

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9231458

**Achieving understanding: Repair mechanisms in mother-child
conversations. (Volumes I and II)**

Montes, Rosa Graciela, Ph.D.

Georgetown University, 1992

Copyright ©1992 by Montes, Rosa Graciela. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

ACHIEVING UNDERSTANDING:
REPAIR MECHANISMS IN MOTHER-CHILD CONVERSATIONS

VOLUME I

A Dissertation
submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of Georgetown University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Linguistics

By

Rosa Graciela Montes, B.S., M.S.

Washington, D.C.
December 12, 1991

Thesis 6264

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL



The dissertation of..... Rosa Montesentitled
Achieving Understanding: Repair Mechanisms in
Mother-Child Conversations
submitted to the department of..... Linguisticsin partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of..... Doctor of Philosophy
in the Graduate School of Georgetown University has been read and approved by the
Committee:

Ryszard Strykowski
Michael...
Barbara M. Herndl

Solomon Sara...
Head of Department

February 20, 1992
Date

© Copyright by Rosa Graciela Montes, 1992
All rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

ACHIEVING UNDERSTANDING: REPAIR MECHANISMS IN MOTHER-CHILD CONVERSATIONS

Rosa Graciela Montes

Mentor: Dr. Roger W. Shuy

This is a longitudinal study of the development of communicative competence in a child acquiring Spanish as her first language. The specific focus of the study is the child's emerging competence to identify and repair problems in ongoing conversation with an adult. Both self-initiated and other-initiated repairs are studied. The principal types of repairs used by the child are identified and traced through the tapes from their moment of first occurrence. Comparisons are made between the child and the adult.

The child seems to acquire the ability to effect repairs on her own and her interlocutor's utterance from an early age. However, the process of using the repair mechanism to achieve understanding rather than simply correct mistakes, depends on finely tuned interactive work between the participants in the conversation.

The corpus to be analyzed in this thesis was drawn from a set of spontaneous conversations between the researcher and her daughter taped over a period of a year and a half. Thirteen tapes were selected for transcription (T1: K = 1:7.21 - T13: K = 2:11.15).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people have participated at different times in the process of bringing this dissertation to completion.

In the first place I would like to thank the members of my committee who understood and accepted the time constraints that I was working under, even when this imposed on them unreasonable demands. Their accessibility and flexibility made it possible for me to concentrate fully on writing and to avoid panic during those final days when it seemed that the work would never get done.

I would like to thank Dr. John Staczek for his careful reading of the final draft and his many incisive observations on content. In addition, his helpful suggestions on style have contributed to making the text more readable.

I would like to thank Dr. Barbara Horvath who gave up part of her sabbatical to spend many hours reading and discussing with me the various chapters. She constantly pushed me to look beyond the analysis to implications for theory or for future research. This work is richer because of her.

Words cannot express the extent of my debt to my mentor and friend Dr. Roger Shuy. His work and his teaching have

been influential since the early days of my formation as a sociolinguist at the beginning of the Sociolinguistics Program which he created and nurtured until fully established. To him I owe my approach to the discipline and methodological principles that guide my research. Among these is to respect data and be fully accountable to it. Among these, is, more importantly, never to lose sight of the social responsibility of the scientist. As a friend, he has been supportive when it was needed and confident, even when I wasn't. I thank him for his patience and for his belief that "someday the lion will roar".

I would like to acknowledge the support of the Universidad Autonoma de Puebla for granting me an extended study leave to complete and defend this dissertation. In particular, I would like to thank my colleagues in the Maestria en Ciencias del Lenguaje for their continued encouragement in spite of being left short-handed.

I would like to thank the Child Language Data Exchange System and especially Dr. Brian MacWhinney and Dr. Catherine Snow. The CLAN programs provided by Dr. MacWhinney were used constantly throughout the analysis.

Finally, I would like to thank my friends and family. I thank Peg Griffin and Donna Christian for hours of discussion on children's communicative competence at the

beginning of the development of the present work and for their time, patience and expertise in the actual preparation and production of the final manuscript. They were there from beginning to end. I thank my parents who provided unstinting support for my studies. I thank my husband and colleague, James Fidelholtz for his constant discussion of early drafts; for his questions no matter how exasperating at the time, which led me to resolve thorny problems which I would rather have ignored; for his careful proofreading; and finally for taking over so competently full responsibility for the family while I disappeared. I would like to thank my children for being patient and understanding. It's finally over.

A very special thanks to that pesky two-year-old Koki, who can still make me laugh and from whom I have learnt so much.

To my parents who never doubted
To my children who waited
To Jim who was always there .

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
DEDICATION	viii
LIST OF TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS	xiii
Chapter I: INTRODUCTION	1
1. COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE	4
2. AWARENESS OF THE INTERLOCUTOR	10
3. INPUT LANGUAGE	14
4. ADULT-CHILD INTERACTION	21
4.1 Learning Interaction	21
4.2 Learning Conversation	26
4.3 Learning Language through Interaction	31
4.3.1 Explicit teaching	33
4.3.2 Modeling	40
4.3.3 Learning language through interaction: some conclusions	50
Chapter II: THE STUDY OF CONVERSATIONAL INTERACTION	58
1. CONVERSATIONAL INTERACTION	58
1.1 General Considerations	60
1.2 Aspects of Conversational Organization	64
1.2.1 Turn-taking	65
1.2.2 Sequential organization	67
1.2.3 Interpretive principles	70
2. APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF CONVERSATIONAL INTERACTION	74
2.1 An Anthropological Approach: The Ethnography of Speaking	77
2.2 An Ethnomethodological Approach: Conversation Analysis	79
2.3 Philosophical Approaches	81
2.4 Linguistic Approaches: Discourse Analysis	82
2.4.1 A structural approach	82
2.4.2 A rich interpretation approach: Labov and Fanshel	95
2.4.3 An illocutionary act approach	102
3. TOWARDS A MODEL FOR THE ANALYSIS OF CONVERSATION ...	106
4. THE PLACE OF REPAIRS WITHIN CONVERSATION	115
Chapter III: METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	125
1. LINGUISTIC BACKGROUND OF THE PARTICIPANTS	125
1.1 Biographical Data	126
1.2 Linguistic Background	127

1.3	Koki's Language Development Prior to Taping	132
1.4	Koki's Mean Number of Words per Utterance	133
2.	DATA COLLECTION	133
2.1	Obtaining Conversational Data	134
2.2	General Description of Taping Conditions	139
3.	TAPE SELECTION - FIRST STEP IN THE FORMATION OF THE CORPUS	143
3.1	Criteria Used in Tape Selection	143
3.2	Brief Description of Tapes K01 to K13	146
4.	TRANSCRIPTION OF THE RECORDINGS	149
5.	SELECTION OF THE CORPUS ON REPAIRS	161
5.1	Considerations for Corpus Selection	161
5.2	Identification of Units of Analysis	162
5.2.1	Self-initiated repairs	162
5.2.2	Identification of other-repairs	169
5.2.3	Identification of repair sequences	173
5.2.4	Summary of identificational criteria	176
Chapter IV: SELF-INITIATED REPAIRS		178
1.	PREVIOUS ANALYSES OF SELF-INITIATED REPAIRS	179
1.1	Studies on Repairs by Adult Native-speakers	179
1.2	Studies of Self-repairs by Adult Second-language Learners	182
1.3	Studies of Children's Self-repairs	187
2.	CLASSIFICATION OF REPAIR TYPES	198
3.	THE CORPUS	205
3.1	Distribution of Repair Types in the Data	206
3.2	Comparisons with Previous Studies	211
3.3	Structural Characteristics of Koki's Repairs	215
3.3.1	Repair initiation markers	215
3.3.2	Retracings	216
3.3.3	Multiple repetitions of a repair	217
4.	DESCRIPTION OF KOKI'S REPAIRS	225
4.1	Repetitions	226
4.1.1	Occurrences of repetition repairs by word class .	231
4.1.2	Interruption versus completion of a word prior to repair-initiation	235
4.1.3	Repetition repairs on nouns and verbs	247
4.1.4	Conclusions on repetition repairs	253
4.2	Corrections	262
4.2.1	Phonological corrections	264
4.2.1.1	Monitoring and correction of speech errors	265
4.2.1.2	Approximations to the adult standard Spanish form	270
4.2.1.3	Other phonological modifications	273
4.2.2	Syntactic corrections	277
4.2.2.1	Syntactic substitutions	277
4.2.2.2	Additions	281
4.2.2.3	Pronoun substitutions, additions and deletions	283
4.2.2.4	Deletions	287
4.2.2.5	Word-order changes	288

4.2.3	Lexical substitutions	290
4.2.4	Reference substitutions	300
4.3	Postponements	306
4.4	Abandonments or False-Starts	311
5.	DESCRIPTION OF THE MOTHER'S REPAIRS	327
5.1	Repetitions	327
5.1.1	Placement of interruption	328
5.1.2	Retracings	330
5.2.	Corrections	333
5.2.1	Error corrections	334
5.2.2	Non-error modifications	339
5.3	Postponements	348
5.4	Abandonments or False-Starts	352
5.5	Solicitation of Other-Repair	354
6.	CONCLUSIONS ON SELF-REPAIRS	356
.		
Chapter V:	OTHER-INITIATED REPAIRS	366
1.	PREVIOUS ANALYSES IN THE LITERATURE	367
2.	CLASSIFICATION OF TYPES OF REPAIR INITIATORS	383
3.	REQUESTS FOR REPETITION	391
3.1	Non-Specific Requests for Repetition (NRR)	392
3.2	Specific Requests for Repetition (SRR)	394
4.	REQUESTS FOR CONFIRMATION	396
4.1	Non-Specific Requests for Confirmation	397
4.1.1	Exact repetitions	401
4.1.2	Exact repetitions with phonological modifications (Exp)	403
4.1.3	Reformulated repetitions (RF)	405
4.1.4	Reduced repetitions (RR)	411
4.1.5	Repetitions with additions	414
4.1.6	Paraphrases	415
4.1.7	Minimal form confirmation requests	416
4.2	Specific Requests for Confirmation	418
5.	SPECIFICATION CLARIFICATIONS	422
5.1	WH-Requests for Specification	422
5.1.1	Types of specifications	425
5.1.2	Frequency of occurrence of specification requests	432
5.2	Specification Confirmations	434
6.	OTHER TYPES OF OTHER-INITIATED REPAIRS	441
.		
Chapter VI:	REPAIR SEQUENCES	474
1.	STRUCTURE OF THE REPAIR SEQUENCE	475
1.1	Sequence Patterns	478
1.2	Review of the Occurrence of Patterns	494
2.	SEQUENCES WITH MULTIPLE REPAIR REQUESTS	496
2.1	Multiple Questions within a Turn: "Stacking" Pattern	496
2.2	Chained Clarification Exchanges within Sequences	508
2.3	Reiteration	512
2.4	Negotiating the Responsibility for Providing an Answer	522

3.	COLLABORATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS	526
3.1	Construction of More Complex Structures	530
3.2	Collaborative Construction of Narratives	531
4.	CONCLUSIONS	535
Chapter VII:	GENERAL CONCLUSIONS	537
1.	FOCUS ON THE LEARNER: THE ACQUISITION OF A NEW WORD	539
2.	FOCUS ON THE MOTHER: TEACHING SYNTAX	546
3.	FOCUS ON THE INTERACTION - COLLABORATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS	548
4.	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	552
5.	IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY OF REPAIRS	556
	Epilogue: Understanding Achieved	559
	REFERENCES	561

LIST OF TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

.	statement
?	question
!	exclamation
#	pause
#1.8	pause (in tenths of seconds)
-	abrupt cut-off
+/.	other-interruption
+...	trailing off
:	lengthened previous sound
()	missing parts of word
xx	unintelligible, single word
xxx	unintelligible, fragment
---	omitted text
<text>	indicates scope to which following symbol applies (when no scope is indicated symbol applies only to preceding word)
<text> [?]	unclear, doubtful transcription, best guess
<text> [>]	overlap with following utterance
<text> [<]	overlap with preceding utterance
<text> [//]	previous fragment is repeated exactly
<text> [///]	previous fragment is modified, also used to indicate false starts

The preceding transcription conventions have been adapted from the CHAT (Codes for the Human Analysis of Transcripts) system developed by the Child Language Data Exchange System (CHILDES) (MacWhinney and Snow 1990, MacWhinney 1991).

The complete corpus of thirteen transcripts has been included in the CHILDES database and is available through CHILDES.

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In the last decade a sizeable body of the literature on language development has been concerned with the child's acquisition of communicative competence as first outlined by Hymes (1972). The process of language development is seen as involving not only the acquisition of words and grammatical structures but also the ability to use language to communicate in different interactional contexts.

This broadening of scope has entailed positing new questions with respect to the child's language development. Among these are questions about the relation of form to function in language development, questions about the child's acquisition of specific language functions and abilities (e.g., directives, clarification questions, explanations, argumentative and narrative abilities), questions about the development of oral interactive skills (e.g., beginning and ending conversations, maintaining or switching a topic, participating in turn-taking, or repairing conversational problems) and questions about the role played by context and in particular by the interlocutor in facilitating language acquisition.

The present thesis addresses some of these questions through a longitudinal study of the development of communicative competence in a child acquiring Spanish as her first language. The data to be studied are taken from transcripts of conversations between the child, Koki, and her mother, who is also the author. Thirteen transcripts of conversations, taped over a period of one-and-a-half years, were used for this study. The tapes have been successively labeled K01 through K13 and will be referred to by these designations throughout the thesis. In the first one (K01), Koki is 1;7.21 and in the last (K13), she is 2;11.18. A complete description of the data will be given in Chapter III.

Specifically, I propose to analyze one aspect of the child's emerging competence, her growing ability to identify and repair problems in ongoing conversation with an adult. Both self-repairs and other-repairs will be examined. The child seems to acquire the ability to effect repairs on her own and her interlocutor's utterances from an early age. It will be shown that the process of using the repair mechanism to achieve understanding rather than simply correct mistakes, depends on finely tuned interactive work between the participants in the conversation.

The main focus of this thesis is on repairs. However, an examination of how this activity emerges and is carried out will also allow us to present some evidence in an attempt to answer some of the other questions mentioned above, such as the developmental relation of form to function, e.g. in the relationship between requesting clarifications and the acquisition of various question structures, and the role of context and, in particular, the interlocutor's contribution to achieving mutual understanding.

With respect to the presentation of the discussion, the nature of the research presents some organizational difficulties. Since this study examines aspects of the development of communicative competence in a child, various issues discussed within the literature on child language, which provide a background for the development of the thesis, are taken up in this chapter. At the same time, because of its focus on conversational repairs, the literature relevant to discourse and conversational organization provides the methodological principles and procedures used for the analysis. Finally, the specific literature on repairs and in particular those studies dealing with repairs in children's speech is reviewed.

In Chapter II, I present an overview of the different ways of approaching the study of the organization of

conversation, which will provide the analytical framework for analyzing repair sequences. In addition, I review the literature on conversational repairs. Chapter III discusses methodological considerations that went into the processes of data collection and corpus selection. Chapter IV, V and VI present an analysis of the data on repairs: Chapter IV and V present results from the study of self- and other-repairs respectively, and Chapter VI examines the organization of repair sequences. In these chapters the specific literature on children's conversational repairs is also examined. In Chapter VII I review the principal research results and discuss the conclusions to be drawn from this study.

The remainder of the present chapter will address some key issues with respect to the child's development of communicative competence, in order to situate the present study within the body of language development literature.

1. COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

The study of language development has centered around the development of linguistic competence which was first defined by Chomsky (1965) as the native speaker's knowledge of the well-formedness properties of the native language. Studies of child language in the sixties and early seventies concentrated mostly on studying how the child developed a grammar of his language. Initially, phonological and

morphosyntactical development were studied (Braine 1963a, 1963b; Brown 1968, 1973; Ingram 1971, 1974; McNeill 1970; Miller and Ervin 1964) proceeding later to semantic development (Bloom 1970, 1973). The growth of interest in pragmatics and language use in context in the middle seventies led to an extension of the study of language development to these domains.

Hymes (1972) broadened the discussion of competence to what he termed communicative competence. The process of language development is seen as involving not only the acquisition of words and grammatical structures but also the ability to use language to communicate in different interactional contexts:

... a normal child acquires knowledge of sentences, not only as grammatical, but also as appropriate. He or she acquires competence as to when to speak, when not, and as to what to talk about with whom, when, where, in what manner. In short, a child becomes able to accomplish a repertoire of speech acts, to take part in speech events, and to evaluate their accomplishment by others (Hymes 1972:277).

The knowledge that underlies the child's ability to act appropriately in a wide variety of social situations is called communicative competence and encompasses several systems of rules of which the grammatical would be one.

The concept of "communicative competence" has been of interest to different researchers involved with language

development and the learning of language, and a number of different models have been proposed to describe the set of competencies to be included.

Osser (1971) speaks of a set of "formal linguistic rules", "sociolinguistic rules" and "social-cognitive rules", which include the ability to analyze listener characteristics in order to adapt speaking behaviors to these.

The model proposed by Shuy and Staton (1982) encompasses both linguistic competence (knowledge of phonology, vocabulary, syntax and semantics) and sociolinguistic competence (which includes, among other abilities, knowledge of the rules for oral interaction, narrative abilities, language functions, referencing, style shifting and sequencing) (Shuy and Staton 1982).

Communicative competence, in this model, is the combination of linguistic competence (the forms of language) and sociolinguistic competence (the way a speaker uses language to get things done). It is in a sense a combination of form and function. (Shuy and Staton 1982:183)

Green and Morgan (1981) hold that the competence a speaker needs to have in order to interpret discourse includes knowledge of language, meaning by this grammatical and semantic knowledge, and also knowledge about the use of language or "pragmatic competence" which involves "using or exploiting the forms provided by the grammar of the language to achieve goals" (Green and Morgan 1981:178). In addition,

it also includes knowledge about communicating conventions such as the conventions underlying cooperative conversation (Grice 1975) and knowledge of one's interlocutor in terms of his or her personal history and with respect to:

estimates of her knowledge of the world, including what she can observe at the time of the speech act, and her relevant beliefs. It also includes beliefs about her view of her role in the ongoing conversation, her model of the speaker's model of the world, and beliefs about her goals and plans for the ongoing discourse. Finally, it includes beliefs about her reasoning ability -in particular about the likelihood of her having correctly interpreted acts of the speaker earlier in the discourse (Green and Morgan 1981:180).

In the model proposed by Canale and Swain (1980), within the framework of second language acquisition research, sociolinguistic and strategic competence are included along with strictly linguistic or grammatical competence. Sociolinguistic competence encompasses "sociocultural rules of use" which determine appropriateness within particular social contexts and "rules of discourse" which determine aspects of textual cohesion and coherence (cf. Halliday and Hasan 1976). Finally, strategic competence "will be made up of verbal and non-verbal communication strategies that may be called into action to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to performance variables or to insufficient competence" (Canale and Swain 1980:30).

The above research is representative and illustrative not only of the discussion that has been carried out to elaborate Hymes' original concept but also it represents discourse addressed to members of different fields of study for whom it is important to know what goes into the idea of "knowing" a language. Thus, for example, Osser directs his remarks to psychologists and, in particular, those assessing the linguistic abilities of children from different language backgrounds. Shuy and Staton direct their remarks mostly to teachers whose work demands a constant assessment of children's oral language abilities. Their discussion includes ideas that teachers might incorporate into their curricula to aid in the development of some of these sociolinguistic abilities in children. The article by Canale and Swain is directed at second language teachers and aims at providing some theoretical bases for the "communicative approach" to second language teaching. Finally, Green and Morgan direct their remarks to linguists, in the context of determining the types of knowledge needed for discourse interpretation and production. They end their discussion with some general considerations about the scope of linguistics and in particular about whether even strictly theoretical linguists can afford to ignore the more "social" competencies and abilities. In this respect, they observe

that given "pragmatic" phenomena often become incorporated into grammatical structure (Morgan 1978). In addition, even a linguist interested only in the domain of strictly "linguistic" competence must be aware of other types of possible explanations for particular phenomena, ignorance of which would result in "constructing bloated linguistic theories to account for nonlinguistic problems" (Green and Morgan 1981:180).

All of the above models of communicative competence include linguistic competence, knowledge of the phonology, syntax, semantics and vocabulary of a particular language, as a component. In addition we find that the child must acquire knowledge that will enable her to create organized, coherent, connected texts. She must develop an awareness of macro-structural requirements of particular text types, such as narratives, for example. The child must also develop pragmatic knowledge that will enable her to participate in different types of social interactions. She must learn how to carry out specific language functions such as requesting, explaining, asserting and also be aware of the implications and assumptions underlying the use of particular types. In order to participate in interaction, the child must acquire knowledge of conversational principles and strategies that will enable her to take turns, interrupt when necessary,

tailor her contribution at any given point to the particular requirements of the conversation at that time and be able to repair communicative problems that might arise. She must also develop competencies that will enable her to interact in accordance with the norms of appropriateness developed within the community of which she is a member and to adapt her language to contingencies of setting, topic and interlocutor. This final point related to knowledge of who one's interlocutor is and what she knows, is of critical importance in the development of this thesis, and is discussed in greater detail below.

2. AWARENESS OF THE INTERLOCUTOR

The issue of being aware of who one's interlocutor is, is important to the development of this thesis. With respect to the development of communicative competence the child must learn that she has to speak differently to different (types of) people. She will have to learn to distinguish various facts about an interlocutor's social identity that will affect the use of language. She will have to learn cultural norms for addressing or referring to people of a certain age or sex or who hold a particular position in the community. She will have to learn that the interlocutor may hold several different roles of which some may be more salient or of more importance than others in particular social situations. In

addition, the child will have to learn to take into account facts about her interlocutor's knowledge and beliefs including among these last, as Green and Morgan (1981) observe, the interlocutor's beliefs about her own role in and plans for the conversation, and the interlocutor's assessment of the state of the child's knowledge.

I will take the position presented in ethno-methodological studies, that participants in a social encounter will display to each other those bits of their social identities and competencies that are relevant for the purpose of the ongoing interaction. It will be shown that interactants use their contributions in a conversation to display to each other relevant information about what they know, including in this display what they have understood the interlocutor to say.

In language development studies, the effect of the listener has most often been discussed in terms of the ways in which adults interacting with the child will adjust their speech according to what they believe is the child's level of competence. The relevant literature will be discussed below in the section on the "input language" that the child receives. In this section I will concentrate on the development of the child's ability to take into account listener variables.

It has been shown (Shatz and Gelman 1973, 1977; Sachs and Devin 1976; Gelman and Shatz 1977) that children do modify their speech on the basis of who they are talking to and that this ability is acquired or at least manifest by age four. In the Shatz and Gelman studies cited above, four-year-olds were recorded speaking to an adult, to a two-year-old with the adult present and directly to the two-year-old with the adult absent. The speech that the older children directed to the two-year-olds was shorter in terms of Mean Length of Utterance (MLU) and the syntactic structure of the utterances tended to be simpler with a reduction in the use of subordinate or coordinate constructions when compared with the speech used with the adult (Shatz and Gelman 1973). Gelman and Shatz (1977) reanalyzed a subset of the original data (complex sentences) with respect to the functional meaning of utterances. Again they found a difference in use when comparing the speech directed to the younger child and that directed to the adult. Younger children received a greater number of utterances aimed at directing the interaction, while other functions such as modulating the degree of certainty with which a proposition is expressed or expressing a mental state were found in the speech directed to the adult but rarely to the younger child. When comparing the speech directed to the younger children in terms of other

situational factors it was found that a larger number of directives occurred in a structured task with an adult present than when the children were alone in an unstructured play situation.

Shatz and Gelman (1977) proceed to ask what is the reason behind the child's modification of his speech. When adults modify their speech to young children in similar ways one of the suppositions has been that they are doing so to teach the child language. With respect to the child, it seems far-fetched for the authors to believe that the four-year-old has the goal of teaching the younger child. Rather, they hold that situational constraints may be operating on the older child's speech. In the data analyzed, these constraints are related to the goals of each type of interaction. Thus, in the structured task, where an outcome needed to be produced, the older child employed a greater number of directives. The presence of the adult guaranteed the possibility of mediation should the younger child resent this use. In the unstructured play situation with no other adult present, the older child used a lesser number of explicit directives and made greater use of more mitigated forms. Here the goal seemed to be to maintain the ongoing interaction so that play would continue, and the decrease in use of directives and increase in number of modulated

statements seemed to reflect the older child's recognition of changed social conditions.

In this thesis, I maintain that both the child and the adult display in their speech an awareness of the possibilities and limitations of their interlocutor and that they vary their speech to increase the likelihood of reaching the particular conversational goals of each interaction.

Since the data studied here are limited to one child interacting with one single adult (the mother), I will not be able to describe variation across speakers. However, when describing the different sequences of talk, I will show how different contextual features, including the adult's or the child's estimation of the knowledge and competence of her interlocutor actually influence the production of repairs in conversation. Both the child and the adult make estimates of how much the other has understood and they repair or modify their utterances accordingly. These estimates do not seem to be based on some pre-formed idea of what particular types of interlocutors know or can do but rather they depend on the displays in the ongoing interaction of what and how much each participant has understood.

3. INPUT LANGUAGE

The effect of the language spoken to the child in the development of that child's linguistic competence has been

one of the central concerns in the language development literature in the last fifteen years or so. Studies have focused on the characteristics of "motherese", "baby talk"¹ or, in general, the language of the primary caretaker and compared different interactive styles to rate of language development in an attempt to sort out competing language acquisition theories. In particular, there has been interest in the discussion of what in language development is innate and what is a function of or contribution by the environment, specifically by the language that the child hears. This particular point, however, falls outside the scope of this thesis.

Studies of the language addressed to young children have shown it to have general salient characteristics which

¹I do not mean to say here that these terms are completely interchangeable. "Motherese" refers to characteristics of the style that primary caretakers use when talking to their children including the various types of simplifications, repetitions and other redundancies, etc. that they use. "Baby talk" also refers to the language used by and with children and though its description includes reference to simplification mechanisms, it gives particular emphasis to the special lexicon developed within a group to be used with young children, and to various "affective" phonological and prosodic modifications to standard speech. Whereas many of the features of "motherese", for example simplification, might be found in speech to others, e.g. adult non-native interlocutors, "baby talk" seems to be mostly used with very young children, although it is also used in other "affective" situations (between lovers, or to pets, for example). At the same time, although we speak of children using "baby talk", we would not say that they use "motherese".

function to facilitate understanding by the child and to make the language used by the adult more adapted to the child's level of development (Ferguson 1964, 1977; Snow and Ferguson 1977).

Some of the features of the language used in addressing young children seem to be geared to the child's perceptual capabilities. Notable among these are the prosodic and paralinguistic features of "baby-talk" (Sachs 1977; Garnica 1977) such as the use of a higher pitch (between 400 and 600 Hz) and other prosodic and rhythmic modifications in speech (e.g. pausing, greater amplitude, patterned rhythms, and stressing for emphasis or saliency). One paralinguistic feature noted is the increased use of rising terminal pitch in the language adults address to children, that is, the use of a rising "question" intonation. What will be argued in this thesis is that this particular feature is a result of the increased use of contingent clarificatory questions used by adults as repair mechanisms to guarantee the maintenance of the conversation.

Other characteristics that have been noted for baby-talk are: constraining talk to the "here and now" in each particular conversational context, which leads to the use of a constrained, limited vocabulary; the reduction of length of utterances, which results in a reduction in the number of

clauses contained in each utterance; the use of simple rather than complex sentences, which may be a function of attempts to reduce sentence length or a real attempt to simplify sentential structure; diminished use of inflections; replacement of personal pronouns by nouns or noun-phrases, especially, for the purpose of self- or addressee-reference; increased redundancy such as, for example, increased repetitiveness (Ferguson 1964, 1977; Blount 1977).

Ferguson notes that many of the characteristics found in "baby-talk" are similar to characteristics in the language native speakers address to foreigners or to others that they perceive as not fully competent linguistically (Ferguson 1975, 1977). He sees the modifications in the language used with children as responding to three types of functions: expression, simplification and clarification.

Some of the adaptive characteristics of baby-talk are geared to enhancing the expressive function, in particular to expressing affection and the warm, nurturing and fun character of the interaction between parent and child. This aspect of the uses of baby-talk has been neglected in the child-language literature in spite of the fact that the importance of the "affective tenor" of the interaction can be seen in reports of the language deficits and/or delays in institutionalized children who have been deprived of a warm,

nurturing, individual relationship with an adult. Other characteristics of baby-talk seem to be geared to facilitating communication. Thus Brown (1977) subsumes Ferguson's simplification and clarification functions into a more general communicative function in which various types of mechanisms are used to assure mutual understanding and avoid communicative breakdowns. The desire to communicate, "to understand and to be understood; to keep two minds focused on the same topic" (Brown 1977:12), is for Brown the main reason behind a parent's use of "baby talk". However, it is not the only reason, since he observes that achieving successful communication on one level seems to act as a "launching platform" for attempting more adult forms of communication on another level.

With respect to this last point, a number of studies have noted that the characteristics of caretaker language change as the child's language develops, so that the adult's language becomes increasingly like the language used with other adults (Phillips 1973; Cross 1977, 1981; Bellinger 1979; Kirkman and Cross 1984, Snow 1977, 1984). One interesting characteristic that has been noted is the fluctuation in the MLU of the parent's speech to a child. The parent's MLU increases as the child's language competence increases. Kaye (1980) in a study of 36 mother/child dyads

found that the mother's MLU increased from 2.76 when the children were infants to 3.68 in the language addressed to the same children at two years of age. In the tapes examined, the mother's MLU goes from 2.82 in K01 to 3.99 in K13.

With respect to the role of the input language, there is still a relative amount of controversy as to what these modifications or adaptations accomplish. Newport, Gleitman and Gleitman (1977) found no correlation between syntactic characteristics of the input language and the children's linguistic output. Gleitman, Newport and Gleitman (1984) suggest that if there are facilitative aspects in the adult's speech to the child, the effect of these on language learning would seem to be limited to younger children. Gleitman (1982) maintains that positing a simplified, restricted model of language does not explain the process of language learning but rather makes understanding how that process takes place more difficult since, as Chomsky and others have pointed out, the end result has to be a complete grammar of the language (Chomsky 1975, Wexler 1982).

Shatz (1984) re-evaluates the role of input language in language development, suggesting that parents do not "fine-tune" their language to their assessment of the child's state of linguistic development or in an attempt to control their

child's language growth but rather modify their language in ways that are congruent with their assessment of the requirements of the current communicative situation. They use their linguistic knowledge and expertise in ways that will aid the maintaining of interaction with their children.

Berko-Gleason (1977) indicates that the early work on language acquisition that was done in the sixties concentrated on the language of the child and the development of the linguistic system, disregarding the fact that this language was obtained from taped interactions with an adult. Work in the seventies seemed to concentrate on the adult half of the interaction and there was a surge of interest on the characteristics of the language that parents used with young children. Most of the studies discussed in this section fall under that category. Berko-Gleason suggests, however, that the time has come to fit together both halves of the picture and to look at the ways in which interacting partners use language to engage in and maintain conversations. She suggests that as a result we will see what pressures the "life of the conversation" brings to bear on the use of language and how the interaction itself may play a role in language development. Therefore, in the section that follows I will discuss adult-child interaction and the development of interactive communicative abilities in the child.

4. ADULT-CHILD INTERACTION

Snow (1984) states that learning language is a relatively late stage in the development of communicative abilities. By the time the child is able to utter his first word he has already been communicating needs, wishes and intentions to the various members of his family using a variety of means to convey "meaning". In this section I will examine some of the steps involved in the development of communicative abilities and how different types of interactive strategies may help in the development of these.

4.1. Learning Interaction

One of the principal issues in child development studies has been to determine how much of the child's early communicative behavior is innate and what or how much is acquired. Studies that have been carried out in the first few days after birth show that the child engages with the mother in patterned, sequential behaviors that could be said to indicate the beginnings of interactive, "communicative" exchanges in which the alternation and reciprocity of actions might show the beginnings of a turn-taking system (Bullowa, Fidelholtz, and Kessler 1975). Studies have also shown that the neonate does seem to have certain innate perceptual abilities that would make him particularly receptive to some of the behaviors that he will encounter in the very first

interactions with the adults in his medium and particularly the mother (e.g responsiveness to human faces, to a moving object placed at a certain distance from him, or to sounds of a certain frequency). Adults, from the very first moments, place themselves and act in such ways so as to maximize their child's attention and responsiveness: they modify their pitch in various ways, they place themselves at the optimum distance for the child to be able to focus on their face, they move their face when talking or vocalizing to the child in ways that have been shown to capture and hold the child's attention. Moreover, they organize the stream of time through language. That is, they use their language in such a way that the time that the mother and child are interacting is broken up into segments during which the mother speaks to the child and segments during which she pauses, as if to allow the child to intervene. Very soon the child does intervene and vocalizes during these pauses, and in a study carried out by Bullowa and other researchers there are examples of "turn-taking" in interactions between mothers and ten-day-old babies (J.L.Fidelholtz, personal communication).

How much of this is innate in the child and how much is acquired through a combination of perceptual predisposition and adult facilitation is unknown and it will not be addressed in this thesis. The point I do want to address

is, that from very early on, the child and the mother engage in interactive communicative exchanges and through these exchanges the mother teaches or facilitates for the child knowledge of how to interact.

Through her early interactive exchanges the mother begins to socialize the child into her cultural role as "baby", which in most Western societies, carries the concomitant features of requiring care and attention from others. The mother begins to act as if the child, through her behaviors, were communicating information about the care that she requires, making her intentions and needs known. Thus, the mother begins structuring times of being together as communicative interactive events.

The key element in the early interactions between mother and child seems to be the fact that the mother acts as if the interaction were a regular communicative interaction and as if the child were indicating meaning through his actions and vocalizations, regardless of whether the mother fully believes this or not. Since the mother is a competent communicating adult, her defining a situation as a communicative event leads her into regular patterns of actions appropriate to communicative events, which structure or organize the interaction. The mother's assumption also leads her to assign interpretations to her interlocutor's

actions as if the baby herself were a fully aware (although not fully competent) interactive participant. Thus, not only does the mother assign meanings or interpretations to the child's actions or vocalizations but, using her knowledge of conversational conventions, these meanings are related to salient aspects of the context and/or to objects that the child seems to be focussing on.

Perhaps one of the most important characteristics of the mother's actions is the establishment and displaying of what Snow calls "contingency responding" (Snow 1978). Snow puts forward the hypothesis that the child's learning to signal depends upon her having experienced contingent responding. The mother's responding to the child's vocalizations is an instance of such contingent responding and from the very earliest times, before the child can move about to create effects in her environment, this contingent responding enables him to establish cause and effect relationships. Snow goes on to say that although in her studies she cannot point to any direct link between experience with contingent responding and the development of particular communicative behaviors, there is indirect evidence that has led to a general recognition of the importance of contingent responding for cognitive development. This evidence is based on the fact that although different groups may vary as to the

particular behaviors that they are responsive to and the particular form of the response, all cultural groups whose interactive patterns have been studied and reported seem to exhibit maternal contingent responding to infants. In addition, it has been shown that early intervention in the mother-child relationship which increases the opportunities for contingent responding also seems to increase the development of communication. Finally, those infants who are considered at a high risk for communicative development are usually those whose behavior or some particular disability reduce the possibilities of the mother responding contingently (Snow 1978).

Through contingent responding the mother not only indicates the communicative potential of the child's actions and vocalizations but also the contingency relations between words and objects in the environment or between words and events. New elements introduced into the context are remarked upon when first noticed. New topics to be talked about are introduced by drawing the child's attention to the object.

In summary then, the mother structures interactions with the child as if a communicative interaction were being carried out in which both interacting partners shared the same interacting conventions. The child's vocalizations are

attended to as if the child were intentionally communicating. The mother applies interpretations to these vocalizations operating under the general conversational principles and constraints that govern adult conversations. Thus, if the child's gaze or attention is focused on an object, a vocalization will be interpreted as referring to or attending to that object. If the child's cries or gestures indicate some emotion, e.g. distress or discomfort, the mother responds as if the child intended to communicate his distress. The mother's own interventions follow the rules and conventions prevalent in her milieu for participating in interaction, for taking turns, or for allowing for reciprocity of actions.

The mother structures and organizes a situation as if it were an interaction. She models for the child how interactions are carried out. She interprets the child's actions and vocalizations within the context of a communicative interaction establishing by this last contingency relations between vocalizations and eventually between language and actions or objects in the situational context.

4.2. Learning Conversation

In the previous section I mentioned specific features of the organization of conversation such as turn-taking, the

remarking on or mentioning of salient features in the environment, the introduction by drawing attention to them of new topics of conversation. These are all general features acquired in learning how to interact. In this section I will focus on how particular conversational features are "practiced" by the mother with the child in what Bruner has called "formats" for language development.

Bruner (1975, 1978, 1981; Ratner and Bruner 1978) has discussed in numerous studies the importance of games, repeated routines or "standard action frames" as providing formats for the acquisition of language. A format "is a device for framing communication, for locating it in a particular piece of social reality to which intentions and conventions relate" (Bruner 1981:44). Although there are no content limitations on the formats, each format is highly restricted with respect to types and modes of participation. At first, the mother controls the organization and carrying out of the format. Once a format is established it is repeated successively and variations are introduced only when the child seems to manifest having grasped understanding of the format as is. As the child becomes more competent, the child takes over, very often, the carrying out of the format.

The most salient structured formats are game routines such as peek-a-boo, pat-a-cake and others, variants of which

seem to occur in various cultures.² These games follow fairly invariant scripts for each participant's actions and are often accompanied by standard rhymes or ditties. But aside from these games, other little routines appear repeatedly and repetitively. In order to give just one example from the data, note the routine established for the mother calling the child's attention to an object.

1.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| M. <u>y su niño?</u> | M. and your baby? |
| K. no (e)stá e(l) nino? | K. the baby isn't here? |
| M. <u>dónde está el niño?</u> | M. where is the baby? |
| --- | --- |
| M. #2.0 <u>y su niño?</u> | M. #2.0 and your baby? |
| K. no está e(l) niño. | K. the baby isn't here. |
| M. no está el niño? | M. the baby isn't here? |
| M. <u>y éste, quién es?</u> | M. and this, who is it? |
| [refers to doll that's there] | [refers to doll that's there] |
| K. e(s) e(l) ninosh. | K. it's the baby. |
| M. es el niño. | M. it's the baby. |
| K. ah, e(s) a nino! | K. ah, it's the baby! |
| M. qué bonito! | M. how pretty! |
| M. #2.1 <u>y Grover?</u> | M. #2.1 and Grover? |
| [refers to Grover doll, not in room] | [refers to Grover doll, not in room] |
| K. no está Vove? | K. Grover isn't here? |
| M. no está Grover? | M. Grover isn't here? |
| M. <u>dónde está Grover?</u> | M. where is Grover? |
| K. no está Vove? | K. Grover isn't here? |
| [higher voice] | [higher voice] |
| M. <u>dónde está?</u> | M. where is he? |
| K. no está Vove? | K. Grover isn't here? |
| [squeal] | [squeal] |
| M. y lo va ir a buscar? | M. and are you going to look for him? |

²In my interactions with Koki, Spanish variants of games such as peek-a-boo, this little piggy, bouncing games and pat-a-cake were frequent although few instances are recorded in the transcripts.

K. ése [//] # ne [//] ne
 posteye a Vove.
 M. no quiere Grover?
 [K01]

K. that [//] # no [//] no
 look for Grover.
 M. you don't want Grover?

In this sequence taken from the first tape (K01)³ there are three successive instances of the same format being repeated. In the first two, the mother calls attention to an object that is present in the context, although the child is unaware of it. In the last case, the object is not present. This format seems to be used to introduce a new topic of conversation about which some comment can then be made. When the object thus introduced is not present, the sequence functions as a pre-sequence for requesting that the child look for that object. All instances are very similar in form as can be seen:

M: And the x?	And the x?
Ch: Not here x.	Here is x.
M: X isn't here?	Here is x.
Where is it?	
Go get it.	Look at x!/How pretty!/etc.

³A complete description of the tapes and of the transcription conventions used, is given in Chapter III and a summary of transcription symbols is given following the Table of Contents. The English glosses will follow the Spanish text as closely as possible but changes will be made when necessary to allow the reader to capture the sense of the interaction in those cases where a literal translation would not do so. The English glosses however, will fail to capture details of the child's "baby-talk" Spanish.

I have not made a systematic search for routines in this data but they may be fairly easy to pick out. A rapid examination of the data suggests that they are adult-initiated sequences of talk that occur in conversational lulls or when external pressures require that the adult take the lead in the conversation. Let us remember, however, that for the most part the adult lets the child take the conversational lead and responds to child-initiations in an appropriate "semantically contingent" manner (Snow 1984, Wells 1981).

What Bruner has found is an ordered pattern for establishing the carrying out of these conversational sequences. At the beginning the mother takes control of the format, often carrying out all the parts in it but indicating where the child is expected to intervene and what the nature of the child's response ought to be. With respect to games, for example, often the mother will physically manipulate the child when it is her turn to act. Gradually, the child assumes the role as respondent, intervening appropriately in the slots allotted to her. At this point small variations in form and/or content may be introduced. Eventually, the child takes over the mother's role as initiator and controller of the format, introduces variations in it or extends parts of the established format to novel situations.

These routinized interactive formats are part of what Bruner terms the Language Assistance System (LAS). Through it, the adult interacting with the child facilitates various aspects of interactive behavior with the intent of maximizing the child's role in communicative interactions. Language learning (e.g. syntax acquisition) seems to be a fall-out from the interaction engaged in, although not an initial primary concern for the adult.

Through these highly predictable routinized interactions the child learns many of the organizational features of conversation: turn-taking, reciprocal or complementary turns, exchange organization, ways of introducing topics, acknowledging and/or evaluating others' interventions, and closing off sequences among others.

4.3. Learning Language through Interaction

Wells (1985) in his report on the Bristol Language Study, states that his analysis of data of children 15 to 60 months of age, interacting with adults both at home and at school, has led him to view the development of communication as "truly interactional".

At each stage the child endeavours to communicate using the resources currently available to him. The adult with whom he is interacting interprets his behavior in terms of her own cultural and linguistic framework and responds in a way that both reflects to the child the perceived significance of his behavior and, in the form and content of that response, provides

information about the communication system and its relation to the world that enables the child to supplement and modify his communicative resources. (Wells 1985:397)

More and more studies in the last few years stress the importance of examining adult-child interactions as a whole, when attempting to describe the development of communicative competence and the conditions or requirements for this development (Bloom, Rocissano and Hood 1976; Blount 1977, 1981; Bruner 1975, 1977, 1978, 1980, 1981; Chapman 1981; Cross 1978; Howe 1981; Moerk 1983; Rondal 1985; Snow 1977a, 1978, 1979, 1984; Wells 1981, 1985). Snow (1978) maintains, however, that to say that interaction is necessary for developing language is just too broad a hypothesis to be considered interesting. She insists that an effort must be made to define precisely just what in interaction contributes to what aspects of language development.

We can begin an approximation to this topic by saying that through interaction we find that: a) some aspects of language are actively and explicitly taught to the child; b) some aspects are repeatedly modelled; c) particular interactive strategies enable the child to form and test out hypothesis about his language and appropriate modes of interaction.

4.3.1. Explicit Teaching

With respect to what is explicitly taught, various researchers have noted that parents rarely seem to be concerned with their children's grammatical errors but that rather what they teach or correct is appropriateness of interaction and politeness (Brown and Hanlon 1970, Brown 1977, Berko-Gleason 1977). There is some active teaching of linguistic elements but mostly restricted to vocabulary. When mothers have been asked about what they hope to teach the child through their interaction, they specifically refer to helping their children understand and develop their communicative abilities but not to teaching language as such (Garnica 1977).

Data from the tapes in this study seem to corroborate these findings. We can see some cases of teaching or practicing new lexical items, as in examples (2) and (3):

2.

K. miya e(1) ten.	K. look at the train
M. ése no es el tren.	M. that's not the train.
M. éso es un cuaderno.	M. that's a notebook.
K. #2.0 <a-> [>] +/.	K. #2.0 <n-> [>] +/.
M. <cuaderno> [<].	M. <notebook> [<].
K. eh, <u>ayeyno</u> .	K. eh, notebook.
M. cuaderno.	M. notebook.
K. atí.	K. like this.
K. <u>e(1) ayeyno</u> .	K. the notebook.
M. cuaderno.	M. notebook.
M. sí.	M. yes.
M. es un librito.	M. it's a book.
M. un librito de la mamá.	M. mommy's book.
[K01]	

3.

K. #4.7 qué son?

F. son esnaps.

K. naps.

[whispered]

K. qué [//] dici que el
papa son en- [//]
enaps.

M. snaps?

F. esnaps.

M. snaps. [K12]

K. #4.7 what are they?

F. they are [esnaps].

K. [naps].

[whispered]

K. what [//] he says that
the daddy are [en-]
[//] [enaps].

M. [snaps]?

F. [esnaps].

M. [snaps].

Example (2), which is taken from the first tape, shows the various types of strategies that the mother may use when teaching a new vocabulary item. The mother gives the correct designation for the object the child is focused on and appears to have named incorrectly. She repeats the word with a particular intonation, models it again after the child says the word, agrees to the correctness of what the child attempts and then gives a descriptive paraphrase. In example (3) less teaching work goes on but again the item is modelled various times following an explicit query by the child. Other examples of the mother's explanations or paraphrases when introducing items that the child seems to not know are the following:

4.

K. éshe e- [//] éshe e #
peyeno.

M. el cuaderno.

M. el librito de la mamá.

[K01]

K. that i- [//] that is #
notebook.

M. the notebook.

M. mommy's book.

- 5.
- | | |
|---|--|
| M. son pedacitos de pellejito de la mamá.
--- | M. they're little bits of mommy's skin.
--- |
| M. <u>la piel de la espalda de la mamá.</u> [K08] | M. skin from mommy's back. |
- 6.
- | | |
|---|--|
| M. #2.0 no: se meta el [//] ese pepelito [*] en la boca . | M. #2.0 don't put the [//] that paper in your mouth. |
| M. <u>es plástico.</u>
--- | M. it's plastic.
--- |
| K. # qué es éste <meta> [?] de plástico? | K. # what is this <put> of plastic? |
| M. es esto. | M. it's this. |
| M. <u>plástico.</u> | M. plastic. |
| M. <u>de nailon.</u> | M. it's nylon. |
| M. <u>no se puede comer.</u> [K10] | M. it can't be eaten. |
- 7.
- | | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| M. póngalos todos en orden.
--- | M. put them all in order.
--- |
| K. en cuál orden? | K. in which order? |
| M. <u>así, todos en una línea.</u> | M. like this, all in a line. |
| M. <u>acá.</u> | M. here. |
| M. <u>todos [//] uno a (e)l lado de (e)l otro.</u> | M. all [//] one next to the other. |
| M. <u>ahí:.</u> [K11] | M. there. |

One important thing to note is that every single one of the numerous examples in which the parent's attention seems to be focused on a vocabulary item occurs after active interest manifested by the child. Thus the child may show interest by repeating and attempting a word, as is shown in her repetitions of "cuaderno" in examples (2) and (4) above,

which leads the mother to model or define the word, or, what appears most often in the later tapes, the child may actively request the name of some object or may question a word introduced by the mother as in examples (6) and (7) to show that the word is not fully understood. The strategy most often used by the child is to request the name of an object by using phrase such as "Qué es éso?" (What is that?) or "Cómo se llama?" (What is that called?/How do you say it?):

8.

K. #13.9 es ésho?

K. #13.9 is that?

M. <éso> [?] es un
micrófono. [K03]

M. that is a microphone.

9.

K. qué es esas cos#ses
[?]?

K. what is those things?

K. qué es esas cosas?

K. what is those things?

M. qué son esas cosas?

M. what are those things?

M. todos ésos son hilos.

M. all of those are
threads.

[K05]

10.

K. hizo y [//] y [//] y o
[//] y [//] y [//] y lo
sopé.K. it did and [//] and [//]
... and I blew it.

K. y [//] y +...

K. and [//] and +...

K. cómo se llama?

K. how do you say it?

M. lo prendió?

M. you lit it?

K. sí.

K. yes.

K. y lo pendí.

K. and I lit it.

K. e me quemé. [K08]

K. and I burnt myself.

11.

K. <cómo> [?] se llaman?

M. cuál?

K. ésos.

K. ésos bonitos.

M. cortinas?

K. sí.

K. <esas cortinas ## o

[//] <endónde le> [?]>

[//] esas bonitas

cortinas nónde los

comparon? [K09]

K. how are they called?

M. what?

K. those.

K. those pretty ones.

M. curtains?

K. yes.

K. those curtains ## o

[//] where [//] those

pretty curtains where

did you buy them?

Thus the mother teaches vocabulary by providing requested names or labels, by paraphrasing items or adding explanations, but only after the child has demonstrated some interest in a new word. In the early stages that interest might be just a display of the child's attention on some object. As the child acquires more linguistic resources she cues the mother in various ways, as we can see in these examples, as to what she knows, what she can do and what she is having problems with.

Brown (1973, 1977), Ferguson (1977) and others have remarked that parents do not seem overly concerned about correcting grammar but do seem to be concerned about the child speaking politely or behaving appropriately. In the data tapes there are numerous examples of the parents requesting that the child speak politely by using "por favor" (please) and "gracias" (thank you). The request that the child provide these is expressed in regulatory terms: "Cómo

se dice?" (what does one say?) or "Cómo hay que pedir Koki?" (how must one say?).

12.

K. a:.	[whiny, demanding]	K. a:	[whiny, demanding]
M. <u>cómo se dice?</u>		M. how do you say?	
K. po favor.		K. please.	
M. por favor.		M. please.	
M. <u>y cuando la mamá le da se dice?</u>		M. and when mommy gives it to you you say?	
M. #1.5 <u>gra:</u> +...		M. #1.5 tha +...	
K. yashias.		K. thank you.	
M. <u>gracias mamita.</u> [K03]		M. thank you mommy	

At times, cause and effect relationships between acting politely and obtaining what the child wants are made explicit:

13.

K. #4.5 quiero más.	K. #4.5 I want more.
K. quiero más.	K. I want more.
K. #2.9 quieyo más.	K. #2.9 I want more.
F. #9.6 <u>sabe cuándo <voy a:> [/] voy a darle más?</u>	F. #9.6 you know when <I'm going to> [/] I'm going to give you more?
F. <u>sabe cuándo?</u>	F. you know when?
K. sí?	K. yes?
F. cuándo?	F. when?
K. cuándo?	K. when?
F. #5.7 <u>cuando me pide #3.7 en una manera: educada eh.</u> [K05]	F. #5.7 when you ask me #3.7 in a polite manner, eh.

In this last example it is also found that the father labels the appropriate behavior expected as asking for something "en una manera educada" (in an educated manner, politely). Various examples of corrections of other inappropriate social behaviors with prescriptive (or proscriptive) remarks are

found in the data: "No se dibuja en los libritos" (one doesn't draw in books) "Los libritos no se rayan" (books are not scribbled on), "No se lee mordiendo el papel" (one doesn't read biting on the paper), "Las mamás se enojan si los niños gritan" (mothers get angry if their children scream). At the same time behaviors are labelled as good or bad in different ways: saying "I don't want to, I don't want to" when the mother suggests or directs a certain action is considered "pícaro" (not nice) and "de pelea" (fighting); complying to a request by saying "Yes mommy" is "bueno" (good); scribbling on one's leg is "hacer cosas locas" (do crazy things).

In all of the tapes, however, there is only one example of a correction which can be said to be correcting and/or attempting to teach grammar. That is the following:

14.

K. <dejo a e> [//] deja
esto ahí <para que>
[//] para que no se
rompe.

M. para que no se rom+...

K. pe?

M. pa.

K. d- [//] la qué?

M. para que no se rompa.

K. la qué?

M. el: grabador.[K08]

K. I leave th- [//] I
leave this there so
that [//] so that it
won't breaks.

M. so that it won't +...

K. breaks?

M. break.

K. d- [//] which?

M. so that it won't
break.

K. which?

M. the: tape-recorder.

Here the child's error in not producing a subjunctive form is noted and a repair initiated by cueing a correction. The

child initially participates by trying out a completion to the mother's cue. The mother provides the correct ending. The child, although she understands the meaning of what the mother says, as evidenced by her subsequent semantically appropriate questions, does not seem to understand the function of the mother's intervention and cedes the topic requesting that the mother clarify the content by specifying the referent of "se rompa". The syntactic correction as such receives no uptake from the child and is not pursued further.

In this section I have been looking at instances of active teaching by the adult. The data from this study corroborate what has been found in other studies. There is practically no teaching of strictly linguistic items aside from vocabulary teaching. Appropriate behaviors and politeness are focused on, however, and the child is corrected in various ways when her behavior is considered inappropriate.

4.3.2. Modelling

During the course of the interaction, the adult's language provides the child with constant modelling of words and structures. Here we do find a focus on syntactic structures when the adult repeats something previously said by the child and recasts it into "correct" syntactic form. In some cases, the modelling sequence involves only the adult's reformulation of the child's utterance; but very often what

is found is that the child picks up the adult's reformulation and attempts to repeat it. This type of interest shown by the child often seems to motivate the mother to continue by repeating the modelled utterance once again or expanding upon it. Following some examples:

15.

K. #2.5 éshe e(s) a titín.

[refers to Desitin tube = tintín]

M. ése es el tintin?

K. éshe esh el titín.

M. aha.

K. éshe (e)s al titín.[K01]

K. #2.5 that [a titin].

[refers to Desitin tube =tintin]

M. that's the [tintin]?

K. that's the [titin].

M. aha.

K. that's [a titin].

16.

M. no lo toque.

M. no lo tire.

K. no (l)o tote.

M. no lo toque. [K01]

M. don't touch it.

M. don't drop it.

K. don't touch it.

M. don't touch it.

17.

K. miya wauwau.

M. sí.

M. ahí está el wauwau chiquito.

K. wauwau titito # baíto.

M. diablito?

M. no.

M. está el chanchito.

M. dónde está el diablito?

K. #2.5 tatitosh.

M. chanchitos.

M. sí. [K01]

K. look doggie.

M. yes.

M. there's the little doggie.

K. little doggie # devil.

M. little devil?

M. no.

M. there's a piggy.

M. where's the little devil?

K. #2.5 piggies.

M. piggies.

M. yes.

In these examples, taken from K01, there is immediate uptake by the child in responding to a previously modelled utterance by the mother, and the mother once again modelling it after the child's attempt. Examples like the above are extremely frequent in the earlier tapes but decrease in the later ones, although there may still be some modelling by the mother, especially if the child's utterance has a problem. However, immediate uptake later on is not frequent and may not be expected.

Aside from the reformulating or recasting of a child utterance in more standard form, there is additional modelling in sequences that are used over and over again with minor variations. The type of talk that ensues between mother and child is reminiscent of pattern-practice exercises in language teaching in which a structure is held constant but variations in particular slot-fillers are requested. In the previous section, formats that get repeated over and over again have been discussed. Following are some more examples. One thing to note is that very often these repeated formats occur in a sequence so that the child is presented with or has the opportunity to try out two or three or more instances of the patterned structure, sometimes with slot/filler variations. This helps the child get evidence about things

like structural organization, equivalence relations, or segmenting possibilities.

Following are examples of utterances structured by the attention-getting form "mira". Since this form is used to get participants focused on an object in the environment it very often is used to elicit talk about a new object or one whose name is not known by the child and sentences with "mira" become good environments when teaching or modelling needs to be done.

18.

M. mire, acá están los
petes.
[sets each item on
table]

M. acá está la papita.

M. acá está el mono.

M. y acá está el niñoito.

K. aha. [K01]

M. look, here are the
pacifiers.
[sets each item on
table]

M. here's the bottle.

M. here's the monkey.

M. and here's the dolly.

K. aha.

19.

K. #1.7 miya.

M. mira el mono.

K. miya payita.

M. está todo tapadito.

[K01]

K. #1.7 look.

M. look at the monkey.

K. look covered.

M. he's all covered up.

20.

M. mire los zapatitos!

M. #3.0 mire acá tiene
zapatitos.

M. y mire acá tiene
botas.

M. oh!

M. #2.7 oh!

M. #3.2 qué zapatitos más
raros!

M. como los de Koki!

M. look at the shoes!

M. #3.0 look here she has
shoes.

M. and look here she has
boots.

M. oh!

M. #2.7 oh!

M. #3.2 what strange
shoes!

M. like Koki's!

---	---
K. amá miya esos zapatitos	K. mommy look at those shoes.
M. qué zapatitos bonitos! [K02]	M. what pretty shoes!

In (18) the mother produces the "Mira" (look) format alone. It involves drawing attention to an object and displaying it or labelling it. In (19) and (20) we see both mother and child collaborating in producing this format. Here the element of commenting upon the displayed object is added:

M. mire acá tiene zapatitos.	M. look here she has shoes
---	---
M. qué zapatitos más raros!	M. what funny shoes!
K. amá miya esos zapatitos.	K. mommy look at those shoes.
M. qué zapatitos bonitos!	M. what pretty shoes!

In the following example, it is the child who initiates the "Mira" (look) format. The mother produces labels.

21.	
K. miya e(l) seyor.	K. look at the man.
M. un señor?	M. a man?
K. miya e(l) seyor.	K. look at the man.
M. otro señor.	M. another man.
K. miya e(l) seyor.	K. look at the man.
M. mmhmm.	M. mmhmm.
K. #7.2 0 [=! coughs].	K. #7.2 0 [=!coughs]
K. miya e(l) seyor.	K. look at the man.
M. mira señor.	M. look man.
M. qué tos!	M. what a cough!
K. #3.6 miya.	K. #3.6 look.
M. la muñequita.	M. the dolly.
K. miya.	K. look.

M. un policía.	M. a policeman.
K. #3.0 miya.	K. #3.0 look.
M. un auto.	M. a car.
K. miya.	K. look.
M. #4.0 otro auto.	M. #4.0 another car.
K. dos monitos?	K. two monkeys?
M. dos monitos, sí.	M. two monkeys, yes.
K. utos [?] monitos?	K. utos [?] monkeys?
M. muchos monitos. [K02]	M. many monkeys.

We see in these examples that the mother uses the occasion of "Mira" to label or name the object displayed. The "Mira" structure provides a frame where the object slot is filled successively by the names of various objects presented. In (18) the mother produces the frame by herself. In (19)-(21), mother and child both participate in presenting and labelling the object. In the following example from the beginning of K03, we see something similar to this happening, but the interactional frame has been altered. When showing the objects, (which in this example consist of pictures from a book, as is also the case in example (21) above), the child calls attention not to the objects' names but to the activity that they display. The mother follows the child's lead and in subsequent turns with "Mira" comments on or describes an activity. The underlying question that the participants are responding to is not "Qué es?" (What is it?), as in previous examples but "Y ahí qué pasa?" (What's happening there?):

22.

M. el niño se está
bañando?

K. mmhmm.

K. miya <a ni> [//] a nino
eta nanano.

M. #1.8 el niño ése se
está bañando?

K. #2.1 miya a <nina>
[?].

K. miya e(1) pat [//]
patito.

M. #2.1 un patito tiene.

K. # miya, una nena.

M. y hay una nena y un
niño.

K. mmhmm.

K. #1.5 miya.
[points to plate 21]

M. y ahí qué pasa?

K. <hasin # non-> [//] ha
[//] hacen noni.

M. hace noni el niño?
[K03]

M. the boy is taking a
bath?

K. mmhmm.

K. look the b- [//] the
boy is taking a bath.

M. #1.8 that boy is
taking a bath?

K. #2.1 look at <girl>
[?]

K. look the du- [//]
ducky.

M. #2.1 she's got a
ducky.

K. # look, a girl.

M. and there's a girl and
a boy.

K. mmhmm.

K. #1.5 look.
[points to plate 21]

M. and what's happening
there?

K. <goes # bed-> [//] go-
[//] goes beddy-bye.

M. the boy goes beddy-
bye?

These examples show how a certain structural pattern is established and then varied in ways that would facilitate the child acquiring knowledge about component parts, segmentation, and equivalence between structures. There is a gradual progression in the pattern, with small variations upon what is known. These are instituted, however, only when the child indicates readiness or displays interest.

In the following examples, we will see that performing transformations on established patterns is not simply the

work that the adult does, but that the child carries this out actively:

23.

K. oh, miya e(1) piyito!	K. oh, look at the hair!
K. oy!	K. oy!
M. oh, mira el pelito!	M. oh, look at the hair!
K. miya ese piyito.	K. look at that hair.
M. mira ese pelito.	M. look at that hair.
M. +^ qué cosa!	M. what a thing!
K. oh tosa ese piyito!	K. oh thing that hair!
M. <qué cosa> [>] esa Kokita! [K01]	M. <what a thing> [>] that Koki!

24.

K. #9.5 miya piyitosh.	K. #9.5 look at hairs.
M. mira el pelito.	M. look at the hair.
K. piyitosh?	K. hairs?
K. mamita?	K. mommy?
K. piyitosh?	K. hairs?
K. mamita?	K. mommy?
M. pelitos de la mamá?	M. mommy's hairs?
M. #3.0 pelitos de la mamá? [K01]	M. #3.0 mommy's hairs?

25.

M. y mire pato!	M. and look at duck!
M. mire el pato allá!	M. look at the duck there!
K. pato allá.	K. duck there.
K. #2.1 pato allá!	K. #2.1 duck there!
K. mira pato ahí.	K. look duck here.
K. no a pato?	K. no [a] duck?
K. allá?	K. there?
K. <miya> [>] +/. [mike noise]	K. <look> [>] +/. [mike noise]
M. <el pato> [<].	M. <the duck> [<].
K. el pato allá? [K01]	K. the duck there?

26. Two pottery figures of the sun and the moon are hanging on the wall:

M. mire la luna.	M. look at the moon.
K. #4.8 el sol.	K. #4.8 the sun.
M. el sol. [K02]	M. the sun.

These examples show that the child from a very early age is able to carry out some of the behaviors that have normally been ascribed to the mother: focus on a certain structural pattern and modify it successively in small ways, making explicit hypotheses for segmentation of elements, or about constituent structure. The mother complements the child's activity by herself joining in pattern transformation as in example (23) part of which is repeated below:

23.

K. miya ese piyito.	K. look at that hair.
M. mira ese pelito.	M. look at that hair.
M. +^ qué cosa!	M. what a thing!
K. oh tosa ese piyito!	K. oh thing that hair!
M. <qué cosa> [>] esa	M. <what a thing> [>]
Kokita! [K01]	that Koki!

She also confirms the child's hypothesis by repetition of the child's utterance, provides an additional model when the repetition is reformulated into standard Spanish and often explicitly evaluates either positively or negatively the child's contribution.

Positive evaluation includes an acceptance by agreeing to something, usually by the use of "sí" (yes, that's right) or by actually commending the child by the use of phrases like "muy bien" (very good). Here it should be noted that often

positive acceptance is given to child utterances when the mother agrees with the content, even if the syntax does not match adult syntax.

27.

K. bitos e mamita.	K. bugs [e] mommy.
M. bichos en la mamita.	M. bugs on mommy.
M. sí. [K01]	M. yes.

28.

K. payita me ye frío.	K. covered [me ye] cold.
M. tapadita para que no tenga frío.	M. covered so that you won't be cold.
M. sí. [K01]	M. yes.

29.

K. un a ya yaíz a tatitosh.	K. one [a] the nose [a] yucky.
M. un chanchito de la nariz, sí. [K02]	M. a yucky from the nose, yes.

Negative evaluations include rejections by the use of "no" or questioning the child's previous turn before proceeding to modify it. This seems to be limited to rejecting the child's labelling or identification of an object, as in examples mentioned previously and repeated below:

K. miya e(l) ten.	K. look the train.
M. ése no es el tren.	M. that's not a train.
M. é s o e s u n cuaderno. [K01]	M. that's a notebook.

K. wauwau titito # baito.	K. little doggie # devil.
M. diablito?	M. devil?
M. no.	M. no.
M. está el chanchito.	M. there's a piggy.
M. dónde está el diablito? [K01]	M. where's the little devil?

4.3.3. Learning language through interaction: some conclusions

I have been stressing how the structure of the interaction helps in the acquisition of syntax because that is what has been questioned in the literature, with some researchers doubting that parental linguistic strategies do facilitate the acquisition of grammatical structures (Shatz 1981, 1984; Newport, Gleitman and Gleitman 1977). What I have tried to show, through the lengthy presentation of the examples above, is how a lot of work is carried out in the conversation between mother and child which probably for the participants would not have the primary goal of teaching syntax but which would probably have that effect nevertheless. The type of activity carried out resembles what is often used in language teaching programs. The mother very systematically modifies one or another aspect of the interaction, but she seems to do this only after receiving some cue from the child that this is what the child is focused on and is interested in. The types of topics introduced by the child, the types of comments made about those topics, questions that the child asks, repetitions by the child which may indicate interest in some aspect of the mother's language, all these are taken as

cues which will guide the mother in making her subsequent contribution to the conversation.

Studies that have indicated no correlation between the mother's speech and subsequent acquisition of grammatical structure by the child seem to have a basic problem in their conception. They are usually set up to compare the language of the mother and the child at two times or points in development, as discussed in Ingram (1989). Time 1 is a stage before the child has acquired a certain linguistic feature and Time 2 is a stage when the feature is present in the child's speech. If a positive correlation is found between the child's language at Time 2 and the mother's language at Time 1, then a causal relationship may be established between the two and it may be said that the mother's language has positively facilitated the child's acquisition of the feature under scrutiny (Ingram 1989). Shatz (1984) and Newport, Gleitman and Gleitman (1977) have found that their results from studies of this type lead them to doubt that the mother's language has a facilitating effect on syntactic development since no positive correlation can be found between the child's acquisition of forms at Time 2 and the mother's language at Time 1. The basic problem that I find with this is that studies of this type seem to have as an assumption that the adult's language is in some sense

invariant and its features can be examined and described independently of the communicative context in which it occurs since the basic characteristics of the mother's speech will be a function of the rules of the already acquired adult system. This position can be seen in the following quote from Shatz (1984):

However, when accounting for the nature of speech to children, one must not forget that speech production is a highly automatic process. Parents talking to their children do make adjustments, but they do so within the framework of their overall linguistic competence. It would be surprising to find that their patterns of child-directed speech were entirely different from those directed to other listeners (Shatz 1984:43).

The assumptions underlying this quote are that there is a relatively stable invariant system used by the mother in her speech to other adults, which she can modify within some restricted limits imposed by the grammatical system when speaking to the child. Most sociolinguistic work since the sixties has shown that the assumption of a relatively invariant stable system simply cannot be sustained. Speakers vary their language as a result of numerous situational factors that may affect use, such as, for example, characteristics of the interlocutor, of the physical properties of the setting, of the psychological, social or cultural definition of the situation, and as a function of the topics being discussed. These modifications are not simply a case of varying functional or strategic uses but

include modifications or variations to the system itself in its phonology, morphology and syntax. In addition, discourse and conversational analysis have shown that one person's contribution to an ongoing conversation is highly constrained by previous turns in that conversation. The initiation, sustaining and ending of linguistic events like conversation is accomplished jointly by the interacting participants. Within the conversation itself, linguistic and social meanings are seen to occur as a result of negotiations and on-line definitions. But in addition, studies have also shown that very often the actual syntactic constructions which emerge in the conversation are the result of active collaboration and joint construction by the interacting partners (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974, Schegloff 1979; Ochs, Schieffelin and Platt 1979). Therefore, one partner's activity in conversation often cannot be fully understood when examined independently of what the other person was doing. Conversation is co-constructed and each contribution at one point in the ongoing talk is responsive to and contingent on previous talk (the text that has been developing), and various definitional aspects of the situation including knowledge bases and social or cultural assumptions that have been displayed explicitly or can be derived from what has been said and done.

To recapitulate some of the points discussed in this section, what is accomplished when a child linguistically interacts with an adult seems to play an important role in the child's development of communicative competence. In adult-child conversations we see that the adult does a limited amount of explicit teaching of linguistic items, mostly presentation of new vocabulary items and of politeness routines. The adult also models in his language "correct" linguistic forms and places these modelled forms conversationally at those points or times in the conversation where they are most likely to receive uptake. Guidance on when to model seems to come from the child who displays interest and readiness through his language. General conversational constraints on what can be done during one's turn, seem to make conversation an optimal place for learning about language, since there is such a high degree of contingency between one turn and what has been done previously in the conversation, especially in the immediately preceding turns. Each contribution has to be relevant to previous text (Grice 1975), to maintain semantic relatedness and to be functionally appropriate to what has gone on before (Snow 1984). The setting up of expectations from one turn on what can occur in the turn that follows provides a good environment for making and testing out hypotheses about

language. The face-to-face nature of the interaction allows for immediate feedback on the correctness of those hypotheses.

Throughout this chapter, I have presented evidence to support the position that the activity that is carried out in interaction is not just conducive to learning "language" in general, but also contributes very specifically to the acquisition of syntactic structures. Correlation studies between child acquisition and mother language will probably yield inconclusive results because of the arguments made previously: one cannot abstract from the particularities of the local situation in the construction of a turn-at-talk. It is doubtful that definitive answers to acquisition problems will be resolved by attempting to elucidate how and when the mother "teaches" possessives, how and when the subjunctive is introduced, or the difference between "ser" and "estar". What the mother seems to do is "teach" the child about linguistic structure as such, more than focussing on individual structures. The manipulations that are performed on sentences allow the child to form hypotheses about what types of things can be considered units, what elements are segmentable and how segmentation can be carried out. In doing the segmenting, relations of equivalence are set up, for example, in that two constructions can occupy a

same slot in a frame, but at the same time differences between equivalent items are displayed. The child is therefore in an environment rich with possibilities for the formation of hypotheses. As the child's role becomes more active she can receive confirmation of these predictions, receive models for dealing with problem items and for adding on to or expanding constructions into more complex ones (Snow 1984). As Wells (1985) states, the locus of control over the rate and manner of learning lies with the child who displays his readiness, his interests or his problems. Constraints built into the organizational structure of conversation itself insure that these displays by one interactive partner will be taken into account by the other partner in the construction of the next turn.

This thesis examines some ways in which this is done, namely by analyzing the use of repairs in conversation as one set of strategies which are carried out interactively with the goal of maintaining the conversation itself. Since "repairing" is a metalinguistic function for which the focus of attention is language structure or language use, it's study will provide very clear examples of how language is "taught" and learnt. However, focus on any aspect of conversational interaction would allow us to see, with varying degrees of explicitness, how a situated text in

conversation, its meaning, and eventually, communicative competence itself, are co-constructed.

CHAPTER II

THE STUDY OF CONVERSATIONAL INTERACTION

1. CONVERSATIONAL INTERACTION

In this chapter I will review the literature relevant to the analysis of conversational interaction and present the guidelines I will use as a framework for the analysis of repairs. A review of the literature, however, indicates a theoretical problem. There have been many approaches to the study of what speakers do with language. Where do we place a study of the activities and structures that emerge when speakers engage in verbal interaction? Even the initial step poses problems: What shall we call what we are about to do? The available terms are not neutral or interchangeable (Schiffrin 1988). Thus "Conversation Analysis", "Discourse Analysis", "Speech Act Analysis", or "Text Analysis" all presume particular theoretical and methodological perspectives which often do not coincide in basic aspects such as the definition of the object of study, the scope of what is to be looked at, or the validity of methods to be used for obtaining and analyzing data. In this study, I want to examine the activities carried out by participants in a conversation, to examine the structure of the discourse that

is constructed, and, within this, to examine various language functions that are being carried out. In addition, although it is not a primary focus, I will also examine the structure of particular types of discourse, such as narratives. Which of the approaches mentioned above might best be suited to the present research goals? The answer is that there is no one approach that is sufficient of itself to address all the complexities of conversational interaction, and yet all of them provide rich and valuable insights which have been influential in understanding what is going on in the data and, at the same time, they provide useful methodological tools for analysis.

In this chapter various different approaches to the analysis of "conversational interaction" are reviewed, and the methodological and analytical guidelines taken from each, that underlie the present research, are indicated. The resulting framework is necessarily "eclectic". Unfortunately, this term has negative connotations; however, it seems that such an approach is unavoidable given the scope and complexity of conversational interaction and the present state of our knowledge. At the moment, there is no one global, unified, coherent theory for the analysis of what people do with language. However, many different approaches have provided rich and varied insights into all aspects of

conversational interaction, hence the proposed "eclecticism". To offset some of the negative aspects of this, a very explicit account is provided of what will be taken from each approach to conversation, and of how various elements will be integrated in this study of repairs in conversation.

First, some general considerations about conversational interaction are presented. These provide some basic definitions of what this activity encompasses. There follows a review of various different approaches to the study of what goes on within conversations. This review is not exhaustive, but within each major approach I have chosen one representative model or perspective. Finally, I present the guidelines, drawn from these different approaches, that have directed the present research and which underlie the procedures for data analysis.

1.1. General Considerations

A first approximation to a definition of the term "interaction" as it is being used here would be the following: the concerted behaviours of two or more participants who are jointly engaged in carrying out some activity in such a way that the actions of one result from and at the same time constrain the actions of the other. Conversational interaction is one form of social interactive

activity and therefore will display general characteristics of social interactive behaviour, but it is also particular in that through conversational interaction other types of social interaction are organized and regulated. For this reason, the study of conversation is of interest not only to linguists but to sociologists and anthropologists who through the study of conversation hope to gain insight into the organization of everyday activities and how rules and norms of interaction and interpretation for everyday events are displayed and transmitted (Garfinkel 1967; Cicourel 1973; Hymes 1972, 1974; Duranti 1988).

General characteristics of interaction in conversation have to do with the ways in which the activities of each participant are organized relative to those of the others. Erickson and Shultz (1982) propose that conversation is socially and culturally organized and locally produced.

The social organization of conversation refers to the fact that each participant's contribution at any given time is designed to reflect and display features of the social context in which the conversation occurs, and at the same time redefines that same context.

Erickson (1982) points out two dimensions of this social organization of activity, a reciprocal dimension and a complementary dimension. The reciprocal dimension of

organization refers to the sequential organization of one partner's actions relative to the other's. A speaker in a conversation will organize his turn at any moment in the conversation both retrospectively with respect to previous turns and prospectively with respect to the future course of the conversation (Erickson 1982:213). This means that the speaker reacts to what was said previously and anticipates what might occur. The form and content of the turn will display to the other participant what has been interpreted as happening and what is expected to happen next.

The complementary dimension in the organization of conversational interaction is often neglected in linguistic approaches to conversation. This refers to the simultaneous organization of behaviours in real time. That is, while a speaker takes his turn as speaker, the other participant in the conversation is "taking his turn" as listener. Both participants simultaneously display to each other complexes of behaviours, verbal and non-verbal, that indicate that each one is aware of his role and of what the other one is doing.

Linguists, because of their particularized interest, have tended to concentrate their attention on verbal behaviours when studying conversation, giving predominance to aspects of sequential organization. Yet, everything that is subsumed under the term "non-verbal" -gestures, body posture

and movement, facial expressions, use of space- plays an important role in establishing, maintaining and eventually breaking off interaction. In this study, because of the lack of a visual record of the interactions, I will restrict the discussion only to what would fall under sequential aspects of organization and within this I will only address verbal behaviours; however the importance of the communicative behaviours displayed through other channels is clearly recognized.

The end result of both dimensions of organization is a co-constructed ongoing activity in which each participant relates his actions to what the other has done, is doing, and will or might do. Each participant displays in his turns his interpretations of what the other has done or is doing and of what is assumed to be "going on", so that meanings become subject to negotiation through conversational activity. Each turn responds to multiple features of the situated context in which the interaction is taking place, including such features as roles and identities of the participants relative to each other. But through each turn the context, including definitions of who or what each participant is, is constantly being redefined (Gumperz 1982).

In addition to social organization, Erickson and Shultz (1982) discuss the cultural organization of conversation.

Conversation is culturally organized in that the options for participating, at any given time, are taken from the repertoires of possible actions according to the norms for interacting prevalent within the participants' group or community. In addition the behaviours or activities displayed will also be interpreted according to the group's norms for interpretation (Hymes 1972). However, these norms for interaction and for interpretation are not applied in a mechanical manner. They are used keeping in mind the specificities of the particular face-to-face encounter that is going on, and in this respect then it is said that conversation is locally produced.

In this discussion, we have been looking at some general organizational features of interaction as applied to conversation. In the following section, particular features of conversational organization will be discussed.

1.2. Aspects of Conversational Organization

In Chapter I, I stated that the mother in her early interactions with her child, acts as if the child were a fully aware, even though not fully competent, interactional partner. In interpreting some of her interactions with her child as "conversations" and reacting accordingly, the mother displays the organizing features and principles that underlie conversational interaction. In the sections that follow,

three such conversational organization features are discussed: the turn-taking system, adjacency pair organization, and the principle of conversational cooperation.

1.2.1. Turn-Taking

Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) initiate their characterization of conversation with the general observation that in conversation speaker change recurs. That is, conversation is a type of interaction made up of dialogic exchange of talk between participants. An examination of the turn-taking mechanism in conversation allows one to see how conversations are interactionally accomplished.

Some general observations about conversations are that generally one party speaks at a time. Overlapping talk may occur but is of short duration. Additionally, the vast majority of transitions between speakers occur with no gap between speaking turns. Most turn transitions are accomplished smoothly. These observations must be seen in the light of additional observations about turns and turn-assignment in conversation. In particular, it is notable that the length, duration or content of any turn is not pre-determined in advance but varies, and that allocation of turns is not pre-determined in advance but varies. Therefore, the smooth transition from one speaker to the next

stands out as something to be accounted for. If speakers do not know in advance when a turn is going to end and who is to speak next, it becomes of interest to try and determine what mechanisms are employed to nevertheless create smooth turn transitions.

What we find is that speakers, through the units they choose to construct their turns, project possible points at which the turn will be completed. A listener who wishes to speak can predict when the current speaker will end by analyzing the unit of turn-construction and anticipating the point of completion of that unit, which then becomes a possible completion point for the turn. Transitions from one speaker to the next are usually accomplished at these possible completion points.

To ensure the functioning of the turn-taking mechanism both participants must be actively engaged and focussed on the ongoing interaction. Turn-transition is organized locally, so that at each transition only the immediate "next turn" is allocated. The parties to the conversation negotiate the duration of each turn: the speaker "proposes" a turn-constructive unit; the hearer may "accept" this or may modify the proposal by either starting to speak or passing up the chance to speak at a possible transition place.

The turn-taking system is thus a system that is "locally managed (i.e., turn-by-turn), party-administered (i.e., by them), and interactionally controlled (i.e., any feature being multilaterally shaped)" (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1978:42). That this can happen responds to a general principle of conversational organization which the authors call "recipient design" (p. 43). Speakers construct their turns taking into account who their interlocutor is, and what his knowledge base or competence is, for example. This will lead to establishing or restricting options for word-selection, topics, turn-construction-units, or turn-length.

1.2.2. Sequential Organization

In discussing the organization of interactional discourse, most researchers seem to agree that conversations can be analysed minimally in terms of two-part units which are considered to be the basic unit of interaction: the sequence or exchange (Wells 1985). The units that make up these sequences are related to each other in that the unit that is used to initiate the sequence will restrict the possibilities of what can follow, and will often set up strong expectations that a particular type of unit will follow. This corresponds to what Sacks and Schegloff have termed "adjacency pair organization" (Schegloff and Sacks 1973).

Schegloff and Sacks characterize the adjacency pair as a type of organizational mechanism used in conversation wherever the close-ordering of types of utterances is desired. They are sequences of utterances which have the following structure: a) they are two utterances in length, b) these two utterances are adjacently positioned, c) different speakers perform each utterance. In addition, these two utterances show a certain "relatedness" to each other beyond that which may spring from the fact of being adjacent to each other. The relatedness is seen from the operation of a typology in which the first utterance is seen as belonging to a certain pair-type and being the first-pair-part of that pair-type. The use of a first-pair-part in conversation sets up the strong expectation that a second-pair-part will follow.

A basic rule of adjacency pair operation is: given the recognizable production of a first pair part, on its first possible completion its speaker should stop and a next speaker should start and produce a second pair part from the pair type the first is recognizably a member of. (Schegloff and Sacks 1973:296)

Pomerantz (1978) in her definition of "action chains" modifies the way in which members of a pair should be seen relative to each other:

An action chain may be characterized as a type of organization in which two ordered actions, Action1 and Action2, are linked such that the performing of A1 provides the possibility of performance of

A2 as an appropriate next action. (Pomerantz 1978:82)

An essential difference between these two definitions is in the obligatoriness of a second pair part following from the first pair part. Pomerantz says that the production of the second pair part is not a must but a may. That is, the first pair part opens up the possibility of a second pair part being used, which is "an option among several specifiable options", and there is some evidence to suggest that at least some of these options may be preferentially ordered with respect to each other (Pomerantz 1978:109-110, fn6).

An additional point that Pomerantz mentions in this footnote will be of importance for the methodological procedures used in identifying units of analysis. She states that often it is on the basis of a second pair part having been chosen, that is, of a certain option having been taken, that the previous turn can be identified as a first pair part of that particular pair type: "In part, it is in the performing of the second that a prior becomes treated (formulated) as one or another first action which is linked with that given second." (Pomerantz 1978:110, fn6). This goes back to the discussion that Sacks and Schegloff initiate about why certain types of conversational structures seem to require adjacency pair organization:

But, it may be wondered, why are two utterances required for either opening or closing? ... What two utterances, produced by different speakers, can do that one utterance cannot do is: by an adjacently positioned second, a speaker can show that he understood what a prior aimed at, and that he is willing to go along with that. Also, by virtue of the occurrence of an adjacently produced second, the doer of a first can see that what he intended was indeed understood, and that it was or was not accepted. Also, of course, a second can assert his failure to understand, or disagreement, and, inspection of a second by a first can allow the first speaker to see that while the second thought he understood, indeed he misunderstood. It is then through the use of adjacent positioning that appreciations, failures, correctings, et cetera can be themselves understandably attempted. (Schegloff and Sacks 1973:297-8)

As can be seen from this quote, the type of organization imposed by structures such as adjacency pairs or action chains plays an important role in maintaining the interaction by displaying what each party is understanding, thus allowing the possibility of corrections or repairs being initiated if they are needed. I will return to this in the discussion of repairs at various points in the development of the thesis.

1.2.3. Interpretive Principles

Grice (1975) discusses some of the principled ways by which participants derive meaning from conversation. These are subsumed under what has become known as the Cooperative Principle and the set of conversational maxims that spring from it.

Grice holds that speakers who interact assume that the interaction is a cooperative effort in which both participants have at least some common goals, one of which would be accomplishing the interaction. Given this initial assumption, each participant will assume subsequently that the other's actions at any given point will respond to what is needed at that given point to continue the cooperative effort.

Grice states this assumption in the form of a principle said to underlie communicative interaction:

Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged. (Grice 1975:45)

From this principle of cooperation four conversational maxims are derived:

-Quantity: the speaker will give as much information and no more information than is required.

-Quality: the speaker will not give false or unsupported information.

-Relation: the speaker's contribution will be relevant to the preceding talk.

-Manner: the speaker will present his contribution in ways that will maximize understanding by

avoiding ambiguity, circumlocution, and verbosity,
and by being brief and being orderly.

These principles, or principles like these, are said to underlie conversation such that a speaker in planning his turn takes these principles into account, and a listener attempting to understand his interlocutor's turn also keeps principles like these in mind to carry out an interpretation.

Large portions of text in conversation can be analyzed as adhering to these maxims. However, there are also segments of text in which one of the speakers appears to ignore or have flouted the maxims and his contribution seems irrelevant, ambiguous or opaque. Grice sustains that conversationalists, even in these cases, act on the assumption that the cooperative principle is being maintained. Faced with an apparent irrelevancy, a listener will ask himself what additional assumptions need to be made if the utterance were to be seen as relevant. These additional assumptions, conversational implicatures, are the set of inferences made by a listener from a previous speaker's turn, going under the assumption that cooperation is being maintained.

In Chapter I, when discussing adult-child interaction, it was stated that the mother acted as if her interactions with the child were regular communicative interactions, and

this had two implications. The first is that the mother will organize and structure her participation in the interaction following conversational conventions, since she is a communicatively competent speaker. The second implication is that the mother will act as if she believed that her child is also actively engaged in a cooperative communicative effort and will respond to actions or vocalizations by the child as if they had communicative intention. The examination of the various organizational features of conversation allows us to see some of the specific things that the mother can do to structure and interpret an interaction with her child as a communicative interaction.

The mother shows how turn-taking is to be carried out by combining moments of talk with moments of silence and interpreting any activity by the child, while the mother is being silent, as an instance of a turn. The content of that turn is interpreted by applying conventions such as Grice's conversational maxims, so that the child's intervention will be assumed to be responding to previous features of talk or of the context and to be relevant to those features. If the child vocalizes and says [a:] following the mother's introducing or displaying some new object, the mother might respond with something like "You like that, eh?" or "Yes, that's your ducky". She would in these turns display that

she assumes that the child is intending to communicate and that his "utterance" follows some of the conventions that conversationalists normally follow such as, for example, that salient aspects of the context are talked about, that introducing a new object makes that object a salient aspect of the context, and that a new object must be talked about the moment that it is first noticed by a participant (Sacks 1973 lecture notes). If the child says [a:] following a turn by the mother, the mother would probably interpret this as a comment or response to her turn; that is, as a second pair part following upon her first one, because that is what would be relevant at that time. In this way, the mechanisms of adult conversation are presented and used over and over, at first under the mother's control and later co-managed by both participants.

2. APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF CONVERSATIONAL INTERACTION

In this section I will discuss various approaches to the study of conversation and some of the theoretical and methodological issues that arise from each approach, and will relate the issues discussed to the particular methodological problems addressed in this thesis.

The study of verbal interaction did not develop in a unified manner. There have been anthropological,

sociological, philosophical and linguistic approaches to the study of "speech events", "conversation" and "discourse". Each approach has examined the data from the theoretical and methodological perspective of each particular discipline. Specifically, there have been differences in the initial questions that each discipline tried to address through the study of speech events and discourse organization, which have had an effect not only on the final analysis but also on observational procedures and data selection.

Linguists, for example, have asked whether units of structure can be identified beyond the sentence level. If so, what are these units: paragraphs, narratives, or texts? How are the sentences that make up these larger units linked together? What would distinguish the unit as such from a collection of smaller units such as sentences? Are the units identified part of the speaker's native linguistic competence and can a speaker's intuitions be used to resolve problems of structure?

Philosophers have confronted problems of language use through their interest in resolving problems of meaning. They have asked what is the relationship between the words that a speaker issues and the meaning that is imparted? What is the relationship between the logical meaning of utterances and a speaker's meaning when using one of these utterances?

Can one form have more than one meaning? What role do speaker's intentions play in the identification of meaning in the language used?

Anthropologists have been interested in studying the rules and norms that govern speech events as elements of culture. There has been particular emphasis placed on highly formal, ritualized speech events which are "significant" in the culture. They have been interested in what these events are. How do they intersect with other elements of culture such as participant statuses or roles, for example? What function and significance does the event have for the group? How is the event structured?

Sociologists have been interested in discussing the methods and procedures that members use for organizing their life and how they make these explicit in and through the use of speech. Verbal interaction is studied to gain evidence of members' formulating practices and procedures for social events but since talk is one of these events itself it becomes an object of study in its own right. Sociologists are also interested in what evidence of socialization practices can be obtained from analyzing the use of language.

This list of questions is not meant to be exhaustive, but illustrative of different concerns which may guide the methods of analysis and the direction that the analysis

itself takes. In the sections that follow, I will examine different analytical models and discuss what features in each and what questions raised by the researcher, or raised by the model proposed, have oriented this research.

2.1. An Anthropological Approach: The Ethnography of Speaking

The "ethnography of speaking" (Hymes 1972, 1974; Gumperz and Hymes 1972; Duranti 1988) studies the use of language in social situations encountered in everyday life within a speech community. Language is seen as the locus for transmission of cultural patterns and socialization (Duranti 1988). According to Duranti, through the use of language members of a community establish social identities and relationships, or challenge assumed ones. Language is used to explain why the world is organized as it is. Language is used to frame or bracket activities, and define them as various types of events. Language is also used for establishing or breaking social barriers of different types (p. 213).

The speech community has been defined as a group who share at least one language or language variety and a set of norms for interaction and interpretation (Gumperz 1972; Hymes 1972, 1974).

Within the daily life of the community social situations are regulated or organized by the activity of speaking.

The unit of analysis for this approach is the speech event, defined as a bounded social event through which members of a community accomplish some goal or end.

The speech event can be described by identifying and describing its components. Hymes (1974) presents a listing of several components which ought to be studied.¹ These are the physical setting of an interaction, the social situation that is being developed and particulars about the scene, which includes social and psychological definitions of the context. The description should include the numbers of participants and their roles in the interaction, as well as descriptions of their social identities relative to each other. It should also describe the ends which are hoped to achieve through the event. A distinction should be made between societal ends or goals and an individual's ends. The activity which is carried out can be described as a series of acts organized in act sequences. The activity will be carried out in a certain key, which refers to social definitions of the tenor of the interaction as serious, joking, playful, for example. Finally, the analysis should

¹Hymes uses the term SPEAKING as an acronym in which each letter represents one of these components. I will follow this order of presentation.

include a description of the instrumentalities (languages, language varieties, channels) used by the speakers, of norms for interaction and interpretation and of the genres to which the speech event, or the acts included in it, might belong.

2.2. An Ethnomethodological Approach: Conversation Analysis

In the discussion of conversational organization at the beginning of this chapter, many of the basic premises underlying the ethnomethodological approach to conversation have been presented. Conversation is verbal interaction which is organized by several structuring principles such as the turn-taking system. There may be particular culture-specific characteristics of these systems, but it is posited that all will be "locally managed, party administered and interactionally controlled" (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974:727).

This approach derives from the work of Goffman for analyzing interaction (Goffman 1967, 1971), and ethnomethodological principles outlined by Garfinkel and others (Garfinkel 1967) for understanding everyday events. A basic premise is that the analyst should approach the study of interaction with the goal of uncovering the methods that participants use to produce and interpret ongoing activity. This has the corollary that the analysts should not attempt

to impose preconceived analytical categories on the data but should use only categories that arise from the analysis and are validated by the data. An important guiding principle for the analysis is that participants will display to each other relevant features of the context which are to be taken into account when interpreting the talk or saying what an utterance should count as.

All aspects of the interaction are attended to; not only talk but gaze, facial expression, gestures, body posture and movements, use of space, and, possibly, use of other semiotic systems, dress for example. Data consists of very detailed transcriptions of what actually occurred and is presented in such a way as to render it as faithfully as possible without attempting to impose upon the data preconceived ideas of clause or sentence structure.

This approach rejects the speaker bias found in most linguistic approaches. Both participants should be seen as interacting co-occurently in complementary roles relative to each other, so the assumption by one of the role of listener, for example, might lead to the assumption by the other of the role of speaker. The linguist's interest in determining speaker intentions for the analysis of meaning is discarded and it is assumed that meanings will be displayed and

negotiated through the interaction so that the final event that emerges will be a co-constructed product.

2.3. Philosophical Approaches

As was mentioned previously, philosophers have approached the use of language through their interest in resolving problems of meaning. Discussions have centered on the characterization of the illocutionary or speech act (Austin 1962; Searle 1969, 1975) and how to distinguish between the propositional meaning of an utterance and the speaker's meaning when uttering it. Searle's work in this area has been particularly influential in linguistics, as will be shown below when describing various linguistic approaches to verbal interaction. In addition, the research will draw on work on conversation by the philosopher H.P. Grice, which expands or touches upon areas unresolved by Searle's speech act theory. The main aspects of this work relative to the present study have been mentioned above in the discussion of the cooperative principle. It will be assumed that some principle like the cooperative principle and the maxims that derive from it can be used to explain much of the verbal activity of the participants during interaction.

2.4. Linguistic Approaches: Discourse Analysis

Whereas social approaches speak of analyzing verbal interaction, speech events or conversation, linguistic approaches generally refer to the analysis of text or discourse when referring to the analysis of verbal units that transcend sentence boundaries. Most discourse analysis models take conversation as the basic type of dialogic discourse.

2.4.1. A Structural Approach

There have been numerous attempts to apply structural principles to the analysis of dialogic discourse and derive systems in which each unit is defined by reference to its constituent structure and its ability to occur in higher level units (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975; Coulthard 1977; Coulthard and Brazil 1981; Edmondson 1981; Wells 1985). The model proposed by Edmondson (1981) will be used to exemplify a structural approach to conversation. This model was chosen because of the degree of detail at which the various structures are presented, and because in developing this particular model he has taken into account problems encountered in similar previous models such as the one developed by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975).

Edmondson presents a five-level hierarchical system in which each category is made up of units from the rank below.

The highest level unit, the Encounter, is made up of a number of Phases. Each phase is composed of one or more Exchanges. These, in turn, are made up of Moves which are made manifest by Communicative Acts. Each structural unit will be examined with respect to the structural composition of the category, its classification into different types, the function of each and the criteria used for their identification.

Encounters and phases: These higher-level units are not really discussed in the model. Encounters are social interactions that members of a group engage in for a variety of purposes. The model is designed for the analysis of a particular subset of encounters defined as verbal or conversational. An ethnographic study of a community might reveal different types of encounters. These would be characterized by elements outside the system, having to do with social rather than linguistic aspects of the situation, although possibly some of the intermediate level structures in the model might display sensitivity to higher levels. However, there is no attempt to establish a typology of encounters (or speech events).

Encounters are made up of phases of which you could expect to find a Business phase in which the main order of

business of the encounter is carried out, and greeting (Ave) and leavetaking (Vale) phases, which open up and close the speech event.

Phases are made up of exchanges. The number of exchanges possible in a phase is indeterminate. Each phase contains an obligatory Head exchange, and may contain one or more subordinate exchanges.

Exchanges: The exchange is a potentially closed sequence of verbal acts that produces outcome, meaning that when the exchange is completed, speakers have closed the matter at hand and may then proceed to other business. The exchange is composed minimally of two interactional moves. It is considered by Edmondson and others (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975; Wells 1985) to be the central unit in interactional structure.

In addition to the main or Head exchange, there are three optional subordinate exchanges characterized by their structural placement relative to the Head exchange: Pre-Head exchanges, Post-Head exchanges and Pre-responding exchanges. Pre-Head exchanges are similar to what the ethnomethodologists call pre-sequences (Schegloff 1980). These serve to anticipate the speaker's purpose, and, in some cases, to allow the hearer a way out before the speaker

commits himself with some act or other. In other cases, these pre-sequences serve to forestall objections to or rejections of the speaker's subsequent moves. Post-head exchanges, according to Edmondson, serve to firm up the agreement or outcome that was reached during the exchange. If speakers feel that they were hasty in closing the exchange, matters may be reopened at this point. Pre-responding exchanges interrupt an exchange before its completion. Pre-responding exchanges are inserted into exchanges and usually carry out clarificatory or other kind of work needed in order to finish the exchange. Pre-responding exchanges include what other researchers have called "side-sequences" (Jefferson 1972), "contingent queries" (Garvey 1977, 1979), or "clarification sequences" (Cherry 1979, Christian 1980, Christian and Tripp 1978), and many of the other-repairs initiated by clarification questions would fall into this group. These three types of exchanges would be subordinately linked to the main Head exchange.

Exchanges are made up of moves. Minimally, you must have an initiating move, which Edmondson calls the Proffer, which begins some order of business and a subsequent move related to the first which brings this order of business to completion. Edmondson calls this the Satisfy move. It is at

the level of move within the exchange that turn-taking takes place. Additional non-obligatory moves are: Primes, Counters, Contras, Rejects, and Reruns and Supportive moves. Moves and their structure are discussed below.

Moves: The obligatory moves are defined with respect to Exchange structure. Optional moves are defined with respect to other moves, in particular the Proffer. The complete inventory of moves is the following: Proffer, Satisfy, Contra, Counter, Prime, Reject and Re-run. Supportive moves: Expander, Disarmer and Grounder.

The Proffer is an initiatory move which begins the exchange setting up the expectation of something to complete it. It expresses the speaker's purpose for initiating the exchange, through the use of some illocutionary act.

The Satisfy move completes the exchange by having the interlocutor act in a manner consistent with the first speaker's purpose. The Satisfy move indicates to the first speaker that his perlocutionary intent has been successful. Through the Satisfy move the exchange is completed and an outcome is reached. This implies that a Proffer must in some way indicate what would count as a satisfying response to it and a speaker that produces a Satisfy does so knowing that it counts as satisfying the Proffer.

Other systems speak of Initiations and Responses for much the same thing (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975). Edmondson discards the term Response as being too vague. Not all Responses will be instances of a Satisfy move. There are additional possible responses to a Proffer which in some way reject it. These are Counters (which attempt to have the Proffer amended), Contras (which attempt to have the Proffer withdrawn) and Rejects (which reject the validity as a communicative act of the previous move).

The Proffer and some response to it would be the basic moves in an Exchange. In addition there may be other moves. Re-run moves are made upon inappropriate uptake, when the original speaker realizes that his original move is insufficient in some respect, or that it has been misunderstood or misconstrued. The re-run substitutes for the original move and cancels it and all moves arising from it. A Prime is an initial move that elicits a following Proffer. It requests a speech act but is unspecific as to content. Finally, there are three additional moves which are not independent; they are moves which support other moves. These are: Grounders, Expanders and Disarmers. Grounders give reasons or justifications for why a certain move is being done. Expanders give additional information after a move and Disarmers anticipate possible objections or

rejections of an act and try to nullify them before they are done. These secondary moves are seen to stem from speakers' strategies for carrying out the interaction and may be related to face-saving strategies for speakers.

Moves are made up of Communicative Acts. Again, at the level of the act Edmondson differs from other proposals. He makes a distinction between what he calls the interactional act that is carried out and the illocutionary act. He argues that previous models have fallen short of giving an adequate account of the act. The ethnomethodologists are primarily interested in what is done through acts. They see acts as they function interactionally but pay little or no attention with respect to what is being said as such. Units are ill-defined and the recognition of a token as an instance of some type of discourse unit is largely left to intuition. "The central interest is not on what is said, but on what is done in interactional terms. What is said is assumed to be transparent, and intuitively interpretable as a means of interaction." (1981:50). On the other hand, most "linguistic" analyses also fall short, concentrating on characterizing locutionary or illocutionary aspects of the act but not what it does interactionally.

What Edmondson proposes is that at the level of the act a distinction ought to be made between the illocutionary and

the interactional aspects of the speaker's utterance. The acts that are carried out have to be attended to both as actions that respond to the ongoing dynamics of the encounter and are interactionally managed or negotiated, and as locutions with an illocutionary value. For Edmondson, previous models have neglected one or the other aspect of these acts or have assumed a distinction implicitly without expounding on it or following up on the implications of such a distinction.

Communicative Acts: Interactional acts are slots which are then filled by locutions with an illocutionary value. Three types of interactional acts can enter into a move: an Uptaker, which indicates that the previous act has been attended to; a Head act, the main act that is being carried out by the move; and an Appealer, which seeks uptake from the next speaker. Each of these interactional slots is filled by elements from the Illocutionary Act inventory, of which twenty-six different acts are described. Thus "accepting", "agreeing", "contradicting" and "complying" would be interactional acts since they have to be defined in relation to other acts in the conversation. "Requesting", "Claiming", "Opining" or "Complaining" are examples of illocutionary acts which are "made via a locutionary act consisting of a

locutionary force marker and a propositional act, which together constitute the logical sense of the utterance" (Edmondson 1981:137).

These different structural units comprise the underlying discourse structure which is acquired by the child as he develops communicative competence. Underlying structure is an interactional structure which must be viewed independently of the illocutionary acts which realize it in any given conversational event. However, interactional structure may be modified on the surface through the use of strategies for getting a point across or achieving a discourse goal. Following is his definition of strategy:

By a conversational strategy we wish to denote the manipulation of interactional structures in conversational behaviour, in the interests of achieving conversational goals...hearers use interpretive strategies as much as speakers behave strategically, and thus conventionalisation occurs, such that what we shall term a strategy may be generally recognized as such inside a particular language community. (p.115)

Speaker strategy may result in re-ordering of deep structure elements, for example, by the manipulation of turn-taking mechanisms in order to retain or evade a turn at talk, and also it may result in what Edmondson calls the "strategic anticipation" of a hearer response. A speaker anticipating an objection to his initiation may add what Edmondson calls "supportive moves", additional information,

explanations, and recognition of problems. This concept of strategic anticipation also allows Edmondson to posit tacit or implicit moves; i.e., a speaker may assume by anticipation that a certain reply is forthcoming from his interlocutor and may proceed as if that reply had indeed been made. This type of anticipatory strategy is especially prevalent in highly ritualized sequences

In addition to deep and surface structure, Edmondson talks of the surface "texture" of conversation which is determined by other conversational procedures such as "fumbling", "overlapping", "re-ordering" and by the insertion of interspersed sequences irrelevant to the matter at hand. Fumbles are "elements of verbal communicative activity" (p.81, 153-55) which have metacommunicative functions and are used to enable the discourse, to assure that it will be interpreted as the speaker intended it to be. They help to further the speaker's conversational goals by plugging gaps, gaining speaker time, indicating the start of sections of talk, or underscoring how something is to be taken. Examples would be various interjections, lexical items such as "Well" or "Now", often used as Starters, phrases as "Let me tell you" or "The point is..." or "See what I mean?", among others. Overlaps intervene in the texture by making repairs or reiterations necessary. At the same time, they allow

speakers to disregard elements for which no appropriate uptake can be given. Reorderings through the implementation of speaker strategies also result in texture modifications. Finally, interspersed sequences which are in some ways interruptions of the ongoing discourse also affect the texture.

In summary, interactional structure defines the possible structural configurations; speakers' anticipatory strategies account for the actual occurrence of talk; and in addition there are surface elements such as fumbles which result in the final discourse "texture".

From the number of elements listed and the possible combinations available it is apparent that the system of analysis proposed is an extremely complex one. It is made even more so by allowing some of these moves to be implicit and tacitly assumed in "deep structure" although they may have no overt realization. The description thus becomes unfalsifiable since if some surface reordering does not match what the system proposes one can assume that this is a "surface" phenomenon resulting from strategic considerations.

At the level of illocution there are some problems in definition which are important because they point very clearly to a theoretical-methodological problem for discourse analysis which has not been adequately resolved. Edmondson

fluctuates between a speaker and a hearer-based interpretation of the illocutionary act. Thus we find the following definition: "An illocutionary act communicates a speaker's beliefs, feelings, attitudes and opinions with respect to a specific event or state of affairs" (Edmondson 1981:137). Speakers have as part of their competence a set of illocutionary acts with specific definitions and constraints on their possibilities of occurrence. This set of acts and their definitions are "independent of their placing in discourse structure" (p. 137). However, Edmondson also has a hearer-based definition from which he derives the notion of conditional or sequential relevance:

...the response a speech act produces may in part at least determine what it is, or at least what it may be held to count as in an ongoing conversation. For the purposes of identifying utterances as particular moves in an interactional sequence, it is therefore relevant to consider the notion of sequential relevance, rather than to place the stress on unobservable intentional states. (p.44)

In the identification/interpretation of acts, interactional structure is taken as given and it is against his knowledge of what a speaker might be doing that a hearer interprets what is said. An utterance is said to "count as" an instance of one or another of these acts on the basis of the locutionary form of the utterance, knowledge of rules or

constraints on illocutionary acts and by using sequential or conditional relevance.

There are two ways in which sequential or conditional relevance is used in interpretative strategies: an act sets up an expectation of what is to follow, eliminating certain possibilities of occurrence and in some cases setting up strong expectations of a particular following act. A hearer then interprets the following utterance using in part this knowledge of what is "required" interactionally. However, conditional relevance may also be used a different way, in the opposite direction, so to speak, to interpret in the light of what follows what the initiating utterance is said to count as. Edmondson calls the first strategy the Sequence rule for interpretation and the second strategy is called the Effect rule. In his discussion of these rules he shows that at times two alternative analyses may be possible depending on which of the interpreting strategies is applied. Following is his example.

- A. Can you do a handstand?
- B. (Does handstand) (Fabricated data, p.49)

If we apply the sequence rule to the exchange above, we would say that utterance A is a Question therefore B ought to count as an Answer, the expected response following a Question. On the other hand, the Effect rule would say that B is a Compliance, therefore A ought to count as a Request.

Edmondson holds that both interpretations are possible and we may not be in a position to choose between these alternative analyses (p.50). In case of conflict, he proposes a "hearer-knows-best" principle, since the hearer's interpretation determines what the utterance counts as at that particular point in the discourse. Of course there is the possibility of misinterpreting, so that what the hearer interprets may not be what the speaker meant. If the mismatch is serious, the original speaker will probably correct the "wrong" interpretation. What is stressed however is that only one value or force should be assigned per act. If the force is opaque, this may be a result of "strategic indeterminacy" on the part of the speaker, which would motivate his using an ambiguous or non-direct act in the first place.

2.4.2. A Rich Interpretation Approach: Labov and Fanshel (1977)

Labov and Fanshel are not satisfied with what to them is a trend in the analysis of conversation of looking for the smallest units before going on to larger units. From observing that the parties to conversations seem to react to speech acts at many different levels of abstraction, they realized that there was a great deal of activity going on

which was not verbal at all. There are implicit communications in paralinguistic cues and other vocal gestures, such as hesitation phenomena for example. There is additional implicit communication in the form of social and psychological propositions which are addressed in the discourse. In addition, most utterances can be seen to be performing several functions at the same time. Labov and Fanshel suggest that conversations should not be studied so much as a sequential chain of utterances "but rather as a matrix of utterances and actions bound together by a web of understandings and reactions" (p.30).

There is in conversation a many-layered hierarchical organization, but for these researchers conversation should not be seen as a linguistic form:

We have come to understand conversation as a means that people use to deal with one another. In conversation, participants use language to interpret to each other the significance of the actual and potential events that surround them and to draw the consequences for their past and future actions. (Labov and Fanshel 1977:30)

Events are, following Hymes (1962): "a routinized form of behavior, delineated by well-defined boundaries and well-defined sets of expected behaviors within those boundaries" (p.30).

Conversation is one type of such contextually situated interaction. Interviews are another type of event and the

therapeutic interview, which is studied by Labov and Fanshel, is a sub-type of the Interview.

The specifics of interviews or of the therapeutic interview are not a concern here. What has to be kept in mind is that particulars of the speech event, e.g., the type of speech event that is perceived as being carried out, the degree of formality of the situation, the relations between the participants, and the setting are all going to influence the language and the type of talk that develops in the conversation.

One type of influence is the creation of distinct fields of discourse within the therapeutic interview, characterized by particular styles. In the therapeutic interview the fields are everyday, neutral, colloquial style (EV). There is also an interview style (IV) marked by special vocabulary, and emphasis on certain topics. Finally there is family style (F) embedded within the other styles, characterized in this particular case by intonational contours and use of familiar or slang expressions as well as marked displays of emotions. Labov and Fanshel suggest that the distinct fields of discourse or styles ought to be seen as concentric frames and that speakers engaged in an interaction can switch frames, expanding or narrowing the focus as it were.

According to Labov and Fanshel, if conversational interaction is going to be seen as "a complex matrix of utterances, propositions and actions", then the matrix will show two kinds of relations: vertical relations between surface structures and deeper actions, linked by rules of interpretation and production; and horizontal sequencing relations between actions and utterances, linked by sequencing rules.

Labov and Fanshel consider that one of the first methodological tasks in analyzing discourse will be that of segmenting the stream of talk into analyzable segments. However, they caution that any such segmentation is likely not to be lasting. It should be considered a preliminary task rather than an outcome or discovery. They consider that most segmentation decisions are necessarily arbitrary, although it is hoped that they are done in as principled a manner as possible. In their study, the interview is divided into five Episodes, identified or segmented on the basis of "radical shifts in the overt topic or reference of the conversation" (p. 38). Some of these episodes show sub-episodes, e.g., a narrative used to illustrate or reinforce the main point in an argument. Within these episodes different speech actions are carried out.

For Labov and Fanshel most utterances represent two or three speech actions, and they see a hierarchical organization where more abstract actions such as orientation, evaluation and control, or decision and tension-management are identified and interpreted through the identification of speech acts such as representations, requestives and meta-linguistic actions.

Meta-linguistic actions have to do with the regulation of speech itself. A speaker may initiate, continue, or end an event. Within an event he may re-direct the conversation, interrupt the other speaker, respond to the other, repeat an utterance, reinforce the other speaker, signal completion of his turn or withdraw from the interaction into silence.

Representations present some state of affairs. These are of two kinds. A-events are those of which the speaker alone can give adequate information; they are what other researchers have called Internal reports. They refer to the speaker's needs, desires, feelings, emotions, sensations, or perceptions. The speaker may impart information about these or express feelings. The hearer's response to these acts is limited to acknowledgement and reinforcement.

Other representations deal with disputable events (D-events). The truth of the proposition cannot be assumed.

The speaker normally acts by asserting some fact. The hearer may

agree with or deny, or support the previous assertion. The speaker may in a subsequent turn contradict something said previously or add support to it.

There are various kinds of requests: action, information, confirmation, agreement, evaluation, interpretation, sympathy, attention, approval. Some may appear in mitigated form such as petitions, pleas and suggestions; while others are unmitigated or even aggravated as commands, orders or demands. There is a greater constraint of conditional relevance on what follows. In response to a request, the other may accede and give X, he may carry out X, he may put off the request or he may refuse the request, with or without an accounting. If the request is complied with, the speaker may acknowledge this. If the request is put off or refused, the speaker may reinstate it, mitigate it, redirect it or retreat. A refusal may lead the speaker to withdraw.

Additional acts are, for example, challenges, which negatively affect the status of the other person, and support which would raise or reinforce the status. A common challenge is to show doubt or question some statement made by the other. In response to a challenge a speaker may defend

himself, often by making a counter-challenge. A person may admit the challenge to be valid with all its consequences. A challenge may also be retreated from, aggravated, or mitigated.

As can be seen, the acts are defined in social, interactional terms. There are no connections between utterances as such. It is actions that demand responses and obligatory sequencing. The form that the utterance takes, and the use of particular linguistic devices, may lead one to interpret a particular action as aggravated or mitigated, though.

What distinguishes this approach from others are some of the methodological procedures used, in particular the procedure for text expansion. The text is expanded by adding to it in explicit propositional form every element from the context which may be seen to be used or appealed to in the text. Different paralinguistic cues such as prosody or hesitations would be expressed as propositions. Hesitations, for example, would be translated as propositions expressing uncertainty such as "I am not sure". The text would also be expanded by providing referents for all pro-forms. In addition, the analyst can use for his interpretation information from other texts, both previous or subsequent to the one being analyzed. This expansion is therefore an

analyst's construction, which is carried out post hoc, often using material not available to the interactants at the moment of interaction. The expansion is a potentially open-ended process, and the analyst will decide when to stop, depending on what his research goals are.

This approach is of particular importance to an analyst working within the framework of therapy who might use the results of analysis to make a diagnosis or recommend a course of action. However, this approach may not allow us to see how interactants interpret and reinterpret each other's actions during the course of the interaction using information mutually displayed at that time to solve problems of understanding or misunderstanding.

2.4.3. An Illocutionary Act Approach

Searle's work on Speech Act Theory has given rise to numerous studies on the pragmatic functions of language. One approach to children's pragmatic competence based on Speech Act Theory is that developed by Dore (Dore 1977, 1978; Dore, Gearhart and Newman 1978).

The model is a "grammatical-illocutionary-
-interactional" model. The conceptual framework includes a grammatical component, such as that formulated by Transformational Grammar, and an illocutionary component such as Searle's Speech Act Theory, but including Grice's

discussion of maxims and implicatures for interpreting non-direct acts. To these is added a turn-taking system such as that developed by the ethnomethodologists and the notion of Frame (Goffman 1975), which works in two ways: the ongoing talk creates the frame and at the same time the frame thus created influences the interpretation of talk (Dore, Gearhart and Newman 1978:355-356).

The model incorporates three components: the text, the task and the interactive methods. It is assumed that the speech encounters that speakers engage in have some extralinguistic purpose; there is something in the social world, a task, to be accomplished through the interaction. Speakers use verbal means, the text, to accomplish the task through interactive transactions.

The task consists of the socially negotiated and mutually constructed activities which comprise the "frame" in which the text may be interpreted. Tasks can be described in terms of components, of which the principal ones are the participants, the ecological location, the schedule and the procedure. Particularities of the task may affect the type of interaction which can ensue. For example, within the school setting studied by Dore, sitting at a table where children can face each other allows for certain kinds of

interaction different from when children are in Circle or in line or sitting one behind the other.

Tasks are determined by various aspects of the ongoing social situation. For example, in the school setting, curriculum goals may determine a task. A main task may involve several sub-tasks or lower-level activities. A drawing task may involve the sub-tasks of clearing the table, getting paper and pencils, and sharpening pencils. Each task may, in addition, involve several sequential phases, such as the setting up or arrangement, the accomplishment phase, during which the task is carried out and a finish phase. (p.343)

Each participant has a plan relative to the task, which is that individual participant's cognitive construction of the task at hand. Lower level plans are guided by higher-level plans in a hierarchical organization.

Tasks are accomplished through transactions, which are sequences of verbal negotiations which partially accomplish the task. These verbal sequences constitute the carrying out of the activities included in the plan or they may be formulations which display or index the task (metaTask talk).

The talk used in the transactions constitutes the text:

Grammatical forms are chosen to accomplish an interactional purpose via the participants' recognition of the operative illocutionary phenomena (p.341)

Each utterance expresses a Conversational Act (C-act) which consists of a content in propositional form, a grammatical structure, including semantic presuppositions and an illocutionary function. With respect to function, a distinction is set up between the illocutionary effect of an act (that a hearer understand and recognize the illocutionary act) from the Intended Perlocutionary Effect (that a hearer carry out the expected response to the act), following Mohan (1974).

The principal classes of acts discussed are assertives (report facts, state rules, convey attitudes); requestives (solicit actions or information); responsives (supply solicited information or acknowledge remarks); regulatives (control personal contact and conversational flow); expressives (non-propositionally convey attitudes or repeat others); performatives (accomplish actions by being said, e.g., protest, claim, joke, warn, tease).

Acts occur in a conversational sequence, which is defined as a series of related speech acts which share a topic and which accomplish some interactional purpose.

Finally, the lowest level of social interaction achieved by conversation is the turn-taking system.

In this discussion, as in others, the main points discussed are how speakers identify or interpret the

illocutions in each other's utterances. Towards this end, one of Dore et al's goals for future work is to be able to formulate sociolinguistic discourse rules of the form: Utterance U counts as illocutionary act IA in context C. At the moment, however, researchers have to employ a decision procedure based on a variety of interpretive criteria, such as the following (Dore 1977), which, we can observe, might also be used by participants in choosing their own interventions and interpreting the actions of the other:

1. The literal semantic reading of the primary proposition of the utterance, on the basis of its logical subject, predicate, adverbial phrases and other constituents (according to Katz 1972).
2. The grammatical and prosodic operators on the proposition.
3. The new, or focused, information; new in relation to both conversation and context (Halliday 1970b).
4. The speaker's related utterances and nonlinguistic behavior.
5. The reciprocal and contingent behavior, both verbal and nonverbal, of his interlocutors (Garvey 1975).
6. The contextual features directly relevant to the pragmatic status of the utterance (Lewis 1972). (Dore 1977:143)

3. TOWARDS A MODEL FOR THE ANALYSIS OF CONVERSATION

Cicourel (1980) observes that discourse is part of a complex, multilevel, not always integrated setting. It has been approached in many different ways, from many different perspectives. A goal for people working on discourse analysis research would be to integrate useful aspects of

competing models, to attempt to give a view of all the complexity involved. However, some selection must be made from among the "competing" types of analysis. This selection and the reasons for making it should be made explicit, and the accounts should also include the principled decisions that the analyst made both for obtaining and then analyzing data, as Cicourel 1980 says,

The researcher must use his or her knowledge of the world as a resource for interpreting discourse and textual materials. An account of the way a data-driven analysis is accomplished would help us create a larger context for clarifying how actual materials in a data base are augmented by the way the researcher links them to other sources of information. (Cicourel 1980:127).

The discussion which follows, as well as the exposition of methodological assumptions and procedures in Chapter III, aims at providing such an account

The models presented make numerous similar observations regarding the facts to be accounted for and the level of description that a coherent model will have to attain. They also are very dissimilar in the means selected for carrying out the analysis of verbal interaction. Usually, it is the differences between models which are remarked upon. However, it is important to also discuss the similarities between them and draw from these the guidelines and procedures which will be used in this analysis.

So far, no complete integrated model for the analysis of verbal interaction has been formulated. Therefore, from the different approaches discussed I would like to draw an outline of the types of components that such a model should include, basing this on the different phenomena that have been presented above.

Every one of the approaches presented indicates that the analysis of verbal interaction should be backed up by ethnographic descriptions to situate the event or activity being analyzed within the context of the speech community. Dore's "school tasks", Labov and Fanshel's "therapeutic interviews", Edmondson's "encounter" all refer back to the notion of "social situations" (Hymes 1972) located in particular settings and institutions within a community or group. Among the tasks of an ethnographic description would be to situate an activity or event to be described with respect to all the other possible events in a given institutional context, and to describe the repertoire of roles available to participants within a setting, and the repertoire of norms for interaction and interpretation that members of a specific community or group may draw upon. In addition, an ethnographic description would give the particulars (e.g., setting, participants, tasks, goals or

plans, instrumentalities) of the event at hand (Hymes 1972, 1974).

In the present study, the importance of a full ethnographic description is recognized. However, time limitations have limited description to a rough ethnographic sketch which provides a background for the analysis of repair exchanges. In this sketch many concepts and categories are taken for granted e.g., "mother" and "child", "play situation" and "teaching situation". A brief description of setting, activities and participants is given in Chapter III. A preliminary examination of different types of situations shows that the frequency of use of specific language forms will vary with respect to particularities of the situation. However, at this point, I have not attempted to examine this more fully.

It will be assumed, as proposed by the ethnomethodologists, that participants' ways of organizing and constructing their environments and relevant contextual features that participants are attending to, will be displayed in the data. Therefore, in the transcripts there will be continuous evidence of how participants define "play situations" and how they go about being "the mother". Any evidence which is used to explain what is going on in a

particular excerpt will have to be based on what occurs in the transcripts.

With respect to interpretation of what is being done, it will be assumed that speaker intentions are not open for inspection. Therefore, hearers will use different interpretive mechanisms to derive what is meant by what is said. An utterance will be interpreted as an instance of one or another verbal act on the basis of the locutionary form of the utterance, knowledge of rules or constraints on illocutionary acts and by using knowledge of sequencing rules (Labov and Fanshel 1977) or conditional relevance (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974; Edmondson 1981) or by using their knowledge of the operation of cultural norms for interaction and interpretation (Hymes 1972), or of more general conversational principles such as those proposed by Grice (1975).

As has been mentioned previously, there have been several alternative proposals to account for how hearers might select an interpretation. In the same way that the speaker's mind is not open for inspection neither is the hearer's. One can only speculate as to what mechanisms he uses to interpret an utterance. It will be assumed that either through conditional relevance or through an inferential process, or both, the hearer arrives at an

interpretation. In his subsequent turn he will display in some form the results of that interpretation which will again be subject to interpretation in a continuous process of meaning negotiation.

I agree with ethnomethodologists that an optimal analysis of social interaction would attend to all features of the interaction, both verbal and non-verbal. However, limitations of the present data restrict the analysis strictly to the verbal aspects of interaction. The transcripts on which the analysis is based have been made with rigorous attention to the recommendations of conversational analysts regarding transcribing what was said, as faithfully as possible, without editing or interpretations.

After reviewing the various approaches presented for the study of discourse it would seem that a discourse model would need to have several components. Some of these could be analyzed as being in a hierarchical relation to each other, but others seems to be parallel. This will be taken up in the discussion that follows.

One possible component is a conversational one. The units of analysis of this component would be turns at talk. A system such as the turn-taking system developed by Sacks,

Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) would be needed to explain transfer of turns between speakers in a conversation.

In addition, there needs to be a structural organization component in which units such as "exchange" and "move" are described relative to each other. Within this component, an utterance would be analyzed as "initiating" an exchange or "responding" to an initiation.

To describe what people actually do within these initiations and responses we need to resort to two components. I will go along with Edmondson in calling these "interactional" and "illocutionary". The interactional component would refer to actions such as "reinstating" , "continuing", "acknowledging", "agreeing with" or "rejecting", for example, to use many of the observations made by Labov and Fanshel. The actions would be defined with respect to what an utterance is doing relative to other utterances in the conversation and particularly to those in the same exchange. Thus an initiation might be seen as a "reinstatement" if it had been attempted previously. A response might be seen as an "agreement with" or as a "rejection" of a previous utterance, for example. In addition, at some level we need to describe what the act is in itself. This will be part of the "illocutionary component". The units here will be speech acts as defined by Speech Act Theory

(Searle 1975). These would be identified on the basis of grammatical form, conventions, and the occurrence of particular marking devices (Dore 1977; Dore et al 1978). Examples of units at this level would be "assertions", "requests" and "expressives".

The following examples can be used to illustrate the use of these terms:

1.

a.K. miya e piyito!	a.K. look the hair!
b.M. el pelito.	b.M. the hair.

2.

K. miya!	K. look!
a.K. miya miya!	a.K. look look!
b.M. a ver?	b.M. let's see.

3.

a.K. miya e(l) ten.	a.K. look the train.
b.M. ése no es el tren.	b.M. that's not the train.

With respect to the conversational component, the (a) and (b) utterances in each example constitute two successive turns. With respect to structural organization, (1), (2), and (3) are instances of exchanges composed of two moves, an Initiating move at (a) and a Response at (b). The turn (2a) would be a reinstated initiation.² At the interactional level, both (1b) and (2b) might be considered acknowledgements of the initiation; (3b) would be a

²We could speak of original initiations to contrast with reinstated ones.

rejection.³ At the illocutionary level, all the (a) utterances would count as requests, (1b) and (3b) are statements⁴ while (2b) is a request. Thus, (3b) is an instance of M's turn, it is a responding move within an exchange which acknowledges a prior initiation and its force is that of a statement. In the course of the present description, one or another of these aspects of what an utterance like (2b) is, may become more relevant to the discussion.

It will be noted here that some of the terms by which the data is referred to, such as acknowledgements or agreement, have not as yet been fully defined within linguistic, discourse or conversation theory. To a large extent they will be "common-sense, not technical categories"; this was one of the objections raised by Edmondson to Searle's speech act categories (Edmondson 1981) and also to some of the acts mentioned by Labov and Fanshel. In Chapter III, I will define, as rigorously as our current state of

³An additional problem would be distinguishing between a rejection of the initiation or a rejection of the truth of a proposition, for example. At this point, the discussion is simply being used as an illustration of what is needed; the terms are not being defined.

⁴(1b) is considered a statement on the basis of its intonation contour. Here we can see an additional complication though: when dealing with sentence fragments, how much can be validly reconstructed? Ellipsis is not the answer; at least, not for this example.

knowledge allows, various categories that will be used in the analysis. If, however, in the discussion of examples other terms that have not been so defined are used, these should be understood as descriptive labels and not as analytical terms.

4. THE PLACE OF REPAIRS WITHIN CONVERSATION

In all of the models formulated for the analysis of verbal interaction discussed above, there are references to the need for inclusion of a component which will deal with problems in the system. This set of devices, which I call repair mechanisms, will be the focus of study in this thesis.

Most of the initial studies of repairs come not from linguists but from conversation analysts (Jefferson 1975, Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974, Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977, Schegloff 1979). In what follows I will present the main observations about repairs drawn from the works of these authors.

First, they make a distinction between conversational repair and error correction. Not all repairs are due to errors and not all repairs are corrections. With respect to the first distinction, it is assumed that repairs are initiated in response to a problem or trouble source in the conversation. This problem, however, does not necessarily mean that something incorrect was said. Very often, the

existence of some problem can only be inferred on the basis of occurrence of a repair initiation. This will often be the first inkling the interlocutor (and the analyst) will have that there is a problem. With respect to the second distinction, although a repair may be initiated, the completion or correction of the problem may not be effected. In this last sentence, a further distinction is made between the initiation of the repair and its completion.

Repairs can be differentiated on the basis of who initiates them. Thus, a repair might be initiated because a speaker may perceive some problem with his utterance, or it may result from a hearer perceiving some problem in the other's utterance. Once a repair is initiated, either of the participants may proceed to completion, although Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) note that there is in the system a preference for self- (that is, speaker-) completion. Combining possibilities for initiation and completion, we can note that repairs may be:

self-initiated, self-completed
 self-initiated, other-completed
 other-initiated, self-completed
 other-initiated, other-completed

These types are distinct but not independent of each other. They are related in that they are used to repair the same kinds of conversational problems, and their placement in

conversation seems to be ordered relative to each other (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977).

The placement of repairs in conversation can best be described with reference to the occurrence of the trouble-source. Most repairs seem to be initiated in the same turn in which the trouble occurs and most are completed in that same turn. If not in the same turn as the trouble source, there are two other ordered possibilities of placement for the repair. The repair could occur in the transition place after the trouble source, or the repair could occur in the next turn following the trouble source.

The turn-taking system would exert pressure on a speaker to repair a problem as soon as it is noticed, if possible before the completion of the turn. If the repair is not carried out before reaching a transition point, the turn might pass to the other, and the speaker would lose the opportunity to repair. In this way, the authors see the system imposing a preference for self-initiation.

Additionally, the system shows a preference for self-completion (or self-correction). The turn-taking system again would impose a pressure to have the repair completed before the turn passes on; so it is assumed that if the speaker can complete the repair he will. But, at the same time, if an other-repair is initiated, this seems usually to

take the form of a question which displays or locates the trouble source, but in being performed passes the turn and thus the opportunity for completion to the original speaker. Thus, both self- and other-initiation would lead preferentially to self-completion of the repair.

In conclusion, the authors hold that the organizing principles of conversation, such as the turn-taking system would lead one to assume that most repairs would be self-initiated and self-completed, and that other-initiated repairs would also lead to self-completion. The empirical evidence seems to bear this out.

Repairs interrupt the flow of conversation. Within-turn repairs cause a disruption in the structure that is being produced. Next-turn repairs occur in what have been called parenthetical or "side" sequence (Jefferson 1972). Here the utterance containing the repair is seen to initiate a new exchange which is inserted into the ongoing conversation. The repair exchange needs to be completed before the conversation can resume, and the sequential organization of the conversation is disrupted by the presence of the repair.

The initiation of a repair is often marked by these disruptions in the expected order or organization of structures. At the same time, repairs can be introduced by several repair-initiation markers: abrupt cutting off of a

word, use of interjections, within-turn pauses or silences, lengthening of a phonological segment. These are some of the mechanisms that speakers use to display to each other that a repair is being carried out.

Self-initiated repairs are attempts by a speaker to correct some problem in one of his utterances. Problems which a speaker attempts to correct are of two general types: a) a problem in the speaker's production of an utterance, and b) what the speaker believes to be a difficulty that will affect his interlocutor's understanding and interpretation of the utterance.

The types of production problems a speaker may encounter are many. There are what are commonly referred to as "slips of the tongue" resulting in phonological, lexical and other types of alterations of an utterance. A speaker may have a momentary memory lapse where he can't recall the name of a person or object, for example, or he may realize after embarking on a sentence that he doesn't know a word or term. There may be momentary interferences or distractions which may interrupt a speaker's train of thought, causing him to say something other than what he wanted to say. These interfering factors may be external to the speaker, as for example a sudden noise, interruption by another speaker, the emergence upon the conversational situation of some new

person or object. They may also be internal, counting among these any of the various psychological or emotional states which may cause a sudden, momentary wavering of attention away from what one is saying. Errors are seen to increase under stress, under fatigue and when a person is overly careful about how he speaks (Fromkin 1973, 1980). However, the problem in production may not be due to a distracting factor, external or internal to the speaker, but may be caused by the speaker having as yet "imperfect" command of the linguistic system in which he is attempting to express himself. This would be the situation of speakers who are learning a foreign language and children who are acquiring their native language.

Some types of problems may be immediately apparent to the speaker, such as realizing that he does not know the name of a certain object. Other problems, for example systematic errors, will only become apparent to the speaker when he notices an inconsistency between his own linguistic production and that of other speakers, or when he is in the process of switching from one sub-system to another so that he becomes aware of the existence of competing systems of linguistic organization.

Aside from production problems, a speaker may realize or believe that an interlocutor may have some difficulty in

hearing, understanding and/or interpreting what the speaker is saying or has planned to say, and may modify his utterance to avoid what he believes to be the difficulty. Some of the perceived sources of difficulty may be in the context, so to speak: a noise or an interruption by another, including the interlocutor himself, may lead the speaker to realize that his utterance may not have been heard completely. Alternatively, the speaker may assume some possible difficulty with the actual or planned phrasing of an utterance: some word may not be known by the interlocutor, or its reference may be obscure or ambiguous in the context, or the illocutionary act being uttered may be too direct or too indirect for adequate interpretation and uptake, or it may become apparent to the speaker that some additional prior information is needed, before continuing a particular utterance, including at times additional linguistic information, as for example making explicit the linguistic roles of items or the relations between items.

Whatever the source of the difficulty, when the speaker becomes aware of it, whether or not an actual error has occurred, he may engage in a series of repair mechanisms to resolve an actual problem or to get around a potential one. Note, however, that an error may go unrepaired because the speaker doesn't notice it or has noticed it but decides not

to correct it, either because he thinks it will not affect the understanding of his interlocutor, or because he simply decides to ignore it.

In some cases the speaker's handling of possible difficulties may never become apparent in the actual conversation or may be only minimally apparent as a hesitation or a silence while the speaker replans or recasts his utterance. While all of us as speakers are aware that this happens, insight into this process is only available through introspection. However, other repairs are performed overtly in the conversation and those are the ones that will be examined in Chapter IV.

Other-initiated repairs respond to some difficulty that a hearer has in hearing or understanding a prior utterance. In this section I will not attempt an exhaustive list of possible troubles but will enumerate general ones that give rise to the specific repair-initiation strategies that will be examined in Chapter V.

If the problem has been in hearing the utterance the hearer may request that the utterance or some part of it be repeated. A problem in understanding may have several different trouble sources and the repair or clarification request will normally indicate what type of repair is in order.

One possible problem is not being able to identify a specified referent because the term used is ambiguous or vague; the repair-request usually consists in a request for further specification of the referent. Another problem occurs when one of the words used is unknown to the hearer; the hearer doesn't know what the word means or what it refers to. In this case the repair-request may request the original speaker to define or paraphrase the term or to point out possible referents. The usual question used for this purpose is to ask "What is that?", where "that" refers to the new, at least for the hearer, term, and the expected answer is a definition of the term or the pointing out of some object to which the term can be applied. A related problem occurs when an object of conversation is identified but the term by which to designate it is unknown or proposed terms are rejected. In this case, as in the previous one, the most usual strategy is for the hearer to question the original speaker by asking "What is that?" where "that" refers to the object being talked about and the expected answer is a designation for that object. Another problem may be that the hearer feels that the speaker's text is not complete, either because the speaker is not giving all of the information that he has or because the hearer is not obtaining all the information he needs in order to be able to continue the conversation. When

this occurs the hearer may resort to different strategies to have the original speaker elaborate on or complete what he or she was saying. Additional problems may be relying on unwarranted presuppositions, inadequate appraisal of the interlocutor's knowledge (including linguistic knowledge), discourse contradictions, incongruities or inconsistencies, saying what is not true (lying) or what is factually incorrect (being wrong), acting or speaking inappropriately within the context.

In Chapters IV and V I will examine self-initiated and other-initiated repairs, respectively. I will classify the various types that are found in the data and describe the emergence of the ability to repair talk in conversation. As has been seen in previous studies, repair phenomena are orderly, are describable, and as will be shown in the following chapters, are remarkably similar even across languages.

CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. LINGUISTIC BACKGROUND OF THE PARTICIPANTS

This thesis examines several aspects of the development of communicative competence of a child acquiring Spanish as her native language. However, there are a number of idiosyncrasies in this particular language development situation which must be made explicit since the child, prior to the first taping, had been exposed to a number of different linguistic environments (Polish, English, Argentine Spanish, Mexican Spanish) and a bilingual situation prevailed in the home. In spite of this, the only language that the child seemed to be acquiring was Spanish; and the variety which the child developed was Mexican Spanish rather than the mother's Argentine Spanish. As can be seen in the tapes, the child's speech, in its phonology and its prosodic characteristics is more Mexican than Argentine although much the mother's Argentine vocabulary is incorporated into the child's lexicon together with numerous Mexican lexical items which the mother rarely uses.

1.1. Biographical Data

Koki is the first child of a middle-class professional couple. Both parents are linguists. The father is American and a native English-speaker. The mother is from Argentina and a native Spanish-speaker. At the time the tapes were made, the parents had research and teaching jobs in a linguistics program in Patzcuaro, Mexico, where they had been living for approximately five months. Koki, who is approximately 20 months at the time of the first recording, was the only child; however, towards the end of the period of observation the mother is pregnant with her second child, and reference is made to this baby in some of the tapes.

During the period of observation, the mother held a job outside the home, which meant that she would be away for extended periods during the day. The father was working at home. Koki spent most of the day at home. An additional person in the household was a housekeeper. This was a Mexican woman who lived at home but came in for a number of hours each day. All three adults had considerable daily contact with Koki and were all involved in various ways in daily activities related to caretaking. Long non-transactional conversations and game-playing, however, were carried out almost exclusively with the mother. Towards the

end of the period of observation, in September of 1981, Koki started to attend a local pre-school. Tape K13 from November, 1981, is the only tape made after she started going to school.

1.2. Linguistic Background

During the observation period, Koki was acquiring, and eventually did acquire, Spanish as her first and, for a number of years only, language. On gross inspection, what Koki was doing in terms of language learning, and her emergent Spanish, does not seem different from what other children do when acquiring Spanish as a first language (Hernández Piña 1984; Linaza 1991). Yet, the family's linguistic background, Koki's exposure to different linguistic environments and the linguistic situation operant in the household are sufficiently varied so as to require some mention. It is interesting that in spite of all the variations in who speaks what language to her and when, Koki does acquire (Mexican) Spanish, that she does so quickly and that she seems to be progressing well within the age-norms mentioned in the literature.

The father, as has been mentioned, is American and his native language is English. He was learning Spanish at the time that the tapes were being made. He also had varying degrees of knowledge of several other languages (Micmac,

Polish, French, Hebrew, Yiddish and Russian) but none of these were used actively by him in everyday situations. His contact with Spanish prior to living in Mexico had consisted in a short summer course while in high school and everyday contact without formal instruction in Argentina (six months) and in Mexico (five months when taping started). His assessment of his language at this time was that he could "get along" and usually make himself understood in everyday face-to-face situations. However, his language did not approximate native-speaker fluency and he made numerous errors of various types. Even though he was not fluent in the language, he nevertheless usually addressed Koki in Spanish.

The mother is Argentine and her native language is Spanish, but she had acquired English as a child living in various English-speaking countries, so that she had native or near-native fluency in English. The mother had no problem understanding or being understood by Mexicans, although several phonological and paralinguistic features of her Argentine Spanish would be remarked upon, for example, the aspiration in the pronunciation of [s]. The mother's only problem with Mexican Spanish was with respect to vocabulary, in particular the substantial vocabulary of Nahuatl origin used for everyday words such as foods or cooking utensils.

Koki was born in Poland, where her parents were teaching. From the beginning the mother spoke to her in Spanish while the father at first spoke in English. Both parents used English when speaking to each other in the home and visitors usually spoke English. Exposure to Polish occurred only when going outside the home in visits to the park, the movies, other people's houses, shopping or standing in line. Rarely, if ever, did anyone address the baby directly in Polish.

When she was six months old, the family left Poland and went on an extended trip to Argentina where they stayed until just before Koki's first birthday. During this time, they lived with the mother's family in a Spanish-speaking household consisting of the grandparents and the mother's sisters. Everybody in this household was or should be considered a native Spanish-speaker. However, the family had lived in the United States for several years and everyone in the family could speak English fluently. Aside from contact with the "immediate" family there were numerous daily visitors and frequent expeditions outside the house to the park, shopping, and so on. Everybody outside and in the house used Spanish when addressing Koki. At this point, the father started using Spanish with her as well as English. The parents, however, would still speak in English to each

other unless a non-English speaker was present. Several other members of the household would use English when addressing the father but he would often respond in Spanish. So during this time the child had a very intensive extended contact with numerous speakers of Argentine Spanish. However, she still had some exposure to English being used in the home¹.

Just after the child's first birthday the family moved to and lived briefly in Nashville, Tennessee, staying at the home of the paternal grandparents where they lived for a period of two and a half months from the middle of December of 1979 to February 1980 (Koki 1;1 - 1;3). The household here consisted of the father's parents both native English speakers with no knowledge of Spanish. They would address Koki in English but would often seek mediation from the mother rather than speaking to the child directly. The child at this point had a few vocalizations and it was felt by the grandparents that these were "Spanish" and that the child would not understand English. During this period all visitors to the house spoke English, as well as all contacts

¹From the time of her arrival in Argentina at age six months, adults would often address Koki directly and make comments like "Esta nenita entiende todo" (This little girl understands everything). This last was probably not true but it did influence the way people interacted with her.

outside the house. The parents, however, still spoke to Koki in Spanish.

In late February, the family moved to Patzcuaro (Michoacan) in Mexico, where the recordings were made. Here they lived in a house by themselves but, as has been mentioned, a Mexican woman would come daily and stay for several hours. There were frequent visitors, some of whom spoke English, although most spoke Spanish (Mexican, Venezuelan and Argentine). All of the child's contacts outside the home were in Spanish. At this time also she had her first contact with peers, two little neighbor girls, slightly older than Koki, with whom she spent a considerable amount of time. At the time the recordings were started, the family had been living in Patzcuaro for four and one-half months (Koki 1;7.20). The parents continued speaking English to each other, but both spoke mostly in Spanish to Koki.

During the time that the tapes were collected the child made two trips outside of Mexico. The first was between Tape K03 and Tape K04, when the child spent four weeks in Cuba visiting her maternal grandparents without her parents. Then in March of 1981 she and the father spent two weeks in Nashville visiting the paternal grandparents. Tape K06 was recorded while shopping in a drug-store in Nashville.

1.3. Koki's Language Development Prior to Taping

The parents did not keep a systematic diary record of Koki's language development, but notes indicate that her first "words" were at around 10 months.

A recording (60 min.) of mother-child interaction, made in September of 1979 when Koki was nine-and-a-half months old, does not show any recognizable Spanish words. The child produces a number of vocalizations usually of a mid open vowel with different kinds of intonations. These may have different functional meanings but the parents do not seem to recognize clearly what the child "says". There are a few CV vocalizations, notably [ma], again not interpreted by the parents as a "word". An additional feature of her speech at this time is the production of long "babbling" units with what seemed to be a unitary intonation contour.

One final fragment of evidence about Koki's speech prior to the tapes is a list of her productive vocabulary drawn up on June 15, 1980, one month before the first recording, which contains approximately 60 words.

1.4. Koki's Mean Number of Words per Utterance

To obtain a gauge of Koki's linguistic development I ran an MLU program² on all the utterances in each transcript. The results obtained are not strict MLUs since only words and not morphemes were counted. However, these counts do give an indication of three stages of development:

K01	-	Words/utterance: 2.0
K02-K07	-	Words/utterance: 2.5
K08-K13	-	Words/utterance: 3.1

2. DATA COLLECTION

The data from which the corpus is constructed consist of thirteen transcripts of audio-taped conversations between a mother, who is also the researcher, and her daughter, the only child at the time. The tapes, thirty-one in number, were recorded over a period of approximately one-and-a-half years. The first tape dates from July 21, 1980 and the last is from November 26, 1981.

In this section I discuss general considerations that went into obtaining the data samples and the actual conditions of the taping situation and, in the next section, I discuss criteria that were used to select the tapes that used for analysis.

²The program used was MLU in CLAN (MacWhinney 1991), however words per utterance were counted rather than morphemes.

2.1. Obtaining Conversational Data

First, I would like to address some questions that people, including myself, have had when discussing studies in which the researcher was also an active participant. Perhaps all questions can be subsumed under one general one which could be phrased as: how and to what extent did the researcher's privileged knowledge about the research affect what went on in the interaction? The answer to or discussion of this question has wider implications than the validity of one or another particular study and relates to some of the major methodological problems affecting researchers who attempt to work with "naturally occurring" language situations.

The main problem has been labelled by sociolinguists "the observer's paradox" (Labov 1971; Bailey 1972): sociolinguists need to observe and record the kinds of language interactions that occur when there are no observers and recorders present. The sociolinguist needs to investigate what kind of sound the tree makes falling in the forest when there's no one around to hear. In child language studies, the problem is compounded by the fact that to study longitudinal development the researcher needs frequent, periodical samplings, over a long stretch of time, of similar types of interactions between the same parents and their

babies. There seem to be three generally accepted ways of confronting this issue. Each presents some advantages and poses some problems. First, the linguist may study his own child's language development, either through a diary record or through taping of situations. Second, the linguist may observe and record the naturally occurring interactions between some other parent and his child. Third, the linguist may hand the other parent a tape-recorder and ask him or her to keep a diary record and/or to tape instances of naturally occurring interactions whenever they feel like it.

The main advantage of the researcher being one of the participants is that he then knows and can report on what were the conditions under which each tape was made. If he follows his own rules about taping "what actually occurs" and not "testing" the child, he is likely to have obtained instances of naturally occurring situations and he is likely also to know which bits and pieces in his tapes were conscious attempts to elicit particular items or to get the child to perform for the tape recorder. Secondary advantages relate to the relative ease of data-gathering without having to go through previous schedulings, appointments, and so on. The main disadvantage is not knowing to what extent the researcher's knowledge of language and of particular research needs influenced the interaction. For example, did the fact

that he was interested in studying requests lead to putting all of the child's toys out of reach on the top shelf and did he ignore the first couple of times that the child asked for them because he is usually unresponsive or inattentive or because he wanted data?

There are "licit" ways of dealing with situations to obtain certain outcomes because what is done are the types of actions that "everybody" does anyway, or what any participant in a situation would do to get something accomplished. The "danger of death" question is an example of a licit manipulation of this type (Labov 1972). It is "licit" in that this topic is one of the things that speakers (not necessarily linguists) are often interested in talking about in conversation. It is "licit" also in that, if the linguist is acting as a conversationalist and not as an interviewer, the question leading to this topic will be brought up at the appropriate time, as dictated by the development of the conversation so far, and according to the appropriate interactive norms of the particular speech community or social group. The big caveat is contained, however, in the if-clause in the previous sentence. That is, there are also things that a researcher can do to get data, using his specialized knowledge, and which may result in artificial types of exchanges or in "natural" but uncharacteristic

behavior. The problem for the researcher lies in recognizing which exchanges or interactions were non-natural or uncharacteristic and of giving these exchanges their proper place in the analysis. Studies in which the researcher observes some other parent's behavior pose different problems with respect to naturalness or spontaneity. No matter how good the relationship may be between the researcher and the parent, one can rarely get away from the fact that the "natural" way to act in a situation in which an observer is present is to "be on your best behavior". These studies have a big drawback with respect to naturalness. Additional problems have to do with the practicalities of data collection. Sessions have to be scheduled in advance and preparations made for them. The actual session may be canceled by the parent because of some contingency thus throwing off the research design. Alternatively, the session may occur on a "bad" day where either the child or the parent is sick, tired or cranky and would rather be doing something else. Politeness constraints will probably lead a parent to behave adequately should this happen, but not the child. The researcher may end up with either a blank tape or nice data on the strategies that a harried parent uses to try to cajole or coerce interaction from a non-cooperating child. However, again, the research design may be affected.

The advantage that this situation has over the previous one is that the parent is "blind" to the actual, specific research interests (e.g., phonology, directives, subordinate clauses). The disadvantage for the researcher is that the data will tend towards more monitored styles and the researcher will not know whether the frequency of behaviors recorded during observation is characteristic of "normal, everyday" interaction. Some of the formality constraints may be eased as researcher and parent get to know each other; however, in a longitudinal study of language development there is very little time leeway. Time elapsed means "stages" lost.

A recent trend is the practice of giving the parents tape recorders and asking them to tape when and what they want of the normally occurring interactions with their children. This avoids the problems of participants knowing what the study is about and altering their behavior to suit the data, and it also avoids some of the problems of the observer effect. However, not all these problems are avoided and at the end the researcher has no way of knowing what is "natural", what is "artificial", what is uncharacteristic, whether the frequency of some behavior is what usually occurs and what things were simply omitted or erased because the parent did not feel that they should be made public.

That is, the problem of the "face" or image that one wants to present to the world and the ways in which this may impose constraints on what occurs is a problem for all three types of data-collection techniques. Even though linguists do not label parents as "mean" or "insensitive" but speak rather of "different interactive styles", the image that one presents as a parent does lead the adult to monitor his behavior and to respond to the child's behaviors using the more socially acceptable of the options available to him. The adult never fully gets away from the fact that the tape recorder is a silent witness and his behavior is influenced accordingly. The advantage when the researcher is a participant is that he knows to a great extent what his motivations were at different times, so he can avoid the pitfalls of constructing a theory around bits of data that were really only performed for the observer's benefit.

2.2. General Description of Taping Conditions

With respect to this particular study, at around the time that Koki started saying her first "words" both parents became interested in keeping some sort of record of her development. However, the early notes that were made were sporadic, unsystematic remarks on particular behaviors that caught one of the parent's attention.

Around the time that Koki showed a spurt in her language development, started using a fairly large number of words and started putting words together in "syntactic" constructions, the mother decided to tape regularly Koki's interactions with the members of the household.

Because of my background in sociolinguistics and pragmatics, I was interested in the development of communicative competence and I was also interested in seeing whether the bilingual situation in the house would play a role in the child's language development. Therefore, when planning the gathering of data my main concern was to obtain "conversations" situated in context. This was the theoretical directive under which the taping was carried out.

On the basis of the literature, I considered issues of frequency of recording, comparability of situations, and variety of situations. My goal at this time was to have frequent recordings, weekly if possible, and a variety of different situations with various participants. Thus, at this point comparability was eschewed in favor of variety.

Another decision was whether to record "situations" or to record "instances". What I mean by the first is identifying or defining a situation and recording it from beginning to end and by the second, keeping the tape-recorder by one's side and turning it on when the child approached and

off when she left, thus having instances of different types of things. This last was tried in one tape, but the majority of the recordings were of situations for which the beginning point might coincide with the beginning of the tape but often the situation continued after the tape had run out, so endings are not always there.

Some of the situations are more structured, in that all of the participants focus on a game, activity or object. The parent in these cases is giving his or her full attention to the child and there is an interest on the parent's part in keeping the conversation going. Other situations are more fluid: the mother is attending to various activities while the child comes and goes and moves in and out of interactive sequences into periods of self-talk.

With respect to participants, the mother is present in all of the tapes except two and in a large number she is the only one interacting with the child. The father is present for long or brief periods in a number of tapes and in two he is the sole adult participant. The housekeeper appears briefly in some tapes. A four-year-old neighbor is present in one tape, having dinner with the family. Aside from these, there are no other participants.

The actual taping was done openly. The tape recorder was often placed close to where the child was and the child

was aware of its presence. The tape recorder is a topic for discussion and a source of argument in several of the tapes and, especially in the early tapes, there are instances of the mother trying to draw the child's attention away from it when she becomes too interested.

In addition to taping, the mother made notes on different things that were going on, sometimes as they were occurring, sometimes immediately afterwards. On a couple of occasions the father was called in to be present and make "context" notes. There is enough contextual information available to get a good sense of what is going on in an interaction. However, particularities of actions and gestures accompanying language are lost, for example. The mother's notebook and her writing in it were noticed by the child and a few times she asked questions about this, but it never became a major or salient issue. There is one episode in one of the tapes where Koki asks the mother to write something for her and the episode develops into a letter-teaching sequence. There must have been at least one time when Koki took over the writing because one page of my context notes is completely covered with her scribbles. Thus, writing became one of the activities that were carried out by the participants.

To summarize, between July 21, 1980 and November 19, 1981, thirty-one recordings were made. These were recordings of various naturally-occurring situations and were mostly carried out in the child's home. The mother is the most frequent adult participant. The father is the sole adult participant in two of the tapes and is present in various others. There are two additional tapes, one from September 1979 and one from June 1982, giving a total of thirty-three recordings, 30 to 60 minutes in length. From these tapes a selection was made for this particular study. In the section that follows I will discuss criteria for tape-selection.

3. TAPE SELECTION - FIRST STEP IN THE FORMATION OF THE CORPUS

3.1. Criteria Used in Tape Selection

The idea for this study began to develop a number of years after the tapes were collected and transcribed. The definition of the study played a role in what tapes were ultimately selected for analysis, but it should also be noted that the characteristics of the available data influenced the type of study that was proposed.

Since the study was to be a study of the child's conversational development, two criteria were dominant: to span the longest possible period and to have a certain periodicity so that stages in development could be traced.

The interval between sessions to be studied was set at one month. This was an arbitrary but informed decision.

A review of the literature gave various time intervals: Brown (1973) weekly or bi-weekly; Bloom (1970) six-week intervals, Scollon (1976) weekly with several months intervening between sets of data; McTear (1985) three to four months³; Wells (1985) three months.

Since this study was of a very young child, it was felt that frequent samples were needed but at the same time, the amount of data had to be restricted within manageable bounds. In the Bristol study (Wells 1985), a minimum of 110 child utterances were considered sufficient data to give an adequate picture of the child's language at any one period. Koki, however, was very verbal and her transcripts were long. The number of child utterances in the tapes that were ultimately selected range from 235 to 494 child utterances in the 30 minute tapes and 507 to 612 in the 45 minute tapes.

With the aim of achieving a balance between frequency and manageability, the time between tapes was set at one-month intervals. Putting together all of the considerations above, thirteen tapes were selected.

³The children in this study were three and four-years-old and it could be expected that their rate of development would be slower.

There was one conflict between criteria. If I wanted a long time-span, there would be some intervals between tapes that were longer than the proposed four weeks. If I wanted to stay as closely as possible to a four-week interval between sessions, then the beginning and end-points of the study would be reduced. The decision made was to opt for a long time-span at the expense of similar periodicity. Thus, there are eight- to ten-week intervals between some of the sessions, especially for the earlier sessions. The tapes selected were the best (in terms of sound) available tapes for each time period. The following chart lists the tapes which were included, the date and duration of each tape, the age of the child at that time and the time elapsed from the previous taping session.

TAPE	DATE	AGE OF CHILD	DURATION	APPROXIMATE TIME ELAPSED
K01	21-JUL-1980	1;7.20	30 min	-
K02	19-SEP-1980	1;9.18	30 min	8 WEEKS
K03	16-NOV-1980	1;11.15	30 min	8 WEEKS
K04	30-JAN-1981	2;1.29	30 min	10 WEEKS
K05	28-FEB-1981	2;2.27	30 min	4 WEEKS
K06	22-MAR-1981	2;3.21	10 min	3 WEEKS
K07	19-APR-1981	2;4.18	30 min	4 WEEKS
K08	25-MAY-1981	2;5.24	45 min	5 WEEKS
K09	11/13-JUN-1981	2;6.10	30 min	3 WEEKS
K10	11-JUL-1981	2;7.10	30 min	4 WEEKS
K11	10-AUG-1981	2;8.9	30 min	4 WEEKS
K12	15-SEP-1981	2;9.14	30 min	5 WEEKS
K13	08-NOV-1981	2;11.7	45 min	9 WEEKS

One problematic tape is K06. It differs from the others in terms of participants (father-child), location (Nashville) and duration (10 minutes, 79 child utterances). It was included because there was no other tape available for that time, and it was felt that it was better to use what there was rather than have a long time gap at that point. It is not going to be used very much in the analysis and my only interest in including it was to have some evidence of what the child was doing at that time.

3.2. Brief Description of Tapes K01 to K13

K01 - 21-JUL-1980. Age of child: 1;7.20. Participants: Koki, Mother. Location: Patzcuaro, living-room in home. Situation: M and K are sitting on the floor in the living-room. There is no set activity. Activity evolves from noticing and playing with various objects in the room. M's attention is fully on interacting with K. K has the conversational "lead". Duration: 30 min. Number of utterances: 826 (K: 494, M: 332)

K02 - 19-SEP-1980. Age of child: 1;9.18. Participants: Koki, Mother, Father. Location: Patzcuaro, parents' bedroom. Situation: M and K are lying in bed looking at picture book. F is present but involved in his own work. He participates briefly from time to time. Activity is fluid and goes from looking at picture book to noticing and talking about various objects around the room. The child climbs on and off the bed, requests that shoes be taken off then put on, plays with spinning top, dances, gets back in bed. There is a short episode of test elicitations by M. Duration: 30 min. Number of utterances: 528 (K: 254, M: 226, F: 48)

K03 - 16-NOV-1980. Age of child: 1;11.15. Participants: Koki, Mother, Housekeeper. Location: Patzcuaro, outside, in roofed corridor that runs the length of the house. Situation: M and K are looking at a picture book. H is nearby ironing. Activity is fluid and goes from looking at the picture book to playing with various toys that are

outside. There are two episodes in which K wants M to write or draw. M "teaches" K some letters. Duration: 30 min. Number of utterances: 591 (K: 308, M: 282, H: 1)

K04 - 30-JAN-1981. Age of child: 2;1.29. Participants: Koki, Mother, Housekeeper. Location: Patzcuaro, in parents' bedroom. Situation: M is in bed and K is sitting on the bed playing with Play Family dolls and a house. M and K have switched identities so that K is "Mama" and M is "Toti". The activity revolves around the little toys with K acting out various parts involving the dolls. Numerous short monologues by K. Towards the end of the tape K leaves briefly and returns with a mouse-trap. There is talk of that and a short toilet-training episode. Duration: 30 min. Number of utterances: 699 (K: 446, M: 251, H: 2)

K05 - 28-FEB-1981. Age of child: 2;2.27. Participants: Koki, Mother, Father. Location: Patzcuaro, parents' bedroom. Situation: M is sitting on the bed fixing a doll. F is in room reading an article. K plays with various objects in and around bed. M is focussed on sewing but responds to K. Long, unsuccessful toilet-training episode ends with K crying. Tape gets turned off. Tape continues in kitchen later that same day. F and M are preparing lunch. K comes into kitchen and sits at table observing parents and remarking upon various objects present. Duration: 30 min. Number of utterances: 565 (K: 277, M: 225, F: 63)

K06 - 22-MAR-1981. Age of child: 2;3.21. Participants: Koki, Father. Location: Nashville, TN, drug-store. Situation: K and F are in drug-store. K is being wheeled about in a shopping-cart while F is waiting for a prescription. They talk about various objects in the store. Short section in English between F and Pharmacist. Duration: 10 min. Number of utterances: 183 (K: 79, F: 99, Others: 5)

K07 - 19-APR-1981. Age of child: 2;4.18. Participants: Koki, Mother, Father. Location: Patzcuaro, in child's room. Situation: K and M are sitting on the floor playing with Play Family dolls. Talk revolves around these dolls. Role-playing with dolls. F comes in and there is a long section of all three interacting, talking about various objects, fluid activity including moving around room and dancing. After F leaves, M and K continue talking about various objects. Short pretend phone-call. Duration: 30 min. Number of utterances: 799 (K: 399, M: 339, F: 61)

K08 - 25-MAY-1981 Age of child: 2;5.24. Participants: Koki, Mother, Father. Location: Oaxaca (Mex), hotel room. Situation: F is getting ready to take a shower. M and K talk in bed. Topics are mostly child-initiated about various objects around: travel brochure, tape-recorder, headphones, M's sunburn. Numerous questions by K. Duration: 45 min. Number of utterances: 919 (K: 507, M: 335, F: 77)

K09 - 11/13-JUN-1981. Age of child: 2;6.10/12. Participants: Koki, Mother. Location: Patzcuaro, in parents' room. Situation: Very short initial situation in M's bed. K remarks that M sounds angry. Second situation, two days later, again in M's room. Some remarks about past events. M and K start looking at "counting" book. Long "teaching" episode involving counting book. Exchanges are mother-initiated. Duration: 30 min. Number of utterances: 798 (K: 325, M: 473)

K10 - 11-JUL-1981. Age of child: 2;7.10. Participants: Koki, Mother, Father, Housekeeper. Location: Patzcuaro, in parents' room. Situation: There are several focussed situations. First K is playing with jigsaw puzzles while M attends. Then there is a long section of looking together at a book which takes up most of the tape. This is interrupted at various points by F requesting a shopping list (in English), H calling Koki from the kitchen, K leaving at two points and returning with some food and with other objects which get talked about. Duration: 30 min. Number of utterances: 558 (K: 235, M: 291, F: 22, H: 10)

K11 - 10-AUG-1981. Age of child: 2;8.9. Participants: Koki, Mother, Housekeeper. Location: Patzcuaro, in parents' room. Situation: M and K sit on M's bed. M cuts out "cards" from the back of a cereal box and "teaches" K two games. First there is a memory game and then a pairing game. Talk is focussed on the game and is mostly mother-initiated. The tape covers the end of the games and a transition to a more unstructured situation. Duration: 30 min. Number of utterances: 749 (K: 244, M: 484, H: 19)

K12 - 15-SEP-1981 Age of child: 2;9.14. Participants: Koki, Mother, Father. Location: Patzcuaro, in parents' room. Situation: M and K on bed playing with Play Family dolls. F taking notes on situation. There is role-playing with dolls then M starts mending clothes and K's attention switches to M's activity. Conversation centers on M's activities and other everyday activities: K taking her medicine, putting on

socks. Duration: 30 min. Number of utterances: 576 (K: 246, M: 288, F: 42)

K13 - 08-NOV-1981 Age of child: 2;11.7. Participants: Koki, Mother. Location: Patzcuaro, in parents' room, then in K's room. Situation: First part is an attempt by M to elicit long song from K to make a tape to send to grandparents. Second part takes place in K's room sitting on the floor playing with Play Family dolls. Long section role-playing with dolls. M attempts unsuccessfully to get K to talk about her school. Long sections talking about past events. Duration: 45 min. Number of utterances: 1101 (K: 612, M: 489)

4. TRANSCRIPTION OF THE RECORDINGS

Initial transcriptions were done shortly after the recordings were made. The goal had been to do each transcription immediately after recording but this in general was not carried out. Initial transcriptions followed transcription procedures outlined in the conversational analysis literature (Sudnow 1972; Jefferson 1972, 1973, 1974) and by Ochs (1979) although adaptations were made to suit the researcher's needs.

In the last year, however, the transcripts were incorporated into the Child Language Data Exchange System (CHILDES). The original transcripts were once again checked against the tapes and were retranscribed according to the guidelines and conventions of the CHAT (Codes for the Human Analysis of Transcripts) system used by CHILDES (MacWhinney and Snow 1990, MacWhinney 1991). In what follows, I will describe what phenomena were indicated in the transcripts to

give an idea of what degree of detail was rendered in each. At the same time, I will show the use of specific transcription conventions.⁴ The examples given in the text, however, are "simplified" with respect to the actual transcripts.⁵

Layout: Some analysts prefer that each participant's turn be kept in a separate column. This allows for easier comparisons between successive turns by one same individual (see the discussion in Ochs 1979). At the same time, assigning the left-most column to the child, allows one to break out of the mind-set that would give the adult primacy in the conversation. I have not adopted a columnar layout for two reasons. The first is simply personal preference, since I find column transcripts harder to read. Secondly, since most of my data deals with utterances that are tied in

⁴A full description of the CHAT conventions is given in MacWhinney 1991.

⁵The CHAT transcription system is designed to be used with the CLAN computer programs which can carry out an automatic analysis of various aspects of transcripts, e.g. MLU, frequency analysis, etc., (MacWhinney 1991, 1). Some of the codes included in my transcripts have been added to facilitate automatic processing. For example, in order to obtain accurate frequency counts, homonyms need to be distinguished so that [ten] "2nd p. sing. imp of 'tener' " is distinguished from [ten] "simplification of 'tren' ". In the transcripts the first word would be given as "ten" using standard orthography and the second would be transcribed as "ten@sf" where the codes indicate what kind of a word it is. These codes are not necessary in the examples and have been eliminated.

very closely structurally and semantically to the previous and the subsequent utterance, I have found it a visual aid to have these closely related utterances one directly underneath the other.

CHAT distinguishes between main speaker tiers (text) and secondary tiers (analyst's comments and coding tiers). The examples presented include only text and comments and do not have coding tiers.

Orthography: The transcriptions attempted to give as accurate a rendition as possible of the talk of each participant. This was given in standard Spanish orthography. Child words were transliterated into Spanish orthography and in some cases a broad phonetic transcription was used following IPA or UNIBET conventions.⁶ Some utterances contain parts of words included within parentheses. These parentheses indicate "missing" elements. In some cases it is fairly clear from the context what word was being attempted and what the missing element is. In other cases, the missing element may not really be missing, as in the case of phonological variants, but it is included within parentheses to avoid

⁶UNIBET is a transcription system based on the International Phonetic Alphabet but adapting this alphabet to the ASCII requirements of working with computers. A description of this system is given in the description of the CHILDES Project (MacWhinney 1991, 66-81)

problems with programs such as those calculating word frequency. Following are examples of "missing" elements:

1.

a. K. hay más de con(ejo) [//] # hay uno de [//] de [//] de [//] de madera, esto es? [K13]
[there's more rab(bits) [//] # there's one wooden one, is this it?]

b. K. miya e(1) seyor. K. look the man.

c. M. #2.5 acá (es)tá. #2.5 here it is.
M. #3.0 (es)tá sucio. #3.0 it's dirty.
M. #2.3 a(hí) (es)tá. #2.3 there it is.

The example given in (1a) shows some of the difficulties in adding missing elements. From the context in the transcript, it is clear that some form of the word "conejo" was started, but the analyst cannot say for sure that the singular or the plural was intended. In example (1b) the missing elements indicate that the analyst has made a decision that this form is a variant of the article and should be classed in the dictionary together with "el". The missing element is included to distinguish "e(1)" from "e(s)" for example. The examples in (1c) show various instances of simplification involving the word "está" which became ['ta], or in combination with deictic adverbs [ay'ta] and ['akata].

Distinguishing between words: CHAT uses a symbol "@" that allows the marking of words which the analyst would like to consider as special. This is placed following the word. Additional indications can be included to it to show in what

way the word is special, e.g., baby-talk [@b], child simplification [@sf], regularized form [@r], and so on. I have used this convention to mark special words in the transcripts included in CHILDES. These markings have, however, been eliminated from the examples in the text.

Units: Each participant's turn was divided into utterances and each utterance was placed on a separate line (Ochs 1979). An utterance often corresponded to a clause or clause fragment (elliptical). The chief identifying criterion was a final intonation contour and the presence or absence of a pause following it. Thus, there was a difference between the following two segments:

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|---------------------------|
| A. | no.
no.
no lo toque.
[don't touch it] | B. | no no no.
no lo toque. |
|----|--|----|---------------------------|

Intonation contour and pauses were used to distinguish between these. In B, the three instances of "no" are given in quick succession with one single intonation contour which falls after the final "no". In A, each "no" is separate with its own falling intonation contour.⁷ In cases of doubt, a decision was taken and an attempt was made to be consistent with that decision throughout all the transcripts. This involved various re-checkings of previous transcripts.

⁷Actual examples very similar to the above are found in K01.

Punctuation: CHAT restricts the use of standard punctuation conventions. Upper-case letters are used only to indicate a proper name. Aside from this only lower-case letters are used, so that utterances usually begin with a lower-case letter, as in A and B above. The reason for this is to facilitate the use of case-sensitive computer programs which might consider "No" and "no" as two separate words. Each utterance must include final punctuation markers which correspond to final intonation contours. Thus, "." corresponds to a falling final contour, as in statements; "?" corresponds to a rising final contour, as in questions and "!" indicates an "exclamation". A few other symbols can be used to indicate, for example, utterances which are broken off "+/." or utterances which trail off with a sustained final intonation "+...". No other punctuation symbols are used. Use of the comma is not proscribed but it is suggested that it be limited to particular structures such as tags, for example.

Pauses or silences: Gaps or pauses within an utterance or between utterances were indicated in the transcripts by the symbol # and the duration of the pause given in tenths of seconds. This usually meant that within-utterance pauses longer than 1 second and inter-utterance pauses longer than 2 seconds were indicated. In some cases, however, shorter

pauses were perceived as silences if the conversation at that particular time was proceeding at a very rapid tempo. The pauses marked are those perceived by the analyst and may not correspond to what participants perceive as gaps or lulls in the conversation. But even for the analyst, perception of "noticeable" gaps depended on the tempo and rhythm of surrounding talk.

Simultaneous talk: Interruptions and simultaneous talk were also indicated. Originally overlaps were indicated by placing overlapped segments immediately underneath one another and marking beginning and approximate end-points for the overlap. The conventions used by CHAT, however, are to place overlapped segments within angle brackets and to mark by a following arrow whether the segment overlaps with something in a preceding "[<]" or a following "[>]" utterance.

2.

K. Pit@sf?	K. Pit?
M. <Ernie> [>].	M. <Ernie> [>].
K. <Ernie> [<]?	K. <Ernie> [<]?
M. Ernie, muy bien. [K02] ⁸	M. Ernie, very good.

3.

K. esto@p <&sa> [>] +/.	K. this <sa> [>] +/.
F. <se> [<] lastimó, no? [K02]	F. <you> [<] got hurt, no?

Here both examples show cases of overlap. In (3) K breaks off her utterance and this fact is indicated by the utterance incompleteness marker [+/.]. The symbol & is used to indicate a word fragment which shouldn't be counted as a separate word by a frequency program. The angle brackets used here were used in general to separate out a stretch of talk to which some "observation" might apply. The "observation" itself is usually placed in following square brackets. In the above examples, the "observation" relates to overlap. Below, other uses of these "scope" devices will be described.

Unintelligible utterances: If something is unintelligible then this is indicated in the transcript by the symbols "xxx" or "xx". Sometimes the analyst can make a guess at what something sounds like, but if he is not sure of his transcription the tentative nature of this guess should also

⁸In this example and in the following examples in this section I have not edited the transcription conventions, so as to give the reader an idea of what the symbols employed are and what the transcripts look like. In the data examples in Chapters IV, V and VI, coding symbols such as @ or & were eliminated.

be indicated by a question mark [?] following the dubious segment. Using CHAT conventions example (4) shows a completely unintelligible utterance and a long unintelligible fragment within a partially intelligible utterance. The symbol "xxx" is used since no indication is given as to length or number of words each of these might contain. Example (5) is a case where only one word is unintelligible. This is indicated by use of the symbol "xx". Examples (6) and (7) show dubious fragments included in angle brackets. The question symbol in square brackets following the material in angle brackets shows the tentative character of this transcription.

4.

F. #2.4 you@e mean@e xxx <do@e that@e> [?]?
 M. yeah@e.
 F. xxx.
 M. #1.9 and@e <fix@e the@e> [/?] fix@e the@e blankets@e
 and@e stuff@e . [K02]

5.

K. #2.5 xx a mí@p me buhta@sf. [K07]
 [#2.5 xx I like it]

6. K. <utos@sf> [?] monitos?⁹ K. [utos]¹⁰ [?] monkeys?
 M. muchos monitos. [K02] M. many monkeys.
7. K. #7.2 <eto@psf e(s)@sf oto@sf> [?].
 %par:whispered
 [#7.2 <this is another> [?]]

Hesitation markers: The transcription included as close a rendition as possible of what was actually said. This meant including all interjections, "fillers" , retracings and other hesitation markers. A conventional spelling was given to each interjection: ah, oh, eh, um, mm (phatic marker), aha (agreement), mmhmm (agreement), uhuh (agreement), unhunh (negation). The word "este" when used as a hesitation marker or filler was transcribed as "este@i" to distinguish it from the demonstrative.

Retracings: Hesitations or repairs that involved the retracing of some previous segment were also indicated. A distinction was made in the transcription between retracings

⁹The angle brackets are actually not needed for this example since the "observation" in square brackets is taken to apply to the immediately preceding word if there are no other scope indications.

¹⁰When unsure of what a child word means, I have not translated it. It is included in the English version in phonetic transcription. In this example the word in Spanish is unclear and therefore is marked with a [?] in the Spanish transcription, at the same time, the meaning of this is not certain, therefore the word was not translated but transcribed as closely as was possible.

that repeated a previous element (word fragment, word, phrase or clause) exactly and those that retraced and changed something. Exact retracings were indicated by the symbol [//]. The scope of this symbol is the immediately preceding word but if more than one word is involved, the scope is the fragment placed in angle brackets. Retracings that involve a modification are indicated by the symbol [//]. Again the same scope conditions apply.

8.

a. K. <uno su> [//] uno subido. [K07]
 [<one u-> [//] one up.

b. K. e [//] <e cachó> [//] <a caba> [//] el caballo no
 cabe ? [K07]
 [th- [//] <the cho-¹¹> [//] <a ho-> [//] the horse
 doesn't fit?]

Since retracings are the main focus of attention in the chapter on self-repairs, all of the examples in that chapter will make use of these symbols. Sometimes complex nested

¹¹Translations of these examples pose many problems derived from the nature of the data. In cases such as the one in this example, the English "version" of the retracing is constructed to illustrate the type of problem faced by the speaker and is not meant as a literal translation. In example 8, the child makes what seem to be three attempts at saying "caballo" (horse): [ka'cho], [ka'ba] and [ka'baz]. The "translation" shows three attempts, two incomplete ones and then the full word. The "translations" given attempt to illustrate the fact that the first attempt is phonologically different from the target word, while the second is not, although incomplete. The three attempts have been given as 'cho-', 'ho-' and 'horse'.

retracings are found, as in example (9). Here the transcription attempts to show what replaces what.

9.

K. #4.2 <yo qu-> [//] <yo voy a [/] a> [/] yo voy a tener ésto acá pa que todos los niños lo descuchen. [K13]
[I wa(nt) [//] I'm going to have this here so all the children can hear it.]

Other paralinguistic or prosodic phenomena: Lengthening or stretching out a sound is indicated by a colon immediately following the lengthened segment. The number of colons following attempts to give a comparative estimate of length.

K. #2.2 tune::l! K. #2.2 tunne::l!

Other phenomena such as stress, volume or intensity or pitch variations are often not indicated by CHAT on the utterance line itself but would be included as comments on a subsidiary line. My transcripts follow CHAT conventions in this but in the examples I will use the following conventions to indicate stress or increased volume: boldface = stress, emphasis; CAPS = volume, loudness. Other paralinguistic modifications such as whispering, sing-song rhythm, or singing, are indicated by comments included in square brackets following the text.

In this discussion I have attempted to describe the main phenomena that were attended to, to give the reader an idea of the level of detail that can be expected from the

transcript. In the discussion, some of the principal conventions used for indicating these various phenomena are presented. A complete presentation of CHAT conventions is given in MacWhinney (1991).

5. SELECTION OF THE CORPUS ON REPAIRS

5.1. Considerations for corpus selection

The main objective of this thesis is to study one aspect of the development of the child's communicative competence: the ability to repair conversational difficulties. The study will then be set two tasks. The first is the description of repair types used in conversation and their emergence in the child's communicative competence. A second task is the description of the structuring of sequences of talk that have been identified as repair sequences, and of how the child's participation in these discourse sequences evolves as her communicative competence develops. For each of these tasks I propose a quantitative analysis to determine frequency of occurrence of particular types and a qualitative analysis in which particularities of use of each type are discussed relative to the ongoing discourse. In section 5.2, the criteria used in the formation of the corpus, to identify units of analysis will be presented.

5.2. Identification of Units of Analysis

In Chapter II, I discussed the role of repairs in conversation and presented a general classification of these into self- and other-initiated repairs. In discussing the identification of units of analysis each of these types will be taken in turn. I will indicate if and how the phenomena to be studied is being restricted, and will give the explicit criteria by which instances of selected phenomena were identified. These same guidelines will be followed in the discussion of the third unit to be studied, the repair sequence.

5.2.1. Self-initiated Repairs

As seen in Chapter II, a general definition of a self-initiated repair is a repair started by a speaker in response to some perceived problem in his own speech, but a distinction is made with respect to who completes the repair. Thus a self-initiated repair may be self-completed or other-completed.

Following an examination of the data and preliminary analysis on a subset of the same, I decided to restrict the analysis of self-repairs to self-initiated, self-completed repairs, and of these to consider only those in which the repair was carried out within the confines of one utterance. Various reasons led to making this decision.

A repair may be initiated and completed in one utterance or it may be initiated in the utterance where the trouble source is located but be completed in subsequent utterances, even in subsequent turns, sometimes with intervening help from the other interlocutor.

It is relatively simple to identify unequivocally intra-utterance repairs since there are disruptions in the structural organization of the language unit which makes up the utterance. However, it is more difficult to say unequivocally whether a new utterance by a speaker is acting as a repair.

For example, certain repetitions of an item within the sentence are types of repair and there are prosodic cues to help distinguish repetition repairs from repetitions used for some other function such as emphasis or rhetorical effect. The following are examples of intra-utterance repetition repairs.

10.

- a. M. mire cómo la [/] la mamá le arregló el pelo a la muñequita. [K05]
[look how the [/] the mommy fixed the dolly's hair.]
- b. K. eh, e(1) [/] e(1) [/] e(1) oto. [K05]
[eh, th(e) [/] th(e) [/] th(e) other.]
- c. M. <no es pe-> [/] no es peligrosa pero es delicada. [K12]
[<it's not da-> [/] it's not dangerous but it's delicate.]
- d. K. <si no> [/] si no # dejas un poquito de lugar y(o) [/] y(o) [/] yo te apago eso, eh. [K13]
[<if (you) don't> [/] if (you) don't # leave me

a little room I [/] I [/] I turn this off, eh.]

The repetitions that are found in these utterances cause a disruption in sentence structure. These structures, as they stand, cannot be generated by the rules of the grammar, even though Spanish syntax has recursive rules that would allow repeated items to occur in well-formed sentences such as the following:

Eso es muy muy peligroso.	"That's very very dangerous."
Vi un perrito chiquito chiquito.	"I saw a tiny tiny dog."
Es una larga larga historia.	"That's a long long story."

It is thus assumed that the disruption of sentence structure is evidence of some problem and that the eventual continuation following this problem indicates a repair or resolution of the same, although, with this particular type of repair, the source of the problem remains obscure. In this way, intra-utterance repairs may be identified.

With sequences of utterances however, when two contiguous utterances occur, one of which repeats the other, it cannot be assumed with any degree of certainty that the repeat is an instance of a repair. The repetition of utterances may be done to effect a repair or it may be done for some other purpose, e.g., emphasis, empathy (when across speakers), to verbally accompany an action, and so on. It is difficult to pull out unequivocally all and only cases of

utterance repetitions which have solely a repair function, although some may of course be identified.

Similarly, some lexical substitutions would be seen to have a repair function when occurring within the boundaries of an utterance, but if these same substitutions occurred in two successive utterances it would be more difficult to say whether a repair was being intended or whether the substitution was simply an expansion or part of a topic continuation mechanism. Let's compare the following:

11.

- a. K. hace- [//] tengo mucho frío.
K. it's- [//] I'm very cold.

- b. hace mucho frío. it's very cold.
tengo mucho frío. I'm very cold

12.

- a. K. dibuje- [//] haga como hacen las vacas.
draw- [//] do how the cows go.

- b. dibuje como hacen las vacas. draw how the cows go.
haga como hacen las vacas. do how the cows go.

The examples in (a) are regularized versions of actual examples.¹² It can reasonably be inferred from examining these examples that the speaker is substituting one element by another, thus effecting a repair in the original utterance. However, the same assumption does not follow in the (b) utterances. It is unclear if in fact the speaker

¹²In these examples, the phonology and syntax are rendered in standard Spanish since the examples are only being used as illustrations of a methodological point.

wants to correct his previous utterance or if new additional information is given in (11b) and two different requests are being made in (12b).

Again, it is possible to identify particular cases where one utterance follows another with a repair function. Thus, in the following example there would probably be no doubts about considering the second utterance a repair:

13.

K: qué es esas cos#ses [??]? what is those thu#ungs[??]
 K: qué es esas cosas? (K05) what is those things?

We would probably make this inference by considering, first, that in the first utterance some problem is evident and in fact an error occurs in the production of the noun "cosas".¹³ Secondly, the second utterance adds no new meaning with respect to the first. The same elements are found, ordered in the same way, except that the problematic element is now rendered in standard form. Thus in this particular instance these two criteria, in combination, would allow one to support that this is in fact a repair. However, for the examples given in (11b) and (12b) there are no such unequivocal criteria. At the end of the analysis, it would still not be clear that all and only cases of repair were examined.

¹³There is of course a further "error" in verb-noun agreement but the child does not attempt to correct this.

Some repair types are more easily identified than others, when across utterances. Repairs where an overt correction occurs are usually clear. Repetition repairs, also called "covert repairs" (Levelt 1983, 1989), are not. So for example, when carrying out a quantitative analysis, there might be a skewing of the data in favor of successive utterances with phonological or lexical corrections rather than other, more subtle types of repairs.

Finally, when a repair stretches past an utterance completion point there is the possibility that other speakers may intervene and either carry out the repair or participate in its completion, which for exposition purposes in this thesis are included as cases of other-repairs.

In view of the difficulties mentioned, it was decided to limit the quantitative analysis of the corpus, only to cases of intra-utterance self-repairs. That is, those for which all instances can be identified with a relative degree of certainty. However, in the discussion of repair sequences in Chapter VI, instances of inter-utterance self-repairs and also cases of self-initiated, other-completed repairs are found, and will be analyzed within the context of a repair sequence.

Intra-utterance repairs have been described in the literature as cases of self-initiated repairs usually

occurring after some trouble source perceived by the speaker before the finalization of his utterance. Since the trouble source may be covert or may not be an error, the occurrence of a problem cannot be used as a defining or identifying criterion. Rather, often it is the initiation of the repair that clues somebody in to the fact that a problem may have occurred. Therefore, intra-utterance repairs will be identified by the fact that they modify or disrupt an emergent clausal organization. In addition, the initiation of a repair within the utterance is often indicated by one of a number of repair-initiation techniques (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977, Schegloff 1979). Instances of these last are an abrupt cutoff of the ongoing sentence sometimes occurring in the middle of a word, drawling or lengthening of a final word-segment, a pause or silence, use of hesitation markers and abrupt changes in intonation. More than one of these repair indicators may be used at the same time. Although the main identifying criterion will be instances of clause disruption, in doubtful cases the presence of a repair initiation marker will be used to make a decision. The presence of one of these phenomena alone, however, without clause disruption, will not be sufficient to include the utterance in the self-repair corpus.

The corpus constructed by applying these criteria consists of 707 repaired utterances in which the repairs are usually indicated by an abrupt cut-off or interruption of the sentence sometimes in the middle of a word, followed by a pause or some other editing marker and then by a disruption in the projected sentence word order. Hesitation markers used in Spanish may be the prolonged or drawled continuation of the last segment of a word or interjections such as "eh", "uh" or "este". Following the break, part of the original utterance may be recycled or some part of the original utterance may be corrected or abandoned depending on what is causing the trouble. In some cases the beginning of the repair phase is indicated by a markedly different intonation contour when the utterance is continued.

The child repairs 592 utterances over a total of 4,426 utterances produced, that is 13% of her utterances are repaired. The mother repairs 80 utterances or 2% of a total of 4,015 utterances, and the father repairs 35 utterances or 8% of the 412 utterances produced. Since a number of utterances have more than one break or repair occurring, the total number of repairs which make up this corpus is of 1047.

5.2.2. Identification of other-repairs

In this group, all repair instances in which the interlocutor intervenes will be examined. Thus, there will

be cases of self-initiated but other-completed repairs and of other-initiated repairs which may then be self- or other-completed.

INITIATION	COMPLETION
Self	Other
Other	Self
Other	Other

Self-initiated, other-completed repairs are cases in which, after initiating a repair, the original speaker finds that he cannot go through with it and abandons the utterance midway. The interlocutor then picks this up and completes the utterance. In addition there will be a few cases in which the speaker solicits the other to complete an utterance or provide a missing word.

Other-initiated, self-completed repairs are those in which the interlocutor questions some part of the prior speaker's turn, giving this speaker the chance to modify, clarify, explain, expand or correct. These repairs have been discussed in the literature under the rubrics of contingent queries or requests for clarification and will form the bulk of the other-repairs corpus. They take the form of questions, both Yes-No and WH-questions which are contingent on a previous utterance. A further defining criterion is that the questions cannot introduce new meaning to the conversation (Corsaro 1977). That is, the clarification request may apply to all or part of a previous utterance but

it cannot introduce a topic not contained in the previous utterance. This was an initial guideline for identifying repairs but it was found that this criterion needed to be expanded. For example, an interlocutor may initiate a repair because he feels that there is some element of meaning which should have been included in the previous utterance but was omitted. Additionally, he may request clarification of something that is not explicit in the previous utterance but is derivable from it such as an implication or presupposition. Thus, a broader criterion must be used for what can be legitimately said to be part of the "meaning" contributed by a previous utterance to the conversation. The specific criteria for identifying contingent query repairs will be discussed in Chapter V when discussing various systems for classifications of contingent queries proposed in the literature and proposed modifications of them.

Other-initiated, other-completed repairs are what are usually known as corrections, both explicit and implicit. Explicit corrections have some explicit marker of rejection of the previous utterance, such as "No" or "You don't say x", "That's wrong" or even "You mean to say x, not y". Although there are many instances of the parents' corrections of the child's behavior, there are few linguistic corrections by any

participant. The cases that occur are discussed in Chapter V.

Implicit corrections are more difficult to identify. Basically, they involve that all or part of the speaker's previous utterance is "rejected" by the interlocutor who proposes something else in its place. The rejection is not made explicit by saying "No" or some other device, but rather is implicit in the proposal of an alternative. These types of repairs are very interesting when analyzing the co-construction of meaning because they invariably give rise to negotiations. However, because of their non-explicit nature they are not always easy to identify as corrections and may be taken as something else: an addition, a continuation to the previous speaker's utterance. This ambiguity is part of their character and is part of what makes this and other "implicit" devices useful in conversation. However, when defining a corpus and encountering an "implicit" strategy, the analyst is faced with the same problem that a conversationalist is faced with in identifying what the utterance should count as or trying to interpret his interlocutor's intent. However, the analyst does not have the possibility that a conversationalist has of simply "calling" it an x and negotiating meaning from there.

Because of these problems, it was again decided to limit quantitative analysis at this point to those cases that are unequivocal and can be identified following the criteria set.

Cases like these implicit corrections will be discussed in general. Individual instances which are clear and non-equivocal will be shown as examples. Instances that may occur in the examination of a repair sequence will be discussed in the context of that sequence but, at this point, a quantitative analysis of these will not be attempted.

5.2.3. Identification of repair sequences

A third set of data analyzed is that of interactive sequences in which a repair is cooperatively accomplished.

Other-repairs have usually been examined in the literature as three-part exchanges:

Trouble-source
Repair request
Repair

However, very often in conversation the initiation of a repair gives rise to much longer sequences into which a variety of repair exchanges may be incorporated. These sequences will be examined to determine how they are organized and how they are cooperatively accomplished.

Because of the length and number of sequences, I decided to restrict the analysis to a subset of transcripts. The

ones selected were K01, K04, K08 and K13. Since my interest was in studying the course of development of repairing, one criterion for selection was to have, as closely as possible, evenly spaced transcripts that would include the end-points. In order to get comparable data, an additional criterion was to select similar types of situations. I decided to pick situations in which the mother was fully involved with the child and in which the conversation evolved through interaction, since that was what was going on in K01 and K13. On the basis of this, K04 and K08 were selected. Interestingly enough, these transcripts turn out to be the ones in which the percentage of child-utterances relative to the total number of utterances is the highest, ranging from 55% to 64%, as opposed to 33% child-utterances in K11 where the mother is teaching the child a card-game or 41% in K09 where the mother is teaching the child to count.

For the purposes of this study, the analysis of repair sequences was restricted to types of interactive situations that were similar to each other. At some future point it might be interesting to compare what goes on in child-directed situations (K01 or K13) with what goes on in mother-directed ones (K09 or K11), for example.

A second limitation was to restrict the repair sequences studied to those initiated by contingent queries. Repair

sequences were identified by searching for the first contingent query in a sequence and tracing back to the utterance that prompted that query. This gave the beginning point of the sequence.

The end-point of the sequence was much more difficult to determine and will remain more open to debate. Various factors were taken into account: topic maintenance, presence of closure or evaluation markers, resolution of the problem, initiation of a new type of sequence. When a number of these coincided, the decision to consider the sequence at an end was made with relative confidence. End-points do remain fluid though, and very often in conversation the participants will realize that something has ended after they realize that something else has begun. Also, on occasions, a sequence was abandoned by one or both of the participants but then brought up again later on in the conversation. This often occurred when the repair was not successfully accomplished and when problems still remained. This brings up the point of whether these re-introduced sequences should be considered as continuations of a previous one or as new sequences. The elucidation of this point remains a question for analysis. Repair sequences are analyzed and discussed in Chapter VI.

5.2.4. Summary of identificational criteria

Self-repairs were identified by the occurrence of breaks in the ongoing utterance coupled with a disruption of sentence structure. These breaks were often accompanied by the occurrence of hesitation markers, silences and or drawling or lengthening of words. These were taken as additional criteria for identification, but the occurrence of one of these markers alone without a break and disruption was not considered sufficient evidence to include the utterance in the corpus.

Other-initiated repairs were utterances contingent on a previous turn by the interlocutor, usually the immediately prior turn. These repairs took the form of questions which sought the clarification, completion or verification of what the interlocutor said.

Repair sequences were identified by locating an other-initiated repair. Then the utterance that this repair was addressing was located. This was considered the Original Utterance for the sequence and marked the beginning point. Any subsequent queries of the original utterance and responses to them, were included in the repair sequence. The end-point of the sequence was identified by the occurrence of one of various phenomena: an acknowledgement or completion marker for the repair, a resumption of the conversation from

the point of interruption, a change in topic, or a new initiation. These were not always easy to identify, and the definition of the end-point in a few cases remains open to re-examination. In general, however, the repair sequences are fairly clear and present few organizational problems.

CHAPTER IV
SELF-INITIATED REPAIRS

In this chapter I will examine a corpus of the child's self-initiated repairs drawn from the thirteen tapes described in Chapter III. I will examine the occurrence and use of self-repair strategies in the spontaneous conversations of a young (1:7.20 - 2:11.15) child acquiring Spanish as a first language engaged in interaction with an adult, usually the mother. Both child and adult self-initiated repairs will be discussed, comparing the types of repairs used by each participant and describing any changes that might occur in both the child's and the adult's speech in response to the child's developing linguistic abilities and growing linguistic awareness.

A typology of these repairs will be established on the basis of previous studies reported in the literature, and any changes in repair-behavior that may reflect the child's developing linguistic awareness and communicative competence will be described. Although the analysis will be primarily of the child's repairs, the mother's repairs are also examined, in order to establish comparisons with adult

native-speaker's repair behaviors. In the first part of the chapter, I review the literature on self-repairs and especially those studies that have reported on self-repair mechanisms by children. In the second section, presents a classification of the types of self-repairs found in these data. The third section will describe the repairs effected by the child with reference to the child's linguistic development.

1. PREVIOUS ANALYSES OF SELF-INITIATED REPAIRS

1.1. Studies on repairs by adult native-speakers

As was mentioned in Chapter II, there have been relatively few studies of repairs in the literature. A sizable group of studies come not from linguists but from conversation analysts (Jefferson 1975; Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974; Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977; Schegloff 1979). As has been mentioned, they establish a two-way distinction between self- and other-repairs and between initiation and completion of the repair, so that four possibilities for carrying out a repair may be distinguished: (a) self-initiation and completion of a repair, (b) self-initiation but other-completion, (c) other-initiation but self-completion, and (d) other-initiation and other-completion. In their analyses of American-English conversational data they make minute observations on the

placement and functioning of repairs in conversation. Of particular importance for the analysis of self-repairs is to examine their functioning with reference to the turn-taking system in conversation. The turn-taking system exerts pressure on speakers to repair a problem in an utterance before reaching a possible completion point for that utterance. Should a speaker fail to do so, he may lose the chance to repair his utterance since the turn may pass to another speaker at the completion point. Thus, there is structural pressure for the repair to be accomplished before the completion of the unit, i.e. in the same utterance in which the repairable occurred. Throughout the description of self-repairs, I will refer to observations made by conversational analysts. It will be shown that repair phenomena are orderly, are describable, and are remarkably similar even across languages.

Among linguists, even though there has been considerable interest on speech errors (Fromkin 1973, 1980) there have been very few descriptions of repairs. Nootboom (1973, 1980) discusses error productions and corrections re-analyzing Meringer's data. In these articles Nootboom notes the occurrence of different types of "slip-of-the-tongue" errors. He classifies errors into lexical or phonological, according to where the error occurs. There is a further sub-

classification of errors into anticipation errors, perseveration errors and "switches". Anticipation errors are those in which a sound or word still to be produced may influence the production of a previous sound or word. In perseveration errors, a previously produced element is carried over and affects a later one. In the third type, phonological or semantic elements of one word may be switched to another one. Among his findings, he reports that anticipation errors are corrected more frequently than others and phonological errors more frequently than lexical. Lexical and phonological errors also differ as to the place of repair initiation. Although both types of errors tend to be repaired at the first word boundary after the error is produced, there is a slightly greater tendency for the utterance to continue beyond this boundary when the error is lexical rather than phonological. At the same time, when lexical errors are repaired, the repair more often retraces one or more words from the original utterance prior the error.

Another comprehensive study was carried out by Levelt (1983, 1989) who discusses the repairs effected by Dutch-speaking adults engaged in a quasi-experimental task in which they had to describe the relative placement of colored circles to an interviewer. From this data he obtained a

corpus of 959 spontaneous self-initiated repairs. He found that speakers were selective in repairing so that only 46% of errors produced were repaired. The most frequent type of repairs made by the Dutch adults were error-repairs (42%). However, speakers also made changes to make the utterance more appropriate for the context or more suited to the particular recipient. Appropriateness repairs accounted for 30% of the corpus. Additional repairs occurred when a speaker changed his mind about what he wanted to say (1%). Finally, a large number of repairs were covert repairs (25%). In this type of repair, the occurrence of a problem was made apparent by a disruption in the utterance. However, the repair was effected with no apparent modification to the projected utterance so that the source of the trouble was not displayed overtly to the hearer. This type of repair is the most frequent in Koki's corpus. Levelt's classification system for repairs will be taken up again below when I discuss the classification of repairs in our corpus.

1.2. Studies of self-repairs by adult second-language learners

In the area of second language learning there is growing interest in learners' communicative behaviors, including the use of repair mechanisms. I have not included an exhaustive

review of this literature in this study because it was considered that this would exceed the intended scope of our particular research goals at this time. The study of repairs is still in an exploratory stage both in first and second language research, and the differences between the situation of an adult learning a second language and a child acquiring her first language are too great, and there are too many additional variables in the case of the second language learning situation, to allow for systematic comparisons. The crucial difference in the language learning situation is that the second-language-learning adults already have a language, their native language, in which they are competent, so that in their repair work on the second language they can use already established repair mechanisms which have been developed in their first language. What the studies report on is how the learners' competence in the second language develops, and how this growing competence allows for successful error correction of particular structures. In the child, what is found is a development of awareness and competence in repairing as such.

This discussion brings up another variable about which there is no information at this time. The variable introduced is that although repair mechanism have been proposed as universal, there is as yet little knowledge about

what in repairs may be language specific. If the study of learner's repairs involves speakers from different language backgrounds then there is an uncontrolled variable introduced into the research.

In addition, there is the problem of variability in the interlocutor. There can be variability with respect to language background and there can be variability with respect to language proficiency. With respect to language background, the interlocutor may be a native speaker of the second language that the learner is in the process of acquiring; he may be of a different language background, possibly himself a learner and with a different degree of proficiency than the learner himself; or he may be a native speaker of the same language as the learner.

With respect to proficiency in the target language, the interlocutor may be more advanced than the learner, at approximately the same level or less advanced. If he is more advanced in the second language the situation is probably not much different than in other types of asymmetrical less competent/more competent situations. However, we do not know if speakers behave differentially if they perceive that their interlocutor is not a native speaker, even though he may be more proficient than them. If the interlocutor is less competent, there is the added variable of a learner who is

having problems and is not able to rely on his interlocutor's knowledge to solve those problems.

Finally, if the interlocutor is a speaker of the same language as the learner and yet they are conversing in another language, there is the additional variable of artificiality of the situation if there are no extraneously imposed constraints, or in formality when outside constraints dictate that the conversation be carried out in a particular language. This last is the case of many language-teaching settings, where the teacher may be a native speaker of the learner's L1 but may use the target language within the instructional setting. Here, a learner may resort to code-switching for solving a conversational difficulty. This is not an option for the child.

Several studies that have been carried out recently are, however, beginning to address some of these issues (Faerch and Kasper 1983a, 1983b; Haastrup and Philipson 1983). Salo-Lee (1987), reviewing current research on repairs in second language learning, reports that in informal situations between learners, self-repairs are produced and the sequence is cooperative in nature. In informal asymmetrical situations, where the interlocutor is a native speaker, the distribution of self- and other-repairs depends on the level of proficiency of the learner. In instructional settings,

other repairs most often occur, and usually take the form of corrections. Within interview testing situations, self-repairs are expected to occur and repairs of different types have been found. Other-repairs seem to be solicited only at the lower levels of proficiency. One interesting comment is that repair markers are found only with the more advanced learners, which would indicate that some aspects of repair mechanisms are dependent on the language being used rather than being universal, and are only found when the learner is more competent. However, this points out a difference with young children who use repair markers even at very early stages of linguistic development.

In her own research findings, on repairs effected by English-speaking college students learning German, Salo-Lee found that a curvilinear pattern emerged with respect to self-repairs. In the three proficiency levels that she studied, repairs increased as the learners' ability to effect repairs increased, and diminished as the learners' competence increased. Earlier repairs tended to be more code-related, that is, they dealt with problems of structure, while later repairs tended to be more discourse related, i.e., trying to adapt the discourse to the communicative needs of the situation. Salo-Lee derives from her study a number of pedagogical implications about how language teachers can

incorporate research on repairs into the language situation in the L2 classroom, by actively including the teaching of repair mechanisms and strategies (see also Faerch and Kasper 1982b), and at the same time promoting in the students a reduction of concentration on the code and encouraging them to try out new things in the target language, to be linguistic "explorers" using language to achieve communicative ends and taking advantage of the possibility of feedback from more competent speakers. I will return to these implications in the conclusions.

1.3. Studies of children's self-repairs

Clark (1978) gives an overview of early studies or discussions of spontaneous self-repair in child-language literature. The earliest that she cites are the works of Bohn (1914) and Snyder (1914) who found that children two and a half and younger can carry out different types of self-repairs such as addition of words, changes in word-order and lexical substitution. Most of the studies on children's repairs are cross-sectional studies which correlate repair mechanisms to speaker variables such as sex or age. MacWhinney and Osser (1977) examined a broad range of what the authors call hesitation phenomena in the speech of twenty 4-5 year-old British children in one-to-one interviews with

an adult. These hesitation phenomena include pre-turn and within-turn pausing, drawling of final segments of words, use of interjections, repetitions of parts of sentences and phonological, lexical and syntactic corrections. Examination of the various hesitation phenomena led the authors to posit the use of two types of planning functions for the production of utterances: pre-planning, indicated by pausing before initiating the utterance, and co-planning, indicated by interruptions and false-starts once the utterance had been started. In addition, some children made use of a strategy which the authors characterized as the "avoidance of superfluous verbalization", in which the type of repair chosen (e.g., pausing), helped the speaker gain time without inserting additional material. The use of interjections, for example, would add extra material to the utterance while a pause or silence would be an instance of avoiding superfluous verbalization. The authors found a significant correlation between the type of repair used and sex of the child. Boys seemed to carry out more co-planning indicated by within utterance filled and unfilled pausing, repetitions and false starts, while girls seemed to take more time to pre-plan their utterances, evidenced by the number and length of initial pauses. In addition, boys showed a greater number of superfluous verbalizations than did girls.

Rogers (1977) carried out a study on spontaneous repairs occurring in the speech of 5 and 6 year olds in a pre-school. The children were interviewed separately and asked to talk in response to picture stimuli about events having to do with their life and activities outside school. He found that both age-groups were actively monitoring their speech and producing spontaneous corrections to their sentences; but while the 5 year-olds had more corrections that involved "relatively minor changes (particularly morphology)" (Rogers 1977:370) the corrections by the 6 year-olds involved using more advanced syntactic rules than those used spontaneously in the original utterance. Also, the older children had a higher overall frequency of spontaneous self-corrections, which indicates for the author that as the child becomes more mature linguistically he also develops the ability to make judgments about how he is saying what he is saying, and about the effect that his utterance may have on others.

Evans (1985) compared spontaneous self-initiated repairs across two age-groups, 18 kindergarten children (mean age 5.5) and 18 second graders (mean age 7.9) in "Show and Tell" sessions in their classrooms. Repairs were classified into Repetitions, Corrections, Abandonments and Postponements. The older children were found to effect more self-repairs than the younger ones, but had a similar distribution of

repair types, with repetitions being significantly the most frequent. There were, however, differences between groups in the types of corrections made. The younger children had more reference corrections while the older ones had a greater number of other word-choice corrections. Evans emphasizes that even the younger children were shown to be actively monitoring and correcting their utterances and showed the full range of repair types used by the older children.

Three additional studies examine longitudinal data to obtain spontaneous self-repairs in natural conversations. These are of particular relevance to our study since they are the closest both with respect to methodology and because of the age of the children studied.

Scollon (1976) studies the development of conversation in the speech of a child, Brenda, from the time she was 1:0.2 to 2:0.12 years of age. Brenda is slightly younger than the child in our study. The data are taken from naturally occurring interactions between the child, the mother and two adult observers. There are also sequences of interaction with an older sibling, (4:0.6 - 5:0.16). Scollon does not deal specifically with repairs; but discusses several related features such as adults' adaptations of their speech in response to the child's linguistic capacities, the child's variability in intelligibility as a response to her role in

conversation, and several types of "discourse redundancies", some of which seem to carry out repair functions.

The adult interacting with Brenda makes an evaluation of her abilities which will guide his or her future talk in the interaction. The adult's expectations of what Brenda can do limit what she is allowed to do. An adult that frequently interacts with the child allows the child greater flexibility because frequent interaction permits frequent re-evaluations of the child's competency and abilities. With respect to participation in interaction, while in the later tapes the child seems to control the interaction by choosing when to participate and controlling the topics to be discussed, in the earlier tapes, the adults tend to fit in their talk around the child's utterances and make their own talk semantically related to them. These behaviors are related to repair behaviors in adapting speech in terms of the listener's needs and abilities.

One finding indirectly related to repairs was of a correlation between intelligibility of utterances and participant status. It was observed that in those instances when the adults excluded Brenda from the conversation, her speech tended to become unintelligible. Scollon ponders the cause and effect relationships of this phenomenon. Was the unintelligibility of the child's speech what resulted in her

being excluded from the conversation, or was she excluded and therefore made no further effort to adapt her speech to the listener's needs? Scollon surmises that both operate contingently. When not in the role of direct addressee, some monitoring mechanisms may relax with the result that the speech becomes less intelligible. This, at the same time, affects the interactions of others with the child who reduce interaction because of unintelligibility.

Scollon also describes various "discourse redundancies", in particular imitation and repetition, which play a role in repair strategies. He describes the child's repetition of her own speech and imitation of her interlocutor's, and it is shown that some of the functions that these strategies carry out are repairs. In particular, he notices that Brenda's repetitions very often are practices of words and phrases which usually occur in quick succession. Repetitions also seemed to increase with age. Scollon distinguishes two types of repetition which he calls phonological and discursive. Phonological repetitions seem to be approximations of pronunciation towards more standard forms. Discursive repetition secures uptake of an initiation; the child repeats until she is understood and gets a response. It seems, therefore, that these repetitions carry out repair-related functions. The child secures uptake when the adult is

inattentive, obtains a display of understanding, and corrects her utterances by approximating a more adult form at each successive try. These successive tries may occur as self-repairs, as the child attempts to match in her production a target form already acquired in her competence or they may be attempts at making an utterance more intelligible, maybe in response to the adult's lack of understanding.

Both spontaneous and elicited imitations also occur in the data. Imitations seem to have the function of modelling or pattern-practice. Following an adult correction, for example, the child often imitates the correction. Also, there are numerous spontaneous imitations of stressed words or words that stand out in the interaction. Imitation allows the child to practice words while the adult model is present, and when there is a possibility for immediate feedback. It leads to expansion of the phonological system and of the child's vocabulary. Imitation provides the child with means to practice contrasts and structures which are not yet in her system while "repetition provides means for elaborating the system from within and testing it out" (Scollon 1976:100).

Clark and Andersen (1979) give an overview of the spontaneous self-repairs in the natural conversations of three children aged 2 to 3 years old: Sean (2:2.16-2:11), Kate (2:8-3:0.5), and Zelda (2:11.20-3:7.14). The two

younger children cover an age-span very similar to that of the child in our study. The age-span of the older child picks up where this study leaves off.

The authors identified two major groupings of repairs: "repairs to the system" and "repairs for the listener". With respect to the first group, the authors hold that these occur when a child's production does not match an internal representation of some form. The authors hypothesize that children monitor parts of the system that they are acquiring and therefore repair what they are working on at each particular moment in their development. The data from the three children would lend support to this. For example, there are greater numbers of phonological repairs in the younger children than in the older one. Conversely, the older one has many more syntactic repairs. All three children are at a development stage where they are adding new inflections to their morphological system and there is no significant variation with respect to number of morphological repairs.

Repairs made for the listener are those in which a modification is made to aid the listener's understanding of the utterance. Some phonological or syntactic repairs are made to assure better understanding. Notable however, are word substitutions, sometimes in response to an error, having

chosen the wrong word, sometimes in an effort to make an utterance more precise by replacing a more general term (animal, shoe) for a more specific one (dog, sandal). Also geared to the listener's needs were replacements of pronouns by nouns or noun phrases, especially in cases where use of the pronoun would result in ambiguities (multiple referents for the pronoun "he" for example).

Clark and Andersen stress that children's repairs provide strong evidence that from a very early age they are aware of their language and that this metalinguistic awareness plays an important role in motivating language acquisition.

McTear (1985) examines the self-repairs occurring in the spontaneous conversations between two children, Siobhan (3.8-5.5) and Heather (4.0-5.9). The data are drawn from video tapes made in the home of one of the children during spontaneous play. He analyzes repairs along with other conversational processes. He finds that both children have the ability to manipulate grammar as needed to effect a repair. In addition, both showed sensitivity to social factors underlying interaction, for example, in corrections of the other, they showed awareness of politeness requirements for smooth social interaction.

With respect specifically to self-repairs, he found that the children showed a preference for self-repair. The data shows higher frequencies of self-repair, both self- or other-initiated than of other-repair, as occurs in adult conversations studied by the conversation analysts (Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks 1977). There are some repairs to pronunciation but these are infrequent. There are two examples of repairs aiming at more correct pronunciation, and some examples of corrections of anticipation errors and other slip-of-the-tongue phenomena. Repairs to grammar, however, are more frequent. The data show no clear overall pattern, but several different types can be distinguished. Some of the repairs are purely grammatical; others, however, involve grammatical repair but seem to be pragmatically motivated. These grammatical repairs show that the children have awareness of various grammatical rules. Pragmatically occasioned repairs include various kinds of lexical substitutions, such as substituting nouns for pronouns to make an utterance more explicit, and changes to make an utterance more polite by replacing stronger by more tentative forms.

With respect to their structural characteristics, self-repairs by children are similar to what has been reported for adults. Most self-repairs occur within the same turn as the

problem source, before the possible completion point of the utterance. However, there are some that occur at the turn transition point and some at a following turn. Repairs are located at turn beginnings or post-verbal position within the clause. Following a repair, there may be recyclings of other material in the utterance. These recyclings, for adults, go back to the beginning of the clause in which the repair occurred; thus repairs occurring in main clauses might recycle back to the beginning of the utterance while those in subordinate structures would only recycle to the beginning of the clause.

McTear's findings seem to correspond to what has been reported in previous studies. He indicates a broad range of linguistic and situational phenomena that children are attuned to and a broad range of repairs that they are capable of effecting.

The virtual absence of phonological self-repairs would support Clark and Andersen's hypothesis that children self-monitor and repair those items that they are in the process of "working on" in their acquisition. Correspondingly, he finds in these children awareness of politeness considerations, which haven't been reported in studies of younger children.

There are no reports in the literature of repair or revision behaviors in Spanish-speaking children. In this respect the present study will be a contribution. Additionally, it fills in the age-span in between the study by Scollon and that carried out by McTear. This study thus will provide comparative data on repairs from a language other than English and will also allow for a display of the continuity of development in children's ability to self-monitor and correct or avoid problems in their conversations.

2. CLASSIFICATION OF REPAIR TYPES

Self-initiated repairs are attempts by a speaker to correct some problem in one of his utterances. Problems which a speaker attempts to correct may be of two general types: a) a problem in the speaker's production of an utterance, and b) what the speaker believes to be a difficulty that will affect his interlocutor's understanding and interpretation of the utterance. Once the speaker becomes aware of a problem, whether actual or potential, he may initiate a series of steps to repair the problem if it has occurred or prevent it from occurring, in the case of a potential difficulty.

There have been few classifications of within-utterance repairs. MacWhinney and Osser (1977) in the study mentioned previously, analyze several types of "hesitation phenomena"

in speech, which can be grouped into pausing, both initial and within the utterance, drawls or sound lengthening, repetitions of parts of words, words or phrases, corrections which may add, delete or substitute material in an utterance and sentence incompletions where the sentence that has been started is abandoned. Evans (1985) classifies the repairs found in her corpus into Repetitions, Corrections, further sub-divided into reference, word-choice and syntactic corrections, Abandonments or "radical corrections" of multiple elements within a sentence which may lead to the abandonment of the original sentence formulation, and finally Postponements in which a sentence is interrupted in order to insert extra material before it is continued. Evans does not examine some of the phenomena discussed by MacWhinney and Osser, namely, pausing or word-drawling. However the remainder of the phenomena are the same for both studies: repetitions of part of the utterance, corrections and abandonments or sentence incompletions. In both studies the emphasis is placed on the type of strategy used for effecting a repair, whether it be a repetition or a correction of some part of the ongoing utterance. There are, however, differences between these classifications. For example, MacWhinney and Osser classify sentence corrections in terms of the process by which the repair is effected, whether they

add to, delete or substitute material in the original utterance, while Evans classifies them in terms of what is being corrected: reference, lexical choice or syntax.

Levelt (1983) proposes a primary classification which stems from a consideration of the type of problem being repaired, in particular whether the repair is occasioned by an error (E-repairs) or whether the repair is an attempt to accommodate the listener by a more appropriate choice of words (A-repairs). He distinguishes four broad categories of repairs, as follows. Difference or D-repairs occur when the speaker self-interrupts because he wants to say something different from what he started to say. Appropriateness or A-repairs are repairs in which the speaker makes changes in his utterance to make it more appropriate to the ongoing social situation. Error or E-repairs are those in which the speaker perceives and seeks to correct some error in his utterance. Finally, there is a group of Covert or C-repairs where a repair is carried out but it is not apparent to a listener, given the characteristics of the repair, what the trouble source is.

Within these major groupings, there are some subdivisions. Thus, within A-repairs Levelt distinguishes among three types: ambiguity-reduction, lexical appropriateness and coherence repairs. Ambiguity-reduction repairs are changes

made to replace an ambiguous element in a sentence, for example, replacing pronouns by a corresponding noun phrase. Lexical- appropriateness repairs are cases in which a speaker substitutes lexical items in "trying to find the appropriate level for expressing the core of the concept to the hearer" (Levelt 1983:52). This category encompasses word-choice substitutions, for example. There are few examples of this in this corpus but in general these word-choice replacements seem to substitute a more precise term in place of a more general term in the original utterance. Finally, Coherence-repairs, the third category within the appropriateness repairs, monitor for "coherence with previous text, especially previously used terminology" (Levelt 1983:53).

In general, what has been found is that children show examples of all the different types of repairs found in adult studies, but, as will be discussed more fully in the analysis of my own results, frequency of occurrence will vary greatly. To take but one case, covert repairs (repetitions of previous material) comprise only 25% of the repairs made by adults in the Dutch corpus while they account for approximately 50% of the repairs made by the children in Evans' corpus and close to 60% of the Koki corpus.

In this study I will maintain the distinction between Error and Appropriateness repairs posited by Levelt. Among

the competencies that children display as evidence of their growing linguistic awareness are both the ability to repair their speech spontaneously, occurring as early as one-and-a-half or two, and the ability to adjust their speech to their listener, which has been documented for children three to four years old (Clark 1978:35). In these transcripts Koki shows both an awareness that some of the forms that she uses are not right, resulting in error repairs and also there are several instances of repairs in which she adjusts her speech to her listener's needs, especially to reduce reference ambiguity. A research goal will be to separate out cases of repair because of a problem in production and repair for maximizing understanding. However, as a first approximation to the data, I use Evans' classification of repairs according to the type of modification effected: Repetition, Correction, Postponement or Abandonment. This provides an entry into the data for purposes of classification which does not interpret a priori functions or speaker's intentions in speech activities.

Repetitions are any exact repetitions of part of the utterance. If there was any change in a word or change of word order then the repair did not count as a repetition but rather as a correction or modification; however, there may have been some prosodic differences which were not taken into

account. Correction¹ repairs were those that effected any change between the original utterance and the repair: addition of elements, deletions, substitutions or changes in word order. Postponement repairs were those in which some new information was inserted before the sentence was continued. The sentence, however, would have been grammatical without the addition. Finally, Abandonments refer to what others have called false starts or as Evans describes them "discarding all of the interrupted utterance and replacing it anew" (Evans 1985:367): when a speaker drops his original utterance and starts it over again or starts to say something different. Following are examples of each of these types of repairs.

Repetition:

1. K. con e- [/] con esa cucharita. [K12]
[with that spoon]
2. F: esta familia de San An- [/] de San Antonio? [K06]
[this family from San Antonio?]

Correction:

3. K. ese agua [//] esa agua es para echar agua ...
[K05]
[that water is to pour water ...]

¹ I am using the term "correction" since that was the term employed by Evans. However as has been mentioned above, not all of these corrections involved the correction of an actual error. In many cases the repair changed some part of the original utterance though there may have been no apparent error.

4. M. no Koki no [//] la mamá no se [//] Koki no se lastimó.
[no Koki didn't [//] mommy didn't [//] Koki didn't hurt herself] [K04]

Postponement:

5. K. no se- [//] pero ya no se prendió la luces. [K08]
"no se- [//] pero ya no se prendió las luces"
[they didn't [//] but they didn't come on, the lights]
6. M. #4.4 pero hay que [//] cuando es de noche hay que tener una casita. [K13]
[but one has to [//] when it's night one has to have a house]

Abandonment:

7. K. mejor no me [//] mejor [//] ay, un ajerito! [K12]
[better not [//] better [//] oh, a hole!]
8. F: ese es el abuelito Cho- [//] ah, así. [K07]
[that's grandfather Cho- [//] oh, this way.]

Following Levelt I will refer to the sentence to the point of interruption as the original utterance. The interruption marks the point of repair initiation which Levelt calls the "editing phase" of the repair and following the repair-initiation marker there is the "repair phase" in which the utterance is continued and possibly completed. We speak of the sentence being possibly completed because in some cases completion does not occur, or at least, not immediately. The repair itself may undergo a repair cycle before continuing and sometimes there are two or three essays at repairing the same item or construction in the sentence. In addition, some point further along in the sentence may

undergo a repair cycle and the sentence may eventually be abandoned.

In the data, there are approximately 700 utterances that are interrupted in mid-production, repaired and then completed following the repair. These constitute the corpus to be analyzed, in which the boundaries of the sentence constrain the form and placement of the repair in various ways.

The present study will show that even in the earliest tape (1:7.20) Koki was monitoring and correcting her utterances using a wide variety of different repair strategies in response to various types of conversational difficulties.

3. THE CORPUS

Using the criteria for identification of self-repaired utterances outlined in Chapter III, I selected all instances of similar repaired utterances found in the transcripts. The corpus thus formed consists of 707 repaired utterances in which the repairs are indicated primarily by an abrupt cut-off or interruption of the sentence, sometimes in the middle of a word. Following the break, part of the original utterance may be recycled or some part of the original utterance may be corrected or abandoned depending on what is

causing the trouble. In some cases the beginning of the repair phase is indicated by a markedly different intonation contour when the utterance is continued.

3.1. Distribution of Repair Types in the Data

The child repairs 592 utterances over a total of 4,426 utterances produced, that is 13% of her utterances are repaired. The mother repairs 80 utterances or 2% of a corpus of 4,015 utterances, and the father² repairs 35 out of 412 utterances, or 8% of his utterances.

Since a number of utterances have more than one break or repair occurring, the total number of repairs which make up this corpus is 1047 (907 by Koki, 90 by the mother and 50 by the father).

Tables 1 and 2 show the distribution of repaired utterances versus the total number of utterances for each of the participants, across the 13 transcripts, and Table 3 gives the total number of repairs.

²We will not analyze the father's data since he is not a native speaker of Spanish and this introduces additional variables with respect to his linguistic behavior which go beyond the scope of this study. However, we will examine briefly the frequency and distribution of his self-repairs to show some differences in use between a child acquiring language, an adult learning a second language and an adult native-speaker of the language.

Table 1:--Distribution of repaired utterances

TAPE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	TOTAL
Koki	44	15	28	54	39	6	78	111	46	47	25	15	84	592
	9%	6%	9%	12%	14%	8%	20%	22%	14%	20%	10%	6%	14%	
M	2	2	2	8	7	-	5	7	10	6	17	4	10	80
	1%	1%	1%	3%	3%	-	1%	2%	2%	2%	4%	1%	2%	
F	-	-	-	-	9	7	4	10	-	-	-	5	-	35
	-	0%	-	-	14%	7%	7%	13%	-	0%	-	12%	-	

Table 2:--Total number of utterances for each participant

TAPE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	TOTAL
Koki	494	254	308	446	277	79	399	507	325	235	244	246	612	4426
M	332	226	282	251	225	-	339	335	473	291	484	288	489	4015
F	-	48	-	-	63	99	61	77	-	22	-	42	-	412

Table 3:--Total number of self-repairs in each transcript

TAPE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	TOTAL
Koki	65	22	35	71	59	7	113	171	69	84	50	22	139	907
Mother	2	2	3	9	9	-	7	7	10	8	18	5	10	90
Father	-	-	-	-	13	12	4	14	-	-	-	7	-	50

Tables 1 and 2 show the percentages of repaired utterances with respect to the total number of utterances each participant produces in the transcripts. The mother's percentage of repaired utterances remains relatively steady throughout the thirteen transcripts ranging from 1% to 4%. In the child, however, there is quite a bit of variation from tape to tape. There is no firm explanation for this variation but would suggest that some of the fluctuation may be due to differences in the situation. Thus, tapes K09 and K11 are markedly different from the others in that in both

these tapes the mother is involved in teaching situations in which she leads the interaction and uses a great number of cued elicitations and test questions. K12 is also different in that conversation centers around what the mother is doing as she mends clothes or attends to other everyday activities. Exchanges are short and centered on momentaneous activities rather than on talk itself. In these three tapes the percentage of repaired utterances seems to drop from what appears to be a trend to rise starting from tape K07 on. This trend towards an increase in repairs as children get older is what has been reported in the literature (Evans 1985, Rogers 1978).

The following tables show the distribution and frequency of the different repair types found in Koki's data.

Table 4:--Distribution of self-repair types for Koki's data

TAPES	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	TOTAL
REPAIRS														
Repeat	65	22	35	71	59	7	113	171	69	84	50	22	139	907
	37	16	17	47	36	4	81	101	44	47	29	8	73	540
	57%	73%	49%	66%	61%	57%	72%	59%	64%	56%	58%	36%	53%	
Correct	19	5	13	19	16	1	25	42	16	23	10	7	38	234
	29%	23%	37%	27%	27%	14%	22%	25%	23%	27%	20%	32%	27%	
Abandon	7	1	3	4	6	2	5	26	7	13	8	3	21	106
	11%	5%	9%	6%	10%	29%	4%	15%	10%	15%	16%	14%	15%	
Postpone	2	-	2	1	1	-	2	2	2	1	3	4	7	27
	3%	-	6%	1%	2%	-	2%	1%	3%	1%	6%	18%	5%	

What is striking about the data presented in Table 4 is that the relative frequency of types of self-repairs seems to be maintained throughout the tapes with only two exceptions (K06, K12). Repetitions are the most frequent type of self-repair, followed in descending order of frequency by Corrections, Abandonments and Postponements. The data here correspond to what has been found in the literature with respect to young children's repairs. There do not seem to be marked changes between K01 and K13 but this should not be surprising since patterns and proportions similar to the ones above are found for much older children, as has been reported by others (Evans 1985, MacWhinney and Osser 1977). Therefore, we would not expect the child to have marked changes at this point between use of Repetitions versus Corrections, for example. As children grow older, however, there is a decrease in the use of repetitions and reports on adults' repairs indicate that corrections exceed repetitions (Levelt 1983).

Postponements and Abandonments occur with a much lower frequency than the other two types of repairs but there is a slight increase in their occurrence as the child grows older. For these repairs, the raw numbers may be more illuminating than the percentages. This increase as the child grows older would correspond to what has been reported in the literature.

Postponements, especially, are indicative of growing metalinguistic awareness and being able to take the interlocutor's point of view.

In Table 5 Koki's overall frequencies of occurrence of types of repairs are compared to the repairs carried out by the adult in the study. It will be shown that Koki and her mother³ differ greatly in use of repair types. The mother's use patterns more closely with frequencies reported for other native-speaker adults (Levelt 1983).

Table 5:--Comparison of overall frequencies of repair types in the child's and adult's self-repairs

	Koki	Mother
Repetitions	540 60%	29 32%
Corrections	234 26%	39 43%
Postponements	27 3%	12 13%
Abandonments	106 12%	9 10%
Other		1 1%

³The Father's data will not be analyzed; however, it is interesting because his patterns are different from the mother's and Koki's. Here we have to take into account that he is both a language-learner but also a communicatively competent speaker in his own language. At times, some of his repair behaviors seem to mirror the child, for example with respect to strategies for dealing with production problems, and at other times they mirror the mother's behavior, in being able to take the other's point of view, for example.

3.2. Comparisons with Previous Studies

In order to establish a point of reference between what Koki is doing in her repair behaviors and what has been reported for other children, frequencies obtained in Koki's data will be compared to those reported for other children (Evans 1985; MacWhinney and Osser 1977).

Table 6 shows frequencies of occurrence of types of repairs at two points⁴ in Koki's data and compares these to the frequencies reported by Evans for her Kindergarten and Second Grade children:

Table 6:--Comparison of frequency of use of repair types between Koki and the children in Evans' study (Evans 1985)

	K01 (1:7.21)	K13 (2:11.7)	Kindergarten (5:5)	Second Grade (7:9)
Repetitions	57%	53%	53%	51%
Corrections	29%	27%	21%	26%
Postponements	3%	5%	7%	10%
Abandonments	11%	15%	19%	13%

Keeping in mind the differences between the studies that are being compared, the figures obtained are, nevertheless, similar enough to allow one to posit some developmental trends: favoring of Repetitions over Corrections as a repair strategy, a tendency to decrease Repetitions as children grow older, an increase in Postponements, i.e. strategies that are

⁴The first and final tapes were chosen for this comparison.

basically hearer-oriented, which add information that is not grammatically necessary but which may help the hearer to make sense of what the speaker is saying. The studies, however are sufficiently different that these conclusions should be taken with a great deal of caution and seen only as possible indications of trends which may be borne out by other studies.

Evans further subclassified the group of Corrections in terms of what was being corrected : syntax, word-choice or reference. Her results compared to the data in this study are shown in Table 7.

Table 7:--Comparison of use of type of correction repair between Koki and the children in Evans' study

Corrections	Koki	Kindergarten	Second-graders
Phonology	81 35%	-	-
Syntactic	52 22%	25%	18%
Word-choice	61 26%	26%	48%
Reference	39 17%	49%	34%

Koki does not seem to be focussing on making the same types of repairs as the other children. One noticeable difference is that the most frequent corrections are in phonology while Evans says that in her data phonological corrections were rarely observed and she gives no data for these. Also noticeable is the relatively lesser proportion of reference corrections when compared to the other children.

Table 8:--Frequency of use of different correction repairs by each of the participants

Corrections	Koki	Father	Mother
Phonology	81 35%	5 63%	3 8%
Syntactic	52 22%	1 13%	4 10%
Word-choice	61 26%	-	25 64%
Reference	39 17%	-	7 18%

The groupings given by Evans are not directly comparable to Levelt's since Evans' Corrections category seems to encompass both what Levelt would call A-repairs and E-repairs. I reclassified the data according to the types set forth by Levelt (1983). C(overt) repairs are equivalent to Repetitions, D(ifferent) repairs correspond to sentence abandonments, the group of Corrections has to be sorted out between those corrections which do in fact correct a previous error which would form the class of E(rror) repairs and those which are merely modifications of a grammatical sentence. These together with Postponements would comprise the class of A(ppropriateness) repairs. Our data compared to Levelt's data for Dutch adults is shown in Table 9.

Table 9:--Comparison of frequency of occurrence of repair types between the participants in this study and those in Levelt (1983)

	Koki	Father	Mother	Dutch adults
C-repairs	540 60%	39 78%	29 32%	236 25%
E-repairs	143 16%	6 12%	17 19%	399 42%
A-repairs	102 11%	3 6%	34 38%	290 30%
D-repairs	112 12%	2 4%	9 10%	10 1%
Remainder	10 1%	-	1 1%	24 1.5%

It should be noted here that the two language learners, Koki and her father, have a much higher proportion of covert repairs (repetitions) than the "competent" speakers. It seems important therefore, to analyze covert repairs in order to determine what they are being used for. However, this category has not been studied in other investigations (Levelt 1983; Salo-Lee 1987). In the description of repairs, I will pay particular attention to the category of covert repairs (repetitions). It should also be noted that in Table 9 the higher proportion of error-repairs in the Dutch adults which is probably due to increased self-monitoring because of the formality of the "laboratory" situation, which apparently leads to increased correction of errors. In addition, the type of task which they had to carry out would probably cause a lot of errors (describe the distribution of very similar objects which only differed in their position and in color). The frequency of A-repairs is similar for the mother and for the Dutch adults, and low in Koki. D-repairs are similar for the mother and Koki but different for the Dutch adults. Here the difference in the speech situation may be posited as an explanation. In the Dutch study, the situation was highly constrained, speakers were not really free to talk about other things. Both Koki and the mother had numerous D-repairs (Abandonments or False-starts), this sometimes was

due to language difficulties, sometimes to topic- or conversation interruptions when elements from the situational context impinged upon their thought.

3.3. Structural Characteristics of Koki's Repairs

3.3.1. Repair Initiation Markers

The initiation of a repair is indicated usually by an abrupt cut-off in the sentence that the child is producing. The break frequently occurs in the middle of a word. Descriptions in the literature (Schegloff 1979; Levelt 1989) have indicated that following the break, the initiation of a repair may be marked by the use of several repair initiation techniques. Those described for English include a pause or silence, the use of hesitation markers which include various interjections and set phrases like "y'know", and drawling or lengthening the final word segment. Hesitation markers used by the child include all the ones that have been mentioned above. Self-repairs are often accompanied by internal pausing and, especially in the later tapes, the use of the interjections "eh" and "este". There are some occurrences of lengthening or drawling of a word but this is not used very frequently. Following are examples of repairs with various types of repair initiation markers:

9. K. .. [//] cómo hace e- [//] e- [//] el lobo, este, de [//] de el, este, en [//] en [//] #1.8 en [//] en [//] en allá, que [//] dónde vive su lobo? [K08]

[..[//] how does it do the [//] the [//] the
balloon eh, of [//] of him, eh, in [//] in [//]
(1.8 sec) in [//] in [//] in there, that [//]
where does his balloon live?]

10. K. y: [//] y [//] # y éste? [K09]
[and: this one?]

11. K. e q- [//] eh # qué stoy ecuchando? [K08]
[and wh- [//]eh # what am I listening?]

Levelt calls the display of markers the "editing phase" of the repair following which the repair proper is initiated.

3.3.2. Retracing

The repair proper may pick up the sentence from where it was cut off, but more often one or more elements in the sentence are retraced. The retracing displays to the hearer how far back he has to go to pick up the original utterance and what elements in the utterance prior to the break should be edited out.

12. no pe- [//] ne- [//] no keye [//] no teye.
"no quiere" [(s/he) doesn't want] [K01]
13. ayoya a tata [//] se tata los zapatos. [K02]
"ahora a saca [//] se saca los zapatos."
[now a take [//] she take off her shoes.]
14. ese agua [//] esa agua es para echar agua
..[K05]
[that(m) water [//] that(f) water is to
pour...]
15. e la otro ma- [//] e la otra mariposa. [K11]
[and the other(m) b- [//] and the other(f)
butterfly.]
16. cómo se van- [//] se llamaban a ver? [K13]
[how are they going- [//] were they called,
eh?]

In some cases the repair retraces just to the trouble source as in (13). Levelt calls this "instant repairing". However, often there are retracings beyond the point where the problem occurs, as in (12) or (14)-(16). Levelt calls this "anticipatory retracing". Often the retracing is to the beginning of the utterance, however if the problem occurs in a subordinate clause, the retracing stays within the bounds of that clause.

Problems are corrected as soon as they are perceived. Levelt proposes a rule which he calls the Main Interruption Rule, which states that the flow of speech should be interrupted immediately upon perceiving trouble (Levelt 1989:478). However, as can be seen in the examples above, there may be a delay of one or two syllables, and on occasion more, before the utterance is interrupted.

3.3.3. Multiple repetitions of a repair

At times there may be multiple repetitions on one item before continuing. The majority of these are two repetitions of the same word or phrase although the number goes as high as six in our tapes.

Most of the observations on multiple repetitions of repairs have been made by Schegloff (1979). He notes several characteristics. For example, he makes the observations that when cut-offs occur they often occur in the initial segment

of an utterance, that the cut-off may break off part of a word (and even part of a sound since "uh" can also be cut off), and the preference for occurrence of repair at "just post-initiation" or "just post-completion" loci for units of different types (Schegloff 1979:275).

He notes that, although not common, it is also not rare to find two successive repairs on the same repairable. These successive repairs exhibit certain regularities. They are often ordered as a series displaying a certain "progressivity" in completion in which "each next try adds to the prior tries", "each next try changes an element of prior tries", "each next try backs up far less than its predecessor" (Schegloff 1979:278). There are occurrences of repair-conversion or the switching from one to another type of repair in mid-repair. Successive identical repetitions are for Schegloff instances of "marking time", and very often give way to word-searches, evidenced by use of different types of devices such as drawling on a syllable, pausing and using hesitation markers. Finally, a try may be identical not to the last try but to an earlier one. In this case Schegloff speaks of "regressive tries" and notes that regressive tries are the last tries on the same repairable before continuation (Schegloff 1979:279).

In Koki's speech there are examples of all the regularities of ordering in successive repairs that have been observed by Schegloff:

a) The majority of these multiple repairs involve two successive repairs and may involve single words or phrases:

17. K. <es ese> [//] <es ese> [//] es ese nu [//] nusio. [K01]
 "es ese sucio" [is that dirty.]
18. K. y un [//] éste e [//] e [//] e arrelá? [K02]
 "y un [//] este e? arreglar?"
 [and a [//] this e? to fix?]
19. K. eh, e [//] e [//] e oto. [K05]
 "eh, el otro." [eh, the other (one).]
20. K. que [//] que [//] # que hace así "bbbb". [K06]
 [that # goes like this "bbbb".]
21. K. yo [//] yo [//] yo quiero verlo. [K08]
 [I want to see it.]
22. K. ah # que # la pequeña está con [//] con [//] con la cola. [K09]
 [ah # that # the little one is with the tail.]
23. K. y este qué [//] qué [//] qué está siendo bailando acá? [K10]
 [and this one what is he doing dancing here?]
24. K. pelian [//] me [//] me [//] me quería pelear. [K11]
 [fightin(g) [//] he wanted to fight me.]
25. K. si no [//] si no # dejas un poquito de lugar y- [//] y- [//] yo te apago eso, eh? [K13]
 [if you don't # leave a little bit of room I turn that off, eh?]

b) However there are numerous cases of more than two repairs, as many as 6 or 7:

26. K. esos [//] ese [//] ese [//] ese pasi. [K01]
 "esos [//] ese lápiz." [those [//] that pencil.]
27. K. mire un [//] un [//] un [//] un astón. [K04]
 [look a mouse.]

28. K. a compar un [//] u- [//] u- [//] un [//] un [//] un
 lemelito tara curar a su [//] a su patita?
 [K07]
 [to buy a/some medicine to cure his foot.]
29. K. y [//] y su papá de [//] eh de [//] de [//] de [//]
 del pollito Koki. [K09]
 [and the father of eh, of chicken Koki.]

Numerous repetitions like this are rare for adults.

c) There are many instances of the progressivity mentioned by Schegloff, where the repetitions or hesitations are used to produce successively longer or more complete forms of the word or phrase until the whole utterance is completed:

30. K. ti- [//] tiye [//] tiye. [K01]
 "tire." [throw (it).]
31. K. n- [//] no me c- [//] no me come. [K07]
 "no me coma." [don't eat me.]
32. K. qué es [//] qué es ést- [//] qué es ésto acá?
 [K08]
 [what is this here?]
33. K. te saqué un pelle- [//] pellejit- [//]
 pellejito. [K08]
 [I pulled out a piece of skin from you.]
34. K. tu [//] tu b- [//] tu bebito también tiene mucho
 frío? [K13]
 [your baby also is very cold?]

d) There are changes or modifications of previous tries as mentioned by Schegloff, where the child alternates between different types of repairs such as repetitions and corrections.

35. K. qué es es- [//] qué es éso [//] qué es ésto acá?
 [K08]
 [what is that [//] what is this here?]

36. K. *cóm-* [//] *cómo se ha-* [//] *cómo se pende* [//] *cómo se pende la luz?* [K08]
[how do you do- [//] how do you turn on [//] how do you turn on the light?]
37. K. <*yo se*> [//] *yo* [//] *yo se* [//] *se* [//] *se* [//]
me> [//] *yo mañana se lo voy a dar.* [K09]
[..[//] I'm going to give it to them tomorrow.]
38. K. *yo qu-* [//] <*yo voy a*> [//] *a*> [//] *yo voy a tener*
ésto acá ... [K13]
[I wa(nt) [//] I'm going to [//] to [//] I'm going to have this here ...]

e) As has been mentioned in the previous section, when a repair backs up or retraces, most of the retracings go back to the beginning of the constituent being repaired. This also seems to hold for multiple repairs:

39. K. <*ese pu-* [//] *pe*> [//] *ese pe-* [//] *pe-* [//]
piyito. [K01]
"ese pelito." [that hair.]
40. K. <*hasin # non-*> [//] *ha-* [//] *hacen noni.* [K03]
[(they) make noni.] "they go beddy-bye."
41. K. *queyo <un va->* [//] *un* [//] *un vasito.* [K05]
[I want a glass.]
42. K. *ay, m-* [//] <*me voy a*> [//] <*me voy*> [//] *me voy*
a mashucar. [K07]
[aw, I'm goin to get hurt.]
43. K. <*y ace-*> [//] *y* [//] <*y acete*> [//] *y aceite.*
[K10]
[and oil.]
44. K. *y* [//] <*y a*> [//] <*y Ot-*> [//] <*y el Lun-*> [//]
y [//] *y +/.*
[and [//] and a [//] and Ot- [//] and the Lun-
[//] and [//] and +/.] [K13]

In the data there are only two examples where a successive try does not back up as far as its predecessors:

45. K. <ese agua> [//] esa agua es para echar agua
<en ya> [/] en <ya mama-> [/] <ya mamama->
[//] la mamadera.
[that water [//] that water is to pour water
in the baby-bottle] [K05]
46. K. dónde está el otro cosa e- [/] el [/] el tu
[//] de tu espalda? [K08]
[where is the other thing the your [//] from
your back?]

In all of the previous examples except (42), there are cases also of what Schegloff has called "regressive tries", where a try is identical not to the last repair but to a previous one. When this happens, Schegloff has found that the fuller repair is usually the final one. In our data this holds in the majority of cases, but not always as can be seen in examples 37 and 41 above, and in 35.

f) Schegloff proposes that those repairs that have been called Repetition repairs are anticipatory repairs of a trouble source in the succeeding segment. Therefore, Repetitions "mark time" while the speaker is conducting a word search and they are often accompanied by other time gaining mechanisms such as drawls, pauses or hesitation markers:

47. K. e: [/] e: [/] e: [/] e: [/] e: [//] ásilo.
[K05]
[e: give it (to her).]
48. K. ha- [/] hácelo [/] ## hácelo dar vu [//]
güeltas. [K07]
[make it ## make it go in circles.]

49. K. y: [//] y [//] # y éste? [K09]
[and this one?]
50. K. sí con [//] con [//] con # é:sto aquí [//] aquí.
[K11]
[yes with this one here.]

g) Finally, it should be noted that although in parent-child conversations there is quite a bit of tolerance for allowing a large succession of multiple repairs, these utterances sometimes do get cut off by the adult and in some other cases the child abandons the utterance after a certain number of repetitions:

51. K. me voy [//] me voy a hacer popó e [//] en la
pelelita sí se puede e a [//] e a [//] e a +/.
[I'm going to go poo-poo in the potty yes one
can in the +/.]
52. K. estoy sa [//] sacando los pe [//] pelle [//] los pe
[//] pelle +... [K08]
[I'm taking out the pieces (of skin) +...]
53. K. que [//] quiere [//] quiere que [//] hh que [//]
que +...
[w- [//] (I?) want [//] (I?) want that [//] hh
that [//] that]
54. K. es un [//] u [//] un [//] un [//] un [//] # un: +...
[it's a +...]
55. K. y [//] <y a> [//] <y Ot-> [//] <y el Lun-> [//]
y [//] y +/.
[and [//] and a [//] and Ot- [//] and the Lun-
[//] and [//] and +/.] [K13]

Example (51) above seems also to be an example of another type of repair mentioned by Schegloff in which two structures are blended around a pivotal element which occurs in both. In the example above the two structures are "me voy a hacer popó en la pelelita" and "en la pelelita si se puede".

According to Schegloff and as can be seen in the example above "the shared element is often used as the place to initiate repair" (Schegloff 1979:275). I have not systematically looked for this type of structure but there are a few examples in this corpus:

56. K. de qué éste [//] ésto de plástico? [K10]
 [of what is this [//] is this of plastic?]

All of the ordering regularities mentioned by Schegloff as occurring in adult data also occur in Koki's data. In Koki's data, multiple repetitions are more frequent than what he seems to find; in addition, there are more cases of three or more repetitions, which in his data are "harder to find". Aside from this, Koki's repairs at two years of age exhibit all of the regularities found by Schegloff in adult data.

Schegloff, and conversation analysts in general, propose that many of the organizing principles of conversation are universal. These data provide evidence that, at least in the case of repairs, there are no appreciable differences between English and Spanish, and Levelt's data on repairs by Dutch speakers also show the same characteristics. Thus, Schegloff's observations on repairs seem to be valid at least for a number of European languages.

With respect to adult-child differences, the only real difference in the child's data is a high number of multiple

repairs, higher both with respect to overall frequency and number of instances per utterance from what has been found for adults. Otherwise, Koki between two and three years of age shows all of the characteristics noted for adult repairs.

Can the child have learned these from the mother or do they reflect innate organizing principles? In the examples given above I have included and listed in ascending order instances from earlier to later tapes. It can be seen that even at K01 and K02 Koki is already displaying many of these repair characteristics. Some of the features are language specific and acquired as the child gets older. This is the case for specific interjections and hesitation markers; "este", for example, appears around K08. Other characteristics such as where the break occurs and retracing characteristics are there from the beginning of our data and may reflect some more general organizing principles.

4. DESCRIPTION OF KOKI'S REPAIRS

Koki initiates repairs on 540 utterances and carries out a total of 907 repairs. This statement should be qualified, however. We speak of "carrying out" a repair, but it should be noted that not all of the child's repair attempts are successful and neither are all of the mother's attempts. There are cases in the data when the child takes up again in

a subsequent utterance one of her "repaired" utterances and again attempts a repair. There are also cases when the mother or father take up the "repaired" utterance previously uttered by the child and either correct it or initiate an other-repair sequence. This seems to indicate that the original repair was not successful. Nevertheless, a repair was carried out, that is, it was initiated and taken to a completion, notwithstanding the fact that it may later have been judged by the speaker himself or by the hearer to be insufficient. This is the sense given to the terms "repair" and "repairing" throughout this section.

In this section I will describe the different repair types found in the data --Repetitions, Corrections, Postponements and Abandonments-- and present some general conclusions about self-repair behaviors by the child. In section 5, I examine the mother's self-repairs.

4.1. Repetitions

In this corpus there are 540 repetition repairs accounting for 60% of the repairs carried out by Koki. As mentioned previously, not all the repetitions occurring within the sentence are to be considered repairs. There are a number of cases of intended repetitions used for other purposes such as emphasis or expressive effect or in word-play. The types of repetitions discussed in this section are

all those cases where the utterance is cut off at some point and then re-started repeating a portion of the originally produced utterance. In order to be included among repetition repairs, as opposed to corrections or some other type, the repetition has to be exact, i.e. the same semantic content has to be expressed by the same phonological form⁵. If there is a change, however minimal, then the type of repair would be classed along with corrections, not repetitions.

Although all the studies of intra-utterance repairs note the occurrence of repetition repairs, not much has been said in the literature about them. Levelt classifies them along with intra-utterance pausing or the use of hesitation markers, as "covert repairs" (C-Repairs). Since nothing is overtly corrected it becomes impossible to say what trouble-source the speaker is focussing on; for this reason, Levelt sets this group aside. Covert repairs as a whole make up 25% of his corpus and repetition repairs 7%.

In MacWhinney and Osser's (1977) study, the authors note the occurrence of repetitions of different types which they list as follows: initial segment phonological repetitions as in "b- b- boy", word-included phonological repetitions as in "I c- I can't", word repetitions as in " I want some some

⁵There may have been, however, some prosodic differences which were not noticed.

more" and several-word repetitions as in "I want some more some more ice cream" (MacWhinney and Osser 1977:980-981). Common words such as the conjunction "and", articles, prepositions and deictic and personal pronouns are the words more often repeated, together accounting for 75% of all word repetitions. The fact that it is common words that are repeated leads the authors to conclude that this type of hesitation is used by the speakers as a strategy to gain time to plan or decide on some other portion of the utterance. Thus these strategies are used as a pre-planning mechanism by speakers. MacWhinney and Osser note that these results go along with previous research in which it has been pointed out that hesitations that occur on "content" words usually occur with correction or false-start repairs while hesitations on "function" words seem to correlate with pausing or repetition repairs (Maclay and Osgood 1959).

Schegloff (1979) does not speak of repetitions specifically although he includes repetition repairs in his examples of intra-utterance repairs. He makes a distinction between repairs that are post-positioned relative to some trouble-source and pre-positioned repairs which occur just before a trouble-source (Schegloff 1979:275). Repetition repairs, along with pauses and hesitation markers, function as place-holders while the speaker plans or organizes the

rest of his utterance. They are anticipatory repairs in the sense that the trouble-source is in what follows.

Given the large number of repetition repairs in Koki's data and that they are the most frequent type of repair used by her (540, 60%), I have looked at these in detail in order to describe how this type of repair is carried out. At the same time, while the why of the repair, that is the trouble-source or difficulty, can never be fully ascertained, Koki's data do seem to point to conclusions similar to those found by the authors cited previously about the use of this type of repair as a time-marking space while different activities such as searching for a particular word or planning the continuation of the utterance are performed.

The cases to be discussed in this section are all cases in which an utterance is broken off abruptly, sometimes in the middle of the word, and then some portion of the original utterance is repeated before the utterance is continued to completion. The following are examples of this type of self-initiated repair.

57. K. e q- [/] eh # qué stoy ecuchando? [K08]
[and wh- /eh # what am I listening to?]
58. K. ése- [/] ése es Lu- [/] Lucas. [K07]
[that [/] that is Lu- [/] Lucas.]
59. K. <qué es-> [/] <qué es est-> [/] qué es ésto acá?
[K08]
[what is [/] what is th- [/] what is this here?]
60. K. te saqué un pelle- [/] pellejit- [/] pellejito.
[K08]
[(I) took out one p- [/] pie- [/] piece of skin]

In these examples, several of the structural characteristics noted previously are found. Cut-offs may occur in the middle of a word (q- Lu- est- pelle- pellejit-) or after a completed word (ese- es-). When the cut-off occurs in the middle of the word the break need not correspond with a syllable boundary (q- est- pellejit-) although sometimes it does (Lu- pelle-). Once the cut-off occurs, the repetition may be of just the last word before the break (ése- [/] ése, Lu- [/] Lucas), or the restarted utterance may retrace back a certain number of words previous to the cut-off point and repeat them (qué es- [/] qué es..., qué es est- [/] qué es ésto...). After the cut-off point the repair phase may start immediately or there may be an editing phase marked by a pause, a hesitation marker or some other repair-initiation technique before the repetition (example 57). More than one repetition may occur before the utterance is completed. Successive repetitions often show progression towards completion as in examples 59 and 60. In the sections that follow I examine repetition repairs in detail, examining what parts of utterances get repeated, where breaks or cut-offs occur and whether a relationship can be established between repetition repairs and words that are in the process of being acquired.

4.1.1. Occurrences of Repetition Repairs by Word Class

MacWhinney and Osser found that in the 171 repetitions that occurred in their data, common words were most often repeated (22% subject personal pronouns, 22% conjunction "and", 16% articles, 8% prepositions and 7% deictic pronouns). Together these were slightly over a dozen lexical items but they accounted for 75% of the repetitions. In the case of several word repetitions the most common constructions were subject personal pronoun + verb, preposition + article and conjunction + personal pronoun.

In Koki's data there are 540 repetition repairs (440 single-word repetitions, 100 several-word repetitions). Unlike what MacWhinney and Osser found, Koki repeats a large number of different words from all grammatical categories. Table 10 shows the number of repetitions of single words in each of the 13 tapes, by grammatical category.

Table 10:--Distribution of Koki's single-word repetitions

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	TOTAL
ART	-	-	3	8	6	-	10	10	7	4	7	2	8	65
PREP	-	1	-	6	-	-	8	7	12	11	6	-	11	62
VERB	4	-	5	10	7	-	12	9	2	4	1	-	7	61
NOUN	2	5	2	2	3	1	6	16	-	1	-	1	2	41
CONJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	8	3	2	-	18	37
DEM P	8	-	1	1	1	-	5	5	4	4	1	1	2	33
QW	-	-	-	-	1	-	4	6	2	5	-	-	4	22
PRO	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	7	1	-	1	-	5	20
CLITICS	-	-	-	2	1	-	3	6	-	1	4	-	3	20
ADV	-	1	-	1	-	-	6	5	1	1	1	-	1	17
NEG	2	-	-	3	1	-	2	1	-	2	2	-	1	14
ADJ	3	1	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	8
DEM AJ	4	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	6
INTERJ	-	-	-	1	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
PART	-	5	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
REL	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	5
"sí"	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
OTHER	3	1	2	2	1	-	2	-	-	3	-	-	-	14
TOTAL	26	14	14	37	25	3	70	79	40	39	25	5	63	440

This table shows the range of Koki's single-word repetition repairs (N=440). As can be seen, practically any part of speech may be repeated. ART (articles) includes repetitions of definite and indefinite articles, both masculine and feminine and their plurals. Within the prepositions (PREP) the majority of repetitions are of the most frequent "a" and "en" but 7 prepositions in all are repeated. Verb and Noun repetitions are spread over a large number of different verbs and nouns although in particular tapes a certain noun or verb may cause problems. Thus there are six repetitions of the verb form [efe'me] "enfermé" [I got sick] in K04 and 12 repetitions of the noun "pellejito" [piece of skin] in K08.

Within conjunctions (CONJ), 84% of the repetitions were of "y" although there were repetitions also of "porque" and "pero". As to the remaining categories, QW refers to question words of which the most frequent were "qué" and "(en)dónde". The PRO (pronoun) category includes both possessives and the relatively infrequent subject pronouns; CLIT refers to all pronominal clitics. DEM P and DEM AJ refer to the demonstratives "este/esta/esto", "ese/esa/eso" and their plurals which can occur either as deictic pronouns or as noun determiners. Repeated adverbs (ADV) were mostly deictic place adverbs, especially "aquí", "acá". With one exception all adjectives (ADJ) were instances of predicate adjectives in clauses with a copula (Ex: [tayita] "sentadita" [seated], [payita] "tapadita" [covered], [solito] "solito" [alone]). Modifying adjectives are rare in the tapes. The category PART refers to the particle [a] which is a child-created function word used frequently in the early tapes. This particle occupied places prior to a verb or to a noun which would later be filled by clitics in the case of the verb and articles in the case of the noun; however, its exact function has not been determined. The INTERJ category refers to interjections, almost exclusively the hesitation marker "eh" which was itself hesitated on or repeated in several utterances. REL refers to the relative marker "que"

and NEG is "no". The category OTHER groups together isolated words like greetings or exclamations that don't fit easily into other categories, as well as unidentifiable words and unidentifiable fragments which were repeated but abandoned before completion.

If the single-word repetitions shown in Table 10 are compared to the results mentioned by MacWhinney and Osser, we can see that Koki repeats a greater variety of words and word-types than is reported for the children in that study. However, there does seem to be a change between the early tapes and the later ones. In the early tapes there is a greater tendency to stop or hesitate at content words, while in the later tapes the child stop more at words that belong to closed sets, such as demonstratives or pronouns and other "function" words. In MacWhinney and Osser's study, 75% of the repetitions occurred in certain word-classes (personal and deictic pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions and articles). In this study, 36% of repetition repairs occur with these word-classes in the early tapes (K01-K06) and 62% in the later ones (K07-K13). So there does seem to be an appreciable tendency even in the relatively short span of time of this study, to reduce the types of words that will be repeated to "function" rather than "content" words.

In Table 10 I include all repetitions of single words including those of words that are interrupted before completion. In the next section I will re-examine the distribution of repairs across word-categories taking into account whether the repeated word was interrupted or completed prior to the repair.

Table 10 shows the distribution of 440 out of the 540 repetition repairs in the corpus. The remaining 100 repetitions are several-word repetitions. There are about 30 different word groupings represented, sometimes corresponding to syntactic constituents. The most frequent are DET + N, where DET includes articles, demonstratives and possessives, with 19 instances (19%) and PREP + NP again with 19 instances (19%).

4.1.2. Interruption versus completion of a word prior to repair initiation

It has been noted previously that when a repair is initiated there is an abrupt cut-off of a final word which may break off the word before its completion. Following are examples of utterances with interrupted words prior to repair initiation:

61. K. yasha- [/] yashas. [K01]
"gracia- [/] gracias" [thank-you]
62. K. efe- [/] efemé Koki. [K04]
"enfe- enfermé Koki" [I got sick, Koki]

63. K. u- [/] uno subido al columpio? [K07]
 [one up on the swing?]
64. K. m- [/] m- [/] me dejan un poquito de lugar?
 [K13]
 [(can you) leave me a little room?]

There were 250 cases of breaking off in the middle of a word (46% N=540). These include cases where what is then repeated is only the last word initiated before the break (single-word repetitions, N=440) as well as cases in which several words are repeated after the break (N=100). Levelt and Schegloff both note that, when words are broken off, the break tends to occur towards the beginning of the word. This is also found in our data. Table 11 shows how many phonological segments of a word were pronounced before the cut-off:

Table 11:--Number of phonological segments before cut-off in interrupted word

	1	2	3	4	5	7	TOTAL
Segments	143	66	25	14	1	1	250
	57%	26%	10%	6%	.4%	.4%	

With respect to consonant (C) vowel (V) combinations we find the following:

Table 12:--Segmental structure of interrupted words up to the point of interruption

1 seg	2 seg	3 seg	4 seg	OTHER
V 94	CV 47	CVC 15	CVCV 11	CVCVCVC 1
C 49	VC 19	VCV 4	VCVC 2	VCVCV 1
		VCC 3	VCCV 1	
		CVV 3		

This indicates that when words are interrupted they tend to be interrupted close to the beginning of the word. Of these words, 84% are interrupted before or at the second segment and 57% of the total number of interruptions occur at the first segment. These breaks do not necessarily correspond with syllable boundaries. There are 127 words (51%) interrupted at a syllable boundary and 123 (49%) interrupted at a non-syllable boundary. The breakdown is the following:

Table 13:--Syllable structure of interrupted words up to the point of interruption

+syllable boundary N = 127

1 seg	2 seg	3 seg	4 seg	5 seg
V- 53	CV- 44	CVC- 6	CV-CV- 10	V-CV-CV- 1
	VC- 5	V-CV- 4	VC-CV- 1	
		CVV- 3		

-syllable boundary N = 123

1 seg	2 seg	3 seg	4 seg	7 seg
V 41	CV 3	CV-C 9	CV-CV 1	CV-CV-CV-C 1
C 49	VC 1	VC-C 3	V-CV-C 2	
	V-C 13			

It would seem that for the child, the syllable as such does not play a part in determining a cut-off point. This was also found by Levelt in his study of Dutch adults. The child seems to be stopping as close to the beginning of the word as possible, with a higher incidence of stopping after a vowel (161 = 64%) than after a consonant (89 = 36%).

An initial inspection of the data seemed to show that content words were more frequently interrupted than function words; the latter were more often brought to completion before the break. To verify this, I sorted the data into the various word categories shown in Table 10, but making separate tables for interrupted and completed words:

Table 14:--Interrupted words distributed by word-class

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	TOTALS ⁶
N	6	6	5	3	9	1	8	20	-	4	-	1	3	66
V	3	-	4	10	7	-	7	10	1	5	-	-	6	53
ADJ	4	2	1	1	1	-	2	1	-	-	-	1	-	13
ADV	-	1	-	-	1	1	4	5	1	-	-	-	1	14

ART	-	-	2	-	1	-	4	7	5	3	1	1	3	27
DEM	2	-	1	1	2	-	2	7	2	2	-	3	1	23
PREP	-	-	-	1	-	-	3	2	3	2	1	-	-	12
CONJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PRO	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	1	3	-	-	-	2	12
CLIT	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	2	5
PART	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
QW	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	4	2	3	-	-	1	13
REL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NEG	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	1	-	2	7
"sí"	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
INT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
OTHER	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	5
TOTALS	19	10	13	16	21	2	42	58	17	21	3	6	22	250

⁶In Table 10, since we were looking at what words get repeated, we included only 440 instances of single-word repetitions, leaving out the 100 "phrase" or multiple-word repetitions. In Tables 14 and 15, since we are looking at what words get cut off, we can include all 540 instances of repetition repairs.

Table 15:--Completed words distributed by word-class

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	TOTALS
N	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3
V	3	-	1	5	-	-	6	7	2	1	1	-	2	28
ADJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ADV	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	1	1	-	-	5

ART	1	-	1	10	8	-	6	4	2	3	7	1	4	47
DEM	13	-	-	1	-	-	3	1	2	2	2	-	2	26
PREP	-	1	-	5	1	-	8	5	9	10	5	-	12	56
CONJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	8	3	2	-	18	37
PRO	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	7	-	-	1	-	3	12
CLIT	-	-	-	2	1	-	4	5	-	1	6	1	2	22
PART	-	5	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
QW	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	6	-	2	-	-	3	12
REL	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	5
NEG	1	-	-	3	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	1	8
"sí"	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
INT	-	-	-	1	1	-	6	1	-	1	-	-	2	12
OTHER	-	-	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	8
TOTAL	18	6	4	31	15	2	39	43	27	26	26	2	51	290

The results are indeed that words that are interrupted before completion are mostly "content" words (146 interrupted, 36 completed) while more "function" words are completed (104 interrupted, 254 completed). These results are what would be expected taking into account the tendency that was mentioned before to interrupt as close as possible to the beginning of the word. If the speaker breaks off one or two segments into the word this would allow most articles, most conjunctions, and the most frequent prepositions to be completed prior to breaking off. At the same time, most nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs would be interrupted, except perhaps for the copula "es", the verb "va" and the adverb "ya".

The explanation given above is not complete, however. So far it would seem that what is happening here with the child is the same as what has been noted by Schegloff (1979) and others: that breaks tend to occur one or two segments into the unit; therefore short words may be completed and long words are more likely to be interrupted. However, a case-by-case examination of the data seems to show that when words are interrupted in the middle the child is having some problem, usually a "pronunciation" problem with that word. Reasons for saying this are that the words that she interrupts are usually long, sometimes they are new to her, sometimes they have complicated syllables in them (that is, syllables with diphthongs or consonant clusters), very often the repetitions are coupled with corrections and often, even if there are no overt corrections in the same utterance the child shows variability in her pronunciations of that word within the transcript, which indicates that at that point in time, the phonological representation of that word is in the process of change or re-evaluation. In addition to interruptions on "difficult" words, there is also a second type of interruption on the initial segment of the first word of an utterance. This initial segment "stutter" has also been noticed by Schegloff (1979).

The following examples show initial segment "stuttering" at the beginning of the utterance:

65. K. n- [/] no peye eyayo? [K01]
 "no puede cerrarlo" [you can't close it?]
66. K. a- [/] ayeno e la cocina. [K04]
 "trayendo de la cocina" [bringing from the kitchen]
67. K. e- [/] era un perrito con dientes. [K08]
 [(he) was a doggie with teeth]
68. K. y- [/] ya no caben más. [K13]
 [now no more fit]

As has been noticed by other researchers, the word with initial-segment "stutter" tends to be the first word in the utterance although this type of hesitation is also found in non-beginning words.

So far in the data two facts emerge. First, sometimes the beginning of the repair cuts off a word before it is completed. Second, cut-off words are more often "content" words while completed words are more often function words. From these observations, the question that arises is whether repairs that break off a word are functionally different from those that start up after completion of the previous word. Is there some reason for breaking off a word in the middle, or does the fact that some words get interrupted and others completed respond to word-length?

A quantitative examination of the data seems to point to word-length as an explanation. Yet, when hearing or reading

these utterances, as a potential interlocutor, it seems that interruption versus completion is not fortuitous. When the child interrupts a word in mid-production it is because she is having some problem with the production of that word. When the child interrupts after completion of a word, it is because she is pausing to plan how to continue. In the discussion that follows, I examine cases of word interruptions versus completions and the additional context data that support these intuitions and lead to the proposal of two functional strategies. Examples 69 through 71 show cases where the child seems to be interrupting a word that she has trouble in pronouncing:

69. K. y ace- [//] <y [//] y acete> [///] y aceite. [K10]
[and oil]
70. K. mire acá está un pie- [//] pie- [///] pellejito.
[K08]
[look here is a piece of skin]
- 71a. K. e- [//] efemé Koki⁷. [K04]
"enfermé Koki" [I got sick, Koki]
- b. ep- [//] epemé Koki. [K04]
"enfermé Koki" [I got sick, Koki]
- c. e- [//] e- [//] epemé un abaio. [K04]
"enfermé un labio" [I got sick (hurt) a lip]
- d. efe- [//] efemé Koki. [K04]
"enfermé Koki" [I got sick, Koki]

⁷"Koki" in these examples is being used by the child as a vocative when addressing the mother. These examples are taken from a tape where Koki and her mother have switched identities, so that Koki is "la mama" and the mother is "Koki".

In all of these cases the child is showing different variants of a word that she is trying to say: [asete]/[aseite], [pye-]/[pežexito], [efemé]/[epemé]. It seems likely that her hesitations on those words are due to the problems that she has with the form of the word.

The following examples show stopping at function words, possibly while searching for a word or planning a complex construction:

- 72a. K. es ése [/] es ése [/] es ése nu- [/]
 nusio. [K01]
 "es ése sucio." [is that dirty.]
- b. K. #10.3 es ése [/] ése [/] ése a tititosh. [K01]
 "es ése ?a chiquito." [is that the little one.]
- c. K. ése a [/] ése a tititosh. [K01]
 "ése ?a chiquito" [that the little one]
- d. K. #1.6 ése [/] ése [/] # éses a payita. [K01]
 "ése ?(e)s ?a tapadita." [that is covered (up)]
- 73a. K. #2.6 quiero hacer popó e [/] e [/] e [/] e ya
 peyeyita. [K04]
 [I want to go poo-poo in the potty]
- b. K. me [/] me voy a hacer popó. [K04]
 [I'm going to go poo-poo.]
- c. K. me voy [/] me voy a hacer popó e [/] en la
 pelelita. [K04]
 [I'm going to go poo-poo in the potty.]
- d. K. no [/] no quiere a poner. [K04]
 [I don't want to put it (on).]
- 74a. M. y adónde van a ir los niños de la wawa?
 K. a [/] a la [/] a compar un helado. [K07]
 M. [and where are the children (on) the school-
 bus going?
 K. to the [/] to buy ice-cream.]

- b. M. y adónde van a pasear?
 K. a [//] a [//] a m- [//] a mencedoo! [K07]
 M. [and where are they going for a ride?
 K. to the market.]
- c. K. ya se van a pagar al mercado a curar la patita.
 M. a curar la patita en el mercado?
 K. sí. a comprar un helado +...
 a comprar un [//] u- [//] u- [//] un [//] un [//] un lemelito tara curar a su [//] a su patita. [K07]
 K. [now they're going for a ride to the market to cure the leg/foot.
 M. to cure the leg in the market?
 K. yes. to buy ice-cream +...
 to buy medicine to cure their leg.]
- 75a. K. #4.2 yo qu- [//] yo voy a [//] a [//] yo voy a tener
 esto acá pa que todos los niños lo descuchen. [K13]
 [I wa(nt) [//] I'm going to have this here so all the children can hear it.]
- b. K. hay más de con- [//] # hay uno de [//] de [//] de [//] de madera, esto es? [K13]
 [there's more rab(bits) [//] # there's one wooden one, is this it?]

All of the examples in 72 are from K01 where Koki seemed to be acquiring copula constructions and alternating between sentences with and without the copula. In addition, she had a number of sentences with verb-inversion which may have been the beginning of WH-questions. Her breaks here seem to correspond with planning these new types of constructions. The examples in 73 come from K04, here there are hesitations as the child formulates complex verb phrases such as "me voy a hacer" or "no quiero poner" and she is also adding

constructions, e.g., locative phrases. The sentences that result are both complex and long. The examples from 74 and 75 seem to show hesitations while the child searches for the appropriate word or phrase to describe an event or activity. In all the examples in 74 the child is not describing an actual event but rather making up a story. She seems to hesitate as she decides what to say next. Examples 75a and 75b, both from K13, require background explanation to make them intelligible. In 75a, "esto" refers to the tape-recorder and "acá" is the child's lap. Throughout the tapes, the mother has been trying to prevent the child from touching the tape-recorder. In this example, Koki is proposing to carry-out what so far has been a "no-no", and she seems to be trying to phrase her utterance so that her proposal will not be rejected. Her supportive argument "so that all the children can hear it" is "reasonable" but she is the only child in the room. The utterance in 75b is part of a lengthy argument between Koki and her mother about which little dolls are "rabbits" and which are "doggies" or "mommies". One or two turns previously Koki stated the rule that "all wooden ones are rabbits". Therefore, determining whether a doll is "wooden" or not is important. The utterance in 75b introduces a further discussion about which ones are "wooden" (therefore rabbits, therefore Koki's) and which ones are

"plastic". In these two examples (75a, 75b), there seem to be pragmatic motivations for careful phrasing of the utterance, hence the hesitations.

This discussion would lead us to posit at least two functions for repetition repairs. One is that the repair provides a space for the speaker to project forward in his utterance and plan or recast it or carry out a word-search. Overwhelmingly, repairs that start at a word boundary seem to carry out this function. A second use of repetitions is when the speaker is having problems with the pronunciation of a certain word. Very often, there are interruptions in mid-word followed by repetitions and leading at times to overt correction. As Scollon (1976) mentions, some of these seem to have the function of essays or practice tries to approximate a target. When the child is having problems with a word, most often she breaks that word off before completion. In order to further support this proposal, in the following section I examine repetition repairs on nouns and verbs.

4.1.3. Repetition repairs on nouns and verbs

There are 71 cases of repetition repairs on 44 different nouns. A number of nouns show two or three repairs, sometimes in the same transcript, sometimes in the same utterance. The noun that shows most repairs is

"pellejito(s)" which is hesitated on twelve times in the same transcript. There are 81 cases of hesitation on 32 different verbs.

Of these 152 hesitations, 82 occur in words that are new to the child (at least as far as the transcript record is concerned), that show variability in form in the child's production, or for which the child is still using some simplified or modified form, even in the later transcripts when the majority of her words are without simplifications. In addition, a few of the words that get hesitated on are long words of four syllables: [atimitas] "betlemitas", "pasajeros", "teléfono", "pellejitos", "mamadera" and others. There are nine four-syllable words on which she hesitates a total of twenty-six; this number includes twelve hesitations on the word "pellejito(s)".

Table 16:--Hesitations on nouns and verbs

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
TOTALS														
incomplete N		6	6	5	3	9	1	8	20	-	4	-	1	36
completed N		-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	3
incomplete V		3	-	4	10	7	-	7	10	1	5	-	-	65
completed V		3	-	1	5	-	-	6	7	2	1	1	-	28

As can be seen from this table, most of the hesitations on nouns (87%) and verbs (78%) occur between Tapes K01 and K08

and decrease after that⁸. As the child gets older she ceases to hesitate on nouns and verbs. Therefore, it can be surmised that there is a developmental explanation for these facts. The child hesitates on these words early on as she is learning the words or sorting out pronunciation difficulties. As she grows older these problems decrease. Table 16 shows that the majority of nouns (96%) and a high proportion of verbs (65%) are broken off before completion. If this fact is taken together with the developmental pattern, then it appears to be that breaks or interruptions indicate a problem with the word itself.

In the previous section I presented evidence from the context in which the repairs occurred that also led to this conclusion. The child produces the same word with several different forms in the same transcript, sometimes in the same utterance, as evidenced by self-corrections that will be discussed in the following section. There are examples like the following where the variability in form occurs in the same utterance:

76. K. y ace [//] y [//] y acete [//] y aceite. [K10]
 [and oil.]
77. K. mire acá está un pie [//] pie [//] pellejito.
 [K08]
 [look here is a piece of skin.]

⁸The 20 repairs on nouns in K08 include 12 instances of repairs on the word "pellejito".

78. K. có- [//] có- [//] có- [///] t- [//] t- [//] tómatalo
 todo. [K13]
 [take it all.]

or like the following in which the variability in form is seen in following utterances:

79. K. e [//] e [//] e [//] e [//] e [///] ásilo. [K05]

 e [//] e [//] éselo. [K05]
 "dáselo/déselo" [give it to her]
80. K. #2_6 dónde está este, la estatua rande de el no
 quie- no quiere tener?
 M. cómo? dónde está qué?
 K. la e [//] estacua rande # que Mickey no tiene [*]
 tener.
 M. cuál no quiere tener?
 K. la estata grande del Mickey. [K10]
 K. [where is eh, the big statue (that) he doesn't
 want to have?
 M. what? where is what?
 K. the big s- [//] statue # that Mickey doesn't have
 to have.
 M. which one doesn't he want to have?
 K. the big statue of?/belonging to? Mickey]

Note in this last example the hesitation that ensues when the child actively focusses on the form of the noun "estatua", a noun she is evidently unsure of, in response to M's question "Dónde está qué?" [where is what?].

Hesitations on these words seem to occur because of different problems with the words themselves, either remembering the lexical item or pronouncing it "correctly" during the time that her phonological system is in flux. During the course of the year Koki's hesitations on content

words decrease as her vocabulary grows. The vocabulary used in the tapes is very much context-based referring to objects in the immediate surroundings, objects and situations which are talked about again and again in the tapes and with which she becomes increasingly familiar. At the same time, her phonological system moves closer to the adult standard and there are fewer phonological alternations towards the end, which also reduces difficulties in the production of words.

I would like to conclude this section by summarizing the discussion of repetition repairs and different word categories in this and the previous section. With respect to nouns and verbs, many of the repairs seem to be occasioned by the child having difficulty with the word itself. There is a greater incidence of the child breaking off the word before completion; very often there is more than one stumbling on the same word in the tape, frequently accompanied by corrections on that word. A number of the nouns or verbs that are repaired in this way are either long, new to the child, or different phonological renderings show that the child is unsure of the form of the word. There is a greater number of hesitations on nouns in the earlier tapes, and then a decrease from K09 on. This may be due to the fact that she is now familiar with the vocabulary regarding most of the objects in her surroundings. With respect to "function

words" like articles, demonstratives and prepositions, it seems that the child more often than not completes these words before breaking off. Since the majority of these are very short words the completion may be a function of their length, however it does not seem that the child has problems with the words themselves. In most cases, the child is using the function words appropriately and there is no evidence from other uses in the transcripts that she has trouble with them. At times the child will hesitate repeatedly on the same function word and will couple the repetitions to what Schegloff has called overt indicators of a word-search (Schegloff 1979) that is, pausing and use of hesitation markers such as "eh" or "este" in Spanish. This makes it seem that it is the following item that the child is having difficulties with. She may be using the repetition repair as a strategy to gain time while doing a word-search, while trying out a doubtful pronunciation or in some other way planning the continuation of the utterance. Since the majority of these repetitions occurs on items that precede a noun or noun-phrase (articles, determiners, prepositions), again there are indications that most repairs center around the different nouns in the sentence. In some cases, however, several corrections made on the same utterance indicate that the child is having some problem with the function word

itself. In this respect, there is some correcting or switching between prepositions, especially between the preposition "a" (the earliest and most frequent) and others. At the same time, it may be the case that the demonstratives cause some problems in terms of choosing appropriate agreement endings.

4.1.4. Conclusions on repetition repairs

Repetition repairs have also been called "covert repairs" in previous discussions in the literature because by their nature they do not make the trouble source explicit and a hearer can only hazard guesses at what was in the speaker's mind when effecting the repair. However, these repairs exhibit regularities as to form and placement, and while a hearer can never say for certain what the speaker is intending to do, hearers can and do give interpretations to what may be happening when a repair is carried out; and use these interpretations to orient their next contribution to the conversation. In this section, I have not looked at what happens in the turn following the self-repaired utterance, but in the section on other-repairs it will be shown that in a number of cases the adult focusses on the repair in the child's turn to initiate an other-repair or correction. With this in mind, we can recapitulate from the previous

discussion several different uses to which repetition repairs can be put and infer from them different trouble-sources.

Repetition repairs seem to be caused by the following:

(a) Not knowing what to call a certain object:

81. K. el oto # cosa e- [//] el- [//] el tu- [//] de tu
 espalda? [K08]
 [the other # thing th- the the your from your
 back?]
82. K. yo comí un- [//] un paquete de conos [*] [//] #
 de éstos. [K11]
 [I ate a a packet of "cones" # of these.]

(b) Difficulties with the form of the following word, which can also be seen by hesitations on the words themselves:

83. K. ... para echar agua en ya- [//] en ya mama- [//]
 ya mamama- [//] la mamadera. [K05]
 [... to pour water in the- in the bo- in the
 bobo- the bottle.]
84. K. ...e- [//] el cachó- [//] a caba- [//] el
 caballo. [K07]
 [... [//] the horse]

(c) Some of the hesitations seem to be due to doubt over what type of pronoun or determiner to use. Examples 83 and 84 show switching between different article forms as well as trouble with the form of the noun. In addition there are examples like the ones following. Note that to show that it is the article that she is hesitating on I have taken examples where overt repairs are carried out or co-occur with repetitions:

85. K. aya un [/] una "o". [K03]
 "haga una "o" [draw an "o"]
86. K. un [//] uno [//] un tin. [K03]
 "un [//] uno [//] un tren". [a train]
87. K. eh, el Pa- [//] ese Pampú hace eh pipí ... [K05]
 [eh, the Pa- [//] that Pampú goes eh pipi..]
88. K. yo quiero ver esa- [//] l- [/] los dibujos.
 [K08]
 [I want to see that [//] th- [/] the drawings.]
89. K. e la- [//] e el bebé pollito. [K09]
 [and the(fem.) [//] and the(masc.) baby chick.]

(d) In some cases, where there are multiple repetitions successive tries get the child progressively closer to the target word. Examples 83 and 84 show this as well as the following:

90. K. a [/] a [/] a m- [/] a mercado:!! [K07]
 [to [/] to [/] to m- [/] to market!]
91. K. qué es es- [/] qué es eso [//] qué es esto acá?
 [K08]
 [what is th- [/] what is that [//] what is this here?]
92. K. cóm- [/] cómo se ha- [//] cómo se pende [/] cómo se pende la luz? [K08]
 [ho- [/] how do you do- [//] how do you turn on [/] how do you turn on the light?]
93. K. que [//] quiere [//] quiere que [/] hh que [/] que +...
 [w- [//] (I?) want [//] (I?) want that [/] hh that [/] that]
94. K. e- [/] el [/] el blanco no e des. [K12]
 [th- [/] the [/] the white one don't give her/me.]

(e) Some of the hesitations seem to be due to doubts about what to do next in the interaction. In the following examples, Koki seems to use the hesitation while deciding on what toy to choose for a game, what action to perform, what

to name an object she has chosen, or how to respond to objections:

95. K. voy a poner los- [/] los muñecos acá. [K13]
[I'm going to put the [/] the dolls here.]
96. K. a pasear a u- [/] a un caminito. [K13]
[to go for a walk on a [/] a road]
97. K. ya se van a pagar a (e)l mercado, a curar la patita.
:::
K. a comprar un helado.
K. a comprar un [/] u- [/] u- [/] un [/] un [/] un lemelito tara curar a su [/] a su patita? [K07]
[Now they're going to the market. to buy ice-cream.
to buy a/some medicine to cure his foot.]
98. K. se van las- [/] # las Kokis a otro lugar. [K09]
[they're going the [/] the Kokis to another place.]
99. K. las- [/] las mamás sí quieren con los cuen- [//] puertita. [K13]
[mommies do want (it) with a .. [//] little door.]
100. K. si no [/] si no # dejas un poquito de lugar y- [/] y- [/] yo te apago eso, eh?
[if you don't [/] if you don't # leave a little bit of room I- [/] I- [/] I'll turn that off, eh?]
101. K. hacemos una- [/] una casita de- [/] de septiembre ... [K13]
[we're making a [/] a little house of [/] of september]

In 95 she appears to hesitate as she chooses where to place the little dolls she is playing with. In 96 and 97 she is making up a story and deciding what to say as she goes along. In 97 this is especially clear as she is participating with the Mother in talking about a children's rhyme said when somebody hurts himself, the expected completion is "fueron al

mercado a comprar un helado" (they went to the store to get ice-cream). Koki first says this then corrects herself. Following several repetitions of the indefinite article "un" she substitutes [lemelito] "remedito" (medicine) for "helado". "Remedito" is not the "correct" word according to the rhyme but it makes more sense in real terms, it is more congruent with the purpose of "curing" a hurt foot. In 98 she is moving some mushroom shapes around, the hesitation coincides with choosing what to call these mushrooms. The choice, Koki-mushrooms, was consistent with prior discourse since previously she and the mother had been talking about mommy-mushrooms and baby-mushrooms. The word for "mushroom", "honguito" was introduced by the mother in this tape and may not have been familiar to Koki. Examples 99 and 100 seem to show planning what speech acts to use with or on the mother, a threat in 100 and a counter to an objection by the mother in 99. Finally, in 101 she hesitates before switching "genres". That is, the utterance that she starts out with seems to be a proposal for joint action, but in between the first and second "una" she adopts story-telling intonation and begins to tell the Mother a story which she makes up as she moves little dolls around.

(f) One additional use which hasn't been mentioned previously in the text but has been discussed in the conversational

analysis literature is that some of the repetitions correspond to recyclings of overlapped segments of utterances. Although not very frequent in this corpus, there are examples like the following:

102. K. esta la abuelita Noni.
 M. -sí?
 K. -e- [//] e colgue aquí. [K07]
 K. [it's Grandma Noni (on the phone).
 M. yes?
 K. e? [//] e? hang up here.]
103. K. mamá! [hands over toy apple]
 M. -gracias. [takes apple]
 K. -u- [//] una para tú.
 [one for you]
 M. gracias. [K09]
 [thank you.]

The preceding discussion has been based on examination of a corpus of 540 cases in which the child in the study repeated spontaneously a word or part of a word within the utterance before proceeding to complete the utterance. It can be seen that words from almost every grammatical category may be repeated. There may be only one of these repetitions at a particular time or there may be more. Since in the cases that have been discussed in this section the repair consists of an exact repetition, as hearers we can never be sure what problem the child is responding to. For this reason some researchers have classified these repetitions among "covert repairs". However, examining other types of

repairs in the utterance or the immediate conversation, a hearer can hazard some guesses about the type of things that may be going on. These are guesses, and it would be difficult to ascertain for any particular case that what is being proposed was indeed in the child's mind; but these guesses are based on different types of evidence taken from the context, which make the guess a possibility as a language strategy, although not a certainty in any particular case. At the same time, the "guesses" are the same kinds of interpretations that a participant in the conversation would make about what was occurring.

A large number of these hesitations seem to occur when the speaker is searching for a "content" word, especially a noun. The cut-off may occur before or just after the word is started and the speaker finds some problem with it. That is, the hesitation may be due to a word-search in terms of retrieving the name of a particular object or realizing that the name is not known to the speaker. Here, the child pauses on the word previous to the word she is searching for: a noun determiner (demonstrative, possessive pronoun or article) a preposition or sometimes a conjunction. In addition, the child may "know" the word but have some problem in producing a "correct" form. In this case, the child may start to say the word, and then hesitate, trying out different forms

(epemé/efemé) or making successive tries, each one slightly longer than the other until the complete word is produced (pelle- pellejit- pellejito). In some cases the child uses the repetition to pace or match speech to actions. In some cases, the repetitions are used not to retrieve some particular word but while the child plans her next utterance, thinks about what to say next (for example, what should be the next line in a story that she is making up as she speaks) or when she notices some incongruity between what she has just said and something that she had said before. In addition, it is possible that some of these hesitations may be due to noticing some problem in the context, for example, that the interlocutor is not attending to the talk or to the particular object, action, and so on, that the child wants him or her to attend to. This has been found in other studies, but since there is no visual information to accompany the tapes, I can only propose it as a possibility. In addition, in a large number of the cases of break followed by a repetition, the cut-off point does not coincide with a possible completion point, although it may project a possible completion point. That is, most of the breaks for repairs occur in the middle of a word or in the middle of a constituent, e.g., after the preposition in a prepositional phrase, after the determiner in a noun phrase or after the

auxiliary or the negative in a verb phrase, all of which project a larger unit. By doing this the child is displaying to her interlocutor that there is more to come, so that even if there are pauses in the middle of her utterance, these pause are not to be interpreted as turn completions.

The child exhibits the same type of behavior noted for adults, which would indicate sensitivity and responsiveness to systems for conversational organization as early as the second year. However, the number of repetitions is far greater than those found in adult speech. This responds to the fact that a large number are the result of "production" problems, in pronunciation, in formulating complex syntactic constructions, or in retrieval of appropriate words. A reduction in frequency of repetitions can be expected as the child's mastery of the linguistic system and her vocabulary increase. At the same time, it seems that repetition repairs are good indicators of what the child is working on at a particular point in time, in terms of developing her linguistic system. Thus, the child is concentrating on syntax in K01 (copula constructions) and K04 (subordination), in constructing narratives (K07, K13) and various pragmatic phenomena (e.g., politeness, effective argumentation) in the later tapes, especially K13.

So far the discussion has centered on Repetition repairs. This is one of four types of repairs mentioned in the literature. In the following sections I examine Corrections, Postponements and Abandonments or false-starts.

4.2. Corrections

Corrections are intra-utterance self-initiated repairs where the speaker interrupts and modifies the original utterance in some respect. There are 234 instances of this in the data. Some of these modifications appear to be real corrections after an error, others seem to respond to the child's desire to change the phrasing or wording of what she was going to say. There are modifications in pronunciation, in word order, syntactic additions or deletions and changes in word-choice.

Tables 17 and 18 give overall figures and frequencies of occurrences of the various sub-types of Correction repairs.

Table 17:--Breakdown of Correction Repairs

TYPE OF CORRECTION

Phonology	Syntax	Lexical	Reference	Other	TOTAL
81 35%	52 22%	61 26%	39 17%	1 .4%	234

Table 18:--Frequencies of Correction Repairs

TAPES	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
PHONOLOGY:	42%	60%	54%	21%	56%	-	24%	38%	31%	30%	30%	14%	32%
SYNTAX:	37%	20%	23%	16%	19%	-	12%	26%	19%	9%	30%	42%	26%
LEXICAL:	16%	20%	15%	37%	6%	100%	40%	21%	25%	30%	30%	14%	32%
REFERENCE:	5%	-	8%	26%	19%	-	20%	14%	25%	30%	10%	29%	11%
OTHER:								4%					

Phonological repairs are overall the most frequent (35%). There is no appreciable difference in frequency between Syntactic and Lexical repairs (22-26%). Finally, there is a lower frequency of Reference repairs (17%). If the distribution of repair types is examined over time, however, some proportional differences become apparent. In tapes K01 through K05 there is a strong pattern of a greater frequency of phonological corrections. In most cases approximately 50% of all corrections are phonological corrections. The only place where the pattern breaks is in K04 where there is a high incidence of lexical corrections. This responds to particularities of the specific situation in K04 and does not reflect a change. In this tape Koki and her mother switched identities: Koki was "la mamá" and her mother was "Koki". Keeping this straight is very confusing for the participants and 63% of these lexical corrections respond to this.

Reference correction is low at the beginning and increases from K04 on.

From K07 to K13, however, the pattern is different, and there is a much more even distribution of repairs across the four repair types mentioned. There is a decrease in phonology and an increase in the other categories, especially in word-choice corrections. This corresponds to what has been indicated in the literature on self-repairs (Evans 1985) and in it will be shown in Chapter V that children's corrections in response to an other-repair also follow this same pattern (Gallagher 1977, 1981; Konefal and Fokes 1984; Brinton et al 1986)

4.2.1. Phonological Corrections

In Koki's data there are 81 cases of phonological corrections. Table 19 shows the distribution of these through the tapes.

Table 19:--Distribution of phonological corrections

TAPES	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	TOTAL
PHONOLOGICAL CORRECTIONS	8	3	7	4	9	-	6	16	5	7	3	1	12	81

In the following sections I take up different kinds of phonological corrections found in the data: correcting apparent "slip of the tongue" errors, modification of a

simplified child form to a standard Spanish form or a form closer to the standard, modifying a form given in standard pronunciation to a simplified form. It appears that most of the changes (58/81 72%) result in an adult form or a form closer to the adult form. Table 20 shows the proportion of different types of phonological corrections found in the data.

Table 20:--Types of phonological corrections (N=81)

CORRECTIONS	Towards Standard		Away from Standard	
	"Slips"	20	25%	
Systematic modifications	46	57%	10	12%
Other	5	6%		
TOTALS	71	88%	10	12% = 81 100%

4.2.1.1. Monitoring and correction of speech errors

The child, from the earliest tapes on, seems to be able to detect and correct speech errors. There are twenty cases of corrections of what appear to be non-systematic slip-of-the-tongue errors. This equals 25% of the total number of phonological corrections. Errors corrected seem to be of the various different kinds noticed for adults, such as anticipations, perseverations and "switches". (Nootboom 1973, 1980).

The following seem to be corrections of anticipatory errors:

104. a. no pe- ne- [//] no queye- no teye ...[K01]
 b. no yeye- [//] tere ...[K02]
 c. qué se- [//] qué te saco? [K08]
 d. vengo la- [//] a leer. [K10]
 e. son chalch- [//] salchichas. [K11]
 f. yo se- se- se- me- [//] yo mañana se lo voy a dar.
 [K11]
 g. son can- [//] se caen los conejos. [K13]

In 104(a) the slip of the tongue, anticipation of an [e] so that [no] becomes [ne], is nested within other repairs that the child is making in producing "no quiere". The slip is perceived and corrected as soon as it is produced. 104(b) is interesting because of the repair results. At this point in her tapes, because of a systematic alternation between [y] and [r], the word "quiere" (wants) alternated between the forms [teye] and [tere], the second being closer to the adult form. The slip occurs in the first syllable of [teye] where an anticipated [y] yields [yeye]. The child corrects this immediately, but the correction seems to go across the board to both instances of [y] so that the second non-standard but systematic [y] gets changed to [r] giving [tere] which ends up closer to the adult form "quiere". In 104(c) the [s] from "saco" is anticipated giving [se] instead of [te]. In 104(d) the [l] from "leer" is anticipated resulting in an addition anticipation (Nootboom 1973, 1980). In 104(e) the [ch] from the following syllables is substituted for the initial [s]. 104(f) may be an example of an anticipation or it may be a

perseveration. That is, it is not clear whether the child hesitates while planning to insert the word "manana" which then affects the word "se" which is produced as "me", or whether the vowel in "se" is carried over to the first syllable in "mañana" resulting in [me(ñana)]. Either way, this error is perceived and corrected immediately. Finally in 104(g) the CVC structure of the first syllable of the word "conejos" seems to affect the first two words, giving "son can-" instead of "se caen".

There are also numerous repairs to perseveration errors:

105. a. ayoya a ya- [//] ayoya a tata ... [K02]
 b. te ponistes ese po- [//] collar? [K08]
 c. cuál am- [//] umiritos? [K09]
 d. quieren con los cuen- [//] puertita ... [K13]
 e. los queren- non- [//] no los queren ... [K13]

Examples 105(a) and (b) seem to be self-explanatory. In 105(c) it may be that the [a] from "cual" affects the following word. The other examples are cases of consonants from preceding words being retained. 105(d) and 105(e), both from K13, show the influence of a preceding syllable-final consonant. The child in most of the tapes alternated between forms with and without the {-n} for 3rd person plural; it may be that here she was focussing particularly on the {-n} ending for marking 3rd person plural verb forms and this carried over to the following words. In example 105(d) there is an additional correction. In most of these tapes the

child alternates between "cuertita" and "puertita" as part of a general [k]/[p] alternation. When she stops to correct the [n] in "cuen-" she also changes the systematic alternant [k] to the "correct" adult [p]. This is not a slip-of-the tongue but an example of a systematic alternation which will be discussed in the next section.

With respect to the slip-of-the-tongue error types set forth by Nootboom, examples 104 and 105 show instances of anticipation and perseveration errors and their corrections. There are also a few cases of switches, as in the following:

106. M. ésa es Pinki? [that is Pinki?]
 K. est- [/] est- [//] tú es Pinki.
 [thi- [/] thi- [//] you are Pinki.]
 K. #4.2 tum Piki. [you Pinki.]
 M. aha. [K08]
107. K. el orso va a- [/] atá- [//] adelante. [K08]
 [the bear goes behi- [//] in front.]

In 106 [tú pinki] becomes [tum piki]. In 107 the switch is between the words "oso" and "atrás" which are given as [orso] and [atá-]. In neither case does the child show that she has noticed the errors and these do not get repaired. In 107 Koki interrupts "atrás" immediately after the "slip" has been made, but she then proceeds to make a "factual" correction, substituting "adelante" for "atrás", which is what corresponds to the bear's actions in this line taken from a children's song.

The other apparent slips of the tongue which get corrected are of various types. The cases found are the following:

- 108 a. séntalo mar- [//] más. [sit it down more.][K04]
 b. éshe a Col- [//] éshe e a Carol. [that's Carol's.][K05]
 c. yu- [//] yo estoy- yo ya- ya yo las saqué. [K08]
 [I am- I already- already I took them out.]
 d. el a- [//] el oso ... [the bear...][K08]
 e. en un sueño [//] en un suelo. [on a floor][K10]
 f. quiero una cosita [//] casita chiquitita. [K13]
 [I want a small little house.]

In the first four examples an apparent slip-of-the-tongue, an error that does not correspond to any of the systematic substitutions that the child has, is noticed and corrected. The last three examples are of a different type. In 108e and 108f the error involves the substitution of a complete word, a possible Spanish word which belongs to the same grammatical category and is a near homonym of the word that was aimed for: [sueño] "dream"/ [suelo] "floor, ground", [kosita] "thing"/[kasita] "house". When this is noticed, it gets corrected. These last two examples are included as phonological errors and repairs but may be more properly lexical "slips".

4.2.1.2. Approximations to the adult standard Spanish form

Apart from cases of corrections of slips of the tongue, there are 46 instances of modifications of systematic "errors" towards the standard form or towards an intermediate child form that is closer to the standard. These modifications account for 57% of the phonological corrections. In a previous study of this child's phonological development (Fidelholtz and Montes 1990) a number of systematic substitutions and simplifications were noted. The repairs made here reverse many of the regular sound alternations or simplifications that were observed in the previous study:

- 109 a. p repaired to k: [no pe- ... [//] no keye] [K01]
 b. [po- [//] kolge] [K07]
 c. [se esp- [//] eskucas] [K08]
- 110 a. t repaired to k: [de to- [//] de koki] [K05]
 b. [ko- ko- ko- [//] t- t- tómatelo] [K13]
 c. [se ta- [//] se kae] [K13]
111. t repaired to x: [las abutas- [//] las abuxas] [K12]
112. y repaired to r: [eya- [//] era un pa- ...] (perrito) [K08]
113. y repaired to l: [ya mamama- [//] la mamadera] [K05]
114. l repaired to r: [kyele- [//] kyere] [K10]
115. x repaired to f: [i si xu- [//] i si fwerá] [K05]
- 116 a. diphthongization: [pu- [//] peyno] [K01]
 b. [te:ne- [//] tyene] [K09]
 c. [ke- [//] kyele] [K10]
 d. [i asete- [//] i aseyte] [K10]

addition of missing consonants:

- 117 a. [i o- [//] i- i- i lo sope] [K08]
 b. [de los a- [//] bariretes] [K09]

- c. [kon lo mu- [//] kon los muñekos] [K13]
 d. [poke- [//] porke ...] [K13]

addition of missing syllables:

- 118 a. [a pat- [//] a sapatos] [K02]
 b. [aytá mano- [//] mañano] [K03]
 c. [e kačó- [//] a kaba- el kabažo] [K07]
 d. [efo- [//] keléfono] [K07]

metathesis reversal:

119. [un abayo- [//] un pa- [//] un abyo] [K04]

various vowel changes:

- 120 a. [pe- [//] papita] [K01]
 b. [asin non- [//] asen noni] [K03]
 c. [a bevi- [//] e biyito] [K03]
 d. [los pve- pve- [//] pezexitos] [K08]
 e. [e po- [//] i porke...] [K08]

A few of the corrections show the child attempting or essaying several different versions until she opts for one. In some cases the transitional rejected forms are in fact closer to the adult form than the one she eventually picks; but in most cases the transitional forms show successive approximations to the final standard or close-to-standard form.

121. a. está en le- [//] en ela- [//] e a pasi [K05]
 "está en la casa." [it's in the house]
 b. e [kačó-] [//] a [kaba-] [//] el [kabažo].] [K07]
 "el caballo" [the horse]

- c. e lor- [//] en la ro- [//] en lore- [//] o- [//]
[orexa].
"en la oreja" [in the ear] [K08]
- d. [ke-] [//] [kyele] [//] [kyere] .. "quiere" [wants]
[K10]
- e. [i] se le [en-] [//] [in-] [//] e- [//] e- [//] e- se
ensució su ombligo. [K13]
"y se (le) ensució su ombligo." [and her
belly-button got dirty (on her).]

In these examples the child making several approximations until an acceptable form is reached. Sometimes there are several things to be corrected at once in a phrase. The child often seems to take one correction at a time as in 121(b) or (d):

e kačó -- a kaba -- el kabažo
ke -- kyele -- kyere

In 121(b) the child first concentrates on the form of the noun "caballo" and then on the article. In 121(d) she works first on the first syllable of the word, diphthongizing the vowel, then she works on the second syllable, changing the consonant from [l] to [r].

In other cases, these multiple problems in an utterance may prove too much and the child only carries out some of the corrections, or when working on one form relaxes her hold on another:

en le- -- en ela- -- e a pasi
e l or -- en la ro -- en l ore -- o [//] orexa
[i] se le [en-] [//] [in-] -- [e- e- e-] se [ensució]

In 121(a) she is attempting the phrase "en la casa" (which she says successfully in a following utterance). She is trying to manage both the preposition "en" and the article "la". The article apparently proves too difficult for the child and she ends up simplifying both the article and the preposition. In 121(c) she is attempting the phrase "en la oreja". Most casual pronunciations of "la oreja" by adults would reduce the two successive vowels to either [lawrexa] or [lorexa], as the child in fact does in this example. In her first repair the child corrects the preposition [e] to [en] but loses control over the vowel changes; in her next repair she then corrects this and proceeds to repeat (practice?) the word "oreja" which is completed successfully. In 121(e) she concentrates on giving the correct pronunciation of "ensució" and loses control over the form of the preposition "y" which reverts to the earlier [e].

4.2.1.3. Other phonological modifications

There are 10 cases of changes away from a standard form to a simplified form. In some of these, after having produced or having started to produce the more standard form the child changes to a previous form:

- 122 a. pu- pe- [//] piyito "pelito" [hair] [K01]
 b. no keye [//] no teye "quiere" [wants] [K01]

- c. as testeyitas [//] a teyitas "estrellitas" [stars] [K03]
- d. está en ade- [//] nento "adentro" [inside] [K04]
- e. en le- en ela- [//] e a pasi "en la " [in the] [K05]
- f. ásele bu- [//] gweltas "vueltas" [turns, circles] [K07]
- g. la mu- [//] a música "la" [the] [K07]
- h. i- [//] e me keme] "y" [and] [K08]
- i. ablas [//] abas] "hablas" [you speak] [K09]
- j. i se en- ... [//] ... e se ensució] "y" [K13]

In some of these cases the more standard form occurs as a transitional step where the child tries out a pronunciation which she then rejects and later repairs. In some cases the more standard form is tried but may prove too difficult, and then the child opts for a simplified form. This may be the case in 122(d), where the child starts to say "adentro" (inside) but abandons this for the simplified "nento". Example 122(e) has been discussed previously. Here the child discards [en ela] which, although not correct is an approximation to the standard form [en le] and repairs to [e a] where both article and preposition are simplified.

Finally, there are five cases where the correction seems to be a phonological one, or at least one result is a phonological change, but something else may be going on and there is just not enough information to tell. The examples are the following:

- 123 a. no tiene [ni-] [//] [nanana]. "banana" [K03]

- b. e [po-] [//] e [solito]. [alone] [K04]
- c. voy a [u-] [//] [kučar]. "escuchar" [hear, listen] [K08]
- d. es para [s-] [//] [eskučar]. [hear, listen] [K08]
- e. [esta] [//] [este] Mickey ... [this] [K10]

123(c) and 123(d) should probably be included among the cases that change from a more simplified to a more complex form. I have included them here because since only one segment of the repairable is given before the child interrupts, what the child was intending to say can only be guessed at. It might be that in 123(c) the child has simplified the target verb "escuchar" to "uchar" which she then corrects to "cuchar"; in 123(d), she may be starting to say "scuchar" which she corrects to "escuchar" achieving the target verb. If the child before the cut-off was starting some version of "escuchar", this would be a case of the use of a strategy widely mentioned in the literature: the child concentrates on the final segments of a unit and builds backwards from there: uchar - cuchar - scuchar - escuchar.⁹

The other three examples all result in phonological changes between the original utterance and the repair; however, there is some doubt as to whether the child is in fact making a phonological correction or whether the

⁹This would be good psycholinguistic evidence if it could be proven, but on the basis of one segment, with no additional contextual evidence, it is no more than a guess.

modification is the result of a word-choice repair, where the child started to say one thing and substituted another word for it.

In general terms, all of these examples and their corrections show the fluctuations and variations encountered when the child is in transition between two systems. Aside from slip-of-the-tongue errors and their corrections, which are also found in adult data, the remaining errors and their corrections seem to be cases of problems in approximating the adult system. The child may have several alternating forms for a word: Toti/Koki, piyito/peyito, teyitas/seteyitas/testeyitas. The majority of phonological repairs seem to occur on words with alternating forms. In the majority of the cases (88%) the child moves towards the adult standard as she makes the repair, although in a few cases (12%) the change is away from the standard towards a more simplified form. Some of these "simplifications" may result from too much pressure on the child when she has to monitor at the same time several different parts of the utterance of which she may be unsure. When several problematic constructions are attempted within one utterance, focus on one problem (e.g., syntax) may lead her to relax on another (e.g., phonology) and thus repair away from the

standard towards an earlier form which may be easier to produce.

4.2.2. Syntactic corrections

There are 52 cases of syntactic corrections which involve the addition, deletion, substitution or reorganization of elements within the utterance. The distribution of syntactic corrections is as follows:

Table 21:--Distribution of syntactic corrections.

TAPES	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	TOTAL
SYNTACTIC CORRECTIONS	7	1	3	3	3	-	3	11	3	2	3	3	10	52

There is a small number of syntactic corrections in each of the thirteen tapes. Longer transcripts, such as K01, K08 and K13, have a greater number of corrections. The syntactic corrections can be sub-classified according to the type of syntactic modification effected. There are 25 substitutions, 12 addition corrections, 11 deletions and 4 word-order changes.

4.2.2.1. Syntactic substitutions

The majority of syntactic corrections correspond to substitution of elements within the utterance: substitution of forms to achieve number or gender agreement, substitution

of verb forms, clitic substitution. The total number of substitutions is 25.

There are 12 cases of substitution to achieve gender or number agreement, 11 of which occur from Tape 4 on. Following are examples:

- 124 a. esos- [//] eshe- eshe pashi. [K01]
 "esos [//] ese lápiz." [those [//] that pencil]
- b. ese- [//] eta la mamá e bobito. [K04]
 "ese [//] esta la mamá de bobito." [that(m) this(f) bobito's mother.]
- c. ese agua [//] esa agua es para echar agua ..[K05]
 [that(m) water [//] that(f) water is to pour...]
- d. está en le- [//] ... están e a pasi. [K05]
 [it is in the [//] .. they are in the house.]
- e. ponga ehe aquí [//] estos aquí. [K07]
 [put that here [//] those here.]
- f. éste- [//] éstas también? [K09]
 [this(m)? [//] these(f) also?]
- g. e la otro ma- [//] e la otra mariposa. [K11]
 [and the other(m) b- [//] and the other(f) butterfly.]

The majority of agreement substitutions are in determiners, as in the first five examples. There are gender and number substitutions, sometimes both occurring at the same time, as in 124(a) and (e). 124(b) shows in addition the substitution of a proximal demonstrative "ésta" [eta] for "ése". However, since there is no visual information to accompany the transcripts, it is not apparent why the child changed deictics at this point. Example 124(d) is the only one that

shows an agreement substitution of a verb form: 3rd person singular changing to 3rd person plural.

There are six cases of clitic substitutions which will be discussed below together with clitic additions and deletions. The remaining seven substitutions are of verb forms:

- 125 a. éshe a [//] e nushio. [K01]
 "ése a [//] es sucio." [that a[//] is dirty]
- b. éshe seta e- [//] e seta e- ... tayita. [K01]
 "ése sienta e- [//]?se sienta e- ...
 sentadita."
 [that (one) sits ..[//] sits .. seated.]
- c. ámelo al lapicito ea ibuj- [//] e ibujar una
 "o". [K03]
 "dámelo al lapicito ea? (?voy a) dibuj- [//]
 e? dibujar una "o"." [give me the pencil to
 write an "o".]
- d. que haces [//] haciendo con la grabadora.
 [K10]
 [what do you [//] doing with the tape
 recorder?]
- e. se ponen en su cueva.
 y se ponen a- [//] y pu- [//] y se ponen a
 llover.
 [they go into their warren. and they start to
 [//] ... and they start to rain.] [K13]
- f. cómo se van- [//] se llamaban a ver? [K13]
 [how are they going- [//] were they called,
 let's see?]

In example (125a) she replaces the particle "a" by a simplified version of the copula [e] "es". This "particle", which has been mentioned when discussing repetition repairs, is very frequent in the first three tapes and seems to serve functions not exactly equivalent to those of any one standard

Spanish form but it occupies places that will later be occupied by the copula, clitics, prepositions and determiners. K01 is of course the first tape in the corpus and there is no previous data, but it seems that for Koki at this time the introduction of a copula is a fairly recent occurrence and she seems to be alternating throughout the tape between sentences like "ese nusio" "ese a nusio" and "ese e nusio" (that (is) dirty). The correction in 125(a) substitutes the copula [e] "es" for "a". In 125(b) she seems to be attempting some form of the verb "sentar" (se sienta en (?)). The verb form gives her problems and she goes back to what is familiar, the use of the participle [tayita] "sentadita".

Examples 125(c), 125(d) and 125(f) seem all to be related to producing periphrastic verb forms "voy a dibujar", "van a llamar", "estás haciendo". In 125(e) what causes difficulty is the use of the impersonal verb "se pone a llover". This utterance comes from a sequence where the child is telling a story, based on a children's song, which has the following line: "Los conejos en sus cuevas miran llover" (The rabbits in their warrens watch how it rains). What Koki says is "Se ponen en su cueva. Y se ponen a- [//] y pu- [//] y se ponen a llover." (They get into their warrens and they start ... and they start to rain). In the second

line, where the repair occurs, her sentence seems to continue with the rabbits as agents but the choice of the verb "ponen" leads her to a dead-end unless she were able to say "se ponen a mirar como llueve" (they start to look at how it rains), "se ponen a mirar la lluvia" (they start to look at the rain) or some such form. The breaks make it apparent that she notices a problem with the verb, which is what she tries to modify, but the repairs that she tries make it seem that she is unclear in this case as to where the problem lies. This is the first example so far of a type of strategy that will be discussed below when examining word and phrase substitutions. This seems to be a strategy to complete the frame the child started with. If the child starts to say something and runs into a problem instead of recasting her utterance she sometimes evades the problem by switching to another completion for the syntactic frame she started with, even though the meaning may be totally different from what she was originally trying to say.

4.2.2.2. Additions

There are 12 cases of addition of elements. Seven cases are additions of pronominal elements, which I discuss in the following section. The remaining five examples the following.

In the first tape there is insertion of the copula:

126. éshe # nu- [//] éshe e nushio. [K01]
 [that # di- [//] that is dirty.]

There are two examples of addition of a determiner to a noun phrase:

- 127a. el heyor eta m- [//] a manito. [K03]
 "el señor esta m- [//] la manito." [the man
 has h- [//] the hand.]
 b. y comía nini- [//] e ninito e melón. [K05]
 [and boy ate [//] the boy ate the melon.]

There are two cases of addition of prepositions, the preposition "de" and the particle "a" seeming to function as a preposition:

- 128a. eta mamá Chocho [//] a Chocho. [K04]
 "esta mamá Chocho [//] a Chocho" [this mommy
 Chocho [//] of? Chocho.]
 b. dónde está el oto # cosa e- el el tu [//] de
 tu espalda? [K08]
 [where is the other # thing th- the the you-
 [//] from you back?]

In 128(a) we can still see the persistence of the possession relationship being indicated simply by the juxtaposition of nouns but repaired by inserting the particle "a" which eventually gives way to "de". In 128(b) she also inserts a preposition, in this case "de"; it is interesting to note that this repair shows her awareness and correct use of a fairly complex syntactic NP "el de tu espalda": det + <prep + <poss + n>>.

4.2.2.3. Pronoun substitutions, additions and deletions

There are sixteen instance of syntactic corrections involving pronouns. Fourteen of these have to do with the addition or deletion of clitics, and two are instances of insertion or deletion of the optional first person subject pronoun "yo".

Clitics were being used from the first tape on but there is a marked increase in use of types of clitics and frequency of use of pronouns in general after tape 7 (Koki: 2:4). At the same time, the bulk of corrections or repairs in general involving pronouns occurs from Tape 8 on. The following table shows the distribution of corrections on pronouns (pronoun insertions, deletions and substitutions), and also repairs involving pronoun repetitions, and the occurrences of pronouns in the child's speech throughout the transcripts:

Table 22:--Repairs on pronouns

TAPES	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	TOTAL

REPAIRS														
Corrections	1	1		1				4				3	5	15
Repetitions				2	1		14	15	3	1	7	2	9	54
PRONOUN USE														
	6	20	5	47	25	5	107	158	74	75	65	66	171	824

It can be seen from this table that even though Koki uses pronouns from the first transcript, frequency of occurrence

increases from K07 on. In tapes 1 through 6 there are 108 occurrences of pronouns, approximately the same as the number of pronouns found in tape 7 alone. And, as can be seen, the bulk of repairs involving pronouns also occurs from tape 7 on. Repairs may not coincide with first use of a form but may start to occur together with what is very often a rapid increase in use of the form.

Corrections on pronouns involve six substitutions of pronominal forms, seven pronoun additions and three deletions. The first three substitutions occur in the early tapes and all involve replacing the particle "a" by a clitic:

- 129a. a [//] e pita. [K01]
 "a [//] (l)e pica." [it itches.]
- b. ayoya a tata [//] se tata los zapatos. [K02]
 "ahora a saca [//] se saca los zapatos."
 [now she takes off the shoes.]
- c. a [//] e- e subo. [K04]
 "a [//] (m)e subo." [I climb up.]

In the later tapes the substitutions involve a number of different pronominal forms:

- 129d. me voy [//] te lo voy a ven- poner. [K08]
 [I'm going to put it on you.]
- e. ellos me- [//] se van a ir...[K12]
 [they are going to go...]
- f. que no se- [//] te lo robe tu dinero. [K13]
 [that he doesn't steal from you your money.]

There were seven cases of addition of pronouns:

- 130a. soy- [//] yo soy eschando oso acá. [K08]

- "soy [//] yo soy escuchando "oso" acá."
[I'm listening to "bear" (=song) here.]
- b. voy- [//] te voy a mostrar un # dibujito. [K08]
[I'm going to show you a # drawing.]
- c. me voy [//] te lo voy a ven- poner. [K08]
[I'm going to put it on you.]
- d. me voy a ir- vo- [//] me voy a ir ahí ...
[K12]
[I'm going to go there...]
- e. te po- [//] te lo pongo mucho? [K13]
[do I put it on a lot?]
- f. que no se- [//] te lo robe tu dinero. [K13]
[that he doesn't steal from you your money.]
- g. y vas- [//] y le vas a pedir al señor ...
[K13]
[and you're going to ask the man ...]

Finally, there were three pronoun deletions of optional pronouns:

- 131a. yo- [//] estoy escuchando?¹⁰ [K08]
[I- [//] (I) am listening?]
- b. me voy a ir [//] vo- me voy a ir ahí ... [K12]
[I'm going to go there..]
- c. y se le en- [//].. e se ensució su ombligo.
[K13]
"y se (le) ensució su ombligo." [and her belly-button got dirty (on her).]

These sentences are grammatical with the pronouns and remain grammatical after the deletions and the basic meaning is not altered:

yo estoy escuchando -- estoy escuchando
me voy a ir ... -- voy a ir ...
y se le ensució ... -- y se ensució ...

¹⁰The intonation of the sentence helps determine that "estoy escuchando" is not a continuation after "yo".

It is difficult to interpret at this point what problems the child is having with the clitics in some of these examples. She doesn't seem to have problems with clitic ordering but may have some confusion with respect to who is doing what to whom especially in sentences with three arguments (examples 129(b), (d) and (f)).

It has been noted that some of these clitics are optional. It should also be mentioned that in the mother's variety of Spanish there is a high incidence of optional "reflexives": for example, "me voy a ir al Centro", "me voy a comer melón".

There is one further note. In Spanish, clitics have the possibility of being pre-posed or post-posed relative to the verb. In the examples that have been called "additions", it is not clear whether she is really adding a left-out clitic or preposing one which she had originally planned for a post-verbal position. For example in 130(g) she might have been planning to say "Y vas a pedirle al señor ..." and then repaired to "Y le vas a pedir al señor ...". Since the surface outcome is the insertion of a pre-verbal clitic, I have called them additions.

4.2.2.4. Deletions

There are 11 cases of deletions, including the three pronoun deletions mentioned above. Most of the deletions are of optional elements and the majority of them (9/11: 82%) occur at or after tape 7. Aside from the three pronoun deletions, there are four cases of preposition deletions, one case of deletion of the article changing the noun phrase from a specific noun phrase to a generic one, one case of a demonstrative subject being deleted and two cases of the deletion of a noun phrase serving as direct object.

Following are some examples:

- 132a. miya e p- [//] oh miya! [K01]
 [look at the p- [//] oh look!]
- b. de~~jo~~ a e- [//] de~~jo~~ esto ahí. [K08]
 [I('ll) leave this here.]
- c. este es con ve- [//] ... este es verde. [K13]
 [this is with gr- [//] ..this is green.]
- d. en nónde está su mamá # Koki de los- [//] de honguitos. [K09]
 [where is the Koki mommy of the [//] of mushrooms.]
- e. M. no tiene pelito verde la mamá.
 K. co- qué tiene pe~~li-~~ [//] qué tiene? [K08]
 [M. mommy doesn't have green hair. K. ho- what does she have ha- [//] what does she have?]

The use of the preposition "a" with a direct object is optional in 132(a), but what is happening in this sentence may be a phonological problem rather than syntactic or maybe a combination. Both "dejo" and "deja" refer to an action of Koki's. The use of the 3rd person form "deja" may be due to

reverting to her early strategy of referring to herself in the 3rd person (Koki deja..) or it may result from some reduction or fusion of the two contiguous vowels in "dejo a..", in which case we couldn't speak of the preposition being deleted. 132(b) eliminates a non-standard use of a preposition in the phrase "este es con verde" used to mean "this is green". In examples 132(d), (e) she eliminates an object noun phrase. The resulting sentence is simpler, especially in 132(e) where she is working herself into a syntactic dead-end. The deletion of the object noun phrases in these cases does not create communicational problems since what she is referring to is clear from the context.

4.2.2.5. Word-order changes

There are four repairs to word-order in which Koki tries out different possible orders before deciding on one:

- 133a. yo ya- [//] ya yo las saqué. [K08]
 [I already [//] already I took them out.]
 b. co- [//] de- [//] como de- del zoológico.
 [K11]
 [li- [//] from- [//] like from from the zoo.]
 c. que- [//] dici que el papá son en- enaps.
 [K12]
 [that [//] says that daddy they are snaps.]

133(a) is a straightforward reordering of elements although the repaired utterance is less acceptable in adult terms than the original. The next two examples show attempts at

relative ordering of elements. In 133(b) there are two repairs on the target phrase "como de". The child tries one word first, then the other before deciding on the correct ordering. In 133(c) the utterance she is aiming for is some version of the sentence "Dice el papá que son esnaps." (daddy says they are (called) snaps). She could say "El papá dice que ..." or "Dice el papá que ..." where the postposed subject is inserted between the verb and the complementizer. Koki seems to opt for postposing the subject, but she maintains "dice que" as a unit. This results in the non-standard "Dice que el papá son esnaps." This repair seems to be based on a linear or surface analysis of the target utterance and does not take into account underlying structure.

To summarize the discussion of syntactic corrections, it appears that the child is aware of various types of syntactic problems and seems to be able to repair a number of them adequately. Of the 54 repair examples only five give a non-standard result after the repair. The examples show remaining "errors" that the child either is unaware of or does not attempt to correct, but in what she does repair she has 91% success. One observation about these repairs, that will also come up later on, is that the child seems to rely, at least partly at this stage, on the surface linear ordering

of elements, although there are examples that will be discussed later on where the repairs indicate awareness of "deeper" structural relationships.

4.2.3. Lexical Substitutions

There are 58 cases of repairs which substitute a word or phrase by another. The following table shows the distribution of these repairs through the tapes:

Table 23:--Distribution of lexical substitutions

TAPES	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	TOTAL
LEXICAL SUBSTITUTIONS	3	1	2	7	1	1	10	9	4	7	3	1	12	61

A few of these substitutions affect verbal elements, and also included in this group substitutions of one preposition by another, but the majority of instances are exchanges of nouns or noun phrases. Some of these substitutions are actual corrections of factual mistakes or wrong initial lexical choices. Other substitutions replace a correct item by an equivalent one which may be either more specific or, sometimes, more general than the original.

24 of the word substitutions are corrections of some type of error. Some of these errors are apparently slips of the tongue, as the following:

- 134a. papá [//] mamá, el papá está lelando la
bicikeka. [K07]
[daddy [//] mommy, daddy is fixing the
bicycle.]
- b. a cuántes [//] cuáles señor ...? [K13]
[to which man ...]

In 134(a) Koki starts to call the mother, who is the only one in the room with her, to tell her what her father was doing but instead seems to anticipate the word "papá"¹¹. In 134(b) the child produces a blend [kwantes] "cuántes" between two words "cuántos" (how many) and "cuáles" (which), this may result from the fact that both words start alike and also come from the same grammatical category (interrogatives).

135. te voy a mostar el di- los dibujos estos.
voy a di- [//] mos- ... [K08]
[I'm going to show you the dr(awing) these
drawings.
(I'm) going to dr- [//] sho- ...]

In the second sentence, she is apparently trying to repeat the initial one "voy a mostrar los dibujos" but substitutes "di(bujar?)" for the verb "mostrar". Here it is not clear whether this is a perseveration error from the previous "dibujos" or an anticipation of the next one.

¹¹The intonation of "papá" and "mamá" lead us to this interpretation. However, there is an alternative analysis of this example as a Postponement or word-insertion repair: the child is starting to say the sentence "Papá esta arreglando..." but repairs to insert the vocative and draw the mother's attention. In this as in other examples, when in doubt as to what the child is intending, I have based my decision on "surface" criteria.

Other errors which are repaired are due to confusion or memory lapses, as seems to be the case in the following:

136. el orso va a- atá- [//] adelante.[K08]
 [the bear goes b- behi- [//] in front.]
- 137a. mamá [//] Toti. [K04]
 [mommy [//] Koki.]
- b. mira Koki [//] mam- [//] mira Koki. [K04]
 [look Koki [//] mom- [//] look Koki.]
- c. a péfono de To- [//] de eta mamá. [K04]
 [telephone of Ko- [//] of this mommy.]

In 136 she is singing a song about two bears where one of them (oso) walks in front ("adelante") and the other (osito) walks behind ("atrás"). Koki says "el orso va a- atá(s)" (the (big) bear walks behind), decides that what she said is wrong (according to the words of the song) and corrects "atrás" (behind) to "adelante" (in front). In this sentence there is an additional phonological slip, "orso atá(s)" instead of "oso atrás", which does not get repaired. The errors in example 137, all of which come from K04, are due to a game which Koki and the mother are playing in which they have switched roles so that Koki is "mamá" and the mother is "Koki/Toti". Since during the course of the conversation they switch in and out of their game roles into their real ones, addressing each other gets to be rather confusing. A number of the mistakes made by the Mother, which are discussed in section 5, are due to the same problem. In 137(c) Koki is laying claim to a toy phone and resorts to the

use of a demonstrative and pointing to herself [eta mamá] to avoid any possible ambiguity.

Finally a few of the other substitutions which correct errors are cases in which Koki notices as she speaks that she is making a mistake and corrects herself; in 138 she uses an overt editing "no" to indicate that what was said previously should not count:

138. ése de es- éste [//] no, éste- éste de elle. [K09]
[that is th- this one's [//] no, this- this is hers.]
139. ya tenemos oto cuchi- [//] un- un- [//] oto tenedor. [K10]
[we already have another kni- [//] one- one- [//] another fork.]
140. ésta es rand- [//] ésta es chiquita, la voy a cortar yo. [K11]
[this is bi- [//] this is small, I'm going to cut it.]
141. no son- [//] sí son y éstos son para mí. [K11]
[they're not [//] yes they are and these are for me.]

This discussion has centered on twenty-four instances of word-substitution error-corrections. These errors are due to slips, to confusion between names or to re-evaluating judgments (no son, sí son...), as the utterance is being produced. As has been found in other studies (Nooteboom 1973, 1980) the substitutions in the majority of cases are of words from the same grammatical category and often from a small semantic class where many of the terms substituted are or could be considered "opposites" if not quite antonyms of

the term they replace: grande/chiquito, cuchillo/tenedor, atrás/adelante.

The remaining 34 word or phrase substitutions do not correspond to mistakes or perceivable errors although some of the repairs may be due to the child attempting some construction which either leads her to a dead-end or is too difficult for her.

A number of these substitutions are cases of substituting equivalent terms which are either more general or more specific than the one in the original utterance. The first three examples are cases in which the child goes from a more specific to a more general term:

142. mamá buje- [//] yaya hace a vatas. [K03]
 "mamá dibuje [//] haga hacen (l)a vacas."
 [mommy draw [//] do (how) the cows go/do.]
143. yo tengo mi- [//] as meyas amarillos. [K07]
 [I have my [//] the yellow socks.]
144. ahora lo ponemos e- e- [//] a- [//] e- [//] acá.
 [K09]
 [now we put it i- i- [//] h- [//] i- [//] here.]

In 142, asking the mother to write an "m", Koki replaces [buje] "dibuje" by [yaya] "haga". In 143 she seems to be replacing a more specific "mis" (mis medias) by the more general "las" (las medias); note however that in this example "yo tengo mis medias amarillas" would probably be considered "incorrect" by most Spanish speakers and "las medias .." or absence of a determiner would be preferred. In 144 she seems

to be attempting to say a locative prepositional phrase "lo ponemos en X" but opts for the demonstrative adverb "acá". Aside from these cases, the other substitutions are, as has been observed in other studies, from more general to more specific terms:

145. a p- [//] miya pono. [K01]
 "a p- [//] mira pongo." [look I put (on).]
146. am- [//] eh bújelo arriba. [K07]
 [gi- [//]eh, look for it up top.]
147. a- a- [//] # más. [K07]
 [a- a- [//] more.]
148. hace- [//] quengo mucho fiyo. [K07]
 [it's [//] I'm very cold.]
149. cóm- cómo se ha- [//] cómo se pende..? [K08]
 [ho- how do you do- [//] how do you turn on ..?]
150. dehc- [//] a a # a ocho. [K10]
 [lat- [//] at at # at eight.]
151. porque ya se ha- [//] se puso un poq- [//] no.
 [K13]
 [because now it's get- [//] it's become a litt-
 [//] no.]

In 145 she is replacing the general particle "a" by the verb [miya] "mira" which makes the child's illocutionary intent explicit. In 146 she is requesting a toy monkey that is up on a shelf. She starts to say [ámelo] "dámelo" and changes to [bújelo] which may be either "búsquelo" (get it, look for it) or "bájelo" (bring it down). Example 147 is included among these substitutions although not properly a word-choice change. Here she is using a whiny [a] which was a form of request together with pointing towards the object requested. In this utterance she replaces this [a] by verbalizing "más"

(more, again). In 150 she is about to repeat [dehkwes] "después" (later) as a reply to a previous "when are you coming back?" but replaces it with a time phrase [a oĉo] "a (las) ocho" (at eight)¹². The other three substitutions replace the verb "hace" which can serve as a wild-card verb in many cases, by an appropriate verb for each utterance:

cómo se hace -> cómo se prende (how do you turn on ..)
 ya se hace -> ya se puso (de noche). (it got dark, it's night-time)
 hace frío -> tengo frío (it's cold -> I'm cold)

In this last example she was using the utterance as a grounder to request a "ponchito" (sarape, wrap) that she had run across. "Hace frío" (it's cold) could have been disputed by the mother, but not "tengo frío" (I'm cold). This is an example of what Labov and Fanshel call A-(or speaker-based) events. The child in this case, is the only one who can attest to the truth of the utterance. By switching from a disputable "hace frío" to a non-disputable "tengo frío", the child pre-empts possible objections that the mother might make to her request.

A few cases of substitutions seem to be rephrasings in which the apparent sense of the original utterance is

¹²This was untrue. She returned a few minutes later. But the reply was more specific than "después" and probably more adult-sounding.

maintained but the phrasing is changed in some cases because it may have proved to be too difficult for the child:

152. un Mickey de- de- [//] con la estatuita y su- [//]
y tenía muchos libros. [K10]
[a Mickey of of [//] with the statue and his [//]
and he had a lot of books.]
153. con- [//] sin- sin los todos. todos no. [K13]
[with [//] without without all of them. not all.]

In 152 there is a substitution of the preposition "de" by "con", but there is not enough information about what she was trying to say with the "de" phrase to know what this was responding to. Example 153 from K13 seems to be a case of rephrasing while maintaining a same semantic meaning. The mother is piling toy people into a house and Koki objects to her putting all of them in, she seems to be hesitating about how to phrase her objection and seems to start to say something related to "con todos no" which she changes to "sin los todos" here she shows grasp of fairly complex semantic relations.

Two examples may show changes for pragmatic reasons:

154. éstos son para mi pa- [//] porque me de los relaló
Isabel. [K10]
[these are for me to- [//] because Isabel gave
them to me.]
155. no wemes porque- [//] que hay que- [//] porque en
el caminito no se weme.
en el caminito sí se weme! [K13]
[you don't sleep because- [//] you have to- [//]
because you don't sleep on a road. You do sleep
on a road.]

In both of these the switch is in what could be called a grounding phrase, one that gives reasons or explanations for making a certain claim. In both she opts for a "because" phrase, one which does give a reason, to initiate her grounder. In 154 she has come into the room where the mother is, and is holding some plastic cutlery. She apparently starts to say "éstos son para mi pa(ra jugar)" (these are mine to play with) but she changes the final phrase to "porque me los regaló Isabel" (because Isabel gave them to me) which grounds her claim to having them before the mother can object. After grounding her claim she then continues in a following utterance with "son para jugar" (they're to play with). 155 is part of a long argument about what actions are appropriate on a road (caminito) that is being built with blocks. The mother has been trying to convince Koki that they should build a house rather than a road since, according to the game, it's getting dark, one can't sleep on a road and kids need to sleep at night: "De noche hay que dormir" (mother's arguments). Koki rebuts these arguments by saying "no duermes" (you don't sleep) and then adds reasons for this assertion: "No duermes porque [//] que hay que [//] porque en el caminito no se duerme". The switches are between alternative groundings which although different syntactically are similar in that both are prescriptive generalizations:

"hay que ...", "no se ..." . This type of grounding or argumentation was first noted in this transcript (K13). Actually her argument led her to the mother's position, since M had been saying all along that one shouldn't sleep on the road. So immediately after saying "no se weme", Koki retracts it with: "en el caminito sí se weme" (you do sleep on a road.).

The final group of word or phrase substitutions are all cases of deciding to say something different from what she was originally trying to say while maintaining part of the original utterance, the beginning "frame". These correspond to a change of mind or change of focus about what to say but unlike false-starts which are discussed in section 4.4, the same frame she started with is maintained.

156. ése ya- [//] ése tenía muchos. [K04]
[that goes [//] that had a lot.]
157. ya no está [//] no tiene mas pelo ahí? [K05]
[now she isn't [//] doesn't have more hair there?]
158. (van) a- a la [//] a compar un helado. [K07]
[(they're going) to to the [//] to buy ice-cream.]
159. van a pasar lo- [//] ## a compar un helado. [K07]
[they're going for a ride the [//] to buy ice-cream.]
160. te lo voy a ven- [//] poner. [K08]
[I'm going to ?ven- [//] put it on you.]
161. esos dos juntitos co- [//] e- en dónde los pu-
[//] estos dos. [K10]
[those two together ho- [//] wh- where did (they)
[//] these two.]
162. y el elón qué- [//] por qué se está bajando..?
[K10]
[and the lion what [//] why is he coming down ..?]

To recapitulate what has been said about word-choice corrections, some of the substitutions seem to occur after noticing a factual error of some sort. Some of these errors seem to be performance slips-of-the-tongue while others are a variety of what have been called "performance" errors: memory lapses or momentary distraction or confusions. Practically all the words substituted after an error are from the same syntactic word-class as the word they replace and the majority are part of the same semantic group: usually both words stand in a relation of opposition to each other. There are 24 cases of error correction which account for 41% of the word substitutions. The remaining 34 word or phrase substitutions (59%) do not correct an error but attempt to rephrase the utterance. Some of these rephrasings seem to respond to the child's needs, for example difficulty with a particular word or construction and some seem to be due to the child taking the listener and the situation into account and rephrasing her utterance to make it more illocutionarily felicitous or perlocutionarily successful.

4.2.4. Reference substitutions

There are 38 cases of word changes in the terms she uses to refer to different objects. Table 24 shows the distribution of Reference Substitutions through the tapes:

Table 24:--Distribution of Reference Substitutions

TAPES	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	TOTAL
REFERENCE														
SUBSTITUTIONS	1	-	1	5	3	-	5	6	4	7	1	2	4	61

30 (79%) of these changes help make the reference more specific either by substituting a pronoun by a noun or noun phrase (19 cases), an indefinite by a definite noun phrase (1 case), by substituting an article by a deictic (3 cases) or a distal deictic "ese, eso" by the proximal one "éste, esto" (6 instances). One additional case is the substitution of the more general interrogative pronoun "qué" for the more specific "cuál". The first group of examples shows the substitution of a pronoun by a noun or descriptive noun phrase:

163. no yoya ell- [//] e Toti. [K03]
[she doesn't cry [//] Koki.]
164. tome esa- [//] a sopita. [K04]
[drink that [//] the soup.]
165. (a) comer es- [//] el melón. [K05]
[to eat tha- [//] the melon.]
166. el oto # cosa [//] e- el tu- de tu espalda. [K08]
[the other thing [//] th- the your- from your back.]
167. elle- [//] del Mickey. [K10]
[his- [//] Mickey's.]
168. un rebu- ... y voy a buscar el rebocito de la Inocencia. [K12]
[a shaw(l) ... and I'm going to get the shawl of Inocencia.]
169. que vas a p- [//] cuáles [//] cuál disquito vas a poner. [K12]
[what are you going to p- [//] which ones [//] which record are you going to put on.]

170. eso- [//] el verde lo ponemos acá. [K13]
 [that [//] the green one we'll put it here.]

Example 166 shows the substitution of the wild-card noun "thing" by a descriptive phrase "el de tu espalda", both paraphrases for "pellejito" (peeling skin) which is a word that she is learning while this tape is going on and for which she has trouble both in remembering it and producing it. In 169 it is interesting to note the progression in specificity between the three forms of formulating her question:

qué	--	cuáles	--	cuál	disquito
what		which		which	record

A second group of reference substitutions shows the substitution of an article by a demonstrative and distal by proximate demonstratives:

171. miya a pa- [//] ese piyito. [K01]
 [look at the h- [//] that hair.]
172. e- el Pa- [//] ese Pampú hace eh pipí ..? [K05]
 [Pa- [//] that Pampú goes pipi ...?]
173. te deso los- [//] eh aquellos zapatos allá. [K08]
 [I leave the [//] eh those shoes there.]
174. que es éso- [//] qué es ésto acá. [K08]
 [what is that [//] what is this here.]
175. ése- [//] éste viv- éste vive ahí. [K09]
 [that [//] this one liv- this one lives there.]
176. acá- [//] aquí. [K10]
 [here [//] right here.]

In each case the substitution makes the reference more specific. Example 176 is one of three instances of place

reference substitutions. Both "acá" and "aquí" are proximate deictics but for most Spanish speakers "aquí" pinpoints a place while "acá" is a slightly more general proximal location.

The remaining reference substitutions are of various sorts. There are three cases of substitution of a noun or noun phrase by a pronoun:

- 177. a pap- [//] él. [K07]
[dad- [//] him.]
- 178. un paquete de conos- [*] [//] de éstos. [K11]
[a packet of cones- [//] of these.]
- 179. más n- [//] más de éstos. [K13]
[more n- [//] more of these.]

In all of these cases the object being referred to is present in the context and there is no real loss in specificity as in the repair the object is shown or pointed to. In 178 she names an object depicted on a card (a corn-flakes package) but has trouble with the name "un paquete de copos (de maíz)" saying "conos" instead. She seems to realize that "conos" is wrong even though she apparently can't produce or remember "copos" and opts for the referring pronoun to get out of the difficulty of providing a name. In example 179 she has been playing with wooden dolls which she now places in a bus. These dolls are usually referred to as "niños" (children) in most of her games, but in the conversation prior to 179 each of them had been given a grown-up identity. In 179, when she

puts them on the bus, Koki seems to be about to say "más n(iños)" but perhaps to be consistent with what went before she changes it to "más de éstos" since in what went before the dolls did not represent "niños" (children) but adults.

One of the substitutions is of an indefinite article "un" instead of the definite "el". The indefinite is more appropriate than the definite given the circumstances:

180. estaban unos payasitos con e- el lo- [//] con un lobo... [K10]
 [some clowns were there with the ba- [//] with a balloon.]

Here she is telling a story about some clowns she remembers seeing in town. She corrects what would have been an inappropriate definite description to an indefinite one.

Two of the changes seem to be a result of a focussing strategy where an extraposed noun phrase is replaced by a pronoun in the main clause: however, intervening hesitations and breaks make it seem as corrections in which a noun phrase is replaced by a pronoun. The examples are as follows:

181. esa es la bombashita de- [//] me la va (ayudar)?
 [those are the pants of [//] can you (help) me with them?] [K07]
 182. uno- [//] eh eh a yo lo tengo acá. [K07]
 [one- eh eh I'll hold it here.]

The final example is the substitution of two proximal demonstratives. In this case either form of reference is

equally appropriate and neither adds nor detracts from specificity:

183. de qué éste [//] ésto de plástico? [K10]
[of what this one [//] this one of plastic?]

To recapitulate what has been seen in this section, the child is able from an early stage to make changes in her utterances in order to more adequately identify her referent. Even though in the transcripts there are often cases of ambiguous or vague utterances, in these repairs there are only three cases (177-179) in which she substitutes more ambiguous or more general terms for more specific ones but even here there is no ambiguity in context since the objects referred to are shown. These less specific referring terms are used when the child has no problem in referring but difficulty in recalling the name of an object or possibly also in producing it correctly.

This completes the discussion of Correction repairs¹³, and I will recapitulate some of the principal points from the discussion of the data. It appears that the child makes corrections at all the levels previously identified in other studies (phonological, syntactic, lexical and reference

¹³We have omitted from the discussion the single instance in the "Other" category. This is the following:
a s- // a Koki tamién? [K07] [? // [a] Koki also?]
which is not interpretable from the context.

corrections). Her proportion of phonological corrections is higher in the earlier tapes and decreases as the child develops. This is consistent with what has been found in the literature on children's self-repairs. As she gets older she seems to increase lexical and reference repairs. Whereas all phonological repairs are error-corrections, most lexical and reference substitutions are not. They are changes made either to make an utterance more specific and thus clearer or to be more consistent with aspects of the situation. In the later tapes there are also strategic uses of lexical substitutions in which the child seems aware of larger structures of discourse than the utterance at hand, and she uses word-changes in order to gain points, support actions or win arguments.

In the sections that follow I will examine the two remaining classes of self-repairs: Postponements (Section 4.3) and Abandonments or False-starts (Section 4.4).

4.3. Postponements

There are 27 cases of repairs to insert material which the child wants to add to the original utterance. The additions may be of more "content" or they may be additions of markers to make the discourse function or coherence more

explicit, as for example the insertion of attention markers, connectives, and so forth.

Table 25:--Distribution of Postponement repairs

TAPES	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	TOTAL
POSTPONEMENTS	2	-	2	1	1	-	2	2	2	1	3	4	7	27

Among what I am calling discourse additions are the addition of an exclamation to mark a noticeable:

184. n- [//] oh nushio! [K01]
 [d- [//] oh dirty!]

addition of a vocative:

185. mi- [//] amá miya! [K03]
 [lo- [//] mommy look!]

addition of verbs that make explicit the function of the utterance:

186. tayita [//] te- tere tayita. [K01]
 [sitting down [//] I want sitting down.]
 187. e- e va- [//] quieyo un vasito. [K05]
 [th- the gla- [//] I want a glass.]
 188. Ko- [//] ésa es la- l- la Koki. [K07]
 [Ko- [//] that is Koki.]
 189. esto- [//] mire estos chiquitos. [K12]
 [thes- [//] look at these little ones.]

Throughout these tapes, Koki's utterances are very context-dependent. She relies heavily on indexical expressions accompanied by gestures to complete her meaning. As can be seen in the above examples, there are several single-argument

utterances such as "tayita" (sentadita, seated), or "el vaso" (the glass). These may have different functional meanings. "Sentadita" could be a request, a description, or a statement of intent. "El vaso" could be used to label an object, to call attention to it object, to have somebody look at the glass or to request it. In the four examples above; Koki breaks her utterance to insert verbs that make explicit her meaning and illocutionary intent. Thus she inserts "quiero" (I want) in 186 and 187, "that is" in 188 and "look" in 189.

There are eight cases of addition of connectives which occur from tape 8 on. The most common addition is of the conjunction "y" but there are also instances of the addition of "pero" and "para que". These make explicit to the hearer how the utterance is going to function in the discourse, as an addition to what went before, as an adversative or objection or as a grounder. Examples are the following:

190. no se- [//] pero ya no se pendó la luces. [K08]
 [they didn't [//] but they didn't come on the
 lights.]
191. en- [//] y- y entonces qué? [K08]
 [then [//] and then what?]
192. n- [//] para que no se vayan ahí. [K09]
 [d- [//] so that they don't go there.]

There are seven cases of inserting additional content to further specify her utterance. Examples are the following:

193. abuelita s- [//] Noni sí. [K07]
 [Grandma y- [//] Noni yes.]
194. yo se- se- se- me- [//] yo mañana se lo voy a dar.
 [K11]
 [I'lll ...[//] tomorrow I'll give it to them.]
195. y- y quería un fresco.
 y se- [//] y tenía chup y se cayó al agua. [K13]
 [and she wanted a "cool". and she- [//] and she
 went "chup" and she fell in the water.]
196. ahora anón- [//] todos a- [//] los muchachos adónde
 se van a ir? [K13]
 [now wh- [//] all of them wh- [//] the boys where
 are they going to go?]

In all of these she adds content material to the utterances to further specify or give additional information about what she is saying. 193 and 196 are two examples of adding information to further specify the referent. In 193, talking about a doll which represents "abuelita" (Grandma) she adds the name, "Noni". In 196 she first makes a reference change by inserting the subject "todos" so that the sentence "ahora adónde se van a ir?" becomes "ahora todos adónde se van a ir?" but then she further specifies the non-ambiguous in context "todos" by adding "los muchachos": "ahora todos los muchachos adónde se van a ir?". In 194 she specifies the time "mañana" at which a projected future action is going to take place. In 195 she interrupts a story which she is making up as she tells it, to insert what should be a previous step. Before the repair the "story" seems to go like this: "Y quería un 'fresco'. Y se (cayó al agua)". Here the relevance relation between the first and the second

utterance is not clear. Koki inserts the phrase "y tenía chup" where "chup" seems to be an onomatopoeic sound probably for drinking. This provides the necessary link between the first sentence in the sequence "y quería un fresco" (she wanted (something) cool) and the reference to "el agua" (the water) in the third. The complete sequence would go: she wanted something cool and she went "chup" and fell in the water".

Finally there are two insertions of material without which the sentence is uninterpretable or wrongly interpreted:

197. *esto* [//] con *esto se caen.* [K12]
 [this [//] with this they fall.]
198. *los quieren-* [//] non- no *los quieren tener ahí.*
 [K13]
 [they want- [//] they don't want to have them there.]

These additions are necessary in order to express correctly the relation between elements. These two examples, included here because they insert material, may be more closely related to syntactic or word-choice corrections than to the more discourse-oriented additions that make up the rest of the examples.

Aside from example 193 all of the additions of content material come from the later tapes K10-K13. These repairs are pragmatically motivated. They reflect a growing awareness of communicative requirements and of discourse

organization. As was mentioned in the previous section, as she grows older the child seems to be more able to use repairs to carry out activities and not simply to correct structural or production problems in "getting her utterance out".

4.4. Abandonments or False-Starts

There are 106 cases of Abandonments or False-Starts, utterances in which the child interrupts what she is saying and starts a new utterance. 92 utterances get interrupted in this way, sometimes as many as four times before being completed.

Table 26:--Distribution of Abandonment repair types

TAPES	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	TOTAL
ABANDON	7	1	3	4	6	2	5	26	7	13	8	3	21	106

It is to be expected that the type of situation in which the child participates with her parents to yield a larger number of false-starts than for example Levelt's focussed task situation. In the data described by Levelt (1983), the adults participating in the study had a specific task at hand and were therefore more severely constrained in what they were supposed to talk about than the participants in a spontaneous conversation. False-starts accounted for only 1%

of the repairs in his corpus, while this category comprises 12% of Koki's repairs. In this data, what occurs are several interruptions due to shifts of attention by the child to other aspects of the situational context different from whatever is the topic at hand. Other false-starts by the child are cases in which the restart is due to what seems to be a slow processing of aspects of the situation, including her interlocutor's prior turn. Within this group there are several cases where she starts to talk without realizing that she can't complete what she had started to say because she is missing some information. Finally, the largest group involves rephrasing of what she had started to say. Sometimes there are pragmatic motivations for these rephrasing; sometimes they occur because of some difficulty in what she had started, either syntactical or factual.

There are 16 cases of re-starts due to having attention drawn to something else in the context other than the ongoing exchange or because some intrusive aspect of the context takes precedence. Following are some examples of this:

199. mire lo [/] lo- [//] la manita está arriba de la mamá! [K05]
 [look at the [/] the [//] the hand is above the mommy!]
200. el oso es pequeñ- (singing) [//] yo voy a escuchar con éstos (talking). [K08]
 [the bear is sma- (singing) [//] I'm going to listen with these (talking).]

201. me voy a ca- [//] ay! [K08]
 [I'm going to fa- [//] ay!]
202. voy- [//] ay mira ahí! [K08]
 [I'm going t- [//] oh look there!]
203. acá está la víbo- [//] y su colita dónde está?
 [K08]
 [here is the sna- [//] and where is its tail?]
204. mejor no me- mejor- [//] ay un ajerito! [K12]
 [(I) better not- (I) better [//] hey a little
 hole!]

These are all cases of self-interruption due to a shift of attention to some new or just noticed aspect of the context. A number of these are given as exclamations, some with a surprise exclamation marker "ay!" (oh, hey) to indicate a just-noticed noticeable.

Other cases are re-starts due to slow processing of information from the context, in some cases visual information, which makes her change her judgments and decisions about the state or condition of surrounding objects, in other cases auditory information (her interlocutor's previous turn) which makes her change her responses. There are 33 instances altogether amounting to 31% of the False-starts.

In nine of these cases the child changes her mind or self-contradicts, as she re-evaluates her context. Following are some examples:

205. éshe nu- nushio!
 éshe e nushio!
 éshe- [//] atá nino!
 nushio! [K01]
 [that di- dirty!
 that is dirty!
 that- [//] here nice!
 dirty!]

Here the child is picking up some pacifiers and saying that they are dirty: [éshe nushio] "ése sucio" (that dirty). She picks up one and seems to start to say [éshe nushio] interrupts herself to say [atá nino] "ahí está lindo" (here nice) and then re-corrects herself when she decides it is dirty after all.

206. K. mi setai- [//] está atostadito ...[K04]
 [?mi sitting- [//] it's lying down...]

Here Koki starts to say that the doll is sitting down "sentadito" and realizes that she has to change to "acostadito" (lying down).

In the following sequence, Koki and her father are in a drugstore and Koki asks her father to hand her some object which she wants to look at. The father tries to clarify which item she wants by showing her one (the correct one) and then another:

207. K. ... a verlos?
 F: cuál? ésos?
 K. sí.
 F: o éso?
 K. no- [//] sí. [K06]
 [K. ...can I see them?
 F: which? those?
 K. yes.
 F: or that?
 K. no- yes.]

K starts to answer "no" to the second choice since it wasn't what she had requested originally but then changes her answer probably because she realizes that she would like the second object as well.

In the following example, she is assigning names to little dolls, she picks one up which is "Koki" and then another which she calls "Noni". In the last utterance she seems about to repeat herself then corrects herself and picks up another one which she identifies as "Noni":

208. K. Ko- [//] ésa es la [//] la Koki.
 [Ko- [//] that's the [//] the Koki.]
 K. e- ésa es la Noni.
 [th- that's Noni.]
 M. ésa es la Noni?
 [that's Noni?]
 K. sí.
 [yes.]
 M. bueno
 [good.]
 K. és- [//] no, ésa es la Noni. [K07]
 [th- [//] no, that's Noni.]

In several of these examples there is the use of an overt contradiction marker "no" to mark the self-correction.

Following are some examples of Koki changing her mind about what to say as she processes her interlocutor's previous turn. There are ten cases of this.

In the following sequence Koki and her mother are talking about a Grover doll. M asks whether Koki is going to go look for it:

209. M. y lo va a ir a buscar?
 K. ése- [//] # ne- ne pos # teye a Vove.
 [K01]
 [M. and are you going to go get it?
 K. that [//] # no- no ?ge # want Grover.]

Koki starts to talk, interrupts and then answers her mother's previous utterance after a slight pause¹⁴.

In the following sequence Koki wants her mother to draw on some paper:

210. K. ebuhe. [draw.]
 M. pero qué? [but what?]
 K. uno. [one.]
 M. uno? [one?]
 K. u- [//] sí. [o- [//] yes.] [K03]

In the corrected utterance she seems to be about to repeat her own previous utterance but changes her answer to "yes" to respond to the yes-no question from the mother.

¹⁴The sequence [pos#teye] which above I have glossed as "get" switched to "want", is not firmly identified, it may be an attempt by the child to repeat "buscar" which according to her phonological system would have been [postay].

In the following sequence the mother tells Koki that she is breaking the tape-recorder by playing with it. Koki rejects this:

211. K. yo no estoy rompiéndolo.
 M. muy bien.
 K. yo no estoy- [//] me voy a correr un poquito.
 [K08]
 [K. I'm not breaking it.
 M. very good.
 K. I'm not [//] I'm going to move a little.]

Koki seems to start to repeat her previous statement "yo no estoy (rompiéndolo)" until she realizes that the mother has already accepted this by saying "muy bien" (very good). She then interrupts herself and goes on in the conversation stating what she will do next.

In the following sequence Koki and her mother are starting to look at a counting book. They had just finished with Number One ("un gatito" (one cat)) and were looking at the "twos" page which had two lady-bugs.

212. M. y acá cuántos hay? [and how many are here?]
 K. cuántos hay? [how many are there?]
 M. uno ... [one ...]
 K. qué- [//] uno? [what- [//] one ...]
 M. y ... [and ...]
 K. qué? [what?]
 M. dos. [K09] [two.]

The mother prompts the child by saying "uno" with a marked non-final intonation which is often used to prompt or elicit

particular answers. The child first seems to try to get a continuation from the mother, but interrupts herself as she apparently interprets that the mother's intonation requires her to enter into the counting game.

There are 11 cases where the child starts to say something, e.g., make a statement and interrupts herself as she seems to realize that she is missing some crucial information (213, 214). Conversely she may start to ask a question and find out that she herself can supply the answer (215):

213. K. ése a- [//] es eso? [K04]
 [that's a- [//] what is that?]
214. M. dónde está Koki?
 [where is Koki?]
- K. ac- [//] no sé.
 [he(re)- [//] I don't know.] [K07]
215. K. adónde stá- [//] ahí. [K07]
 [where is- [//] there.]

All of these interruptions may be due to the child hurrying to take a turn before she has fully processed the preceding one, but what can also be seen here is that the child plans her utterance to some degree independently of or in some sense anticipating her interlocutor's contribution; in a number of cases she seems to have begun to respond even before she has fully processed what has been said to her, but even here her responses are "relevant" to the ongoing topic, although the specifics of her interlocutor's turn may lead

her to re-start. Therefore, it seems likely that aside from the previous turn, there are other structural clues as to what might constitute a relevant response.

The majority of false-starts that are found in the data are instances of rephrasing what she originally intended to say. There are 57 instances of this amounting to 54% of the total number of false-starts.

There are a number of cases which correspond to what Schegloff has termed changing of frames for an utterance (Schegloff 1979).

There are, for example, 19 instances of false-starts involving frame-switches between different questioning phrases:

216. K. acá- [//] qué es és- [//] y acá qué dice? [K08]
[here [//] what is th- [//] and what does it say here?]
217. K. cóm- [//] c- cuántos? [K09]
[ho- [//] how many?]
218. K. ..su lobo có- [//] eh, qué pa- [//] cómo hace e-
[//] qué- [//] nónde vive su lobo? [K10]
[..his balloon ho- [//] eh, what doe- [//] how does it- [//] what- [//] where does his balloon live?]

Here the child seeks to ask a question about some object without having completely planned how to go about it.

There are eight examples where the child starts to say something and opts for the strategy of showing or requesting to be shown:

219. un- [//] amá miya! [K03]
[one- [//] mommy look!]
220. quiero un- [//] mire! [K04]
[I want a- [//] look!]
221. uh no kwedo po- [//] mira. [K12]
[uh, I can't bec- [//] look.]
222. me das para la ca- [//] a verlos? [K06]
[can you give it for the fa- [//] can I see
them?]
223. qué s- [//] a ver? [K08]
[what ar- [//] let's see.]

There are two cases of the converse happening. The child seems to start with a request to look but changes the utterance to a full statement:

224. mi- [//] ete empotó. [K01]
[loo- [//] this one broke.]
225. miya q- [//] e papá tene eh una nanana. [K03]
[look wh- [//] the daddy has eh a banana.]

There are six examples of rephrasing where the child seems to continue to say the same thing that she had started to say in the original utterance but paraphrasing or rephrasing it. Some of these rephrasing are used to solve or avoid a grammatical difficulty, others seem to be changes that will make the utterance more effective with respect to previous discourse:

226. K. es un nenado grande! [it's a big deer!]
 K. #1.7 sí es un nenado. [#1.7 yes it's a deer.]
 M. póngalo con el otro. [put it with the other one.]
 K. #5.8 sí es un menado. [#5.8 yes it's a deer(s).]
 K. si es un menados. [yes it's a deer(pl).]
 K. dos son- [//] sí son [the two are [//] yes they
un- sí son randes. are a- [//] yes they are
 [K11] big.]
227. K. #2.9 Lucio hace # cosas locas.
 K. pelian- [//] me- me- me quería pelear. [K11]
 [Lucio does # crazy things.
 fightin- [//] he wanted to fight with me.]
228. M. y no van a caber porque es muy chiquitita la casa.
 K. #3.1 quiero quitar el techo.
 M. y entonces qué?
 K. que van- [//] sí van a caber. [K13]
 [M. and they're not going to fit because the house is
 very small.
 K. I want to take the roof off.
 M. and then what?
 K. that they're [//] they are going to fit.]

Example 227 shows a rephrasing in a grounding statement used to support the assertion "Lucio does crazy things", but the reason for the rephrasing may be syntactic rather than pragmatic. In 226 and 228 the child reaches back into previous discourse and re-starts linking her utterance to other utterances: to solve a local syntactic difficulty in 226, and to make an effective counter-statement in 228. In 228, the way the sentence starts out is an adequate response to the immediately prior utterance "And then what?". But Koki rephrases it to make it a counter to the mother's

objection a number of turns earlier in the sequence: M. "y no van a caber.." K. "sí van a caber".

There are 17 cases where she seems to switch between different speech acts which, although not exactly equivalent in what they would accomplish, fit the ongoing situation. Some of these examples are cases where she interrupts and replaces an utterance with what could have been a continuation of that utterance, stating a consequence of the first. Following are examples:

229. éshe n- [//] tiya. [K01]
 [that d- [//] throw (it).]
 230. pap- [//] eh Koki quiere oto- más melón. [K05]
 [dad- [//] eh Koki wants another- more melon.]
 231. te muesto los- [//] eh acá es e- el mar de Tulum.
 [K08]
 [I'll show you the- [//] eh here is th- the sea at Tulum.]

In 229 she is about to say "eshe nushio" (that's dirty) and changes to "tiya" (throw it away). In 230 she switches from calling the father to expressing the request which was the reason for her calling. She may have seen, as she called, that the father was paying attention to her already. In 231 she is about to show her mother the pictures in a travel brochure; "Te muestro los dibujos" occurs in several utterances in the episode. Here she switches from an utterance stating her intent "I'm gonna show you.." to

actually starting to do it "here is the sea ..". One similar case is the following:

232. M. dónde está su colita? [where is its tail?]
 K. no la veno eyuna. [I don't see any.
 M. cómo? [what?]
 K. n- [///] voy a [I don- [///] I'll look
 buscar eh? for it, ok?] [K07]

In this example the mother questions Koki about her toy-monkey's tail, which is missing. In her reply Koki seems to be aiming for the target utterance "no la veo neyuna" "no le veo ninguna" (I don't see it/any). The mother seeks a clarification of this utterance, probably because of phonological problems. Koki starts her reply as a repetition of the previous utterance, which is what the mother's question requires, but she changes her reply to "voy a buscar, eh?" (I'm going to look for it, ok?). This change seems to result from a reinterpretation of the mother's question. "Where is it?" is often used in these tapes as an indirect request or a pre-request to "Go look for it". The placating tone of Koki's offer to look may also be due to her interpreting the mother's request for clarification as a challenge to the appropriateness of "I don't see it" as a reply.

Some of the examples are interruptions to insert preconditions or missing information needed to support the act in the utterance:

233. K. porque ya el caminito- [//] vamos a hacer un caminito ahora. [K13]
 [because now the road- [//] we're making a road now.]
234. K. como los- [//] así son las casas .. pero todavía- [//] así hagas las casitas porque- [//] # hagas con una cuertita. [K13]
 [like the- [//] this is the way houses are .. but now- [//] make the little houses like this because- [//] # make them with a door.]

In 233 she interrupts her talk of "el caminito" (the road) to inform her mother that they are going to build a "caminito" (a road) instead of a house. In 234 she interrupts a series of directions on how to make a house by grounding them with "así son las casas" (that's how houses are).

There are five cases of alternative phrasing for carrying out the same act or an equivalent one. Three examples involving expressing the same intent in sentences of the opposite polarity:

235. no hay que ya- [//] hay +... [K05]
 [one mustn't [//] one must +...]
236. es para mi- mi- [//] no es para tocarla. [K08]
 [it's to loo- loo- [//] it's not to touch.]
237. no bu- [//] todos arriba. [K13]
 [not ?do- [//] all of them up.]

In 235 and 236 the changes seem to be:

no hay que ... --> hay (que) ...
 es para mi(rar) --> no es para tocarla

Example 235 seems to be self-directed as it occurs in the middle of a sequence where the parents are talking to each other. She then abandons the utterance and since the parents are busy in their own conversation it doesn't get picked up. In example 236, referring to the lamp in the room, she seems to be saying "es para mi(rarla)" (it's to look at/ to see) and changes it to "not to touch". In 237 it is impossible to say with certainty what word she is starting with "bu-" although it might have been "no bajas" (don't set them down); nevertheless, there is a polarity switch, and the meaning of her utterance seems to change from a prohibition to an alternative directive which would have the same results but phrased in positive terms, "todos arriba" (all of them up [on the bus]).

The following example shows a change in expressing her intent to do from "yo quiero" (I want to) to "yo voy a .." (I'm going to.. so that...) which makes her utterance more "reasonable" and less likely to be questioned or rejected.

238. yo qu- [//] yo voy a- a- [//] yo voy a tener esto
 acá pa que todos los niños lo descuchen¹⁵. [K13]
 [I wa- [//] I'm going to- to- [//] I'm going to
 have this here so that all the children can
 listen]

Throughout this section I have been discussing cases of "false-starts" or rephrasing of utterances. Some of these are accidental, in that something new or unexpected catches the child's attention and causes her to change her utterance. In some cases there is a syntactic or other type of production difficulty that causes the child to change her utterance. But what the majority of these cases show, even where the repair is due to some difficulty, is that the child from a very early age has the ability to keep in mind as she plans her utterance both semantic relations (e.g., synonymy), and discourse requirements for sequentiality or cohesiveness, that she has flexibility to allow her to switch in mid-stream or recast her utterance as she becomes aware of changed discourse or situational conditions, that she can keep in mind stretches of previous discourse and tie her utterance in to these to satisfy the thrust of an exchange in addition to making a locally appropriate intervention, and that she seems to have a growing pragmatic awareness that leads her to

¹⁵This utterance has already been discussed in the section on repetitions, since the second repair in the utterance is a repetition repair.

rephrase to make her utterance not just appropriate but successful.

This completes the section of analysis of the child's self-repairs. I have already discussed conclusions to be drawn from the use of each type of self-repair. These will be taken up again in the final section, and a comparison with the self-repair behavior shown by the mother will also be made. In the following section we will briefly discuss the mother's self-repairs.

5. DESCRIPTION OF THE MOTHER'S REPAIRS

The mother repairs 80 utterances and produces a total of 90 repairs. There are nine utterances with more than one repair. There were 29 repetition repairs, 32% of the mother's total repairs. All were single repetitions, except for one time where a certain item was repeated twice before continuing (example 271). The remaining 61 repairs (67%) were different types of substitutions, corrections or rephrasing.

5.1. Repetitions

The mother carried out 29 repetition repairs. Four of these occurred in utterances spoken in English, three addressed to the father since the parents always spoke to each other in English. One is addressed to the child who

does not speak English. This came about when the mother was making a comment in English onto the tape recorder and the child asked what she was saying, the mother answered "I s- [/] said something in English." Aside from this particular example which was obviously not intended to be understood, there is nothing noticeably different about the English repairs when compared to the ones in Spanish either with respect to their placement or as to how the repair is carried out. Repetition repairs occur when the mother is talking to an adult as well as to the child. In this section I will examine the same phenomena that were examined for the child's repairs with respect to placement of the repairs, whether the utterance was interrupted in mid-word or not, repetitions of particular categories of words and functions for which this type of repair is apparently used.

5.1.1. Placement of interruption

There are fifteen instances (52%) of repetition repairs that break off or interrupt the preceding word. That is, the mother starts a word, halts it before it is completed and starts again. All of these interruptions occur at or before the first syllable is completed, eight of them at the first segment. Of the 15 interrupted words 7 are verbs. The remaining eight interruptions are of the following words: 2 nouns, 1 adjective, 2 pronouns, 1 preposition, 1 negative and

1 relative/adverb. That is, 47% of the interrupted words are verbs and the rest of the interruptions are spread over different categories. The percentage of interrupted words is slightly higher than what was found in the child's data (Koki: 46% interrupted words, Mother: 52% interrupted words).

When Koki's breaking off of words was examined, I proposed that Koki was interrupting words that she had problems with, either in remembering or producing them: words she had just acquired, whose pronunciation she was unsure of, and so on. This explanation does not seem to fit the mother's data. None of the words is particularly long or could be considered difficult. "Peligrosa" (dangerous) is the longest word that is interrupted, but most of the words (12/15 80%) are one-syllable (6) or two-syllables (6) long. At this point I have no definitive explanation as to why some words are interrupted mid-word and others are not. It seems that the data from Koki does show clearly that a number of the interrupted words are words that she is having problems with, but in the mother's case there are no particular phonological problems, yet there are still a large number of interruptions. One reason for interruptions was already mentioned when discussing the child's data and probably account for a number of these cases as well. That is, the interruption serves to display the repair. It indicates that

there is a problem, that a repair is in progress and that the speaker still holds the floor. In the case of the non-interrupted words, these are usually of a kind that of themselves indicate that the turn-unit has not been completed and that there is more to come (e.g., articles, prepositions, conjunctions)

There are 14/29 (48%) cases of repetition repairs after the completion of a word. Seven of the breaks occur at an article or determiner and two others occur at a preposition introducing a noun phrase. That is, 9/14, or 64% of the repairs that start after a completed word, occur preceding a noun or noun phrase. The remaining five repetition repairs are of the negative, one preposition, one conjunction, the interrogative "qué" and one adjective intensifier. None of these word-completion repairs occur with any of the major categories. So it would seem that a number of these types of repairs are co-planning strategies by which the Mother gains time to think of the following word, especially a following noun.

5.1.2. Retracing

There are six cases of retracing beyond the point of interruption to start the repair. In two cases there is a retracing, in both to the beginning of the utterance:

239. M. qué t- [/] qué [/] qué tiene acá en la manito?
 [K03]
 [what d- [/] what [/] what do you have here in
 your hand?]
240. M. no es pe- [/] no es peligrosa pero es delicada.
 [K12]
 [it's not da- [/] it's not dangerous but it's
 fragile.]

Two go back to the beginning of the utterance but eliminating discourse markers from the retracing:

241. M. and fix the [/] fix the blankets and stuff.
 [K02]
242. M. pero no a los [/] no a los verdaderos, eh? [K04]
 [but not the- [/] not the real ones, eh?]

In the remaining two cases the repaired element occurs in post-verbal position and the repairs do not cross beyond the verb. In both cases they go back to the beginning of the particular construction in which the break occurs, a noun phrase and a prepositional phrase respectively:

243. M. juegue con el [/] con el ## patito. [K01]
 [play with the [/] with the ## duck.]
244. M. d'you think you could bring me the other [/] the
 other pelelita? [K05]

In the remaining 23 cases, the repair picks up directly from the interrupted word. Ten of these repeated words are utterance-initial so there cannot be any retracing. But there remain 13/29 (45%) repairs where there is no retracing even though the interrupted word is in the middle of the

utterance and may be at non-initial position for either clause or phrase.

At this point, after examining both the child's and the mother's data, it is still impossible to formulate a prediction with respect to when a repair initiation will be retraced and when it will be picked up directly. However, it can be seen in the data that when a retracing does occur it will pick up from the beginning of a constituent. This is not very significant, according to Levelt (1983, 1989). Given the right-branching characteristics of the language it would be almost impossible not to retrace to a constituent beginning. There are some general tendencies which, although they do not explain all the cases, do account for the majority: a sentence that breaks off at or before the verb-phrase will in the majority of cases retrace to the beginning of the utterance; a sentence that breaks off after the verb-phrase may retrace one or two nodes up the tree but usually will not include the verb-phrase, the exception is interruptions which occur at the direct object, these seem to retrace either just to the beginning of the NP or may retrace back to include the VP in the retracing. Again, there may be no real structural significance to these observations. Since most retracings are of two or three syllables this would account for the number of nodes one can retrace.

One final general observation about repetition repairs is that there are differences in these repairs between the cases where a word gets interrupted and those in which the words are completed. Ten of the broken-off words are major category words while none of the completed words are. All of the repairs where a word is completed start up from the beginning of a clause or phrase while at least 47% of the broken-off words start-up again immediately, even phrase-internally.

5.2. Corrections

There are 39 instances of substitutions of overt corrections or modifications to the form of an utterance. Some of these are cases of error-correction, while others replace words or modify the clause structure where there is no apparent error. There are two phonological corrections, thirteen lexical corrections and two syntactic corrections, giving a total of 18/39 (46%) corrections or error-repairs. The remaining substitutions, 21/39 (54%), are cases of replacing one item by another where there is no apparent error. In most cases this serves the purpose of making the utterance easier to process by the interlocutor.

5.2.1. Error corrections

As mentioned above, there are 18 self-corrections. Two of these are phonological corrections:

245. M. y Sham- [//] Pampú hace pipí en el pa- pastito.
 [K05]
 [and Sham- [/] Pampú goes pipi on the gra- [/]
 grass.]
246. M. y cada cane- [//] conejito tiene +... [K09]
 [and each rib- [//] rabbit has +...]

The first is a factual error but with a phonological motivation. "Pampú" was a dog's name. The name was given by the child and it was the simplified form of the word "shampú" (shampoo), which is what the mother starts to say before she corrects. The second example shows correction of a slip-of-the-tongue error. Even though there are several phonological slips-of-the-tongue in the mother's data, this is the only one that gets repaired. It is a perseveration error in which the beginning of the preceding word seems to be the influencing factor. The problem is corrected as soon as it happens, interrupting the word, and there is no retracing.

There are fourteen examples of word-choice error corrections, in which the wrong word or phrase was used in the original utterance to designate a particular object or action and then corrected. Examples are the following:

247. M. no Koki no- [//] la mamá no- [//] Koki no se lastimó. [K04]
[no Koki didn't [//] mommy didn't [//] Koki didn't hurt herself.]
248. M. no se vaya a hacer la bo- [//] pipí en el pañal [//] en la bombachita. [K05]
[don't go make your pa- [//] pipi in you diaper [//] in your pants.]
249. M. hola abuelit- [//] hola Chocho! [K07]
[hi Grandp- [//] hi Chocho!]
250. M. me parece que ese librito no es del o- [//] que ese disquito no es del oso y el osito. [K08]
[I think that that book doesn't have the B- [//] that that record doesn't have the Bear and the Little Bear.]
251. M. ah, ése es para oi- [//] para la boca. [K08]
[ah, that's to hea- [//] for the mouth.]
252. M. ..we were playing with this fit-the-pieces-into-the-puzzle [//] two fit-the-pieces-into-the-puzzles games. [K10]
253. M. en la casit- [//] cajita? [K13]
[in the hou- [//] box?]

The sources for the errors are various: in some cases confusion (247), lexical "slips" (248, 250, 253), factual errors (251, 252), appropriateness errors (249). Although not exhaustive, these examples display a variety of different trouble-sources. The error found in the example from K04, of which there are several similar cases, is due to the confusion already noted when discussing the child's error corrections, which resulted from the mother and Koki having switched identities and having difficulty in remembering how they were supposed to refer to themselves and each other. Note that the mother seems to have as much difficulty as Koki in keeping this sorted out. Examples 248, 250 and 253 are

cases of lexical "slips of the tongue". Example 248 seems to be the type of error that has been called a "blend" (Fromkin 1973, 1980). Here the mother may have been deciding between two sentences:

"no se vaya a mojar la bombachita"
 [don't go and wet your pants]
 "no se vaya a hacer (pipí) en la bombachita"
 [don't go and make pipí in your pants]

Two phrases in these sentences are semantically equivalent but have different structural characteristics: hacer pipí en NP = mojar NP. The NP is the direct object of "mojar" but part of a prepositional phrase in "hacer (pipí en)". The "blend" thus involves combining the syntactic specifications of "mojar" with the lexical item "hacer (pipí)".

The error gets corrected immediately, maintaining the original frame "no se vaya a hacer.." and inserting an appropriate direct object but in the repair a further error occurs as the mother substitutes "pañal" (diaper) for the original "bombachita" (pants). The use of "diaper" is a factual error since at this particular time Koki was not wearing diapers but pants and requires a further correction. It seems that the mother perceives an error in "bombachita" but does not completely analyze what this error is due to; she interprets the problem as "lexical" and substitutes the word "pañal"; however, the problem is syntactical.

In 250 and 253 the slip involves choosing one word for another (disquito/librito, casita/cajita). In each case, the erroneous word, although not factually correct in the particular sentence, is semantically non-anomalous. In addition the "error" and the "correct" word are usually from the same grammatical category and phonologically similar, a minimal pair in the case of [kasita]/[kaxita] and similar at least as to number of syllables and having the same vowels and stress placement for [li'brito]/[dis'kito]. In example 249, there is a correction of an appropriateness error. The utterance occurs while playing with several dolls. The mother greets one of the little dolls who represents the child's grandfather by calling him "abuelito" (grandfather), she corrects herself by changing this greeting to the usual term of address for this person. All the other examples (250-253) are instances of correcting factual errors. Five of the errors are corrected immediately after they are produced, interrupting the erroneous word, and 8 are corrected later on after other words have been completed. Examples 250 and 252 show the longest stretches of talk following an error and before the initiation of a repair. In 250 there may be a delay in noticing the error until the mother starts to say the name of the song "el oso y el osito" and then realizes that she has to change the erroneous

"librito" (book) to "disquito" (record). In 252 it looks like the mother doesn't stop until she completes the current unit and it would seem that "fit-the-pieces-into-the-puzzle" is treated as just one unit. Four of the errors occur in the first word of the utterance. Of the remaining ten cases, in three the repair is retraced to the beginning of the utterance; the other seven retrace to the beginning of a clause or phrase. In some of these cases the choice of a wrong word may be apparent from the time that the article is chosen: "el pañal" instead of "la bombachita", "la mamá" instead of "Koki", yet there are no cases of interruptions after the article but rather in the content word itself.

There are 2 examples of correction of syntactic errors, an agreement correction in 254 and a tense correction in 255:

254. M. éste- [//] ésta calle. [K13]
 [this(m) [//] this(f) street.]
 255. M. que tu- [//] teníamos antes. [K13]
 [that we ha- [//] used to have before.]

Example 254, although apparently a correction of agreement choices, may have another explanation, namely a case of word-choice substitution. In this tape the mother and Koki are building a road which they refer to during the tape as "calle" (fem) and "caminito" (masc). The mother's hesitation may be due to trying to decide between these alternate terms. I have called this an error-repair because on the surface

that is what it appears to be, but the case may be one of appropriate word-choice aiming at terminological consistency rather than error. In 255 the mother corrects what would have been an incorrectly used past tense form "tuvimos" instead of "teníamos".

5.2.2. Non-error Modifications

There are 21 word-choice substitutions which modify a non-erroneous utterance. These are all cases of the mother choosing an alternate phrasing for her utterance without there being any apparent error.

Two of the substitutions are syntactic modifications:

256. M. abra la p- [//] abralá. [K04]
 [open the do- [//] open it.]
257. M. ésto lo- [//] éso se puede tirarlo [*]. [K11]
 [this can [//] that can be thrown out.]

In 256 the mother switches from expressing the direct object by a noun phrase "la puerta" to using the object clitic. There is also a more insistent tone in the repair than in the original utterance, so there may have been a pragmatic motivation for the switch or for the repetition of the imperative verb. Example 257 is a case of giving an alternative rephrasing towards a more impersonal way of saying the same thing: "esto lo puede tirar" [//] "eso se puede tirar". However note that the repaired utterance is

ungrammatical. The error that is produced by the repair could be evidence that the repair is not the simple substitution of a surface "lo" for a "se" but that rather the correction occurs at a deeper syntactic level.

There are 3 substitutions of articles which seem to be cases of breaking for word-search or while the appropriate word is decided on:

258. M. está toda # envuelcita con un- [//] con una
 cosita rota. [K01]
 [it's all # wrapped up in a- [//] in a torn
 thingie.]
259. M. lo llevamos para que se tire al- [//] a la
 basura. [K11]
 [we'll take it so it can be thrown in the gar-
 [//] in the trash.]
260. M. los niños del- [//] de la wawa. [K12]
 [the kids in the- [//] in the bus.]

All of these seem to be cases of word-search interruptions. They all halt at the article but at a point where gender agreement can be continued either way towards a masculine or towards a feminine noun. In 258 the mother is performing an act common in these tapes, particularly the early ones, by which she verbally describes or interprets the child's actions. In this case the child hands the mother a hair-clip wrapped in a piece of torn foam rubber. The mother halts while she thinks of the appropriate term to name this object finally using a general term "cosita" (thingie). In the other cases, rather than searching for a word the mother may

be deciding between possible choices. In 259 she has to choose between two words commonly used within the family for referring to "trash", "el tacho" y "la basura". Both of these words were known to the child. Either would have been suitable. In 260 the mother seems to be choosing between "omnibus", the word that she and most Argentines would normally use for "school-bus", the toy with which they are playing, and two other choices: "camión" and "wawa". "Camión", the word used in Mexico for "bus", means "truck" in Argentina not bus. "Wawa" is not in the mother's vocabulary either but it was a word with which the child was familiar and which to the mother seems an easier word than "omnibus". She finally opts for this. Note in all cases that the repair involves a retracing, which in each sentence goes back to the beginning of the prepositional phrase.

Two other examples of word-choice substitutions replace a word by a synonym:

261. M. look through [//] check in your big suitcase.
[K08]
262. M. primero espere que la mamá la [*] va a cortar
las car- [//] las tarjetitas. [K11]
[first wait for mommy to cut the de- [//] the
cards.]

261 is addressed to the father and seems to be a case of equivalent meaning substitution. In 262 the mother changes from "cartas" to "tarjetitas", both words for "cards". It is

unclear whether this change is due to a speaker problem or an accommodation for the hearer's benefit. The mother is cutting out cards from the back of a cereal box prior to playing a game with them. "Cartas" would be more appropriate for "playing-cards" and is the word the mother normally uses but it has a homonym in Spanish which means "letters, correspondence" which might make it difficult for the child. "Tarjeta" is a general word for a card which the child may or may not know but has no other meanings. The mother may have opted for "tarjetitas" to avoid the problem which the child might have with "carta(s)", or the use of "cartas" in the first place may have been a slip influenced by the set phrase "cortar las cartas" ("to cut cards" prior to dealing them out) even though the mother is using the verb "cortar" in its literal sense to describe the action of cutting out. Whatever the source of the error, the repair is the substitution by a synonym.

Of the remaining 14 word or phrase substitutions, 12 seem to be cases of changes to make the sentence easier for the child to understand. Six of these are different reference-substitutions where in each case the repair makes the reference more specific. In the remaining 6 the mother tries to make the utterance easier for the child by switching from a more abstract to a more concrete expression, adding

intermediate steps to complex actions, adding links that will make the relationship to a previous utterance more explicit and in general making the utterance more direct. The 2 remaining changes are pragmatically motivated.

(a) Reference substitutions:

263. M. saque algu- [//] uno si quiere. [K08]
[take a- [//] one if you want.]
264. M. ése es el perrito [//] la Perrita Blanca
pollito. [K09]
[that's the doggie [//] PeeBee chick.]
265. M. no se meta el- [//] ese pepelito [*] en la boca.
[K10]
[don't put the- [//] that paper in your mouth.]
266. M. vamos a jugar otra c- [//] otro juegito. [K11]
[we're going to play another th- [//] another
game.]
267. M. ahora busque si tiene do- [//] otro chinito
usted, en la mano. [K11]
[now see if you have tw- [//] another chinese in
your hand.]
268. M. que trabaja en la del- [//] en donde hacen los
muebles. [K13]
[who works in the one at- [//] where they make
furniture.]

In 263, there is the substitution of "alguno" by "uno" which although not definite is more specific: "uno" (one, only one). In 264, there is a switch from a generic doggie to a specific one, one of the family's pets. In 265, there is the substitution of the definite article by the deictic "ese". In 266, the substitution seems to be of the general noun "c(osa)" (thing) by the specific "jueguito" (game). In 267, in the context of a card game, the mother switches from "see

if you have two" i.e., a pair, to "see if you have another chinese", inserting a noun phrase and thus making very explicit what the child has to look for. In 268 she changes to a more precise description "en donde hacen los muebles" (where they make furniture) to replace the vaguer "en la del ..." (the one ? at ...), to refer to a workshop. Even though the description is not complete there is enough evidence to indicate the use of a vague referring expression.

All of the reference substitutions show retracings. In 268, the repair starts within a prepositional phrase and is retraced to its beginning. The rest occur in noun phrases; except for 264 they are all direct object NPs, they all retrace to the beginning of the noun phrase if the substituted word is not at the beginning, but in no case do they go beyond the beginning of the noun phrase.

(b) Substitutions to make it easier for the child:

269. M. quiere ayu- [//] quiere que la mamá le cuente cómo es? [K09]
[do you want hel- [//] do you want mommy to tell you how it goes?]
270. M. está atadito el Mickey en un- [//] como un bebé. [K10]
[Mickey is tied up in a- [//] like a baby.]
271. M. yo le explico [//] # enseñar [*] un jueguito lindo con éstas. [K11]
[I'll explain [//] # to teach a nice game with these.]
272. M. para que uno no sepa qué es- [//] dón- dónde están. [K11]
[so that one won't know what it is [//] where they are.]

273. M. ésos se los- [//] mm son para Koki. [K11]
 [those (were) [//] mm are for Koki.]
274. M. ahora ponga [//] busque todos los igualitos que
 tenga. [K11]
 [now put [//] look for all the same ones you
 have.]

In 269, talking about using a counting book, the mother switches from "quiere ayuda" (do you want help) to "quiere que la mamá le cuente cómo es" (do you want mommy to tell you how it is/goes). The mother's offer becomes more concrete. In 270 the repair is used to make the mother's utterance more directly linked to the child's previous utterance, and therefore easier to perceive it as relevant. Koki refers to a picture of Mickey Mouse as "el bebé". Mickey is wrapped up as a mummy and strapped to a cart. The mother's repairs seem to be aimed at making explicit why Koki refers to Mickey as "el bebé". Examples 272 to 274 are all from K11 and all occur in the context of the mother teaching Koki a card-game. They involve eliminating ambiguous expressions, concepts which the child may not have mastered like "winning a card", looking for "pairs", and so on. For example, in 273 the mother starts to say "ésos se los ganó Koki", which she eventually says in a subsequent turn; but she changes the verb phrase to the more direct "son para Koki" which achieves the purpose of saying that the cards are Koki's but does not invoke game rules or the concept of "winning" which may

require further explanation. Once she establishes that the cards are Koki's, she then paraphrases it with the more involved "se las ganó Koki" in a following utterance. Finally, example 271 is interesting because it may reflect again that while on the surface the repair entails the substitution of a word by another there may be a "deeper" processing of the repair involving rule-ordering. One repair is a lexical substitution of "explicar" to "enseñar". The mother starts to say that she is going to explain (explicar) a game and changes this to "teach" (enseñar) probably thinking "enseñar" will be easier for the child. But there also seems to have been another substitution being carried out between the use of the simple present "yo le explico/ enseño" to the use of the compound periphrastic form "yo le voy a explicar/ enseñar". The substitutions that the mother seems to be making are:

a) V+T(pres) -> aux+T(pres) + V

b) V "explicar" -> V "enseñar"

Of these two substitutions, the first is omitted and the infinitive "enseñar" is simply added on to the tense-carrying verb which was not replaced by the aux "voy (a)". It is difficult to explain why the mother's sentence is ungrammatical unless it is supposed that the mother was aiming for a repair along the lines of (a) and (b).

* yo le explico enseñar...

or * yo le enseñar...

There was a similar, although not identical, example in Koki's data ("Qué haces [//] haciendo con la grabadora?"); which blends "Qué estás haciendo ..." and "Qué haces ...". These repairs seem to be reorganization of elements at a deeper level than that of surface structure. However, in 271 the repair seems to be based more on surface word order than on underlying relations; thus, "ésos", the beginning "frame" for a repair, passes from being an extraposed direct object in the original utterance to being the subject of the sentence in the repaired utterance.

In the examples above, the repair starts from the beginning of the construction that the problem occurs in: verb-phrase or subordinate clause.

The 2 remaining examples of substitutions are the following:

275. M. para que no se- [//] haga tanto ruido. [K09]
 [so that it doesn't ge- [//] doesn't make so
 much noise.]
276. M. la grabadora es una cosa muy peligrosa [//] muy-
 muy delicada. [K12]
 [the tape-recorder is something very dangerous
 [//] very- very fragile.]

Both of these utterances are explanations accompanying prohibitions about touching the tape-recorder. In 276, for example, the substitution seems to be from the standard (but

in this case untrue) grounder "it's dangerous" to something more factual "it's delicate, fragile". The hesitation after "muy" seems to be a case of pausing while searching for the appropriate word to use, that the child will understand. Both of these switches seem to use a strategy that respects the child more as a conversational partner. Very often the mother grounds her directives by telling the child that what she is doing is dangerous. Very often the reason is true but often saying "it's dangerous" becomes an easy way out. In both of these groundings, the mother seems to try to use as a reason the one she is really thinking of.

To summarize the discussion in the section on substitutions, there are a total of 39 substitutions. Of these, 18 (46%) are corrections because of an error, either phonological (3), syntactic (2) or lexical (13). The remaining 21 (54%) are non-error substitutions in which a more appropriate word or phrase is chosen. Almost all of these changes are made in order to make the utterance easier to process by the child.

5.3. Postponements

There are 12 cases where the utterance is interrupted for the insertion of additional content material and then it is resumed from the point at which it was interrupted. All of these sentences add information which will make the

sentence easier to process, e.g. easier to identify a referent, easier to process the relationship between objects, or make explicit the steps in a procedure or the reasons for saying something.

The following two examples insert information to make a referent explicit:

277. M. nos vamos a pelear si # hace a- [//] usted
hace así. [K02]
[we're going to have a fight if # (you) go li-
[//] you go like that.]
278. M. es para- [//] un librito para aprender a
contar. [K09]
[it's for- [//] a book for learning how to
count.]

In the following two, a time specification is inserted:

279. M. yo se [//] después se lo voy a dar. [K11]
[I'll gi- [//] later give it to you.]
280. M. pero hay que- [//] cuando es de noche hay que
tener una casita. [K13]
[but one has to [//] at night one has to have
a house.]

The following two cases make discourse organization or function more explicit. Example 281 inserts the marker "primero", to make sequencing connections explicit. In 282 the mother emphasizes the adversative function of her rejoinder by inserting "pero".

281. M. bueno se- [//] primero sentadita en la
pelelita. [K05]
[OK si- [//] first sitting on the potty.]

282. M. no- [//] pero no. [K11]
[no- [//] but no.]

In the following case the mother keeps adding information to make the referent more explicit:

283. M. póngalo ahí al la- [//] en la mesita de- [//]
que está ahí en la- [//] al lado de la cama del
papá. [K10]
[put it there next to- [//] on the table ne-
[//] that's there in the- [//] next to daddy's
bed.]

Here the mother's additions expand the utterance in the following way:

póngalo ahí al lado ...
póngalo ahí en la mesita de al lado ...
póngalo ahí en la mesita que está ahí al lado
de la cama del papá.¹⁶

In two of the insertions the mother makes explicit her reasons for saying something:

284. M. dónde est- [//] falta uno, a ver dónde está?
[K04]
[where is- [//] there's one missing where is
it?]

285. M. bueno pero traiga otro para l- [//] para
sonarle la nariz. [K04]
[well bring another one for you- [//] for
blowing your nose.]

¹⁶An additional correction in this utterance (en la.. -> al lado) was included in the count of E-repairs.

In 284 the mother notices that a little doll is missing, starts to ask where it is, but interrupts herself and makes her noticing explicit to the child who may not be aware that there is a doll missing. The mother also adds the phrase "a ver" which disambiguates "dónde está" from a possible question to a request. In 285 the mother refers to a kleenex and asks Koki to bring another one for her nose "para la nariz", but rephrases this by adding "sonarle" (to blow (her nose)). The utterance was probably unambiguous, nevertheless the mother's repair makes explicit something that was going to be left implicit in the original utterance.

The last two examples are also cases of making explicit something that could be understood from the context. Both of these examples are in the context of teaching the child a card-game.

286. M. y entonces hay que buscar- [//] hay que dar
 vuelta una tarjetita #1-4 por vez y buscar la
 otra tarjetita que es igual a ésa. [K11]
 [and then one has to look for- [//] one has to
 turn one card #1.4 at a time and look for the
 other card that is the same as that one.]
287. M. ahora la- [//] mire a la mamá. [K11]
 [now the- [//] look at the mommy.]

Example 286 is similar to example 274 that was examined previously. In both the mother supplies missing steps in the explanation of a card-game. The function of both these repairs is similar but the repairing strategies used are

different. The repair in 274 involves rephrasing the original utterance. In example 286 additional material is inserted into the original utterance. In 287 the mother is about to take her turn "ahora la mamá" but she inserts the imperative "mire" to make explicit what she wants the child to do, she's not just taking her turn but wants the child to look at her so that she can show the child by doing.

To recapitulate, in all these cases the mother adds more information to what she originally planned to say. In the examples, this additional information is used to make explicit presuppositions, discourse relations or intentions, it is also used to describe or specify a referent or add a time specification. This list, which is based on what occurs in this particular corpus, however, is not exhaustive and further uses or functions of additions may occur in other data.

5.4. Abandonments or False-Starts

The final group of repairs is the group of false-starts where the mother starts to say something and for some reason interrupts and re-starts the utterance from the beginning, either re-phrasing the same utterance or saying something new. There are 9 instances of false-starts. Two of these seem to be self-interruptions as some new element from the context is focussed on. These examples are the following:

288. M. porque # sol- [//] ay los botones también!
 [K05]
 [because onl- [//] oh and the buttons too!]
289. M. y mar- [//] abre la puertita! [K09]
 [and ?mar- [//] open the door!]

In both of these examples an element from the context intrudes on the mother's perception and she interrupts herself to take care of the intrusion.

The other 7 false-starts are cases of trying to rephrase an original utterance. There are changes in how questions are framed, rephrasing of the possessive relation, and of opting for showing instead of explaining. Each case is different and though in some of the examples the repair seems to be intended to make the utterance clearer in others the reason for the change is not apparent. The examples are the following:

There is a change from "explaining" to showing:

290. M. con- [//] así mire. [K11]
 [with- [//] like this look.]

From a general to a specific explanation:

291. M. todos- [//] uno al lado del otro. [K11]
 [all [//] one next to the other.]

From a WH-question to a yes-no question:

292. M. pero e- en- [//] caminando¹⁷? [K07]
[but ho- [//] walking?]

Between WH-words, from "qué" to "cuántos":

293. M. qué [//] cuántos es [*] esos? [K09]
[what [//] how many is that?]

All these changes seem to be rephrasing intended to make the utterance easier for the child.

The final 3 cases however are changes which neither add nor detract from simplicity, and it is not obvious why the substitution was made.

294. M. ése tiene c- [//] ésta es la casita de él. [K09]
[that one has a ho- [//] this is his house.]
295. M. no e- [//] si usted tiene otro acá! [K11]
[not ?e- [//] you have another one here!]
296. M. y to- [//] y cómo se llamaban? [K13]
[and al- [//] and how were they called?]

All of these, interestingly enough, are objections or calling into question some previous statement made by the child.

5.5. Solicitation of Other-Repair

Finally there is one case of a repair in which the mother solicits help from the child in order to carry out a word-search. The child, however, does not intervene in this

¹⁷The WH-question is not apparent here, but what the mother says seems to be the reiteration of a previous question "En qué va a ir (el abuelito)?"

repair probably because, as is indicated by her initial question, she doesn't have the information.

297. M. y "Florinda" se la regalamos a: Rosa.
 K. cuáles Rosa es?
 M. Rosa es la hermana de +...
cómo se llama?
este:: +...
ay, que me he olvidado!
 (pause 3.6 sec.)
 de Georgina.
 Rosa es la hermana de Georgina. [K13]
 [M. and Florinda we gave to: Rosa.
 K. which Rosa is it?
 M. Rosa is the sister of +...
 what is her name?
 u::m +...
 oh, I've forgotten!
 (pause 3.6 sec.)
 of Georgina.
 Rosa is the sister of Georgina.]

We can observe that at the end of the repair sequence there is a final turn which provides the "good" version of the interrupted utterance.

The child also has one similar example. This was not included in the data on self-repairs because in the case of the child it becomes an other-completed repair where the mother provides the requested information.

298. M. qué estaba haciendo usted con un fósforo?
 K. estaba tocando.
 M. tocando el fósforo?
 K. sí.
 M. y cómo hizo?
 K. hizo y [//] y [//] y o [///] y [//] y [//] y lo
 sopé y [//] y +...
 K. cómo se llama?
 M. lo prendió?
 K. sí.

K. y lo pendi. [K08]
[M. what were you doing with a match?
K. I was touching.
M. touching the match?
K. yes.
M. and what did you do?
K. do and [/] and [/] and I [//] and [/] and [//]
and I blew it
and [/] and +...
K. how do you say it?
M. you lit it?
K. yes.
K. and I lit it.]

6. CONCLUSIONS ON SELF-REPAIRS

In this section, I will present an overview of the principal findings discussed in this study and some conclusions to be derived from these.

Several things were attempted in this chapter. The primary concern here was to trace and document the development of self-repairing mechanisms through a detailed description of one child's self-repairs, using a classificatory system derived from those discussed in the literature. I also wanted to compare the child's behaviors to those of an adult from her same speech environment, in order to situate the progress of Koki's development against the "finished" model. In addition, I was interested in comparing results obtained from this study with what has been reported in the literature concerning children's repairs. Since all the reported studies are of children from a

different language background (English), I was interested in seeing whether similar or different behaviors were found.

From readings of previous research, it was found that one category of self-repairs has been largely ignored and that is the group of Repetition repairs, or Covert repairs in Levelt's classification (Levelt 1983). Since these repairs comprised 60% of the self-repair corpus for Koki, it was considered that these could not be ignored in this study. I proceeded to a very detailed analysis of this type of repair in order to determine their function.

Finally, the analysis led to several reflections about possible pedagogical implications of the study of repairs. These will be mentioned briefly here and taken up again in Chapter VII where the general conclusions to be derived from this study are discussed.

6.1. Koki's Development of Self-Repairs

Koki's self-repairs were studied taking into account different classificatory systems that had been proposed in the literature. Initially I classified the data according to the type of repair process utilized: repetition of part of an utterance, modification of an utterance, insertion of additional elements and abandonment of the initiated structure in favor of a new one. As a second step, I examined the repairs that were found to determine what the

source of the problem was. From this, some inferences about the function that the repair was intended to accomplish could be derived.

From the analysis of Koki's repairs, it was found that these repairs could be grouped together into two broad types. First, there were some that reflect problems in production and respond to an actual difficulty that the child is having; often related to her limited linguistic competence. Other studies have referred to this type of repair as Error repair (Levelt 1983, 1989) or code-related repairs (Salo-Lee 1987). Second, there were other types of repairs where no apparent linguistic difficulty could be discerned, and that seemed to stem from efforts by the child to adapt her contribution to the surrounding social situation. These have been called Appropriateness repairs (Levelt 1983, 1989) or discourse-related repairs (Salo-Lee 1987).

In the early tapes, the majority of Koki's repairs were responding to a production problem. In the later tapes, more pragmatic repairs began to emerge. In carrying out these repairs, the child seemed to be aware of different contextual elements including role requirements and obligations, and the necessity to be consistent with previous discourse. She also seemed to develop awareness that language could be used to do different things, and that the form that the language took

could affect the outcome of winning arguments, forestalling objections or getting what she wanted. Studies on adults have found an additional function for this type of repair, namely, to adapt language to the interlocutor in order to facilitate his understanding of the utterance. Koki showed a number of instances that might relate to this function, such as making reference more specific, but in general most of her adaptations seemed to be directed towards her own communicative goals.

An additional point emerged concerning the relationship of repair process to repair function. Repetitions, Corrections or Abandonments could be used to resolve or correct production problems, or in order to adapt the language to the situation. The category of Postponements, in which additional elements were inserted into the utterance, seemed to be used only to make the language more adequate to the situation.

6.2. Comparison with the Adult in the Study

When comparing the child's repairing mechanisms to those used by the adult, it was found that there were no appreciable differences between the mother and the child with respect to how repairs were effected. The breaking off of sentences, retracings, substitutions, the organization of multiple repairs and the use of pauses and other hesitation

markers, were remarkably in the child's and the adult's speech. In fact, in the child's speech before three-years of age, all of the regularities mentioned by Schegloff (1989) in describing conversational repairing behaviors for American adults could also be observed. This brings up two issues, that of universality and that of innateness of some of these behaviors which I will return to below.

The differences between the mother and the child are those that one would expect from a learner. The child has a greater number of problems with the language and this results in a greater number and proportion of code-related repairs. In the mother, there are a number of code-related repairs, but these are in a smaller proportion to repairs aimed at adapting the discourse to the situation. In the child, there is an increase through time in discourse repairs. However, many of the mother's repairs are used to adapt her language to what the mother believes to be the child's level of competence. She replaces general descriptions with more specific ones; she inserts "background" material to her utterances; she makes changes in sequencing; she makes "common knowledge" assumptions explicit. All of these modifications would have the result of making the mother's discourse easier to understand by the child. In the child's speech, as has been mentioned previously, there are a few

instances of repairs towards making her discourse easier to understand; however, most of the child's adaptation repairs are for her own conversational success.

6.3. Comparison with Other Children

There have been very few studies of self-repairs in children and most of them give quantitative results rather than qualitative description and analysis. Nevertheless, Koki's overall behaviors could be compared to what has been reported by other studies (Evans 1985, MacWhinney and Osser 1977). What is found is that Koki's use and Koki's development seems to follow the general trends reported. Thus there are a greater number of repetition repairs than of all the other types. Not only is there a greater proportion but the frequencies themselves are remarkably similar, around 60% repetitions. Of course, not too much reliance can be placed on statistics obtained from just one subject, but this result is interesting enough to suggest verification with a larger group of subjects in order to see if there is some significance to the similar frequency or whether it is simply coincidental.

I would like to return here to the points of universality and innateness mentioned before. Again, comparison with the English-speaking children in other studies would lend support to the view that some of these

behaviors are universal. A qualitative analysis of the English-speaking children's repair behaviors and a quantitative analysis of a broader sample of Spanish-speaking children would be required, however, to begin to address this subject and determine what is universal and what is language, or culture, specific.

With respect to questions of innateness, what can be seen is that from a very early age Koki is able to carry out repairing processes using all the mechanisms found in adults. Her repairs change with respect to what she is focussing on in the language, and what she expects to accomplish through them. There is a later acquisition of specific repair initiation markers, yet the repairing processes themselves are remarkably stable. So, it can be seen that from the time that the child begins to put words together to form sentences, she can effect repairs on these sentences. Her retracings follow the pattern that adults' retracings follow and she does not retrace to disallowed nodes. Levelt has stated that to say that retracing is effected to a constituent-node is a trivial finding because given the right-branching nature of the language almost any retracing to a word-beginning would lead to a constituent beginning. However, when we consider that this constituent-beginning rule is also found in a child at two-years of age, then the

result does not become so trivial. There is no real reason to suppose that the child would have the same conception of units as the adult, so that when in her repairs she retraces to a word-beginning, to the beginning of a prepositional phrase, to the beginning of an object noun phrase or to the beginning of a verb-phrase, this provides evidence that the child must be responding in her repairing to some pattern of constituent organization.

6.4. Analysis of Covert Repairs

I was interested in studying covert repairs because they were the most frequent type of self-repair found in the child, and because they have usually been set aside in previous studies of repairs (Levelt 1983, Salo-Lee 1987). The sheer number of repetition repairs in the child's data warranted that a close and minute analysis be made. The difficulty with repetition repairs is that there is no apparent change in the product after the repair, so the trouble source for the speaker is not made apparent overtly.

It was found that a close inspection of covert repairs, however, does allow hypotheses to be formed as to the source of the problem, and that co-occurring evidence from the context in which the repaired utterance is situated often corroborates the likelihood of the hypothesis being correct. This evidence may be the co-occurrence of overt "corrections"

in the same utterance or in the same tape, or evidence from discourse structure may be used. I found that my ability to identify problem sources in covert repairs was modified as my knowledge of clarification sequences increased. This point will be taken up in the general conclusions.

6.5. Pedagogical implications

It has been stated in other studies, and has been also found in this one, that children seem to monitor, and thus "repair" those aspects of the system that they are working on. I have not carried out a detailed analysis of Koki's overall syntactic acquisition, nevertheless, it can be seen that Koki's repairs often correspond to things that are being introduced into her system. In K01, Koki was working on early syntax putting together demonstratives and nouns ("ese piyito" "that hair"), and also introducing copula constructions ("eshe (e)s e titín" "that (i)s the Desitin"). In K04, there were hesitations on sentences with complex verb phrases ("voy a traer", "quiero tener"). In K08, she seems to begin to concentrate on a "new" word ("pellejito"), and has numerous successive hesitations until she gets it right. Repairs thus seem to provide a "window into the mind"; they provide a picture of what the child, or the learner, is monitoring. An interlocutor, mother or teacher, can thus "see" what the other is focussing on. The

overall pattern is usually "lost" in spontaneous interaction. The elements that are "edited out" through repairs are not retained in the conversational record, and memory limitations prevent the interlocutor from getting the overall picture. Locally, however, repaired utterances will often be addressed in successive conversational turns.

In instructional settings, on the other hand, teachers could use recordings of their students' language to assess progress that they were making, and to "see" how the system was being constructed. I will also take this point up in the general conclusions.

ACHIEVING UNDERSTANDING:
REPAIR MECHANISMS IN MOTHER-CHILD CONVERSATIONS

VOLUME II

A Dissertation
submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of Georgetown University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Linguistics

By

Rosa Graciela Montes, B.S., M.S.

Washington, D.C.
December 12, 1991

Thesis 6264

CHAPTER V
OTHER-INITIATED REPAIRS

In the preceding chapter I have analyzed self-initiated repairs occurring when a speaker perceives some problem with his ongoing utterance. Sometimes however, the intended recipient of an utterance may perceive a problem which has not been perceived or has not been attended to by the speaker, and upon taking his turn may initiate a repair. These other-initiated repairs may include actual corrections of what was perceived as an error, but most often these other-initiated repairs take the form of some sort of indication that some trouble has been perceived in the previous turn and leave it up to the speaker of the troubled utterance to effect the correction. This is one of the reasons that lead Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) to note that in conversation there is a preference for self-correction since both self-initiation and other-initiation of repairs most often lead to self-repair.

The other-initiated repair techniques that will be examined in this section consist of requests that the utterance or some part of it be clarified or completed.

These requests take the form of statements by the intended recipient of an utterance that the utterance was not heard or was not understood or questions about some part of the utterance which seek a clarification or a completion. Thus, the majority of the other-initiated repair techniques that will be discussed are instances of what in other studies have been called clarification requests.

1. PREVIOUS ANALYSES IN THE LITERATURE

Conversational analysts have noted that conversational organization includes a mechanism for repair of problems with the conversation (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974, Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977). They observe that the turn-taking system gives preference to the speaker of a troublesome utterance to repair it, since he can carry out the repair at various points in the interaction before the other can intervene (within the same turn, at turn transition and in next turn after self-selection). However, there may be problems not noticed or not repaired by the speaker, and for these, other-repair mechanisms are instituted. Jefferson (1972) noted the occurrence of "side-sequences" in conversation. These were sequences, mostly of question-answer pairs, which interrupted the flow of talk of the ongoing conversation to effect "parenthetical" work relative to what was going on. At the conclusion of the sequence, the

conversation would be resumed at the point where it had been broken off. Jefferson found that one of the functions of these "side-sequences" was to initiate repair to a speaker's prior utterances. Other repairs are thus inserted into the conversation according to the following schema:

Troubled utterance
 Repair initiation
 Response to repair initiation
 Resumption of conversation

The studies that are discussed below have been directed at filling in the details in the schema mentioned above, especially with respect to the subset of repairs that have been referred to as clarification requests.

This aspect of language, the structure and function of clarification requests, seems to have been studied almost exclusively with reference to conversations involving children, and in particular in adult-child conversations. There are various reasons for this. One is the relatively higher frequency of occurrence of these sequences in conversations with children than in other conversations. Additionally, clarification sequences have been of interest to those studying the influence of parental language on the speech of the child. Clarification sequences show how adults modify their language according to the child's level of development. These sequences also display how adults carry out various types of organizing and guiding tasks aiming

toward a successful conversation and shed light on the process of communicative development. Since these sequences often display where children are having linguistic problems, there has also been interest in studying them in the context of teacher-child discourse in school settings.

Most of the studies of the clarification sequence have focused on the adult's formulation of clarification requests (Corsaro 1977, Cherry 1979, Frank 1981, Langford 1981). There have also been a large number of studies on young children's understanding of and responses to these requests (Gallagher 1977, 1981; Gallagher and Darnton 1978; Wilcox and Webster 1980; Pearl, Donahue and Bryan 1981; Konefal and Fokes 1984; Tomasello, Farrar and Dines 1984; Brinton et al 1986; Furrow and Lewis 1987). Finally, there are a relatively smaller number of studies that have looked at the child's use of clarification sequences (Garvey 1977; Christian 1980; Christian and Tripp 1978; McTear 1985). None of these studies address the development of the clarification function in children under three. I proceed to review the principal findings of the studies in each of these three groups.

Studies on adults' use of clarification requests have centered around three major questions. What function do clarification requests serve? What types of requests are

used by the adult? Do these requests exhibit adaptation to the child's linguistic competence?

With respect to the function of clarification requests, Corsaro (1977) examined the clarification requests used by adults interacting with three children. He found that clarification requests served four major functions. First, indicating problems in hearing an utterance. Second, indicating a problem in understanding the other's contribution to the conversation. Third, clarification questions could also be used as phatic markers of one's place in talk. Finally, clarification questions were used to express a reaction of surprise at something unexpected in the other's utterance. Corsaro maintains that adult-child discourse is particular in that it involves a suspension of the usual communicative interpretive procedures (Cicourel 1970). One of these is the assumption of "reciprocity of perspective" through which an interlocutor assumes that his conversational partner shares his perspective about the work that they are engaged in and shares norms for interacting. Another procedure interactants make use of is what Cicourel has named the "etcetera principle". Faced with a problematic utterance, participants assume that it can be interpreted using common understanding. Finally, interactants use a retrospective-prospective

strategy for interpretation by which they assume that if something is unclear it will be clarified further on in the discourse.

Corsaro holds that adults interacting with children cannot assume that these interpretive procedures will serve them. Mechanisms like clarification requests, on the other hand, are used to achieve understanding without relying on interpretive procedures. Thus, they serve to maintain the flow of conversation. At the same time, they allow adults to take over control of the direction of conversation, to a certain extent. Along this same line of reasoning, Frank (1981) holds that in analyzing conversations with children, one can get a glimpse of the workings of conversation through examination of the "breaches" that occur to common, taken for granted communicative procedures.

With respect to the types of requests used, studies classify these according to the form of the question used (WH- or Yes/No questions) and in terms of the specific type of response that they try to elicit (repetition, specification, elaboration, and so forth). Different classifications are examined in greater detail in the following section; however, for the purposes of this discussion most studies distinguish between a minimal clarification requests (What? Huh?), confirmation requests

which repeat a prior utterance and requests for specific information derived from the interlocutor's utterance.

With respect to use of these types of requests, Corsaro (1977) found that of the requests used with the younger children in his study (two to three-years-old), 16%-21% were minimal requests and 60%-70% were confirmation requests. Requests to the older child (five-years-old) were divided more equally between minimal requests (45%), and confirmation requests (54%). Although the data sample is small, there seems to be an indication that adults vary their use of these requests as a function of the children's linguistic abilities. Corsaro reports, in addition, that when comparing the use of clarification requests of three different adults (mother, father and interviewer) with one of the children, he found that between 6% to 8% of the parents utterances were clarification requests, compared to 18% of the interviewers interventions. Cherry (1979) compared data from mothers' conversations with their two-year-old children and teachers' language use with two to four-year-olds. She found that 9% of adult utterances in both cases were clarification requests. Of these, 66%-76% were confirmation requests while 23%-28% were minimal form requests. There were more confirmation requests and less repetition requests with children of higher MLU. From these studies there seem to be

indications that adults adjust their language to the children's linguistic development.

The second set of studies to be discussed have focused on the other half of the adult-child dyad and have examined how children respond to adults' clarification requests. There have been several guiding questions underlying these studies. Can young children understand and respond to clarification requests? Related to the above, can they distinguish between different types of requests? Do they respond differently as they develop linguistically?

Gallagher (1977) studied responses to clarification requests in eighteen children at three stages of linguistic development. Six each were at Stages I, II and III in Brown's scale of development (Brown 1973). The article reports a laboratory study in which an adult interviewer indicated to the child by the use of minimal forms such as "What?" or "Huh?" that she hadn't understood the child's utterance. She found that the majority of the children revised their utterance in response to the adult's clarification request. However, there was a difference between the children in terms of the form that the revision took. Stage I children carried out mostly phonological revisions; Stage II children more often deleted elements from their utterances, and Stage III children substituted words.

Gallagher and Darnton (1978) carried out the same study with children that had been classified as language disordered and found that although the same types of revision behaviors occurred, in LD children the proportions between different types of revision behaviors remained uniform in children at all three stages (phonetic change 31%, utterance elaboration 29%, utterance reduction 33%).

The remaining studies in this group, have been modifications or expansions of Gallagher's (1977) study. They all follow the same format in which an interviewer randomly asks for a clarification of a previous child utterance by using a minimal form request "What?". Konefal and Fokes (1984) extended the study to children at Brown's Stages III and V and to five and six-year-olds. They found that all of the children responded appropriately 95-99% of the time, but there were differences as to the type of response between the age-groups. Younger children's responses had twice as many repetitions as revisions, while for the older children the ratio was inverted. Wilcox and Webster (1980) investigated young children's responses to an explicit query and to a display of misunderstanding of intent. The children were Stage I children (MLU 1.10-1.58). In this study, conducted in the children's homes, the experimenter would either query a child request using the

minimal form "What?" or would pretend to interpret and acknowledge a request as if it were a declarative. Children's responses were equally distributed between repetition and revisions in response to the query, but showed a greater proportion of revisions in response to the display of misinterpretation. However, here there were also a large number of abandonments or no responses. Pearl, Donahue and Bryan (1981) also tested the difference in response to explicit and other types of cues to misunderstanding. In this case, the implicit cue to misunderstanding was a puzzled facial expression. The subjects were school-age children in Grades 1 through 8. Results were very similar to those of other studies. Most of the children (95-99%) provided a response to an indication of non-understanding. Repetitions decreased with age in favor of utterance revisions. However, they found that only the older children in the study were able to respond consistently to the facial indication of non-understanding. One study compared responses to different interlocutors. Tomasello, Farrar and Dines (1984) compared the clarification responses made by twenty children (20-28 months old) when talking to the mother and with an interviewer. They found that all children repeated 30-36% of the time to both interlocutors. However, the revision behaviors varied in response to interlocutor differences,

with children providing a greater number of new lexical items when talking to the interviewer. Finally, Brinton et al (1986) compared the responses of four sets of children (Pre-school, Kindergarten, Grade I and Grade III) to three successive indications of misunderstanding. That is, the adult queried a child utterance and upon receiving a reply indicated failure to understand twice more. The three probes used were "Huh?", "What?" and "I don't understand", given in this order. Again the use of repetitions as a response decreased with age. All children in addition showed differential behavior to the three probes. Repetitions were the most frequent response to the initial probe for all age-groups. In response to the second probe, the younger children again tended to repeat while older children switched to revision behaviors. In response to the third probe, the most frequent responses were those that added additional content. Younger children, however, increased the proportion of no response after the second probe while third-graders often queried the third probe.

These studies have all shown consistently that even very young children (18-24 months) at an early stage of linguistic development (Brown Stage I) are able to respond appropriately to requests for clarification. Younger children respond to minimal requests by repeating their original utterance. As

the children get older, they decrease use of repetition as a response and increase use of revision of the original utterance. In addition, children are able to take several contextual variables into account when planning their response, such as for example differences in listener variable. With an unfamiliar adult the child cannot take for granted shared assumptions and provides additional content as a response, which may remain implicit for a familiar adult. In addition, children seem to be able to distinguish different functional implications of a request depending on its place in interaction (as a first, second or third probe, for example).

This last point leads to a methodological problem that these studies present. All of them seem to consider that since the form of the query doesn't vary this can be considered a constant for purposes of establishing correlations. However, the results from Brinton et al's study indicate that, at least the children were sensitive to the functional difference of a "same" query depending on its placement in a sequence. Furrow and Lewis (1987) similarly indicated that children's responses to queries varied depending on the interactional role of the original child utterance. Children tended to respond to queries when their original utterance had an interactional function but had a

greater number of no responses if their utterance was part of a monologue or talk-to-self. In Chapter VI I take up this point again. It will be shown that the child in this study varies her response to a clarification request depending on the function of the original utterance which is queried and that successive "same" questions in a sequence are interpreted as indicating different problems and thus receive differential responses.

The third set of studies deal with children's use of clarification requests to solve their problems in understanding their interlocutor's utterances.

Garvey (1977) examined the occurrence of clarification queries in child-child discourse of children three, four and five years old. She identifies six types of queries which request repetition, specification and elaboration using two question formats: WH- and Yes/No questions. She finds that by three years of age children have clarification requests well established in their linguistic repertoires, which indicates that the development of this form occurs very early. Garvey further suggests that the use of this form may play a role in children's subsequent language development. Gallagher (1981) compared frequencies of queries in child-adult conversations in data from nine children, three each at Stages I-III of linguistic development). She found that all

children were able to query and to respond. However, the children's queries were less frequent than those of the adult. In addition most of the children's queries were requests for confirmation (85%), compared to 69% in the adult data. Gallagher proposes that some of the difference in frequency of questions between children and adults may derive from status considerations, with children showing a greater reluctance to question adults.

Christian (1980, Christian and Tripp 1978) studies clarification requests in the speech of forty children engaged in child-child conversations. The children were all of school age at five different grade levels (Nursery through Third Grade). They were all found to be able to produce and respond to requests of eight different types. She found a greater frequency of use of WH-questions (60%) than of Yes/No questions (34%). In addition, over 40% of the total number of queries were requests for repetition (What?, Huh?). Frequency of use of clarification requests increased with the age of the child, but seemed to decrease again in the older children (Grade III). All children responded appropriately to an interlocutor's query, but there was an increase of frequency of elaborated responses and a decrease in repetition as the children grew older.

McTear (1985) carried out a longitudinal study in which he analyzed several aspects of the development of children's conversational abilities, including the ability to repair utterances. His data come from child-child conversations of two children, Siobhan and Heather (ages S=3:8-5:5; H=4:0-5:9). This study is similar to the present study in that the data are taken from naturalistic interactions and in that McTear carries out a qualitative analysis of this data. He suggests that, particularly in the study of sequences, a qualitative approach seems inevitable, due to the wide range of possible sequences resulting from the numerous speaker options at each point in the conversation. However, this type of study permits an estimate of the extent of competence development in the children and of their ability to deal with conversational requirements.

Data were extracted from transcripts of video-tapes made in the home of one of the children during spontaneous play. With respect to repairs, both children showed an ability to manipulate grammar to effect repair. In addition, they displayed sensitivity to social factors, especially with respect to correction of the other interlocutor, tempering corrections with mitigation or politeness conventions to allow for smooth social interaction.

To analyze requests for clarification, he relied basically on Garvey's classification (Garvey 1977, 1979). He found that clarification requests decreased as the children grew older. He hypothesizes that this is probably due to the fact that their understanding ability increased, but also their ability for recipient design of talk, so that breakdowns or problems were less likely to occur. McTear also found that the children were able to produce sequences of related requests and that, of these, the majority (14/17, 82%) followed ordering patterns of weaker to stronger requests that have been found in other data (Garvey 1977, 1979). There were some overt other-corrections, but linguistic corrections as such were infrequent: two grammar corrections, five pronunciation corrections. Corrections decreased as the children grew older, indicating a developing sensitivity to politeness constraints. Some of the corrections to lexical items arise from disagreement as to what is the appropriate name or description for an object (Lego vs Plasticine, old vs new, outside vs inside). Other-corrections however were dispreferred. The data shows that there is a higher frequency of self-initiated self-repair or of other-initiated self-repair rather than other-correction.

From reviewing the literature, I noticed a gap in the research which has guided this study. There are very few

studies of children's use of clarification requests to begin with, but more importantly all of them study requests when they are already apparently well-established and there are no studies tracing the development of this language function. The present study is designed to provide data in this particular area. I also noticed that most studies are limited to requests for clarification. I was interested in seeing whether other types of other-repair initiators were found aside from requesting clarification. In addition, I was interested in comparing adult to child uses of clarification, and with respect to the adult, to note if and how her language may be said to be adapted to the needs of the child and how this adaptation may aid in the child's development of communicative competence.

In this Chapter I examine the forms used to initiate other-repairs and examine their distribution through time. In Chapter VI, I discuss the use of these forms in clarification sequences, concentrating particularly on varying response patterns.

In the following section I present a classification of other-repair-initiators based on classificatory systems proposed in the literature (Garvey 1977, 1979; Christian 1980; Christian and Tripp 1978). The use and distribution of

the different repair types are then examined for both the mother and the child's data.

2. CLASSIFICATION OF TYPES OF REPAIR INITIATORS

Garvey (1977) analyzes a subset of questions or requests for information which she calls "contingent queries". The contingent query is defined as "a dependent speech act" which is contingent on the occurrence of some prior utterance that is "contingent in the sense that it occurs in the domain of another speech act" (Garvey 1977:67). The query exercises a "selectivity" function with respect to the speech act which dominates it and a "determining" function with respect to the speech act that will follow the query. The selectivity function, which can be non-specific, specific or potential refers to that part of the previous speech act which is selected for clarification: it "selects the particular content of the query" (Garvey 1977:70). If the query is non-specific, no particular part of the utterance is selected; rather the utterance as a whole is queried. A specific query would select one particular part of the previous utterance: either a word, phrase, clause or in some cases smaller structures such as parts of words. If the query is "potential", what is being questioned is something not actually present in the previous act but somehow felt to be "missing" although "potentially available" (Garvey 1977:71):

in some way recoverable by the interlocutor and licit as a relevant query. This group has proved the most difficult to specify for analysts since it is virtually open-ended and I will return to a discussion of it when considering the classification into types of strategies. The determining function determines what type of speech act is expected as a reply to the query. The query can thus be a request for repetition, confirmation, specification or elaboration of the previous speech act or some part of it as determined by the selectivity function (Garvey 1977:70).

Combining these two functions results in the following types of contingent queries:

	Non-specific	Specific	Potential
Repetition	NRR	SRR	-
Confirmation		SRC	PRC
Specification	-	SRS	-
Elaboration	-	-	PRE

A non-specific request for repetition (NRR) requests the repetition of the prior utterance ("What?"). A specific request for repetition (SRR) requests the repetition of a selected part of the prior utterance ("You bought a what?"). A specific request for confirmation (SRC) requests that some part of the prior utterance be confirmed (A: "Mary took my books." B: "Your books?"). A potential request for confirmation (PRC) provides a possible elaboration of what is

felt to be missing from the prior utterance and asks for its confirmation ([continuing the previous illustration] B: "To her house?"). A specific request for specification (SRS) requests that something mentioned in the utterance be further specified (B: "Which books?"). A potential request for elaboration (PRE) requests that an elaboration of the prior utterance be given (B: "Where did she take them?").

As can be seen from the chart above, and as is pointed out in Christian and Tripp (1978), only some of the cells obtained by combining the selectivity and determining functions result in actual possible types of contingent queries for Garvey. Necessarily empty cells have been marked with a hyphen. Non-specific requests for confirmation are not mentioned by Garvey although they wouldn't be excluded by the definitions given¹. Christian and Tripp modify Garvey's framework and propose a different way of organizing the data which is "more complete and economical" (Christian and Tripp 1978:37) in that it reduces the number of necessarily empty cells while at the same time showing other distinctions not allowed for by Garvey's model.

The system proposed by Christian and Tripp has two parameters. One relates to the nature of the request itself,

¹To continue the illustration given previously, a non-specific request for confirmation of the utterance "Mary took my books" would be "Mary took your books?".

whether it requires that some information be provided (by means of a WH-question), or whether it requires that some information be confirmed or rejected (by means of a Yes/No question). WH-question queries are called Non-confirmation (NC) requests and Yes/No-question queries are Confirmation (C) requests (Christian and Tripp 1978:34). The second parameter relates to what part of the previous utterance is being checked and what is expected as a reply. From it four categories are derived according as to whether the expected response is a whole repetition, a partial repetition, a specification or an elaboration. The combination of the different categories results in the following:

	Repetition		Specification	
	Whole	Partial		
Elaboration Non-confirm (WH-question)	WR-NC (NRR)	PR-NC (SRR)	Spec-NC (SRS)	Elab-NC (PRE)
Confirm (Y/N question)	WR-C	PR-C (SRC)	Spec-C	Elab-C (PRC)

This is the organizing framework that will be used in this study, because it provides more complete distinctions of the types of clarification requests found in the data. However, the terms or labels in the chart will differ slightly, simply to avoid referring to a category by the negative term "Non-confirm". I will refer to WH-question forms as "queries" and to Yes/No question forms as "confirmations". As suggested by

Christian and Tripp's classification, requests will be subdivided according to the relation they hold with respect to the originating utterance, whether the question is a repetition of all or part of it or whether it is some sort of expansion of the previous utterance. Finally, the names for the individual strategies will be based on those proposed by Garvey since these are the ones which have been most often cited in the literature.

RELATION TO OU:	Repeat		Expand	
	Whole	Part	Specify	Elaborate
QUESTION TYPES				
WH-Q(query)	NRR	SRR	RSpec	RElab
YN-Q (confirm)	NRC	SRC	CSpec	CElab

Following are examples of the different categories as they would be used following the initial utterance "Tiene una pelusa." [She has some lint.].

ORIGINAL UTTERANCE = Tiene una pelusa.

QUERIES	CONFIRMATION REQUESTS	
Q: Qué(2) ² ? [What?]	Q: Tiene una pelusa? [She has some lint?]	Q: Sí? [Yes?]
R: Tiene una pelusa. [She has some lint.]	R: Sí (tiene una pelusa). [Yes (she has some lint).]	R: Sí. [Yes.]

²Que(2) indicates a rising final intonation contour. WH-questions which requested repetition showed this rising contour as opposed to those that requested specification and which had a falling contour.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Q: Tiene qué(2) ?
[She has what?] | Q: Una pelusa?
[Some lint?] |
| R: Una pelusa.
[Some lint.] | R: Sí (una pelusa).
[Yes (some lint).] |
| Q: Cuál?
[Which one?] | Q: Esta?
[This one?] |
| R: Esa.
[That one.] | Una chiquita?
[A little one?] |
| Una chiquita.
[A little one.] | R: Sí (una chiquita).
Yes (a little one). |
| Q: Quién?
[Who?] | Q: La muñeca?
[The doll?] |
| R: La muñeca.
[The doll.] | R: Sí (la muñeca).
[Yes (the doll).] |
| Q: Dónde?
[Where?] | Q: En el pelo?
[One her hair?] |
| R: En el pelo.
[On her hair.] | R: Sí (en el pelo).
[Yes (on her hair).] |

These examples show that there is a relationship between queries and confirmations in that the confirmations could be appropriate responses to the query at the same level:

- | | |
|--|--|
| A: Tiene una pelusa.
[She's got some lint.] | A: Tiene una pelusa.
[She's got some lint.] |
| B: Qué(2)?
[What(2)?] | B: Qué(2)?
[What(2)?] |
| B: Tiene una pelusa?
[She's got some lint?] | A: Tiene una pelusa.
[She's got some lint.] |
| A: Sí.
[Yes.] | |

It would be expected, therefore, that successive queries be organized in this way relative to each other. This follows not only from the question/answer organization displayed but also from the fact that confirmations are "stronger" relative to queries in that they impose a hearer-interpretation of the

other's speech. Garvey (1979) proposes a similar hierarchy, indicating that when multiple contingent queries occur in a sequence, weaker and more general ones (non-specific requests) will precede stronger or more specific ones.

All of these clarification requests have in common that some part of the previous utterance poses a problem for the interlocutor, either in hearing or understanding it. The majority of repair-initiators examined correspond to requests for clarification of a previous utterance. However, there are other problem sources which may refer back to structures other than the previous utterance. For example, the utterance as such may have been understood but the interlocutor may have trouble in relating it to other utterances in previous discourse or to other aspects of the conversational situation. To give another example, there may be no problem in understanding a previous turn, but it may be considered to be incomplete or insufficient when seen in the light of the larger discourse unit that may be being carried out, such as a narrative, for example. So it was found necessary to broaden the scope of what would be included under repair requests to include cases where the problems are not in understanding the utterance as such, but rather in understanding the relationship between the utterance and the

context or previous text. Some of the additional sources for a repair-initiation were the following:

- The speaker is being insincere.
- The speaker is factually incorrect.
- The speaker is contradicting herself.
- The speaker is making unwarranted assumptions.
- The speaker is being inappropriate.
- The discourse is incomplete.

This list does not account for all possible types of conversational problems but for the principal kinds of additional problems found in this data. The specification of these "additional" problems and of the repairs used to resolve them, became one of the research interests as the study progressed.

In the discussion that follows, the use and frequency of occurrence of "repair" requests will be analyzed, both in the mother's and the child's speech. Because of the tentativeness and open-ended quality of what should be included in requests for elaboration and other types of repairs such as requests for completion, I will restrict quantitative analysis to repetition, confirmation and specification requests. Section 3 examines requests for repetition, Section 4 examines requests for confirmation, and specification requests are discussed in Section 5. Section 6 will examine other types of repair requests such as requests for elaboration and for completion.

3. REQUESTS FOR REPETITION

Requests for repetition may request that all or part of the previous utterance be repeated. These seem to be issued in response to a problem in hearing all or part of the utterance. Other writers (Christian 1980, Corsaro 1977) have made a distinction between "real" requests for repetition and "similar" questions whose function seems to be to indicate the questioner's surprise at a statement, often prior to a rejection of the same. I believe that this distinction is in a sense artificial and that the "fake" or "surprised" requests for repetition are "exploited" requests for repetition. That is, they are or act as requests for repetition, exploiting the sincerity condition on the same. The speaker expresses something to the effect of "Please repeat because I can't quite believe my ears. I can't believe I really heard what I thought I heard. I can't believe you could have said what I thought you did." These also exploit the question format which gives a token semblance to a willingness to let the original speaker self-repair. However, the questioner usually proceeds to correct or reject some part of the original speaker's utterance without allowing a real opportunity for self-repair. Real and exploited requests are exactly the same in terms of form and placement. The only way of distinguishing them would be by

assuming different speaker intent for each one; but the speaker's intent is not available for inspection. Therefore, I am not going to distinguish "exploited" requests for repetition from "real" requests that occur in response to an actual problem in hearing due to noise or overlap, for example. In the discussion, however, the few cases in which the adult seems to be making use of this strategy to convey some negative feeling about the child's prior utterance will be pointed out. In any case, regardless of the real nature of the trouble source which occasions them, whether an actual problem in hearing or not, all of these requests for repetition seek to initiate a repair and act as if an actual problem in hearing had occurred.

Requests for repetition all use WH-question forms. Two types have been identified: Non-specific requests for repetition (NRR) and specific requests for repetition (SRR).

3.1. Non-Specific Requests for Repetition (NRR)

These request a repetition of the prior utterance without specifying anything other than a general question about it. The most common forms found are the questions "Cómo?" and "Qué?" with rising final intonation. "Hmm?" is also used, and there is one instance of the statement "No entiendo" (I don't understand) which serves the same function. Additionally, the same request could be achieved

indirectly by a statement that the hearer hasn't been able to hear properly, or even that the hearer wasn't listening. These, however do not occur in this data.

Examples of non-specific requests for repetition are the following:

- | | | |
|----|--|--|
| 1. | K. <potó> [<].
M. qué? [K01] | K. <broke> [<].
M. what? |
| 2. | K. <a- [/] a- [/]> [<]
atimitas.
M. qué? [K02] | K. <a- [/] a- [/]> [<]
atimites.
M. what? |
| 3. | K. shuna.
M. cómo? [K03] | K. [shuna].
M. what? |
| 4. | K. ehe no etaita
Yu+a+wini.
M. cómo?
M. no le entiendo.
M. qué dice? [K03] | K. that no sit Yu+a+Winnie.
M. what?
M. I don't understand.
M. what are you saying? |
| 5. | M. va a ver que se
prende la luz
solita.
K. cómo? [K08] | M. you'll see that the
light comes on by
itself.
K. what? |
| 6. | M. #7.0 y que está
haciendo la
grabadora ahora
Koki?
K. qué?
M. qué está haciendo la
grabadora ahora?
[K12] | M. #7.0 and what's the
tape-recorder doing now,
Koki?
K. what?
M. what's the tape-recorder
doing now? |
| 7. | M. y?
K. qué?
M. qué más? [K13] | M. and?
K. what?
M. what else? |
| 8. | M. me parece que no.
K. qué?
M. me parece que no se
van a tumbar. [K13] | M. I think they're not.
K. what?
M. I think they're not
going to fall. |

In all of these the final intonation is a rising one as opposed to the falling intonation contour which would make these into requests for specification as will be seen below. Both the mother and the child use these strategies. However, it seems that some of the instances in which the child questions, seem to be more appropriate for a specification request rather than a repetition request (7,8). The child pronounces these questions with the rising contour of repetition requests, nevertheless the mother replies to both by expanding them, providing material which had been left out of the original utterances. The mother seems to rely more on what she assumes to be a possible trouble-source, and responds accordingly rather than answering strictly according to the form of the request given by the child.

Table 1:-- Use of nonspecific requests for repetition:

	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	TOTAL
Mother	2	3	7	2	4	5	2	-	4	-	4	3	36
Child	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	2	3	8

3.2. Specific Requests for Repetition (SRR)

These differ from non-specific requests in that the questioner indicates that only part of the previous utterance need be repeated. The questioner may repeat the complete

previous utterance up to the point of the word or phrase that needs to be clarified, substituting that word or phrase by an appropriate WH-form; or she may simply focus on the construction that is the source of the problem, omitting the rest of the utterance. The final intonation is high rising as in Non-Specific Requests. Examples of this strategy are the following:

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|----------------------|----|--------------------------|
| 9. | K. | ése a- [/] ése a | K. | that a [/] that a |
| | | tititosh. | | littles. |
| | M. | ése qué? [K01] | M. | that what? |
| 10. | K. | no pedo avanzar con | K. | I can't lift with these, |
| | | éstas, ésto. | | this. |
| | M. | no puede qué? [K04] | M. | you can't what? |
| 11. | K. | estaban este en un | K. | they were um in a |
| | | hwelo. | | [hwelo]. |
| | M. | en un qué? [K10] | M. | in a what? |
| 12. | K. | donde está este la | K. | where is um the big |
| | | estatua rande de él | | statue of he doesn't wa- |
| | | no quie- [/] no | | [/] doesn't want to |
| | | quiere tener? | | have? |
| | M. | ... donde está qué? | M. | ... where is what? |
| | | [K10] | | |
| 13. | K. | pero se llamaban los | K. | but the men were called |
| | | señores # Tecoplam. | | # Tecoplam. |
| | M. | cómo se llamaban? | M. | what were they called? |
| | | [K13] | | |

The preferred position for the question word is final position, although as can be seen from example 13, the WH-word may occur in its more usual position at the beginning of the question. When the WH-word in initial position is

functioning as a request for repetition, however, its prosodic characteristics seem to be different from those of "real" questions or of requests for specification. The pitch starts at a higher level, and there may be a slight rise and often a slight pause after the WH-word. The exact characteristics would have to be verified by acoustic analysis, however, which goes beyond the scope of this work. There are only eight examples of the use of this strategy and they are all from the mother's speech.

Table 2:-- Use of specific requests for repetition

	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	TOTAL
Mother	2	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	3	-	-	1	8

4. REQUESTS FOR CONFIRMATION

Requests for confirmation repeat all or part of a speaker's previous utterance with a question intonation. This gives the speaker of the utterance an overt display of what his interlocutor has understood, and provides an opportunity for corrections to be effected should they be needed. The expected response is a confirmation that what is displayed in the question is in fact what was said. The original speaker has the opportunity of making any corrections that are needed; if none are needed the conversation may proceed. Confirmation requests may be

specific or non-specific. In the non-specific request no particular part of the utterance is singled out, rather the original utterance is repeated in its entirety. In specific requests for repetition, only a part of the original utterance is singled out for confirmation. There seems to be a functional difference between these two types of confirmation requests. Non-specific requests seem to function on a "correct me only if I'm wrong" principle; the person who issues the request often does not pause to wait for an answer to it, although many are responded to. This strategy seems to be used when there is no real expectation of a problem. If there are no corrections to be made, the original speaker may just continue the conversation. The absence of a correction indicates that the hearer's interpretation is correct. Specific requests for confirmation, on the other hand, often reflect real misunderstandings or they are used to precede disagreements or other-corrections.

4.1. Non-Specific Requests for Confirmation

Non-specific requests for confirmation repeat and question the previous utterance of a speaker. However, some qualifications must be made about the form that these repetitions take since, at least in this data, the repetition often differs from the original utterance. An exact

repetition would match the interlocutor's original utterance in every way except for the sentence intonation which in the confirmation request is high rising; but since, in the earlier tapes, the child's phonology is markedly different from that of the adult, a number of otherwise exact repetitions involve one of the speakers "translating" the utterance into its phonological equivalents in her own system. This group of repetitions will be referred to as "exact with phonological changes" (ExP). Note that these phonological changes may sometimes also change the meaning of what the child has said. If the child's phonological system has eliminated some contrasts in the adult's system, thus resulting in homonymous words, then when the adult "repeats" one of these words, she may not really be repeating what the child said but its homonym. For example, at one point in Koki's development [peyito] was the child pronunciation of two possible adult words "pelito" and "perrito". If the child says [peyito] intending to refer to a dog and the mother "repeats" "pelito?" [hair], the confirmation request serves the function of indicating a problem in understanding; however, it is not really a repetition of what the child said. Additionally, with respect to repetitions, it should be noted that sometimes the mother repeats the phonetic form of the previous utterance exactly when she can't make out

what word the child is saying. Here the mother tries to imitate the sounds that the child pronounced and only to this extent is she repeating what the child has said. In cases like these mentioned above, the confirmation request is usually followed by other clarification requests, however.

With the observations made in the above paragraph in mind, I made an initial classification of non-specific confirmation requests into sub-types according to the form that the repetition took when compared to the original utterance. Exact repetitions (EX) were cases in which the confirmation request matched the original utterance word for word and with the same phonological renderings, regardless of whether the speaker "knew" the meaning of what she was saying. A separate initial category was the phonologically "transliterated" non-specific confirmation requests (Exact but with Phonological changes: Exp). A third category was the ReFormulated repetition (RF). This included all cases where the original utterance was repeated but appropriate deictic changes were made or where syntactic markers or function words were added. The added words were not supposed to add any additional meaning. The fourth type of repetition, Reduced Repetitions (RR) delete syntactic markers or function words found in the original utterance. There are some reduced repetitions by the mother in which she

eliminates or edits out repeated material in the original utterance, or in some cases material which to her seems superfluous or uninterpretable. There are a few cases of reduced repetitions for which a decision had to be made as to whether they should be classed among non-specific confirmation requests, since if only part of an utterance was singled out for confirmation then a different type of strategy is being carried out: the Specific Request for Confirmation (SRC), which is discussed in the following section. If the reductions involved only function words or markers, the repetition was classified as a reduced non-specific request. A fifth type of repetition (AD) adds material to the original utterance (e.g., addition of discourse markers), or gives a complete "repetition" of an elliptical original utterance or adds elements that make the intent of the original utterance clear. The two final type of requests for confirmation are paraphrases and polarity questions. Paraphrases (PA), which are almost exclusively used by the adult, involve lexical substitutions in the original utterance, that is, the substitution of a standard language word for one of the words in the child's original utterance. Finally, the last type of request for confirmation are "polarity questions", in which only the polarity of the original utterance is given and questioned:

"Yes" for a positive previous utterance and "No" for a negative utterance. This type of question does not seem very useful as a request for clarification, since the person who attempts to answer it can never be sure what his interlocutor has understood. Nevertheless, it is very frequent both in the child's and the adult's speech, functioning as other non-specific confirmation requests. In the following sections I discuss each of these sub-types in turn.

4.1.1. Exact repetitions

As has been mentioned, the confirmation request has an interrogative final rising intonation and very often this will differ from the intonation of the previous utterance even if this is a question (examples 17, 19); at the same time, expressive paralinguistic features of the original utterance, such as lengthening of certain sounds, or changes in intonation, would be omitted in the repetition (example 19). Paralinguistic features aside, for a repetition to be considered exact it has to match the original utterance in every way with no additions, deletions or permutations in word-order. Following are some examples:

- | | | | |
|-----|----|--------------------|-----------------|
| 14. | M. | #2.1 no cabe. | it doesn't fit. |
| | K. | no cabe? [K07] | it doesn't fit? |
| 15. | K. | es un túnel. | it's a tunnel |
| | M. | es un túnel? [K05] | it's a tunnel? |
| 16. | K. | nenito llora. | baby cries. |

- M. nenito llora? [K02] baby cries?
17. K. ves? (you) see?
 M. ves? [K01] (you) see?
18. K. cómo? how?
 M. cómo? [K12] how?
19. K. ya:: se acabó! now it's finished!
 M. ya se acabó? [K08] now it's finished?

The repetition here is exactly like the original utterance in every way except for the final intonation contour and other paralinguistic features. Even in (16) where the child has a non-adult utterance, this is repeated exactly. However, hesitation phenomena which are edited out by the original speaker in a self-repair, and discourse markers may be omitted and the utterance would still count as an exact repetition, as long as the full clause or phrase is repeated without changes:

20. K. eh, un señor. um, a man.
 M. un señor? [K04] a man?
21. K. #2.2 no los niños, eh! not the children, eh!
 M. no los niños? [K07] not the children?
22. K. #2.1 ése [/] ése es #2.1 that [/] that's
 Lu- [/] Lu- [/] Lucas. Lucas.
 M. ése es Lucas? [K07] that's Lucas?

4.1.2. Exact Repetitions with Phonological Modifications

(ExP)

As was mentioned previously, since the child's phonological system differed from that of the adult, especially in the early tapes, a number of otherwise exact repetitions involve one of the speakers "translating" the utterance into its phonological equivalents in her own system. Following are some examples:

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|----------------------|----|------------------------|
| 23. | F: | betlemitas? | F: | bethlemites? |
| | K. | atamitas. | K. | atamites. |
| | | atemitas? [K02] | K. | atemites? |
| 24. | K. | payita. | K. | covered. |
| | M. | tapadita? [K01] | M. | covered? |
| 25. | K. | ne tayita. | K. | no lying (down). |
| | M. | no acostadita? [K01] | M. | not lying down? |
| 26. | M. | #3.1 está flaquito! | M. | #3.1 it's flat! |
| | K. | tá hatito? [K03] | K. | it's flat? |
| 27. | K. | #3.5 quiere <a pa-> | K. | #3.5 want <a bo-> [//] |
| | | [/] a papita? | | a bottle? |
| | M. | quiere la papita? | M. | (you) want the bottle? |
| | | [K02] | | |
| 28. | K. | oto tatito. | K. | another piggy. |
| | M. | otro chanchito? | M. | another piggy? |
| | | [K02] | | |
| 29. | M. | ay, se salieron los | M. | oh, the other came |
| | | otros! | | out! |
| | K. | #4.1 se salieron los | K. | #4.1 the others came |
| | | otos? [K10] | | out? |

In a few cases, as has been mentioned, the "transliteration" could point out a problem if the simplifications or changes in the child's system resulted in the elimination of a contrast for the adult. However, in the majority of cases the mother repeats accurately what the child has said. The following two examples -are cases where the mother guesses at one possible meaning of what the child has said, in both cases the mother is wrong since the child persists in her utterance until the correct meaning is achieved:

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|--------------------|----|-----------------|
| 30. | K. | eshe atito? | K. | that [atito]? |
| | M. | ese patito? | M. | that duck? |
| | K. | eye e atito. [K01] | K. | that a [atito]. |
| | | | | |
| 31. | K. | a [///] e pita. | K. | a [///] it itch |
| | M. | apita? | M. | up? |
| | K. | #1.8 e pita. [K01] | K. | #1.8 it itch. |

The difference between these two sub-groups of "exact" repetitions seems to be purely a function of the child's developing phonological system. The mother did not otherwise change her speech to adapt it to simulate the child's pronunciation unless she could not make out what the child was saying and therefore made an effort to imitate the sounds exactly, independently of whether they resulted in an adult word. As the child's phonological system approximated the

adult pronunciation, the number of ExPs decreased as is shown in the following table:

Table 3:-- Comparison of exact (EX) and phonologically changed (ExP) repetitions.

TAPES		1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	TOTAL
Mother	EX	1	3	4	4	1	6	7	1	1	-	3	6	37
	ExP	14	8	8	8	1	3	2	-	-	-	-	-	44
Child	EX	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	1	7
	ExP	-	1	3	1	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	9

Since the difference between EXs and ExPs is in this sense accidental or incidental, and does not depend on a discourse clarificatory strategy, this distinction will not be maintained from now on. However, when responses to confirmation requests are examined in Chapter VI, it will be seen that when the mother's pronunciation differs from that of the child, the child will often repeat the utterance modelling the adult's pronunciation. In all subsequent discussion, EXs will include both phonologically exact and phonologically changed otherwise "exact" repetitions.

4.1.3. Reformulated Repetitions (RF)

Reformulated repetitions repeat all the main components of the original utterance, but may include changes in deictic elements, modifications to the syntax (for example, the addition of function words like articles or prepositions), or changes in word order; and what is also found in early tapes

is the reformulation of the child's vertical constructions (Scollon 1976) into one horizontal construction. In addition, some reformulations may correct errors in the original utterance, for example errors in number or gender agreement. This category is biased in favor of adult language use, in the sense that the filling in of syntactically appropriate elements is mostly done by the adult. On the other hand, technically the reverse process can also be considered a reformulation, when function words are omitted or deleted while the major elements in the original utterance are repeated. However, confirmation questions which repeat an utterance but involve omission of elements are grouped separately as reduced repetitions (RR) which will be discussed below. Table 4 shows use of reformulated non-specific confirmation requests by both the mother and the child.

Table 4:-- Occurrences of Reformulated Repetitions (RF)

TAPES	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	TOTAL
Mother	10	7	5	10	6	15	5	2	1	1	6	6	74
Child	1	-	-	-	1	2	-	2	-	-	-	1	7

Examples (32) and (33) show reformulations by the child involving the addition of function words while otherwise repeating the original utterance:

32. M. pelito mamá. M. mommy hair.
 K. #3.2 ese piyito? K. #3.2 that hair?

- K. e ya mamá? [K01] K. of the mommy?
33. M. una vaquita en el cenicero. M. a little cow on the ashtray.
 K. hay una vaquita en el cime#sero? [K05] K. there's a little cow on the ash#tray?

Example (32) reformulates the mother's reduced utterance by adding determiners and, apparently, a preposition. At the same time the repetition is performed as a vertical construction, each part having its own final question intonation. Both (32) and (33) also show the child's phonological adaptations. Aside from these two, the remainder of the child's RFs are cases of deictic reformulations as in the following:

34. M. ésta es la abuelita Noni. M. this is Grandma Noni.
 K. #1.8 ésa es la awelita # Noni, sí? [K07] K. #1.8 that is Grandma # Noni, yes?
35. M. ésa es la casita de los barriletes. M. that is the house for the kites.
 K. esta es la casita de los a [/ /] barriretes? [K09] K. this is the house for the k- [/] kites?
36. M. ahí. M. there.
 K. acá? [K09] K. here?

The reformulated repetitions used by the mother involve:

a) the insertion of function words (articles, clitics, copula)

37. K. tayita mono. K. monkey lying down.

- M. acostadito el mono? M. the monkey lying down?
[K01]
38. K. pita. K. itches.
M. le pica? [K01] M. it itches?
39. K. manito de papá. K. hand of daddy.
M. la manito del papá? M. the hand of daddy?
[K02] (daddy's hand)
40. K. #19.0 tatito. K. #19.0 piggy.
M. un chanchito? [K02] M. a piggy?

b) reformulations correcting wrongly used syntactic
elements:

41. K. qué es esas cosas? K. what is those things?
M. qué son esas cosas? M. what are those things?
[K05]
42. K. para que oyes. K. so that you hears.
M. para que yo oiga? M. so that I hear?
[K08]
43. K. ... [//] y se ponen K. ... [//] and they start
a llover. to rain.
M. se pone a llover? M. it starts to rain?
[K13]

c) changes in word order with respect to the original:

44. K. a nena etá vetiyita. K. the girl is dressed.
M. vestidita está la M. dressed is the girl?
nena? [K03]
45. K. van a comprar ellos. K. going to buy, they (are)
M. ellos van a comprar? M. they're going to buy?
[K07]
46. K. con el Shosho. K. with Chocho.
K. con la Koki. K. with Koki.
M. con la Koki y con el M. with Koki and with
Chocho? [K07] Chocho?

47. K. ésa te busta nada K. that one you like, only.
 más.
 M. ésa nada más me M. that one, only, I like?
 gusta? [K08]
48. K. n o [/ /] K. no [//] "lleve+lleve"
 "lleve+lleve" no she doesn't sing.
 canta.
 M. n o c a n t a M. she doesn't sing
 "llueve+llueve"? "llueve+llueve"?
 [K13]

It is not clear what the motivation is for these changes in order. In some cases the word order is regularized to SVO (45,48), but in others such as (44) it is changed away from SVO order. In all cases the final post-verbal construction is fronted with respect to the verb but there is no apparent reason behind this except perhaps to avoid the monotony of exact repetitions.

d) Some of the mother's reformulations involve the combining of the child's vertical constructions into one utterance, as in the examples below; example 46, above is also similar to this:

49. K. piyitos? K. hairs?
 K. mamita? K. mommy?
 M. pelitos de la mamá? M. mommy's hairs?
 [K01]
50. K. pita. K. bite.
 K. bititos. K. bugs.
 M. los bichitos la M. the bugs bite you?
 pican? [K01]

e) The majority of the reformulated utterances involve adapting the original utterance deictically to the circumstances of the new speaker. These deictic adaptations most frequently involve personal pronoun substitutions and changes in place deixis markers.

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|---|----|---------------------------------|
| 51. | K. | #2.0 es ésto? | K. | #2.0 is this? |
| | M. | qué es éso? [K02] | M. | what is that? |
| 52. | K. | ése mío. | K. | that mine. |
| | M. | ...
éste tuyo? [K04] | M. | ...
this yours? |
| 53. | K. | #4.3 atí [/] atí. | K. | #4.3 here [/] here. |
| | M. | ahí? [K04] | M. | there? |
| 54. | K. | #3.4 voy a bujar. | K. | #3.4 I'm going to draw. |
| | M. | va a dibujar? [K03] | M. | you're going to draw? |
| 55. | K. | me la da? | K. | (you) give it to me? |
| | M. | se la doy? [K05] | M. | (I) give it to you? |
| 56. | K. | te lo [/] te lo
realó la abuelita
Noni. | K. | Grandma Noni gave it to
you. |
| | M. | me lo regaló la
abuelita Noni? [K07] | M. | Grandma Noni gave it to
me? |
| 57. | K. | con [/] conmigo. | K. | with [/] with me. |
| | M. | con [/] con Koki?
[K07] | M. | with [/] with Koki? |
| 58. | K. | yo. | K. | me. |
| | M. | usted? [K12] | M. | you? |

There are also a few cases in which confirmation of an imperative is sought but the imperative is reformulated:

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|-----------------|----|-----------------|
| 59. | K. | hácele güeltas! | K. | make it rounds. |
|-----|----|-----------------|----|-----------------|

- M. que haga que de M. to make it to go around.
vuelatas? [K07]
60. K. abre la cuertita tú! K. you open the door!
M. yo abro la puertita? M. I open the door?
[K09]

All of the reformulated requests for confirmation involve one or more of the changes listed in (a)-(e). What can be seen here is that the repetition in a request for confirmation is a repetition of something other than the surface form, in many cases, nevertheless, the child from a very early age has awareness of the relationship holding between variable surface forms.

4.1.4. Reduced Repetitions (RR)

These involve all cases in which the confirmation request repeats the original utterance but some elements are eliminated. Here there are differences between the kinds of reduced repetitions produced by the mother and by the child. The mother's reductions involve eliminating non-essential redundant elements from the clause, although here are also included cases where she edits out uninterpretable material. The child's reduced repetitions are the inverse of the mother's syntactic reformulations: the child eliminates syntactic markers such as articles or the copula.

Table 5:--Occurrences of Reduced Repetitions (RR)

TAPES	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	TOTAL
Mother	2	6	2	4	-	2	2	-	1	-	-	-	19
Child	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4

Following are examples of the mother's reduced repetitions.

a) elimination of superfluous material which leaves a trace or remains "present" at some point in the repetition:

61. K. #2.0 ése sí e o K. #2.0 that yes I
pono. put it on.
M. le va a poner? [K01] M. you'll put it on.
62. K. a manito se potó, a K. a hand broke, a
mano de papá. daddy's hand.
M. la manito del papá M. daddy's hand broke?
se explotó? [K02]
63. K. #2.5 xx a mí me K. #2.5 xx I like it.
buhta.
M. le gustan? [K07] M. you like them?

b) Elimination of unidentifiable or uninterpretable parts of the utterance. Among these will be included all cases where the mother eliminates the child particle [a]:

64. K. ése [//] # ne [//] ne K. that [//] # no [//] no
pos#teye a Vove. [pos]#want Grover.
M. no quiere Grover? M. you don't want Grover?
[K01]
65. K. ea e: tata los K. [ea] take off the shoes.
zapatos.
M. se saca los zapatos? M. take off the shoes?
[K02]
66. K. #20.1 teye rerere K. #20.1 want [rerere]
ayuda. help.
M. quiere ayuda? [K02] M. (you) want help?

67. K. me [//] me mordió a K. bit me [//] me a [//] on
 [//] en la eh [//] a the eh [//] a [//] on
 [//] en la mano para the hand so that it
que no me muerde. doesn't bite me.
 M. la mordió en la M. he bit you on the hand?
 mano? [K08]

In the above examples, the eliminated material, which has been underlined in the original utterance, is material which the mother cannot identify as words in the standard language or as usual child words. Example 67 is different, however, because the phrase "para que no me muerda" is perfectly acceptable and understandable as a Spanish phrase, but it is uninterpretable in context. Following are cases where the mother eliminates the child particles [a] or [e]:

68. K. #4.1 a nusio lo K. #4.1 [a] dirty the
 peyos! hairs!
 M. sucios los pelos? M. dirty the hairs?
 [K02]
69. K. e year a un nenito. K. [e] cry [a] the baby.
 M. llora un nenito? M. cries the baby?
 [K02]
70. K. a s [//] a Koki K. [a s-] [//] [a] Koki
 también? also?
 M. Koki también? [K07] M. Koki also?

c) Finally there is a small group in which what is eliminated is an essential part of the sentence, that is, one of the arguments of the verb.

71. K. no [/] no vene más K. not [/] not coming again
 as vaca. the cows.
 M. no viene más? [K04] M. not coming again?
72. K. está acá su colita. K. here is its tail.
 M. ahí está? [K08] M. there it is?
73. K. todavía es gande K. it's still big, this
 éste. one.
 M. todavía es grande? M. it's still big?
 [K10]

The child's reduced utterances have also eliminated material, but they are not directly comparable to the above reduced utterances. Rather, they are the mirror-images of reformulated repetitions in the mother's speech. In the syntactically reformulated utterances the mother adds syntactic markers and function words to the repetition. The child's reduced utterances eliminate these function words:

74. M. tapadito el mono? M. the monkey covered up?
 K. payita mono? [K01] K. monkey covered up?
75. M. tienen las patitas M. they have (det) dirty
 sucias. feet.
 K. ... # tene patas K. ... # they have dirty
 nushas? [K04] feet?

4.1.5. Repetitions with additions

There are very few of these and they are all carried out by the mother. They are a small group of non-specific confirmation requests which repeat the original utterance and make some addition to it. Some of these are cases of

addition of the discourse marker "también" (also) to the repeated utterance, tying in that utterance to what was said previously. In some cases, as in example 77, the added material is material which through ellipsis has been eliminated from the previous utterance.

76. K. #11.3 e oto. K. #11.3 the other.
 M. el otro también? M. the other also?
 [K03]
77. M. adónde van a ir los niños de la wawa? M. where are the children in the bus going?
 K. a [//] a la [///] a comprar un helado. K. to [//] to the [///] to buy an ice-cream.
 M. ah, se van a comprar un helado? [K07] M. ah, they're going to buy an ice-cream.

4.1.6. Paraphrases

An additional sub-grouping in non-specific confirmation requests is that of paraphrases, of which there are several instances from the mother's speech. In paraphrases the previous utterance is "repeated" but synonyms for lexical items are substituted. This sometimes happens when the child uses words which though recognizable to the mother are not standard for the meaning intended.

78. K. #2.5 oh, potó! K. #2.5 oh, it poded!
 M. 0 [!= laughs]. M. 0 [!= laughs].
 M. explotó? M. it exploded?
 M. se rompió? M. it broke?
 [laughing] [K01] [laughing]
79. K. e- [//] efemé Koki. K. g- [//] got sick Koki.

M.	se <u>lastimó</u> Koki.?	M.	Koki hurt herself
K.	ep- [//] epemé Koki.	K.	go- [//] got sick Koki.
M.	se <u>lastimó</u> mamita Pinky?	M.	you hurt yourself mommy Pinky?
K.	sí. [K04]	K.	yes.

Here the mother paraphrases what the child has said by substituting lexical items which are more appropriate for the particular situation.

4.1.7. Minimal form confirmation requests

These involve the use of a polarity question "Yes?" or "No?" to request confirmation of a preceding utterance. The relation of the request form to the originating utterance can be determined through ellipsis. In these forms, the complete previous utterance is elided and only its polarity is maintained (Halliday and Hasan 1976). These minimal-form questions then stand in an inverse relationship with respect to the originating utterance in comparison with the full-form questions. The full-form questions repeat everything without any elliptical material. The minimal-form questions elide everything except for the polarity marker, yet both serve the function of requesting confirmation of the preceding utterance. As the child develops, the number of full-form repetitions decreases and the number of minimal form repetitions increase. Minimal form repetitions are not very useful for displaying what the interlocutor has understood,

so in early language development where the display of this understanding is particularly important, these minimal form requests are less frequent. However, later on, these confirmation markers reserve a place for possible repair initiation without the need to rely on the cumbersome strategy of repeating everything that the interlocutor has said. It would be interesting to examine in adult conversation what happens when these forms are used. It is likely that, in addition to indicating the interlocutor's attentiveness, the use of these forms serves to open a conversational space for the insertion of qualifications, modifications, additions or other repair work.

Table 6 shows the occurrences of all the different types of Non-Specific Confirmation requests.

Table 6:--Use of non-specific confirmation requests

TAPES	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	TOTAL
Mother	30	26	22	32	9	29	17	3	3	1	10	13	196
Koki	3	1	4	4	2	5	-	5	1	1	1	2	29

a) Breakdown of non-specific confirmation requests by type of request:

		1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	TOTAL
Mother	EX	1	3	4	4	1	6	7	1	1	-	3	6	37
	Exp	14	8	8	8	1	3	2	-	-	-	-	-	44
	RF	10	7	5	10	6	15	5	2	1	1	6	6	74
	RR	2	6	2	4	-	2	2	-	1	-	-	-	19
	AD	-	1	1	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	1	6

Child	EX	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	1	7
	ExpP	-	1	3	1	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	9
	RF	1	-	-	-	1	2	-	2	-	-	-	1	7
	RR	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	AD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1

4.2. Specific Requests for Confirmation

Specific requests for confirmation focus on one part of the previous utterance which gets repeated with a question intonation, requiring the original speaker to confirm whether the interpretation given is indeed correct. The same subgroupings mentioned for non-specific confirmation requests apply here. Exact and reformulated partial repetitions form the bulk of SRCs and then there are a few cases of paraphrases and partial repetitions in which additional material such as a noun modifier may be added.

The SRC may repeat any part of the previous utterance but the majority of them seem to focus on the final part of the previous utterance and usually a noun phrase. As has been documented in the literature, the final part of an utterance seems to be a preferred place for placing important information to be conveyed by that utterance, and it has also been documented that repeating the last part of an utterance seems to be a common learner strategy for both children and adults. What seems to be the case, however, is that there is a difference in occurrence between non-specific confirmation requests and specific ones, in that the complete utterance

is repeated when the interlocutor is fairly certain that she has heard and understood correctly but the specific request seems to occur to a greater degree when there is a problem in hearing or understanding.

Following are examples of specific requests for confirmation by both the child and the adult.

a) Exact partial repetitions with and without phonological modifications.

By the mother:

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|---|----|---|
| 80. | K. | es ése [//] es ése
[//] es ése nu-
nushio. | K. | that is [//] that is [//]
that is di- [//] dirty. |
| | M. | nushio? [K01] | M. | dirty? |
| 81. | K. | wauwau titito #
baíto. | K. | little doggie # devil. |
| | M. | diablito? [K01] | M. | devil? |
| 82. | K. | un [//] un atón. | K. | a [//] a [aton]. |
| | M. | un botón? [K04] | M. | a button? |
| 83. | K. | quiero el osito. | K. | I want the little bear. |
| | M. | el osito? [K05] | M. | the little bear? |
| 84. | K. | que [//] dici que el
papá son en- [//]
enaps. | K. | what [//] (he) say that
the daddy they are s-
[//] snaps. |
| | M. | snaps? [K12] | M. | snaps? |
| 85. | K. | ahora sí [//] ahora
sí los abrimos. | K. | now yes [//] now yes we
open them. |
| | M. | los abrimos? [K13] | M. | we open them? |

By the child:

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|---------------------|----|----------------------|
| 86. | M. | ésos [*] es # Bert. | M. | those [*] is # Bert. |
| | K. | Pit? [K02] | K. | Bert? |

87. F: es vinagre. F: it's vinegar.
K. #1.9 sí, inagre? K. #1.9 yes, inegar?
[K05]
88. M. porque es viejito. M. because he's old.
K. es viejito? [K07] K. he's old?
89. M. este es un Maizoro. M. this is a Maizoro.
K. Maizoro? [K11] K. Maizoro?
90. M. #3.4 tiene una M. #3.4 you've got some
pelusita que se la lint that I want to take
quiero sacar por out, please.
favor.
K. una pelusita? [K13] K. some lint?

b) Reformulated partial repetitions repeat a word or phrase from the preceding utterance and at the same time may add missing syntactic elements, alter word order and/or change deictic elements to accommodate the circumstances of the new speaker.

By the mother:

91. K. miya e seyor. K. look at the man.
M. un señor? [K02] M. a man?
92. K. #42.1 teye mo- [/] K. #42.1 I want [mo- [/]
mobito. mobito].
M. #1.6 un globito? M. #1.6 a balloon?
[K04]
93. K. cuál ése la abuelita K. which this Grandma
Noni? Noni?
M. cuál es dice? [K07] M. which is it, are you
saying?
94. K. hh, diso "m- [/] mi K. hh, I say "m- [/] my
[/] mi [/] mi mano!" [/] my [/] my hand!"
M. su mano? [K08] M. your hand?

K. Lucas really crazy,

95. K. Lucas loquísimo, right?
 M. he's really crazy?
 M. es loquísimo? [K13]

By the child:

96. M. acá es la casita de ellos. M. here is their little house.
 K. # es acá, eh? [K09] K. # it's here, eh?
97. M. mira acá tiene un barco. M. look here you have a boat.
 K. ahí? [K11] K. there?
98. M. abajo del librito # M. underneath the book #
 ése. that one.
 K. éte? [K11] K. this one?

Table 7:--Occurrences of Specific Requests for Confirmation

		1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	TOTAL
Mother	EX	8	3	4	4	5	1	4	1	1	-	8	5	44
	RF	2	2	2	1	2	4	3	-	2	1	-	1	20
Child	EX	-	1	4	1	1	1	-	-	-	3	-	3	14
	RF	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	3	-	-	7

In summary, requests for confirmation are strategies that seek the verification of what the hearer assumes the speaker to have said. The non-specific confirmation request is usually used when there are no real problems in understanding, and it provides a periodic check to corroborate that both participants are on track. There are two forms to this request: a repetition of the complete prior utterance or a minimal form request ("Yes?", "No?"). Both seem to have the same function, however only the full-form

request actually displays what it is that the interlocutor has understood. The specific request for confirmation selects part of the previous utterance for verification. This strategy seems to be used when there are real problems in understanding. Very often the speaker produces a series of "guesses" as to what the interlocutor said, and very often they are disconfirmed. The occurrence of these strategies within clarification sequences will be discussed in the following chapter.

5. SPECIFICATION CLARIFICATIONS

These request that the speaker more fully identify or specify some part of his previous utterance that is considered vague or ambiguous by the hearer. To an utterance "x verb z" (The boy took the book.), the interlocutor may request further specification by asking "which x?" or "what z?". Alternatively, the interlocutor may propose a specification for the speaker's confirmation: "My brother?", "the blue book?". Thus there are two types of specification clarifications: WH-query requests for specification and Y/N specification confirmations.

5.1. WH-Requests for Specification

The WH-request for specification queries a previous utterance and requests that some part of it be further

specified. This may be done by using just the appropriate WH-question word that refers to the part of the utterance that is being queried, or part of the previous utterance may be repeated to lead in or focus what needs to be specified. In Spanish, the question words most often used are "qué?" and "cuál?", but since somebody may require time, place or manner specification other question words, e.g., "como?", "dónde?" or "cuándo?", may also be used.

It was mentioned previously that questions like "qué?" or "cómo?" may be used also to request repetition of an utterance. The two functions, repetition and specification are kept separate by differences in intonation. When the question word is being used as a request for repetition the final contour is rising, while if it is being used for specification there is a falling final intonation. Following is a comparison of single question words being used as requests for repetition and requests for specification, where the only distinguishing feature is the difference in intonation. In these examples the interlocutor identifies the speaker's intent correctly, supplying what seems to be the requested information in each case:

99. K. há- [//] hácelo [//] # K. ma- [//] make it [//] #
 hácelo dar bu- [//] make it go aro- [//]
 güeltas. around.
 M. cómo [2]? M. what [2]?
 K. hácele güeltas. K. make it around.
 [K7][RR]

100. K. #4.5 quiero que K. #4.5 I want you to make
hagas una linda. a nice one.
M. cómo? M. how?
K. #2.3 quiero quitar K. #2.3 I want to take off
al techo. [K13][RS] the roof.
101. K. miya! K. look!
M. qué [2]? M. what [2]?
K. un [//] amá miya! K. a [//] mommy look!
[K03][RR]
102. K. miya, ves? K. look, see?
M. qué? M. what?
K. miya baítosh. K. look at the little
[K01][RS] devils.
103. M. #7.0 y qué está M. #7.0 and what's the
haciendo la tape-recorder doing now,
grabadora ahora Koki? Koki?
K. qué [2]? K. what [2]?
M. qué está haciendo la M. what's the tape-recorder
grabadora ahora? doing now?
[K12][RR]
104. M. ése es +... M. that's a +...
K. qué? K. what?
M. un pollito. M. a little chicken.
[K09][RS]

The child does not always keep the two intonations differentiated, especially when the question word is just "qué?". In example 101, she hesitates between giving a specification "un ..." and repeating. In this example she opts for the correct or expected response but in a number of other cases she repeats her original utterance when the mother seems to be requesting a specification. In cases of doubt between specification and repetition the child always seems to favor repetition. Here it is hard to know whether

she has trouble recognizing the different intentions associated with, for example, the difference in intonation or whether she has trouble with the strategy of specification which syntactically and semantically has more complications than repeating a previous utterance.

5.1.1. Types of Specifications

a) The request for specification occurs when a referent in an utterance is vague or ambiguous. The request is made by using an appropriate question word ("qué?", "cómo", "dónde?") to question some part of the previous utterance. The types of constructions which lead to a specification request are often constructions with pronominal noun phrases, or zero-subject constructions, where the specification effected is that the pronominal element is replaced by a noun or noun phrase. Following are examples of specification requests occurring after constructions with pronominal elements:

- | | | | | |
|------|----|--------------------|----|----------------------|
| 105. | K. | éshes a papita. | K. | that's a bottle. |
| | M. | cuál es la papita? | M. | which is the bottle? |
| | | [K01] | | |
| 106. | K. | uno. | K. | one. |
| | M. | ... un qué? [K03] | M. | ... one what? |
| 107. | K. | míyalo. | K. | look at it. |
| | M. | qué? [K05] | M. | what? |

108. K. acá que di- [/] acá K. here what does it sa-
 qué dice? [/] here what does it say?
 M. dónde? [K08] M. where?
109. M. ahí está guardadita. M. it's put away there.
 K. nónde? [K05] K. where?

The following request that the referents of a zero subject be specified:

110. K. ahí está. K. there (it) is.
 M. quién está? [K04] M. who's there?
111. K. qué es? K. what is (it)?
 M. qué es qué? [K05] M. what is what?

A specification request may question a previous noun or noun phrase. In this case it requests that the noun phrase be further specified by providing additional descriptive material or by indicating the referent.

112. K. #2.3 oy- [/] oyo la K. #2.3 I h- [/] hear the
 señora. woman.
 M. qué señora? [K08] M. which woman?
113. K. qué está haciendo el K. what's the baby doing to
 bebé a [/] al [/] to Mickey?
 Mickey?
 M. ... cuál bebé? [K10] M. ... which baby?
114. M. saque algunas M. take a few thingies.
 cositas.
 K. qué cositas? [K08] K. what thingies.
115. M. las sacamos, o M. do we take them out,
 miramos las or do we look at the
 mariposas?
 K. cuál mariposas? K. which butterflies?

[K09]

A particular subset of this type of question is when the question requests that a descriptive "de + NP" phrase be provided.

- | | | | |
|---------|---------------------|----|--------------------|
| 116. M. | ése es el castillo. | M. | that's the castle. |
| K. | de qué? [K08] | K. | of what? |
| 117. M. | es un librito. | M. | it's a book. |
| K. | de qué? [K10] | K. | of what? |

Examples like 116 and 117 which require a descriptive "de + NP" are primarily a child strategy and sometimes are hard to process by the mother as is shown in the following examples:

- | | | | |
|---------|--------------------|----|----------------------|
| 118. K. | qué te molesto? | K. | what bothered you? |
| M. | una mosca. | M. | a fly. |
| K. | de qué? | K. | of what? |
| M. | a mí. [K08] | M. | me. |
| 119. M. | numeritos. | M. | numbers. |
| K. | de qué [/] de qué? | K. | of what [/] of what? |
| K. | de qué? | K. | of what? |
| M. | de +... | M. | of +... |
| K. | de qué? | K. | of what? |
| M. | numeritos del: | M. | the numbers of the: |
| | disquito. [K08] | | record. |

In 118 the mother simply ignores the question which cannot be semantically interpreted and replies as if the child had asked a different question "a qué (quién) ?", "what or whom did the fly bother". In 119, where the child is asking about counter numbers on the tape recorder, the mother is unsure of

what answer to give, as is shown by the hesitation markers in her replies. The "de qué?" (of what?) specification question seems to be appropriate only with particular semantic and syntactic classes of nouns such as "picture" nouns, for example as in 117 above or in 120 below, or when the specification being requested is something like location, provenance or "belonging"ness.

- | | | | |
|---------|-------------------|----|---------------------|
| 120. K. | ... ama miya! | K. | ... mommy look! |
| M. | ... qué son esos? | M. | ... what are those? |
| M. | dibujitos de qué? | M. | drawings of what? |
| K. | ujitos. [K03] | K. | drawings. |

As was mentioned previously, this strategy seems to be primarily used by the child. There are only two instances by the mother of which that in example 120 is one.

b) The request for specification is sometimes used to request the speaker of the utterance to fill in or specify a missing surface form where the appropriate slot for that form can be assumed to occur in underlying structure, as for example a direct object noun phrase in a sentence with a transitive verb or an indirect object noun phrase in a clause with a three-place predicate. Also included here are place specification for verbs of location and of movement and there is one instance of a time specification request following a past tense verb. Other analyses may prefer to include these last two kinds of requests under requests for elaboration or

expansion rather than specification. In this analysis, a distinction is made between, for example, requesting a place specification where the verb is a verb of motion or location from other requests that a place or location be named with other types of verbs. The second case, with any verb, would be expansion or elaboration; while the first, with verbs of motion or location, would be considered a specification. Following are examples of requests for specification of a "missing" surface element.

- | | | | |
|---------|--|----|---|
| 121. K. | ves? | K. | see? |
| M. | ...qué? [K01] | M. | ... what? |
| 122. K. | dibuje. | K. | draw. |
| M. | qué dibujo? [K03] | M. | what do I draw? |
| 123. K. | no teye, amá. | K. | don't want (it) mommy. |
| M. | cuál no quiere?
[K03] | M. | don't want which? |
| 124. K. | oyo: # "el [/] el
osito le da
palizas". | K. | I hear: # " the [/]
the little bear gives
a spanking". |
| M. | a quién? [K08] | M. | to who? |
| 125. K. | se jue. | K. | he went. |
| M. | se fue adónde? [K07] | M. | he went where? |
| 126. M. | se fue. | M. | he went. |
| K. | none sta? [K07] | K. | where is he? |
| 127. M. | para que no se
rompa. | M. | so that it doesn't
break. |
| K. | la qué? [K08] | K. | the what? |
| 128. M. | por favor sí Isabel
que ya # casi no me
queda. | M. | please do, Isabel,
because there's almost
no more left. |
| K. | nónde te queda?
[K11] | K. | where is there left? |

129. M. no, los regalamos. M. no, we gave them away.
 K. ... a quién los regalamos? [K13] K. ... we gave them away
 to whom?

The single instance of a time specification request is the following:

130. K. po qué te bu- [//] K. why were you [//] were
 hacistes [//] por you [//] why were you
 qué te hacistes e- a- [//] angry?
 [//] enojada?
 M. cuándo? [K09] M. when?

c) In addition, among requests for specification are questions which ask for the name or identification of objects referred to and for the definition of terms used and not understood.

131. K. ésto. K. this.
 M. qué es? [K02] M. what is it?
132. K. ... amá miya! K. ... mommy look!
 M. oh! qué son? [K03] M. oh! what are they?
133. M. otra. M. another.
 K. # qué es? [K09] K. # what is it?
134. M. mire que bonito! M. look how pretty!
 K. qué son? [K09] K. what are they?

In these four examples the referents are clear to the participants but the questioner requests that a name or designation be supplied for them.

In the following examples the questioner requests that a name or designation be clarified either by definition or by showing examples:

135. K. es un rabito digo. K. it's a [rabito] I say.
 M. un rabito? M. a [rabito]?
 M. qué es éso? M. what is that?
 K. pelo. K. hair.
 K. #2.5 es un pelo. K. #2.5 it's a hair.
 M. ése es un pelo pero M. that's a hair but
 qué es un rabito? what's a rabito?
 [K12]
136. M. son pedacitos de M. they're pieces of skin
 pellejito de la from mommy.
 mamá.
 K. #2.7 qué son? K. #2.7 what are they?
 M. la piel de la M. the skin from mommy's
 espalda de la mamá. back.
 [K08]
137. M. éso es basura. M. that's junk.
 K. #10.1 qué son esas K. #10.1 what are those
 basuras? junks.
 M. son los pedacitos M. they're the pieces we
 que no sirven. [K11] don't need.

d) One final type of request seeks the identification of the speaker of an utterance. In these tapes, these requests occur in role-playing situations when it is unclear if the participant is speaking for herself or acting out a part or speaking for an inanimate object. In adult conversations these have been seen to occur when material is quoted either directly or indirectly. There is only one instance of this:

138. K.	yo quiero que venga el conejito. [role-playing voice]	K. I want the rabbit to come. [role-playing voice]
M.	quién dice?	M. who says that?
K.	la niña. [K13]	K. the girl.

5.1.2. Frequency of occurrence of specification requests

There are three major types of specification requests:
 a) the specification of an item present in the previous utterance, b) the specification of an item missing from the previous utterance although presumably there is a slot for it in underlying structure, c) a request for definition or specification of some term. In addition, there is d) which requires the specification of who is the speaker or source of the utterance. I have kept this last separate because it does not fit easily into any of the other groups; however, there is only one instance of this. The frequency of use of these four types of specification requests is as follows:

Table 8:--Occurrences of requests for specification

TAPES	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	TOTAL
Mother													
a	2	2	4	2	6	4	13	9	8	2	4	13	69
b	2	1	8	1	1	1	5	3	-	-	-	2	24
c	1	2	2	-	2	3	-	-	-	-	5	1	16
d	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
TOTAL	5	5	14	3	9	8	18	12	8	2	9	17	110
TAPES	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	TOTAL
Child													
a					1	-	3	7	2	6	3	11	33
b						1	4	1	-	2	-	7	15
c							2	5	3	1	-	-	11

Other				9	-	1	-	1	11
TOTAL	1	1	9	22	5	10	3	19	70

The "other" category in the child's use corresponds to those specification requests which copy a previous specification request by the mother.

With respect to the mother's use of requests for specification, they are used from the beginning and are used throughout the thirteen tapes. The gaps in use of strategies (b) and (c) in the later tapes may be a result of the child's linguistic development. In some cases, strategy (b) which required the specification of missing elements was used when the child left out some necessary item from the sentence, at the same time the request for a definition (c), often occurred as a result of the child using made up words like "babito", "mobito", "rabito". As the child's words and constructions approximated the standard, there was a decrease in questioning these aspects. With respect to the child, although there are two instances at K05 and K07, she really starts to use specification requests in the later tapes, from K08 on. This is a result of acquisition of WH-questions.

5.2. Specification Confirmations

These specification confirmations are parallel to requests for specification. Using the subdivisions found in requests for specification as a guideline, the following requests for confirmation of a specification can be identified:

a) (M:50/K:43) The specification of a vague or ambiguous element in the original utterance either by substituting a more specific or unambiguous term to designate it or by expanding the original term by the addition of some qualifying word or phrase. Pronouns or zero-subject are replaced by noun phrases, noun phrases are expanded by the addition of adjectives or determiners, possessive phrases or relative clauses and in some cases noun phrases are replaced by deictics presumably accompanied by pointing or other appropriate disambiguating behaviors. Examples of this strategy are the following:

By the mother:

- | | | | | | |
|------|----|--|--|----|--|
| 139. | K. | piyito. | | K. | brush. |
| | M. | cepillito de la mamá? [K01] | | M. | mommy's brush? |
| 140. | K. | #3.5 oto? | | K. | #3.5 another? |
| | M. | otro pedacito? [K01] | | M. | another piece? |
| 141. | K. | hacin #non- [//]
ha- [//] hacen noni. | | K. | go # bed- [//] go-
[//] go beddy-bye. |
| | M. | hace noni el niño? [K03] | | M. | the boy goes beddy-bye? |

142. K. eh, voy a bustayos. K. eh, I'll go get them.
 M. los va a buscar a M. you'll go get the
 los perritos? [K04] doggies?
143. K. a [//] awelita Noni K. g- [//] grandma Noni
 se fue ahí. went there.
 M. en esa bicicleta? M. on that bicycle?
 [K07]
144. K. #8.0 qué le está K. #8.0 what's he doing
 haciendo él a su to his tail?
 cola de él? M. to the # the bear's
 M. a la cola de # el tail?
 oso? [K08]
145. K. #3.4 éstas son para K. #3.4 these are for
 mi. me.
 M. las mariposas? [K11] M. the butterflies?
146. K. có- [//] có- [//] có- K. k- [//] k- [//] k-
 [//] t- [//] t- [//] [//] t- [//] t- [//]
 tómalo todo. take it all.
 M. todo mi lugar? [K13] M. all my place?
147. K. así. K. like this.
 M. más alta? [K13] M. taller?

Example 141 shows the replacing of a zero-subject by a NP. Examples 142, 143, 144, 145 and 147 show the substitution of a pronoun by the appropriate noun phrase in each case (obj "-los" -> "los perritos"; "ahí" -> "en esa bicicleta"; "estas" -> "las mariposas"; and "así" -> "más alta"). Examples 139, 140 and 146 show the expansion of a noun phrase. Example 139 adds a possessive prepositional phrase to the noun in the previous utterance while 140 and 146 add the appropriate noun to nominalized adjectives.

Examples of "expansion" confirmation requests by the child:

- | | | | |
|---------|----------------------|----|-----------------------|
| 148. M. | mira el pelito. | M. | look at the hair. |
| K. | piyitosh? | K. | hairs? |
| K. | mamita? [K01] | K. | mommy? |
| 149. M. | hay que arreglarlo. | M. | it has to be fixed. |
| K. | sí? #2.2 eso ayeyayo | K. | yes? #2.2 that fix |
| | a beyi- [//] e | | a b- [//] the book? |
| | biyito? [K03] | | |
| 150. M. | Koki también sabe. | M. | Koki also knows. |
| K. | esa Toti sabe? [K04] | K. | that Koki knows? |
| 151. M. | #2.1 no cabe. | M. | #2.1 it doesn't fit. |
| K. | ... el caballo no | K. | ... the horse doesn't |
| | cabe? [K07] | | fit? |
| 152. M. | una estatuita. | M. | a little statue. |
| K. | elle [//] del | K. | her [//] of Mickey? |
| | Mickey? [K10] | | |
| 153. M. | porque el es | M. | because he is little. |
| | chiquito. | | |
| K. | el Mickey? [K10] | K. | Mickey? |
| 154. M. | no se ponga un lápiz | M. | don't put a pencil |
| | en la carita. | | on your face. |
| K. | de los chicos? [K11] | K. | the boys'? |
| 155. M. | y así se cortan. | M. | and they're cut like |
| K. | ésas # chiquito se | | this. |
| | cortan? [K11] | K. | those # small they're |
| | | | cut. |

All the strategies that were mentioned above are found in the mother's speech. The child seeks the confirmation of an expansion of a noun phrase in examples 148, 152, and 154, in all of which she adds a possessive noun phrase to the noun and in 150 where she adds a determiner. In 149, 153 and 155

she substitutes a noun phrase for a pronoun and in 151 adds a noun phrase in a zero-subject.

In addition, there is a large group of cases in which a noun phrase in the mother's utterance is replaced by a pronoun, usually a demonstrative, which presumably was accompanied by appropriate pointing gestures although this cannot be verified. There is only one instance of the mother replacing a noun by a demonstrative (156).

- | | | |
|---------|---|---|
| 156. K. | si, más grande lo hacemos. | K. yes, we make it bigger. |
| | K. ... con ésto. | K. ... with this. |
| | M. así? [K13] | M. like this? |
| 157. M. | #2.5 dónde está la carita de la nena? | M. #2.5 where is the girl's face? |
| | K. eya? [K03] | K. her? |
| 158. M. | no: no toque las cosas. | M. no: don't touch the things. |
| | M. mire y va a ver que la luz se prende solita. | M. look and you'll see that the light comes on by itself. |
| | K. #2.0 cuál? | K. #2.0 which? |
| | K. ésto? [K08] | K. this? |
| 159. M. | el Perrito Tulum vive # en # Tulum. | M. the little dog Tulum lives # in # Tulum. |
| | K. #1.9 acá vive? [K08] | K. #1.9 he lives here? |
| 160. M. | hágalo de la otra manera. | M. do it the other way. |
| | K. así? [K13] | K. like this? |
| 161. M. | #1.9 no toque las cositas tampoco. | M. #1.9 no don't touch the little things either. |
| | K. éstas? [K13] | K. these? |

b) (M:10/K:4) The addition of items missing in the surface structure of the original utterance but which are presumed to be present although they may have been left unspecified in the underlying structure, such as for example, the direct object noun phrase for a transitive verb phrase or the indirect object noun phrase in a three-place predicate.

- | | | | | | |
|------|----|----------------------------|--|----|------------------------------|
| 162. | K. | peino. | | K. | I comb. |
| | M. | la peina a la mamá? | | M. | you comb mommy. |
| | | [K01] | | | |
| 163. | K. | payita. | | K. | covered up. |
| | K. | <así> [>] | | K. | <like this> [>] |
| | M. | <tapadita> [<] la mamá? | | M. | <covered up> [<] mommy? |
| | | [K01] | | | |
| 164. | K. | e espemé de Koki. | | K. | [e] I hurt of Koki. |
| | M. | se lastimó la boquita? | | M. | you hurt your mouth? |
| | | [K04] | | | |
| 165. | K. | estaba tocando. | | K. | I was touching. |
| | M. | estaba tocando el fósforo? | | M. | you were touching the match? |
| | | [K08] | | | |

We find similar additions by the child:

- | | | | | | |
|------|----|------------------------------|--|----|------------------------------|
| 166. | M. | el Puki hacía en el pastito. | | M. | Puki made/went on the grass. |
| | K. | pipí? [K05] | | K. | pipi? |
| 167. | M. | para escuchar. | | M. | to listen with. |
| | K. | #1.9 para escuchar yo? [K08] | | K. | #1.9 to listen with me? |

c) (M:2/K:8) The break-down of nouns or verbs which encompass multiple objects or actions as the case may be, into their component parts. For example, "us" may be specified as "you

and me", "all" as "this x and that x ?" and so on. The majority of uses of this strategy are by the child as in the following:

168. M. ... cuando fuimos al Centro.
 K. yo también fui al Cento? [K09] M. ... when we went downtown.
 K. I also went downtown?
169. M. #2.4 primero nos vestimos y después lo buscamos, eh.
 K. #8.9 te viste?
 M. <mmhmm> [>]
 K. <y yo> [<] me visto? [K08] M. #2.4 first we get dressed and then we look for it, eh.
 K. #8.9 you get dressed?
 M. <mmhmm.> [>]
 K. <and I> [<] get dressed?
170. M. ponga todos así.
 K. #3.9 éstos n- [/] no? [K11] M. put all of them like this.
 K. #3.9 these n- [/] no?

We find two cases by the mother which might also be considered in this category:

171. K. hay muchos muchos muchos.
 M. muchos muchos muchos?
 M. ocho? [K04] K. there's many many many.
 M. many many many?
 M. eight?
172. K. #2.3 pon- [/] ehe aquí [//] éstos aquí.
 M. #2.3 éste?
 M. ... o éste? [K07] K. #2.3 pu- [/] this here [//] those here.
 M. #2.3 this?
 M. ... or this?

d) (M:8) A strategy used exclusively by the mother is to seek the confirmation of an identification. Confirming the name provided for an unambiguous referent shown or pointed at by the child.

173. K. mamá miya. K. mommy look.
M. es un Piglet? [K02] M. it's a Piglet?
174. K. ése. K. that.
M. ése es Babito? [K04] M. that is Babito?
175. K. éste. K. this.
M. #3.2 ése es el bebé? M. #3.2 this is the baby?
[K10]
176. K. #2.5 mire. K. #2.5 look.
M. ése: es un rabito? M. that is a [rabito]?
[K12]
177. K. acá. K. here.
M. ése es un conejo M. that is a rabbit
también? [K13] also?

e) (M:2) Finally, two requests require the confirmation of the specification of the speaker when the child is role-playing or speaking for her toys and dolls.

178. K. "por qué estabas K. "why were you shouting
gritando papá?" daddy?"
M. el papá gritaba? M. the daddy was shouting?
[K13]
179. K. "no hay que gritar K. "you shouldn't shout
porque sino te vas a because you're going to
enfermar." get sick."
M. éso le dice el papá? M. the daddy says that?
[K13]

Table 9:--Use of specification confirmation requests

TAPE	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	TOTAL
Mother	7	5	7	5	5	7	6	3	6	4	7	11	73
Child	2	1	2	2	1	5	14	11	2	7	3	5	55

6. OTHER TYPES OF OTHER-INITIATED REPAIRS

In the previous sections, I discussed requests for repetition, requests for confirmation and requests for specification all of which have usually been classed as clarification requests. They all require that the content of what is being queried be all or part of a previous utterance, usually the immediately previous one. In this section, I examine other cases of other-initiated repair which have in common that the content of what is being queried is related to but not made explicit in the content of the previous utterance. What all of these have in common is that what is being queried, the information that is necessary in order to be able to proceed with the interaction, is not some explicit part of the previous utterance but rather something that the interlocutor perceives should have been added to the previous utterance. In some cases what is being queried are implications of or propositions derivable from the previous utterance. The interlocutor wants to ask or have confirmed whether the assumptions that he is making from the speaker's

statements are indeed warranted and also accepted by the speaker. These are requests for elaboration, requests for completion, and a group of miscellaneous discourse-related repairs.

The first category, requests for elaboration, has often been classed among clarification requests, although, as discussed below, problems have been noted in defining it and delimiting what may be considered to enter into this group. In addition, there are requests for completion, when the interlocutor feels that the original speaker has not completed the sentence, or that it is missing information that should be added. Finally, there is a group of miscellaneous queries designed to make sense of the previous utterance(s). These may question whether the speaker is telling the truth, whether assumptions about common knowledge hold or whether some consequences or inferences derivable from the utterance are to be assumed. In some cases a query is designed to question the appropriateness or politeness of an utterance or to elicit politeness routines. Some queries question the logic or congruity of an utterance in the light of previous statements or of contextual evidence.

6.1. Requests for Elaboration

All previous studies on requests for clarification have considered the elaboration category where the clarification request goes beyond what is expressed in the previous utterance. These have proved somewhat problematical to define and to delimit. Requests for elaboration are troublesome for this analysis, as they have been for prior studies, because there is a fine shading separating those which seek the elaboration or expansion of some utterance which has failed to provide sufficient information, and therefore warrants a repair-initiation, from other requests or questions which seek to obtain additional information about some object or event, for example, in order to continue the conversation. Other writers (Garvey 1977, 1979; Christian 1978; Corsaro 1977), noting the difficulty of identifying members of this category, have opted for the following criteria to identify and/or distinguish requests for elaboration which seek to clarify some previous utterance from general continuation questions:

- The question must be contingent on some prior utterance.
- The question cannot add to the meaning of the previous utterance.

Keeping in mind the constraint that a clarification request cannot add new meaning to the conversation, a request for elaboration which goes beyond what is expressed in the previous utterance can then only question meaning which in some way is implicit in the previous utterance although not overtly expressed, or as Garvey says, meaning that is "potentially available" (Garvey 1977, 1979). Garvey suggests that sources for potential selection may be found in the case structure of verbs where of the possible case arguments of a verb only some may have been overtly expressed; those not expressed would be potentially available for further elaboration. Another source might be questioning about the cause, consequences and accompaniments of actions as suggested by Chafe (1972). A third source would be the underlying conditions for speech acts and presuppositions in general, since underlying conditions have been equated with presuppositions. Finally, Garvey considers questions about the mode of discourse, whether something was supposed to be taken "for real" or as "pretend", for example. Christian (1978) also considers ellipsis as a possible source for material to be considered "implicit" and therefore a candidate for elaboration. Christian, however, stresses that not all possible elaborations of a preceding utterance comply with the constraint of not adding meaning. For example, in

the two following exchanges (which are slightly reformulated versions of the ones that she gives),

180. A: she put chapstick on.
 B: where? on her lips?
181. A: let's go out (somewhere).
 B: where? to the movies?

the query to the first example ("on her lips?") would be a case of elaboration since the meaning is not open for negotiation, while in the second example, the query ("to the movies?") introduces new meaning which is open for negotiation in subsequent turns, and therefore this is not a true request for elaboration. Christian suggests that in the first example, the "location" of the action is unstated but unambiguous and also non-negotiable, while in the second the "location" is unspecified and therefore subject to negotiation which will add new meaning. I will maintain that in both cases a "location" is presumed although unstated. In the first example a specific unambiguous location is unstated, possibly because it is redundant. In the second a "location" slot is implicit but unspecified. The potential specification may introduce particular "meaning" but restricted by the meaning specification "location" which is already present or implicit in the utterance.

From the questions found in the data, requests for elaboration are all those requests which base an elaboration on the case structure of verbs, request that reasons or consequences be made explicit, request the confirmation of conclusions drawn from previous utterances and base queries on propositions implicated by the previous utterances. These types are discussed below.

a) Requests for elaboration of elements from the case-structure of preceding verbs. The elaboration could be from a case specific to the case frame of a particular predicate or they can make explicit general case arguments such as time, place or manner, that all utterances are potentially expandable to. All of the preceding may be in the form of WH-questions or may be in the form of Y/N questions in which a completion is given and the speaker of the original utterance is required only to confirm it. One particular form of manner specification is to establish a comparison with something else: "like me?", "like Lucas did?", "like the parrot eats?".

Examples from the mother's speech:

- | | | | |
|---------|----------------------|----|------------------------|
| 182. M. | y Koki qué hace. | M. | and what's Koki doing? |
| K. | jugando. | K. | playing. |
| M. | ... y con qué juega? | M. | ... and what's she |
| | [K12] | | playing with? |
| 183. K. | uno subido ahí? | K. | one up there? |
| M. | sí? | M. | yes? |
| M. | cómo se subio? | M. | how did he get up? |

- | | | | | |
|------|----|---------------------|----|--------------------------|
| | K. | bien. [K07] | K. | well. |
| 184. | K. | da po haor. | K. | give please. |
| | M. | adónde? | M. | where? |
| | K. | acá. [K05] | K. | here. |
| 185. | M. | y el osito va | M. | and the little bear goes |
| | | detrás. | | behind. |
| | K. | #2.1 agarrado. | K. | #2.1 holding on. |
| | M. | ... de la manito? | M. | ... with his hand? |
| | K. | sí. [K08] | K. | yes. |
| 186. | K. | haga una o. | K. | make an "o". |
| | M. | ... en ese librito? | M. | ... in that book? |
| | M. | no, a la mamá no le | M. | no, mommy doesn't like |
| | | gusta hacer os en | | making "o"s in books. |
| | | los libritos. [K03] | | |
| 187. | M. | con la cucharita le | M. | with the spoon I give |
| | | doy el de la tos. | | you the cough one. |
| | K. | con esa cucharita. | K. | with that spoon. |
| | M. | ya? | M. | now? |
| | M. | #2.5 ya le doy? | M. | #2.5 now I give it to |
| | | [K12] | | you? |

A few examples are also found in the child's speech. These are mostly queries about time and place specifications:

- | | | | | |
|------|----|----------------------|----|--------------------------|
| 188. | M. | pero Koki se llevó a | M. | but Koki took the mommy |
| | | la mamá a otro | | to another place, look. |
| | | lugar, mire. | | |
| | K. | ... lejos? [K09] | K. | ... far away? |
| 189. | K. | es del bebito, mamá? | K. | is it the baby's, mommy? |
| | M. | no de usted. | M. | no yours. |
| | K. | ... cuando yo era | K. | ... when I was little? |
| | | chiquitita? [K12] | | |
| 190. | M. | bueno usted tenga | M. | well you hold this while |
| | | ésto mientras la | | mommy dances with daddy. |
| | | mamá baila con el | | |
| | | papá. | | |

- | | | | |
|---------|--|----|---|
| K. | pa- [//] anóne?
[K07] | K. | [pa-] [//] where? |
| 191. M. | lo llevamos para que
se tire al [//] en
la basura. | M. | we take it to throw
it on [//] in the trash. |
| K. | ónde va a tirar? | K. | where you going to
throw? |
| M. | #2.9 en la basura.
[K11] | M. | #2.9 in the trash. |

or establishing a manner comparison:

- | | | | |
|---------|-----------------------------|----|-------------------------------|
| 192. K. | mire co- [//] cómo
hace? | K. | look ho- [//] how
he goes? |
| M. | así. | M. | like this. |
| K. | #4.3 porqué? | K. | #4.3 why? |
| K. | como yo? [K10] | K. | like me? |

b) Requests for statements of reasons or purposes of utterances when these help to clarify the intended meaning of the utterance. Again, these may be WH-questions asking (usually) "why?" or a reason may be proposed and the speaker of the original utterance is asked to confirm it.

- | | | | |
|---------|---|----|---|
| 193. K. | Yo tengo mi- [//] as
meyas amarillos.
--- | K. | I have my- [//] the
yellow socks.
--- |
| K. | pero a mí me gustan. | K. | but I like them. |
| M. | le gustan? | M. | you like them? |
| M. | son lindas? [K07] | M. | they're pretty? |
| 194. K. | ése no porque es de
madera. | K. | not that one because
it's wooden. |
| M. | ah. a usted no le
gustan los de
madera? [K13] | M. | ah. you don't like
the wooden ones? |

c) Some utterances allow the derivation of an additional utterance from it either as a presupposition or some type of

implication. This derived utterance may have an unspecified element. A series of requests for elaboration request the specification of this unspecified element. These will be grouped with elaborations rather than with requests for specification because what needs to be specified is not part of the previous utterance but rather is part of a proposition derivable from the previous utterance.

195. Listening with ear-phones to tape-recorder

- | | | | |
|----|---------------------|----|-----------------------|
| K. | #2.6 oy- [/] oyo la | K. | #2.6 I he- [/] I hear |
| | señora. | | the woman. |
| M. | ... qué [/] qué | M. | ... what [/] what was |
| | decía la señora? | | the woman saying? |
| | [K08] | | |

- | | | | |
|---------|-------------------|----|-----------------------|
| 196. K. | ... habas con voz | K. | ... speak with a nice |
| | buena. | | voice. |
| M. | y qué digo? [K09] | M. | and what do I say? |

- | | | | |
|---------|--------------------|----|------------------------|
| 197. K. | esas cucharitas y | K. | those spoons and forks |
| | tenedores son para | | are for me. |
| | mí. | | |
| M. | ... quién los | M. | ... who gave them? |
| | regaló? [K10] | | |

In all of these the originating utterance gives rise to an additional proposition in which some element is unspecified:

I hear the lady -> the lady is saying something
 speak in a nice voice -> say something
 those spoons are for me -> somebody gave/brought them for
 me

All of these queries act as requests for specification of something not present in but derivable from the previous

utterance. There are no examples by the child that fit into this category.

In addition, the questioner may ask whether a presupposition of the originating utterance does in fact hold. There are numerous cases of questioning the existential presupposition. If a person or object *x* is talked about with a definite description the presupposition is that there is such an *x*. This presupposition may be questioned, especially if the interlocutor has some reason for challenging it, or a confirmation of it may be requested:

198. K. wauwau titito baíto. K. little dog # devil
 M. diablito? M. devil?
 M. no, está el M. no, there's a piggy.
 chanchito.
 M. dónde está el M. where is the devil?
 diablito?
 K. #2.5 tatitosh. [K01] K. #2.5 piggies.
199. K. está miyando una K. looking at a cow.
 vaca.
 M. está mirando una M. looking at a cow?
 vaca?
 K. sí. K. yes.
 M. y dónde está la M. and where is the cow?
 vaca? [K04]
200. M. y Sham- [//] Pampú M. and Sham- [//] Pampu
 hace pipí en el pa- goes pipi on the g-
 [//] pastito. [//] grass.
 K. sí? K. yes?
 K. #2.6 enónde está el K. #2.6 where is Pampu?
 Pampú? [K05]
201. K. enónde está la mamá K. where is the mommy #
 # Koki de los [//] Koki of the [//] of
 de honguitos? mushrooms.
 M. no se. M. I don't know.

- | | | | |
|---------|---|----|---|
| M. | cuál es la mamá Koki del honguito? [K09] | M. | which one is the Koki mommy of the little mushroom? |
| 202. K. | {el bebito está en la casa} sí. | K. | {the baby is in the house} yes. |
| M. | y ésta es la casa del bebito ahí adentro? [K05] | M. | and that is the baby's house in there? |

The following is a query by which underlying conditions for a directive seem to be questioned or challenged:

- | | | | |
|---------|----------------------|----|-----------------------|
| 203. K. | #2.7 ameyó. | K. | #2.7 give it to me. |
| M. | dónde lo puso? [K03] | M. | where did you put it? |

d) A group of elaboration queries request the confirmation of conclusions or summing-up of previous statements. For example if the child says "x is dirty.", "y is dirty." and "z is dirty." the mother might sum-up the three previous utterances by asking "all of them are dirty?". In some cases the conclusions are drawn not from what is said but from propositions which are not stated but are "implicated" in some sense by the utterance. The implication may be a true logical implication but often there are cases of practical "real-world" implications, which are not strictly logical. Any utterance may have several implications derivable from it. The content of the query shows us which implication was focused on by the hearer. Following is an example of a "practical" or real-world implication" (the example is a

slightly modified version of an actual exchange from the tapes):

204. A: they're cooking.
B: they're in the kitchen?

Leaving aside the ambiguity of "they're cooking" which is not an issue in this example, common knowledge (at least for the present cultural context) is that "cooking" is usually carried out in the kitchen. The proposition "they are in the kitchen" is in some sense implicated by the previous utterance. Since this is a practical rather than a logical implication there is a certain amount of doubt about its validity which leads to the query being made.

Another example is the following:

205. A: those shoes, I bought them
B: you had money?

Here B's question is based on the meaning and implications of "buying". "Buying" has been analyzed as a complex predicate which has as its meaning that someone gives money to another person and receives goods from that person. It implies that the buyer had money. In the above example B queries whether this in fact holds. This seems to be a case of questioning a logical implication.

In some cases the request for elaboration queries or requests the confirmation of propositions which are necessary in order to establish the relevance or connectedness of utterances. For example:

206. K. the cows aren't coming.
 I closed the door to the room.
 M. the cows are in the room?

The query in this case helps to supply an intermediate proposition, which is needed to relate Koki's two statements and see them as related. M uses her knowledge about discourse and language as well as her knowledge of the context to determine what question to ask. Following are examples of summing up or drawing conclusions.

207. M. qué hacen los niños? M. what are the children doing?
 K. ...hacendo papita. K. ... making a bottle.
 M. ...están en la cocina? [K04] M. ... they're in the kitchen?
208. M. todos tienen la patita enfermita? M. they all have a sick foot?
 K. sí. K. yes.
 M. les duele? M. it hurts them?
 K. sí. [K07] K. yes.
209. K. mamá esas a compó y- K. mommy those were bought
 [/] yo. by m- [/] me.
 M. ... usted tenía platita? [K07] M. ... you had money?

The first two are requests for confirmation of real-life implications. If the children are making food then they are in the kitchen -> are they in the kitchen?. If they have a hurt/sick foot then it must hurt -> does it hurt? The third case is similar to the other two although the implication is derivable from the semantics of the verb "to buy", as has been discussed above.

The following examples show a process of "summing up" using several utterances as input.

210. K. éshe n- [/] éshe e K. that d- [/] that is
nushio. dirty.
K. éshe nushio. K. that dirty.
K. #4.5 éshe [//] atá K. #4.5 that [//] here
nino [//] nushio. nice [//] dirty.
K. #6.5 éshe a [//] e K. #6.5 that [a] [//] is
nushio. dirty.
M. #1.9 otro nusio? M. #1.9 another dirty (one)?
M. todos son nusios? M. they're all dirty?
[K01] M. and Grandpa Chocho?
211. M. y el abuelito K. he's not there.
Chocho? K. Cuba [a] Grandpa
K. no stá. Chocho.
K. Puya a abuyito M. ... and Grandma Noni?
Toto.
M. ... y la abuelita K. in Cuba Grandma Noni.
Noni? M. ah. and Annie?
K. a Puya abuyita Noni. K. Annie.
M. ah. y Ani? K. Cuba.
K. Ani. M. they're all in Cuba?
K. Puya.
M. todos están en Cuba? K. she'd gone to the mud.
[K02]
212. K. se había ido al ---
lodo. K. and she got all dirty
--- the- [//] in black.

- K. y se ensució todo el- [//] de nega. ---
 --- and f- [//] and she had [chup] and fell into the water.
- K. y se [//] y tenía chup y se cayó al agua. M. hah! and she got covered in mud?
- M. hah! y se llenó de lodo? [K13]

Examples 210 and 211 are two of several examples in which the mother requests the confirmation of a conclusion drawn from summing up several previous utterances. Example 212 is also a summing up although slightly more involved. Koki, in telling this story makes the statements that a little girl "had gone to where the mud was" and "had gotten all black"; the story goes on and then she says "she went 'chup' and fell into the water". Her mother, drawing on the statements made at the beginning of the story and attempting to tie it all together, then says "and she got covered with mud" proposing this as a consequence of the action of falling into the water which has not previously been mentioned except insofar as "the mud" mentioned at the beginning lets one assume that there is water around.

There is one example of summing up by the child:

213. Separating cards into pairs.

- M. ahí hay otro. M. there's another one.
 K. hay dos? [K12] K. there's two.

e) Related to the above strategy, there is also questioning or querying based on sometimes unwarranted assumptions derived from a negative sentence. When a speaker makes a negative statement, very often the other speaker will follow with an elaboration query on some positive version of that statement. For example:

214. A: the drawing isn't there.
B: where is it?
A: I don't think there is any drawing.
215. A: the doll isn't here.
B: where is it?
A: I don't know.

The first example, drawn from an actual case, is strange because A is accountable for the presupposition of existence for "the drawing" by her use of the definite article, which she then goes on to negate by her subsequent utterance. In both examples the questioner makes the assumption that since the speaker can give information about where the doll and drawing are not, that the speaker can also give information about where the doll and or drawing are. This assumption is unwarranted as both answers by A show. A can look around and know that the doll isn't there and still not know where the doll is. Another type of incorrect assumption is related to problems with negative scope:

216. A: mommy's green hair!
 B: mommy doesn't have green hair.
 A: who has? / A: what color hair does she have?
 B: nobody. / B: mommy has black hair.

The above is a modification of an occurring example. A, in this case the child, makes a wrong predication about her mother's hair, calling it green. B, the mother, denies that this is true. From the negative statement the assumption could be made that if mother doesn't have green hair she has other-than-green hair. This is in fact what the child does. However, the child could have been mistaken about the scope of the negative and interpreted it as not-mommy has green hair which then makes the query "who has?" a warranted request for elaboration. Following are some examples:

- | | | | |
|---------|----------------------|----|------------------------------|
| 217. K. | no, acá no se ponen. | K. | no, you don't put them here. |
| M. | en dónde se ponen? | M. | where do you put them? |
| K. | se ponen. [K13] | K. | you put them. |
-
- | | | | |
|------|----------------------------------|----|---|
| 218. | Singing song "el oso y el osito" | | |
| M. | el osito llora? | M. | the little bear cries? |
| K. | no. | K. | no. |
| K. | no [//] no llora el osito. | K. | the little bear doesn't [//] doesn't cry. |
| M. | quién llora? | M. | who cries? |
| K. | yo lloro. [K08] | K. | I cry. |

The first example shows a warranted conclusion drawn from a negative statement. If the speaker makes a prohibition by

saying that something should not be placed in a particular place it is plausible to assume that she can then elaborate about where things should go. This is not necessary in any logical sense, but plausible in terms of practical reasoning. The mother draws this conclusion in the first example. In the second example the mother seems to exploit the possible scope ambiguity of the negative to ask her question which draws on an unwarranted conclusion. After the child tells a story about two bears, the mother's first question is a request for elaboration of the ending: "Does the little bear cry (at the end)?" K answers in the negative "No llora el osito" (= Neg(llora osito)). This is unambiguous, however the mother chooses to interpret the answer unwarrantedly as (llora neg(osito)) which then makes her further question acceptable, and which gets the conversation to continue along a different tack.

Following are some examples from the child:

- | | | |
|---------|---|--|
| 219. M. | no tiene pelito verde la mamá. | M. mommy doesn't have green hair. |
| K. | co [//] qué tiene peli- [//] # qué tiene? | K. ho- [//] what hair do- [//] # what does she have? |
| M. | pelito +... [K08] | M. hair (that is) +... |
| 220. M. | no se meta ese pepelito [*] en la boca. | M. don't put that paper in your mouth. |
| M. | es plástico. | M. it's plastic. |
| M. | no se puede comer. | M. it can't be eaten. |
| | | K. which f- [//] # which |

- K. cuál c- [/] # cuál food can be eaten?
comidita se puede
comer?
M. lo que es comida. M. that which is food.
M. no lo que es M. not what is paper.
papelito. [K10]
K. ugly record.
221. K. disquito feo. M. and we won't put it on.
M. y no lo vamos a
poner.
K. qué vas a p- [//]
cuáles [//] cuál K. what are you g- [//]
disquito vas a which ones [//] which
poner? [K12] record are you going to
put on?

In 219, the child correctly interprets that the scope of the negative involves the qualifier "green" which allows the conclusion "M has not-green hair" which then permits the question "What (color) hair does she have?". In example 220, the mother prohibits the child from eating a plastic bag and says "x can't be eaten". The child then asks a warranted question "what can be eaten?". The child's question is unwarranted in other respects however. In the originating utterance the mother has left the direct object of comer unspecified but it can be recovered from the previous context as either "ese papelito" or "ese plástico"; however, from the child's question the child seems to have filled in this slot by "(esa comida) no se puede comer" and then requests to know, "cuál comida se puede comer?" The mother's answer seems to address just this by saying "you can eat food, not paper." Finally, example 221 is a case of drawing the wrong

scope of the negative. K pointing at a cassette qualifies it as "ugly" (disquito feo) on the basis of this the mother states/suggests that they shouldn't then put it on (neg(put on ugly record)), the child however seems to interpret this as (put on (neg(ugly record))) and then requests the mother to elaborate on what record is going to be put on. This is exactly parallel to M's example in 218 above.

f) There is one strategy which may not be valid for adult-adult speech but is found in the data, mostly used by the child although the mother also uses this from time to time. It is unclear at this point whether these should be included among repair techniques or whether these questions simply request additional information. It seems that, however unwarrantedly, the questioner feels that the information requested should have been given.

The elaboration request requires that information about a group or set be completed. This is similar to what was discussed in (d). When some predication is made about some member of a group or set there may be additional questions about what happens to the other members of the group or set, regardless of whether these others had been mentioned previously in the discourse. Statements about "grandma" may lead to elaboration queries about "grandpa"; statements about "the baby" may lead to queries about "the mommy"; statements

about "the little x" may lead to queries about "the big x", and so on.

222. M. el papá la alza o le pega?
 K. el papá me alza.
 M. y la mamá?
 K. y la mamá también me quiere. [K08]
- M. daddy picks you up or spansks you?
 K. daddy picks me up.
 M. and mommy?
 K. and mommy also loves me.
223. K. pero Mickey no me conoce.
 M. y usted lo conoce a Mickey? [K10]
- K. but Mickey doesn't know me.
 M. and you know Mickey?
224. K. a [/] awelita Noni se fue ahí?
 M. en esa bicicleta?
 K. sí.
 M. y el abuelilto Chocho en qué va? [K07]
- K. G- [/] Grandma Noni went there?
 M. on that bicycle?
 K. yes.
 M. and what does Grandpa Chocho go on?
225. M. #3.4 cómalo que Isabel se los hizo a los dos para usted.
 K. #2.0 y para tú? [K10]
- M. #3.4 eat it because Isabel made both of them for you.
 K. #2.0 and for you?
226. M. póngalo ahí ... al lado de la cama del papá.
 K. #7.7 allá no?
 M. acá no hay lugar. [K10]
- M. put it there ... next to daddy's bed.
 K. #7.7 not over there?
 M. over here there's no room.
227. M. por qué tiene # ganas de bajar.
 K. #3.1 y subir otra vez? [K10]
- M. because he feels like # going down.
 K. #3.1 and then go up again?

One subset of queries about sets or groups of objects is a strategy that establishes or tests the range of objects to which a predication applies. When a predication, description or qualification is made about some referent, very often the interlocutor will go into a series of questions to test or establish to what other similar objects that description or predication applies. Often the purpose is to try to ascertain on what basis the predication was made, or what criteria were used. Examples are the following:

228. M. no se dibuja en los libritos. M. you don't draw in books
 M. ya le dijo la mamá. M. mommy already told you.
 K. e aquí? [K03] K. and here?

229. M. en ese papelito se hacen "os". M. on that paper you make "os"
 --- ---
 K. e otro pateyito? K. and another paper?
 M. no los otros papelitos son de la mamá. [K03] M. no the other papers are mommy's.

230. Sorting out different shapes:

M. ... acá es la casita de elle. M. ... here is her little house.
 K. # también elle hh vive ahí? K. # she also hh lives there?
 M. no. M. no.
 K. # ellos viven ahí también? K. # they also live there?
 M. no. [K09] M. no.

Not all of the types of elaboration request mentioned here might be accepted by other researchers, especially if they

adhere to stating that a clarification request cannot add meaning. The crux is in defining what is meant by adding meaning or how much addition of meaning is accepted. Most requests for confirmation of specification that have been accepted by previous researchers do add meaning. That is, any referent may be described and talked about in different ways, and, although co-referential, these different expressions are not equal in meaning. For example, a speaker, say the child, may say the utterance in A with an unspecified referring expression "here". Her interlocutor, the mother, may respond in a number of ways requesting a specification for the expression "here":

231. A: I want to draw here.
 B: a. On that page?
 b. In mommy's new book?
 c. In that silly book?

All of these are co-referential and it will be assumed that they could equally truthfully be applied to the same referent, although (b) and (c) might not be held by the speaker at the same time. The description in (a) could be considered neutral and objective, and A would not know upon hearing it whether B will agree or disagree with the action proposed. A response like the one in (b), on the other hand, cues the hearer to a disagreement and possibly a prohibition. The mother establishes her rights towards the object

mentioned and at the same time qualifies it in a way that would lead us to expect that she would not like the child to scribble all over it. In (c) the mother distances herself from the object mentioned and it would not be surprising if she were to agree to let the child draw in the book unless something intervenes such as general adult qualms about children drawing in books no matter how silly or useless they might be. All of these ways of referring to the referent of "here" do add meaning to the conversation, meaning which may be taken up by one of the speakers for continuing the conversation. For example, referring to a new book might lead to questions about when it was acquired, who gave it, did the mother buy it, where did she buy it, was the child along, who else was with her, and so on. However, all of the researchers who have examined clarification requests would include queries such as those in a-c as requests for specification confirmation.

I have adhered to the constraint that all clarification requests must be contingent upon a previous utterance. They cannot be queries which initiate exchanges. In addition, specification requests seek the specification of either an element present in the surface structure or of a necessary element which may be assumed to be present in the underlying structure, although absent from the surface. Requests for

elaboration seek the specification of optional elements, for example, those case arguments that might show up as time, place, reason, purpose or manner adjuncts in any sentence. They may also request the specification of unspecified elements in propositions implicated by the originating utterance. Finally, they would request the corroboration of presuppositions, assumptions and implications of the originating utterance, or the corroboration of conclusions to be drawn from examining the originating utterance in its contextual placement.

6.2. Requests for Completion

A number of other-initiated repairs seem to suggest that the speaker has not given all the information that is necessary to continue the conversation or has omitted relevant information. Requests for completion ask for the addition of some material which was left out of the previous utterance. Thus, the source utterance seems to be considered as in some way having violated Grice's conversational maxim of Quantity (Grice 1975).

There are different instances in which a speaker may be seen as needing to provide additional information. These are the following:

a) Requests for completion of routines or events with a pre-specified format known to participants, or expected by one of the participants to be known to the other.

232. M. #5.0 cómo le va a decir al papá?
 K. po seyó.
 M. ... por favor qué? [K02]
- M. #5.0 what are you going to say to daddy?
 K. please.
 M. ... please what?
233. K. vamos a hacer un caminito ahora.
 K. porque ya no vamos a hacer más casitas.
 M. no?
 K. porque se puso de noche. ["story" intonation]
 M. y entonces? [K13]
- K. we're going to make a little road now.
 K. because now we're not making any more houses.
 M. no?
 K. because it became night. ["story" intonation]
 M. and then?
234. K. ... y yo lloro y yo diso "upa".
 M. y cuando usted dice "upa" y cuando llora qué pasa?
 K. qué pasa?
 M. qué le dice el papá?
 K. qué me dice el papá? [K08]
- K. ... and I cry and I say "up".
 M. and when you say "up" and when you cry what happens?
 K. what happens?
 M. what does daddy say to you?
 K. what does daddy say to me?

b) Requests for completion of "known" scripts (stories, songs) which are known by both participants. Some of these may be well-known nursery rhymes or fairy-tales. Others may be family-specific but they have a known or shared script nevertheless.

235. Singing "El oso y el osito".
- | | | | |
|----|---|----|---|
| K. | el oso chiquitito no quiere caminar. | K. | the little bear doesn't want to walk. |
| K. | porque está cansado. | K. | because he's tired. |
| M. | <u>y entonces?</u> | M. | and then? |
| K. | entonces el oso # grande está enojado o o. | K. | and then the big # bear is angry y y. |
| M. | <u>y entonces?</u> | M. | and then? |
| K. | en- [//] y [/] y entonces qué? | K. | th- [//] and [/] and then what? |
| M. | <u>el oso está enojado y qué le hace al osito chiquitito?</u> | M. | the bear is angry and what does he do to the little bear? |
| K. | qué le hace? [K08] | K. | what does he do? |
236. The child recalls the story of when the mother's wallet had been stolen.
- | | | | |
|----|--|----|--|
| K. | pero ya no me puede comprar mis # vitaminas. | K. | but then you can't buy me my # vitamins. |
| M. | no le pude comprar vitaminas, no. | M. | I couldn't buy you vitamins, no. |
| K. | no. pero ibas al centro? | K. | no. but you were going downtown? |
| M. | iba al centro. | M. | I was going downtown. |
| K. | <u>a comprar qué?</u> | K. | to buy what? |
| M. | vitaminas. [K13] | M. | vitamins. |
237. The mother asks the child to recall a song that she had made up previously, "the one about the dead cow":
- | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|-----|--|
| K. | v a c a m u e r t a . [singing] | K. | dead cow. [singing] |
| M. | [laughs] | M. | [laughs] |
| M. | a ver, cómo era? | M. | let's see, how did it go? |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| K. | #2.6 el de la vaca muerta. [singing] | K. | #2.6 the one about the dead cow. [singing] |
| M. | #2.1 y? | M. | #2.1 and? |
| K. | #3.1 qué [2]? | K. | #3.1 what [2]? |
| M. | <u>qué más?</u> | M. | what else? |
| K. | el de la vaca muerta. [singing] [K13] | K. | the one about the dead cow. [singing] |

238. Playing with little toy dolls. Mother sings a line from a children's song known to both:
- | | | | |
|----|---|----|--|
| M. | cuántos conejos en sus cuevas! | M. | how many rabbits in their warrens! |
| M. | los conejos en sus cuevas miran llover. [singing] | M. | the rabbits in their warrens watch how it rains. [singing] |
- A long dialogue (approx. 32 utterances) intervenes as they play with the dolls which are "rabbits".
- | | | | |
|----|---|----|---|
| K. | se ponen en su cueva. | K. | they go into their warren. |
| K. | y se ponen [*] a [//] y pu- [//] y se ponen a llover. | K. | and they start to [//] and st- [//] and they start to rain. |
| M. | se pone a llover? | M. | it starts to rain? |
| K. | sí. | K. | yes. |
| K. | <u>y qué- [//] los conejos qué hacen?</u> | K. | and what- [//] the rabbits what do they do? |
| M. | se meten en sus cuevas para no mojarse. | M. | they go into their warrens so they won't get wet. |
| K. | no. [K13] | K. | no. |

c) Requests for completion of something mentioned or pre-figured in an utterance (e.g., "I will make three points" or "On the one hand ..."). Utterances like the preceding hold the speaker accountable for completing three points, for speaking about the other hand, and so on. and may be followed by a completion or elaboration request should he fail to do so. There are only a couple of cases of something similar to this involving not a metalinguistic statement like those mentioned above but a factual quantification:

239. M. y cuántos perritos tenía el señor Rafael?
- | | | | |
|----|---|----|--|
| M. | y cuántos perritos tenía el señor Rafael? | M. | and how many doggies did Mister Rafael have? |
| K. | ... diez. | K. | ... ten. |
| M. | diez perritos? | M. | ten doggies? |
| K. | sí. | K. | yes. |
| | | M. | and all- [//] and what |

- M. y to- [//] y cómo se llamaban?
 M. Tutito, Rafael, Lunerito, qué más?
 [K13]
240. M. {ésos se los compró} la abuelita Sadye y el papá y la mamá.
 F: sí?
 M. #4.1 ésos se los compró la abuelita Sadye.
 K. con la mamá?
 M. con la mamá.
 M. fuimos con la mamá y la abuelita Sadye y le compramos los zapatitos.
 K. e- [//] el papá?
 M. el papá no fue.
 [K07]
- were they called?
 M. Tutito, Rafael, Lunerito, what else?
 M. {those were bought by} Grandma Sadye and daddy and mommy.
 F: yes?
 M. #4.1 those were bought by Grandma Sadye.
 K. with mommy?
 M. with mommy.
 M. we went with mommy and Grandma Sadye and bought you those shoes.
 K. d- [//] daddy?
 M. daddy didn't go.

The child in this last example seems to notice that M's originating utterance mentioned three people and in her subsequent one she left some out, so she inquires about each of them.

6.3. Various Types of Other-Initiated Repairs

Finally there are miscellaneous queries which attempt to obtain information to make sense of the interaction by questioning whether expected conditions for carrying on the conversation hold at that particular time including questions pertaining to some of Grice's maxims. For example, whether the speaker is being sincere in her last utterance, whether the interlocutor can indeed hear what has been said, or

whether the interlocutor knows or remembers something which hitherto has been assumed as common knowledge. Also included here are queries which question or challenge statements that seem to pose an incongruity in the context of known facts (previous discourse or contextual evidence).

There are two examples which question whether what has been said is true or not. One of them is a direct questioning of the truth: "Es verdad?" (Is it true?). The other (242) is indirect. It expresses the mother's doubt that what the child says could have occurred.

241. K. #2.6 quiero hacer K. #2.6 I want to go poo-poo
 popó ... e la ... in the potty.
 peyeyita. M. come here.
 M. venga. M. #6.4 is that true?
 M. #6.4 es verdad?
 [K04]
242. Child has bad cough and raspy voice. M gives child her medicine.
 K. ya no tengo mucha K. now I don't have
 tos. [voice still a bad cough. [voice
 raspy] still raspy]
 M. ya no? M. now you don't?
 M. porque ésto lo cura? M. because this cured it?
 M. tán <rápido> [>]? M. that <quickly> [>]?
 K. <mamá> [<]. [soft K. <mommy> [<]. [soft
 voice] [K12] voice]

In this last example, at the child's statement that immediately after taking a spoonful of medicine she is cured the mother expresses doubts. She stacks a series of

confirmation questions of which the last "So quickly?" expresses her doubts.

Some queries seem to function as challenges to statements by questioning whether what is stated does in fact hold in the light of what was stated in previous discourse or what is apparent in the context. They also cast doubt on the truth of what is stated but their function seems to be to challenge the congruity rather than question the veracity of something:

- | | | | |
|---------|---|----|--|
| 243. K. | no está e nino. | K. | the baby isn't there. |
| M. | no está el niño? | M. | the baby isn't there? |
| M. | y éste quién es? | M. | and who is this? |
| K. | e e ninosh! [K01] | K. | it's the baby! |
| 244. K. | #1.7 hay más? | K. | #1.7 are there more? |
| M. | no. | M. | no. |
| K. | esos todos qué son? | K. | what are all of those? |
| M. | esos son los chiquitos. [K13] | M. | those are the little ones. |
| 245. K. | cuál es la Pandita, a ver. | K. | which one is Pandita, let's see. |
| M. | era uno, el que tiene Itsamná. | M. | it was one, the one Itsamna has. |
| | --- | | --- |
| K. | a verla? | K. | let's see it? |
| M. | cómo a verla? | M. | how let's see it? |
| M. | está en la casa de Itsamná. | M. | it's at Itsamna's house. |
| K. | pero quiero que vamos a la casa de Itsamná mañana y la vemos. [K13] | K. | but I want that we go to Itsamna's house tomorrow and we see it. |

Examples 243 and 244 show uses of the same strategy once by the mother and once by the child. In each case the speaker

states that something is not present whereupon the other questions the statement by asking the original speaker to identify a present object which seems to fit the description (and would therefore contradict the statement just made). At this point, the speaker can either acknowledge that the object is indeed present (243), or show that the objects pointed out do not fit the description, at least in that speaker's mind (244). In this last example, the objects being talked about are building blocks. The child points to the existence of additional blocks even though the mother had said there weren't any. The mother then describes these as "the small ones" indicating that she had assumed they were only considering big ones.

In the final example (245) the problem arises because of the child's request to be shown a doggie they're talking about just after the mother says that they had given it away. The form of the request "a verla" (let's see, show me) usually is used for immediate compliance. The mother questions this request and this results in the child self-correcting it in the next utterance: "I want to go to Itsamna's house tomorrow and see it".

There are different questions by the mother about whether or not expected discourse conditions hold. The questions are like the following:

246. M. #2.5 me oye? [K05] M. #2.5 do you hear me?
247. M. sabe? [K05] M. you know?
248. M. usted lo sabía no? [K13] M. you knew (that) didn't
you?
249. M. no se acuerda del Oso? [K13] M. you don't remember
Oso?
250. M. se acuerda cuando fuimos a buscar la
carta? [K13] M. do you remember when
we went to pick up
the letter?

Through these questions the mother checks or confirms that the child indeed does (or does not) know or remember a topic or situation, and can then either proceed to its discussion or introduce additional relevant information if the presumed assumptions of mutual knowledge do not hold.

CHAPTER VI
REPAIR SEQUENCES

In the previous chapter other-initiated repairs were examined, and various types were identified in terms of their relationship to the originating utterance: requests for repetition, for specification, for confirmation, for elaboration and for completion being the most frequent. Each of these types were discussed individually and the frequencies of their occurrence in the data were also examined, tracing their development from the moment of first appearance in the transcripts. However, missing from the discussion so far is an examination of how these strategies are used in context within repair sequences and how the sequence is completed by a response. In this section I will look at the repair sequence and its placement within the conversation. The structure of the sequence will be examined and special attention will be given to the turns following the repair initiation. For this analysis I have selected a subset of tapes (K01, K04, K08 and K13) as discussed in Chapter III.

The term "sequence" is used to refer to stretches of talk of two or more turns that are in some way perceived as being about the same thing. For example, the cases that will be discussed are "repairing" or "clarificatory" sequences. Some sequences may be formed of one exchange, others may be formed by a series of exchanges, and they may be part of larger structures. When speaking about the repair sequence I will be referring to those sequences of talk that follow upon the emergence of some problem that is addressed by an other-initiated repair. Self-repairs are not an integral part of the repair sequence; they may, but need not be present. However, many clarification sequences start after an originating utterance with self-repairs since the occurrence of hesitations and self-repairs often signals to the listener that the utterance that is being produced is in some way problematic.

1. STRUCTURE OF THE REPAIR SEQUENCE

A repair sequence is initiated when the addressee of an utterance perceives in that utterance a problem for the continuation of the conversation. The recipient of the troublesome utterance then has to communicate to his interlocutor both that there is a problem and where that problem resides. It is then up to the speaker of the original utterance to make the necessary corrections.

The fact that there is a problem for continuing the conversation will be communicated as soon as a problem is perceived. This means that there will be a preference for other-initiated repairs to refer back to the immediately preceding utterance as the location of the problem and for other-initiated repairs to take the form of clarification requests contingent upon this utterance. As has been shown through the discussion in Chapter V, clarification requests and related queries are designed to indicate that there is a problem, to indicate with varying degrees of specification the location of the problem, and to indicate the type of response that would prove satisfactory.

If a repair-initiator is to be issued upon realization that there is a problem, it is expected that it will follow immediately after the problem utterance, and in the majority of cases this is so. In a few cases, however, the problem does not reside in an utterance as such, but in incongruities that may arise when that utterance is examined against earlier or later discourse. That is, the hearer will have made certain inferences and held certain assumptions allowed by the discourse so far, which may then be contradicted by a new utterance. The hearer will then have to retrace his steps in the interpretation of the discourse so far to the point where the first incorrect assumption was made. An

analogous problem has been presented in interpreting sentences like the following (Bever 1970):

The horse raced round the track fell down.

A person hearing or reading such a sentence is liable to interpret the verb "raced" as an active verb until the continuation of the sentence shows that there is a problem with that interpretation. The hearer then has to re-process the sentence to give the correct "passive" derivation for the verb "raced". In this data, I have found some instances in which the repair sequence has to retrace a number of previous turns in the conversation to where the first wrong assumption was made. However, in general, the problematic utterance seems to be the immediately preceding one. I will take this as the canonical case in the discussion that follows.

Repair sequences have been called side- or parenthetical sequences because they deviate from the main topic of the conversation to talk about the ongoing conversation itself. The hearer communicates that some point in the previous utterance needs clarification and will shape his contribution so that the source of the problem can be identified by the original speaker, who then has the option of correcting his original utterance. Once the problem has been corrected, the appropriate clarifications have been made or ambiguities

resolved, then the conversation can continue and the original topic can be resumed.

Repair-initiating utterances are such that they trace back to a previous utterance in the discourse and call forward a following response. They thus have retrospective and prospective characteristics. Although they are the first indicators in the discourse that a problem has been perceived, the utterance which contains the problem should also be considered as part of the repair sequence since the repair initiator is contingent upon it. Some researchers have suggested that the utterance following the repair-response should also be included in the sequence, since it often shows a completion marker of some sort before moving on to other topics or resuming the conversation (Cherry 1979, Gallagher 1981).

1.1. Sequence Patterns

The other-initiated repair sequence can first be identified upon the occurrence of a query contingent upon a prior utterance which seeks to resolve or clarify some conversational problem which is posed by that utterance. The sequence then continues with a response to the question posed (e.g., a clarification, explanation and so on) and then the conversation is resumed from the point of interruption. As mentioned by Garvey (1977, 1979), the type of query used will

indicate what is problematic in the originating utterance ("selectivity function") and will also indicate what the expected appropriate response would be ("determining function"). The canonical shape of the repair sequence is the following:

"Canonical" pattern

- 1 A: Originating utterance
- 2 B: Repair request
- 3 A: Response to 2
- 4 B: Response to or acknowledgement of 1

Following an utterance which presents some problem for the listener, a repair sequence is initiated by a repair request (request for clarification, for elaboration, for specification, and so on). The speaker of the original utterance responds to the repair request, usually by providing the requested information. The conversation is then resumed from the point of interruption with the listener providing the appropriate response to the originating utterance. The following examples show instances of the canonical repair sequence taken from the actual data.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1. K. ayós.
K. cerré [?] la perta #
(d)e la peza.
M. cerró la p [//]
puerta de la pieza?
K. sí.
M. muy bien. [K04]</p> | <p>K. good-bye.
K. I closed [?] the door #
of the room.
M. you closed the d- [//]
door of the room.
K. yes.
M. very good.</p> |
| <p>2. K. y poqué ya se
acabó és [//] éso?</p> | <p>K. and why did th- [//]
that stop?</p> |

M. el aire?	M. the air?
K. sí.	K. yes.
M. se apagó un ratito porque estaba haciendo mucho ruido, y no podíamos oír nada. [K08]	M. it stopped for a while because it was making too much noise and we couldn't hear anything.

Although in the data there are numerous examples of this pattern, actual sequences may vary from the canonical pattern in a variety of ways. Different patterns emerge depending on the form of the originating utterance, what type of act is produced following the repair request and also with respect to who speaks in turns 3 and 4.

One type of variation results from the form of the originating utterance in 1. The canonical pattern would be as follows:

A: 1.Question?	1.Statement.	1.Request.
B:	2.Repair-initiating query?	
A:	3.Response to 2.	
B: 4.Answer.	4.Rejoinder.	4.Compliance.

As mentioned in the literature, however, questions, directives and statements set up different continuation expectations (Edmondson 1981, Garvey 1977, McTear 1985). For example, questions and directives seem to convey a strong expectation of a response from the interlocutor B, so that following the repair sequence B is expected to resume the conversation with an appropriate response to A's utterance in

1. Statements, on the other hand, do not set up such strong response expectations so that following the repair sequence the conversation may be resumed with either A or B initiating a new sequence, even switching to a new topic and there may never be an acknowledgement of (1) by B. The type of response occurring at (4) thus varies according to the force of the originating utterance, and there is a possibility of (4) being omitted when the originating utterance is a statement.

Another possible pattern mentioned in the literature (Cherry 1979, Gallagher 1981) is that speaker B may insert additional turns after the response to the clarification request and before resuming the conversation. These additional turns take the form of an acknowledgement and/or evaluation of A's response.

- 1 A: Originating utterance
- 2 B: Repair request
- 3 A: Response to 2
- 4 B: Acknowledgement or evaluation of 3
- 5 B: Response to or acknowledgement of 1

Both Garvey and Gallagher suggest that the acknowledgement or evaluation of the response to the repair request should also be included as part of the clarification sequence. In this data, I have found few instances which are clear cases of

evaluation of the repair response (3). These seem to occur more in the early tapes. The following is one example:

- 3.
- | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| K. haciendo papita. | K. making a bottle. |
| M. haciendo papita? | M. making a bottle? |
| K. sí. | K. yes. |
| M. están en la cocina? | M. they're in the kitchen? |
| K. sí. | K. yes. |
| M. <u>aha</u> . | M. aha. |
| K. <hacen> [?] [<] la papita. | K. <they make> [?] the bottle. |
| K. atí sí (e)stá cerrado.[K04] | K. like this it's closed. |

The mother acknowledges the child's response ("aha") and then the child continues, first by reformulating her original utterance and then starting a new topic. Although an acknowledgement of the response is a possible move in the sequence and often occurs, I have found, however, that it is difficult at times to decide whether an acknowledgement such as the "aha" above should be counted as a response to the child's answer or to the originating utterance. However, for the interactants this distinction may be less important than the fact that an acknowledgement has occurred allowing the conversation to resume.

One thing that is noticeable in many sequences with repair requests is that the request often goes unanswered and patterns like the following occur:

- 1 A: Originating utterance
- 2 B: Repair request?
- 3 B: Response to or acknowledgement of 1

or

- 1 A: Originating utterance
- 2 B: Repair request?
- 3 A: Continuation or new topic

Many of these unanswered questions are found in the early tapes where the child may not yet have acquired appropriate responding behaviors. However, it seems to be the case that when the question is a confirmation question requiring a yes-no response, unless there is disagreement, answering is not compulsory. The confirmation request seems to be used for purposes of verifying or checking that there are no problems so far. A principle of "tell me only if I'm wrong" seems to operate, so that often after making a repair request for confirmation, speaker B will simply respond to the originating utterance and thus resume the conversation without seeming to expect a reply or speaker A will continue without responding to the question if the response is affirmative. I will call this the "verification" pattern:

"Verification" pattern

- 1 A: Originating utterance
- 2 B: Repair request (YN-question, confirmation)
- 3 B: (Response to or acknowledgement of 1)
- 4 A/B: New Initiation

sequences initiated by repair requests turn into sequences that follow what I am calling "modelling" and "stepping-stone" patterns as described below.

The mother through her repair request may provide for the child a model for her original utterance, particularly in the early tapes when the child's syntactic constructions still differ markedly from adult constructions. For example, in cases where the repair request at 2 is a confirmation request which repeats the child's utterance, the child often reinstates the originating utterance as a response, but models the new utterance taking into account whatever reformulations the mother might have effected in her "repetition". This may go on for a number of repetitions, often receiving additional modelling from the other.

"Modelling" pattern

- 1 A: Originating utterance
- 2 B: Repair request which reformulates OU?
- 3 A: Reinstatement of OU (OU2)
- 4 B: (Acknowledgement or evaluation of 3)
- 5 B: (Response to originating utterance)

Here the child's response at turn (3) is modelled after the mother's previous utterance. Following the sequence, either speaker may continue either with a follow-up of the topic introduced or with the introduction of a new topic.

Following are examples of sequences where the "modelling" pattern occurs:

- 8.
- | | |
|--|-----------------------|
| K. #2.5 <u>éshe e(s) a titín.</u> | K. that's a titin. |
| M. <u>ése es el tintín?</u> | M. that's the tintin? |
| K. <u>éshe esh el titín.</u> | K. that's the titin. |
| M. aha. | M. aha. |
| K. <u>éshe (e)s al titín.</u>
[K01] | K. that's a titin. |
- 9.
- | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| K. #4.8 payita? | K. #4.8 covered up? |
| M. <u>tapadito el mono?</u> | M. the monkey covered up? |
| K. <u>payita mono?</u> | K. covered up monkey? |
| K. ota payi- [/] <u>payita?</u> | K. [ota] cov- [/] covered up? |
| K. <u>mono?</u> [K01] | K. monkey? |
- 10.
- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| K. ese (e)s atí? | K. that's like this? |
| K. ese (e)s a patito? | K. that's [a] duckie? |
| M. <u>eso le pone a (e)l patito?</u> | M. that you put on the duckie? |
| K. <u>pono ese a patito?</u> | K. I put that on duckie? |
| M. aha. [K01] | M. aha. |
- 11.
- | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| K. #2.1 pu- [//] peino. | K. #2.1 cu- [//] comb. |
| M. <pei-> [>] +/. | M. <co-> [>] +/. |
| K. <peino> [<]. | K. <comb> [<]. |
| M. <u>la peina a la mamá?</u> | M. you comb mommy? |
| K. <u>peina mamá.</u> | K. comb mommy. |
| M. muy bien! [K01] | M. very good! |

The mother in her "repetition" of the child's utterance may reformulate it adding morphological elements left out by the child (example 8) or she may expand the utterance adding missing arguments for example (examples 9, 10, and 11). The child then uses the mother's utterance as a model to reformulate her original utterance. This reformulated utterance becomes the "good" version from which the conversation can proceed.

A similar situation occurs when the child follows the mother's question with an expansion of her original utterance. In the previous pattern discussed, the mother uses the confirmation request to reformulate or expand the child's utterance. In this pattern, it is the child who expands following a confirmation question from the mother. I am calling this the "stepping-stone" pattern since the child seems to wait for a repetition by the mother which confirms her previous utterance to "step up" from there and add to the construction.

"Stepping-stone" Pattern

- 1 A: Originating utterance
- 2 B: Repair request
- 3 A: Expansion of OU (OU2)
- 4 B: Response to OU2

Examples of this pattern are almost all from K01 as in the following cases:

12.

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| K. #5.2 <u>no peye?</u> | K. #5.2 can't? |
| M. no puede? | M. can't? |
| K. n- [/] <u>no peye eyayo?</u> | K. c- [/] can't close it? |
| M. no puede abrirlo? | M. can't open it? |
| M. a ver? | M. let's see? |
| M. ahí está. [K01] | M. there it is. |

13.

- | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| K. #2.0 <u>ese sí e (l)o</u>
<u>pono?</u> | K. #2.0 that yes I put on
(him). |
| M. le va a poner? | M. you'll put it on him? |
| K. <u>pono ese # e(n) piyito?</u> | K. put this # on hair? |
| M. le pone eso en el
pelito? | M. you put that on his
hair? |
| K. sí. | K. yes. |
| K. <u>oto?</u> | K. another? |

M. otro?	M. another?
M. a ver?	M. let's see?
K. <u>oto e(n) piyito?</u>	K. another on hair?
M. otro en el pelito?	M. another on the hair?
K. oh, miya e(l) piyito!	K. oh, look at the hair!
[K01]	

The child seems to wait for her mother to repeat the utterance and thus confirm that the child's utterance was understood so far, and then she steps up from there into a longer more complex construction.

In both of these sequences, "modelling" and "stepping-stone", the mother's utterance seems to be attended to but the clarification request as such is not really responded to. However, when the mother's request for confirmation requires a disconfirming response, then the child does respond to the request.

Pomerantz (1978, 1984) has noted that in conversation there is a preference for agreement. This "agreement" does not reside in sharing the same points of view, but rather in how conversation is handled. Speakers will frame their contributions in ways that will make their interlocutors agree with them rather than disagree. In the case of confirmation questions, Pomerantz's observations are proven correct: the overwhelming majority of the questions are confirmed. There are however instances where one of the speakers, usually the mother, makes a wrong "guess" about

what the other said. The wrong "guess" will receive a disconfirming response.

Questions that often are disconfirmed are those that have been called specific requests for confirmation. As discussed in Chapter V, these often seem to be issued when the hearer is really not sure of what the other said, and therefore is likely to be wrong in her guess as in the following example:

14.

K. ése setaíta.	K. that seated.
K. éshe <seta e> [?] [//]	K. that <sit e> [?] [//]
<e seta e> [?] [//]	<e seat e> [?] [//]
tayita [//] te- [//]	seated [//] wa- [//]
tere tayita.	(I) want seated.
M. <u>tayitas</u> ?	M. [tayitas]?
K. <ése> [>] +/.	K. that [>] +/.
M. <u>rayitas</u> [<]?	M. stripes?
K. #4.5 <ése se a tayitas>	K. #4.5 <that's a seated>
[?]	[?].
K. así.	K. like this.
K. <a seto> [?]. [K01]	K. <I seat> [?].

Here the mother's utterances ("tayitas", "rayitas") are two attempts to guess at what the child said. The fact that there are two successive guesses indicates that the mother does not know for certain what it was that the child said. Following these wrong guesses by the mother, the child proceeds to repeat her original utterance, which seems to be some version of "sentadita" (to be seated).

In general, the conversational pattern for disconfirmations is the canonical form. However, disagreeing

responses seem to require that additional information be given. When the disconfirming response is a "No", the speaker will often add another utterance. This utterance will reformulate the OU, will provide an explanation or will give additional information. In the case of confirming responses, a minimal form is often sufficient. It seems that even in the early tapes the child differentiates between confirming and disconfirming responses, and provides the minimal-form answer only for confirming responses. When a disconfirmation is required the child uses three strategies: she repeats her OU; she attempts to reformulate or rephrase her OU; she rejects the mother's utterance by saying "no". In the early tapes her most frequent response to a wrong guess by the mother is to repeat her original utterance. In some cases, as in example 14 above, she may attempt to rephrase it (se a tayita, a seto). In later tapes, a disconfirmation may be in the form of a rejection: "no". However, when she disconfirms a guess by the mother by saying "no", she will often provide additional information in the form of an explanation or some sort of supporting move (examples 17 a, b). While responses which confirm the mother's previous question do not seem to require additional information, even if the answer is a "no" as long as the "no"

signals agreement with a previous negative question (examples 17a,b, and 18a, b).

15.

K. éshe atito?	K. that [atito]?
M. ese patito?	M. that ducky?
K. eye e atito.	K. she e [atito].
K. #1_3 éshe atito.	K. #1.3 that [atito].
M. #1_7 rotito?	M. #1.7 broken?
K. #4_5 ese atito. [K01]	K. #4.5 that atito.

16a.

K. #12_1 <no s> [//] pero ya no se pendo la luces.	K. #12.1 <it d-> [//] but it didn't come on the lights.
M. no se prendió las luces?	M. it didn't come on the lights ?
K. no. [K08]	K. no.

16b.

K. éso no.	K. that one no.
F. #1_9 no?	F. #1.9 no?
K. no. [K08]	K. no.

17a.

M. el osito llora?	M. the bear cries?
K. no.	K. no.
K. no [//] no llora el osito. [K08]	K. doesn't [//] doesn't cry the bear.

17b.

M. el papá gritaba?	M. the dady shouted?
K. no .	K. no.
K. la niña hwe. [K13]	K. it was the little girl.

18a.

K. pono ése # e(n) piyito?	K. put that # on hair?
M. le pone éso en el pelito ?	M. you put that on the hair?
K. sí. [K01]	K. yes.

18b.

- | | |
|---|---|
| K. #2_6 éste [//] ésta ya
está fea . | K. #2.6 this [//] this one
is yucky now. |
| M. (es)tá fea ? | M. it's yucky? |
| K. sí. [K08] | K. yes. |

The child seems to have differentiated confirming from disconfirming responses, and uses different strategies for each.

A final pattern occurs when the mother rejects or disagrees with the child's originating utterance. Here the mother seems to use the repair request as a rhetorical device to highlight the fact that the previous utterance is put into question. She then proceeds to reject this utterance. The pattern is the following:

"Rejecting" pattern

- 1 A: Originating utterance
- 2 B: Repair request (often "specific" (SRR, SRC))
- 3 B: Rejection or correction of OU

19.

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| K. #6.5 eshe a [//] # e(s)
nusio. | K. #6.5 that a [//] # is
dirty. |
| M. #1.9 otro nusio? | M. #1.9 another dirty
(one)? |
| M. <u>todos son nusios?</u> | M. all are dirty? |
| M. <u>ya están limpitos.</u>
[K01] | M. they're clean now. |

20.

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|
| K. miya poino. | K. look (I) comb. |
| M. <u>peino?</u> | M. (I) comb? |
| M. <u>ese es un broche.</u> [K01] | M. that's a hair-clip. |

Some researchers have excluded repair requests of this type from clarification requests (cf. Christian 1980). I believe however that, as was mentioned in Chapter V, this is a case where the speaker "exploits" (using Grice's terminology (Grice 1975)) both the form and function of clarification requests. She indicates that there is a problem with the previous utterance and indicates by the form that the request takes, where the problem resides. However, she then proceeds to an other-repair instead of allowing the child to self-repair.

There are two instances of the child using this pattern to reject an interlocutor's utterance. Both of them are from K13. One of them occurs in a role-play sequence where the child's interlocutor is imaginary.

21.

K. #4.2 voy a hacer a pi a pa.	K. #4.2 gonna go [a pi a pa].
K. #2.0 ha:a:m.	K. #2.0 ha:a:m.
K. +" es un papá?	K. "it's a daddy?"
K. +" es verde?	K. "it's green?"
K. +" no me parece.	K. "I don't think so."
M. 0 [!= laughs].	M. 0 [!= laughs].
K. dice Lucas +". [K13]	K. Lucas says.

Rhetorical uses such as the above seem to be later acquisitions and may be used first in play situations, where the child practices language, as in the example above from K13.

The minimal organizational structure for repair sequences can be modified in other ways. As both Garvey (1977, 1979) and McTear (1985) mention, there is the possibility of recursion, so that there may be sequences with multiple repair requests before the conversation is resumed. These will be discussed in section 2.

1.2. Review of the Occurrence of Patterns

The "canonical" pattern occurs throughout the tapes. It is not very frequent in its pure form. Rather there are instances of the other different "patterns" that have been described.

A second pattern is the "modelling" pattern. There are two separate aspects to this pattern. One aspect is what the questioner does by expanding or reformulating a previous utterance. This "expansion" seems to be done throughout the tapes by the mother, and the child in later tapes also expands the mother's elliptical utterances or "expands" some non-verbal response. The second aspect of this pattern is the "modelling" response where the interlocutor, always the child in this case, repeats the adult model. This occurs frequently in K01. In K04 there is one instance, and there are two in K08, one play instance and one real one, but repetitions of this type decrease as the child's

constructions become more similar to the adult's. The "stepping-stone" pattern seems also to occur only in the early tapes.

The "verification" pattern persists throughout. However, in the later tapes there are fewer cases of confirmation requests that get no answer at all. What is found is an increase in minimal-form replies, either "Yes" or "No" according to the polarity of the question. In the early tapes "disconfirming" responses are differentiated from "confirming" ones in that the child reiterates the original utterance if the mother's "guess" is incorrect. In the later tapes, when the mother gives an incorrect "guess" the child will reject it by using "no" and will then often proceed to give supporting information.

The "rejecting" pattern is one particular use of the clarification question. The clarification request is often made in a tone of surprise or disbelief, and then the speaker, usually the mother, proceeds to respond to the originating utterance with a rejection or challenge.

The section that follows reviews sequences with multiple clarification questions. Some of these occur in a row as "stacked" requests within a single turn (Garvey 1979); others occur "chained" in successive request/response exchanges. As

will be seen, the patterns that have been discussed in this section recur in sequences with multiple repair requests.

2. SEQUENCES WITH MULTIPLE REPAIR REQUESTS

Previous studies for clarification requests have pointed out that sometimes multiple questions are asked within a sequence. Clarification requests can be "stacked" (Garvey 1979, Cherry 1979) in a turn; and clarification exchanges of successive requests and responses can be "chained" together in longer sequences. In both cases, it has been found that the questions of the repair requests are ordered relative to each other from more general to more specific. There may also be numerous instances of one same question in a "reiterative" pattern. In addition, there is a "negotiating" pattern where each interlocutor attempts to get the other one to respond to whatever question is being asked. These four patterns (stacking, chaining, reiterating and negotiating) will be discussed below.

2.1. Multiple Questions Within a Turn: "Stacking" Pattern

In some cases speaker B can "stack" together a series of requests without waiting for a reply from A, where each successive request serves to more completely specify the expected response to resolve the problems of the originating utterance.

I will first examine turns containing double questions. On the basis of the patterns found in these turns I will look at those turns with more than two questions (usually three questions, but four questions in one instance each for M and K).

"Stacking" pattern

- 1 A: Originating utterance
- 2 B: Repair request 1 (WH-question, information)
- 3 B: Repair request 2 (YN-question, confirmation)
- 4 A: Response to 3
- 5 B: Response to or acknowledgement of 1

22.

- K. ta bayando una vaca. K. is [bayando]¹ a cow.
 M. qué [2]? M. what [2]?
 M. está bailando una vaca? M. is dancing a cow?
 K. está mirando una vaca. K. is looking at a cow.
 [K04]

In the case of these successive repair requests, it seems that the second one provides a tentative answer for the first one. Thus speaker B only expects an answer to the final repair request. Garvey (1979) reports that when multiple clarification requests are used, the successive questions are ordered from more general to more specific relative to each other. Other researchers (Christian and Tripp 1978, McTear 1985) have also found this ordering. Given the

¹"Bayando" which is interpreted by the mother as "bailando" (to dance), is probably an attempt by the child to say "viendo" (to look at) which she then changes in her repaired utterance to "mirando" (to look at).

classification discussed in Chapter V (Section 2), the following sequential restrictions apply. A WH-query usually precedes a yes/no request for confirmation and the request for confirmation is to be taken as a tentative or possible answer to the previous request for information. That is, speaker B asks a question and guesses at what the possible answer will be. Speaker A then has to confirm or disconfirm this guess. Within each group, non-specific requests for repetition (NRR) precede requests for specification (RSpec) and for elaboration (RElab), and non-specific requests for confirmation (NRC) precede requests to confirm a specification (CSpec) or confirm and elaboration (CElab). Specific requests for repetition (SRR) and for confirmation (SRC) seem to occur when particular problems are perceived. As such, they often occur by themselves; however, if used with a non-specific request they would follow the more general non-specific request.

Table 1:--Classification of clarification requests

RELATION TO OU:	Repeat		Expand	
	Whole	Part	Specify	Elaborate
QUESTION TYPES				
WH-Q(query)	NRR	SRR	RSpec	RElab
YN-Q (confirm)	NRC	SRC	CSpec	CElab

Tables 2 and 3 show instances of sequences with multiple stacked questions:

Table 2:--Double questions within a single turn

	K01	K04	K08	K13	TOTAL
MOTHER	9	6	5	3	23
KOKI	3	4	6	1	14

Table 3:--More than two questions within single turn

	K01	K04	K08	K13	TOTAL
MOTHER	4	-	-	1	5
KOKI	2	-	-	-	2

I was principally interested in finding out whether these sequences follow the pattern reported in the literature in terms of going from more general to more specific questions.

In M's double questions, 17/23 of the sequences follow the pattern of going from more general to more specific as indicated in Table 4 below.

Table 4:--Mother's double questions

	K01	K04	K08	K13	TOTAL
FOLLOW PATTERN	5	5	4	3	17
DO NOT FOLLOW PATTERN	4	1	1	-	6

The stacked questions that do follow the expected pattern show a number of differences between them. Five of these

sequences (5/17, 29%) have a WH-query followed by a confirmation question as in example 22 above and the examples below:

23.

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| K. <ése a> [/] ése a tititosh. | K. <that a> [/] that a little. |
| M. <u>ése qué?</u> | M. that's what? |
| M. <u>chiquititos?</u> | M. little? |
| K. tititosh piyitosh mamitash. | K. little brush mommy. |
| M. gracias. [K01] | M. thank you. |

24.

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| K. #1.9 ése mío. | K. #1.9 that mine. |
| M. cuál es? | M. which is? |
| M. éste tuyo? | M. this one yours? |
| M. no ése es el micrófono de la mamá. | M. no that's mommy's microphone. |
| [K04] | |

As can be seen, the second question is the presentation of a possible answer to the first question. However in most of these cases (3/5, 60%), the proposed answer is rejected or disconfirmed.

There are eight cases (8/17, 47%) of a non-specific confirmation request followed by a WH-query:

5 = NRC - Req.Elaboration

3 = NRC - Req.Specification

These seek a continuation or elaboration of the topic or the repair of an apparent incongruity.

25.

- | | |
|-------------------|----------------------|
| M. #2.1 y Grover? | M. #2.1 and Grover? |
| K. no está Vove? | K. not there Grover? |

- | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| M. <u>no está Grover?</u> | M. <u>not there Grover?</u> |
| M. <u>dónde está Grover?</u> | M. <u>where is Grover?</u> |
| K. no está Vove? | K. not there Grover? |
| M. dónde está? | M. where is he? |
| K. no está Vove? | K. not there Grover? |
| M. y lo va ir a
buscar? [K01] | M. and will you look for
him? |
- 26.
- | | |
|---|---|
| K. ése no. | K. that no. |
| M. <u>ése no?</u> | M. <u>that no?</u> |
| M. <u>y con ése qué va a
hacer?</u> | M. <u>and what are you going
to do with that one?</u> |
| K. #2.0 yo voy a #
tenelo nomás. [K08] | K. #2.0 I'm just going to
hold it. |
- 27.
- | | |
|--|--|
| K. #2.8 <ahora sí> [//]
ahora sí los abrimos. | K. #2.8 <now we> [//] now we
open them. |
| M. <u>los abrimos?</u> | M. <u>we open them?</u> |
| M. <u>y qué hacemos?</u> | M. <u>and what do we do?</u> |
| K. #2.6 <qué hacemos> [?]?
[K13] | K. #2.6 what do we do? |
- 28.
- | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| M. #2.0 y su niño? | M. #2.0 and your baby? |
| K. no está e(l) nino. | K. not there baby. |
| M. no está el niño? | M. <u>not there baby?</u> |
| M. y éste, quién es? | M. <u>and who is this?</u> |
| K. e(s) e(l) ninosh. | K. it's the baby. |
| M. es el niño. [K01] | M. it's the baby. |

There are two cases of a confirmation question followed by another confirmation question. Both also follow the pattern of more general to more specific. In this case both are:

2 = NRC - Confirm Specification

- 29.
- | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| K. #6.5 éshe a [//] # e(s)
nusio. | K. #6.5 that a [//] # is
dirty. |
| M. #1.9 otro nusio? | M. #1.9 another dirty? |
| M. todos son nusios? | M. they're all dirty? |
| M. ya están limpios.
[K01] | M. they're clean now. |

30.

M. #1.4 cómo sabe usted
que hay ocho?
K. hay muchos, muchos,
muchos.
M. muchos muchos muchos?
M. ocho?
K. mmhmm. [K04]

M. #1.4 how do you know
there are eight?
K. there's many, many,
many.
M. many many many?
M. eight?
K. mmhmm.

Finally there are two cases of a WH-query followed by another WH-query. These have the same force, but in each case the second more fully specifies the intent of the first. That is, the first is just the question word. The second question expands this question word by adding what the speaker is questioning.

31.

M. escucha algo?
K. #2.3 sí.
M. qué?
M. qué escucha?
K. #1.9 escucha el osito
el osito. [K08]

M. do you hear anything?
K. #2.3 yes.
M. what?
M. what do you hear?
K. #1.9 I hear the little
bear the little bear.

32.

K. yo quería ir contigo.
M. y qué pasó?
K. #2.3 y [//] para ver el
muchacho malo.
K. pa [//] a vello pa(ra)
[//] pa(ra) que no te lo
robe.
M. porqué?
M. usted qué le iba a
decir?
K. que no se [//] te lo
robe e [//] e [//] e [//]
tu dinero. [K13]

K. I wanted to go with you.
M. and what happened?
K. #2.3 and [//] to see the
bad guy.
K. so [//] to see him so
[//] so he wouldn't steal
it.
M. why?
M. what were you going to
say?
K. that he doesn't [//]
doesn't steal e [//] e
[//] e [//] your money.

There are six double question sequences that do not follow the pattern. In five of these, the second question seems to provide a paraphrase of the first. Both questions have the same force but are expressed in two different ways, as in examples 33 and 34. The sixth instance of double question sequences perhaps should not be included in this group. It is an alternative question which is performed in two subsequent utterances. The child answers yes to both parts of the alternative questions (example 35).

33.

K. #2.5 oh, potó!	K. #2.5 oh, poded!
M. [laughs].	M. [laughs].
M. explotó?	M. exploded?
M. se rompió?	M. it broke?
K. #4.7 <to pede> [?] a potó?	K. #4.7 [to pede] [?] it poded?
K. oh potó! [K01]	K. oh poded!

34.

K. #2.1 <ya va> [?] oyer.	K. #2.1 <now go> [?] hear.
M. no se.	M. I don't know.
M. qué hay para oir?	M. what can be heard?
M. #2.7 qué oye usted?	M. #2.7 what do you hear?
K. #2.2 no oye. [K08]	K. #2.2 don't hear.

35.

K. ta [/] ta la mamá de (e)l babito.	K. is [/] is babito's mommy.
M. sí?	M. yes?
K. <sí> [>].	K. <yes> [>].
M. <de (e)l> [<] bebe babito?	M. <of> [<] baby babito?
K. <s-> [>] +/.	K. <y-> [>] +/.
M. <quién> [<] es babito?	M. <who> [<] is babito?
K. ése.	K. that one.
M. ése es babito?	M. that is babito?
K. sí.	K. yes.

M. se llama babito?	M. is his name babito?
M. #1.2 o es bebito [!!!]?	M. #1.2 or is it "bebito"?
K. #1.2 sí. [K04]	K. #1.2 yes.

M's Stacked sequences with more than two questions

M's multiple questions can be seen as combinations of the above double patterns and in all of them the questioning seems to go towards more specific questions. The third question, however, is usually a reiteration of the previous one in which a paraphrase or an expansion is given.

36.

K. <potó> [<].	K. <poded> [<].
M. qué [2]?	M. what [2]?
M. se rompió?	M. it broke?
M. (ex)plotó?	M. exploded?
K. #4.5 es mi eplotó.	K. #4.4 is me epoded.
M. se rompió. [K01]	M. it broke.

37.

M. canta: +...	M. she sings +...
M. +, pinpón es un muñeco todo de cartón?	M. Pinpón is a doll made out of cardboard?
K. #2.0 no.	K. #2.0 no.
M. no?	M. no?
M. y qué canta?	M. and what does she sing?
M. #7.0 cuál canta? [K13]	M. #7.0 which one does she sing?

Table 5 below shows occurrences of Koki's multiple question sequences, most of which are instances of double questions.

Table 5:--Koki's multiple question sequences

	K01	K04	K08	K13	TOTAL
FOLLOW PATTERN	-	1	2	1	4
DO NOT FOLLOW PATTERN	3	3	4	-	10

Four of the child sequences follow the adult pattern. There are two cases of WH-queries going to confirmation requests. In both cases a request for specification is followed by a request to confirm a specification proposal. Here the second question proposes a possible answer to the first. In both cases the response gets rejected. There is one case of a minimal form confirmation query ("Yes?") followed by a confirmation request of the full form of the original utterance, and the final case is of a role-play instance in which the child enacts both roles.

38.

M. ensucian todo el piso.	M. they dirty all the
K. sí?	floor.
K. #3.1 ensucian piso?	K. yes?
K. ensu [/] ensucian todo	K. #3.1 they dirty all the
e(1) piso?	floor?
M. mmhmm. [K04]	M. mmhmm.

39.

M. mire <y> [?] va a ver	M. look and you'll see that
que la luz se prende	the light comes on by
solita.	itself.
K. #2.0 cuál?	K. #2.0 which?
K. ésto?	K. this one?

M. no, ésto.	M. no, this one.
K. #5.2 ésto?	K. #5.2 this one?
M. no.	M. no.
K. qué?	K. what?
K. ésto?	K. this one?
M. no, <ése tampoco> [?].	M. no, not that one.
[K08]	

40.

K. #4.2 voy a hacer e pi a pa.	K. #4.2 gonna go [e pi a pa].
K. #2.0 ha:a:m.	K. #2.0 ha:a:m.
K. +" es un papá?	K. "it's a daddy?"
K. +" es verde?	K. "it's green?"
K. +" no me parece. [K13]	K. "I don't think so".

The remaining ten instances of Koki's multiple question sequences do not go towards more specific questions. There are reiterations of the same question and paraphrases, as in the following:

41.

M. el perrito Tulum vive # en # Tulum.	M. the doggy Tulum lives # in # Tulum.
K. #1.9 <u>acá</u> vive?	K. #1.9 he lives here?
K. el perrito Tulum, <u>vive</u> <u>acá</u> ?	K. the doggie Tulum lives here?
M. no en estas casitas no pero cerca de estas casitas. [K08]	M. not in these houses but close to these houses.

42.

K. #10.1 <qué es> [/] <qué es est-> [/] qué es ésto acá?	K. #10.1 <what is> [/] <what is th-> [/] what is this here?
M. numeritos.	M. numbers.
K. <u>de qué</u> [/] <u>de qué</u> ?	K. of what [/] of what?
K. <u>de qué</u> ?	K. of what?
M. de: +...	M. of: +...
K. <u>de qué</u> ?	K. of what?
M. numeritos de (e)l: disquito. [K08]	M. the numbers of: the record.

There is one instance in K01 of a multiple question sequence that does not follow the adult pattern. In this there are reiterations, but the later questions do not make the clarification request more specific. The function of these is unclear. This seems to be an instance of the child's "practicing" or maybe playing with forms.

43.

M. y acá está el mono.	M. and here is the monkey.
K. #4.8 payita?	K. #4.8 covered up?
M. tapadito el mono?	M. the monkey covered up?
K. payita mono?	K. monkey covered up?
K. ota payi- [/] payita?	K. [ota] cov- [/] covered up?
K. mono?	K. monkey?
K. #3.2 payita?	K. #3.2 covered up?
K. mono?	K. monkey?
K. oh: tije payito # mono?	K. oh: I said covered up # monkey?
K. #6.9 payita mono. [K01]	K. #6.9 covered up monkey.

In summary, overwhelmingly M's multiple-question sequences follow what has been noticed in the literature of going to more specific questions thus guiding more and more closely what response is expected.

In the child's early multiple-question sequences this is not found. The sequence that occurs seems to function as practice rather than serving the function of a "real" request for clarification.

2.2. Chained Clarification Exchanges Within Sequences

The second type of pattern for multiple question sequences is that of "chained" clarification exchanges (Demetras, Post and Snow 1986). These are successive Question/Answer exchanges in which clarification is sought. Successive queries follow the same general patterns that have been seen for within-turn multiple queries.

"Chaining" pattern

- 1 A: Originating utterance
- 2 B: Repair request a
- 3 A: Response to 2
- 4 B: Repair request b
- 5 A: Response to 4
-
- 6 B: Repair request n
- 7 A: Response to 6
- 8 B: Response to or acknowledgement of 1

The possibility of successive requests for clarification or explanation has been noted in the literature (Garvey 1975, 1979; Christian 1978, McTear 1985). When a series of clarification requests are stacked like this, ordering restrictions will apply. In terms of the classification discussed in the previous chapter, successive repair requests will go from greater generality to greater specificity, and a request for information at one level will precede a request for confirmation at the same level if both are present (see Table 1). Following are examples of series of requests taken from the data:

- 44.
- K. e ya aíz epotó Toti. - OU
[e the nose broke Koki.]
- M. la nariz la explotó Koki? - NRC
[the nose Koki broke?]
- K. sí.
[yes.]
- M. qué le hizo? - RE
[what did you do to it?]
- K. atí.
[like this.]
- M. se la sacó? - NRC
[you took it off?]
- K. <sí> [>].
[yes.] [K04]
- 45.
- M. [replaces tea on night-table]
- K. #27.4 (es)tán tuto? - RC
[#27.4 is hot?]
- M. mmhmm
[mmhmm.]
- K. sí? - RC (min)
[yes?]
- M. mmhmm.
[mmhmm.]
- K. #6.8 (es)tán tuto? - RC
[#6.8 is hot?]
- M. sí.
[yes.] [K04]
- 46.
- K. no pedo avanzar con estas, esto.
[I can't lift with these, this.]
- M. no puede qué [2]? - SRR
[you can't what?]
- K. no puede avanzar esto.
[I can't lift this.]
- M. levantar? - SRC
[lift?]
- K. no.
[no.]
- K. no pedo.
[I can't.]
- M. no puede levantarlo? - NRC
[you can't lift it?]
- K. no.
[no.] [K04]

The following examples show instances of sequences in which the child uses successive questions following the pattern of proceeding to greater specificity. There are no examples of this in K01, however. In K04 there are a few examples. Here the alternation between questions is between a full-form non-specific request for confirmation (NRC) and a minimal form confirmation request "Yes?" (example 47).

47.

- | | |
|--|--|
| M. porque acá no pueden venir porque ensucian mucho. | M. because here they can't come because they dirty up too much. |
| M. tienen las patitas sucias. | M. they have dirty feet. |
| K. #7.2 <u>eh, no</u> [/] <u>no peen venir atí, e tene</u> [/] # <u>tene patas nushas?</u> | K. #7.2 eh, they c- [/] they can't come here [e] they have [/] # they have dirty feet? |
| M. mmhmm. | M. mmhmm. |
| K. <u>sí?</u> | K. yes? |
| M. sí. [K04] | M. yes. |

Then there is the following which occurs at the end of K04 and for which the transcript does not include the actual form of the mother's originating utterance (which occurs as the tape recorder is being turned on); however, she states that a certain pair of pants can not be worn because they're torn.

48.

- | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| M. xxx | M. xxx |
| K. no [/] no quiere a poner? | K. don't [/] don't want to put on? |
| K. <u>no se puede poner?</u> | K. can't put on? |
| M. no. | M. no. |
| K. <u>está yotita?</u> | K. it's torn? |

- | | |
|---|---|
| M. (e)stá muy rotita. | M. it's very torn. |
| K. <u>sí?</u> | K. yes? |
| K. <no se pone> [/] <u>no se pone <le ajeritos></u> [?]?
[K04] | K. <don't put on> [/] don't put on the holes [?]? |

Here the child goes from a general question that might possible be a NRC to further questions asking for confirmation of possible reasons for the statement.

In the examples that follow it can be seen that the child can use varying questions with greater specificity for each successive one to clarify a previous utterance (or action by M).

49.

- | | |
|--|--|
| K. <u>qué es esto?</u> | K. what is this? |
| M. eso es # algo para ponerse en la oreja. | M. that is # something to put in your ear. |
| M. #4.9 se llama, un auricular. | M. #4.9 it's called, a ear-phone. |
| K. <u>para qué?</u> | K. to what? |
| M. para escuchar. | M. to listen. |
| F. uu:! | F. uu:! |
| K. #1.9 <u>para escuchar yo?</u> | K. #1.9 to listen me? |
| M. mmhmm. | M. mmhmm. |
| K. <u>para escuchar yo?</u> | K. to listen me? |
| M. sí. [K08] | M. yes. |

50.

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| K. muésteme los ## pellejitos. | K. show me the pieces of skin. |
| K. <u>qué son?</u> | K. what are they? |
| M. pellejitos. | M. pieces of skin. |
| K. <u>de qué?</u> | K. of what? |
| M. de la espalda <de la mamá> [?]. [K08] | M. of mommy's back. |

- 51.
- | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| K. #3.5 <u>quién e molestó?</u> | K. #3.5 who bothered you? |
| M. una mosca. | M. a fly. |
| K. <u>de qué?</u> | K. of what? |
| M. a mi. [K08] | M. me. |
- 52.
- | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| M. saque algu [//] uno si quiere. | M. take som- [//] one if you like. |
| K. bueno. | K. okay. |
| K. <qué se> [//] <u>qué te saco?</u> | K. what t- [//] what do I take? |
| M. saque algunas cositas [?]. | M. take some thingies. |
| K. <u>qué cositas?</u> | K. what thingies? |
| K. ya saqué esta cosa. [K08] | K. I took this thing. |

2.3. Reiteration

A third type of multiple question pattern is the "reiterative" pattern. In this the issuer of the request for clarification repeats the same question various times.

"Reiterative" pattern

- 1 A: Originating utterance
- 2 B: Repair request a
- 3 A: No response or inappropriate
- 4 B: Repair request a (+ addition)
- 5 A: Response to 4
- 6 B: Response to or acknowledgement of 1

In some of the child's previous examples there have already been some instances of reiterated questions within the chained sequence (e.g., example 42, 45, 49). Reiteration occurs both in the child and the adult. The adult repeats a question she has made previously either when there is no

uptake or no appropriate uptake, or when the question is elliptical, in which case the second "repetition" will fill out the previously missing elements. In the later tapes the child also shows reiteration when she is not happy with the response. However, in the beginning she reiterates questions repeatedly where the reiteration does not seem to be communicatively functional, and reiterations persist even after indications from the mother that no further answers can be given. Some of these questions are uninterpretable according to adult norms because, although their form is that of a question the function is hard to determine.

53.

M. y mire pato!	M. and look duck!
M. mire el pato allá!	M. look the duck there!
K. pato allá.	K. duck there.
K. #2.1 pato allá!	K. #2.1 duck there!
K. mira pato ahí.	K. look duck here.
K. <u>no a pato?</u>	K. no [a] duck?
K. <u>allá?</u>	K. there?
K. <miya> [>] +/.	K. <look> [>] +/.
M. <el pato> [<].	M. <the duck> [<].
K. <u>el pato allá?</u>	K. the duck there?
M. aha. [K01]	M. aha.

In this sequence, following an initial utterance by the mother "Mire el pato allá.", the child repeats the fragment "pato allá" successively with varying intonations. These may or may not be intended to be requests for confirmation, although their content and placement make them possible candidates and the mother responds to them as if they were

requesting a response. In this particular instance one could hazard a guess that the child is having some problem either with the segmentation of "pato allá" which she repeats as a unit in various utterances or with the meaning of "allá" (ahí... no allá). However, what should be noted is what is found in several instances in this tape, the successive reiteration of the "same" question with some variations in form. The following example is also a case in point. Here the reiterations persist even after the mother responds.

54.

M. <(es)ta> [<] bien envuelto.	M. <it's> [<] well wrapped up.
M. sí.	M. yes.
K. <u>atí?</u>	K. like this?
M. así.	M. like this.
K. <u>atí?</u>	K. like this?
M. aha.	M. aha.
K. miya.	K. look.
M. ahí está.	M. there it is.
K. #2.0 <u>ese atí?</u>	K. #2.0 that like this?
M. ese así.	M. that like this.
K. <u>sese atí?</u>	K. that like this?
M. a ver?	M. let's see?
K. ayosh. [K01]	K. good-bye.

In the final instance from this tape there is also reiteration following a modelling exchange, here a "teaching" segment occurs where the child displays for the mother what she considers an appropriate response to the exchange:

55.

K. #3.7 <u>petito.</u>	K. #3.7 piece.
K. #3.5 <u>oto?</u>	K. #3.5 another?
M. otro <u>pedacito?</u>	M. another piece?
K. <u>oto sheapsito?</u>	K. another pshish?

K. <u>peyén!</u>	K. good!
K. <u>oto pishito?</u>	K. another piece?
M. #2.5 muy bien! [K01]	M. #2.5 very good!

In tape K04, even though not all successive question sequences are reiterative some still occur, such as the following example.

56.

M. porque acá no pueden venir porque ensucian mucho.	M. because they can't come here because they dirty up a lot.
M. tienen las patitas sucias.	M. they have dirty feet.
K. #7.2 eh, no [/] no peen venir atí, e tene [/] # tene patas nushas?	K. #7.2 eh, th- [/] they can't come here, and they have [/] # they have dirty feet?
M. mmhmm.	M. mmhmm.
K. sí?	K. yes?
M. sí.	M. yes.
K. payitos tene +...	K. doggies have +...
M. ensucian todo.	M. they dirty up all.
M. ensucian todo el piso.	M. they dirty up all the floor.
K. <u>sí?</u>	K. yes?
K. #3.1 <u>ensucian piso?</u>	K. #3.1 they dirty up the floor?
K. <u>ensu [/] ensucian todo e(l) piso?</u>	K. they di- [/] dirty up all the floor?
M. mmhmm.	M. mmhmm.
K. <u>ensucian todo e(l)piso?</u>	K. they dirty up all the floor?
M. sí.	M. yes.
K. #4.9 <u>ensucian todo <e(l)> [?] piso?</u>	K. #4.9 they dirty up all the floor?
M. sí ensucian todo el piso.	M. yes they dirty up all the floor.
K. <u>sí?</u>	K. yes?
M. sí.	M. yes.
K. <u>sí:?</u>	K. yes?
K. #2.6 <u>sí?</u>	K. #2.6 yes?
K. <u>ensucian todo el piso?</u>	K. they dirty up all the floor?

M. sí mi amor ensucian
todo el piso. [K04]

M. yes sweetie they dirty p
all the floor.

M tries different ways of answering the questions alternating minimal responses with full form responses but having no apparent impact on the reiterations which do not seem to have any function at this point other than being repeated and maybe playing with the form.

At K08 reiterative questions are used to indicate non-satisfaction when an answer is not understood or not accepted.

57.

M. cuando esté la música
va a venir.

M. when the music's
there, it's going to
come on.

M. a lo mejor este no
tiene el oso y el
osito.

M. maybe this one doesn't
have the bear and the
little bear.

K. #5.4 va a venir el oso
y el osito?

K. #5.4 the bear and the
little bear gonna come
on?

M. si está ahí sí, si no
no.

M. if it's there yes, if
not no.

K. va a venir el oso y el
osito?

K. the bear and the little
bear gonna come on?

M. me parece que no.

M. I think not.

M. #7.6 me parece <que ese
librito no es de (e)
[//] que ese disquito
no es de (e)l oso y
el osito. [K08]

M. I think that book
doesn't [//] that record
doesn't have the bear
and the little bear.

58.

K. #10.1 <qué es> [//] <qué
es est> [//] qué es esto
acá?

K.#10.1 <what is> [//] <what
is th-> [//] what is this
here?

M. numeritos.

M. numbers.

K. de qué [//] de qué?

K. of what [//] of what?

K. de qué?

K. of what?

- M. de: +...
 K. de qué?
 M. numeritos de (e)l:
 disquito. [K08]
59.
 K. qué es esto?
 M. eso es # algo para
 ponerse en la oreja.
 M. #4.9 se llama, un
 auricular.
 K. para qué?
 M. para escuchar.
 F. uu:!
 K. #1.9 para escuchar yo?
 M. mmhmm.
 K. para escuchar yo?
 M. sí. [K08]
60.
 K. esto es para s- [//]
 escuchar?
 M. mmhmm.
 K. esto es para escuchar?
 M. esto es para escuchar.
 K. eso es para es [//]
 escuchar?
 M. aha. [K08]
61.
 K. <dejo a e> [//] deja
 esto ahí <para que> [//]
 para que no se rompe.
 M. para que no se rom
 +...
 K. pe?
 M. pa.
 K. d- [//] la qué?
 M. para que no se rompa.
 K. la qué?
 M. el: grabador.
 K. #2.0 yo no estoy
 rompiéndolo.
 M. muy bien. [K08]
- M. of: +...
 K. of what?
 M. numbers of the:
 record.
- K. what is this?
 M. that is # something to
 put in your ear.
 M. #4.9 it's called an
 ear-phone.
 K. for what?
 M. to listen.
 F. uu:!
 K. #1.9 to listen me?
 M. mmhmm.
 K. to listen me?
 M. yes.
- K. this is to i- [//]
 listen?
 M. mmhmm.
 K. this is to listen?
 M. this is to listen.
 K. this is to li- [//]
 listen?
 M. aha.
- K. <I leave th-> [//]
 leave this there <so
 that> [//] so that it
 doesn't breaks.
 M. so that it doesn't
 +...
 K. breaks?
 M. break.
 K. d [//] what?
 M. so that it doesn't
 break.
 K. what?
 M. the: tape-recorder.
 K. #2.0 I'm not breaking
 it.
 M. very good.

In all of these examples there is reiteration of a question. Here some of these reiterations seem to respond to some problem in the answer given to the original question. In 57, for example, the mother was deliberately being misleading in leaving open the possibility that the tape-recorder might play "El oso y el osito" when she knew that the tape recorder was recording on a blank tape. Her answers are vague and the child may have realized that they are not right. In 59 there is a reiteration following a sequence where progressively more specific questions are being asked. The reiteration follows upon an affirmative confirming answer by M using the form "mmhmm" which together with "aha" signal affirmation. In many of the tapes, the child does not seem to accept "mmhmm" as a response, and often reiterates a question as in this case and in 60. There are numerous other examples throughout the tapes. The point to note is that whatever the reason for her rejection, when an answer is problematic the strategy that she uses is to repeat the original question rather than try to get information in some different way.

In this tape there is one example where K seems to use reiteration of a contingent query in play:

62.

K. #2.3 te [/] te dejo los
zapatos, allá?

M. bueno.

K. te deso los [//] eh,

K. #2.3 I [/] I leave the
shoes there?

M. good.

K. I leave the [//] eh,

aqueellos zapatos acá?	those shoes here?
M. bueno.	M. good.
K. <poque> [?] es [//] te dejo l [//] zapatos, allá?	K. <because> [?] es- [//] I leave th- [//] shoes there?
M. bueno.	M. good.
K. e los zapatos te dejo de (e)l papá acá.	K. and the shoes I leave of daddy here.
K. #2.7 <u>bueno</u> ?	K. #2.7 good?
K. <u>bueno</u> ?	K. good?
M. sí.	M. yes.
M. <está suficiente> [?].	M. <that's enough> [?].
K. <u>bueno</u> ?	K. good?
K. #2.4 <u>bueno</u> ?	K. #2.4 good?
K. bueno.	K. good.
K. <malo> [?].	K. <bad> [?].
K. <malo> [?].	K. <bad> [?].
K. <u>bueno</u> ?	K. good?
K. #2.2 malo.	K. #2.2 bad.
K. <u>bueno</u> ?	K. good?
K. bueno.	K. good.
K. #1.9 <u>bueno</u> ?	K. #1.9 good?
K. <o bueno> [?]. [K04]	K. <o good> [?].

Here there are two reiterations. First, successive reiterations of the original utterance which has the force of a suggestion "Shall I put daddy's shoes there?". Then there are successive reiterations of a questioning of the agreement marker "bueno". This is a common form to indicate agreement; it is used numerous times throughout the tapes. Even in this tape there are several previous uses by M and one by K. Therefore it is not the case that she does not understand "bueno" as showing agreement. However, what seems to happen is that here she notices the form "bueno" as such, and seems to play with its various meanings as a tag, as an agreement marker and as the opposite of "malo".

In K13 again reiteration is used to mark dissatisfaction with a previous answer.

63.

- | | |
|--|---|
| M. así. | M. like this. |
| K. #4.4 esa salió? | K. #4.4 that one came out? |
| M. mmhmm. | M. mmhmm. |
| K. #2.7 a ver dónde está la pelusita? | K. #2.7 let's see where is the lint. |
| M. la tiré a (e)l suelo. | M. I threw it on the floor. |
| M. por ahí debe estar. | M. it's around there. |
| M. no sé dónde. | M. I don't know where. |
| K. <dónde se> [//] dónde se fue? | K. <where did it> [//] where did it go? |
| M. a (e)l suelo. | M. on the floor. |
| K. <u>pero anónde se hwe?</u> | K. but where did it go? |
| M. a (e)l suelo. | M. on the floor. |
| M. yo la tiré así y se cayó a (e)l suelo.
[K13] | M. I threw it like this and it fell on the floor. |

64.

- | | |
|---|---|
| K. pero se llamaban los señores # Tecoplam. | K. but the men were called # Tecoplam. |
| M. cómo se llamaban? | M. what were they called? |
| K. cómo <se van> [//] se llamaban a ver? | K. what <will they> [//] were they called, let's see? |
| M. Tecoplam. | M. Tecoplam. |
| K. no. | K. no. |
| K. <u>a ver, cómo?</u> | K. let's see, what? |
| M. Rafael. | M. Rafael. |
| K. Rafael, sí. [K13] | K. Rafael, yes. |

65.

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| M. no, los regalamos. | M. no, we gave them away. |
| K. los regalamos. | K. we gave them away. |
| K. an [//] a quién los regalamos? | K. wh- [//] to whom did we give them? |
| M. el Lunerito se lo regalamos a Maru. | M. Lunerito we gave to Maru. |
| K. y a quién? | K. and to whom? |
| M. y el Tutito +... | M. and Tutito +... |
| K. a quién? | K. to whom? |
| M. a (e)l señor: +... | M. to the man: +... |
| K. <u>y a quién?</u> | K. and to whom? |
| M. a (e)l señor de las vacas. | M. to the man with the cows. |

<p>K. y [/] <y a> [//] <y ot> [//] <y el Lun> [//] y [/] <y> [>] +/.</p> <p>M. <Rafael> [<]. K. Rafael? M. y el Rafael a quién? K. a cuáles? M. a (e)l señor de los muebles. [K13]</p>	<p>K. and [/] <and t-> [//] <and ot-> [//] <and Lun> [//] and [/] <and> [>] +/.</p> <p>M. <Rafael> [<]. K. Rafael? M. and Rafael to whom? K. to which? M. to the furniture man.</p>
--	---

In these cases, reiteration is used explicitly following a display of disagreement or dissatisfaction with the answer given. In the final example, there is a reason for using the same question since they are talking about having given away ten puppies. Following the child's initial question "Who did we give them away to?" the mother indicates by her response that she is going to list them one by one. So, the successive "A quién?" questions make sense in this context. However when the child tries to vary this form she runs into problems:

K. y [/] <y a> [//] <y ot> [//] <y el Lun> [//] y [/] <y> [>] +/.

Here she seems to start to say "Y a quién" but self-interrupts. It seems that she is trying to vary the question by inserting the name of each dog ("And X, to whom?"), so she continues with "Y ot-", (possibly "Y otro?", "and another, and who else?"), then "Y el Lun-" (Y el Lunerito?), but this one has already been named. Thus, she runs into difficulties

here possibly due to memory limitations. Following the mother's intervention, K starts using the form "A cuáles?" reiteratively and in the rest of the sequence alternates between "A quién" and "A cuáles".

2.4. Negotiating the Responsibility for Providing an Answer

In some of the examples above it has been mentioned that the child sometimes answers the mother's question by reverting the question to her. There are numerous instances of multiple question sequences in which the parties negotiate who should be the one to answer the question. The "repair" in this case is not to an utterance but to the felicity conditions underlying questions. A question presupposes that the issuer of the question does not know the answer and that the hearer does. This gets suspended in teaching situations in the case of test questions (Shuy and Griffin 1978). "Test" questions and elicitations of material are also very common in mother-child interaction. From K08 on, the child begins to challenge the underlying assumptions to her mother's questions by reverting the question to her. The child begins to treat many of the mother's questions as if they were test questions and she begins to demand that the mother supply the answer. These sequences have not traditionally been classified among repairs since they do not seek clarification. However, they do seek to "repair" wrong

or unwarranted or false assumptions about conversational obligations, and also negotiate who has the knowledge and thus the responsibility for an answer.

Answering negotiation pattern

1. A: Originating utterance (question a?).
2. B: Question a?
3. A: Question a?

4. AorB Response to question a

Turn 4 will be taken by the one who eventually assumes responsibility for providing a response. The question/question sequences may go on for a number of turns, and eventually one of the participants will answer. In these sequences, the mother might have initiated the sequence with an originating utterance which is itself a question. In her subsequent questions the mother very often attempts to change the form of what is said, and provides several ways of saying the same thing. The child's "challenge" questions mirror those of the mother. The most frequent outcome seems to be that the mother is the one who finally answers the question. However, there are also cases in which the child will eventually answer.

66.

K. el oso chiquitito no
quiere caminar.
K. porque está cansado.
K. 0 [!= laughs].

K. the little bear doesn't
want to walk.
K. because he's tired.
K. 0 [!= laughs].

- | | |
|---|--|
| M. y entonces? | M. and then? |
| K. entonces el oso #
grande está enojado
o o . | K. and then the big #
bear is ang- gry- y. |
| M. <u>y entonces?</u> | M. and then? |
| K. <u>en [///] y [//] y</u>
<u>entonces qué?</u> | K. the- [///] and [//]
and then what? |
| M. <u>el oso está enojado, y</u>
<u>qué le hace a (e)l</u>
<u>osito chiquitito?</u> | M. the bear is angry and
what does he do to the
little bear? |
| K. <u>qué le hace?</u> | K. what does he do? |
| M. <u>le hace</u> +... | M. he goes +... |
| K. <u>qué?</u> | K. what? |
| M. +, chas chas chas. | M. +, chas chas chas. |
| K. chas chas chas chas.
[K08] | K. chas chas chas chas. |

The mother requests that the child elaborate on a story she is telling. The child reverts the questions back to the mother. In this case the mother is warranted in asking her questions because it is the child's story and she should be the one to complete it. However, the child treats the mother's question as a test question and the mother completes the sequence.

The following example is similar the one above. Again, it involves negotiation of who should answer. The mother finally resolves the problem by modifying the form of the question from a general WH-question to a closed-alternatives question. The clarification query thus goes from being an open-ended "Qué pasa?" (what happens then?) to one where the child can respond by choosing one of a closed set of alternatives "la alza" (he picks you up) or "le pega" (he

spanks you). This is less demanding on the child since it allows her to focus on the type of answer that the mother would consider an appropriate response. Both of these examples are from K08, where this pattern is first seen.

67.

- | | |
|--|--|
| K. <y yo llo> [//] y yo lloro y yo diso "upa". | K. <and I cr-> [//] and I cry and I say "upa". |
| M. y cuando usted dice "upa" y cuando llora <u>qué pasa?</u> | M. and when you say "upa" and when you cry what happens? |
| K. <u>qué pasa?</u> | K. what happens? |
| M. <u>qué le dice el papá?</u> | M. what does daddy say to you? |
| K. <u>qué me dice el papá?</u> | K. what does daddy say to me? |
| M. no se. | M. I don't know. |
| K. <u>qué me dice papá?</u> | K. what does daddy say to me? |
| M. el papá la alza o le pega? | M. daddy picks you up or spanks you? |
| K. el papá me alza. [K08] | K. daddy picks me up. |

In the following example from K13, the child is more warranted in her rejection or challenge of the questions since the situation is a "test" elicitation, where the mother remembers an event and tries to get the child to recall it. Eventually the child "completes" the sequence and "answers" the question but after having had most of the "answer" except for one final identification provided by the mother.

68.

- | | |
|--|--|
| M. se acuerda cuando fuimos a buscar la carta? | M. do you remember when we went to get the letter? |
|--|--|

- | | |
|---|--|
| K. sí. | K. yes. |
| M. y qué había? | M. and what was there? |
| M. había una [/] una carta
y había un paquete +... | M. there was a [/] a letter
and there was a package
+... |
| M. <u>que mandaba quién?</u> | M. that who was sending? |
| K. <u>quién?</u> | K. who? |
| M. <u>quién mandaba el
paquete con ropa?</u> | M. who was sending the
package with clothes? |
| K. <u>con ropa quién?</u> | K. with clothes who? |
| M. la abuelita +... | M. Grandma +... |
| K. N [/] N [/] Noni. | K. N [/] N [/] Noni. |
| M. la abuelita Noni.
[K13] | M. Grandma Noni. |

3. COLLABORATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

One particular use of these sequences of questions is to arrive at a collaborative construction of a more complex utterance based upon an original child utterance. The adult by successive questions helps construct a more complex utterance from the child's utterance, and in later tapes uses successive questions for collaboratively building up a narrative. At the same time, the child in the early tapes seems to use adult questions to expand from them into more complex utterances. These are the expanding and stepping-stone patterns that have been mentioned previously.

69.

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| K. #5.2 <u>no peye?</u> | K. #5.2 can't? |
| M. no puede? | M. can't? |
| K. n- [/] <u>no peye eyayo?</u> | K. c- [/] can't close it? |
| M. <u>no puede abrirlo?</u> | M. can't open it? |
| M. a ver? | M. let's see? |
| M. ahí está. [K01] | M. there it is. |

- 70.
- | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| M. y acá está el mono. | M. and here is the monkey. |
| K. #4.8 <u>payita</u> ? | K. #4.8 covered up? |
| M. <u>tapadito el mono</u> ? | M. covered up the monkey? |
| K. <u>payita mono</u> ? | K. covered up monkey? |
| K. ota payi- [/] payita? | K. [ota] [?] cov- [/] |
| K. mono? [K01] | covered up? |
| | K. monkey? |
- 71.
- | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| K. #2.0 <u>ese sí e (l)o</u> | K. #2.0 that yes I put |
| <u>pono</u> ? | on? |
| M. le va a poner? | M. you'll put it on? |
| K. <u>pono ese # e(n) piyito</u> ? | K. put this # on hair? |
| M. <u>le pone eso en el</u> | M. you put that on the |
| <u>pelito</u> ? | hair? |
| K. sí. [K01] | K. yes. |
- 72.
- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| K. #1.8 <u>pita</u> . | K. #1.8 bite. |
| M. le pica? | M. it bites (itches)? |
| M. pobrecita. | M. poor baby. |
| K. <u>bititosh</u> . | K. bugs. |
| K. ya. | K. there. |
| M. <u>los bichitos la pican</u> . | M. the bugs bite you. |
| [K01] | |
- 73.
- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| K. miya ete # a un wauwau. | K. look this # [a] a |
| M. un wauwau? | doggie. |
| K. <u>miya wauwau</u> . | M. a doggie? |
| M. sí. | K. look doggie. |
| M. <u>ahí está el wauwau</u> | M. yes. |
| <u>chiquito</u> . | M. there's the little |
| K. <u>wauwau titito # baíto</u> . | doggie. |
| [K01] | K. little doggie # devil. |

In the following example, the mother and the child collaborate through the repair sequence to solve a problem in understanding for the mother. Through the sequence, an original problematic utterance gets broken down into its

component parts, and then reconstructed into an "acceptable" version:

74.

- | | |
|---|---|
| K. ese a nita e [//] eye
pe [//] papita. | K. that [a] girl sh- [//]
she ba- [//] bottle. |
| M. <u>ese qué?</u> | M. that what? |
| K. eshe (e)s a papita. | K. that's [a] bottle. |
| M. <u>cuál es la papita?</u> | M. which is the bottle? |
| K. eshe (e)s a papita
nenito. | K. that's [a] bottle baby. |
| M. esa es la papita de
(e)l niñoito. | M. that's the baby's
bottle. |
| M. esa es la papita de
Koki. [K01] | M. that's Koki's bottle. |

Here an original utterance with a problem displayed by self-repairs and a non-interpretable sentence structure. M questions this with a request for repetition. K responds by repeating one of the propositions embedded in her original utterance "esa es la papita". M follows with a request for specification which obtains as a response the reconstruction of the original utterance "esa es la papita (del) niñoito".

In the following sequence, another misunderstanding problem is resolved by successive questions. A general pattern emerges in which a problematic utterance, usually long, or complex, is broken down into its component parts. Then it is built up again to reconstitute the complete original utterance but in a reformulated version in which some of the initial problems have been eliminated.

75.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>K. #25.4 mamita cómo se
<espe> [/] [?] escuchas
bien <como ser> [//]
como hacer la buena
cosa con [/] con [//]
con qué?
M. <u>cómo</u> [2]?
K. co [/] como hacer la
buena, con qué?
M. no entiendo.
M. <u>cómo se escucha bien?</u>
K. sí.
M. <u>cómo se escucha bien</u>
<u>qué?</u>
K. #1.8 co [/] cómo se
escucha bien o como
hace la buena yo.
M. <u>cómo se escucha bien</u>
<u>como ser la buena</u>
<u>usted?</u>
K. sí.
M. usted ya es buenita
mi amor. [K08]</p> | <p>K. #25.4 mommy how do you
<ha-> [?] [//] hear well
<how it is> [//] how it
makes the good thing
with [/] with [//] with
what?
M. what [2]?
K. ho- [/] how to make the
good, with what?
M. I don't understand.
M. how can you hear well?
K. yes.
M. how can you hear well
what?
K. #1.8 ho- [/] how you
hear well or how to make
the good me?
M. how do you hear well how
to be the good you?
K. yes.
M. you're already good
sweetie.</p> |
|--|---|

The pattern found here is repeated very frequently. The original utterance is broken down following the initial repair request for repetition ("Qué?" or "Cómo?"). The successive questions lead the speaker to build her utterance up again. It appears, however, that the speaker of a problem utterance responds differently at different times to a non-specific request for repetition and seems to be hazarding a guess in her response as to the problem source for the hearer. Following a non-specific repair for repetition, both the mother and the child tend to reduce the original utterance if it is long or complex or if it has many self-

repairs. If the original utterance is elliptical, and dependent on previous discourse, then following the NRR the elliptical material is added in. In addition, although there are very few cases, exact repetitions seem to occur after some noise or other problem in the physical situation which might hinder hearing.

3.1. Construction of More Complex Structures

In the following sequences, the successive repair questions lead the child to add material, which eventually results in the construction of more complex sentences or of sentences that are linked to each other, either sequentially or in cause effect relationships:

76.

K. se va.	K. it's going
M. <se va> [>]?	M. <it's going> [>]?
K. <se hwe> [<].	K. <it went> [<].
M. se fue?	M. it went?
K. sí.	K. yes.
M. <adónde se fue> [?]?	M. <where did it go> [?]?
K. aquí.	K. here.
K. atí se fue. [K04]	K. it went here.

77.

K. ésa te busta nada más .	K. you only like that one.
M. ésa nada más me gusta ?	M. I only like that one?
K. sí.	K. yes.
M. porqué me gusta ésa ?	M. why do I like that one?
K. porque es # linda .	K. because it's # pretty.
M. para qué es ?	M. what's it for?
K. e [//] es para mi [//] mi [//] no es para <tocala> [?] porque se quema .	K. i- [//] it's to loo- [//] loo- [//] it's not for touching because it gets burned.
M. sí:?	M. yes?

M. qué se quema ? M. what gets burned?
 K. <mi de> [//] mi dedito . K. my fi- [//] my finger.
 [K08]

3.2. Collaborative Construction of Narratives

Finally, in the examples that follow, the mother uses the repair questions to co-construct with the child narrative sequences. The questions are used to get the child to include missing or omitted information, and seem to follow a schema for narrative such as the one proposed by Labov and Waletzky (1967): orientation, events, culmination and coda. The sequential events are elicited through "Y qué más?", "Y entonces qué?", "Qué pasa?" (and then what?, what else? and so on), or similar questions that request the telling of the next event.

78.

M. qué se quema?	M. what gets burned?
K. <mi de> [//] mi dedito.	K. <my fi-> [//] my finger.
K. <porque me quemé> [//] porque me quemé con un fósforo.	K. <because I got burned> [//] because I got burned with a match.
M. se quemó con un fósforo?	M. you got burned with a match?
M. qué estaba haciendo usted con un fósforo?	M. what were you doing with a match?
K. estaba tocando.	K. I was touching.
M. tocando el fósforo?	M. touching the match?
K. sí.	K. yes.
M. y cómo hizo?	M. and what did you do?
K. hizo y [//] y [//] y o [//] y [//] y [//] y lo sopé y [//] y +...	K. I did and [//] and [//] and I [//] and [//] and [//] and I blew it and [//] and +...
K. cómo se llama?	K. how do you say it?

M. lo prendió?
 K. sí.
 K. y lo prendí.
 K. y [//] e me quemé.

M. oh.
 K. y ac [//] acá.
 M. ah.
 K. e me lastimé.
 M. se lastimó mucho?
 K. mi#re. [K08]

M. you lit it?
 K. yes.
 K. and I lit it.
 K. and [//] and I got burned.
 M. oh.
 K. and he- [//] here.
 K. ah.
 K. and I got hurt.
 M. you got hurt a lot?
 K. look.

79.

K. yo lloro.
 M. porqué?
 K. porque sí.
 M. (por)que es muy zonza.
 M. #4.5 y qué dice cuando llora Pupi?
 K. #3.6 a [//] uh +...
 K. hh, diso "m [//] mi [//] mi [//] mi mano!".

M. su mano?
 K. sí.
 M. y qué más dice?

K. #3.9 yo diso "upa".
 M. upa?
 M. "mamá:".
 K. <y yo llo> [//] y yo lloro y yo diso "upa".

M. y cuando usted dice "upa" y cuando llora qué pasa?

K. qué pasa?
 M. qué le dice el papá?

K. qué me dice el papá?

M. no se.
 K. qué me dice papá?

M. el papá la alza o le pega?

K. el papá me alza.
 K. <no> [>].
 M. <y la> [<] mamá?

K. I cry.
 M. why?
 K. because.
 M. cause you're very silly.
 M. #4.5 and what do you say when you cry Pupi?
 K. #3.6 a [//] uh +...
 K. hh, I say "m- [//] my [//] my [//] my hand!"

M. your hand?
 K. yes.
 M. and what else do you say?

K. #3.9 I say "upa".
 M. upa?
 M. "mamá:".
 K. <and I cr-> [//] and I cry and I say "upa."

M. and when you say "upa" and when you cry what happens?

K. what happens?
 M. what does daddy say to you?

K. what does daddy say to me?

M. I don't know.
 K. what does daddy say to me?

M. does daddy pick you up or spank you.

K. daddy picks me up.
 K. <no> [>].

M. <and> [<] mommy?

K. y la mamá también me [/] me quiere.	K. and mommy also l- [/ loves me.
M. sí?	M. yes?
K. sí.	K. yes.
K. el papá me quiere # mucho. [K13]	K. daddy loves me # a lot.

Here the mother repairs story-telling problems. One repair seems to follow the principle of the "smoking gun". If the child adds the details that a doggie has a lot of teeth, some discussion of this fact is needed. That is, if a descriptive fact is made salient it is because it must have some relevance to the story that is being told and that saliency must be made explicit. The last repair seems to be of the coda. Stories are not allowed to end at the culminating point, but reference must be made to what happened afterwards for the participants.

The focus of this thesis is on repairs, not on narrative, however, it can be seen that repair questions aid in the constructing of narratives. They elicit the narrative but with respect to those elements that are left out or missing or need to be included.

One brief point to mention is that an examination of the types of questions used by the mother in repair sequences indicates differences between the four tapes that are being analyzed. In the first tape, the questions in repair sequences are limited, and most of them refer to the

identification of referents. The following questions occur: qué, quién, cuál es, qué hay. In addition, after a referent has been introduced, the mother asks for its location: dónde está. There is one case of "por qué?" in a rhetorical question. In K04, there are three instances altogether of "quién?" or "cuál es?". Most of the questions are related to the activities or locations of the referents: qué hace, dónde está, dónde fue, qué dice. There are two instances of "por qué?". In K08 and K13, the majority of the questions are related to activities: qué hace, qué dice, adónde fue. At the same time, a large number of "por qué?" or "para qué?" questions are introduced, and finally there are numerous instances of "y entonces?", "y qué paso?" or "y qué más?". This shows that there is a progression in the mother's discourse with respect to the additional elements that she is going to focus on and request her child to expand on or clarify. The progression seems to follow the steps that have been traced in collaborative constructions of going from constructing a proposition, to constructing sentences relevantly linked to each other by relations of temporality, sequentiality or cause and effect, to finally putting this knowledge together in the constructing of complex discourse, such as narratives.

Table 6:--Occurrences of WH-question words in question/clarification sequences

	CUAL	QUIEN ES	QUE HAY	DONDE	PORQUE	QUE HACEN	QUE MAS
K01	2	-	1	3	1	-	-
K04	1	2	-	3	2	3	-
K08	3	-	1	2	6	5	2
K13	-	-	-	6	2	4	6

4. CONCLUSIONS

This chapter examines how the different types of repair request mechanisms are put together in sequences. I have described a number of these sequences, giving their salient characteristics. However, it must be kept in mind that the patterns that have been found are often combined within sequences.

In the data, there are several indications of changes or steps that the child undertakes developmentally, and the use of strategies different from the adult's which reflect her non-developed competence on the one hand, but her ability to make use of limited resources to solve a variety of needs on the other. One case in point is the use of reiterations. It appears that this strategy is used differently by the child when compared to the adult. The use of repeating or reiterating the same question indicates that the child does not have sufficient mastery either of the code or of different resources to enable her to vary the form used.

However, the strategy is successful in achieving for the child what she needs. Finally, as she develops, her reiterations begin to approximate adult usage.

With this I conclude the examination and discussion of the data. In the following chapter I will present a general discussion of the salient points that have been discussed in this thesis, and of some implications of the present research.

CHAPTER VII
GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

In this thesis, I carried out a longitudinal study of a child's conversations with an adult with the goal of documenting steps in the child's acquisition of communicative competence. It was believed that one area that would yield valuable insight into the acquisition of communicative competence would be that of repairs in conversation. Since repairs have a metalinguistic function and focus on the language itself, either its structure or its use, an analysis of the mechanisms of repairing would provide clear examples of how competence is achieved.

I was interested in documenting the child's work in identifying problem areas, focusing on them, and obtaining the necessary help to resolve the problem and continue with the interaction. I was interested in observing the contribution of the competent interlocutor in these tasks.

The child through various means indicates what are problem areas for her, or makes evident an interest in some aspect of language. Sometimes the display of a problem is "implicit" in the child's self-repairs. Sometimes there is

an explicit display of interest, by asking the mother to supply information, or by "modelling" elements from the mother's speech: words, structural patterns, appropriate rejoinders. The mother responds to the child utilizing the techniques that have been identified as other-initiation of repairs. Through a series of questions based on the child's original utterance, the mother guides the child into being aware of the kinds of knowledge and information that an interlocutor might need or be interested in, in order to continue in the interaction. The mother, through her questions, displays to the child what information is needed in order to understand the child's contribution, and also what additional information would be relevant to the topic at hand. Together, the mother and the child co-construct texts locally, and more globally co-construct communicative competence.

The thesis has examined self-repairs, other-initiations of repair and repair-sequences. There have been specific conclusions on each of these topics, detailing aspects of the acquisition of structures and functions, and these will not be elaborated on further at this point. This chapter will recapitulate the discussion through examination of two illustrations of the "learning" of communicative competence. First, I will examine how the learner goes about the task of

"acquisition" by showing how a word is learnt in context. Secondly, I will examine how co-operatively, through interaction, ever more complex structures are co-constructed. Finally, I will end this chapter with two reflections derived from this study. The first is introspective and relates to the methodology underlying the work that was done. The second is prospective, and deals with the pedagogical implications of research on repairs.

1. FOCUS ON THE LEARNER: THE ACQUISITION OF A NEW WORD

The learning of new words went on constantly through the time-span studied, and goes on constantly through a speaker's lifetime. There was one instance of lexical acquisition that was especially interesting because the child's first contact with a word, and her "competent" use of that word, occurred during the taping itself. In this segment one can see how the child goes about obtaining information about the word, how the mother provides the information solicited, and how, at the end, the child can use the word in conversation.

The segment to be studied is from tape K08 (Koki = 2;5.25). In the first segment of conversation the mother calls the child's attention to a new object. The family had been at the beach and the mother notices "peeling" skin. This is the "new object" introduced.

***** From file K08; line 23.

M:	u:y mire que grandote <u>pedacito</u> [?!]	M:	oo:h look what a big piece [?!]
K:	a ver.	K:	let's see.
K:	dame.	K:	gimme.
K:	a ver.	K:	let's see.
K:	#1.9 qué es éso?	K:	#1.9 what is that?
M:	#2.3 es <u>un pedacito</u> <u>de piel para tirar en el</u> <u>tacho.</u>	M:	#2.3 it's a piece of skin to throw in the trash.

In this first segment, the mother introduces the object using the "Mira!" format, that has been mentioned previously. The child focuses on the object and requests a name for it. The mother provides the description "un pedacito de piel".

***** From file k08; line 61.

K:	qué son éstos?	K:	what are these?
M:	#2.3 no no se comen.	M:	#2.3 no you don't eat them.
M:	son <u>pedacitos de</u> <u>pellejito de la mamá.</u>	M:	they're pieces of skin from mommy.
K:	#2.7 qué son?	K:	#2.7 what are they?
M:	<u>la piel de la espalda de</u> <u>la mamá.</u>	M:	skin from mommy's back.
M:	no se come.	M:	you don't eat it.
K:	#3.5 quién e molestó?	K:	#3.5 who bothered you?

In this second example which occurs several turns after the first one, the child returns to the object and again requests a name. The mother builds upon her previous answer ("pedacito de piel") providing a name for the object and a paraphrase: "pedacitos de pellejito", "la piel de la espalda de la mamá". The last turn is included to show that the child turns away from the topic and initiates a new one.

***** From file k08; line 102.

K:	#5.2 qué son éstos?	K:	#5.2 what are these?
M:	<u>pellejitos.</u>	M:	pieces of skin.
K:	de qué?	K:	from what?
M:	de la espalda.	M:	from the back.
K:	#9.1 <qué es és> [//] qué es éso [//] qué es ésto acá?	K:	#9.1 <what is th-> [//] what is that [//] what is this here?
M:	pellejitos.	M:	pieces of skin.
K:	#3.6 qué es?	K:	#3.6 what is it?
M:	<u>pellejitos de la espalda de la mamá.</u>	M:	pieces of skin from mommy's back.
K:	#2.2 qué es ésto?	K:	#2.2 what is this?
M:	pellejitos.	M:	pieces of skin.
K:	#2.3 yo [//] estoy escuchando?	K:	#2.3 I [//] (I) am listening?

Again, several turns later in the conversation, the child once again returns to the object and asks for a name. Note in the second exchange in this sequence, how the child has learned from the mother's previous description what are relevant questions to ask about the object: "pellejitos de qué?". Note also how through the child's questions, the mother builds up her answer successively:

- pellejitos.
[pieces of skin]
- de la espalda.
[from the back]
- pellejitos de la espalda de la mamá.
[pieces of skin from mommy's back]

The child once more ends the sequence by initiating a new topic.

***** From file k08; line 414.

K:	qué son éstos?	K:	what are these?
M:	<u>pellejitos de la mamá.</u>	M:	mommy's skin.
M:	<de la espalda> [?].	M:	<from the back> [?].

M: está toda quemadita.
K: a ver.
K: #1.9 enónde?

K: ** #2.8 mire acá está un
pie [/] pie [//]
pellejito. LINE 424
K: * #3.1 qué es éste?
M: * pellejito.
K: ** #58.0 muésteme los # p
[/] pellejitos.
K: ** muésteme los
pelle [/] pellejitos.
K: ** muésteme los ##
pellejitos.
K: * qué son?
M: * pellejitos.
K: de qué?
M: de la espalda <de la
mamá> [?].
K: #3.3 qué s [//] a ver?
K: a ver.
M: saque algu [//] uno si
quiere.
K: bueno.
K: <qué se> [//] qué te
saco?
M: saque algunas
cositas[?].
K: qué cositas?
K: ya saqué esta cosa.

K: te saqué un pelle [/]
pellejit [/] pellejito.
K: acá ta [/] tamién.
K: te estoy sacando unas
[?] cosas.

K: estoy sacando algo a la
mamá.
K: #20.3 estoy sacando algo
a la mamá.
K: #18.4 estoy sacando algo
a la mamá # papá.
K: #6.0 <te> [?] estoy
sacando algo.
M: qué me esta sacando?

M: it's all burnt.
K: let's see.
K: #1.9 where?

K: #2.8 look here is a
pie- [/] pe- [//]
piece of skin.
K: #3.1 what is this?
M: a piece of skin.
K: #58.0 show me the #
p- [/] pieces of skin.
K: show me the piece- [//]
pieces of skin.
K: show me the ## pieces of
skin.
K: what are they?
M: pieces of skin.
K: of what?
M: of <mommy's> [?]
back.
K: what ar- [//] let's see?
K: let's see.
M: take so- [//] one if you
want.
K: okay.
K: what ta- [//] what do I
take?
M: take some thingies [?].
K: what thingies?
K: I took this thing.

K: I took a pie- [//]
piece [//] piece of skin.
K: here al [//] also.
K: I'm taking some [?]
things.

K: I'm taking something
from mommy.
K: #20.3 I'm taking
something from mommy.
K: #18.4 I'm taking
something from mommy #
daddy.
K: #6.0 <from you> [?] I'm
taking something.
M: what are you taking?

K: los pie [/] pie [//] K: the pie- [/] pie- [//]
 pellejitos. pieces of skin.

The lines that have been marked with asterisks should be noted especially in this section. In Line 424¹ the child uses the word for the first time. There are a number of hesitations on the word, i.e., repetition self-repairs which break off the word before completion. Immediately afterwards she asks the mother to name the object again. The mother does so, and then the child proceeds to try out the word several more times. Note the 58 second pause between the mother's modelling of the word and the child's re-initiation. At the end of her tries, the child once again asks the mother to produce the name of the object using the same type of exchange initiated previously. Thus the child produces three attempts at the word framed by two "models" provided by the mother at the child's request.

*** From file k08; line 492.

K: #3.1 <acá tamién> [?]	K: #3.1 <here also> [?]
hay por [/] por acá.	there are here [/] here.
K: a ver.	K: let's see.
K: <te junto ahí> [?].	K: <I gather there> [?].

¹The line numbering is only given to provide an approximate indication of distance between pieces of text. Since the transcripts include comment lines which are also numbered, the number of actual utterances between one fragment and another cannot be precisely computed from these examples.

K:	<yo> [?] hicié pellejitos.	K:	<I> [?] maked pieces of skin.
K:	<yo te voy a hacer>[?].	K:	<I'm going to make>[?].
K:	estoy sa [/] sacando <los pe [/] pelle> [//] los pe [/] pelle +...	K:	I'm ta- [/] taking the <the p- [/] piec-> [//] the pie- [/] piec- +...
K:	#6.4 te estoy <cacando> [?] los pe [//] pellejitos.	K:	#6.4 I'm taking the pie- [/] pieces of skin.
M:	muy bien.	M:	very good.
K:	#2.9 para que no venga más pe [//] pellejitos.	K:	#2.9 so no more pie- [//] pieces come.
K:	#3.0 pa(ra) que no venga más.	K:	#3.0 so no more come.
M:	para que no vengan más?	M:	so no more come?
K:	no.	K:	no.

In this fragment, the child uses the word actively in different constructions: "Yo hice pellejitos", "Estoy sacando pellejitos", "Para que no vengan más pellejitos".

***** From file k08; line 762.

K:	haga que se prenda la luz.	K:	make the light come on.
M:	#2.4 no.	M:	#2.4 no.
M:	no no no, no toque nada.	M:	no no no, don't touch anything.
M:	no toque nada.	M:	don't touch anything.
M:	mire nada más.	M:	look only.
M:	va a ver que se prende la luz solita.	M:	you'll see that the light comes on by itself.
-----		-----	
M:	uu cuántos pellejitos que hay sueltos!	M:	uu how many pieces of skin are lying around!
K:	#3.0 <enónde> [>]?	K:	#3.0 <where>[>]?
M:	<hay que> [<] tirarlos a (e)l tacho.	M:	<we have> [<] to throw them in the trash.
K:	#2.8 vamos a tirarlos a (e)l tasho?	K:	#2.8 we're going to throw them in the trash?
M:	bueno.	M:	okay.

This fragment is included to show how the mother is aware of the child's interest in the word. The child is insisting on playing with the tape-recorder and the mother is directing her to stop touching it. She seems to markedly call attention to the "pellejitos" and gets the child to join her in a new activity away from the tape-recorder.

***** From file k08; line 943.

M:	can you throw this in some ## dirty: [?] +...	M:	can you throw this in some ## dirty: [?] +...
K:	no.	K:	no.
K:	no.	K:	no.
	-----		-----
F:	<hmm> [<]?	F:	<hmm> [<]?
M:	#2.1 th [//] that, what she has in her hand.	M:	#2.1 th- [//] that, what she has in her hand.
K:	#1.6 <no> [>].	K:	#1.6 <no> [>].
F:	<gimme> [<].	F:	<gimme> [<].
F:	what's she got?	F:	what's she got?
M:	some skin from my back.	M:	some skin from my back.
K:	ése no.	K:	that no.
F:	#1.9 no?	F:	#1.9 no?
K:	no.	K:	no.
K:	#8.2 éso no.	K:	#8.2 that no.
K:	el [//] los pe [//] pellejitos no.	K:	the [//] the pie- [//] pieces of skin no.

This is the final fragment in which the word is used. The child uses the word to refer to the object even in the absence of a model from the adult.

It can be seen through this long example how the child proceeds from first becoming aware of a new object to requesting a name or designation for it, to finally using the word, and the strategies that are used to obtain modelling

and confirmation of the form of the word. Finally, it should be noted that in the production of the word she hesitates, breaking off the word midway, and produces several successive tries in what seems to be an attempt to approximate some representation of the form of the word.

2. FOCUS ON THE MOTHER: TEACHING SYNTAX

I will take up once again the example given above to address the issue of whether the mother's language may facilitate the teaching of syntax. This has not been a central focus of this thesis; however, this is an issue that has received much attention in the literature. There have been studies that contend that there is no evidence that the mother's adaptations serve the function of teaching syntax to the child, even though they may enhance the child's communicative abilities (Shatz 1982, Newport, Gleitman and Gleitman 1977). The issue still remains controversial.

In the fragment given above, I think that there is evidence that what the mother does when talking to the child does facilitate the teaching of syntax. When the child asks the question "Qué es éso?" the mother responds to it giving several different ways of referring to the object:

-un pedacito de piel de la mamá.
 -la piel de la espalda de la mamá
 -pedacitos de pellejito de la mamá
 -pellejitos de la espalda de la mamá
 -pellejitos de la mamá

Note in the above set of phrases how the different designations and the equivalences that are set up give the child ample evidence of segmentation and substitution possibilities.

Note how in the following example the child sets up a similar segmentation frame and gives evidence of having acquired the ability to carry out various equivalent noun phrase substitutions.

M:	saque algu [//] uno si quiere.	M:	take so- [//] one if you want.
K:	bueno.	K:	okay.
K:	qué se- [//] qué te saco?	K:	what ta- [//] what do I take?
M:	s a q u e <u>a l g u n a s</u> <u>cositas</u> [?].	M:	take some thingies [?].
K:	qué cositas?	K:	what thingies?
K:	ya saqué esta cosa.	K:	I took this thing.
	-----		-----
K:	te saqué un pelle [//] pellejit [//] pellejito.	K:	I took a pie- [//] piece [//] piece of skin.
K:	acá ta [//] tamién.	K:	here al [//] also.
K:	te estoy sacando <u>unas</u> [?] <u>cosas</u> .	K:	I'm taking some [?] things.
	-----		-----
K:	estoy sacando <u>algo</u> a la mamá.	K:	I'm taking something from mommy.
	---		---
M:	qué me está sacando?	M:	what are you taking?
K:	los pie [//] pie [//] pellejitos.	K:	the pie- [//] pie- [//] pieces of skin.
	---		---
K:	estoy sa [//] sacando <los pe [//] pelle> [//] los pe [//] pelle +...	K:	I'm ta- [//] taking <the pie- [//] piec-> [//] the pie- [//] piece +...

I return now to the questions that have been asked in the literature and propose some answers.

Does the mother set out to teach syntax? Probably not. The mother tries to get the child to understand the word and uses several ways to make the meaning clear to the child by setting up equivalent paraphrases with words that she thinks the child might know, by tying in one response to whatever she has said previously. The purpose is to get the child to understand the word so that she can continue in the conversation.

Does the mother "teach" syntax? The answer seems to be that she does. The mother's language provides the child with a set of examples that give clear evidence of how different structures are organized, what elements could substitute one for another, where the structures can be segmented. Linguists can and do utilize evidence like that given to "construct" the syntax of a language that is unknown to them. It shouldn't be surprising if the child does also.

It should be noted, in addition, that only a qualitative study would show the kinds of work that are being done here.

3. FOCUS ON THE INTERACTION - COLLABORATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

It was mentioned at the end of Chapter VI that the mother and the child collaborated in the co-construction of

utterances. The clarification sequence with its successive questions allows the building up of more complex structures from more simple ones. This collaborative work itself progresses from the collaborative construction of sentences to the collaborative construction of larger discourse structures such as narratives. It has been examined mostly as the mother's work in the conversation. In the example that follows, however, it will be seen that Koki uses very similar devices to draw out from the mother the retelling of a past event.

[Assigning identities to little dolls]

- | | | | |
|----|---|----|--|
| M: | ah ése es el muchacho malo que me robó el dinero.[laughs] | M: | ah that is the bad guy who stole my money.
[laughs] |
| K: | sí. | K: | yes. |
| K: | todas las moneditas. | K: | all the coins. |
| K: | pero ya no me puede comprar mis # vitaminas. | K: | but now you can't buy me my # vitamins. |
| M: | no le pude comprar vitaminas, no. | M: | I couldn't buy your vitamins, no. |
| K: | no. | K: | no. |
| K: | <u>pero ibas a (e)l centro?</u> | K: | but were you going downtown? |
| M: | iba a (e)l centro. | M: | I was going downtown. |
| K: | <u>a comprar qué?</u> | K: | to buy what? |
| M: | vitaminas. | M: | vitamins. |
| K: | <u>conmigo?</u> | K: | with me? |
| M: | no. | M: | no. |
| M: | sola. | M: | alone. |
| K: | <u>yo quería ir contigo.</u>
[reproachful tone] | K: | I wanted to go with you.
[reproachful tone] |
| M: | y qué pasó? | M: | and what happened? |
| K: | #2.3 y [//] para ver el muchacho malo. | K: | #2.3 and [//] to see the bad guy. |
| K: | pa [//] a vello pa(ra) [//]pa(ra) que no te lo robe. | K: | to [//] to see him so that he doesn't steal it. |

M:	porqué?	M:	why?
M:	usted que le iba a decir?	M:	what were you going to say to him?
K:	que no se [/] te lo robe e [/] e [/] e [//] tu dinero.	K:	that he don't steal e [/] e [/] e [//] your money.
M:	bueno.	M:	okay.
M:	y mañana cuando vamos a centro usted le va a decir?	M:	and tomorrow when we go downtown you'll tell him?
K:	sí.	K:	yes.

In this final example, the child uses strategies similar to those employed by the mother to elicit from the mother a narrative recollection of a past event. The questions that she uses elicit from the mother the orientation section of a narrative. The sentence "Yo quería ir contigo", however, provides a frame-switch. This sentence could indeed be interpreted as a repair request, not of the conversation but of having left the child out from the trip and the adventure. The sentence switches the text in construction from a recollection of a past event to a planning of a "hypothetical" future event in which bad occurrences are made right, and the mother repairs the previous omission by providing the child with an opportunity to participate.

It was mentioned in Chapter VI, that throughout the tapes there seems to be a progression in the kinds of questions that the mother asks. The questions go from questions designed to identify and specify a referent

("quién?" "cuál?") to questions about the activities of referents ("qué hace?" "qué dice?" "dónde fue?") to questions about the sequencing of activities into a larger whole ("y entonces?" "y qué más?" "y qué pasó?"). This progression allows the child step-wise to go from formulating descriptive propositions about referents, to describing sequential actions and eventually to formulating narratives. The question that arises from these facts is whether the mother is conscious of what she is doing and whether she has a plan or program in mind that she is following. One is led to wonder whether she is in some way "keeping track" of what the child "has" when she adds a new question or progresses to a new structure. The conclusion from the analysis is that she does not, at least not consciously. Using my privileged knowledge from my double role as mother as well as author, I can say that the patterns that occurred were only obvious to me when conducting the analysis, and that some of the results of what was used and what was not were surprising and would have been rejected by me if I had been told about them without evidence from the tapes. That is, several facts about my own use were not part of my intuitions of what was going on in my language². There could be some unconscious

²One example is the virtual non-use of plural indefinite articles, for example. Throughout the thirteen tapes, there were very few occurrences of masculine plural indefinites and

record-keeping and that is interesting speculatively but ultimately unknowable.

It seems that the interaction itself guides the participants into what to do, with both participants providing input. The child provides the initial input which reflects both what she can do and what she is interested in. The mother progresses from this input locally, but using for her progression her own communicative competence. At each point in the conversation the mother is concerned with the turn-at-hand. But in deciding what is relevant to the turn-at-hand, she uses as a guide her own conversational, discursive and textual competence. The mother's competence serves as the guide to what is relevant, what is missing, what needs to be added, expanded, clarified, rejected, and so on. The child's turn determines what and how much of this competence will be drawn upon.

4. METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

In this study I have attempted to combine quantitative methods with a qualitative study of individual cases. I have found that both are necessary to approach the subjects

no occurrences at all of the feminine plurals "unas". However, if questioned about my intuitions about the frequency of use of these forms, I would probably have ranked them among the most frequently used.

examined here, and that without one of them a vital part of the picture would be lost. Several additional types of quantitative work could be carried out on these data, establishing the statistical significance of some of the patterns and findings, and the correlation of some aspects of repair work with the child's stage of linguistic development still remain to be done. Nevertheless, the quantitative results that I do have yield a clear picture of the child's progression in her acquisition of repairs and of the inter-relations between different factors in the repairs that she does carry out. The detailed qualitative study fills in the picture. To take but one example of the inter-relationship between both methodologies, a quantitative study showed that in carrying out self-repairs there was a difference between repairs that broke off a word and repairs that completed a word. A qualitative study of the discourse context, bringing in evidence from other sentences where perhaps there was no repair, showed that the words that were broken off were often words that the child was having trouble with, that showed various forms in the transcripts, that is, words that in some way were in fluctuation in the child's system. Both types of study were needed to interpret what was happening with broken-off words. The combination of the results of both

types of study permitted the proposal of an interpretation of the significance of breaking off a word.

A second methodological note has to do with the validity of the "interpretation" or "filling in" of broken segments. I began to be aware that, without noticing, I had started to complete missing words when the evidence was only one segment at times. A serious question arises about the validity of this, yet intuitively the reading of the sentences made sense. In addition, as I began to know more about how repair sequences worked, and how dialogue in conversation worked, I found that I was supplying the completion of the segment without being aware of it. From this I started a reconstructing process to find out why I assumed that I "knew" what the word was when all I had to go on was one syllable and at times one segment. I found that there were several kinds of evidence that warranted this reconstruction. Substantiating these theoretically would be beyond the scope of this thesis, but co-occurring evidence was: contrast words --the missing words would be the antonyms of occurring words; parallel constructions such as "No ..." / "Sí ..."; and finally place in structure and how the child was proceeding at the time. In footnote 13 in Chapter IV, I listed an example of a repair in the "other" category. Something about which there was not sufficient evidence to be able to say

that it was of one kind or another. However, if this is examined in context the following sequence is found.

K:	a compar un [//] u [//] u [//] un [//] un [//] un lemelito tara curar <a su> [//] a su patita?	K:	to buy a [//] a [//] a [//] a [//] a [//] a medicine to cure <his> [//] his foot?
M:	sí?	M:	yes?
K:	sí.	K:	yes.
K:	<a s> [//] a Koki tamién?	K:	<hi-> [//] and Koki also?
M:	Koki también?	M:	Koki also?

If this example is analyzed in the light of the facts that are known about the structure of clarification sequences -- for example, that after a confirmation request that is answered with a minimal form the child may repeat what she has said previously-- then we can see that in the child's previous turn she was saying "a su patita". In the broken-off "unidentifiable" repair she begins with "a s-". Thus, it is very likely that the child was indeed beginning to say "a su patita" when she broke off the sentence. If this is true, then this example would cease to be unidentifiable and there would be arguments for grouping it together with False-starts.

To conclude, I have used "interpretation" of facts throughout, but this interpretation has not been based on any appeal to speaker's intentions and does not presume to know what was in the mind of the speaker at any one time. These

interpretations are based strictly on evidence from the data, and they are presented as possibilities of what is going on, not as certainties. Certain types of scientific work can only proceed on the basis of certainties, however, other types of work can be done using informed "guesses" as long as the tentative character of the results and the reasons for deriving those results are made explicit.

5. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY OF REPAIRS

Through the study of repairs one can obtain a clear picture of what the learner seems to be focusing on. Not only that, but one can also see the particular types of problems that the learner seems to be having with the word or structure she is focusing on. Child language studies have shown that children's repairs seem to be most frequent in phonology right at the beginning, going from there to morpho-syntactic repairs and then to pragmatic ones. These facts have been corroborated in this study, but here I would like to comment on the conclusions that can be derived from them. From examination of the frequencies of repairs, there is a danger of drawing the conclusion from this that the child proceeds through the learning of the system concentrating first on phonology, then syntax and finally pragmatics. However, from the analysis of the tapes it can be seen that

at all points in time the child is making repairs at all levels and the particular sound or construction or function that she concentrates on depends on her current level of competence. In K01, for example, with respect to phonology the child seems to be working out various problems including handling consonant clusters. In morphology she is beginning to work on articles. In syntax she is concentrating on "deictic phrases" and copula constructions. And pragmatically, she seems to be working on referring functions. The examination of repairs gives indications of what the child's focus is.

The "numbers" reflect two facts. First, the sheer frequency of the phenomena, and secondly, the completion of acquisition. It should not be considered significant that the child has more phonological repairs at the beginning. This can be explained from linguistic facts gauged against the child's level of competence. In any one sentence, there will be a large number of phonological opportunities for repair, for a child who does not yet have a stable phonological system. There will be relatively fewer opportunities for morphological repair, and even fewer for syntactic or pragmatic repairs. So some of the numbers derive from these facts. What is relevant or significant to know is the point at which the proportions in any one of

these categories start dropping off. This might give an indication of completion of acquisition. Thus the proportion of phonological repairs start dropping off first indicating that the child has or is in the process of acquiring mastery of this level, which has a relatively small number of elements and contrasts. Syntax may take more time while pragmatic "mastery" is an open-ended process that increases as the individual faces new situations and may not be accomplished in the course of a life-time. Thus interpretation of research findings requires a careful evaluation of all the facts.

For a teacher of language, the study of repairs can prove an invaluable tool to determine the state of the student's linguistic development and also what particular types of constructions, structures or lexical items they are interested in. This can be of great importance in her assessment of the student's progress and development. Nevertheless, care ought to be taken to determine what if any intervention programs might be derived based on this research. This topic goes beyond the scope of this thesis. However, I would like to point out that we still do not know enough about how the language learning process takes place to be able to say what procedures might best aid learning given the evidence from the learner's repairs.

EPILOGUE

UNDERSTANDING ACHIEVED

The example below involves a repair sequence between the same participants, Koki and her mother. The question that initiates the repair sequence is a strange one however: "Quién soy yo?" (Who am I?). Koki, nevertheless, is able to interpret the mother's intent in asking this question and responds appropriately effecting the repair that is required. The type of interpretive work that is required to carry out this repair is far removed from the direct repair procedures that have been outlined in this thesis, and shows some of the steps that have still to be carried out in the development of communicative competence.

March 1991. Koki, 12 years-old, walks into the house after having been in school all day. Her mother is working at the computer in a little room by herself. Koki walks by the room and goes to her own room to put her books away. Then she comes back and goes into the kitchen to start fixing herself a snack. Her mother calls her:

M:	Koki!	M:	Koki!
K:	Si mamá.	K:	Yes mom.
M:	Venga acá.	M:	Come here.
K:	[walks into room]	K:	[walks into room]

M: Quién soy yo?
K: [slight hesitation, then
apologizing face]
K: Es que no estaba el
auto.
K: Y pensé que no había
nadie.
K: Y no vi la luz aquí
cuando pasé.
K: [hugs M]
K: Hola mamá, te quiero
mucho.

M: Who am I?
K: [slight hesitation
then apologizing look]
K: It's that the car wasn't
there.
K: And I thought nobody was
home.
K: And I didn't see the
light here when I went
by.
K: [hugs M]
K: Hi Mom, I love you.

REFERENCES

- AUSTIN, JOHN L. 1962. How to Do Things with Words. London: Oxford University Press.
- BAILEY, CHARLES-JAMES N. 1973. Variation and Linguistic Theory. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- BATES, ELIZABETH. 1976. Language and Context: The acquisition of pragmatics. New York: Academic Press.
- BELLINGER, DAVID. 1979. Changes in the explicitness of mothers' directives as children age. Journal of Child Language 6:443-458.
- BERKO-GLEASON, JEAN. 1975. Fathers and other strangers: Men's speech to young children. In D.P. Dato (ed.), Developmental psycholinguistics: theory and applications. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- _____. 1977. Talking to children: some notes on feedback. In C.E. Snow and C.W. Ferguson (eds.), Talking to Children: Language Input and Acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BEVER, THOMAS G. 1970. The cognitive basis for linguistic structures. In R.Hayes (ed.), Cognition and the Development of Language. New York: Wiley.
- BLOOM, LOIS. 1970. Language Development. Cambridge, MA: The M.I.T. Press.
- _____. 1973. One Word at a Time. The Hague: Mouton.
- BLOOM, LOIS, LORRAINE ROCISSANO and LOIS HOOD. 1976. Adult-child discourse: Developmental interaction between information processing and linguistic knowledge. Cognitive Psychology 8:521-552.
- BLOUNT, BEN G. 1977. Ethnography and caretaker-child interaction. In C.E. Snow and C.W. Ferguson (eds.), Talking to Children: Language Input and Acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- _____. 1981. Elicitation strategies in parental speech acts. In P.S. Dale and D. Ingram (eds.), Child Language - An International Perspective. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.
- BLOUNT, BEN G. and ELISE PADGUG. 1977. Prosodic, paralinguistic, and interactional features in parent-child speech: English and Spanish. Journal of Child Language 4:67-86.
- BOHN, W.E. 1914. First steps in verbal expression. Pedagogical Seminary 21:578-595. (Cited in Clark 1978).
- BRAINE, MARTIN D. S. 1963a. On learning the grammatical order of words. Psychological Review 70:323-338.
- _____. 1963b. The ontogeny of English phrase structure: the first phase. Language 39:3-13.
- BRINTON, BONNIE, MARTIN FUJIKI, DIANE FROEM-LOEB and ERIKA WINKLER. 1986. Development of conversational repair strategies in response to requests for clarification. Journal of Speech and Hearing Research 29:75-81.
- BROWN, ROGER W. 1968. The development of Wh questions in child speech. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior 7:279-290.
- _____. 1973. A First Language: The Early Stages. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- _____. 1977. Introduction. In C.E. Snow and C.W. Ferguson (eds.), Talking to Children: Language Input and Acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BROWN, ROGER W. and CAMILLE HANLON. 1970. Derivational complexity and order of acquisition in child speech. In R.Hayes (ed.), Cognition and the Development of Language. New York: Wiley.
- BRUNER, JEROME S. 1975. The ontogenesis of speech acts. Journal of Child Language 2:1-19.
- _____. 1977. Early social interaction and language acquisition. In H.R. Schaffer (ed.), Studies in Mother-Infant Interaction. New York: Academic Press.

- _____. 1978a. Learning how to do things with words. In J.S. Bruner and A. Garton (eds.), Human Growth and Development. London: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1978b. The role of dialogue in language acquisition. In A. Sinclair, R.J. Jarvella, and W.J.M. Levelt (eds.), The Child's Conception of Language. Berlin:Springer Verlag.
- _____. 1981. The pragmatics of acquisition. In W. Deutsch (ed.), The Child's Construction of Language. New York: Academic Press.
- BULLOWA, MARGARET. 1979. Introduction. In M. Bullowa (ed.), Before Speech: The beginning of interpersonal communication. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BULLOWA, MARGARET, JAMES L. FIDELHOLTZ and A.R. KESSLER. 1975. Infant vocalization: communication before speech. In T.R. Williams (ed.), Socialization and Communication in Primary Groups. The Hague: Mouton.
- CANALE, M. and MERRILL SWAIN. 1980. Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. Applied Linguistics 1:1-47.
- CHAPMAN, ROBIN S. 1981. Exploring children's communicative intents. In J.F. Miller (ed.), Assessing Language Production in Children: Experimental Procedures. Baltimore: University Park Press.
- CHAFE, WALLACE. 1972. Discourse structure and human knowledge. In J.B. Carroll and R.O. Freedle (eds.), Language Comprehension and the Acquisition of Knowledge. Washington, D.C.: Winston and Sons.
- CHERRY, LOUISE. 1979. The role of adults' requests for clarification in the language development of children. In Roy O. Freedle (ed.), New directions in discourse processing. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- CHERRY-WILKINSON, LOUISE, STEVEN CALCULATOR and CHRISTINE DOLLAGHAN. 1982. Ya wanna trade - just for awhile: Children's requests and responses to peers. Discourse Processes 5:161-176.
- CHOMSKY, NOAM. 1965. Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. Cambridge, MA: The M.I.T. Press.
- _____. 1972. Language and Mind. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

- _____. 1975. Reflections on Language. New York: Random House.
- CHRISTIAN, DONNA. 1980. What do you mean by request for clarification? In R.W. Shuy and A. Shnukal (eds.), Language Use and the Uses of Language. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- CHRISTIAN, DONNA and ROSEMARY TRIPP. 1978. Teachers' perceptions and children's language use. In R.W. Shuy and M. Griffin (eds.), Children's Functional Language and Education in the Early Years. Final report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- CICOUREL, AARON. 1970. The acquisition of social structure: Towards a developmental theory of language and meaning. In J. Douglas (ed.), Understanding Everyday Life. Chicago: Aldine.
- _____. 1973. Cognitive Sociology: Language and Meaning in Social Interaction. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- _____. 1980. Three models of discourse analysis: The role of social structure. Discourse Processes 3:101-132.
- CLARK, EVE V. 1978. Awareness of language: Some evidence from what children say and do. In A. Sinclair, R.J. Jarvella and W.J.M. Levelt (eds.), The child's conception of language. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- CLARK, EVE V. and ELAINE S. ANDERSEN. 1979. Spontaneous repairs: Awareness in the process of acquiring language. Papers and Reports on Child Language Development 16:1-12.
- CORSARO, WILLIAM A. 1977. The clarification request as a feature of adult interactive styles with young children. Language in Society 6, 183-207.
- COULTHARD, MALCOLM. 1977. An Introduction to Discourse Analysis. London: Longman.
- COULTHARD, MALCOLM and D. BRAZIL. 1981. Exchange Structure. In M. Coulthard and M. Montgomery (eds.), Studies in Discourse Analysis. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

- CROSS, TONI G. 1977. Mothers' speech research: from input to interaction. In C.E. Snow and C.W. Ferguson (eds.), Talking to Children: Language Input and Acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1978. Mother's speech and its association with rate of linguistic development in young children. In N. Waterson and C.E. Snow (eds.), The Development of Communication. London: Wiley.
- _____. 1981. Parental speech as primary linguistic data: some complexities in the study of the effect of the input in language acquisition. In P.S. Dale and D. Ingram (eds.), Child Language - An International Perspective. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.
- DEMETRAS, M.J., KATHRYN N. POST and CATHERINE E. SNOW. 1986. Feedback to first language learners - the role of repetitions and clarification questions. Journal of Child Language, 13, 275-292.
- DORE, JOHN. 1977. Children's illocutionary acts. In R.O. Freedle (ed.), Discourse Production and Comprehension. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- _____. 1978. Variation in Preschool Children's Conversational Performances. In K.E. Nelson (ed.), Children's Language (Vol. 1). New York: Gardner Press.
- _____. 1986. The development of conversational competence. In R.L. Schiefelbusch (ed.), Language Competence: Assessment and Intervention. San Diego, CA: College-Hill Press.
- DORE, JOHN, MARYL GEARHART and DENIS NEWMAN. 1978. The structure of nursery school conversation. In K.E. Nelson (ed.), Children's Language (Vol. 1). New York: Gardner Press.
- DURANTI, ALESSANDRO. 1988. Ethnography of speaking: toward a linguistics of the praxis. In F. Newmeyer (ed.), Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey. Vol 4, Language: The Socio-cultural Context. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- EDMONDSON, WILLIS. 1981. Spoken Discourse: A Model for Analysis. London: Longman.
- ERICKSON, FREDERICK. 1982. Money tree, lasagna bush, salt and pepper: Social construction of topical cohesion in

a conversation among Italian-Americans. In D. Tannen (ed.), Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

ERICKSON, FREDERICK and JEFFREY SHULTZ. 1982. The Counselor as Gatekeeper. New York: Academic Press

ERVIN-TRIPP, SUSAN. 1976. Is Sybil there? The structure of some American English directives. Language in Society 5:25-66.

_____. 1977. Wait for me, roller-skate! In C. Mitchell-Kernan and S. Ervin-Tripp (eds.), Child Discourse. New York: Academic Press.

EVANS, MARY ANN. 1985. Self-initiated speech repairs: a reflection of communicative monitoring in young children. Developmental Psychology 21(2):365-371.

FAERCH, CLAUS and GABRIELLE KASPER. 1982. Two ways of defining communication strategies. Language Learning 34:45-63.

FAERCH, CLAUS and GABRIELLE KASPER. 1983a. On identifying communication strategies in interlanguage production. In C. Faerch and G. Kasper (eds.), Strategies in Interlanguage Communication. London: Longman.

FAERCH, CLAUS and GABRIELLE KASPER (eds.). 1983B. Strategies in Interlanguage Communication. London: Longman

FERGUSON, CHARLES. 1964. Baby-talk in six languages. American Anthropologist 66:103-114.

_____. 1975. Towards a characterization of English foreigner talk. Anthropological Linguistics 17:1-14.

_____. 1977. Baby-talk as a simplified register. In C.E. Snow and C.W. Ferguson (eds.), Talking to Children: Language Input and Acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

FIDELHOLTZ, JAMES L. and ROSA GRACIELA MONTES. 1990. Variation and markedness in the phonology of a child acquiring Spanish. In J.A. Edmondson, Crawford Feagin and Peter Mühlhäusler (eds.), Development and Diversity: Language Variation across Time and Space. Arlington, TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics and The University of Texas.

- FRANK, ARTHUR W. 1981. Pooh talk: formulating children's conversational troubles. Semiotica 37:109-120.
- FROMKIN, VICTORIA (ed.). 1973. Speech errors as linguistic evidence. The Hague: Mouton.
- _____. (ed.). 1980. Errors in linguistic performance. New York: Academic Press.
- FURROW, DAVID and SHERRY LEWIS. 1987. The role of the initial utterance in contingent query sequences: its influence on responses to requests for clarification. Journal of Child Language, 14:467-479.
- GALLAGHER, TANYA M. 1977. Revision behaviors in the speech of normal children developing language. Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 20:303-318.
- _____. 1981. Contingent query sequences within adult-child discourse. Journal of Child Language, 8:51-62.
- GALLAGHER, TANYA and BARBARA A. DARNTON. 1978. Conversational aspects of the speech of language disordered children: Revision behaviors. Journal of Speech and Hearing Research 21:118-135.
- GARFINKEL, HAROLD. 1967. Studies in Ethnomethodology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- GARNICA, OLGA K. 1977. Some prosodic and paralinguistic features of speech to young children. In C.E. Snow and C.W. Ferguson (eds.), Talking to Children: Language Input and Acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GARVEY, CATHERINE. 1975. Requests and responses in children's speech. Journal of Child Language 2:41-63.
- _____. 1977. The contingent query: a dependent act in conversation. In M. Lewis and L. Rosenblum (eds.), Interaction, Conversation and the Development of Language. New York: Wiley.
- _____. 1979. Contingent queries and their relations in discourse. In E. Ochs and B. Schieffelin (eds.), Developmental Pragmatics. New York: Academic Press.

- GLEITMAN, LILA R., ELISSA NEWPORT and HENRY GLEITMAN. 1984. The current status of the motherese hypothesis. Journal of Child Language, 11:43-79.
- GLEITMAN, LILA R. and ERIC WANNER. 1982. Language acquisition: The state of the art. In E. Wanner and L.R. Gleitman (eds.), Language Acquisition: The State of the Art. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GOFFMAN, ERVING. 1967. Interaction Ritual. New York: Anchor Books.
- _____. 1971. Relations in Public. New York: Basic Books.
- _____. 1974. Frame Analysis. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- GREEN, GEORGIA and JERRY L. MORGAN. 1981. Pragmatics, grammar, and discourse. In P. Cole (ed.), Radical Pragmatics. New York: Academic Press.
- GRICE, H.P. 1975. Logic and conversation. In P. Cole and J.L. Morgan (eds.), Syntax and Semantics. Volume 3: Speech Acts. New York: Academic Press.
- GUMPERZ, JOHN J. 1972. Introduction. In J.J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.), Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- _____. 1982. Discourse Strategies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GUMPERZ, JOHN J. and DELL HYMES. 1972. Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- HALLIDAY, M.A.K. 1970. Language structure and language function. In J. Lyons (ed.), New Horizons in Linguistics. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- _____. 1975. Learning how to mean. London: Matthew Arnold.
- HALLIDAY, M.A.K. and RUQAIYA HASAN. 1976. Cohesion in English. London: Longman.
- HAASTRUP, KIRSTEN and ROBERT PHILIPSON. 1983. Achievement strategies in learner/native speaker interaction. In C. Faerch and G. Kasper (eds.), Strategies in Interlanguage Communication. London: Longman.

- HERNÁNDEZ PIÑA, FUENSANTA. 1984. Teorías psicosocio-lingüísticas y su aplicación a la adquisición del español como lengua materna. México D.F.: Siglo XXI Editores.
- HOWE, CHRISTINE. 1981. Acquiring language in a conversational context. New York: Academic Press.
- HYMES, DELL. 1964. Introduction. American Anthropologist 66:1-34.
- _____. 1972. On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (eds.), Sociolinguistics. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- _____. 1974. Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- INGRAM, DAVID. 1971. Transitivity in child language. Language 47:888-910.
- _____. 1974. Phonological Rules in young children. Journal of Child Language 1:49-64.
- _____. 1989. First Language Acquisition: method, description and explanation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- JEFFERSON, GAIL. 1972. Side sequences. In D. Sudnow (ed.), Studies in Social Interaction. New York: The Free Press.
- _____. 1973. A case of precision timing in ordinary conversation: Overlapped tag-positioned address terms in closing sequences. Semiotica 9:47-96.
- _____. 1974. Error correction as an interactional resource. Language in Society, 2, 181-199.
- _____. 1987. On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In G. Button and J.R. Lee (eds.), Talk and social organization. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- KATZ, JERROLD. 1972. Semantic Theory. New York: Harper and Row.

- KAYE, K. 1980. Why we don't talk 'baby-talk' to babies. Journal of Child Language 7:489-507.
- KIRKMAN, MAGGIE and TONI CROSS. 1984. Functional diversity as a developmental phenomenon in child and parent conversation. In C.L. Thew and C.E. Johnson (eds.), Proceedings of the Second International Congress for the Study of Child Language. Vol. 2:360-378.
- KONEFAL, JOANNE A. and JOANN FOKES. 1984. Linguistic analysis of children's conversational repairs. Journal of Psycholinguistic Research 13:1-11.
- LABOV, WILLIAM. 1971. Methodology. In W.O. Dingwall (ed.), A Survey of Linguistic Science. College Park, MD: Linguistic Program, University of Maryland.
- _____. 1972. The isolation of contextual styles. In W. Labov (ed.), Sociolinguistics Patterns. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- LABOV, WILLIAM and DAVID FANSHEL. 1977. Therapeutic Discourse. New York: Academic Press.
- LABOV, WILLIAM and JOSHUA WALETZKY. 1967. Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience. In J. Helm (ed.), Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts. Seattle: Washington University Press.
- LANGFORD, DAVID. 1981. The clarification request sequence in conversation between mothers and their children. In P. French and M. MacLure, (eds.), Adult-Child Conversation. London: Croom Helm.
- LEVELT, W.J.M. 1983. Monitoring and self-repair in speech. Cognition, 14:41-104.
- _____. 1989. Speaking: from intention to articulation. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- LEWIS, DAVID. 1972. General Semantics. In G. Harman and D. Davidson (eds.), Semantics of Natural Languages. Dordrecht, Holland: Reidel. (Cited in Dore 1977).
- LIEVEN, ELENA. 1978. Conversations between mothers and young children: Individual differences and their possible implication for the study of language learning. In N. Waterson and C.E. Snow (eds.), The Development of Communication. London: Wiley.

- LINAZA, JOSE. 1991. Spanish database included in CHILDES database. (See MacWhinney 1991).
- MACLAY, H. and C. OSGOOD. 1959. Hesitation phenomena in spontaneous English speech. Word 15:19-44.
- MACWHINNEY, BRIAN and HARRY OSSER. 1977. Verbal planning functions in children's speech. Child Development, 48:978-985.
- MACWHINNEY, BRIAN. 1991. The CHILDES Project: Tools for analyzing talk. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- MACWHINNEY, BRIAN and CATHERINE E. SNOW. 1990. The Child Language Data Exchange System: an update. Journal of Child Language 17:457-472.
- MCNEILL, DAVID. 1970. The Acquisition of Language. New York: Harper and Row.
- MCTEAR, MICHAEL. 1985. Children's conversation. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- MILLER, WICK and SUSAN ERVIN. 1964. The development of grammar in child language. In U. Bellugi and R. Brown (eds.), The Acquisition of Language. Monograph of the Society for Research on Child Development 29(1):9-33.
- MOERK, ERNST L. 1983. The mother of Eve - as a first language teacher. Norwood, NJ: Ablex
- MOHAN, BERNARD. 1974. Do sequencing rules exist? Semiotica 12:75-96.
- MONTES, ROSA GRACIELA. 1978. Extending a concept: Functioning directly. In R.W. Shuy and M. Griffin (eds.), Children's Functional Language and Education in the Early Years. Final report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- _____. 1986. Secuencias de clarificación en conversaciones con niños. Morphé, 3-4
- MORGAN, JERRY L. 1978. Two types of convention in indirect speech acts. In P. Cole (ed.), Syntax and Semantics 9: Pragmatics. New York: Academic Press.

- NEWPORT, ELISSA L., HENRY GLEITMAN and LILA R. GLEITMAN. 1977. Mother I'd rather do it myself: some effects and non-effects of maternal speech style. In C.E. Snow and C.W. Ferguson (eds.), Talking to Children: Language Input and Acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- NOOTEBOOM, S.G. 1973. The tongue slips into patterns. In V. Fromkin (ed.), Speech errors as linguistic evidence. The Hague: Mouton.
- _____. 1980. Speaking and unspeaking: detection and correction of phonological and lexical errors in spontaneous speech. In V. Fromkin (ed.), Errors in linguistic performance. New York: Academic Press.
- NORRICK, NEAL R. 1991. On the organization of corrective exchanges in conversation. Journal of Pragmatics 16: 59-83.
- OCHS, ELINOR. 1979. Transcription as theory. In E. Ochs and B. Schieffelin (eds.), Developmental Pragmatics. New York: Academic Press.
- _____. 1984. Clarification in culture. In D. Schiffrin (ed.), Meaning, Form and Use in Context: Linguistic Applications. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- _____. 1987. Input: a sociocultural perspective. In M. Hickmann (ed.), Social and Functional Approaches to Language and Thought. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- OCHS, ELINOR and BAMBI SCHIEFFELIN (eds.) 1979. Developmental Pragmatics. New York: Academic Press.
- OCHS, ELINOR, BAMBI SCHIEFFELIN and MARTHA PLATT. 1979. Propositions across utterances and speakers. In E. Ochs and B. Schieffelin (eds.), Developmental Pragmatics. New York: Academic Press.
- OSSER, HARRY. 1971. Developmental studies of communicative competence. In R.W. Shuy (ed.), Sociolinguistics: A Crossdisciplinary Perspective. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- PEARL, RUTH, MAVIS DONAHUE and TANIS BRYAN. 1981. Children's responses to non-explicit requests for clarification. Perceptual and Motor Skills 53:919-925.

- PHILLIPS, J. 1973. Syntax and vocabulary of mothers' speech to young children: age and sex comparisons. Child Development 44:182-85.
- POMERANTZ, ANITA. 1978. Compliment responses. In J. Schenkein (ed.), Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction. New York: Academic Press.
- _____. 1984. Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred twin shapes. In J.M. Atkinson and J.C. Heritage (eds.), Structures of Social Action. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- RATNER, NAN B. and JEROME S. BRUNER. 1978. Games, social exchange and the acquisition of language. Journal of Child Language 5:391-401.
- ROGERS, SINCLAIR. 1978. Self-initiated corrections in the speech of infant-school children. Journal of Child Language 5:365-371.
- RONDAL, JEAN A. 1985. Adult-Child Interaction and the Process of Language Acquisition. New York: Praeger.
- SACHS, JACQUELINE. 1977. The adaptive significance of linguistic input to prelinguistic infants. In C.E. Snow and C.W. Ferguson (eds.), Talking to Children: Language Input and Acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SACHS, JACQUELINE and J. DEVIN. 1976. Young children's use of age-appropriate speech styles. Journal of Child Language 3:81-98.
- SACKS, HARVEY. 1973. lecture notes. Summer Institute of the Linguistic Society of America, Ann Arbor, MI.
- SACKS, HARVEY, E.A. SCHEGLOFF and G. JEFFERSON. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. Language, 50, 696-735.
- SACKS, HARVEY, E.A. SCHEGLOFF and G. JEFFERSON. 1978. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. In J. Schenkein (ed.), Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction. New York: Academic Press.

- SALO-LEE, SIRKKA-LIISA. 1987. Self-repairs in learner language: Evidence from German at different oral proficiency levels. Ph.D. dissertation, Georgetown University.
- SCHEGLOFF, EMMANUEL A. 1979. The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation. In T. Givon (ed.), Discourse and Syntax. New York: Academic Press.
- _____. 1987a. Between micro and macro: contexts and other connections. In J.C. Alexander et al, (eds.), The Macro-Micro Link. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- _____. 1987b. Some sources of misunderstanding in talk-in-interaction. Linguistics 25:201-218.
- SCHEGLOFF, EMMANUEL A., GAIL JEFFERSON and HARVEY SACKS. 1977. The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. Language 2:361-382.
- SCHEGLOFF, EMMANUEL A. and HARVEY SACKS. 1973. Opening up closings. Semiotica 7:289-327.
- SCHIEFFELIN, BAMBI. 1979. Getting it together: An ethnographic approach to the study of the development of communicative competence. In E. Ochs and B. Schieffelin (eds.), Developmental Pragmatics. New York: Academic Press.
- SCOLLON, RONALD. 1976. Conversations with a one-year-old: A case study of the developmental foundation of syntax. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- SEARLE, JOHN R. 1969. Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1975. Indirect speech acts. In P. Cole and J.L. Morgan (eds.), Syntax and Semantics. Vol. 3:Speech Acts. New York: Academic Press.
- SHATZ, MARILYN. 1981. Learning the rules of the game: Four views of the relation between social interaction and syntax acquisition. In W. Deutsch (ed.), The Child's Construction of Language. New York: Academic Press.
- _____. 1982. On mechanisms of language acquisition: Can features of the communicative environment account for

- development? In E. Wanner and L.R. Gleitman (eds.), Language Acquisition: The State of the Art. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1984. Contributions of mother and mind to the development of communicative competence: A status report. In M. Perlmutter (ed.), Parent-Child Interaction and Parent-Child Relations in Child Development. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- SHATZ, MARILYN and ROCHEL GELMAN. 1973. The development of communication skills: modification in the speech of young children as a function of listener. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development 38.
- SHATZ, MARILYN and ROCHEL GELMAN. 1977. Beyond syntax: the influence of conversational constraints on speech modifications. In C.E. Snow and C.W. Ferguson (eds.), Talking to Children: Language Input and Acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SHUY, ROGER W. 1982. The importance of understanding function from a sociolinguist's perspective. In The Language of Children Reared in Poverty, ed. L. Feagans and D. Farran. New York: Academic Press.
- SHUY, ROGER W. and MARGARET GRIFFIN. 1978. Children's functional language and education in the early years. Final report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- SHUY, ROGER W. and JANA STATON. 1982. Assessing oral language ability in children. In L. Feagans and D. Farran (eds.), The Language of Children Reared in Poverty. New York: Academic Press.
- SINCLAIR, JOHN H. and MALCOLM COULTHARD. 1975. Towards an Analysis of Discourse. London: Oxford University Press.
- SINCLAIR, ANNE, R.J. JARVELLA and W.J.M. LEVELT. 1978. The child's conception of language. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- SNYDER, A.D. 1914. Notes on the talk of a two-and-a-half year old boy. Pedagogical Seminary 21:412-424. (Cited in Clark 1978).

- SNOW, CATHERINE E. 1976. Mothers' speech to children. In W. von Raffler-Engel and Y. Lebrun (eds.), Baby-Talk and Infant Speech. Amsterdam: Swets and Zeitlinger B.V.
- _____. 1977a. The development of conversation between mothers and babies. Journal of Child Language 4:1-22.
- _____. 1977b. Mothers' speech research: from input to interaction. In C.E. Snow and C.W. Ferguson (eds.), Talking to Children: Language Input and Acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1978. Social interaction and language acquisition. In P.S. Dale and D. Ingram (eds.), Child Language - An International Perspective. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.
- _____. 1979. The role of social interaction in language development. In W.A. Collins (ed.), Children's Language and Communication. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- _____. 1984. Parent-child interaction and the development of communicative ability. In R.L. Schiefelbusch and Joanne Pickar (eds.), The Acquisition of Communicative Competence. Baltimore: University Park Press.
- SNOW, CATHERINE E. and CHARLES W. FERGUSON (eds.). 1977. Talking to children: Language Input and Acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SUDNOW, DAVID (ed.). 1972. Studies in Social Interaction. New York: The Free Press.
- TOMASELLO, MICHAEL, JEFFREY FARRAR and JENNIFER DINES. 1984. Children's speech revisions for a familiar and unfamiliar adult. Journal of Speech and Hearing Research 27:359-363.
- WELLS, GORDON. 1981. Learning through Interaction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1985. Language Development in the Pre-school Years. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- WEXLER, KENNETH. 1982. A principle theory for language acquisition. In E. Wanner and L.R. Gleitman (eds.), Language Acquisition: The State of the Art. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

WILCOX, M. JEANNE and ELIZABETH J.WEBSTER. 1980. Early discourse behavior: an analysis of children's responses to listener feedback. Child Development 51:1120-1125.