

Paper for DISCOURSE STUDIES

Repair receipts: on their motivation and interactional import

Short title: Repair receipts

Version 3 (revision 2), 31.1.2019

Size in words: 8948

Aino Koivisto

Institutional address:

Department of Finnish, Finno-Ugrian and Scandinavian languages

P.O. Box 4 (Vuorikatu 3)

00014 University of Helsinki

Finland

Personal address:

Proviisorinraitti 5 A 14

00790 Helsinki

Finland

Email: aino.koivisto@helsinki.fi

Tel. +358503502780

Repair receipts: on their motivation and interactional import

Abstract

This paper discusses a less-studied aspect of repair sequences in conversation, i.e. their exit phases. It will be argued that while the most common way of exiting is a resumption of the main activity straight after requested repair, sometimes specific receipt objects are also needed. The focus of the paper is on the use of these repair receipts. Two types of motivation for using them as exit devices are discussed: prolongation of the repair sequence and the repairers' critical stance towards the repair initiation. The paper will also consider the use of different change-of-state tokens as repair receipts in Finnish conversation. It will be argued that a claim of now-understanding (*aa*) is the repair receipt proper, enabling sequence closure and resumption of the main activity, while news receipts target the newsworthiness of the information provided in the repair turn, enabling sequence expansion.

Key words: conversation analysis, repair, repair receipt, response particle, change-of-state token

Biographical note

Aino Koivisto is a post-doctoral researcher at the Finnish Centre of Excellence in Research on Intersubjectivity in Interaction at the University of Helsinki. She uses Conversation Analysis to study linguistic structures such as response particles in Finnish conversation. Her work has been published for example in *Journal of Pragmatics*, *Research on Language and Social Interaction* and *Discourse Processes*.

1. Introduction

In Conversation Analytic research, other initiation of repair – the beginnings of repair sequences – have attracted a lot of attention over the past few years. For example, scholars have been interested in the comparison of different formats of repair initiation (e.g. open class, question word, (partial) repeat, see Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks 1977: 367–368) in different languages (see, e.g. Haakana, Kurhila, Lilja & Savijärvi 2016 for Finnish; Benjamin 2013 for English; Rossi 2015 for Italian). These different formats have also been studied cross-linguistically (Dingemanse, Blythe & Dirksmeyer 2014; Dingemanse & Enfield 2015).

The study focuses on a less studied aspect of the repair sequence, i.e. its exit phase. In the literature, this phase has not traditionally been considered as a part of the repair sequence (however, see Floyd et al. 2016: 178–180; also Dingemanse et al. 2014 fn 1; Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 2018: 139). Instead, a typical way of presenting the structure of a repair sequence is as follows: 1) trouble source turn (T-1) 2) repair initiation (T0) 3) repair (T+1) (see Enfield et al. 2013: 345–346; Dingemanse et al. 2014). In this paper, the starting point is an observation that there are (at least) two alternative ways of exiting a repair sequence: 1) the resumption of main activity *straight after the requested repair*, without a sequence-expanding receipt turn (see Haakana 2001: 53; Heritage 1984: fn 18; Schegloff 2007: 116; on resumption and continuation in other type of context, see Mazeland 2007) or 2) the resumption of the main activity *after a specific receipt item* produced by the repair initiator (see Heritage 1984 on *oh*). Consider the following example from Finnish conversation for the first alternative. The example starts with a question which is the trouble source turn (T-1), and is followed by a repair initiation (T0) and a repair which is a repeat of the problem source turn (T+1):

(1) [Haakana 2011: 50]

01 Pekka: no mites onks >sulla< joulumyynti menny hyvin. **T-1**
so how is- did your Christmas sales go well.

02 (.)

03 Reijo: -> >mitä<? **TO**
what?

04 Pekka: => .hh onks sulla joulumyynti menny hyvin. **T+1**
did your Christmas sales go well.

05 Reijo: o:n mul on menny hyvin oikeen hyvin.
yes it went well really well.

In this example, the open class repair initiator (Drew 1997) *mitä* ('what') targets the prior question. As a solution to the apparent hearing problem, the recipient repeats the question (line 4). After that, the repair initiator answers the pending question and thus resumes the base sequence (line 5). Sequentially speaking, the adjacency pair [repair initiation + repair] is inserted between the base first pair part and base second pair part, thus forming a post-first insert expansion (Schegloff 2007: 101–102). The resumption then constitutes the exit phase. That is, providing the pending answer shows that the problem has been successfully repaired and no extra assurance of the successfulness of the repair is needed. Overwhelmingly, repair sequences that occur as post-first insert expansions (that is, between the original question and the answer) are *not* closed with a receipt item.

In the following example from a dinner table discussion between six young men, the repair sequence is organized differently:

(2) [Aa14_Sg396, face-to-face conversation]

01 Lauri: sit se on loistava ku juttelin sielä Aaron (1.0)
then it was great when I talked there at Aaro's (1.0)

02 pippaloissa >oisko se ollu< vappuna.
party was it now on the first of May.

03 Riku: tuff
((untranslatable: some sort of non-verbal sound that
seems unrelated to the ongoing story))

04 Lauri: Moonan kanssa. Antti oli just ollu siellä (0.4) Aaron
with Moona. Antti had been there at (0.4) Aaro's

05 sängyssä °silleen nukkumassa° sanoin Moonalle jotai
bed like sleeping I said to Moona something

06 sivulausees sillai et,
in parenthesis like,

08 Taavi:-> **kuka**.
who.

09 (0.4)

10 Lauri: se Antin tyttöystävä.
that Antti's girlfried.

11 Taavi:=> **aa**.

12 (0.2)

13 Lauri: ni et ku Antti nukkuu tuol ylhäällä @mitä ja Antti --
so that cause Antti is sleeping there upstairs @what so
Antti --
((story-telling continues))

In this case, the ongoing activity is different: Lauri is telling a story. At the point where the multiunit turn (the story) is recognizably incomplete – after a reported first pair part (lines 5–6) – Taavi initiates repair with question word *kuka* ('who', line 8) thus claiming difficulty in recognizing a person reference in Lauri's story. The repair initiation thus suspends the ongoing main activity. The repair turn involves a recognitional description (*se Antin tyttöystävä* 'that Antti's girlfriend', line 10). Immediately upon the completion of the requested repair, Taavi claims recognition with the particle *aa* (line 11). The particle can be considered a third position receipt (a sequence closing third, Schegloff 2007) with respect to the repair initiation. It is only after this receipt when Lauri resumes his unfinished story (line 13). In this case a repair receipt from Taavi is needed to assure Lauri for the sufficiency of the repair turn. In contrast to example 1, then, the repair initiator is not the one that can resume the main activity straight after the successful repair. Instead, it is the other party that needs an explicit signal of problem

resolution in order to resume the suspended activity. The suspended activity thus “belongs” to the original speaker, not the repair initiator.

While the most common way of exiting a repair sequence appears to be the one illustrated in Extract 1 (Haakana 2011: 53; Schegloff 2007: 116), this paper will focus on cases like Extract 2, that is, the role of *repair receipts* (Heritage 1984) or repair uptake (Golato & Betz 2008) in exiting repair sequences. This concept was introduced by Heritage (1984: 315–318) who claimed that one of the main sequential environments for English *oh* is its use as a repair receipt in other-initiated repair sequences. In this position *oh* proposes a change-of-state of information and by implication, problem resolution. I will suggest that even though the use of a receipt is not the most frequent exit strategy (at least not in the current data), in some repair sequences its use is actually mandatory and its absence would prevent the progression of the main activity (see also Betz et al. 2013: 152). I will consider the use of repair receipts in Finnish, and more specifically, Finnish change-of-state tokens as repair receipts.

There will two main issues to be discussed:

- 1) The use of repair receipts in repair sequences (in Finnish conversation): what motivates their use?
- 2) The linguistic form of a repair receipt: how do the different Finnish particles used in this context differ from one another with respect to sequence development?

2. Data

As data, I am using a collection of repair sequences compiled for the project “Repair Practices and Understanding in Interaction,” led by Markku Haakana and Salla Kurhila (funded by the University of Helsinki during 2011–2013). The project studied formats

of repair initiation in Finnish everyday conversation (see Haakana et al. 2016). The data for this project came primarily from the Conversational Data Archive at the University of Helsinki, recorded during a longer period of time (1980–2000), but it also entails fairly recent video recordings from the early 2010, recorded for the purposes of the project. The database consists of both telephone and face-to-face conversation.¹ The total amount of data is 37,5 hours of conversation involving 461 cases of repair initiation (on the distribution of different formats of repair initiation in this collection, see Haakana et al 2016).²

In this data, I found 83 sequences that involved a third position turn produced by the repair initiator. When making this collection, I included all cases where the repair initiator produced a particle response (or sometimes even a more substantial receipt turn involving repetition of the previous turn, see Extract 4, or an account for initiating repair, see Extract 5) to the repair turn. Roughly, these different third position objects vary in terms of whether they function to close the sequence or whether they enable more talk on the topic. I will specifically focus on what will call *repair receipts proper*. These are mainly claims of now-understanding or recognition that are used to close the repair sequence and resume the main activity. Other particle responses in the data – while similarly signaling problem resolution – are different in the sense that they may also target the newsworthiness of what is said in the repair turn and thus promote sequence expansion. I will term them *other receipt objects*. This distinction between repair receipts proper and other receipt objects will be further elaborated in section 4.

¹ This article will focus on verbal means of achieving repair sequence closure. Nonverbal activity is, however, considered as a part of the analysis. On nonverbal means of signaling closure, see Floyd et al. 2016.

² The total amount of instances listed in Haakana et al. 2016 is somewhat higher than the number given here (522). The total of 461 is based on my own count of the collection that I had access to.

The general terms *repair receipt* and *third position turn* are used to refer all cases included in the collection. The table below summarizes the numerical information relevant for this study.

Table 1. Repair receipts in the data.

Total number of repair initiations	Total number of third position turns in repair sequences	Number of repair receipts proper	Number of other receipt objects
461	95	64	31

Considering the relative scarcity of the use of third position turns in the data, one needs to ask what motivates or accounts for their use. In terms of type of repair initiation, the most typical problem associated with their use is problem of recognition (e.g. unclear person reference as in Example (2)). That is, a repair receipt such as a claim of recognition may be needed to indicate problem resolution in a context where the repair initiator has initially failed to recognize a referent. However, there are also more general explanations for the motivation of repair receipts, which encompass problems with recognition and other types of problems indicated with different formats of repair initiation. I will now turn to the two most prominent motivations, prolongation of the repair sequence (section 3.1.) and the co-participant's resistance towards the act of initiating a repair (section 3.2.).

3. What motivates the use of repair receipts?

3.1. Prolongation of the repair sequence and other progression-related troubles

The most common clearly distinguishable motivation for the use of a repair receipt as an exit device is the prolongation of the repair sequence, i.e. situations where the first

attempt to solve the problem does not solve it but an additional attempt(s) is (are) required (see also Floyd et al. 2016). This definition covers both cases where the repair initiator resorts to more than one repair initiations and cases where there is noticeable absence of a sequentially relevant next turn after the repair, resulting in another attempt to repair the problem – that is, without an explicit second repair initiation (see Extract 6). According to Heritage (1984: 318), repair receipts can be found both in simple repair sequences and in the extended ones, but in light of my data, prolongation seems to be a specific motivation: out of 64 cases involving a repair receipt proper, 28 occur in prolonged repair sequences. There are also other, less frequent troubles that relate to progressivity. One is lateness of the repair initiation in relation to the trouble source. The other is the position of the repair initiation within the ongoing activity. That is, suspensions of some recognizably unfinished activity such as story-telling may call for a repair receipt that explicitly allows the original speaker to resume the unfinished activity. Extract (2) and (6) provide an example of this type of situation. It should also be noted that these different interactional contingencies also occur in combinations.

Let us now look at an example of a prolonged repair sequence. In Extract (3), the trouble source turn involving an unidentifiable referent triggers three separate repair initiations and several attempts to solve the problem of recognition. A middle-aged man named Raimo and a young man named Teemu (probably a father and a son) are discussing an invoice that Raimo received in his address but that was addressed to Teemu. The reason for Raimo's call is to inform Teemu about the invoice (lines 6–7).

(3) [Aa17_Sg399l, mobile phone conversation]

01 Raimo: .hh nonii moikka,
PRT hi

02 Teemu: n' morjesta; hh
PRT hi

03 Raimo: soitanko pahaan aikaa,
is this a bad time,

04 Teemu: e:t ollenkaa et °>ihan tossa<° (.) Rastilassa oon ja;
not at all I'm just here (.) in Rastila and;

06 Raimo: (iha hyvä) .hh e:iku; hh mä vahingossa avasin ku
(that's fine) .hh no I accidentally opened when I got

07 tänne tuli ÄsGeen lasku.
here an invoice from SG.

08 (0.3)

09 Teemu: j:oo.
right.

10 (1.0)

11 Raimo: ja se on (.) sun lasku(s).
and it's (.) your invoice.

12 (0.4)

13 Teemu: ↑minkä lasku.=ÄsGeen.
what-GEN invoice. SG-GEN
which invoice.=SG's.

14 (0.4)

15 Raimo: nii;;
yes;;

16 (0.6)

17 Raimo: m- (.) mikä saatana; .hhh (0.2) tää on tää sykil
w- (.) what the fuck (is this); .hhh (0.2) this is this
SYK's lasku;
((name?)) invoice;

18 (0.8)

19 Teemu: >minkä<?
what-GEN
>which one<?

20 (0.8)

21 Raimo: odota; (.) mä avaan sen ja; hh sanon sulle.
wait; (.) I'll open it and; hh tell you.

22 meen tonne va- hh (0.6) tää tää hhhh .hhh
I'm going to- hh (0.6) this this hhhh .hhh

23 (1.4)

24 Raimo: mikä saatana; hh odota vähän.
what the fuck (is this); hh hold on a sec.

25 (0.4)

26 Raimo: .hh pistän valloo että nää. hhh
I'll turn on the lights so I can see.

27 Teemu: mm,
(1.0)

28 Raimo: tää oj jotai tietokonejuttuu;
this is some computer stuff;

29 (1.2)

30 Teemu: **↑tietokonejuttuja. hh**
computer.stuff-PL-PART
computer stuff.

31 (0.4)

32 Raimo: nii-i. .hhh mikä u- r- (0.4) .hhh se on tää SATiksi;
yes. .hh what (-) (0.4) .hhh it is this Satix;

33 (0.6)

34 Teemu:-> **A↑aa joo joo joo. (.) nii: joo [°se on sitte se°.**
right that's that one then.

35 Raimo: [joo.
yeah.

36 Raimo: se on se koval- r- tilasta kai. hh,=
it's about that hard di- space I guess.

37 Teemu: =joo joo. (.) okei joo no se on se kuuskymppi
right. (.) okey yes well that's that 60 euros

38 #varmaan sitte#.=
probably then.

Teemu's first reaction to Raimo's informing is a slightly delayed and hesitantly produced *joo* (line 9). It receipts the informing but does not display any orientation to why this informing was issued – at this point it can of course be unclear. After a silence in line 10 Raimo extends his turn (turn-initial *ja* 'and') by saying that the invoice belongs to Teemu. It is left for Teemu to decide how to respond to this information: he

could, for example, offer to pick up the invoice. Instead of orienting to the implications of the informing, Teemu initiates repair (line 13). Initiating repair at this point is in fact delayed – the problematic referent was first treated as understandable with *joo* ('right') in line 9 and thus the opportunity to initiate repair was initially passed (Schegloff 1982: 87–88; see also Sorjonen 2001: 26). The format of the repair initiation is question word+repeat (*minkä lasku* 'which invoice'). Latched onto that is another repeat (*ÄsGeen* 'SG's') which can have two interpretations in this context: either it asks for confirmation for Teemu's hearing or hints at a trouble of understanding, or more specifically, recognition (see Haakana et al. 2016: 264–267). Raimo treats the repeat as a candidate hearing, now producing a confirmation (line 15).

After the confirmation, there is a clear place for claiming understanding or moving on with the conversation. However, a silence develops (line 16). Teemu's failure to close the repair sequence results in its expansion: Raimo treats Teemu's silence as a failure to recognize the invoice by providing another specification (line 17). However, this does not solve the problem either but leads to another two rounds of repair initiations, in the form of a question word (*minkä* 'which one', line 19) and a repeat (*↑tietokonejuttuja* 'computer stuff', line 30) and several attempts to provide a specification that would make the invoice recognizable. In line 32 Raimo produces another company name that finally triggers a claim of recognition from Teemu in line 34 – though after a pause. The first TCU of this turn is composed of the particle *aa* (in a lengthened form and with some rise-fall pitch movement) and multiple sayings of *joo*. *Aa* claims now-understanding and thus problem resolution (Koivisto 2015a) and the multiple *joos* target the prolonged repair sequence as a whole and clearly propose sequence closure (Stivers 2004). After the particle response, Tommi continues with an explicit claim of

recognition (*nii: joo °se on sitte se°*. ‘right that’s that one then’, line 34). Once the problem of recognition is resolved, the conversation can move back to the business at hand, i.e. to the details of the invoice such as the amount to be paid (see lines 36–38).

Extract (3) illustrates that the pressure for an explicit sign of problem resolution, such as a claim of recognition, may build up as a result of an initial failure or failures to repair the problem. Prolongation of the repair sequence is one possible explanation for the need of using a repair receipt and thus providing a clear exit from the problematic repair sequence. It can be argued that the repair initiator orients to the accountability for the problematic repair sequence by claiming now-understanding and thus allowing resumption of the main activity (see also Koivisto 2015a). I will now turn to cases where the claim of recognition is motivated by the way in which the producer of the requested repair treats the repair initiation.

3.2. Co-participant’s resistance towards the initiation of a repair

The common feature of cases to be discussed in this section is that the producer of the repair treats the repair initiation as in a way or another obvious or unnecessary, i.e. inapposite (on indicating inappositeness from second position see also Heritage 1998; Heinemann 2009; Stivers 2011; Halonen & Lappalainen 2016). The implication is that the repair initiator should have, for example, recognized the referent without any further clarification. In the repair receipt collection, clearly observable resistance is found in 15/64 repair receipt proper cases, often coupled with prolongation.

Resistance can be indicated by laughing voice in the repair turn, certain prosodic means such as high onset (Halonen & Lappalainen 2016), or by marking the referent mutually

identifiable with a determiner (Laury 1997). We already saw an example of the use of a determiner in Extract (2), *se Antin tyttöystävä* ‘that Antti’s girlfriend’. In Extract (4) the repair initiation is treated as unnecessary and thus unexpected with (disbelieving) laughter incorporated in the repair turn. This is an extract from a phone call where S and V, two men in their thirties/forties, are making plans for a get-together in a restaurant in Helsinki city center. The restaurant is located on a street called Kasarmikatu. S’s question in line 1 reveals his unawareness about the location of the street (even though he is the one that made the suggestion).

(4) [SG 094-097 2a6, telephone conversation]

- 01 S: missä se Kasarmikatu oikeen se (missä se) on,
where is that Kasarmikatu actually.
- 02 V: no tiäks mis on Kirurgi. mhhh
well do you know where Kirurgi is ('Surgeon').
- 03 (0.5)
- 04 S: täh,
huh
- 05 V: s'et tiedä mis on Kirurginen sairaala, h
you don't know where the surgical hospital is.
- 06 S: en tiiä.
I don't.
- 07 V: [no se menee kumminkin siin tota noin
well it goes anyway there uhm
- 08 S: [(-)
- 09 ni, mhhh .hh siä mis on toi Pääesikuntah, (.)
so, mhhh .hh there where the main headquarters is, (.)
- 10 sanooks se sulle mitää .hhh Henrik kahdestoista
does that mean anything to you .hhh Henry the twelfth
- 11 sanooks se mitää. h
does that mean anything.
- 12 S: Henrik kahdestoista.
Henry the twelfth.
- 13 V: nii.
yes.

- 14 S: kyllä se mulle jotakin sannoo.
It does mean something to me.
- 15 V: no >se on siäl kumminki siäl< mäen pääl
well it's anyway there on top of the hill
- 16 sinne ku mennään sinne niinku tavallaan krhhym
when you go there like sort of
- 17 .mt .hh ää N:>euvoostoliiton< lähetystön rakennusta kohti
Soviet Union-GEN embassy-GEN building toward
towards the Soviet Union embassy building
- 18 siält jostain .hhh Johanneksen kirkon (1.0) itäpuolella.
DEM somewhere InameM-GEN church-GEN east.side
somewhere around .hhh the east side of (1.0) St John's
church.
- 19 san[looks se °(mitää)°.
does that mean (anything).
[
- 20 S: **[minkä rakennuksen;**
which building,
- 21 (0.4)
- 22 V: **Johanneksen k(h)irk(h)on.**
St John's church.
- 23 S:-> **nii ↑Johanneksen kirkon. [↑joo ↓joo.**
PRT St John's church. right.
[
- 24 V: [mm:,
- 25 krhhym sehän on Korkeevuorenkadulla .hh
that's you know on Korkeevuorenkatu.
- 26 S: [joo just,
right.
- 27 V: [siit #e# seuraava samansuuntanen katu nii
then the next parallel street towards
- 28 <itään päin> eli Länsisatamaan päin niin se on,
east so towards the Port of Helsinki so that is,
- 29 .hh se on Kas[armikatu.
that is Kasarmikatu.
- 30 S: [jaa jaa.
I see.

In response to S's question V tries to illustrate the location of the street by using different landmarks. They turn out not to be helpful: S initiates repair (line 4, 12, 20), claims lack of knowledge (line 6) and gives a vague/evasive answer (line 14). V checks S's ability to recognize the landmarks by asking 'does that mean anything (to you)' several times (lines 10, 11, 19) but does not get a clear yes-answer.³ The repair initiation of our interest takes place in overlap with the third occurrence of this question (line 20). It thus initiates a post-first insert expansion, arguably targeting a name of a church mentioned in line 18. The format of the repair initiation comes close to the format question word+repeat, but the "repeat" part is actually the speaker's own formulation of a more general nature, a superordinate concept, if you will. That is, instead of asking 'which church', S asks 'which building'. The repair initiator is also possible to interpret as targeting a previously mentioned referent, 'Soviet Union embassy building' (line 17) which, in fact, contains the word 'building'. Be that as it may, this formulation suggests that he picked up the fact that some building was mentioned but he did not hear or recognize what exactly.

V interprets the repair initiation targeting the just-prior mentioned referent St John's church by repeating it (line 21). What is noteworthy is that the word *kirkko* ('church') is now produced with laughter. This suggests that V treats the act of initiating repair as unexpected in the sense that S should know the church and should thus not need to initiate a repair. It is also possible that at this point the laughter is a reaction to the fact that the explaining activity has been going on for a long time without a result. That is,

³ The landmark mentioned in line 10, *Henrik kahdestoista* 'Henry the twelfth' is actually misleading, since V most likely means a restaurant called *Kaarle kahdestoista* 'Charles the twelfth' which is located in Kasarmikatu.

while providing the requested repair, laughter indicates resistance towards the initiation of repair (cf. Haakana 2002: 224–226).

The repair initiator's own orientation to the repair initiation as unwarranted can be seen in the formulation of his third position turn in line 22. The turn starts with confirmatory particle *nii* (which is not easy to translate in this turn-initial position) and a repeat of the problem source (on repeats in third position in German, see Betz et al. 2013; see also Schegloff 2007: 126). Applying the observations made of repetitional answers to questions (see Heritage & Raymond 2005, 2012; Raymond 2003; Schegloff 1996; Stivers 2005), one could argue that compared to a mere particle response, repeat implies more epistemic agency over the information provided by the repair turn (on this line of argumentation, see also Koivisto 2013). The turn-initial particle *nii* and the high onset of the repetition seem to add to the impression of now-understanding/recognition. That is, S now claims in retrospect that he does know the church (and where it is located), thereby constructing the problem as a hearing problem.

The repetition is followed by the reduplicated particle *joo*. The first *joo* is also produced with high onset, which is a way of treating the prior turn as newsworthy (Kunnari 2011). That is, while the first part of the turn (*nii* + repeat) is devoted to claiming recognition and epistemic agency, the second part of the turn (*joo joo*) seems to treat *Johanneksen kirkko* as new(sworthy) information in the sense that it finally helps S to locate himself “on the map”, which makes the church a successfully chosen landmark considering the street he is supposed to find. The first part of the composite turn thus has a local scope as a repair receipt and the second part targets the informing that was issued prior to the initiation of repair, marking it as understood. In other words, this case is a demonstration of the fact that sometimes a composite third position turn is needed

you mean corner- (.) here

*TUULA TURNS HER GAZE TO JAANA

- 16 Tuula: [kulma- e:i,
corner- no:,
- 17 (0.2)
- 18 Tuula: se ei oo kulmas ↑ollenkaa.
that's not in the corner at all.
- 19 (.)
- 20 Tuula: *siis ↑kulmakaappi;
so corner cabinet
*JAANA POINTS WITH HER FINGER
- 21 (0.4)
- 22 Jaana:-> ↑**aa** [**tää**,
oh this
- 23 Tuula: [päss[i;
dummy
- 24 Jaana: [no ehän minä nyt tämmössii.
well I don't (know) things like this you know.
- 25 (0.8)
- 26 Jaana: ↓tie[dä,
know
- 27 Tuula: [ni siel on semmosii pienii laseja.=
so there are such little glasses in there.

The sequence starts with Jaana's suggestion to have some liqueur (line 1) and Tuula's agreeing response to that (line 2). Even though Tuula is the hostess, it is Jaana who starts to organize the service – probably because Tuula is holding a cat in her arms. Jaana asks Tuula about the location of suitable glasses (line 6) and gets instructions (lines 8, 10). Jaana then stands up to get the glasses; at this point she goes off camera, so the analyst is unable to detect her movements. At first, Tuula does not pay attention to Jaana's attempt to find glasses but focuses on stroking her cat, thus orienting to the search activity as unproblematic.

However, Jaana's turn in line 15 shows that she does not know exactly where to look. She first initiates candidate-understanding-type repair *siis kulma* ('you mean corner'). Then she produces a deictic element *täs* ('here'), probably pointing at a potential cabinet (line 15). Tuula starts to reiterate her instruction (*kulma* 'corner') but cuts off to give a disconfirming answer to Jaana's proposal (line 16). This is followed by an explicit other-correction ('that's not in the corner at all', line 18), or maybe, a complaint, and yet another, enunciated mention of 'corner cabinet'. It is prefaced with the particle *siis* which has an explanatory function here (see Hakulinen & Couper-Kuhlen (2015) (line 20). It becomes apparent that the two women have a different understanding of what 'corner cabinet' means. In line 22 Jaana claims to have now understood what Tuula refers to by producing a turn composed of particle *aa* and another deictic element *tää* ('this'). Again, a claim of understanding, a repair receipt, is needed for a "mutually ratified exit from the repair sequence" (Heritage 1984: 318).

The repair sequence is not only prolonged but treated as unnecessary or "stupid": after Jaana's claim of now-understanding, Tuula calls her sister 'dummy' (line 23). As a result, Jaana claims lack of knowledge to account for her inability to locate the right cabinet (lines 24, 26). Post-resolution talk such as accounts is not in fact uncommon in my data – it reflects the extent of the transgression oriented to by the participants. It is only after these "post-completion musings" that do "not extend the sequence but reflect on it" (Schegloff 2007: 143) that Tuula resumes the main activity by instructing Jaana on the next step of finding the right glasses (line 27).

The examples in this section have shown that repair receipts are needed when there is something problematic in the progression of the repair sequence or the act of initiating a repair itself. Delay, suspension of main activity and prolongation are progression-

related problems; initiation-based problems are co-participant's orientation to the initiation as inapposite. Both kinds of problems relate to the transgression attributed to the repair initiator which, in turn, relates to the problems of progressivity caused by the problematic repair sequence. It has also become apparent that typically the trouble source is something other than a question and the type of problem is problem of recognition.

In this section, we have not systematically analyzed the composition of repair receipts used in the examples. In most cases we see the particle *aa* that serves to claim now-understanding, but also partial repeats of the trouble source can be used to claim restored access to the information (Extract 4). We will now turn to the variety of possible particle responses available in Finnish language and how they differ in terms of sequential progression. While most particle responses may be classified as change-of-state tokens (as English *oh*, Heritage 1984), there is a difference whether they claim now-understanding (repair receipts proper) or mark a receipt of new information (other receipt objects).

4. Different particle responses in repair sequences

This section will show that different particle responses used as repair receipts differ with respect to how they regulate sequence development after a successful requested repair. I will show that a particle claiming now-understanding effectively closes a repair sequence, while particles that are used for receipting new information have a double duty: they signal problem resolution but simultaneously also target the newsworthiness

of the repair turn (or originally, in the trouble source turn) and thus work to expand the sequence.

For claiming now-understanding there is one particle that is specialized in this task, namely *aa* that has already been mentioned in this paper (see Koivisto 2015a). For treating something as new information, there are an abundance of particles such as *ai*, *aijaa*, *aha(a)*, *jaa*, *ja(a)ha*, *mhy*, *vai niin* (see Sorjonen 1999; Hakulinen et al. 2004). Except for the distinction between *aijaa* and *aha(a)*, the division of labor between these particles is still unclear (Koivisto 2016). The task of this paper, however, is not to tackle those differences – we will operate on a bit more general level, focusing on the sequence-closing work of *aa* and sequence-expanding work of news receipts. It should be noted, though, that news receipts occur in repair sequences far less frequently than claims of recognition/now-understanding (28/83 cases of all third position turns).

Examples of *aa* as a repair receipt have already been seen Extracts 2, 3 and 5. The clearest examples illustrating its central features, i.e. signaling problem resolution and closing implicativeness, are those where some suspended activity is resumed after the production of *aa*. Let us look at one more example of this kind. Two young women are talking on the phone.

(6) [Aa44_Sg401_valitus, mobile phone conversation]

- 01 Veera: >he_i, (.) e_il[↑]en ku mä menin, (.) bussilla?
hey, (.) yesterday when I took (.) the bus?
- 02 Silja: mm,
- 03 Veera: ta- (.) nii tota, (.) [↑]bussi ajo siis [↑]kokonaisen
(.) so, (.) the bus drove over a whole
- 05 >semmosen< niinku [↑]kanttarin yli:,
this kind of like a curb
- 06 (0.4)

- 07 Veera: hh sit se [(- -)]
then it
- 08 Silja: [↑minkä yli.]
WHAT.GEN OVER
over what.
- 09 Veera: täyttä vauhtii- (.) ↑kanttarin.
full-PART speed-PART curb-GEN
full speed- (.) a curb.
- 10 (0.2)
- 11 Veera: siis semmosen, (0.4) niinku ison korok[keen yli].
PRT DEM.ADJ-GEN PRT big-GEN elevation-GEN over
I mean over this kind of (0.4) like a big elevation
- 12 Silja:-> [↑AA. [joo.
aa. yeah.
- 13 Veera: ja ↑sit (.) ↑i:han täyttä vauhtii jossai - -
and then (.) like full speed somewhere - -

In the beginning of this extract, Veera is in the midst of telling a story about her bumpy bus ride. At a point where the story is recognizably incomplete, Silja initiates repair with question word + repeat (*minkä yli* ‘over what’, line 8). The trouble source is Veera’s choice of word *kanttari* (line 5), which is a less common word for curb in Finnish. In line 9 Veera first treats the problem as a hearing problem by repeating the problematic word, but when receiving no response (see pause in line 10), she gives a synonym, now orienting to a problem of understanding. In overlap with this, Silja claims recognition with *aa + joo* (line 12). This seems to be a recognitional overlap (Jefferson 1983) that indicates the exact moment when Silja realizes what Veera is talking about. Note, however, that there is no actual demonstration of the now-achieved understanding, merely a claim (cf. Schegloff 1982: 78). Nevertheless, it is clear that this claim of now-recognition serves its purpose in enabling the resumption of the

suspended activity: immediately after its production, Veera continues her story (see line 13). In other words, no more talk about the problematic word *kanttari* is needed.

Particles that I group together as *news receipts* or *news particles* behave differently in terms of sequential progression after the repair solution. Let us look at the next example where a young woman (Jutta) and a young man (Tommi) are discussing Jutta's husband's/boyfriend's work situation over the phone.

(7) [Sg405 sosionomi.puh, mobile phone conversation]

- 01 Tommi: siis on[ko se vielä] siellä<
so is he still there<
- 02 Jutta: [(iltavuoro)]
(night shift)
- 03 (.)
- 04 Tommi: onko se vielä siellä samassa paikassa töissä.
is he still working in the same place.
- 05 (0.6)
- 06 Jutta: e:iku se on enviro netillä. (.) heh
no he is at Enviro Net. (.) heh
- 07 [heh
- 08 Tommi: **[missä?**
where?
- 09 (.)
- 10 Jutta: **enviro netillä ajjaa jäteautoo.**
at Enviro Net driving garbage truck
- 11 (0.4)
- 12 Tommi:-> .hh ↑**jaa:.** ↑empä minä tien[nyykkää.
NEG-CLI ISG know-PPC-CLI
jaa:. I didn't know that.
- 13 Jutta: [mm
- 14 Tommi: millon se sinne on vaihtanu.
when did he switch to that
- 15 (0.4)
- 16 Jutta: <no tossa:> (.) millonkas se nyt oli lokakuun alussa.
well around (.) when was it now at the beginning of
October.

The trouble source turn is Jutta's answer in line 6 that gives a disconfirming answer to Tommi's question about whether her husband still works at the same place (lines 1 and 4). Tommi initiates repair after this answer and a slight delay (line 8). The format of the repair initiation is a question word (*missä* 'where', line 8), which does not reveal whether the problem is in hearing or recognition. In sequential terms, a repair initiated in this position – after an answer – is a non-minimal post-expansion (Schegloff 2007: 149–151). This means that it comes at a point where Tommi could otherwise appreciate the answer in terms of, for example, its newsworthiness. This action is now delayed. As an attempted repair, Jutta does not merely repeat the problematic referent but also describes what the current work entails (line 10). In his response, Tommi does not claim now-understanding or recognition but treats the repair turn as having provided new information. He does this with the news particle *jaa* produced with high onset and accompanied with a claim of not-knowing (line 12). In line 14, he expands the sequence by asking a follow-up question. Jutta's husband's new job thus becomes a topic of conversation.

In the next example the exit from the repair sequence is organized similarly. P and E, two young women, are trying to find a solution to E's problem: how to get home from a party they are planning to go to.

(8) [RR2_SG 111 2b6, telephone conversation]

- 01 P: .th onks sulla varaa mennä tak₁silla=e:i,
can you afford to take a taxi=no,
- 02 E: e:i ku me lähetää sinne Hel₁sinkii.
NEG PRT 1PL go-PASS DEM-LOC name.of.a.city
no cause we are going to (that) Helsinki.
- 03 P: **mikä Hel[sinki.**
which/what Helsinki.

Aijaa is the most commonly occurring news particle in Finnish, specialized in receipting newsworthy and thus topicalizable information (Koivisto 2015b, 2016). High onset adds to this effect. *Aijaa* opens up a space for elaboration, but since E does not volunteer one, P asks a follow-up question (line 7). Moreover, in line 9 she evaluates the piece of news. This trip then becomes the topic of conversation – even though from the perspective of how much it is going to cost. Similarly to Extract 7, then, the news receipt and the follow-up question can be seen as sequentially fitted responses to the initial informing (here, line 2), only as postponed ones. This means that there is no return to the main activity, as in the *aa* cases, but the content of the repair turn *becomes* the main activity (i.e. topic).

In addition to functioning as news receipts, both Tommi's *jaa* in Extract (7) and P's *aijaa* in Extract (8) also signal that that the problem of recognition is now resolved. However, this kind of particle response – together with the following claim of not knowing and/or a follow-up question – does not specifically *deal with* the fact that the problem is now resolved. Rather, it provides the pending appreciation to the prior (initially problematic) informing, i.e. it is a fitted response to the question-answer sequence. This double-duty is reminiscent of what Schegloff (2007: 76) calls “double-barreled” actions: while treating the information provided in the prior turn as new information the news particle response simultaneously gives evidence for the fact that the problem of understanding is now resolved.

5. Conclusion and discussion

In this article I have discussed repair sequences from the perspective of different exit practices. First I pointed out that the most common way of exiting (at least on the basis

of the current Finnish data) is just resuming the suspended activity. This seems to be almost the exclusive way in repair sequences that are inserted between a question and an answer, as a “post-first insert expansion” (Schegloff 2007: 100–101). After a successful repair solution, the repair initiator may continue just by answering to the pending question. In contrast, specific repair receipts which function as post-expansions of the repair sequence are typically found in contexts where the trouble source turn is not a question. Instead, in the repair receipt cases the delayed turn/activity belongs to the original speaker who cannot resume without a token of understanding that licenses the resumption.

The analysis has shown that a typical type of problem associated with the use of repair receipts is problems of recognition. In a previous work I showed that the Finnish *aa*, a particle claiming now-understanding, is often used in repair sequences (Koivisto 2015a). Correspondingly, when the problem indicated by a repair initiation has to do with recognizing something, *aa* offers an apt solution: it shows that late recognition is now achieved. Late recognition can also be done by repeating (a part of) the repair turn and thus claiming prior, now-restored epistemic access, as we saw in Extract 4.

However, in order to claim that sufficient understanding has also been achieved – so that the repair sequence can be closed – particles claiming understanding are also needed. Mere repeat in third position may be equivocal in terms of whether it receipts information or initiates repair (e.g. Schegloff 2007: 126; Thompson et al. 2015: 60–64; Kurhila & Lilja 2017).

Besides sequential position and the nature of the repair initiation, I also discussed more general motivations for using repair receipts. It seems that each time a repair receipt is used/required, there are specific interactional contingencies that make it relevant. The

most important ones are different kinds of disturbances in the progression of the repair sequence or the placement of the repair initiation in relation to the trouble source. That is, a pressure toward a sign of now-understanding increases if the repair sequence gets prolonged (i.e. the first attempted solution is not successful). Similarly, if the repair initiation clearly cuts off the ongoing main activity (e.g. story-telling) and/or the repair is initiated late with respect to the trouble source, an explicit sign of problem resolution may be in order. The other recurrent motivation for using repair receipts is the co-participant's (i.e. the one who has been requested to produce a repair) stance display towards the initiation of repair. That is, for example laughter or verbal/prosodic markers of mutual, shared knowledge suggest that the repairer does not consider the repair initiation necessary but rather inapposite ("stupid") and thus unexpected. The subtleness of these cues of inappositeness may vary (see Extract 5 for very overt criticism), but the point is that they seem very effectively to trigger a claim of now-understanding at the earliest possible moment.

In the latter part of paper, I compared two kinds of change-of-state tokens used as repair receipts in Finnish language. The division was made between a claim of now-understanding (*aa*) and a news receipt (such as *aijaa, jaa, aha(a)*). A claim of now-understanding (*aa*) signals problem resolution and functions as an exit device. Thus it strongly promotes sequence closure. By using *aa*, the repair initiator orients to the delay of understanding as problematic, i.e. claims responsibility for the delay in understanding/recognizing something in a timely manner (see also Koivisto 2015a). It is thus the repair initiator who "takes the blame", and *aa* is used as a means of restoring intersubjectivity.

By contrast, news receipts as responses to requested repair have the capability of topicalizing the information provided in the repair turn. We saw two examples where the repair was initiated as a “non-minimal post expansion”, i.e. where a third position acknowledgement could have otherwise been produced. Instead of specifically dealing with the repair turn and its successfulness in repairing the problem, news receipts (together with follow-up questions) targeted the newsworthiness of the information provided in the repair turn (and originally in the problematic second position turn). This also means that the act of initiating a repair and the problem is backgrounded and not specifically dealt with. News receipts (are more likely to) promote sequence expansion. The discussion of the different particle responses thus shows that through a closing-implicative repair receipt the repair sequence may remain “local”, thus forming an activity-suspending insert expansion. Through a news receipt, by contrast, the repair sequence merges with the ongoing larger activity, and the line between “dealing with a problem of hearing/understanding” and “receipting new information” gets blurred.

This article has hopefully shed some light on a less-researched aspect of repair sequences, i.e. its exit practices and more specifically, the use of change-of-state tokens as repair receipts. In addition, the articles had hopefully demonstrated that comparing different change-of-state tokens in a similar environment gives evidence for their distinct interactional meanings.

References

- Benjamin T (2013) *Signaling trouble. On the linguistic design of other-initiation of repair in English conversation*. Unpublished dissertation. Groningen: University of Groningen.
- Betz E, Taleghani-Nikazm C, Drake V and Golato A (2013) Third-position repeats in German: The case of repair- and request-for-information sequences. *Gesprächsforschung* 14: 133–166.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E & Selting, M (2018) *Interactional Linguistics. Studying Language in Social Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dingemanse M, Blythe J & Dirksmeyer T (2014) Formats for other-initiation of repair across languages. An exercise in pragmatic typology. *Studies in Language* 38: 5–43.
- Dingemanse M & Enfield N (2015) Other-initiated repair across languages. Towards a typology of conversational structures. *Open linguistics* 2015: 96–118.
- Enfield N, Dingemanse M, Baranova J, Blythe J, Brown P, Dirksmeyer T, Drew P, Floyd S, Gipper S, Gísladóttir R, Hoymann G, Kendrick K, Levinson S, Magyari L, Manrique E, Rossi G, San Roque L & Torreira F (2013) Huh? What? – A first survey in 20 languages. In Hayashi M, Raymond G & Sidnell J (eds.), *Conversational repair and human understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 343–380.
- Drew P (1997) “Open” class repair initiator in response to sequential source of trouble in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 28: 69–101.
- Floyd S, Manrique E, Rossi G & Torreira F (2016). The timing of visual bodily behavior in repair sequences: evidence from three languages. *Discourse Processes* 53: 175–204.
- Golato A & Betz E (2008) German *ach* and *achso* in repair uptake: Resources to sustain or remove epistemic asymmetry. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 27: 7–37.
- Haakana M (2001) Mitä ja muut avoimet korjausaloitteet [Mitä (‘what’) and other open class repair initiators in Finnish interactions]. *Virittäjä* 115: 36–67.
- Haakana M (2002) Laughter in medical interaction: From quantification to analysis, and back. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 6: 207–35.
- Haakana M, Kurhila S, Lilja N and Savijärvi M (2016) Kuka, mitä, häh? Korjausaloitteet suomalaisessa arkikeskustelussa [Other-initiation of repair in Finnish everyday conversation]. *Virittäjä* 120: 255–293.
- Hakulinen A & Couper-Kuhlen E (2015) Insisting on ‘my side’: *Siis*-prefaced utterances in Finnish. *Journal of Pragmatics* 75: 111–130.
- Hakulinen A, Vilkuna M, Korhonen R, Koivisto V, Heinonen T and Alho I (2004) *Iso suomen kielioppi* [The comprehensive Finnish grammar]. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

- Halonen M & Lappalainen H 2016: Itsestään selvää ja pääteltävissä. Vastauksen intonaatio tiedon ja tietämisen muokkaajana haastatteluissa [Obvious and inferrable. Answer's intonation in shaping knowledge in interviews]. In Sorjonen ML, Rouhikoski A & Lehtonen H (eds.) *Helsingissä puhuttavat suomet. Kielen indeksisyys ja sosiaaliset identiteetit*. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Heinemann T (2009) Answers to inapposite inquiries. In Sidnell J (ed.) *Conversation analysis: Comparative perspectives*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, pp. 159–186.
- Heritage J (1984) A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In Atkinson JM and Heritage J (eds.) *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 299–345.
- Heritage J and Raymond G (2005) The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68: 15–38.
- Heritage J and Geoffrey R (2012) Navigating epistemic landscapes: Acquiescence, agency and resistance in responses to polar questions. In De Ruiter JP (ed.) *Questions: Formal, functional and interactional perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 179–192.
- Koivisto A (2013) On the preference for remembering: Acknowledging an answer with Finnish *ai nii(n)* (“Oh that’s right”). *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 46: 277–297.
- Koivisto A (2015a) Displaying now-understanding: the Finnish change-of-state token *aa*. *Discourse Processes* 52: 111–148.
- Koivisto A (2015b) Dealing with ambiguities in informings. Finnish *aijaa* as a “neutral” news receipt. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 48: 365–387.
- Koivisto A (2016) Receipting information as newsworthy vs. responding to redirection: Finnish news particles *aijaa* and *aha(a)*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 104: 163–179.
- Kunnari M (2011) *Kahdentunut dialogipartikkeli joojoo keskustelussa* [Republished response particle *joojoo* in conversation]. Unpublished MA thesis. University of Helsinki.
- Kurhila S and Lilja N (2017) Toisto ja korjauksen rajat [Repetition and the boundaries of repair]. *Virittäjä* 121: 213–243.
- Laury R (1997) *Demonstratives in interaction: The emergence of a definite article in Finnish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mazeland H (2007) Parenthetical sequences. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 1816–1869.
- Raymond G (2003) Grammar and social organization: Yes/no interrogatives and the structure of responding. *American Sociological Review* 68: 939–967.

- Rossi G (2015) Other-initiated repair in Italian. *Open Linguistics* 1 s. 256–282.
- Schegloff EA (1982): Discourse as an interactional achievement: some uses of ‘uh huh’ and other things that come between sentences. In Tannen D (ed.), *Georgetown university roundtable on language and linguistics*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, pp. 71–93.
- Schegloff EA (1996) Confirming allusions: Toward an empirical account of action. *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 161–216.
- Schegloff (2004) On dispensability. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 37:
- Schegloff EA (2007) *Sequence organization in interaction. A primer in conversation analysis* (Vol. 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff EA, Jefferson G & Sacks H (1977) The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53: 361–382
- Sorjonen ML (1999) Dialogipartikkelien tehtävistä [On the functions of response particles]. *Virittäjä* 103: 170–194.
- Sorjonen ML (2001) *Responding in Conversation. A study of response particles in Finnish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Stivers T (2004) “No no no” and other types of multiple sayings in social interaction. *Human Communication Research* 30: 260–293.
- Stivers T (2005) Modified repeats: One method for asserting primary rights from second position. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 38: 131–158.
- Stivers T (2011) Morality and question design: “Of course” as contesting a presupposition of askability. In Stivers T, Mondada L & Steensig J (eds.), *The morality of knowledge in conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 82–106.
- Thompson S, Fox B & Couper-Kuhlen E (2015) *Grammar in everyday talk: Building responsive actions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Scott Barnes and the reviewer Mark Dingemans for useful and accurate feedback on previous versions of this paper. My special thanks to Markku Haakana and Salla Kurhila and their project members for giving me access to their data. I also thank Salla Kurhila for checking the final version.