriented to as still to be followed by more. Juan only confirms the assertion that is made in it and does not yet begin with answering the question that Abdul is repairing. Complementarily, Abdul too is not yet giving any sign that his recipient already should be able to answer the question. Both participants orient to current turn as only the first step of a project that encompasses more. The clarification is observably designed from the beginning as an activity that will enfold over the course of a trajectory of more than one step.

The clarification basis provides the common ground from where the speaker of the trouble source turn will guide his recipient along a path that will enable him to develop a working understanding of the explanandum. Perhaps this is why this move is formulated as a request for confirmation. The assertion about the recipient's married state is oriented to as stating knowledge that is to be ratified interactionally as mutually shared knowledge before the participants continue with the next step of the clarification.

The *clarification target* is the position at which the clarification project is brought towards completion. In fragment 5, Abdul uses a specific device to mark the completion of the clarification trajectory. The turn in which he describes the kind of event it takes to end a marriage is packaged in the [*when* ..., *then* ...] format (see "ja milloi sinä haluat ...": *'and when you want ...'*, line 29). In the *then*-part, Abdul is repeating the repairable in a way that incorporates it in an assertion about the

recipient ("sinun eroja", *'your divorces'*, line 32). By combining it with the (possessive) pronoun *yours*, the speaker demonstrates that the expression-to-be-explained is applicable in the circumstances described in the *when*-part of the ongoing turn:

(5b) detail of fragment 5 ('divorce'): *clarification path and clarification target*

```
29   Abdul: → ja milloi sinä haluat, (0.7)
                and when you want,    (0.7)
30            sinä sano ö sanon nä:: sinun vaimoo (·h) e: e
                you  say uh say   nu::h your wife (·h) u:h uh
31            minä en (0.2)halua sinun e e e:: (0.5) mene °e:°
                I don't (0.2)want your uh uh u::h (0.5) go °u:h°
32         → sinun eroja.
                your divorces
33            0.4
34   Abdul:   onko sinun paikka sama suomia?
                is   your  place same finland?
```

The repeat of the repairable is not only a demonstration of its applicability, however. It is marking the completeness of the clarification project. We already saw a similar use of repairable repeat marking clarification completion in line 32 of fragment 2:

(2a) detail of fragment 2 (he-repairs-car)

```
26   Melbi:   (jos:.) sinää o a: (1.2) auto rikki (0.4)
                (if) you uh u:h (1.2) car broken (0.4)
27            ja hän °tämä°
                and he this
28            1.1
29   Asha:    (°m:h:n:°°)
30            0.4
31   Melbi: → korjaa,
                repairs,
```

So at least two structurally and functionally specifiable positions can be identified in the series of steps into which the clarification is interactionalized: the clarification basis and the clarification target.

The steps along which a trajectory is laid out from clarification basis to clarification target, we will call the *clarification path*. In fragment 5, this is the part in which Abdul characterizes the type of event it takes to end a marriage. He dramatizes the kind of dialogue that leads towards divorce (lines 29-31). Note that

the transition to the clarification-path position is marked as a departure from the clarification basis by formulating this next step as a hypothetical event in the marriage of the recipient (*'and **when** you want ..., you say ... your wife ... I don't ... want your ...'*, lines 29-31). The clarification basis describes the actual marital state of the recipient, whereas the clarification path is designed so as to trigger reasoning about the ways in which this situation may develop hypothetically.

In sum, the following three steps can be discerned in the design of Abdul's clarification repair:

(1) *clarification basis* (assertion about the recipient's married state, line 24)
(2) *clarification path* (narrative characterization of the type of event that ends a marriage, lines 29-31)
(3) *clarification target* (project completion-marking in line 32: the speaker returns to the explanandum by stating it as the outcome of step 2).

In fragment 5, step 1 and the combination of step 2 and 3 are interactionalized in separate turns that are responded to independently by the recipient. Each of these steps may be expanded further, compartmentalized or recursively repeated in separate turn constructional units that are responded to separately as independent turns. Together they implement the trajectory of the repair.

Abdul's second attempt to explain "ero" through clarification is an example of such an expansion. The first clarification round was not successful (see line 38 of fragment 5, which is repeated in the beginning of fragment 6 below: "anteksi en ymmärä. erro", *sorry I don't understand. div(v)vorce*). After another attempt to deal with the troubles as a simple word-recognition problem (see the morphologically modified repeat of "ero" in line 41), Abdul then embarks in yet another attempt to solve the problem by clarification (lines 47-65). This time, his endeavours eventually will be successful. Before they arrive at the clarification target, Juan already indicates that finally the penny has dropped (see his relieved "joo" - *'yes'* - in line 65). Immediately after this, Abdul returns to the trouble-source turn. He repeats the original question (lines 66-68) and Juan is now finally able to answer it (lines 70-74):[8]

(6) **divorce**. Continuation of fragment 5: *the next clarification round*

```
38   Juan:     >anteksi en ymmärä.< erro
                sorry I don't understand. div(v)orce
39              0.2
```

```
40   Juan:     sana erro,=
               word div(v)orce,
41   Abdul:    =eroja,
               divorces,
42             0.2
43   Abdul:    >↑eroj↓aa↑:?
               divorces?
44             2.2
45   Juan:     °erro,°
               °div(v)orce,°
46             2.9
47   Abdul: →  e[si      ] e: esimerkiksis tämä (0.3) tämä (0.7)
               for          uh: example     this (0.3) this (0.7)
48   Juan:      [(°erro,°)]
49   Abdul:    tä- tämä se on nainen.
               th- this it is a woman.
50             0.2
51   Juan:     joo,
               yes,
52             0.2
53   Abdul:    ja tämäm:< mi[es. e]
               and this    a man. uh
54   Juan:                  [mies ]:,
                             a man,
55   Abdul:    ·h hän (°ng-°) (1.1) naimisis:
               ·h he  (°ng-°) (1.1) marrie
56             nai[misissa,  ]
               married,
57   Juan:       [>jaa naimi]sis,<
                 >yes marry,<
58             0.2
59   Abdul: →  ·hh jaa hän (ng:)m hän sano< nainen:<
               ·hh and he (ng:)m  he  say    woman
60             minä en:< h[alua,]
               I   don't want,
61   Juan:                [mi  ]nä en halu[a,
                          I     don't want,
62   Abdul:                              [sinut pois.
                                          you away.
63             0.7
64             jaa [min*ä:*,]=
               and  I,
65   Juan: →       [↑joo     ]=
                    yes
66   Abdul:    =jo-, ·h >onko sinun< m m:: kotima< (.) sama.
                ye-, ·h  is  your m m:: home country (.) same.
67             1.4
68             sama suomia.
               same finland.
69             0.9
70   Juan:     (d)joo↑:< (.) kotimaa (1.0)
               (d)yes,  (.) home country (1.0)
71             on sama. muta (0.7) usko,
               is same. but (0.7) belief,
72             0.4
73   Abdul:    [joo, ]
                yes,
```

```
74  Juan:    [ei ol]e sama.
            is not same.
```

Again, the clarification is delivered as a multi-step project that is distributed over an ordered series of turns. A major difference with the interactional design of the clarification in the first round, however, is that both the clarification basis and the clarification path are expanded into an ordered series of smaller units. Each of them is implemented in a separate turn constructional unit that can be responded to as an independent turn.

The starting point from where the clarification work is begun is moved further back in this second clarification round. The clarification basis itself is treated as something that has to be erected independently along an interactionally warranted series of moves. Abdul this time does not start with an assertion about the married state itself. Instead, he begins with the real basics of marriage: *'... this is a woman, ... and this is a man'* (lines 47-53). The concept *marriage* itself then is introduced by stating it as a relation the latter type of person has with the former: *'he ... married'* (lines 55-56). Each relevant component of the concept *marriage* is delivered in a separate turn constructional unit and each unit is responded to independently by the recipient. First by just acknowledging ("joo", *yes; line 51)* and then by more actively co-producing the relevant utterance parts by repeating them in overlap at the first possible recognition point of their delivery (*cf.* Jefferson 1973; see "mies", *'a man'* in line 54 and "jaa naimisis", *'yes marry'* in line 57).

The clarification path is also interactionalized. It is shaped as a discrete component implemented in a single turn constructional unit that is responded to separately (*'... I don't want,'* line 59-60). Its successful receipt is not only registered by repeating the relevant part at the first possible recognition point (see lines 61).[9] It is also reformulated in a next turn constructional unit (*'you away.'* line 62).

Both the clarification basis and the clarification path are modified so as to maximise the number of opportunities in which the recipient's developing understanding can be monitored. The clarification project is sequentialized into a series of steps in which the ingredients and instructions of a recipe are given in the order of preparation. Each step is delivered as a separate turn for which the effect can be verified independently in the recipient's response. The clarifier gains maximal control over the process in which the recipient is working towards understanding from the components and instructions provided in the successive steps of the clarification.

In the next section we will see that the selection and ordering of the materials that are used in multi-step clarifications may be guided by semantic considerations. For now it suffices to have shown that clarifications are interactionalized into a sequentially ordered series of steps each of which can be oriented to as a separate turn requiring independent response. The order of these steps and their respective functions can be specified. We distinguished the following positions: the clarification basis, the clarification path and the clarification target.

6 Interactional semantics: clarifying state-modifying categories

The semantic logic of Abdul's clarification of "ero" can be formulated in terms of the notions that Harvey Sacks developed for the analysis of the categorization of persons (Sacks 1972a/b). Sacks describes how the members of a culture order knowledge categorically in their perception and interpretation of the social world. They organize the knowledge that is relevant with respect to some topic or task in collections of categories for which specific rules of application and rules of inference hold.[10]

Abdul orients to this type of knowledge organization in his clarification of "ero." He clarifies the problematic expression by specifying its position in a system of categorically organized knowledge:

(a) *Locating the system.* Abdul begins the clarification with an assertion about his recipient's married state (*'you now married'*). He introduces a category that locates knowledge about a specific area of social organization (*marriage*). The use of this category enables him to talk about Juan as the incumbent of the male category in the relational pair *husband* and *wife* and about a specific woman as the incumbent of the counterpart category.

(b) *Telling about a change.* Abdul then tells about a fictive dialogue in Juan's marriage (*'and when you ... want you say ... your wife ... I don't ... want your ... go'*). The things Juan says and does to his wife are designed to be heard as canceling constitutive features of their bond as coupled incumbents of the category pair <*husband, wife*>.

(c) *Find the consistency.* The clarification began with an assertion about Juan (*'you now married'*) and it ends with another one ("sinun eroja": *'your divorces'*). This latter assertion is also about Juan and it has the problematic expression

in it. The first assertion is about Juan's married state and the second is after a story about a hypothetical event in his marriage. The second assertion demonstrates that "ero" can be used to characterize his situation after the event in the story. The whole clarification project is configured so as to suggest the type of order that accounts for the co-selection of the category that is used to describe Juan's situation before the event in the story (*'married'*) and the one that is asserted about him after it ("ero").

(a) Locating the system. The semantic system in terms of which "ero" is clarified is located by the predicate *married* in the clarification basis (*' you now married'*, line 24). Abdul introduces a category that is associated with knowledge about a specific area of social organization (*marriage*). This knowledge is used as a frame of reference that provides the categories in terms of which the actors in the ensuing story are identified. When Abdul is talking about *your wife* (*and when ... you say ... your wife*, line 29-30), he exploits a semantic relation between *married* and the pair of relational categories *husband* and *wife*. Asserting that Juan is married implies there is a woman who is *his wife*. The possessive pronoun *your* - in *you say ... your wife ...* - refers to the addressee *as the* husband of the woman referred to with *wife*.[11]

The recipient's displayed understanding of the category that is introduced in the clarification basis is used as interpretative framework in the clarification path. The expression-to-be-explained is not only related to the state of being married but this latter category is also treated as taking part in a more encompassing system of categorically organized knowledge. The relational pair *<husband, wife>* belongs to it as well, just as the rules of inference that are associated with it.

(b) Telling about a change. Talking about being married also brings along a set of latent assumptions about how the members of a married couple treat each other. Two of these assumptions are made relevant in the story with the fictive dialogue in Juan's marriage. Abdul describes an event in which Juan tells his wife that he does not want her (*'I don't ... want your ...'*). Note that this is a negative statement. The tellable thing is that a specific attitude of the husband towards his wife is no longer present. The absence of this feeling is noticeable and tellable, not its presence. A husband is expected to 'want' his wife, at the least in a programmatically relevant fashion.

The other assumption is activated in the next story unit. Juan's dismissal of his wife (*'... your ... go!'*) does not just terminate a state of accidental togetherness. Rather, it takes some kind of lasting co-presence as a default feature of the relation between husband and wife.

The husband first tells his wife that a condition for preservation of the marriage does not hold anymore. He then actively terminates their state of being together. The order in which Juan is quoted suggests that his first statement is consequential for the second one (*cf.* Labov 1972). The lack of feeling for his wife is presented as a motive for sending her away.[12]

Abdul's fictive anecdote describes an event that is designed to be heard as incompatible with constitutive features of the bond between husband and wife. Prototypical rights and obligations associated with the category pair *<husband, wife>* no longer apply. The husband's actions are selected so as to enable the recipient to infer that the story is about the annulment of marriage.

Note that the packaging of the turns in the clarification basis already projects a change. Abdul says *'you now married'*, stressing the *now* ("sinä nyt naimisissa", line 24). He even maintains the temporal adverb in the partial repeat of this turn ("nyt naimisissa", *'now married'*, line 27). Stating, stressing and repeating that something is presently the case, is a practice for setting up a temporal contrast. In its present context, it projects the upcoming delivery of the other part of the contrast. It makes the ongoing utterance recognizable as a move in a larger project. The project will not be complete until the other part of the contrast pair is delivered.

(c) Find the consistency. Abdul builds two types of clues about the nature of the problematic expression into the final step of the clarification. The first one has to do with the framing and placement of the final unit. The second one is incorporated in its design.

Abdul began his clarification with an assertion about Juan's married state (*'you now married'*). In the concluding step, he makes another assertion about Juan (*'your divorces'*).The second assertion is made in the *then*-slot of a [*when ..., (then)* ...]-frame: *'and when you want ... you say ... your wife ... I don't want your ..., your divorces'* (lines 29-32). Both the framing and the placement of the second assertion locate the story in the *when*-part as a resource for figuring out what is being done with it. The story is pivotal for determining what is being said about Juan when the problematic expression is used in the second assertion.

The other clue is built into the construction type of the second assertion. It is formatted in a way that is similar to the formatting of the first. The first assertion ("sinä nyt naimisissa": *'you now married'*) begins with a recipient reference *('you')*. The second assertion begins with a form of *you* too: "sinun eroja" (*'your divorces'*). The analogy suggests that the second assertion has a design that runs parallel with the format of the first. In the first assertion, *'you'* is followed by a predicate that describes a state that currently applies to the recipient *('now married')*. Analogously, the recipient reference at the beginning of the second assertion projects a slot for a similar type of predicate.

Not just any predicate will do, however. It has to be contextually relevant. The problematic expression is doing something similar to the category that is used in the first assertion. It has to be related to the first category in such a way that it makes a relevant assertion about Juan's married state after the event in the story.

The problem is almost the reverse of the hearer problem Sacks observed for the interpretation of a series of categories. He describes the problem for the now famous little story *"The baby cried. The mommy picked it up."* Why do we hear *the mommy* as *the* mother of the baby? Sacks accounts for this kind of methodical hearing with a relevance rule that he called the *consistency rule.* If two or more categories are used to categorise two or more members of some population, and those categories can be heard as categories from the same collection, then hear them that way. The rule accounts for a hearing of *the mommy* as a member of the same collection of categories as *the baby*. The categories refer to persons that are co-incumbents of the same case of the category *family*. (Sacks 1972b and 1992: 150 *ff.*)

The category-interpretation problem is different for Juan. He does not know the expression that is used in Abdul's second assertion. The consistency rule nevertheless provides a basis for making inferences in a case like this. It proposes to hear the unknown expression in Abdul's second assertion (*'your* [ero]-*es'*) as a member of the same collection of categories as the predicate category in his first assertion (*'you now married'*). The relevant collection has two members: *married* and the category referred to with "ero." The consistency rule provides the kind of relevancy principle that enables the recipient to assemble the collection of categories that matters.

The clarification thus provides the following clues to the recipient. The problematic expression is referring to a category that comes from the same collection of categories as *married*. It is used to characterise the state that results

from a marriage when the husband sends his wife away because he does not want her anymore. The clues exploit categorically organised knowledge with respect to a specific domain of social organisation (*marriage*). The knowledge and the rules of inference that are associated with it have to enable Juan to recognise the situation "ero" is referring to.

Technically spoken, *marriage* is a presupposition of *divorces*. The term presupposes a chronologically prior state, that is, the state in which a couple is still married.[13] Abdul begins the clarification by introducing the presupposition. He introduces the state of being married before depicting the kind of event that dissolves it. The temporal directionality of the pair of categories <married, divorce(d)> (the second state occurring after the first) and the action-logic dependency of the second state on the first (the first one must have been the case before the second one can apply) are carefully built into both the order in which they are introduced and in the way their relation is demonstrated.[14]

"Ero" is explained as a *state-modifying* category of the *state-describing* category *married*. The two categories are presented as co-members from a structured collection of categories. The collection's structure is explicated as a contrastive two-place relation with an order of precedence. It has *married* as its first member and "ero" (*'divorce(d)'*) as the second one: <"naimisissa" (*married*), "eroja" (*divorces*)>. Each pair part is a state-describing category but the second one is shown to be dependent on the first. It refers to a situation in which the state referred to by the first category is terminated in a way that is consequential for its applicability.[15]

To put things a little bit more schematically: "ero" is explained as the second member of an ordered pair of categories $< C_1, C_2>$. C_1 refers to a state of affairs that temporally precedes C_2. C_2 results from events that terminate the C_1-state. The relation between C_1 and C_2 is mutually exclusive, in the sense that C_1 is not applicable anymore as soon as C_2 is appropriately used. The relation between C_1 and C_2 is presuppositional in the sense that the assertion of C_2 legitimates the assumption that C_1 has been applicable.

Although we did not come across many other instances of clarifications of state-modifying categories in our corpus, we have already seen an instance in fragment 2. Melbi's clarification of the Finnish word for *repairs* ("kollejaa") displays an analysis of the repairable as a state-modifying category:

(2b) detail of fragment 2 ('he-repairs-car')

```
17   Melbi:    joo. hän:(0.9) kollejaa (0.3) autoh.
               yes. he  (0.9) repairs (0.3) car.
18             1.5
19   Asha:     >°mitäh?
                what?
          (...)
26   Melbi: →  (jos:.) sinää o a: (1.2) auto rikki (0.4)
               (if) you uh u:h (1.2) car broken (0.4)
27             ja hän °tämä°
               and he this
28             1.1
29   Asha:     (°m:h:n:°°)
30             0.4
31   Melbi:    korjaa,
               repairs,
32             1.6
33   Asha:     °joh°
               yes
34             0.5
35   Melbi:    °autoh,°
               car,
```

In this case too, the repairable is characterised as a state-modifying category. The temporally preceding state is described first with the C_1-category ("auto rikki", *car broken*; line 26). Then the dependent state is referred to with the C_2-category itself ("korjaa", *repairs*; line 31). [16]

The main difference with the repair of "ero" has to do with the way the clarification is interactionalised. The three steps in Abdul's clarification - clarification basis, clarification path and clarification target - are built into a single turn-constructional unit. The clarification path and the clarification target collapse. The terms in which state-1 is described (*'car broken'*) is assumed to provide sufficient ground to govern inference making with respect to what is happening next.

"Korjaa" (*'repairs'*) is explained as a 'paired' category at the semantic level. It is presented as the second part of an ordered pair of categories. The first member of the pair is explicated as the - negatively evaluated - break down of a formerly well functioning, artificial device; the second member refers to a chronologically next state in which state-1 is undone: <*broken device, repair*>.

The unit type that is selected for implementing the clarification still allows for a two-step segmentation of clarification's trajectory, however. The clarification basis is delivered in the *if*-part and the clarification target in the *then*-part of a turn-

constructional unit with an [*if* ..., *then* ...]-format. The design of the clarification turn still correlates with the bi-partite structure of state-modifying categories. The C_1-state is introduced in the *if*-part of the clarification turn, the C_2-category is demonstrated to be applicable in its *then*-part. The design of the clarification turn is guided by the semantic analysis that is made of the repairable.

A similar interdependency of semantic analysis and the architecture of the repair can be observed at the level of its sequentialisation in the case of Abdul's clarification of "ero." The semantic structure in terms of which the repairable is explicated is reflected in the successive steps into which the repair is interactionalised. In the previous section we already showed that the clarification of "ero" was sequentialised into the following steps:

(1) the clarification basis (the assertion about the recipient's married state: *'you now married'*, line 24)

(2) the clarification path (a narrative characterization of the type of event that ends a marriage: *'you say ... your wife ... I don't ... want your ... go'*, lines 29-31)

(3) the clarification target (the demonstration of the applicability of "ero" "sinun eroja": *'your divorces'*, line 32).

The structure of the semantic system that is laid out in the clarification figures prominently in its interactional design. In step 1 (the clarification basis), the first member of the relevant pair of categories is introduced in an assertion about the recipient. In step 2 (the clarification path), the position of the other member of the pair is located by exemplarily specifying the circumstances under which it can be used (*'you say ... your wife ... I don't ... want your ... go'*). In step 3 (the clarification target), finally, the rule of application of the problematic expression is demonstrated by using it in a second assertion about the recipient ("sinun eroja", *'your divorces'*).

The speaker's analysis of the semantic structure of the repairable correlates with the design of the clarification. This is independent of a delivery as a single turn - as is in the *he-repairs-car* fragment -, or as a trajectory of three or more turns. First, the C_1-category is introduced in the clarification basis, then the relation of the C_2-category with the C_1-category may be specified in the clarification path (optionally) and, finally, its applicability is demonstrated in the segment with the clarification target. The lay out of the clarification's trajectory is informed by considerations with respect to the semantic

properties in terms of which the repairable is explicated. The structure of the device returns in the design of the repair and, reversedly, the design of the repair structures the device in a way that is relevant and informative for the occasion.[17]

7 Concluding remarks

We are very uncertain about our data. We recorded semi-elicited interactions. Consequentially, we do not know to what degree and in what way(s) we have been analyzing artifacts of the recording situation. The only thing we are pretty sure about is the unlikeliness that there is no setting-related, assignment-based specialization. We do not know whether similar types of clarification repairs do occur in non-elicited lingua-franca interactions between adult foreign-language learners. If they do, we still have to find out whether the same type of clarification occurs in other environments of use and whether the orientation to pursue clear interactional manifestations of repair success is as persistent as it is in our corpus (most strikingly documented in the succession of several repair cycles in fragment 5-6). We even do not know whether the non-firstness feature - clarification was never resorted to as a first option for solving problems with prior turn - is only typical for our data.

However, we expect that our central results turn out to be valid and insightful. Our phenomena pertain to levels of interaction that were not specified in advance. The data-driven methodology provides some warrant that we did not construe patterns that can not be found in the data. We therefore expect that the methods our students used for solving word-understanding problems are typical for the ways this kind of trouble is dealt with in some other types of lingua-franca interactions between adult foreign-language learners.

On a theoretical level, we made a distinction between different levels of word-clarification design: the conceptual, the interactional and the semantic level. At the conceptual level, we discussed several types of word clarification repairs (clarification by exemplification, by description, or by script-link) and grouped them into classes that differ with respect to the kind of linking procedures they primarily exploit (encyclopedic versus linguistic links). However, our exploration of the semantic logic of state-modifying categories also shows that language knowledge and world knowledge are highly interdependent and reflexively interwoven. Although the clarification of "ero" (*divorce'*) is primarily based upon knowledge linking, it is

explained by positioning it in a little categorical system that is embodied in the language that is used to talk about it.

An interesting result of our tentative exploration of the semantic logic in the design of clarification repairs is the idea that the lexical-semantic features of the trouble-source word are a primary resource for the interactional design of the repair. The material that is used in the respective positions of multi-step clarifications (clarification-basis, clarification-path and clarification-target) is selected on the basis of its position in the categorical system in terms of which the repairable is explained. The design of the clarification is the result of considerations with respect to three interdependent dimensions: the problem-solving mode, the semantic analysis of the repairable and its implementation into a repair sequence.

References

Cruse, D.A. (1986). *Lexical semantics.* Cambridge University Press.

Fillmore, C. (1973). 'Verbs of Judging: An exercise in semantic description.' In: J.S. Petöfi & D. Franck (eds.) *Präsuppositionen in Philosophie und Linguistik.* Frankfurt a/M: Athenäum, p. 288-317.

Fillmore, C. (1982). 'Ideal readers and real readers.' In: D.Tannen, (ed.). *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, p. 248-70.

Geeraerts, D. (1989). *Wat er in een woord zit: Facetten van de lexicale semantiek.* Leuven: Peeters.

Goodwin, C. (1995). 'Co-constructing meaning in conversations with an aphasic man.' In: *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, Vol. 28/3, p. 233-60.

Hester, S. & P. Eglin (1997). 'Membership categorization analysis: An introduction.' In: S. Hester & P. Eglin (eds.) *Culture in action: studies in membership categorization analysis.* Washington: University Press of America, p. 1-23.

Hopper, P.J. (1987). 'Emergent grammar.' In: *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 13, p. 139-57.

Jefferson, G. (1973). 'A case of precision timing in ordinary conversation: Overlapped tag-positioned adress terms in closing sequences'. In: *Semiotica* 9/1, p. 47-96.

Jefferson, G. (1987). 'On exposed and embedded correction in conversation.' In: G. Button & J. Lee, (eds.) *Talk and social organisation.* Clevedon, Ph.: Multilingual Matters, 58-68.

Labov, W. (1972). 'The transformation of experience in narrative syntax.' In: W. Labov (ed.) *Language in the inner city: Studies in Black English vernacular.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, p. 354-96.

Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire and dangerous things*. Chicago University Press.

Mazeland, H. (1980). 'Präsuppositionen - eine Gegenüberstellung.' In: *Linguistische Berichte* 67, p. 30-39

Mazeland, H., M. Huisman and M. Schasfoort (1995). 'Negotiating categories in travel agency calls.' In: A. Firth (ed.) *The discourse of negotiation: Studies of language in the workplace.* Oxford: Pergamon Press, p. 271-97.

Miller, G.A. & C. Fellbaum. 1991. 'Semantic networks of English'. In: *Cognition* 41, p. 197-229.

Pomerantz, A. (1984). 'Pursuing a response.' In: J.M.Atkinson & J.Heritage (eds.) *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis.* Cambridge University Press, p. 152-63.

Sacks, H. (1972a). 'An initial investigation of the usability of conversational data for doing sociology.' In: D. Sudnow (ed.) *Studies in social interaction.* New York: Free Press, p. 31-74.

Sacks, H. (1972b). 'On the analyzability of stories by children.' In: J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (eds.) *Directions in sociolinguistics: the ethnography of communication.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, p. 329-45.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation.* Edited by Gail Jefferson. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schegloff, E. (1972). 'Notes on conversational practice: formulating place.' In: D. Sudnow (ed.) *Studies in social interaction.* New York: Free Press, p. 75-119.

Schegloff, E. (1996). 'Some practices for referring to persons in talk-in-interaction. A partial sketch of a systematics.' In: B. Fox (ed.) *Studies in anaphora.* Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins, p. 437-85.

Schegloff, E. (1997). 'Practices and actions. Boundary cases of other-initiated repair.' In: *Discourse processes* 23/3, p. 499-547.

Schegloff, E., G. Jefferson, H. Sacks. 1977. 'The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation.' In: *Language* 53 / 1, p. 361-83.

Watson, D. 1987. 'Interdisciplinary considerations in the analysis of pro-terms'. In: G. Button & J. Lee (eds.) *Talk and social organisation.* Clevedon, Ph.: Multilingual Matters, p. 261-89.

Endnotes

1. The students, who migrated to Finland as adults, came from Ethiopia, Germany (2), Guatemala, Iraq (2), Russia and Thailand; their first languages are respectively Somali, German, Spanish, Assyrian, Kurdish, Russian and Thai.

   At the time of the first recording round, the participants had lived in Finland for 2.5 months to 3 years. The selection of the participants was based upon recommendations of their teachers (only those students that were estimated to be able to talk in Finnish were recommended) and on the willingness of the students to co-operate with the data-collection procedure.

   The students met three times for data-collection purposes. The first time was circa two months after the beginning of the courses. The second time was about one and a half months later and the third series of recordings was made about three months after the second. The students were told they were free to discuss any topic they wanted to talk about, although a few illustrations of possible topics were given. These examples turned out to be very influential with respect to the topics selected.

2. Our data are *semi-elicited*. The talk we recorded was not 'naturally occurring'. Although the participants had local control over turn-taking and the topical and sequential organization of the talk, the exchange itself was arranged for research purposes. Almost all of the reservations that should be made against the use of elicited data do apply to ours too, unfortunately. Consequentially, we feel very cautious about the generalizability of our results. For example, we do not know whether the patience and persistence with which the speakers in our corpus try to repair trouble is an artifact of the setting. We do not even know whether the type of repair that is examined in this paper does occur in the same way in naturally occurring lingua-franca interactions.

3. We will analyse and gloss the talk in the transcription as much as possible at the level of how the participants themselves deal with it. We will not measure their talk from the perspective of what would have been a 'correct', or more 'appropriate' linguistic form to do the job for a native speaker.

4. Note that the recipient of *'my capital (is) Bagdad'* also has to be able to perform a very subtle type of situated, deictic reasoning with respect to categorically relevant properties of the identity of the speaker in order to be able to develop a working understanding. The possessive pronoun *my* does not just refer to the speaker but to the speaker as a member of the people from Iraq. Only f the speaker's *identity* as an Iraqi is taken into consideration, is it appropriate to say that *his* capital is Bagdad.

Note further that the class of capital names is not exemplified by its most prototypical member. The selection of Bagdad is not governed by considerations with respect to prototypicality - the type of consideration a naive transfer of cognitive linguistic arguments would generate - but by situated pragmatic reasoning. The one member of the class of capital names is selected which would do as an answer to *'what is your capital'* in the event that Abdul himself had to answer the question. So, it is what the word is doing in this particular utterance in this particular context in this particular situation that provides the criteria for selecting a particular member of class of capital names.

5. Pomerantz (1984) also discusses other types of measurement systems in terms of which participants assess the degree of easiness of resolution types. One prominent type is social delicateness. Its resolution might lay bare some kind of disagreement between participants. In our data, assuming that your recipient does not know a word might be valued likewise as a delicate thing to show.

6. Our distinction between knowledge links and linguistic procedures for locating relevant knowledge is inspired by Fillmore's distinction between *text links* and *knowledge links* (Fillmore 1982).

7. We will not go into the primarily male perspective Abdul is offering to Juan. Apart from perhaps culturally motivated, it may be the result of some kind of recipient design of the clarification as well. In this first clarification round, Abdul is linking the clarification to his recipient's personal situation (see *you now married* and *when you want ... you say ... your wife ... I don't want ...*; lines 24 and 29-31 in 5).

8. Note that the participants are able to maintain an orientation to the conditional relevance of the suspended answer over a very long trajectory of inserted repair sequences. The first part of the question/answer pair was delivered for the first time in lines 08-11 of fragment 5. The question/answer sequence is proliferated considerably through insert expansions dealing with the trouble occurring in the first pair part. It is not until line 70 - almost two minutes later - that the second part of the base pair is delivered. This prolonged maintenance of an orientation towards the sequential basis of the inserted repair sequences is an essential difference of adult foreign language learning with first language acquisition: participants are competent with respect to such basic pragmatic skills as the interactional management and maintenance of sequences over a long and very complex trajectory. See also Goodwin 1995, who makes a similar observation for the interaction of an aphasic man with his collaborators.

9. See Schegloff 1997: 527 *ff.* for a discussion of repeats as a practice for registering the receipt of something prior speaker has said.

10. Collections of categories are context-relevantly assembled relative to some task. They should not be re-ifyed too easily as pre-existing, context-independent structures (*cf.* Hester & Eglin 1997). Perhaps it is better to think of them as emerging structures (*cf.* Hopper 1987) for which sufficient cultural continuity holds in the history of their use on the one hand, whereas, on the other hand, a collection is assembled and ordered each time anew as a situated configuration relative to the interactional task at hand. (*Cf.* Schegloff 1972; see also Mazeland *et al.* 1995)

Although Sacks's work on categorization resembles some strands of theorizing in lexical-semantics - such as the semantic-field approach (see for a discussion Geeraerts 1989) or the idea of *cognitive models* in cognitive linguistics (Lakoff 1987) -, Sacks was

primarily interested in the categorization of persons as a means to examine the practical, situated sociological reasoning of competent members of a culture.

11. The general rule of interpretation for expressions such as *your wife* is: when a possessive personal pronoun modifies a category from a relational pair such as <*husband*, *wife*>, the referent of the personal pronoun is heard to be the real-world matching incumbent of the other category from that pair. Other instances of this kind of cross-reference based upon relational-pair semantics are, for example, *my father* (invoking the relational pair <*father*, *child*>), or *her doctor* (<*doctor*, *patient*>). *Cf.* Sacks 1972a/b and 1992 *passim*; Watson 1987.

12. The ending the marriage is described in terms of emotional states leading to relational activities: 'not wanting the wife anymore' is a change in the emotional state of the husband; 'sending her away' is a change in the state of being co-present. Ending the marriage is not characterised in legal terms - the official, administrative dissolution of the formal bond - but as a pair of related everyday actions.

    Note also that Abdul does not tell about, *e.g.*, the death of one of the partners in the marital bond. Such a telling would also allow for inferences with respect to the end of a marriage. However, it would not result in a situation in which the category 'divorce' can be asserted. So the nature of the type of contrast that is relevant is also specified in Abdul's telling.

13. With respect to the category *divorce* 'presupposing' a prior state: Miller & Fellbaum talk about 'backward presupposition' in a partially similar class of verbs (*e.g.*, {arrest, parole}). This term might be somewhat misleading - perhaps 'prior-stage presupposition' would be more appropriate - but the observation is quite similar to the one we want to make. See also Fillmore 1973 or Mazeland 1980.

14. Pairs like <married, divorced> are antonymous but in a different way as, *e.g.*, the pair <bachelor, married>. The relation between the members of the former pair displays some kind of both temporal and logical directionality, - a kind of by default irreversibility. Re-instalment of the original state - 'and then they married again' - is noticeable, a tellable, a not self-evident course of action. The pair is also different from pairs of categories describing frequently alternating states such as <'be-free', 'have-to-work'> in which the replacement of one state by the other usually is not considered to be final (see fragment 4). There is also some specific relation with negation: in the case of <married, divorced>, one has to add *anymore*: 'he is not married anymore'. Saying 'he is not married' does not have to imply that he is a divorcee.

15. Other candidates for the class of state-modifying categories are: *repair*, *recover*, *cure*, *die*, *restore*, *expire*, *fire*, *resign*, *release*, *rescue,* ... Note also that this kind of state-modifying categories is level-specific. In contrast with general state-modification describing categories like 'stop', 'change', or 'modify', the former class specifies at least some particular features of the kind of state that is modified.

16. *Repair* is different from *divorce*, however. The C_1-category is presupposing another state in which the broken device was functioning well. Cruse (1987: 228 ff.) characterises the second member of pairs like <damage, repair>, <remove, replace>, or <stop, resume> as *restitutives*, or *dependent reversives*. The second member of the pair "necessarily denotes the restitution of a former state". The second member of the pair <marry, divorce> is not a restitutive but it has some relevant similarities. In both types of pairs of opposites, the second member is the 'dependent' one; this one needs the other one to hold in order to be appropriately applied.

    There is also a difference with respect to level of specificity. Contrary to *divorce*, *repair* needs an argument - in this case *car* - to arrive at the desired level of specificity, whereas *divorce* is already type-specific. It is specific enough to trigger the particular state it is dependent on.

17. We came across the same type of word-clarification repairs in interactions among native speakers (language learners). In the period we were developing our analysis - and this is typically the time in which one makes this kind of observation - one of the authors made observational notes of an overheard conversation between a mother and her little son (probably around 4 years old) on the side walk in the shopping centre of Groningen in the Netherlands. The boy said to his mother something like 'look mama, there are scaffoldings around the church over there'. The mother then responded to this with 'yes, they are restoring the church.' The boy then asked what 'restoring' meant, after which the mother delivered the following clarification: 'well, that old church, they are doing it up again'. This time, the state describing category is simplified unto *old*, whereas the state-modifying category is specified colloquially as 'doing it up again.'

Previously published in this series:

No. 1   Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, Coherent Voicing. On Prosody in Conversational Reported Speech (1998)

No. 2   Peter Auer, Zwischen Parataxe und Hypotaxe. 'Abhängige Hauptsätze' im gesprochenen und geschriebenen Deutsch (1998)

No. 3   Susanne Günthner, Polyphony and the "Layering of Voices" in Reported Dialogues. An Analysis of the Use of Prosodic Devices in Everyday Reported Speech (1998)

No. 4   Margret Selting, TCUs and TRPs: The Construction of Units in Conversational Talk (1998)

No. 5   Helga Kotthoff, Irony, Quotation, and Other Forms of Staged Intertextuality: Double or Contrastive Perspectivation in Conversation (1998)

No. 6   Peter Auer, From Code-Switching via Language Mixing to Fused Lects: Toward a Dynamic Typology of Bilingual Speech (1998)

No. 7   Martin Sturm, Mündliche Syntax im schriftlichen Text - ein Vorbild? (1998)

No. 8   Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, On High Onsets and their Absence in Conversational Interaction

No. 9   Margret Selting, Fragments of TCUs as deviant cases of TCU-production in conversational talk

No. 10 Barbara Rönfeldt, Paragrammatism reconsidered

No. 11 Susanne Günthner, *Wenn*-Sätze im Vor-Vorfeld: Ihre Formen und Funktionen in der gesprochenen Sprache

No. 12 Gabriele Klewitz / Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, Quote - Unquote? The role of prosody in the contextualization of reported speech sequences

No. 13 Margret Selting, Berlinische Intonationskonturen: 'Der Springton'

No. 14 Ines Lange, Die sequentielle Struktur von Anrufbeantworter-Kommunikation. (Nur online unter **http://inlist.uni-konstanz.de** abrufbar)

No. 15 Peter Auer, Pre- and post-positioning of *wenn*-clauses in spoken and written German

No. 16 Margret Selting, Berlinische Intonationskonturen:''Die Treppe aufwärts'' – nebst Vergleichen mit entsprechenden Hamburger Konturen

No. 17 Beatrice Szczepek, Formal Aspects of Collaborative Productions in English Conversation

No. 18 Susanne Günthner, "wobei (.) es hat alles immer zwei seiten." Zur Verwendung von *wobei* im gesprochenen Deutsch

No. 19 Peter Gilles, Intonation der Weiterweisung. Ein Beitrag zur konversationsanalytisch orientierten Erforschung von Regionalintonation am Beispiel des Hamburgischen und Berlinischen

No. 20 Markus Thumm, The Contextualization of Paratactic Conditionals

No. 21 Beatrice Szczepek, Functional Aspects of Collaborative Productions in English Conversation

No. 22 Susanne Günthner, Constructing scenic moments: grammatical and rhetoric-stylistic devices for staging past events in everyday narratives

No. 23 Peter Auer, ‚Hoch ansetzende‘ Intonationskonturen in der Hamburger Regionalvarietät

No. 24 Christine Gohl, Zwischen Kausalität und Konditionalität: Begründende *wenn*-Konstruktionen

No. 25 Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen,Constructiong *reason-for-the-call* turns in everyday telephone conversation