UC Riverside
Issues in Applied Linguistics

Title

Other-Repair in Japanese Conversations Between Nonnative and Native Speakers

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9rb6b1m6

Journal

Issues in Applied Linguistics, 11(1)

ISSN

1050-4273

Author

Hosoda, Yuri

Publication Date

2000-06-30

DOI

10.5070/L4111005023

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

Other-Repair in Japanese Conversations Between Nonnative and Native Speakers

Yuri Hosoda
Temple University Japan

Although a preference for self-repair over other-repair has been observed in both native speaker (NS) discourse (e.g., Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977) and nonnative speaker (NNS) discourse (e.g., Firth, 1996), researchers note that other-repair still often occurs, especially in interactions with NNSs (e.g., Varonis & Gass, 1983). The present study examines conditions under which other-repair occurs and the response to other-repair in natural NS/NNS conversations in Japanese. Analysis of the data reveals the importance of interlocutors' mutual orientation to each other's verbal and non-verbal behavior in the shaping of other-repair and responses to the repair, particularly in NS/NNS conversation.

The nature and organization of repair in naturally occurring conversation was first characterized by Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977). The phenomenon addressed here includes responses to a wide range of problems of speaking, listening, and understanding, including but not limited to errors or mistakes. Repair may be initiated either by the speaker of the problematic talk (self-initiated repair) or by another speaker (other-initiated repair). The repair may then be carried out by the speaker of the problematic talk (self-repair) or by the other speaker (other-repair). Using data from interactions among native speakers (NS) of English, Schegloff et al. demonstrated a preference for self-initiation and self-repair over other-initiation and other-repair. However, they also mentioned that other-repair may be more frequent in interactions among "not-yet-competent" speakers. This comment stimulated a number of studies on other-repair in interactions with nonnative speakers (NNS), which I will now discuss.

In interactions involving NNSs, other-repair may take the form of negotiation of meaning, that is "the collaborative work which speakers undertake to achieve mutual understanding" (Ellis, 1994, p. 260). In the second language acquisition (SLA) paradigm, negotiation of meaning refers to conversational practices that include changes to the structure of a conversation to adapt to problems of learners' or their interlocutors' understanding, and it deals with the clarification of communication and correction of error by means of conversational exchanges such as confirmation checks, comprehension checks, rephrasing, and the like (see Ellis, 1994; 1999; Long, 1996; Pica, 1994). The Conversation Analysis (CA) notion of repair on the other hand deals with any responses to problems in speaking, hearing, or understanding. Examples of other-repair are not always examples of negotiation of meaning, though the two categories overlap. Unlike repair, which has

Issues in Applied Linguistics
ISSN 1050-4273
© 2000, Regents of the University of California
Vol. 11 No. 1, 39-63

been studied using the detailed analysis of naturally occuring conversational data, negotiation of meaning has been defined primarily in the context of experimental studies of language acquisition.[1] In SLA research, negotiation of meaning has been found to be essential for the success of the interaction for second language learners (Varonis & Gass, 1985) and crucial for developing certain aspects of a second language (Long, 1996). In addition, in the course of negotiating meaning, error correction by other speakers has been found to be more frequent in NS/NNS or NNS/NNS conversation than in NS/NS conversation (e.g., Varonis & Gass). However, a number of studies have shown that even in NS/NNS or NNS/NNS conversations, error correction by the other speaker and other-repair are less frequent than error correction by the speaker of the error and self-repair (e.g., Firth. 1996; Gaskill, 1980; Ogane, 1997; Schwartz, 1980).

In the past, researchers have mainly focused on frequency of other-repair in NS/NNS interactions, but not on the conditions under which the other-repair occurs. Moreover, as Long (1996) claims, although error correction in instructed second language acquisition has been well investigated, the status of error correction in naturally occurring NS/NNS conversation, "where a metalinguistic focus is lacking and where attempts at overt error correction rarely occur, is a theoretically and practically more interesting question" (p. 444). The present study looks at the conditions under which other-repair occurs and the response to other-repair in natural NS/advanced NNS conversations in Japanese. Although the primary purpose of the present study is a preliminary examination of the nature of other-repair in NS/NNS conversation, I will also look at some examples taken from NS/NS conversation to investigate the similarities and differences in the ways interactants provide and respond to other-repair in NS/NNS conversation as opposed to NS/NS conversation.[2] Specifically, the present study addresses the following two questions:

1. Under what conditions do interlocutors provide other-repair? and
2. How do repair recipients respond to other-repair? In other words, is there any uptake after other-repair has been provided and before interlocutors return to the 'main sequence' of the interaction?

Repair as defined here draws upon Schegloff et al. (1977) to include instances of replacement of one utterance with another, instances of supplying of words when there is no apparent error, and outright correction. Replacement refers to repetition of all or a part of the prior utterance with some change in the form of a paraphrase or reformulation. In this case, the repair recipient's utterance may or may not contain an apparent error. Even when an utterance does not contain an error, the other party may replace the utterance with another way of expressing the same thing. On the other hand, outright correction refers to explicit provision of the correct form following a repair recipient's apparent error, and is compatible with what Jefferson (1987) calls "exposed correction," an activity that isolates the correction, "making of it an interactional business in its own right; i.e., exposing it" (p. 97). This kind of repair explicitly isolates the part of the utterance that includes an error, and may contain a word or phrase that indicates that the prior

utterance contains a mistake (e.g., *iya* "no").

In this study, I will focus on self-initiated other-repair. As I will demonstrate below, if non-verbal behavior is taken into consideration, all instances of other-repair in this study were invited by behavior of the speaker of the trouble source (where "trouble source" refers to the linguistic item that is targeted by the repair). In the following analyses, a sequence that proceeds from a speaker's utterance of a trouble source to the end of the repair negotiation will be referred to as a "side sequence" (Jefferson, 1972), and interaction before and after the side sequence will be referred to as the "main sequence."

METHOD

The data analyzed for this study are based on two NS/NNS conversations and one NS/NS conversation in Japanese, involving four individuals in all. The four participants were classmates in a doctoral program in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESOL) at an American university in Tokyo. All were male college teachers of English. The two NNSs, Gary and Jeff, were Americans who were advanced speakers of Japanese. Gary had been living in Japan for 11 years and Jeff had been living in Japan for nine years. Both of them had completed courses in teaching Japanese, conducted in Japanese and offered at the university. The two NSs, Taka and Haru, speakers of the Tokyo dialect of Japanese, were advanced speakers of English. Both Taka and Haru had lived in English-speaking countries for several years and had TOEFL scores above 600. Gary was 46 years old, Jeff was 33 years old, Taka was 44 years old, and Haru was 43 years old.

All three conversations were video- and audio-recorded during a Christmas party held by a group of doctoral students in the university cafeteria on December 19, 1998. The participants were asked to converse in front of a video camera. An audiotape recorder was placed between the two interlocutors. Everyone else (approximately 15 people) was sitting at a large table in the cafeteria. In order to avoid the noise of other conversations, the participants were asked to sit at a smaller table set in a corner of the cafeteria. While recording the conversations, the researcher was talking with the other students at the large table. The conversation between Taka and Haru (NS/NS) lasted approximately 20 min; between Taka and Gary (NS/NNS), approximately 15 min; and between Haru and Jeff (NS/NNS), approximately 20 min. Transcription and translation conventions were adapted from Jefferson (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984), Maynard (1997), and Tsujimura (1996) (see Appendix for transcription conventions).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, I will examine the context of responses to other-repair in my data. Although the focal point of this study concerns other-repair sequences, before introducing instances of other-repair, I will briefly consider instances of other-

correction that are not repair but rather are responses to requests for confirmation.

Responses to Requests for Confirmation

In the data, there were five responses to requests for confirmation in total, including instances found in both the NS/NNS and NS/NS conversations. In response to a request for confirmation, one receives either an agreement (i.e., confirmation) or disagreement (i.e., correction) from his/her interlocutor. Responding to a request for confirmation which was based on an incorrect assumption is *correction*, but it is not *repair* in the sense that it does not address problems with the speaker's speaking or the recipient's hearing or understanding. According to Kamio (1994; 1997a; 1997b), information is in a person's "territory" when: (a) the information is obtained through the person's internal or external direct experience; (b) the information embodies detailed knowledge which falls into the person's professional or other expertise; or (c) the information is about persons, facts, and things close to the person, including information about the person. In these data, in examples in which requests for confirmation were followed by unmitigated correction, the corrected information was consistently within the "territory" of the listener. Some examples are shown below. In Example 1, Taka and Haru are talking about Haru's age and birthday, information that is completely in Haru's "territory."

Example 1

1. Taka: boku yonzyuuyon-desu-yo.
   I 44-POL-IP
   'I'm 44.'

2. Haru: boku:-wa mousugu yonzyuuyon-desu- [yo]
   I-top soon 44-POL-IP
   'I'm going to be 44 soon.'

-> 3. Taka: [ah] sou-desu-ka
   oh right-POL-Q
   'Oh, is that so.

-> 4. zyaa [nizyuukyuu-nen]
   then 29-year
   Then, {you were born in Showa,} the 29th year.'

5. Haru: [itigatu-de]
   January-in
   'In January'

-> 6. san [zyuu-nen.]
   30-year
   'The 30th year.'

7. Taka: [sanzyuu]nen
30-year
'The 30th year.'

In lines 1 and 2, Taka finds that Haru is the same age as himself. Taka then assumes that he and Haru were born in the same year, the 29th year of the Japanese Showa era (1954) and utters *zyaa nizyuukyuunen* "then {you were born in Showa} the 29th year." As in the case of "then" in English, *zyaa* in Japanese can function to request confirmation (Hudson, 1998). Moreover, according to Labov and Fanshel (1977), when a speaker makes a statement about an event that is known to the hearer but not to the speaker, regardless of intonation, the statement is heard as a request for confirmation. Thus, although Taka's utterance in lines 3 and 4 is not marked by rising intonation, because the information is completely within Haru's domain, Taka's utterance, *zyaa nizyuukyuun,* can be taken as a request for confirmation. As soon as Haru hears "the 29th year," he corrects Taka with an unmitigated *sanzyuunen* "the 30th year," spoken with falling intonation (line 6).

Example 2 is from the NS/NNS conversation, and again, the information is in the listener's domain.

Example 2
((Taka and Gary are talking about buckwheat spaghetti, which Gary ate in Seattle.))

1. Taka: tyotto boroboro-siteru-kanzi-zyanai?
a little ONO-being-feeling-TAG
'It seems dry, doesn't it?'

-> 2. Gary: hh boroboro-tte-iu-no-wa azi-wa tigau.
ONO-COMP-say-NR-Top taste-Top-different
'It does not taste dry.'

-> 3. Taka: a tigau. yappari kou ano:: soba-tuyu tukete kou taberu?
oh different as expected this uhmm buckwheat-soup dip this eat
'Oh, it doesn't. You know, like, uhmm, you dip it in the buckwheat soup and eat it?

4. negi-de.
leek-Aux
'with leeks.'

-> 5. Gary: a >iya iya iya< ano: hu hutu:-no spaghetti style-desu-ne. u:n. sou nn
oh no no no uhmm ordinary-Gen -POL-IP hmm right
'Oh, no, no, no. Uhmm, it's ordinary spaghetti style. Hmm, right,'

6. dakedo uhn? yappari tigau.
but as expected different
'but what? It's different, you know.'

7. Taka: tigau-nee.
different-IP
'It's different.'

In the above example, because the person who had the spaghetti that is being discussed is Gary, the information was obtained through Gary's direct experience. Therefore, the information is within Gary's "territory." In lines 1 and 3, Taka makes confirmation requests and the utterances are marked with rising intonation. Gary then provides corrections concerning the spaghetti in lines 2 and 5; the corrections are unmitigated disagreements with falling intonation.

As noted above, correction as a response to a request for confirmation was "invited" by rising intonation, uncertainty markers or by the information being centered in the addressee's domain. The other-repair in my data, to which I will now turn, showed a pattern of self-initiation which was similar to this solicitaion of correction.

Other-Repair Instances

In the approximately 55 minutes of conversation, there were 17 examples of other-repair, of which 2 occurred in the conversation between Taka and Haru (NS/NS), 8 in the conversation between Taka and Gary (NS/NNS), and 7 in the conversation between Haru and Jeff (NS/NNS). These frequencies show that other-repair occurred much more often in the NS/NNS conversations than in the NS/NS conversation. Quantification of instances of other-repair is not the main concern of this paper,[3] and the interpretations presented in this study are the result of case by case analyses. Nevertheless, an indication of relative frequency may provide an overall impression of the negotiation involved in each of the conversations.

In this sub-section I will first look at the discourse environments in which other-repair took place. I will then analyze the responses to other-repair.

Self-Initiation of other-repair

Each time a speaker produces what may be taken as a problem by a hearer, and the hearer notices the problem, the hearer has a choice of repairing "the problem" or not as well as initiating repair or not.[4] In fact, it is usually the preferred choice to initiate repair rather than to actually repair. The question is then, under what circumstances do listeners choose to produce repair in spite of the dispreferred status of other-repair? A closer look at the data reveals that other-repair was consistently given in response to particular verbal and non-verbal behaviors by the speaker of the trouble source. In other words, within my data set, other-repair occurred only after a speaker exhibited verbal or non-verbal behavior that seemed to self-initiate the repair.

The frequencies of verbal and non-verbal behavior initiating other-repair are shown in Table 1. As shown in the table, all instances of other-repair in this data set followed certain verbal and/or non-verbal behavior by the speaker.

Table 1: Frequency of Verbal and Non-verbal Behavior Preceding Other-Repair

Initiation Types	Verbal Only	Non-Verbal Only	Verbal + Non-Verbal	Total
# of Other-Repair	0	7	10	17

The two types of speaker behavior that self-initiate other-repair, verbal behavior and non-verbal behavior, will be discussed along with examples below.

Verbal behavior initiating other-repair

Other-repair in the data often followed particular kinds of verbal behavior of the speaker of the trouble source. According to Schegloff et al. (1977), NSs often self-initiate repair by using a variety of techniques such as sound stretches, fillers, and cut-offs. They mention that although self-initiation of repair results in self-repair much more frequently than other-repair, self-initiation can also result in other-repair. As mentioned above, other-repair refers to replacement, supplying a word, and outright correction by the other speaker. A number of studies on NS/NNS and NNS/NNS discourse report that NNSs often attempt to solicit conversational help from their interlocutors by means of word searches and requests for help (e.g., Chun, Day, Chenoweth, & Luppescu, 1982; Day, Chenoweth, Chun, & Luppescu, 1984; Gaskill, 1980; Hatch, 1978; Kasper, 1985; Klinck, 1984). Færch and Kasper (1983) named this strategy "appealing" and claim that non-native speakers use it to signal to their interlocutors that they are facing communicative difficulty.

Of the 17 instances of other-repair in the NS/NNS conversations and the NS/NS conversation, 10 followed verbal indications of difficulty. Both NNS and NS participants in the conversations displayed difficulty by using verbal techniques such as sound stretches, fillers, cut-offs, rising intonation, the question marker *ka*, and explicit expressions of ignorance. In Example 3, Gary's difficulty is conveyed by his extensive use of fillers (e.g., *ano*, uh).

Example 3
((Gary and Taka are talking about how travelers from Asia cannot go beyond Los Angeles on Korean Airlines.))

-> 1. Gary: hai sou sou da >demo< korean air-wa-nee uhhuh an(hh)o maa
yes right right but Korean air-Top-IP ((laugh)) uhm well
'Yes, right right. But as for Korean Airlines, uhm, well'

-> 2. ano zone hottoni ano: mosi ano: nisi-kaigan-ni ike-ba:, hh mazu: sono
uhm zone really uhm if uhmm west-coast-to go-if at first well
'uhm, zone really, uhm, if uhm, you go to the west coast, at first, well'

-> 3. toko-ni ike-ba, ano: sore-kara ano:: uh: douyatte: uh: i: sa: ikisaki-ni
place-to go-if uhm there-from uhmm uh how uh destination-to
'well, if you go there, uhmm, then, from there, how to {go to the} destination'

4. iku-ka [wakara-nai-desu-ne iwayuru]
go-Q understand-NEG-IP so called
'{you} don't know how to get {your destination}, so called'

5. Taka: [aa dakara rosanzerusu-made] tonderu-kedo=
oh so Los Angeles-to flying-but
'Oh, so {Korean Airlines} flies to Los Angeles but,'

6. Gary: =u::::
uh::::
'Uh::::'

7. Taka: sok-kara saki-ga ike-nai-n-desyo? daikan-kou [kuu-de-wa.]
there-from beyond-Nom go-NEG-NR-TAG Korean-Airline-by-Top
'You can't go beyond there on Korean Airlines.'

8. Gary: [sou sou] sou
right right right
'Right right right'

9. sou.=
right
'right.'

In lines 1 to 4, Gary tries to explain whether travelers from Asia can fly beyond Los Angeles on Korean Airlines but his utterances display verbal distress by their increasing length and the extensive use of fillers. In lines 5 and 7, Taka reformulates Gary's lengthy comments. Hatch (1978), who looked at NS/NNS interactions, repeatedly observed instances of such reformulation by NSs. She argues that a native speaker may be driven to paraphrase an utterance by a NNS because the nonnative speaker's formulation is too lengthy and confusing.

In Example 4, Jeff displays conversational difficulty by using phrases such as *nante-iu-no* "how do you say it?," fillers, and rising intonation, which function as self-initiation for which Haru provides the repair by completing Jeff's final phrase.

Example 4

-> 1. Jeff: sono (?)-san-no i i-ta-no-wa (.) ano:u (.) nante-iu-no ano::u (.) nanimo
that (?)-TL-Gen exist-past-NR-Top well what-say-IP well any
'That (?) was {with his friend's wife} has, uhmm, how do you say, uhmmm,'

-> 2. utagai?
doubt
'any doubt?'

3. Haru: un utagai-ga-nai.
uh-huh doubt-Nom-NEG
'Uh-huh. There's no doubt.'

4. Jeff: nai-to-omotte-ta.
NEG-COMP-thinking-past
'{I} was thinking there was no {doubt}.'

In lines 1 and 2, Jeff searches for the phrase *nanimo utagai-ga-nai* "there's no doubt" and comes up with parts of the phrase: *nanimo utagai*. As Jeff searches for the phrase, he uses the phrase *nante-iu-no* "how do you say it?" and fillers, and marks his incomplete phrase *nanimo utagai* with rising intonation. Haru then supplies the rest of the phrase, making the phrase grammatically correct (line 3).

In addition to the verbal signals for initiating repair mentioned above, the NSs sometimes used the Japanese demonstrative pronoun *are* (translated as "that") to take the place of a specific noun or noun phrase during a word search. In their article on self-repair in Japanese and English, Fox, Hayashi, and Jasperson (1996) also found this use of demonstrative pronouns in Japanese data. They argue that "the demonstrative pronoun serves as a place holder while the speaker looks for some lexically specific noun" (p. 205). In the present data, out of 5 instances of *are* used during a word search in the NS/NS conversation, 2 instances were followed by other-repair and 3 instances by self-repair. Thus, the use of a demonstrative pronoun as a place holder was followed by other-repair as well as self-repair.

Example 5
((Taka is talking about his son, who goes to an art college. He just mentioned that his father and wife are artists.))

-> 1. Taka: sono keiretu-no ano: are- [mitai.]
that kind-Gen uhmm that-like
'It may be a kind of, uhm, that.'

2. Haru: [>sokode<] ah otousan ah sou-ka. sono:
there oh father oh right-Q well
'There, oh, your father, oh, I see. Well,'

-> 3. tisuzi-to-iu-ka-ne,
heredity-COMP-say-Q-IP
'It's something like heredity.'

4. Taka: sou-des(hh)u-nehhehh *hh demo kodomo...
Right-POL-IP ((laugh)) but children
'That's right. But children...'

In line 1, Taka hesitates before a word (a noun or noun phrase signaled by the genitive *no*), inserting a filler *ano:* and a demonstrative pronoun *are*. In the next turn, Haru provides the word, *tisuzi* "heredity."

In this data set, this use of the demonstrative pronoun was exclusive to native speakers. The NNSs did not use this strategy to elicit either other-repair or self-repair. While this strategy is useful for native speakers of Japanese, whose language does not "systematically provide phrase-initial grammatical material" (Fox et al., 1996, p. 206), mastering the strategy may be difficult for native speakers of English, whose language is typologically different from Japanese in that respect.

Thus, both the NSs and NNSs self-initiated other-repair using a variety of verbal resources. However, in this data, a subtle difference was found between the way the NSs and NNSs verbally self-initiate other-repair: the NSs used the demonstrative pronoun *are* to initiate other-repair, while the NNSs stayed more with the kinds of repair initiation they knew from English.

Non-verbal behavior initiating other-repair

A closer look at the non-verbal features of the interaction revealed that the other-repair within my data consistently followed certain non-verbal signals by the prior speaker. The non-verbal signals in the data included eye gaze, posture, raised eyebrows, laughter, nods, pointing to oneself, and head tilts. Among these, eye gaze was a consistent signal in all instances of other-repair; the speaker of the trouble source always focused his gaze on the recipient before the recipient provided repair. Kendon (1990), who examined direction of eye gaze in two-person conversations in English, found that participants use eye gaze to signal when they want a response from their recipients: Speakers look away as they begin an utterance, forestalling a response, and they look back at their interlocutors when they are "open" to a response (p. 64). Moreover, Goodwin and Goodwin (1986), who examined ordinary interactions among native speakers of English, describe some ways that participants in interactions use gesture to change participation patterns during a word search. The authors note that speakers usually withdraw their eye gaze from their current recipients and display a "thinking face" as they begin a word search to show that the action is self-directed; when speakers want assistance, they shift their gaze to recipients from whom they hope to receive help. Similar findings are reported by Schwartz (1980), who examined repair in interactions between non-native speakers with various language backgrounds including Japanese. Schwartz also found that non-native speakers made eye contact with addressees along with the other non-verbal strategies as a means of initiating other-repair.

In the present study, non-verbal signals for initiating repair occurred with or

without verbal signals for initiating repair. Therefore, even examples which might be treated as other-initiated repair based on the audio-tape in fact include non-verbal behavior which seems to function to initiate other-repair, as in Example 6. (Transcription conventions for non-verbal information are shown in the Appendix.) In the transcript, only non-verbal features that are relevant to the analysis are indicated. Non-verbal features of the speaker and the addressee are shown below each utterance.

Prior to Example 6, Taka has started talking about the *enzyokin* "financial aid" that a certain community receives from the government.

Example 6

```
- > 1. Gary:  |enzyou-kin.
               flaming-money
               'Flaming money.*'
               |————————
       Gary:  |((leaning forward and looking closer at Taka))

- > 2. Taka:  enzyokin.
               financial aid
               'Financial aid.'

    3. Gary:  ah enzyokin en en=
               oh financial aid
               'Oh, financial aid, fi, fi,'

    4. Taka:  =enzyokin.
               financial aid
               'Financial aid.'
```

In line 1, Gary displays that he had some difficulty catching the word *enzyokin* "financial aid"; he repeats the word incorrectly and it becomes a trouble source. Gary initially uttered the word *enzyoukin* with falling intonation and with no verbal signals of repair initiation. However, during this utterance, he leans forward and looks closely at Taka. In line 2, Taka provides the correct word.

Even when there were indications of verbal distress such as fillers, if non-verbal indicators did not accompany them, the hearer did not provide repair, as shown in Example 7.

Example 7

((Jeff and Haru are talking about the relationship between two people in a scenario on a Discourse Completion Test they took in a Pragmatics course the previous semester.))

```
    1. Jeff:  demo native speaker-toshite=
               But    native speaker-as
               'But as native speakers,'
```

2. Haru: =hai.
Yes
'Yes.'

- > 3. Jeff: lano:::u goku syousuu-ka lano:u lhhuh
uhmm very few-only uhmm ((laugh))
'Uhmm, very small number of people, uhm ((laugh))'
|— — — — — — — — — — — |— — —|— —
Jeff: l((looking down)) l((looking up and smiling at Haru))
Jeff: l((nods twice))

4. Haru: daitaino hito-wa
most people-Top
'Most people,'

5. Jeff: hai.
Yes
'Yes.'

6. Haru: yappari nanka kou tokubetuna kankei-da-to
as expected somehow well special relationship-Aux-COMP
'After all, {the two} have something like a special relationship'

7. omotyau-wake-da.
think-case-Aux
'{they} think.'

8. Jeff: sou.
right
'Right.'

Immediately before this segment Jeff told Haru that he did not think that the two people in the story had an affair. In line 1, Jeff starts the line with *demo* "but" which indicates a contrast. Therefore, it may not be difficult for Haru to predict what Jeff is trying to say from the context—that Jeff did not think the two had an affair, but most native speakers (of English) did. In line 3, while producing a long filler *ano:::u* and *goku shousuu-ka* "very small number only," Jeff is looking down, displaying a "thinking face." While Jeff is averting his gaze, Haru "withholds" repair in spite of Jeff's display of conversational difficulty. However, toward the end of his turn, Jeff looks up at Haru, smiles, produces the filler *ano:u* again, laughs, and nods twice. Then in lines 4, 6, and 7, Haru articulates what Jeff has been trying to say in lines 1 and 3. Regarding this point, Goodwin and Goodwin (1986) state that while a speaker is withdrawing gaze from a recipient and showing a "thinking face" in an attempt to search for a word, it may not be appropriate to intrude into the search: but when the speaker's gaze returns to the recipient, the recipient's active coparticipation in the search is "not only appropriate, but sought

by the speaker" (p. 71).

When such non-verbal signals were not followed by repair by the interlocutor in my data, the speakers intensified the signals as shown in Example 8.

Example 8

```
    1. Jeff:   sou nazeka minna   souiu kankei-o-suru=
               right somehow everybody such relationship-Acc-do
               'Right. Somehow, everybody {speculates that they're} having an affair.'

    2. Haru:   =a::=
               Oh
               'Oh'

- > 3. Jeff:   =ano !::: (.) nan-desu-ka ano:::      !sui suitei?=
               uhmmm what-POL-Q uhmm  estimation
               'Uhmmm, how do you say, uhmm, est, estimation?'
                    !— — — — — — — — — — — — — !— — —
       Jeff:        !(( turns his face away))      !(( looks at Haru and raises eyebrows))

    4. Haru:   =u: [n ]
               uh-huh
               'Uh-huh.'

- > 5. Jeff:       ![su]isoku?=
                   speculation
                   'Speculation?'
                   !— — — —
                   !((looks at Haru, raises eyebrows, and leans forward))

    6. Haru:   =suisoku-suru.=
               speculation-do
               '{They} speculate.'

    7. Jeff:   =°suisoku-da°
               speculation-Aux
               '{There's} speculation.'
```

At the beginning of line 3, Jeff shifts his gaze from Haru as he hesitates; toward the end of the turn, he returns his gaze to Haru, raises his eyebrows, and says *suitei* with rising intonation. Although using *suitei* is not correct and *suisoku* should be used in this context, Haru lets the opportunity to provide repair pass (line 4). Jeff then carries out what Schegloff (1997) calls "third turn repair." According to Schegloff, third turn repair refers to self-repair in the third position following a listener's contribution which neither points out nor repairs the trouble source in the first position. Schegloff argues that third turn repair has something to do with the speaker's intention to get things right. In the example above, Jeff

seems to be concentrating on getting things right linguistically, while Haru seems to be focusing on meaning. Jeff's attempt at self-repair (in line 5) can also be taken as triggering Haru's repair. In uttering *suisoku* "speculation," Jeff focuses his gaze on Haru, raises his eyebrows, leans forward and uses rising intonation. In line 6, Haru provides the repair, *suisoku-suru* "speculate."

However, listeners may not respond to the speaker's verbal and non-verbal signals right away if some other activity is going on. Consider Example 3 (repeated here as Example 9), focusing on the non-verbal features of the interlocutors.

Example 9
((Gary and Taka are talking about how travelers from Asia cannot go beyond Los Angeles on Korean Airlines.))

```
1.  Gary:  hai sou  sou  da >demo< korean air-wa-nee uhhuh   an(hh)o maa
           yes right right  but    Korean air-Top-IP ((laugh)) uhm   well
           'Yes, right right. But as for Korean Airlines, uhm, well'

-> 2.      a|no zone hotto|ni ano: mosi a|no: |nisi-kaigan-ni ike-ba:, hh mazu: sono
           uhm  zone really   uhm  if   uhmm   west-coast-to  go-if   at first well
           'uhm, zone really, uhm, if uhm, you go to the west coast, at first, well'
                              |— — — — — — — —   |— — — — — — — — — — — — — —
     Gary:                    |((turns face away))  |((looks at Taka))
            |— — — — — — — — — — — — —  |— — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —
     Taka:  |((glances at beer and      |((looks at Gary, holding his beer))
            takes it up while
            looking at Gary))

->3.       |toko-ni ike-ba, ano: sore-kara   |a |no::  uh: |douyatte: uh: i: |sa: ikisaki-ni
           place-to go-if  uhm  there-from uhmm   uh    how     uh     destination-to
           'well, if you go there, uhmm, then, from there, how to {go to the} destina-
           tion'
           |— — — — — — — — — — — — —  |— — — —  |— — — — — — — —
     Gary: |((looks at Taka))          |((turns his  |((looks at Taka))
                                        head to the
                                        left twice))
           |— — — — — — — — — — — — —   |— — — — — — — — — — — —|— — —
     Taka: |((looks at Gary, holding     |((brings his beer up to   |((looks at
           his beer))                     his mouth,drinks it and   Gary))
                                          puts it back on the table
                                          while looking at Gary))
```

4. |iku-ka [wakara-nai-desu-ne iwayuru]
go-Q understand-NEG-IP so called
'{you} don't know how to get {your destination}, so called'
|— — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —
Gary: |((looks at Taka))
Taka: |((looks at Gary))

5. Taka: [aa dakara rosanzerusu-made] tonderu-kedo=
oh so Los Angeles-to flying-but
'Oh, so {Korean Airlines} flies to Los Angeles but,'

6. Gary: =u::::
uh::::
'Uh::::'

7. Taka: sok-kara saki-ga ike-nai-n-desyo? daikan-ko [kuu-de-wa.]
there-from beyond-Nom go-NEG-NR-TAG Korean-airline-by-Top
'You can't go beyond there on Korean Airlines.'

8. Gary: [sou sou] sou
right right right
'Right right right'

9. sou.=
right
'right.'

10. Taka: =demo Betty-wa...
but Betty-Top
'But Betty...'

In lines 2 and 3, besides listening to Gary, Taka is engaged in another activity, getting his beer and drinking it. After Gary's hesitation *an(hh)o maa ano* (lines 1 and 2), Taka glances at his beer and takes it up (line 2) and from there on, he continues to hold his beer while gazing at Gary. After Gary hesitates and turns his head slightly to the left twice, Taka brings his beer up to his mouth, drinks it while Gary utters *douyatte: uh: i: sa:*, and then puts it back on the table (line 3). When Taka finishes drinking his beer and puts it back on the table, he immediately provides other-repair (lines 5 and 7).

In sum, in the present data, the production of other-repair was not arbitrary, but rather a response to a variety of verbal and non-verbal signals; listeners attended to these signals for self-initiating repair and responded to them with repair. This finding from natural conversations in Japanese corresponds with those of Schegloff et al. (1977) from ordinary conversation in English in that the occurrence of other-repair is highly constrained (i.e., just after an invitation for other-repair by the speaker of the trouble source). Interestingly, even between NS and

NNS, other-repair was restricted to certain specifiable interactional contexts: only after verbal and non-verbal invitation by the speaker of the trouble source. Because NNSs are less competent in the language than NSs, it might be expected that NSs would correct them in other interactional contexts (as is the case in language classrooms). However, if the dimensions of eye gaze and engagement discussed by Goodwin and Goodwin (1986) are taken into account, the occurrence of other repair by the NSs in the NS/NNS conversations in my data was consistently associated with NNS self-initiation of other-repair.

Responses to other-repair

In the previous section. it was shown that other-repair in the data was consistently produced in response to particular verbal and non-verbal behaviors by the speaker to self-initiate repair. An additional aspect of the other-repair sequences is the response to the other-repair. Therefore, in this section, I will look at the discourse environment after the repair and turns immediately preceding the interlocutors' return to the main sequential action.

In the data, after other-repair was provided, it was commonly followed by verbal or non-verbal signs of acceptance by the repair recipients. Repair recipients displayed their acceptance of the repair in the form of repetition of the repaired item, tokens such as *sou sou* (right right), and/or nods. The frequency of repair recipients' acceptance behaviors is shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Frequency of Acceptance Behavior

Acceptance	NS/NS	NS/NNS	Total
Total number of repair	2	15	17
Repetition	0	12	12
Tokens of *sous* or nods	2	14	16
No acceptance behavior	0	1	1

As Table 2 shows, in the NS/NS conversation, signs of acceptance followed the repair in both instances. Among the acceptance signals, repetition of the repaired item was not observed in either case, while tokens such as *sou sou* or nods occurred in both instances. In the NS/NNS conversations, other-repair resulted in acceptance in all but one instance. Of 15 instances of other-repair, 12 resulted in repetition and 14 resulted in acceptance tokens such as *sou sou* or nods. The repair recipients' acceptance behavior is discussed below.

Previous research on other-repair in NNS conversations often reports repair recipients' repetition of repaired items (e.g., Klinck, 1984). Consistent with those findings, in the NS/NNS conversations in this study, the repair recipients' agreement or acceptance of the other-repair regularly occurred in the form of repetition.

Consider Examples 10 and 11 below.

Example 10
((Taka and Gary are talking about the Hutterite community.))

1. Gary: |enzyou-kin.
flaming-money
'Flaming money.*'
|— — — — — — —
Gary: |((leaning forward and looking closer at Taka))

2. Taka: enzyokin.
financial aid
'Financial aid.'

-> 3. Gary: ah enzyokin en en=
oh financial aid
'Oh, financial aid, fi, fi,'

4. Taka: =enzyo[kin.]
financial aid
'Financial aid.'

-> 5. Gary: [*hh] ah enzyo hai [wakari-masu.]
oh aid yes understand-POL
'Oh, aid, yes, I understand.'

6. Taka: [enzyokin] okane-ne?
financial aid money-IP
'Financial aid. Money, right?'

7. Gary: hai hai.
yes yes
'Yes, yes.'

Example 11

1. Jeff: =ano |::: (.) nan-desu-ka ano::: |sui suitei?=
   uhmmm what-POL-Q uhmm estimation
   'Uhmmm, how do you say, uhmm, est, estimation?'
   |— — — — — — — — — — — —|— — — — —
   Jeff: |((turns his face away)) |((looks at Haru and raises eyebrows))

2. Haru: =u: [n]
   uh-huh
   'Uh-huh.'

3. Jeff: |[su]isoku?=
   speculation
   'Speculation?'
   |— — — —
   Jeff: |((looks at Haru, raises eyebrows, and leans forward))

4. Haru: =suisoku-suru.=
   speculation-do
   '{They} speculate.'

5. Jeff: =°suisoku-da°
   speculation-Aux
   '{There's} speculation.'

In Example 10, Gary repeats the word *enzyokin;*[5] in Example 11, Jeff repeats *suisoku.* In other words, the speakers used repetition in accepting the other-repair.[6]

While acceptance in the form of repetition was prevalent in the NS/NNS data, in the NS/NS data, other-repair did not result in repetition,[7] but in both instances resulted in production of acceptance tokens and/or nods, which I will address below.

Participants in both the NS/NNS and NS/NS data displayed signs of acceptance by producing tokens such as *hai hai, sou sou,* and/or nodding immediately before they returned to the main sequence of the conversation. Day et al. (1984), examining NS/NNS conversations in English, found a similar pattern. They note that interlocutors returned to the main sequence of conversation when they achieved mutual satisfaction or recognition of a repair. Consider Example 3, repeated as Example 12 below.

Example 12
((Gary and Taka are talking about how travelers from Asia cannot go beyond Los Angeles on Korean Airlines.))

1. Gary: hai sou sou da >demo< korean air-wa-nee uhhuh an(hh)o maa
yes right right but Korean air-Top-IP ((laugh)) uhm well
'Yes, right right. But as for Korean Airlines, uhm, well'

2. ano zone hottoni ano: mosi ano: nisi-kaigan-ni ike-ba:, hh mazu: sono
uhm zone really uhm if uhmm west-coast-to go-if at first well
'uhm, zone really, uhm, if uhm, you go to the west coast, at first, well'

3. toko-ni ike-ba, ano: sore-kara ano:: uh: douyatte: uh: i: sa: ikisaki-ni
place-to go-if uhm there-from uhmm uh how uh destination-to
'well, if you go there, uhmm, then, from there, how to {go to the} destination'

4. iku-ka [wakara-nai-desu-ne iwayuru]
go-Q understand-NEG-IP so called
'{you} don't know how to get {your destination}, so called'

5. Taka: [aa dakara rosanzerusu-made] tonderu-kedo=
oh so Los Angeles-to flying-but
'Oh, so {Korean Airlines} flies to Los Angeles but,'

6. Gary: =u::::
uh::::
'Uh::::'

7. Taka: sok-kara saki-ga ike-nai-n-desyo? daikan-kou [kuu-de-wa.]
there-from beyond-Nom go-NEG-NR-TAG Korean-airline-by-Top
'You can't go beyond there on Korean Airlines.'

- > 8. Gary: [sou sou] sou
right right right
'Right right right'

9. sou.=
right
'right.'

10. Taka: =demo Betty-wa...
but Betty-Top
'But Betty...'

In this example, as discussed earlier, an utterance by Gary is repaired by

Taka (lines 5 and 7). After Taka produces the repair, Gary displays his agreement by uttering *sou sou sou sou* (lines 8 and 9). Then, in line 10, Taka returns to the main sequential action and starts talking about their friend, Betty.

This display of acceptance in the forms of *sou*s or nods is not limited to NNSs. NSs also signaled their acceptance of repair, as seen in Example 13 below. Prior to this segment, Haru and Taka were talking about where a particular college is located. In this segment, Haru attempts to explain what kind of college the college is; specifically, he wants to say that the standard of acceptance for universities in Britain has changed so that now technical colleges are treated as universities. However, Haru fails to come up with the phrase *tekunikaru karezzi* (technical college). and Taka supplies him with the phrase.

Example 13
((Haru is talking about a sister school of the college he works at.))

```
1.  Haru:  saikin nan-nenkan-ka mae-ni |ano:: (.) daigaku-|no
           recently some-years-Q before-Dat uhmm   university-Gen
           'Recently, a few years ago, universities'
                                          |— — — — — — — |—
    Haru:                                 |((looks down))  |((looks at Taka))

2.         |are-o [(kae-ta)]
           that-Acc change-past
           'that of {universities} were changed.'
           |— — — — — — —
    Haru:  |((looks at Taka and circles his right hands))

3.  Taka:        [tekunikaru]-karezzi-ga [ daigaku-tosite ]
                 technical-college-Nom university-as
                 'Technical colleges were {accepted} as universities.'

-> 4.  Haru:                                [>sou  sou  sou  sou] sou  sou<
                                            right right right right right right
                                            'Right right right right right right.'

-> 5.      |souiu-to |ko-desu.
           such-place-POL
           'It's that kind of college.'
           |—        |— — —
    Haru:  |(nods)   |((nods three times))

6.  Taka:  ano-hen  ii-desu-yo-ne  boku ano-hen suki-nan-desu-yo.
           there-around good-POL-IP-IP I  there-around like-NR-POL-IP
           'It's nice around there. I like it around there.'
```

In lines 1 and 2, Haru inserts a filler, pauses, uses a demonstrative pronoun

are to replace a noun phrase (i.e., the standard of acceptance for universities), circles his right hand, and looks at Taka. These verbal and non-verbal indications of difficulty elicit Taka's repair in line 3. As soon as Haru hears Taka's repair *tekunikaru-karezzi-ga*, he displays his agreement by uttering six rapid *sous* (line 4) and by nodding (line 5). Taka then returns to the main sequential action: He starts talking about the place the school is located.

Absence of acceptance

While other-repair in the NS/NS conversation was followed by displays of acceptance, in the NS/NNS conversation, there was one instance in which the repair recipient's acceptance behavior was absent. In this instance (shown in Example 14), the further repair work provided interactional evidence that there was not yet full understanding following the repair. Prior to this segment, Taka has asked Gary if it is possible to go to Dallas on Korean airlines, and if it is, on what route.

Example 14

```
1.  Gary:  da dakedo: rosu-kara un sono: hutatume. |(.) mittu-no::(.) |uh:: hutaltu sono
           but   Los-from yeah well    second     third-Gen      uh  second well
           'But, but from Los Angeles, uhm, well, the second {stop.} The third, uhm,
           the second, well,
                                                  |— — — — — — |— — — — — —
    Gary:                                         |((looks up in   |((looks at Taka))
                                                  the air))
                                                  |—              |-
    Taka:                                         |((nods twice))  |((nods))

2.  Gary:  |atono tokubetu-to  [°(tomonatteru)°]
           other special-with   accompany
           'the other special, ac, accompany,'
           |— — — — — — — — — — — — — — —
    Gary:  |((looks at Taka))

3.  Taka:                       [  soko-wa    ] teikeisiteiru amerika-no
                                there-Top     tying up   America-Gen
                                'American airline companies that are tying up with
                                {Korean Airlines}'

4.         hikouki-gaisha-ni    notte-°i [ku]°
           airplane-company-by get on-go
           'You go there by using'

- > 5.  Gary:                          [ a ] amerika-no  kuru hikouki-wa,
                                       America-Gen come airplane-Top
                                       'Airlines coming from the U.S.,'
```

- > 6. °amerika-no hikouki° amerika ei-ei-wa, toukyou-kara dallas tokubetu-no
America-Gen airplane America AA-Top Tokyo-from Dallas special-Gen
'American airplanes, American, A. A., from Tokyo to Dallas, it has a special,'

- > 7. a[no::::]
well
'uhmm,'

8. Taka: [iya dakedo]
no but
'No but,'

9. (2.0)
|——
Taka: |((raises his left hand to signal 'stop'))

10. Taka: daikan-koukuu-ni not-te:,
Korean-airlines-in get on-and
'You take Korean Airlines and,'

11. Gary: hai
yes.
'Yes.'

12. Taka: rosanzerusu iku-desyo?
Los Angeles go-TAG
'go to Los Angeles, right?'

13. Gary: un.
uh-huh
'Uh-huh.'

In lines 1 and 2, Gary answers Taka's question, but after he displays verbal indications of distress and a non-verbal appeal for participation, Taka reformulates Gary's statement in lines 3 and 4. However, in lines 5-7, Gary neither repeats nor produces acceptance tokens but moves the interaction in a somewhat different direction, talking about how to fly to Japan on American Airlines, instead of how to get to the U.S. on Korean airlines. Then, after Gary's utterance in lines 5-7 and Taka's overlapped short utterance in line 8, Taka signals Gary to stop talking and attempts to get things straight (line 9). In fact, after line 13 in this segment, further misunderstanding occurred, and it took 10 more turns before they reached mutual understanding (a part of the interaction is shown in Example 3). The examples above provide evidence that when a sign of acceptance by a repair recipient is absent, there may be some problem with recognition or comprehension of the repair.

In sum, after other-repair had been provided, verbal and non-verbal signals of acceptance usually followed before the interlocutors returned to the main sequential action. Thus, other-repair may have been a sequence-initiating action that made the repair recipient's acceptance behavior in the next slot relevant. In one exception in NS/NNS conversation, a repair recipient's lack of acknowledgment seemed to correspond to a lack of recognition or comprehension of the repair.

CONCLUSION

This paper has provided an initial analysis of the conditions under which other-repair occurs and of responses to other-repair in NS/NNS and NS/NS Japanese conversations.

First, it was shown that the occurrence of other-repair in the Japanese data follow the findings from ordinary conversation in English (e.g., Schegloff et al., 1977) in that it tends to follow the preference for self-initiation, and this even holds true in native speaker correction of nonnative speaker interlocutors within peer NS/NNS talk. Because NNSs are less proficient in the language than NSs, it might be expected that NSs would support their interlocutors with occasional unsolicited corrections as do teachers in educational settings; however, this did not occur. Second, the self-initiation here was found not to be limited to the stream of speech, but also included embodied cues for soliciting help with a word search through gaze and body orientation. Third, the speakers' practice of upgrading signals that called for help to enlist other-repair was also notable in the data. Fourth, the NSs' practice of initiating repair by the use of the demonstrative *are* was present in the NS talk, but it was not used by the NNSs. Finally, analysis indicates that other-repair made relevant the repair recipients' display of acceptance in the subsequent turns. In the NS/NNS conversation, when the repair recipient did not signal acceptance, this appears to have indicated a lack of recognition or comprehension of the work being performed by the other-repair.

A number of studies of NS/NS conversation have demonstrated how participants in face-to-face interaction attend to and respond to each other's verbal and non-verbal signals in real time (e.g., Erickson & Shultz, 1982; Goodwin, 1981; Goodwin, 1987; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986). This study compared NS/NS and NS/NNS conversations in Japanese and showed that in NS/NNS conversations, even closer attention to verbal and non-verbal signals may be necessary. As NNSs more often request conversational assistance through the use of verbal indicators of distress and non-verbal appeals for participation and may have problems recognizing and comprehending repair given by NSs, NSs need to pay close attention to what their NNS interlocutors are doing, and vice versa. In face-to-face interactions, particularly in NS/NNS conversation, interlocutors' mutual orientation to each other's verbal and non-verbal behavior shapes other-repair sequences.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank Dr. Noël Houck for her help and encouragement, and the IAL editors and the anonymous IAL reviewers, whose help was generously, and gently, given. The author would also like to thank her friends at Temple University Japan who allowed her to record their conversations, and those who gave valuable comments on an earlier version of the paper.

APPENDIX

Transcription Conventions for the Analysis of Conversation

Abbreviations used in Interlinear Gross

IP	Interactional particle (e.g., ne, sa, no, yo, na)
Nom	Nominative (-ga)
Acc	Accusative (-o)
Gen	Genitive (-no)
Top	Topic marker (-wa)
PT	other particles
COMP	Complimentizer (-to, -tte)
Q	Question marker (ka and its variants)
POL	Politeness marker (desu, masu)
Aux	Auxiliary (be-verb)
NR	Nominalizer (e.g., no, n)
TAG	Tag question like auxiliary verb forms (e.g., desyo, zyanai, daroo, zyan)
TL	Title
ONO	Onomatopoetic expressions
PASS	Passive
NEG	for marking negation
CAU	Causative

Transcription Conventions

[ ]	overlapping talk
=	latched utterances
1.	timed pause (in seconds)
(.)	a short pause
co:lon	extension of the sound or syllable
co::lon	a more prolonged stretch
.	fall in intonation (final)
,	continuing intonation (non-final)
?	rising intonation (final)
CAPITAL	emphasis
° °	passage of talk that is quieter than surrounding talk
< >	passage of talk that is slower than surrounding talk
> <	passage of talk that is faster than surrounding talk.
hh	audible aspirations
*hh	audible inhalations
ha)	laughter within a word
(( ))	comment by the transcriber
( )	problematic hearing that the transcriber is not certain about

' ' Idiomatic translation of Japanese utterances

In idiomatic translation,
{ } words or phrases which are not explicitly stated in the Japanese versions.

In transcribing non-verbal features,
| | overlapping of non-verbal behavior
- - - - continuation of the non-verbal feature
Non-verbal features of interlocutors are shown in lines below each sentence.

Romanization
*Official romanization system according to *Monbusyoo* (Japanese Ministry of Education) is used in transcribing data.

NOTES

[1] According to Wong (2000), the essential difference between negotiation of meaning and the CA notion of repair is that while the former is limited to correction of error or to clarification of communication due to the learner's linguistic errors, the CA notion of a repair sequence deals with any problems in speaking, hearing, or understanding of the talk, including problems in redundancy, reduction through noise, lack of understanding of idiomatic use of language, and lack of ability to make inferences.
[2] Schegloff (2000) argues that in order to understand how NNSs make their way in interaction, one needs to start with examination of what is generally the case with talk and other conduct in NS/NS interaction. In this respect, this study, although preliminary, by comparing NS/NNS conversations with NS/NS conversation, may reveal something about what special forms or practices NS/NNS conversations take in other-repair sequences.
[3] Regarding quantification of occurrences of repair, Schegloff (1993) claims that each repair form is unique and has a different discourse environment, and it is important to remember that "relevance is at least as important as incidence in establishing an oriented-to-order" (p. 110).
[4] In some cases, the reason listeners do not carry out repair may be because they do not 'notice' the problem. However, as Firth (1996) mentions, it is often difficult for analysts to find out whether the listener did not notice the problem or noticed but chose to let it pass.
[5] In line 3, before he repeats the correct word *enzyokin,* Gary also utters *ah.* This *ah* may have a function similar to "oh" in English. Heritage (1984), who examined ordinary conversations in English, found that "oh," "a change-of-state token," is "closely associated with the acceptance of the counterinforming as a correction" (p. 312). In line 3, the *ah* may indicate Gary's acceptance of Taka's repair as a correction; the expected repetition of the repaired item then follows.
[6] The fact that the NNSs in the NS/NNS conversations elicited lexical repairs through word searches much more frequently than the NSs in the NS/NS conversation, and the fact that they invariably repeated the repaired items, may have implications for second language acquisition. Other-repair may create environments in which NNSs can use repetition to incorporate the corrected items into their lexicon while accepting the other-repair.
[7] However, in the NS/NS conversation, there was one instance in which repetition followed the response to a request for confirmation. This instance is shown in Example 1. In fact, all four instances of the response to requests for confimation in the NS/NNS data also resulted in repetition.

REFERENCES

Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversational analysis.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Chun, A., Day, R., Chenoweth, N., & Luppescu, S. (1982). Errors, interaction, and correction: A study of native-nonnative conversations. *TESOL Quarterly, 16,* 537-547.

Day, R., Chenoweth, N., Chun, A., & Luppescu, S. (1984). Corrective feedback in native-nonnative discourse. *Language Learning, 34,* (2), 19-45.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1999). Theoretical perspectives on interaction and language learning. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Learning second language through interaction* (pp. 3-31). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Erickson, F., & Shultz, J. (1982). *The counselor as gatekeeper: Social interaction in interviews.* New York: Academic Press.

Faerch, C. & Kasper, G. (1983). Plans and strategies in foreign language communication. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp. 20-60). London: Longman.

Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics, 26,* 237-259.

Fox, R., Hayashi, M. & Jasperson, R. (1996). Resources and repair. In E. Ochs, E. Schegloff, & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 185-237). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gaskill, W. (1980). Correction in native speaker-nonnative speaker conversation. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.), *Discourse analysis in second language research* (pp. 125-137). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational organization.* New York: Academic Press.

Goodwin, C. (1987). Forgetfulness as an interactive resource. *Social Psychology Quarterly. 50,* (2), 115-131.

Goodwin, C., & Goodwin, M. H. (1986). Gesture and coparticipation in the activity of searching for a word. *Semiotica, 62,* 1/2, 51-75.

Hatch, E. (1978). Discourse analysis and second language acquisition. In E. Hatch (Ed.), *Second language acquisition: A book of readings.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

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

Hudson, M. E. (1998). So? (On Japanese connectives *sorede*, *dakara*, and *ja*). In N. Akatsuka, H. Hoji, S. Iwasaki, S. Sohn, & S. Strauss (Eds.), Japanese/Korean Linguistics (Vol. 7) (pp. 59-75). Stanford, CA: CSLI.

Jefferson, G. (1972). Side sequences. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in social interaction* (pp. 294-338). New York: Free Press.

Jefferson, G. (1987). On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organization* (pp. 86-100). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Kamio, A. (1994). The theory of territory of information: The case of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics, 21,* 67-100.

Kamio, A. (1997a). Evidentiality and some discourse characteristics in Japanese. In A. Kamio (Ed.), *Directions in functional linguistics* (pp. 145-171). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kamio, A. (1997b). *Territory of information.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kasper, G. (1985). Repair in foreign language teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7,* 200-215.

Kendon, A. (1990). *Conducting interaction: Patterns of behavior in focused encounters.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Klinck, P. (1984). The ecological validity of error analysis and peer correction. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 41,* 413-420.

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

Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of language acquisition* (Vol. 2) (pp. 413-468). New York: Academic Press.

Maynard, S. (1997). *Japanese conversation.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Ogane, E. (1997). Repair in bilingual/bilingual discourse? *Temple University Japan Working Papers in Applied Linguistics, 10,* 14-26.

Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning, 44,* 493-527.

Schegloff, E. (1993). Reflection on quantification in the study of conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 26,* 99-128.

Schegloff, E. (1997). Third turn repair. In G. R. Guy, C. Feagin, D. Schiffrin, & J. Baugh (Eds.), *Toward a social science of language. Papers in honor of Willian Labov* (Vol. 2) (pp. 31-40). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

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

Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language, 53,* 361-382.

Schwartz, J. (1980). The negotiation for meaning: Repair in conversations between second language learners of English. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.), *Discourse analysis in second language research* (pp. 138-153). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Tsujimura, N. (1996). *An introduction to Japanese linguistics.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Varonis, M., & Gass, S. (1985). Non-native/non-native conversations: A model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics, 6,* 71-90.

Wong, J. (2000). Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/non-native speaker English conversation. *Applied Linguistics, 21,* 244-267.

Yuri Hosoda holds an Masters of Education Degree in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages from Temple University Japan where she is currently a doctoral student. She has taught English to university students in Japan. Her research interests include conversation analysis, discourse analysis, second language acquisition, and second/foreign language teaching.