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Abstract

This study analyzes how intersubjectivity is restored after a repair initiation in native and non-native speakers in Italian conversations. The main objective of the present study is to fill a gap in previous research analyzing a particular instance of repair, *word search*, which focuses on lexical items, both in native (NSs) and non-native speakers (NNSs). Word searches are incidental and are launched when speakers have problems in producing a lexical item during a spate of talk, either because they can’t recall a lexical or grammatical item or because they truly do not know it. At that point the action of the conversation is halted and it is resumed when the word search has been completed (or abandoned). This research aims to look at the strategies that are exploited during this particular action by using Conversation Analysis (CA) as the research methodology that has recently been employed in many Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research studies.

The data consist of eleven hours and fifty minutes of non-elicited videotaped dinners in which 39 Italian native speakers and 8 American students of Italian interacted. The corpus yielded 105 word searches: 52 native speakers’ word search activities and 53 non-native speakers’ word search activities.

Our data show that, unlike English-speaking participants, Italian participants offer potential candidate solutions to speakers even when there is no eye contact or appeal for help. Italians seem to privilege resolutions of the search carried out jointly and done as collaborative completions. When the other participant/s help the speaker resolve the search, the candidate solutions Italian participants offer, are not produced with the questioning intonations, which occur in English.

Non-native Italian speakers carry out word searches in a systematic way. They initiate repairs with hesitation markers and disfluencies. The students’ use of resources to initiate repairs
deals not only with production problems in the talk, but also display and construct their identities as non-native speakers in the interaction. They assume a thinking face and make eye contact to appeal for help. When they offer a possible solution they produce it with questioning intonation, as they need to have it confirmed by the native speaker, who assumes the role of expert. During interactions the ability to use the language emerges and is shaped by the local context. Finally, gestures are found to be salient interactional resources not only at the onset of the search, but also as tools to facilitate its resolution.

Lexical searches are very important in L2 learning because they might provide a crucial moment in the learner’s acquisition (Hammarberg, 1998), the present study showed how the repetition of the searched-for word and its incorporation into the context to complete the action that was on hold resulted in language learning at least at the local level, at that particular moment of the interaction.
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Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Issues and Significance of the Study

Human interaction represents “the primordial site of sociality” (Schegloff as cited in Heritage, 2003); human interaction, ‘talk-in-interaction’ as Schegloff calls it, constitutes almost any social activity. People talk in turns and create sequences to develop actions; they hear and understand (Schegloff, 2007). Talk-in-interaction is fundamental to carrying out an overwhelming proportion of human relationships in society (e.g., politics, economy, family) and its primordial form is conversation (Heritage, 1984b; Schegloff, 1992, 1997a, 1999). However, talk-in-interaction is not just about exchanging messages; it is the result of cooperation and negotiation between interlocutors. The study of talk-in-interaction is fundamental to understanding social life. Interaction also plays an important role in the process of second (L2) or foreign language (FL) acquisition.

The present investigation examines one aspect of a particular interactional practice called repair, specifically word searches. Word searches occur when speakers break off a turn in progress, not modifying anything previously said, but pausing to search for words to continue their turn (Schegloff, 1979a; Schegloff E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H., 1977; Sorjonen, 1997 as cited in Helasvuo, Laakso, & Sorjonen, 2004) until the search is solved; this practice is common to native and non-native speakers (L1, L2).\(^1\)

\(^1\) Some researchers (e.g., Firth & Wagner, 2007a; Olsher, 2000; Rampton, 1990) have questioned the term “native/nonnative speakers,” as a dichotomous term, “native/nonnative” tends to oversimplify the reality of our current multilingual world. They argued that while the term “native” portrays an omniscient figure, the term “nonnative” implies a deficient communicator. Gardner and Wagner (2004) consider the term L1/L2 speakers as more neutral than the term “native/nonnative speakers.” Aware of all the implications related to the choice, in this study we will use the term “L1/L2 speakers” interchangeably with “native/non-native.”
This chapter will introduce some issues related to Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and the usefulness of a conversation analytic approach for investigating L1/L2 Italian conversations. It will then outline the study, its contributions and organization.

### 1.1.1 Second language acquisition

Since its appearance as a sub-field of applied linguistics, SLA has investigated how and why people acquire a second language, also explaining why not everyone is successful in L2 acquisition. SLA research has, traditionally, considered interaction as a source of input (Pica, Halliday, Lewis, & Morgenthaler, 1989) and consequently as promoting language learning (Long, 1983; Gass, 1997; Swain, 1985). Research in SLA has drawn on a variety of approaches, such as: first language acquisition, cognitive psychology, linguistics, psycho- and sociolinguistics, connectionism, neuroscience and bilingualism, examining mainly native speaker (NS) vs. non-native speaker (NNS) conversations in instructional or experimental settings as opposed to naturally occurring conversations. According to Cook (1986), SLA research has relied on three kinds of methodological approaches: (1) the ‘observational’ carried out by eliciting language information and analyzing discourse; (2) the ‘difference method’ that measures learner’s or situational variables and correlates them with proficiency or other aspects; and (3)‘the manipulative method’ based on comparison of the results achieved by treated groups versus untreated groups.

Firth and Wagner (1997/2007a, 2007b) criticize the cognitive and mentalistic orientation that SLA research presents and recommend a reconceptualization of the research in three areas: “(a) a significantly enhanced awareness of the contextual and interactional dimensions of language use, (b) an increased emic (i.e., participant-relevant) sensitivity towards fundamental
concepts, and (c) the broadening of the traditional SLA database” (Firth & Wagner, 1997/2007a, p. 758). They stress the necessity of keeping language acquisition and language use together.

The publication of their article has caused positive and negative reactions among SLA researchers. Mori (2007) insists SLA research does not share Firth and Wagner’s “expansion of the ontological and epistemological parameters of the field” (Mori, 2007, p.581).

Negative remarks come from Gass (1998), Kasper (1997), Long (1997), and Poulisse (1997b), who emphasize that SLA research deals with acquisition and not language use. However, Foster-Cohen (1999) claims that only a fruitful cooperation between all the fields, both of first and second language acquisition, can help us understand how a mind is able to learn a language. Larsen-Freeman (2000, 2007) states that a pluralistic approach, based both on individual-cognitive and social cultural perspectives, is necessary to understand the mechanism underlying the acquisition of a foreign language. Markee (2000), agreeing with Firth and Wagner, affirms that SLA research has shown a “preference for a theory driven, experimental, and quantitative approach … at the expense of a data-driven, microanalytic, and qualitative approach…” (p. 3). This vivid debate seems to have revived interest in a more social and contextual dimension of investigation. Markee and Kasper (2004) highlight the way in which the situation has changed since Firth and Wagner’s 1997/2007a article. They affirm that there is a growing interest in applying a conversation analytic (CA) methodology to the study of L2 and FL classroom talk (Markee & Kasper, 2004, p. 495). Investigations applying a conversation analytic approach to various L2 data analyze both learning (e.g., Brouwer, 2003, 2004; Brouwer, Rasmussen, & Wagner, 2004; Carroll, 2004; Golato, 2002; Hayashi, 1994, 2003a; He, 2004; Hellerman, 2006, 2007, 2008; Kasper, 2009; Koshik, 2002; Markee, 2000, 2004a, 2004b, 2008; Mori, 2004a, 2004b, 2007; Olsher, 2004), and teaching (e.g., Bowles & Seedhouse, 2007; Burns
Some current research in the field of SLA centers on the nature of repair processes, which can be defined as the means used by interactants to resolve trouble sources in interactions. These studies deal with interactions in L2 classrooms (Kasper, 1985; van Lier, 1998; Markee, 2000; Seedhouse, 2004). The research focuses mainly on other-initiated other-repair (initiated and completed by the teacher) and other-initiated self-repair (initiated by the teacher and completed by the student). There are also studies of the types of repair beneficial for language learning (Kinginger, 1995; Boyd & Maloof, 2000; Oliver & Mackey, 2003) and studies comparing native and non-native speakers’ repairs (Gaskill, 1980; Schwartz, 1980; Egbert, 1998). Many studies examine conversation in various language-learning classrooms finding that there is a preference for teachers to initiate repairs of student mistakes and have students correct their talk (other-initiated self-repair) (McHoul, 1990).

Seedhouse (2004) highlights the role context plays in the way repair is organized in institutional settings. However, few studies have compared native speakers’ repair strategies with those of non-native speakers (Egbert, 1998; Liebscher & Daily-O’cain, 2003). On the other hand there is extensive research on both native and non-native mundane conversations analyzing the characteristics of repairs (e.g., Brouwer, 2003; Brouwer, Rasmussen & Wagner, 2004; Helasvuo et al., 2004; Hosoda, 2000, 2006; Kalin, 1995; Kurhila, 2001, 2006; Rasmussen & Wagner, 2000; Wong, 1994, 2000a, 2000b) and some of those studies look at a particular kind of repair: word searches (e.g., Brouwer, 2003; Helasvuo et al., 2004; Kurhila, 2006). Word searches are interactional practices that occur when speakers display trouble in producing a lexical item due in the ongoing turn at talk. Sometimes the trouble is manifested by questions like “What is it
called?” “What’s her name again?” “Whatchamacallit?” Participants in an interaction are able to recognize the features of a word search sequence and engage in building such sequences. Because word searches are present in native and non-native speakers’ interactions, they are loci of great interest for analysis that examines their potential use in promoting language learning.

The present study analyzes word searches in Italian native and non-native dinner table conversation. Although there are other investigations of repair interactions occurring in Italian talk-in-interaction that use a conversation analytical approach. However, to our knowledge, there are no studies of word searches in Italian conversation.

1.1.2 Conversation analysis and Italian conversations


There are investigations of repairs in Italian conversations in both institutional and ordinary settings. Repairs deal with a wide range of problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding talk-in-interaction. Crucially, when repair is initiated, speakers stop the ongoing action and only continue the prior action once the problem has been resolved (Schegloff et al. 1977). Repairs are classified by who initiates repair (self or other) and by who resolves the
problem (self or other) as well as by how it unfolds within a turn or a sequence of turns (see Chapter two for a more detailed discussion of repair) (Schegloff et al. 1977).

Gavioli (1995), analyzing repairs in English and Italian bookshop encounters finds that laughter occupies different positions in the turns with different sequential implications and different talk organization. This finding leads Gavioli to affirm that “the different organization of laughter in English and Italian data can be considered one indication of different ways in which speakers organize their talk in correspondence with different mechanisms of preference in the two cultures and that the different mechanisms can provide clues to culture-specific regularities in the organization of talk in Italian and English” (Gavioli, 1995, pp. 382-383).

Zorzi (1999), in her contrastive analysis of English and Italian bookshop service encounters, presents outcomes similar to Gavioli’s. She shows how openings and requests in English and Italian are apparently similar, but they are accomplished by different activities in the two languages: negotiation of information in English and negotiation of suggestions in Italian. Moreover, she highlights how the interactional sequences are built differently, even if they perform the same action, such as a preferred response. Zorzi (1990) states that Italian and English people say “le stesse cose” (p. 111), the same things, but in different positions. According to Zorzi, the disfluencies present in intercultural exchanges are caused by the different ways interactions are built in the respective mother tongues; that is, the participants in the interactions transfer patterns typical of their languages when speaking another language. This different structure undermines the expectations of the interlocutors, even if the role of the participants in the interaction and the setting are not predetermined by the context, but the speakers themselves negotiate them.
1.2 **Outline of the Present Study**

The main objective of the present study is to fill a gap in previous research analyzing a particular instance of repair, *word search*, which focuses on lexical items, both in native (NSs) and non-native speakers (NNSs). Word searches are incidental and are launched when speakers have problems in producing a lexical item during a spate of talk, either because they can’t recall a lexical or grammatical item or because they truly do not know it. At that point the action of the conversation is halted and it is resumed when the word search has been completed (or abandoned). The present investigation aims to identify the kinds of conversational trouble participants display in word searches. Moreover, it investigates the linguistic means speakers employ, and the cues they orient to, in treating and, eventually, overcoming this trouble. This study also seeks to discover whether the findings of Gavioli (1995) and Zorzi (1998, 1999) can be supported with additional empirical evidence from native and non-native speakers of Italian involved in word searches.

Moreover, since lexical searches are very important in L2 learning because they might provide a crucial moment in the learner’s acquisition (Hammarberg, 1998), the present study also aims to see if it is possible to track any “comprehended input” (Gass, 1997) transformed into “comprehended output” (Markee, 2000). Brouwer (2003) affirms that it is necessary to provide a very fine-grained analysis of the data available to verify any sort of acquisition. It still remains a difficult task, especially considering that, according to Gavioli (1995) and Zorzi (1990, 1991, 1996, 1998,1999), the trouble-source of much misunderstanding between native Italian speakers and English non-native speakers of Italian is the encoding.
1.3 **Research Methodology**

CA became a sustained scientific way of investigation only in the early 1960s. It was Harvey Sacks and, later on, Emanuel Schegloff who, analyzing audio-recordings, realized that there was a system behind conversations. At the beginning, the approach was labeled ethnomethodological by Garfinkel (1974) as it examines the ways in which everyday activities are analyzed by participants and how these analyses are incorporated into courses of action. CA examines procedures used in the production of ordinary conversation.

CA thus begins as a form of ethnomethodology, using recorded data. Its focus is on language considered as a tool deployed in interactions. It is a qualitative methodology that aims to unfold the system and structures of interaction through an emic approach (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984; Markee, 2000; Ten Have, 2007), in which the actions performed by the participants in the talk are analyzed and studied in detail. CA interest lies in the procedural infrastructure of situated action. It works with detailed transcriptions of interactional activities, which are audio or video-recorded. The data recorded are not experimental or research provoked, but ‘naturally occurring,’ that is, CA studies oral language as it used in everyday conversations. Data transcriptions offer the opportunity to analyze in detail what and how something is said without any aprioristic theoretical frame (Markee, 2000; Psathas, 1995; Have, 2007). The analyst can highlight phenomena that would be missed if data were collected using field notes, recall protocol, discourse completion task, or any other form of collection.

The method is based on three important assumptions: “(1) interaction is structurally organized; (2) contributions to interaction are contextually oriented; and (3) these two properties inhere in the details of interaction so that no order of detail can be dismissed *a priori*, as disorderly, accidental or irrelevant” (Heritage, 1984b, p.241).
Such assumptions imply that the organization underlying any conversation is independent from the psychological or other characteristics inherent to the speakers. Participants to talk-in-interaction can be shown to be aware of this organization. Their expectations about the development of a spate of talk are such that, if the other interlocutor does not perform the correct action, a break in the communication (e.g., slight pauses, hesitations, repair, miscommunication) may occur. This occurs especially in cross-cultural conversations, where differences in language proficiency and knowledge of the world can lead to miscommunication and problems in understanding, which surface in the progress of the conversation (Gumperz, 1982, 1992; Egbert, Niebecker, & Rezzara, 2004; Kalin, 1995; Kurhila, 2001, 2006; Zorzi, 1991, 1996, 1998).

The context plays a special role in analyzing and interpreting interactional behavior (Schegloff, 1990, 1995a, 1996c, 2007). Every contribution by each single interlocutor is context-shaped and context renewing. Any action is shaped and strictly related to what comes before and it must be considered in the more global context that frames the whole situation. Actions are considered context renewing as they add elements or change the context given in the previous turn. The data reveal systematic and orderly properties, which are meaningful for the participants in a conversation, influencing their conduct, which is regulated by norms and mutual knowledge of social situations.

Two basic features of the orderliness of a conversation are: intersubjectivity and repairs (Kalin, 1995). **Intersubjectivity** can be considered the foundation of all the negotiations of meaning in which the interlocutors are involved while producing and interpreting talk. In sum the organization of talk is implemented on a turn-by-turn basis and is sustained by the context of publicly displayed and continuously updated intersubjective understandings (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984). **Repairs** are done to check understanding and to either repair production or
interpretation. The social knowledge that speakers have seems to contain norms that underlie most social actions although they are not explicitly taught or sanctioned. Their existence can be recognized during the production and interpretation of a conversation; when these norms are not observed, “the discursive actions connected with the identification of deviations (errors or other ambiguities)” (Zorzi, 1998) require remedial actions, which are part of the organization of repair.

CA, being based on recipient design and recipient display, shows how participants not only create their utterances for specific listeners in specific contexts, but also how listeners display their understanding of those spates of talk; moreover, participants intervene in case of trouble to repair and restore intersubjectivity. In this way meaning is mutually constructed. CA methodology, with its stress on understandability and meaning, is particularly well suited for the present study based on word searches in the dinner talk conversations of Italian families hosting American students learning Italian. Dinner table interactions can present a variety of speech modes and speech genres (Blum-Kulka, 1997) easily caught by the conversation analytic approach. During dinners, complex social performances and social meaning are jointly and dynamically negotiated (Blum-Kulka, 1997). These characteristics of dinner talk make it an excellent resource for examining native and non-native speaker repairs and possible miscommunication in cross-cultural encounters.

1.3.1 **Data and participants**

The data for this study were collected in Italy, between May and June 2001.² The collection consists of eight videotapes of seven dinners and one afternoon “ice-cream” (It is quite

---

² The data collection occurred in compliance with the regulations and policies set by Institutional Review Board of the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign. The participants consented to being videotaped and to taking part in the project. The names of the participants do not appear in the transcripts, general words such as woman, man, boy, etc., have been used to ensure the subjects’ anonymity. Pseudonyms were used in the transcriptions when the participants addressed one another. Each dinner is labeled with the date it occurred.
common, in Sicily, during the summer, for people to meet late in the afternoon for “un gelato.”) for a total of eleven hours and fifty minutes.

Eight families participated in the study. Each of them hosted one of the students from the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign participating in the Study Abroad Program in a major city in Sicily. The students in the study had already taken at least two semesters of Italian at the University of Urbana–Champaign; they were taking the third or fourth semester during the summer program. Some of them were quite fluent because their families were of Italian origin or their mother tongue was Spanish.

The original aim of the project was to collect materials from informal family dinners that would include the participation of the non-native speaker student hosted by each family. Unfortunately, the dinners soon became more formal. The families agreed to being videotaped; however, they invited the researcher to take part in the dinners since she had to go to their houses anyway to position the video camera and the microphones. Moreover, some families extended the invitation to other family members or friends. The dinners became more formal (and larger); this might have affected the students’ involvement in the interactions. The students did not participate in the conversations unless they were explicitly addressed with a question. In multi-party interactions it is difficult to take the floor especially for students who do not have enough competence to project the possible loci where turns end. Other caveats are related to the number of participants at each dinner and the difficulty in recognizing the voices of each individual; the occurrence of more than one interaction at the same time, schisming (Egbert,

---

3 It would have been very impolite to reject the invitations and probably would have compromised the possibility of videotaping the dinners.
1997a), all of which made it difficult to hear and transcribe the different conversations. In addition, the background noise of dishes, music and/or birds singing sometimes covered the voices of the participants.

Even when the researcher asked in advance where she could position the video camera and the microphones in order to avoid possible problems, sometimes the position of the camera and the microphones were changed as they impeded the access to certain areas or the lights were turned on or off. Those changes resulted in videos of poor quality; consequently sometimes the analysis of eye gaze, gestures, and bodily movements is not reliable and is omitted.

Table 1
*Dinners 2001*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>MOTHER</th>
<th>FATHER</th>
<th>CHILD 1</th>
<th>CHILD 2</th>
<th>GUESTS</th>
<th>PARTICIPANTS(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28 May</td>
<td>H.S. English teacher</td>
<td>H.S. P.E. teacher</td>
<td>19 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncle</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 May</td>
<td>M.S. English teacher</td>
<td>Sales rep.</td>
<td>10 yrs</td>
<td>8 yrs</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 May</td>
<td>Elementary teacher</td>
<td>H.S. P.E. teacher</td>
<td>19 yrs</td>
<td>10 yrs</td>
<td>Child 10 yrs</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 May</td>
<td>H.S. P.E. teacher</td>
<td>University Researcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 June</td>
<td>Elementary teacher</td>
<td>H.S. teacher</td>
<td>9-10 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 June</td>
<td>H.S. Italian teacher</td>
<td>Sales rep.</td>
<td>20 yrs</td>
<td>13 yrs</td>
<td>Grand-mother</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 June</td>
<td>Elementary teacher</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>20 yrs</td>
<td>19 yrs</td>
<td>Two guests(^b)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 June</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>18 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\) Including the researcher

\(^{b}\) One of the father's friends & the American student's mother

Once the data were collected, following Ten Have’s (2007) suggested steps, rough transcripts were made to create a visual record of what the participants uttered. These transcripts were rough because details, such as overlap and pause, were not included.

---

\(^4\) Schisming occurs when a previous conversation (to which four or more speakers participate) splits into two conversations and the interlocutors participate in one of the two conversations.
During this first stage transcription, potential instances of repair were noted. At a later stage, when the transcriptions were completed in all their details, the initial instances were analyzed and sorted, focusing attention on word searches. The corpus is composed of a total of 105 word searches: 52 produced by native speakers and 53 produced by non-native speakers.

The transcription conventions adopted are the ones developed by Gail Jefferson (see Appendix A), described in Atkinson and Heritage (1984); when relevant, other actions, such as eye gaze, gestures or body action, are noted as well and they appear above the speakers’ lines. The lines containing the target phenomena are marked with an arrow (⇒). Since the data of the present investigation are in Italian, the transcriptions are on three lines for every line of speech. The first line provides the Italian talk, the second an English gloss and the third one the idiomatic English translation. To make reading easier, the original Italian line is in normal letters, as well as the English gloss, while the idiomatic English lines are in italics.

1.4 Contributions of the Study

The present investigation offers contributions to three research areas: (a) studies in second language acquisition and use; (b) studies on talk-in-interaction; and (c) studies in Italian language.

This study confirms previous research (Hosoda, 2000; Seo, 2008) on the importance of analyzing more than the utterances in native speakers/non-native speakers’ interactions. Past SLA research analyzes and evaluates L2 utterances only according to the linguistic forms they contain. Attention to both linguistic and non-verbal resources deployed in talk-in-interactions is fundamental and may shed some light on the language acquisition process. Our data show native speakers, who are also teachers, sometimes take the role of teachers in dinner table conversations and correct students’ turns as though they were in a classroom setting. However, there are
instances in which L1 speakers do not pay attention to linguistic errors produced by the students. Instead, in order to accomplish their goals in ongoing interaction they deploy not only linguistic forms, but other resources as well, such as sequential organization, local interactional context and bodily movements.

The nativeness and non-nativeness of the participants surfaces only when the students engage in repairs and appeal for the help of a native speaker in their search for a word. Sometimes this action appears to emphasize the bond created with the family members, showing membership in the group. Therefore the present study might contribute to understanding certain distinctive non-native speaker interactions.

This study, examining word searches in Italian L1 and L2 conversations provides an important contribution to studies on CA. In recent years a growing number of investigations have dealt with word searches in languages other than English (cf. Brouwer, 2003, 2004 for Danish; Carroll, 2000, 2004, 2005; Hayashi, 2003a, 2003b; Hosoda, 2000, 2002, 2006; Jung, 2004; Mori, 2002, 2003, 2004a for Japanese; Kurhila, 2006 for Finnish) revealing mechanisms that are the same across languages and others that are language-specific. The present study confirms that Italians engaged in a word search deploy the same features as the speakers of other languages as well as some distinctive characteristics: (1) the recipients offer candidate solutions even when the speakers do not appeal for help; and (2) candidate solutions are not try-marked unlike those in other languages.

The present investigation confirms once again that a CA methodology is adequate for analyzing both native and non-native interactions. As Wong (2000b) affirms, CA has a great potential for noticing features in L2 interactions ignored by research applying traditional SLA.
approaches, because it reveals participants’ understanding and analyses of the ongoing talk that is displayed in the turn-taking system or sequence structure.

Finally, this study contributes to the studies in Italian repair. It explicates the similarities and differences between Italian and English speakers through detailed, empirical examination of participants’ actual orientation and understanding in the sequences of naturally occurring conversations.

1.5 **Organization of the Study**

The following chapter presents the relevant literature on CA, SLA and repair. It addresses the main characteristics of repair in general, presenting examples from this corpus and from the literature on repair, describing the characteristics of repair initiators, their functions, and how trouble is handled. The relevant literature on gestures and interaction is analyzed.

The third chapter contains a discussion of a particular form of repair, namely word searches. It presents all the previous research and the characteristics of word searches in English and in Italian. Finally, it highlights the similarities and dissimilarities between word searches in Italian and other languages. The fourth chapter is devoted to the analysis of word searches carried out by non-native speakers of Italian. It describes their differences from native speakers and possible mother tongue influences. The way native speakers and non-native speakers orient to each other is discussed as well. The last chapter contains a summary of the findings, analysis of possible caveats, and draws conclusions considering the possible implications for CA, SLA and for further research.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The aim of the present investigation is to analyze how intersubjectivity is restored with a repair initiation in native and non-native speakers of Italian conversations. The types of repair under investigation are word searches that are initiated and then resolved or abandoned. This research aims to look at the strategies that are exploited during this particular action by using CA as the research methodology. The present chapter will introduce CA as a theoretical and methodological approach that has recently been employed in many SLA research studies. It will then analyze the main features characterizing CA: turn-taking organization, intersubjectivity based on sequence organization, and repair. In particular, it will define a particular type of repair: a word search. It will introduce relevant studies on word searches both in native and non-native speaker conversation, in both ordinary and institutional interactions. In addition, it will analyze the influence of body language, such as gestures and eye gazes, in resolving the search and re-establishing understanding among speakers. Finally, it will discuss issues related to SLA, such as input–intake–output, and introduce some theoretical implications for communication strategies and the acquisition of vocabulary relevant to the present research.

2.2 Conversation Analysis

CA was developed in the early 1960’s by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson in California. They were influenced by Erving Goffman’s approach to interaction and Harold Garfinkel’s ethno-methodology. Goffman’s research dealt with face-to-face interaction that he named “the interaction order” (Goffman, 1983 as cited in Ten Have, 2007). Garfinkel’s ethnomethodology focused, instead, on “the procedural study of common-sense activities” (Ten Have, 2007, p. 6).
The new theoretical framework emphasized the emergent nature of interaction in contrast to the assumptions of structural-functionalism. The structural-functionalist approach emphasized the stability of cultural patterns, ignoring the local context, while CA highlighted the importance of a detailed analysis of naturally occurring social interactions. As Seedhouse (2004) states, CA privileged a bottom-up approach, which is dynamic, empirical, and emic. CA is emic because it “is interested in the procedural infrastructure of situated action” (Ten Have, 2007, p. 35); that is, the procedures of talk-in-interaction. Such an approach highlights the orderliness that underlies any ordinary and institutional conversation. This orderliness is the product of the speakers’ ability to interact in a variety of situations.

CA is a data-driven approach: no category of analysis can be predetermined according to a particular theory. Analyses are based on what the participants construct and display turn after turn based on the “set of normative resources which interactants make use of to display the meaning of their social actions to their partners and to interpret their partners’ actions” (Seedhouse, 2004, pp. 37-38). Throughout conversation speakers display their meaning to each other, and hence this meaning becomes available to researchers through what Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998, p. 15) define as the “next-turn proof procedure,” that is the understanding that a recipient shows of what the speaker uttered in the prior turn. Hutchby and Wooffitt consider it “the most basic tool” to analyze the orderly properties of talk accomplished by the interlocutors. Any predetermined theoretical assumptions to analyze the data would be considered misleading.

CA researchers do not use follow-up interviews of the participants for their analysis, as the participants to the interactions cannot be fully aware or accurately remember each moment of their interaction. As Markee (2000) highlights, self-report data reconstruct and interpret the original data and such “reconstructions are not necessarily more accurate or insightful than the
original interpretations of the observed behavior” (p. 28). Recorded data of naturally occurring talk can be observed repeatedly and therefore CA researchers believe other data collection methods, such as participant observation or participants’ interviews to be less reliable. Moreover, CA researchers do not base their analysis on pre-formulated category systems (e.g., embedded questions, stimuli, vignettes). Rather they insist on naturally occurring data that are transcribed and analyzed in detail. Potter (2002, 2004) points out that the data can be more appropriately classified as naturalistic rather than natural. He defines naturalistic data as spoken language produced entirely independently of the actions of the researcher in institutional and everyday settings—conversations over the phone, records of a company meeting, interactions between doctor and patient, and the like. Potter highlights that natural talk data are generally collected from research participants who have given informed consent and consequently are aware of the recordings and might modify their actions. However, he concludes that even if naturalistic data may present limits, they cannot be compared to focus group or experimental interaction in so far those interactions have shown “the delicate ways in which researcher generates countable findings” (Potter, 2002, p. 542). Potter (2003) also states “interviews and focus group will be mainly an adjunct to those naturalistic studies” (p. 614). In fact he posits “an interview would not take place without the researcher there to ask the questions; a counseling session would take place whether the researcher turns up to collect the recording or not” (Potter, 2002, p. 541).

CA analyzes and takes into consideration details and subtleties, which are lost in other approaches, using recorded and detailed transcripts that can be analyzed over and over again. Interaction is considered in CA as the locally managed product of two or more participants in a conversation. Talk-in-interaction is an achievement; it is “an emergent collectively organized event” (Ten Have, 2007, p. 9) and CA aims to explain how people organize such an event.
Heritage (1984b) distinguishes two kinds of conversation analytic research because of their different focus. Ten Have (2007) calls these two different types of analysis pure and applied. ‘Pure’ CA deals with “procedures of talk-in-interaction abstracted from specific institutional context,” whereas ‘applied’ CA “focuses on practices typical of setting- and institution-specific (inter)actions and/or framed in wider concerns than just studying talk-in-interaction” (p. 12). CA researchers have analyzed both institutional and ordinary conversations. The studies on ordinary conversation have shed light on basic practices such as turn taking (e.g., C. Goodwin, 1979, Jefferson, 1984a; Lerner, 1991, 2003; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974/2006; Schegloff, 1982, 1987b, 1996c, 1999, 2000a), repair (e.g., Drew, 1997; Jefferson, 1974, 1987; Schegloff 1979b, 1987b, 1987c, 1992, 1997a, 1997b, 2000b, 2006; Schegloff et al., 1977), sequence organization (e.g., Jefferson, 1993; Lerner, 1995; Pomerantz, 1980, 1984; Sacks, 1987; Schegloff, 1980, 1988, 1990, 1995a, 1996a, 1997c, 2007), story-telling (e.g, C. Goodwin, 1984, 1986; Jefferson, 1978, 1984b; Lerner, 1992; Sacks, 1974), word selection, reference and description (e.g., Sacks, 1972; Sacks & Schegloff, 1979; Schegloff, 1972, 1991, 1996b, 1997c), and the structural organization of conversation (e.g., Jefferson, 1980; Schegloff, 1968, 1979a, 1986; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973), to mention only a few topics that have been researched. Research on institutional talk has focused on doctor-patient interaction (e.g., Heath, 1986; Heritage & Maynard, 2006; Have, 1991), courtroom interaction (e.g., Atkinson & Drew, 1979; Maynard, 1984; Levi & Walker, 1990) and classroom interaction (e.g., Lerner, 1995; McHoul, 1990; Macbeth, 2004).

### 2.2.1 Turn-taking organization

Sacks’s et al. (1974/2006) description of a turn-by-turn sequential organization of interaction became the foundation of CA. The authors stress that talk is not chaotic and without
rules but that there is an underlying organization to it. The turn-taking organization underlying any conversation is ‘context sensitive;’ that is, “turn taking was related to the context and is sensitive to whatever occurs in that context, including the immediately preceding talk” (Psathas, 1995, p. 34). It is also ‘context free’ as it seems unaffected by contextual elements such as who the speakers are, the time, the setting and the topics of the interaction. As Heritage (2004) indicates a turn-design implicates two selections: “the action that the talk is designed to perform and the means that are selected to perform the action” (p. 231).

Sacks et al. (1974/2006) found that, in talk-in-interaction, typically one party talks at a time and that the participants orient to this practice. The authors noticed that whenever the interlocutors find themselves speaking at the same time (i.e., when there is overlap), most of the time it occurs at possible completion points of the talk. Overlaps are generally brief and they appear at transition-relevance-places, that is those “places where current speakers can or should exit, removing a component of the overlap” (Sacks et al., 1974/2006, p. 11). In contrast, when the participants are not talking and there is a silence, they try to minimize the silence. From their observations the authors concluded that the interaction is run by the participants, it is locally managed, and is sensitive to what is the ongoing interactional action. This system is based on two characteristic features: the Turn Constructional Unit (TCU) and turn allocation.

The TCU is the minimal unit that forms a turn. It can be lexical, phrasal, clausal, or sentential. These units are grammatically and pragmatically complete and accomplish social actions in particular contexts. However, not all unit types may exist in all languages. Figure 2.1 through figure 2.4 provide instances of minimal units.

Figure 2.1. Data set 6 giugno 2001

01 S: oh sì ho comprato una::[::]
oh yes have1PerSin bought aFemSin
oh yes I have bought a
In Figure 2.1 line two, we have an example of a lexical turn. The student is searching for a word and the woman offers it with rising intonation.

*Figure 2.2. Data set 6 giugno 2001*

```
01 S: ah::: alla taormina
     ah::: in theFemSin taormina
     ah::: in taormina

02 => C: a taormina?
in taormina?
in taormina?

03 S: sì sì
    yes yes
    yes yes

04 => C: sì ci sono tanti cammei a taormina
    yes there are many cameos in taormina
    yes it is possible to find many cameos in taormina
```

In the data segment, Figure 2.2, the first two lines present the same prepositional phrase, the first one contains a mistake and the second is the corrected version. Line four is an example of a sentential turn. A sentential turn can be more complex than this one as it might be formed by more than one independent and/or dependent clauses. The excerpt in Figure 2.3 shows a more complex one.

*Figure 2.3. Data set 29 maggio 2001*

```
01 F: a oxford però poi tu te ne sei andata da anne
     in oxford however then youSubPro youObjPro Pro are gone to anne
     then in oxford, however, you went to anne

02 harris ed io me ne sono andata [(.) da penny.  hr ]
harris and I meObjPro Pro am gone  [(.) to penny.  hr ]
harris’s and I went  [(.) to penny’s.  hr ]
```

This last excerpt (Figure 2.4) instead shows a clausal turn formed only by the verb as the subject pronoun is omitted since Italian is a pro-drop language.

In sum, a turn is a time during which a single participant speaks, within a typical, orderly arrangement in which participants speak with minimal overlap and gap between them (Levinson, 1983).

The TCUs are grammatically and pragmatically complete units as they accomplish recognizable social actions in a particular context. When speakers get a turn to talk they have the right to produce a single TCU. However, there are ways to keep the floor beyond the projectable completion. Two features, projectability and prosody, allow the speakers to project the possible completion of the turn.

Projectability refers to the capacity to anticipate how such a unit can be completed. It gives the interlocutors the opportunity to project the possible end of the turn, allowing the next speaker to start the next turn near a possible completion of the ongoing turn. One of the key features, facilitating projectability, is grammar. Auer (1996) affirms that TCU are “organized in such a way as to provide the recipient with a resource for projecting their (possible) completion; this means that they have an internal (linguistic: syntactic, semantic, prosodic) structure that projects their termination” (Auer as cited in Auer, 2005, p.10).

The speaker marks the terminal part of the turn not only with grammar but also with intonation, making prosody the other critical feature of the turn. The final contour of a turn offers another opportunity to discover the projectable ending. It is generally acknowledged that British
and American English in turn final present either a low fall intonation or a high rise, also referred to as question intonation. Other intonation contours, such as rises, falls to mid or level pitch, have been considered as signaling incompleteness. However, Szczepk Reed (2004) states that final pitch movement alone cannot characterize turn transition, but other prosodic features are involved in the turn-taking negotiation.

Even if the turn-taking system regulates the amount of talk that each participant can utter in a turn, it also “allows for increasing syntactic complexity in a turn’s TCUs” (Markee, 2000, p. 87). Turn size is not fixed: It can vary—they can be as long as a word or as a sentence—and the length of the turn cannot be specified in advance.

Figure 2.5 shows how a turn can be increased.

Figure 2.5. Data set 30 maggio 2001 Zodiaco

01 D: lui è cancro. è un cancrino [sic]. he is cancer. is a cancerian. he is cancer. He is a cancerian.

02 F: è come la figlia di::: di carlotta. [mam]ma mia. nello stesso is like the daughter of::: of carlotta.[ my]goodness. in the same she is like Carlotta’s daughter. [ my]goodness. On the same

03 D: [a:h] [a:h] [a:h]

04 F: giorno sono nati. > [il diciotto luglio. ]< day are born. > [the eighteen july. ]< day they were born. > [the eighteenth of july. ]<

05 D: [l’ideale è- il dodici ]no il diciotto [the ideal is- the twelve ] not the eighteen [the ideal is- the twelfth] not the eighteenth

The previous excerpt (Figure 2.5) shows how in line one the speaker utters a turn with a falling intonation (cancro/'cancer’) indicating that the turn might be completed there. However, she adds another turn, partially recycling the first utterance. In the second line the speaker comments on the first line and she completes the first turn with a falling intonation. But then she
adds a typical Italian expression that can mark different emotions. This noun phrase can imply surprise, fear or happiness. The beginning of the turn overlaps with the change-of-state token *ah* in line three of the other speaker. The woman D in line three clearly noticed the projected completion of the previous turn, the turn was complete and uttered with falling intonation, and since no participant has been chosen to get the next turn she takes the turn. This turn is in overlap with the new turn that the previous speaker instead adds. Speaker F utters the surprised phrase with final intonation, to then start another turn in which she states that the two children were born the same day. F utters this sentential turn again with final intonation. However, F starts another turn, but this time she rushes through the turn-transition relevance space as she might anticipate that D wants to take the floor as well. In fact they overlap again, lines four and five; this time D succeeds in keeping the floor and continues her turn. This example shows how speaker F projects the completion of her own turn not only syntactically, but also prosodically—with a falling intonation at the end of the turn—and D is able to project the end of turn. However, in this excerpt D does not produce talk in the clear as speaker F keeps uttering new turns.

As can be noticed, the size of a turn—the number of incrementally-built TCUs—depends on the way a turn is designed and shaped to complete a certain action by the participants.

In sum a turn is “the spate of talk that is collaboratively constructed by speakers out of one or more TCUs, whose projectability allows possible next and current speakers to identify when current speaker’s turn might hearably be coming to an end” (Markee, 2000, p. 84). When a turn is completed after a TCU, a possible transition to a next speaker can become relevant.

Turn allocation is another systematic feature in interaction by which speakers organize who speaks next. Sacks et al. (1974/2006) noticed that the turns can be distributed in the
following ways: (a) the current speaker selects the next speaker; (b) another speaker self-selects, (c) if the turn has been constructed so that no next speaker has been selected, the current speaker maintains the floor unless one of the other participants self-selects. Here are some examples of how the organization described may work.

This first example (Figure 2.6) shows how the speaker in line three selects next speaker who replies in line four.

*Figure 2.6. Data set 29 maggio 2001*

```
01 U: voleva sentire quello che dicevo. ma tu ()
1PerSin listen thatMassin thatProRel say1PerSin. but you ()

02 hmm:::

03 ⇒ D: francesca tu questo te lo mangi vero?
Francesca youSubPro this youObjPro it eat don’t you?

04 C1: sì
yes

In Figure 2.6 the family is having dinner and they are talking in turns. In line three the mother (U) takes the floor and asks the older daughter (C1) if she is going to eat what she has on the plate. The mother starts the turn addressing the child by her first name, then continues her turn and finishes it with a tag question.

In the next excerpt (Figure 2.7) speaker A in line three has selected a next speaker, but the recipient does not reply as the (0.7) silence makes it evident; therefore speaker A can keep the floor and add another turn. Finally as C2 does not take the floor, the other recipient, U, self-selects in line six.

*Figure 2.7. Data set 29 maggio 2001*

```
01 C2: mamma eh zia-zia io non—non no mamma (de de de) prima di
```

In this excerpt the children are leaving the room as it is time to go to bed, but before kissing goodnight, the younger daughter wants to tell her aunt that her mother says goodnight to her in English, line one. In line two, the aunt answers with a change of state token "ah sì/‘ah yes’ and jokingly she asks a counter question: whether her mother says “gute nacht,” the German words for goodnight. In line four there is a (0.7) silence as the child does not understand the question, and she does not reply. In line five the aunt continues her turn and adds two more words in German meaning “sleep well.” In line six the father confirms that the aunt is speaking German. Unfortunately in the video it is not possible to see the child, but the father clearly turns towards the child when she does not reply and there is a silence. It is after the aunt’s turn that he confirms that the aunt is speaking German, still looking towards the child. The aunt asks the child a question, but since the child does not understand German she does not answer and there is a silence. Consequently the aunt can keep the floor and add another turn. After her turn it is the father that self-selects to talk in next turn.
Figure 2.8 shows how the speaker self-selects to continue since no recipient self-selects to talk.

Figure 2.8. Data set 28 maggio 2001

01 U2: quasi quasi vengo a champaign. 

almost come1PerSin to champaign. 

*I am thinking of coming to champaign.*

02 S: con E? 

with emma? 

03 U2: no lei non mi vuole quindi, 

no she not meObjPro want therefore, 

*no she doesn’t want me therefore,*

04 ⇒ (0.9)

05 ⇒ U2: guarda poi ti racconterò 

look later youObjPro will1PerSin tell 

*look, I will tell you later*

In this example the man is talking to the student and he is saying that he would like to go to Champaign and the student asks if he will come with Emma, who lives in Champaign and is having dinner with them. In line three the man replies that Emma does not want him in Champaign, but his turn is not openly expecting an answer from Emma. Neither Emma nor anyone else at the table takes the turn and there is a (0.9) silence. Since nobody else has taken the turn the man takes again the turn in line five. Such practices enable the interactants to construct and exchange talk whose size can vary from individual turns to very long multi-turn and multi-sequence conversations.

A current speaker can select the next speaker by asking questions, using an address term, or by gazing at someone. According to C. Goodwin (1979, 1981), gaze has an important role in turn allocations since in addition to verbally offering the floor to the recipient, speakers solicit eye contact to select the intended recipient at the end of the possible end of a TCU. If the next speaker is not selected, any other participants can self-select and start talking. If no other
participant takes the floor the speaker can self-select to continue talking. In such a system the recipients monitor the course of the talk to detect a possible completion place at which the non-speakers may be selected or take the turn.

However, research has shown that interactions do not always proceed so smoothly; there are multi-unit turns, silences or interruptions (Schegloff, 1980, 1982). In order to keep the turn, speakers can use several different strategies. They can produce a list-initiating marker (e.g., first of all) or take a deep breath to indicate that there will be a long stretch of talk (Sacks, 1995a). They might use marked verbs such as “I tried to do X,” “May I ask a question?” that convey that more talk is to come (Sacks, 1995a). The speaker might produce a story preface (Sacks, 1974), which indicates that there will be a story to come. The following is an instance of one of the previous mentioned occurrences, namely it shows how T, after asking if he can ask a question, receives a positive answer and keeps the floor for several lines.

*Figure 2.9. Data set Cookston, 4-5, rough from Schegloff, 1980 (p. 109)*

01 ⇒ T: Hypothetically, y’know,--I jus’ wanna ask you a question.=
02 ⇒ J: =Uh [huh. ]
04 T: [From y]er experience with the Bible, (0.?)mM um::, (0.?) ’ll put yourself in th-well le’s (0.?) ima:gine ‘at somebody’s in this situation, say (0,?).
06

The excerpt, Figure 2.9, is a longer one; speaker T keeps the turn until line twenty-one before the other speaker can reply. In line one the speaker starts a turn and says that he wants to ask a question. The other speaker gives the go ahead using a confirmation token *uh*, so T can start his long turn.
Another strategy speakers use in multi-unit-turns, is to rush through or speed up their talk to avoid possible space where the other recipient can jump in as it can be seen in line four in Figure 2.10.

**Figure 2.10.** Figure Data set 30 maggio 2001 Zodiaco

01 D: lui è cancro. è un cancrino [sic].
he is cancer. is a cancerian.
he is cancer. He is a cancerian.

02 F: è come la figlia di::: di Carlotta. [mam]ma mia. Nello stesso
is like the daughter of::: of Carlotta.[ my]goodness. In the same
she is like Carlotta’s daughter. [ my]goodness. On the same

03 D: [a:h]
[a:h]
[a:h]

04 ⇒ F: giorno sono nati. >[il diciotto luglio. ]<
day are born. >[the eighteen july. ]<
day they were born.>[the eighteenth of july. ]<

05 D: [l’ideale è- il dodici ]no il diciotto
[the ideal is- the twelve ] not the eighteen
[the ideal is- the twelfth] not the eighteenth

Speakers may construct a multi-unit turn by rushing through or speeding up the ongoing talk to eliminate the place where a next speaker can start up or speakers may even drop the last sound, syllable or word of the possible completion. They might produce a story preface to keep the floor for many lines, but they can also end up producing a multi-turn if no other participants take the turn at a possible completion and they have the opportunity to start a new TCU.

Transition spaces are loci where silence can occur. Silences can be intra-turn or inter-turn. The first is also called pause and is part of the speaker’s turn. There are two types of inter-turn silences: The first is a very short beat of silence at a transition place and it represents the “unmarked next position onset” (Jefferson, 1984a). When that silence is more than a beat before someone else starts to speak, it is referred to as a gap. A lapse is another type of long silence; it occurs when the prior speaker has not selected the next one and the silence is at a possible
completion of a sequence. There are ways to minimize silences using hesitation marks such as “uhh,” “mhms,” by recycling talk, and other similar features.

When speakers minimize silences between talk, that is, when a next speaker self-selects after the current speaker without the regular beat of silence, the two utterances are said to be “latched” (Schegloff, 2000a). The following excerpts (Figures 2.11 and 2.12) show two utterances latched.

*Figure 2.11. Data set 30 maggio 2001*

01 F: come mai non si sentiva?
    how come not it heard?
    *how come that you couldn’t hear?*

02 C: =mamma
    =mom
    =mom

*Figure 2.12. Data set 30 maggio 2001 Liquore*

01 C: maraschino è liquore?
    maraschino is liqueur?
    *is maraschino a liqueur?*

02 R: =e allora qual era la cosa?
    =and then what was the thing?
    =and then what was the problem?

03 C: maraschino è liquore?
    maraschino is liqueur?
    *is maraschino a liqueur?*

The first example, Figure 2.11, shows the friend asking a question on line one and the child who wants to attract his mother’s attention who latches his turn to the previous one to be able to take the floor before the person asked by F responds. In Figure 2.12 the child asks a question but before anyone can answer his question the older brother latches his turn that refers to a previous one and consequently the child does not get the answer to his question and asks it again.
Overlap occurs when two or more speakers produce talk simultaneously. Jefferson (1984a), Sacks et al. (1974/2006) and Schegloff (2000a) showed how overlap presents orderliness, even if it seems contradictory. Overlaps generally occur at the possible end of a turn. It is the result of the speaker’s projection of the possible completion of the prior speaker’s talk and coming in slightly before the end of the prior speaker’s turn.

*Figure 2.13. Data set 29 maggio 2001 Plaia*

01 ⇒ C2:  mamma me lo dai il pomodoro e la  
          mom me it give2PerSin theMasSing tomato and theFemSing  
          mom can you give me tomato and

02  mozzare[lla.]  
03     mozzare[lla.]  
04     mozzare[lla.]  
05  [ sei ]stata alla  
          [ are ]2PerSin been to the  
          [ have ] you been to the

04  plaia oggi?  
05 ⇒ S:    alla pla[ia? ]  
          to the pla[ia? ]  
          to the pla[ia? ]

06  D:       [ sisî ]  
07       [ yes yes]  
08       [ yes yes]

This data set (Figure 2.13) shows how speaker A, in line three, can project the completion of the turn and starts her turn asking the student S if she has been to the beach overlapping just for a few beats with the child’s request in line two. In lines five and six we have a similar occurrence as the woman in line six overlaps with the last beat of the repair turn uttered by the student. As Schegloff (2000a) noticed, the overlap is locally organized, beat-by-beat.

Overlap is the result of a next speaker’s projection of the possible completion of the prior speaker’s talk. Moreover, Jefferson (1984a) observed that overlaps generally are terminal, that is,
a speaker starts up just at final sound(s) of the last word of what might be a complete turn, such as the ones shown in the previous example, lines five and six. Jefferson also noticed that overlaps can be divided in three categories according to their onset: (a) transitional onset (when the next speaker orients to a possible completion of the prior speaker’s turn); (b) recognitional onset (when the next speaker recognizes what the current speaker is saying and projects the possible completion of the current turn even when the turn has not been completed yet); and (c) progressional onset (when there is some disfluency or hitches in the current speaker’s talk and a next speaker suggests a completion of the turn in order to move the interaction forward).

Jefferson (1984a) also showed how large amounts of simultaneous speech, which look like interruptions, in fact occur at a legitimate TRP. Interruptions, instead, do not occur at a TRP.

Such a break of the norms of turn taking bears consequences for the progress of the interaction and social relations. This excerpt (Figure 2.14) shows how an interruption occurs.

*Figure 2.14. Data set 28 maggio 2001*

01  U1: a me piacciono tantissimo lo faccio [{( )}]io. 
*I like them very much I make it [{( )}].*

02  U2: 
*{{(coughs)}}*

03  U1: io [{( )}]
i [{( )}]
I [{( )}]

04  D: 
*{(ma non così)}*
*{(but not so)}*
*{(but not so)}*

05  U1: quest’anno non l’ho fatto vero? 
this year not it have[1]done true? 
*this year I haven’t done it, have I?*

06  D: non l’hai[mai] per me 
not it ha[ve] for me 
you have [never] for me 
*

07 ⇒ U1:  
*{mi hai fatto perdere}*
*{me have[2]make lose}*
*{you made me lose}*

{mi hai fatto perdere} {me have make lose} {you made me lose}
The conversation is about typical Sicilian food and U1 is talking about a dish that he likes very much and used to cook in the past. In line four the woman D overlaps U1’s turn, but the man keeps the floor and completes his turn. In line six the woman starts her turn but, this time, it is the man who overlaps her and since he is able to keep the floor he recycles the part of the utterance that was produced in overlap. In this case we can claim that this is an interruption because the simultaneous speech starts in the middle of a turn. The woman’s turn is interrupted just after the auxiliary of the present perfect she is uttering and not near a possible TRP. Interruptions have been said to be placed in disaffiliative talk. The previous excerpt demonstrates such an occurrence: the two speakers show disaffiliation as the one affirms that the man has never cooked the dish for her, line six, while the man blames the woman because he has lost the habit of cooking, lines seven and eight.

A well-organized and structured turn-taking system ensures the flow of conversation and allows the participants to achieve intersubjectivity.

2.2.2 Intersubjectivity

Schegloff (1992/2006) explains how each turn in conversation provides “a locus for the display of many understandings by its speaker—understanding of what has immediately preceded or what has occurred earlier or elsewhere that nonetheless figures in the turn’s talk” (p.220) and “for displays of mutual understanding and problems therein—one running basis for the cultivation and grounding of intersubjectivity” (p. 221). By analyzing action sequences, CA traces how intersubjectivity is maintained and how it is restored when there is a breakdown in understanding. Schegloff affirms, “the procedural basis for locating and dealing with
breakdowns in intersubjectivity is woven into the warp and weft of ordinary conversation and, by implication, possibly of any organized conduct” (Schegloff, 1992/2006, p. 219). This “architecture of intersubjectivity” (Heritage, 1984b, p.254), the organization to achieve mutual understanding, relies on “a form of action template” (Heritage, 1984b, p.254), namely adjacency pair. According to Sacks (1995a, 1995b), an adjacency pair is a fundamental unit of interactional social organization. Adjacency pairs, being a combination of a first pair part (FPP) and a second pair part (SPP), provide interactants “with ready–made methods for achieving specific outcomes” (Psathas, 1995, p.18). Schegloff and Sacks (1973) remark that an adjacency pair is a sequence of two communicative actions that typically are adjacent and are produced by different speakers. Adjacency pairs are categorized; a first pair part must be followed by a specific second pair part, for example, a greeting follows a greeting, an offer is followed by an acceptance or rejection. The speakers orient to this structured organization, which shapes their expectations that a relevant action will follow the first pair part. Most of the time a FPP has alternative SPPs: some answers are preferred and others are dispreferred. For instance, a preferred SPP to an assessment in English is an agreement or an alignment or a second assessment, while a dispreferred action is a disagreement (Pomerantz, 1984). In general, positive answers are preferred and negative ones are dispreferred; however, Pomerantz (1984) noticed that there are exceptions: e.g., in the case of self-deprecation, disagreement is clearly preferred. Preference is also evident in the way a turn is constructed. Dispreferred turns generally exhibit some of the following features: delay, associated accounts, prefaces, perturbations and hitches, mitigation, or pro forma ‘agreement.’ The following is an example from the conversation analytic literature.

*Figure 2.15.* Data set [Sacks 1987] from Hutchby & Wooffitt (1998, p. 44)

```
01 A:    You coming down early?
02 B:    Well, I got a lot of things to do before getting cleared up
```
tomorrow. I w- probably won’t be too early.

In Figure 2.15 it appears that in line one the speaker prefers a positive answer. However, speaker B does not want to go and he constructs his response showing two features characteristic of dispreferred turns. He starts his turn with the dispreferred marker *Well*, followed by an account and only then he utters the negative answer in line three. This answer is repaired and it seems that the speaker was going to produce *I won’t* and he repairs it adding *probably won’t*.

Preferred actions are produced straightforwardly and without delay, while dispreferred are delayed, qualified and accounted for. It is important to remember that the concept ‘dispreferred’ refers to the structure of the turn design and it has nothing to do with psychological dispositions or individual motivations. As Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) highlight, these features “emphasize that the alternative designs of second pair parts represent institutionalized ways of speaking by which specific actions get accomplished” (p. 45). The preference is built into the sequence and adjacency pairs constitute the smallest sequence.

Sequence organization, together with turn-taking organization, is the fundamental organization underlying ordinary conversation. Schegloff (2007) affirms that the scope of sequence organization is “the organization of courses of action enacted through turns at talk—coherent, orderly, meaningful succession or ‘sequences’ of actions or ‘moves’” (p. 2). Moreover, he states, “[d]isparate topics can occur coherently within the framework of a single, expanded sequence and achieve coherence by being framed by it” (Schegloff, 1990, p. 72). Interlocutors in a conversation monitor and analyze each other’s talk for the kind of action(s) the current speaker might perform talking since the next speaker’s actions are responsive to the prior turn. Next turns display the speakers’ understanding of the prior turn and it is examined for the kind of response it embodies (Schegloff, 2007). Schegloff (1995a) noticed that an adjacency pair sequence can (a)
present utterances that are used both as a FPP and a SPP; (b) be uttered by the same speaker; (c) be separated by intervening talk; or (d) have more than two turns.

Some sequence types have only one kind of SPP, such as greetings and farewells or terminal exchanges (“Ciao,” “Ciao;” “Arrivederci,” “Arrivederci;” and the like). The SPP can also be postponed (e.g., initiating repair on FPP) or replaced. A particular case is called a “counter;” in counters, before responding with a SPP, the same FPP is redirected to the person who just produced it as the following instance shows.

*Figure 2.16.* Data set (2.01) Tarplee, 1991:1 from Schegloff, (2007, p. 17)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Chi:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Mom:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Chi:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Chi:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Mom:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In line one the child asks the mother a question, this is the FPP, but in next turn the mother does not answer the question nor there is a projection for a later answer; there is no SPP to this FPP. Instead in line two the mother redirects the question back to the child in what represents a counter FPP. Counters reverse the direction of constraint of the adjacency pair; doing so, the conditional relevance and relevance rules (Schegloff, 2007) are disregarded. The adjacency pair organization activates the relevance for a next speaker of doing some particular action (SPP). The FPP poses constraints of action and interpretation, in this way “the recipient of some first pair part is put under certain constraints by it—either to do a relevant second pair part, or be heard as ‘not doing’ such a relevant second pair part” (Schegloff, 2007, p.21). In the present example the “counter” takes the constraint that was cast on the recipient and shifts it back
onto its speaker and in fact in line five, after a silence of (1.0), the child produces a SPP to the counter in line two.

As already stated, a single, basic adjacency pair constitutes a minimal sequence. However, sequences may be formed by more than two turns: that is they can be expanded. Such expansions can occur in three possible places: 1) before the first pair part, called pre-expansion sequence; 2) between the first and the projected second pair part, called insert sequence; or 3) after the second pair part, called post-expansion sequence.

Pre-expansion sequences can be of two types: type-specific pre-sequences or generic pre-sequences. Type-specific pre-sequences are pre-invitations, pre-offers, pre-requests, pre-announcements. They generally project the specified base sequence that is the adjacency pair, formed by a FPP and a SPP. The initial turn of a pre-sequence “projects the contingent possibility that a base FPP (e.g., an invitation) will be produced; and it makes it relevant next the production of a second pair part” (Schegloff, 2007, p.29). Schegloff (2007) discerns three possible responses: (a) the “go-ahead,” (b) the “blocking,” and (c) the “hedging.” The ‘go-ahead” response promotes progress of the sequence as the following instance shows.

*Figure 2.17. Data set (4.01) JG 3:1 from Schegloff (2007, p. 30) (Nelson is the caller)*

```
01  Cla:    Hello
02  Nel:    Hi.
03  Cla:    Hi.
04  Nel: Fpre Watcha doin.’
05  Cla: Spre Not much.
06  Nel: Pb  Y’wanna drink?
07  Cla: Sb  Yeah.
08  Nel:    Okay.
```
In Figure 2.17, line one, we have the answer to the summons that is the ringing of the telephone: the ringing and the *Hello* form the first adjacency pair of the present excerpt. In lines two and three we have the exchange of the greetings. In line four we have the FPP of the pre-invitation and in line five Clara’s response is a “go-ahead” one and Nelson understand it as such. In line six Nelson utters his invitation and in line seven Clara accepts it as the pre-invitation had foreshadowed.

“Blocking” responses block or discourage the invitation from being tendered as they raise the possibility that the invitation, if tendered, is declined or rejected as shown in the following excerpt.

*Figure 2.18.* Data set (4.02) SB, 1 from Schegloff (2007, p. 30) (Allen/Judy are married; John is Judy’s fellow student).

01 ring
02 All: Hello?
03 Joh: Yeah, is Judy there?
04 All: Yeah, just a second.
05 ((silence))
06 Jud: Hello,
07 Joh: Judy?
08 Jud: Yeah,
09 Joh: John Smith.
10 Jud: Hi John.
11 Joh: Fpre Ha you doing—say what ‘r you doing.
12 Jud: Spre Well, we’re going out.

In this example, Figure 2.18, the caller, after the greeting exchange, asks what Judy and her husband are doing, line eleven. This is a pre-invitation like the one in Fig. 2.16, but this time
the recipient blocks the forthcoming invitation as she replies that they are going out in line
twelve.

The third form of response, called “hedging,” “can make a full response contingent on
what the invitation is going to be” (Schegloff, 2007, p. 31). Such responses can be “Why?,”
“Uhm,” or “Probably,” therefore the subsequent sequence can be contingent on how the recipient
answers the question.

Figure 2.19. Data set (4.02a) SB, 1 (continued) from Schegloff (2007, p. 31)

01 Jud: Hi John.
02 Joh: Fpre Ha you doing—<say what ’r you doing.
03 Jud: Spre Well, we’re going out. Why.
04 Joh: Oh, I was just gonna say come out and come over here and
talk this evening, [but if you’re going=
05 Jud: [“Talk,” you mean get
06 Joh: [drunk, don’t you?]
08 Joh: ={out you can’t very] well do that.

In Figure 2.19, with her answer in line three, Judy is foreshadowing a possible negative
reply to the projecting action; however, her next utterance “Why?” clearly shows that she has
heard John’s question as projecting a further contingent action indicating that she has understood
that John’s question was preliminary to something else. Such forms revive the possibility to
modify the possible negative outcome. A result of a pre-sequence can be that, in the end, no
action (e.g., invitation, offer, announcement, etc.) is formulated. Given the action that a pre-
sequence is doing in circumventing rejection, the absence of the action itself is a natural
consequence. Other particular types of pre-sequences are “preliminaries to preliminaries” (pre-
pre) (Schegloff, 2007, p. 44). “These utterances with action projection serve to allow some
preliminaries germane to the projected sequence to get accomplished or established before the base sequence itself has its FPP articulated” (Schegloff, 2007, p. 44). They can be pre-mentions and pre-conditions. The speaker of a FPP may have to refer to or mention something that the recipient does not know and therefore some preliminary work is necessary to make the mention/reference recognizable, as the excerpt can exemplify.

*Figure 2.20. Data set (4.18) ST (Schegloff, 1980:112) from Schegloff (2007, p. 45)*

01 Fre: Fpre Oh by the way ((sniff)) I have a big favor to ask ya.
02 Lau: Spre Sure, go’head.
03 Fre: Fpre ‘Member the blouse you made a couple weeks ago?
04 Lau: Spre Ya.
05 Fre: Fb Well I want to wear it this weekend to Vegas but my mom’s buttonholer is broke.
06 Lau: Sb Fred I told ya when I made the blouse I’d do the buttonholes
07 Fre: ((sniff)) but I hate ta impose.
08 Lau: No problem. We can do them on Monday after work.

In Figure 2.20, line one, Fred’s utterance projects a request that receives a positive go-ahead in line two. In the space engendered by the pre-pre Fred establishes the recognizability of the object to which the request pertains in lines three and four. It is in line five that Fred finally conveys his request that had been projected in the previous lines.

On the other hand, generic pre-sequences are “aimed at a feature generically relevant to the efficacy of talk-in-interaction — the attention, or mobilized recipiency, of an interlocutor” (Schegloff, 2007, p. 48). The modality used to display attention is gaze direction and recipients direct their gaze to speakers (C. Goodwin, 1981). The speakers may seek to secure the attention before the beginning of their talk. The most common place for this type of pre-sequence is the
summons-answer sequence. Various forms are used to implement the summons; the most common are the name or title of the target, a courtesy term or physical contact.

Insert expansions can occur between a FPP and a SPP and they can be of two types: post-first insertion and pre-second insertion. Post-first insertions look back at the FFP and deal with some trouble that the FPP posed, while pre-second insertions are designed by speakers to gather information to produce an appropriate SPP. Unlike counters that defer, cancel, and redirect the base FPP, the insert sequences defer the production of a base SPP. Data segment Figure 2.20 shows how the insert sequence aims to gather information to produce an appropriate SPP.

*Figure 2.21.* Data set (6.16) Merritt, 1976:333 from Schegloff, 2007 (p. 109)

```plaintext
01 Cus: Fb  May have a bottle of Mich?
02 Ser: Fi  Are you twenty one? [sic]
03 Cus: Si  No
04 Ser: Sb  No
```

In Figure 2.21 the customer in line one asks for a bottle of beer, the server, before granting the requested product, needs to be sure that the customer complies with the law. In fact, in line two he asks if the customer is twenty-one, after the customer’s reply the server can utter the adequate base SPP, in line four, to the base FPP in line one.

There is only one type of post-first insertion and it is initiation of repair on the FPP. As we will discuss in the following subsection, other-initiated repair can be introduced by partial repetition of words, less specific questions, such as “Huh?,” “What?,” “Who?,” “Where?” or “When?,” or by offering a candidate understanding. The following example shows an other-initiated repair that is an insert sequence.
In Figure 2.22, line one, the speaker asks a question, after a (1.0) silence in line three the recipient repairs the turn. In line four the speaker repeats the name that caused the repair and in line five the recipient produces the SPP to the original question. In the previous example, a single repair sequence occupies the interval between the base FPP and the SPP; however, if other-initiated repairs do not deal successfully with the trouble in just one single repair sequence, it can be dealt with in multiple sequences. According to Schegloff (2007), if the trouble is not resolved in three tries the parties may give up and find another way to continue the interaction. In conversations with non-native speakers, there may be more than three rounds (Egbert et al., 2004).

Another type of expansion is a post-expansion, which is designed to add a minimal turn to a sequence after the SPP. Post-expansions are called ‘sequence closing thirds’ (SCT), they are “oh,” “okay” or assessments, and they close a sequence (Schegloff, 2007). The particle “oh” generally marks or claims information receipt (Heritage, 1984a), as it produces a change in its recipient from not knowing to knowing. It is referred to as “change of state token” (Heritage, 1984a) and it can mark or propose the closing of a sequence, as the following example (Figure 2.23) demonstrates.
Figure 2.23. Data set (7.03) HG, 16:25-33 from Schegloff, 2007 (p. 119)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Nan: F =·hhh Dz he av iz own apa:rt[mint?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Hyl: S [·hhhh] Yea:h,=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Nan: SCT =Oh:,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Nan: F How didju git iz number,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Hyl: S I(h) (.) c(h)alled information’n San Fr’ncissco(h) [uh!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Nan: SCT [Oh:::</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this data segment, Figure 2.23, we have two consecutive requests for information sequences and each SPP that delivers the information is followed by a sequence-closing third in lines three and seven.

Instead, “okay” claims acceptance of a SPP done in response to a FPP and it is a way FPP speakers can register acceptance of that action. It might be used in closures after preferred SPP.

A sequence can be also closed combining “oh” and “okay,” “oh” and an assessment, or other similar combinations. However, another type of post-expansion sequences is a sequence that presents a trouble source in the SPP, which is repaired in the subsequent turns, as the following instance shows.

Figure 2.24. Data set (7.37) Connie and Dee, 9 from Schegloff, 2007 (p. 149)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Dee: Fb Well who’r you working for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Con: Sb ·hhh Well I’m working through:: the Amfat Corporation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 ⇒</td>
<td>Dee: Fpost The who?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 ⇒</td>
<td>Con: Spost =Amfah Corpora{tion. (. ) ’ts a holding company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Dee: SCT [Oh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Dee: SCT Yeah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In Figure 2.24, line one, Dee asks a question and in line two Con answers. The answer is followed by a (0.8) silence and then in line four Dee initiates repair. The repair sequence is expanded after the SPP in line five with two minimal post-expansions in line six and seven. After closing the post expansion, the larger telling sequence is resumed.

In our earlier discussion of insert expansion and post-expansion we have noted that when trouble in hearing and understanding occurs a repair is initiated in the turn after the trouble source. CA shows that natural conversations are also characterized by troubles in communication, which are repaired by speakers and hearers in specific ways in order to re-establish understanding.

2.2.3 Repairs

Repair is the resource used by the speakers to re-establish the intersubjectivity that has been jeopardized; it deals with any kind of trouble that might hinder the progress of the interaction. Repairs address a wide range of problems such as mishearing, searching for a word, misunderstanding, inappropriate word usage, and the like. The key, defining element of repair is that it puts the current action on hold in order to deal with the problem in speaking, hearing or understanding. The main action is resumed once the trouble has been resolved. This particular phenomenon has been thoroughly investigated by Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977). In their article the authors made it clear that repair is not a synonym for correction. Repair can occur when there are no apparent errors or mistakes. Schegloff (1979b, 1987b, 1987c, 1992, 2000b) carried out further studies on repair and on its importance in conversations, highlighting
how “the occurrence of repair within the boundaries of sentences is not incidental but is the systematic product of the other sequential features of conversation” (Schegloff, 1979b, p. 267).

The following excerpts (Figure 2.25 and 2.26) show how repairs can occur when there is no apparent error or mistake and, conversely, how errors are not repaired (Figure 2.27).

**Figure 2.25.** Data set 28 maggio 2001 Champaign-Urbana

01 ⇒ U2: ma ci sono cose internazionali: anche lì a::=
but there are things international: even there at::=

02 ⇒ R: =puoi dire parolacce [e puoi parlare anche- ]
=can2PersIn say bad words [and can2PersIn speak also- ]

03 U2: [come si chiama (quel- )] ur-
[what PasPro call (thatMasSin-)] ur-

04 F: champaign urbana

The example in Figure 2.25 shows a repair where there is no error. U2 is searching for a name and initiates repair by lengthening the preposition *a*/*at*’ at the end of line one. In line two, latched to the final stretched sound, the boy utters his turn that is overlapped in the second part by U2 that had projected the end of the turn while R is adding another turn that he cuts-off without completing as he realizes that U2 is speaking in overlap. U2 in line three produces an overt interrogative *come si chiama*/*what is it called*’ and attempts to recall the name he is looking for. In line four we have the resolution of the search *Champaign Urbana*. This is a typical example of a particular type of repair, a word search.

**Figure 2.26.** Data set 6 giugno 2001

01 ⇒ D: però devo dirti che le telefona
dovere, I must tell you that the telephone calls from the ameri-
however, I must tell you that the telephone calls from ameri-

02 ⇒ dagli stati uniti all’italia sono molto economiche
from the uniteds states to italy are very cheap
*from the uniteds states to italy are very cheap*
In this excerpt, Figure 2.26, D starts the repair in line one; she cuts-off the word that she was on the verge of saying and partially recycles the prepositional phrase as she has to change the article for the new lexical choice. She then changes *ameri* for a more appropriate geographical name *Stati Uniti* ‘United States.’

Schegloff et al. (1977) explained that they chose the term repair over “correction” because what speakers are doing is not just replacing an error or mistake. The term ‘repair’ “capture[s] the more general domain of occurrences” (p. 363). Nonetheless, they also show that hearable errors are not necessarily repaired, as in the following data set (Figure 2.27).

*Figure 2.27. Data set 30 maggio 2001 Zodiaco*

01  D:  lui è cancro. è un cancrino [sic].
      he is cancer. is a cancerian.
      *he is cancer. He is a cancerian.*

02  F:  è come la figlia di:::– di Carlotta. [mam]ma mia. Nello stesso
      is like the daughter of:::– of Carlotta.[ my]goodness. In the same
      *she is like Carlotta’s daughter.* [ my]goodness. On the same

In this data segment, Figure 2.27, D mispronounces the word *cancrino* ‘cancerian.’ The correct form is “cancerino.” She does not correct herself; no repair is initiated and completed, either by the speaker or the listener. The mistake does not hinder the intersubjectivity of the interaction; therefore it is not necessary to repair it.

A repair sequence starts with an utterance or part of an utterance that is the cause of the trouble; this utterance is called ‘repairable’ or ‘trouble-source.’ The utterance can be repaired by the speaker of the repairable or by the other participants to the talk. When the speaker of the utterance containing the trouble initiates the repair, it is called self-initiated repair; when it is initiated by one of the co-participants of the conversation it is referred to as other-initiated repair. Just as the repair can be initiated by either the speaker or a co-participant, it can likewise be solved either by the speaker or by another participant. Schegloff et al. (1977) distinguish four
types of repairs: self-initiated self-completed, self-initiated other-completed, other-initiated self-completed, and other-initiated other-completed. The following data sets show examples of the four types of repairs.

*Figure 2.28.* Data set 6 giugno 2001 self-initiated self-completed

01 D: [marisa va a ][milano ehm] scusa va a parigi
    [marisa goes to][milan ehm] sorry goes to paris
    [marisa goes to][milan ehm ]sorry she goes to paris

*Figure 2.29.* Data set 6 giugno 2001 self-initiated other-completed

01 ⇒ S: oh sì ho comprato una::[::]
oh yes have bought a::[::]
oh yes i have bought a::[::]

02 ⇒ D: [ca]mmeo?
        [ca]meo?
        [ca]meo?

03 S: sì cammeo molto (        )
yes cameo much (        )
yes cameo much (        )

The two previous excerpts show the two different kinds of self-initiated repair and the second one is also an example of word search.

In *Figure 2.28*, in line two, speaker D produces a complete turn immediately followed by a dysfluency *ehm*; she apologizes and recycles only the prepositional phrase, changing the city from Milan into Paris. In the other excerpt, *Figure 2.29*, the student tries to recall a name, but he is unable to recall the name and the other interlocutor completes the search by offering the candidate solution with rising intonation in line two. The student confirms the solution and repeats it in line three.

*Figure 2.30.* Data set 5 giugno 2001 other-initiated self-completed

01 D: hai conosciuto carmelo?
    have met carmelo?
    have you met carmelo?
The previous examples, Figure 2.30 and 2.31, show the two types of other-initiated repairs. In Figure 2.30, D asks S a question to S in line one. In line two, after the oh token that is cut off, initiates repair on the previous turn repeating the name with high pitch. D repairs her previous turn by repeating the name with falling intonation (as if it was a hearing problem), then she offers specific information saying whose boyfriend he is. In Figure 2.31, instead, the repair is completed by the other interlocutor. It is the continuation of Figure 2.29; the student acknowledges the candidate solution and repeats it in line three, but the boy, in line four, initiates and completes the repair of line three, correcting the student’s turn. The student in line three has uttered used the singular form and the boy corrects it with the plural form, because the boy has heard that the word uttered by the student, which is not audible on the videotape, and has noticed the student’s mistake.
Schegloff et al. (1977) explain that there is a preference in the way a trouble source is repaired. Such a preference is not related to psychological factors, but it is connected to the way a repair is structured. They observed that self-repair is preferred to other-repair. It seems that the architecture underlying conversations favors ‘face saving’ (Goffman, 1967/1982). Face; that is, prestige or honor, is what you lose when you are humiliated or embarrassed during an interaction. As Kalin (1995) states, “the need to maintain both one’s own face, i.e. [sic] to be socially accepted, and the face of one’s interlocutor is of major importance in all interaction” (p. 40). The speaker has the opportunity to repair a trouble-source before the interventions of the other participants. The preference for self-repair is also manifested in the way other-repair is initiated. Other-repairs are very often preceded by a pause to allow the speaker to self-repair; only when the speaker does not complete repair does the listener undertake a repair completion. Moreover, interlocutors typically just locate the trouble, offering the speaker another opportunity to self-repair. The following excerpt (Figure 2.32) clearly exemplifies such an occurrence.

Figure 2.32. Data set GTS:3:42 from Schegloff et al. (1977, p. 370) other-initiated self-repair

01   A: Hey the first time they stopped me from selling cigarettes
02   was this morning.
03   ⇒ (1.0)
04   ⇒ B: From selling cigarettes?
05   A: From buying cigarettes. They [said uh
06   C: [uh huh

In Figure 2.32, line three, speaker A could have initiated a self-repair, instead, there is a silence. In line four participant B initiates repair by pointing out the trouble source, leaving it up to participant A to complete the repair. And in line five speaker A self-repairs. Very often other-initiated other-completed repairs are introduced by devices that display uncertainty or mitigation
such as “I think,” “You mean...?” thereby further indicating that self-repair is preferred over other-completed repair. Moreover, the structures of conversation and repair organization provide fewer opportunities for other-initiated other-completed repairs in L1 speakers’ ordinary talk as opportunities for self-initiation come before opportunities for other-initiation and other correction is highly constrained in its occurrence (Schegloff et al., 1977).

As stated above, repair can be initiated in different places of the sequence in relation to the trouble source and the TCU. The allocation of turns operates on a turn-by-turn basis and the interactants continuously cooperate to determine the length of turns and to choose the point of transfer. As Sacks et al. (1974/2006) affirmed, the turn-taking system is “locally managed” and “interactionally determined” (p. 725). Hayashi (1994) states such seemingly chaotic, dysfluent ‘performance’ as repair is in fact highly patterned, and that native speakers of language seem to know this ‘grammar of repair,’ a way to be ‘fluently dysfluent’ as a part of their knowledge of the language (p. 92).

Bazzanella and Damiano (1997), analyzing repairs in Italian conversations, state that repair is not a polar process, in which comprehension is either present or absent. Instead, the authors consider it a scalar process, in which different phases—coming to understanding, understanding (with different degrees), and misunderstanding on the one hand, and non-understanding on the other—can be distinguished. This scalar process is based on interactional negotiation that varies according to the different phases. In another study, Bazzanella and Damiano (1999) affirm that “gestures, behaviors, objects, situations act as non-linguistic triggers of misunderstanding, but often misunderstandings undergo a linguistic handling” (p. 829). Non-
linguistic misunderstanding—i.e., gestures, behavior—can be detected and repaired by verbal negotiations as the following excerpt exemplifies.

Figure 2.33. Data set C2/BOF/a 19/a from Bazzanella and Damiano (1999, p. 830)

01 Cwl =E del resto: invece quello della professoressa (Carovki).+
02 (Carobbi. Questo:-)
03 AF =Quello sulla letteratura?
04 Cwl Sì. Esatto.
05 AF Vediamo.
     (0.4)
06 AF Questo?
07 Cwl ++ No. No no.
08 AF Allora mi fa vedere quale ⇓(perché a volte)⇐

01 Cwl =And about the others: the one by professor (Carovki).+
02 (Carobbi. This one:-)
03 AF =The one on literature?
04 Cwl Yes. Exactly.
05 AF Let’s see.
     (0.4)
06 AF This one?
07 Cwl ++ No. No no.
08 AF Then can you show me which one ⇓(because sometime)⇐

In Figure 2.33, a potential misunderstanding of the referent intended by the speaker (i.e., a book) is detected and subsequently corrected in line seven, thanks to the use of non-linguistic means on the part of the interlocutor in line six, after linguistic resources, in line three, had failed to produce the understanding. The negotiation ends with a request for explicit gestural reference in line eight.

The mechanism of repair can also be used as a means for participants to establish, confirm, or insist on their belonging to one particular sociolinguistic community over another or even to express affiliation or disaffiliation with each other. Through repair the language identities of the interactants are expressed and negotiated on a moment-by-moment basis. It is one way in which the occurrence of linguistic behavior is embedded in the momentary interactional situation, to achieve a change in the participation framework (Egbert, 1996). Egbert (2004) noticed that in some instances the repair sequence implicated differential categorical membership
of the interactants. Repair initiators are used to affiliate or disaffiliate with another party. In such occurrences “the repair initiation targets a lexical item in the trouble source turn as problematic, either by way of pronunciation or by way of selecting a lexical item from a language variety not (easily) accessible to other coparticipants [sic]” (Egbert, 2004, p. 1472). She analyzed four different practices of regional or linguistic membership categorizing: “(1) translation as a repair operation, (2) post-trouble resolution ‘diagnosis,’ (3) speaker’s successive repair initiations forming an alliance along dialectal lines, and (4) structural elaborateness due to nonnative language deficiency” (Egbert, 2004, p.1472). In her study she also shows how successive repair initiations by different speakers can create a coalition between the speakers of the repair initiations against the trouble-source turn speaker. In native and nonnative conversations the repair sequence can become very complex and elaborate, due to the low proficiency of the nonnative speaker, thus becoming the “characteristic manifestation of the ‘nonnativeness’ of a participant” (Egbert, 2004, p. 1483). The participants can assign, reject or insist upon membership categorization, while co-constructing interculturality by making relevant linguistic and regional categories in their activity. Maheux-Pelletier and Golato (2008) confirmed that repair initiations show the connection between macro and micro levels of language in creating the participants’ identity and attitudes. Their study shows how the participants used repair: (a) to achieve linguistic/cultural inclusiveness, (b) to legitimize language varieties other than one’s own, and (c) to legitimize one’s own linguistic group membership.

Repair sequences can also occur during schisming. Egbert (1997a) describes the systematic pattern by which a single conversation is transformed into two simultaneous conversations. This transformation is referred to as schism (Sacks et al. 1974/2006) or schisming, Schegloff’s preferred term. Schisming is a collaborative effort as it can occur when there are at
least four participants in a conversation, enough to split into two interactions. During a schimming-inducing turn (SIT), a speaker breaks away from the ongoing conversation and initiates a new sequence type and solicits one or more (if the participants are more than four) of the recipients to respond to the SIT, while the other two interactants sustain the ongoing conversation. In order to solicit the recipiency, vocal and non-vocal features—such as eye gaze or body posture—are employed. Egbert (1997b) noticed three possible procedures. First, the schimming inducer targets one person and receives recipiency only from the person targeted; second, the schimming inducer aims to target only one person, but he receives recipiency from more than one interlocutor; third, the inducer targets more than one participant and receives recipiency from several people. In this third case, the people responding can be the ones targeted or even the non-targeted ones. The SIT inducer times the onset of the schimming to position it in a way that does not cause competitive overlap. There are two places where the schimming inducer can begin the SIT: during the turn-transition relevance space or when there is a perturbation, such as a pause, in the ongoing turn before TRP. The SIT results neither sequentially nor topically connected to the ongoing turn, yet neither is it positioned in competition for turn taking. The new SIT launched requires an SPP that fits the sequence type used in the FPP. The SIT represents also a break in topic and action with the simultaneously ongoing talk that is continued by the other interlocutors. Schimming is collaboratively achieved and requires the participation of people of the pre-existing conversation to produce an alternative interaction. Egbert (1993, 1997b) affirms that in some instances gender seems to play a role. She also supports the position that schimming can be used to include or exclude one or more participants. The interactants of the new conversation seem to create a sort of alliance and they seem to dissociate themselves from
the participants of the ongoing conversation. In bilingual or multilingual groups, schimming and change of language can stress affiliation or disaffiliation.

Schimming can promote either affiliation or disaffiliation; instead, the conversational phenomenon of self-repair can be employed as a practice to achieve mutual orientation. Meaning does not lie in an isolated word; rather, meaning is constructed through the social practices of its users. Testa (1994), in her analysis of repair in Italian institutional talk, noticed that, in interviews, repairs are initiated and completed to redefine descriptive categories. She presents the example of an interviewee using different descriptive categories of the Italian language to display her linguistic identity—the initial description of “the Italian language as typical of the area” is gradually modified into “Italian that uses dialectal words and expressions.” Testa calls this procedure “procedura di verifica a spirale” (spiral control procedure). In such a procedure the interviewee’s turn is repeatedly repaired, not because of misunderstandings or to come to an agreement on the interpretation of the meaning, but to force the interviewee to withdraw the original statement.

Instead, Galatolo and Mizzau (1998) show how repairs caused by misunderstanding are used as one of the possible forms to resolve a conflict in Italian talk shows, as is shown in Figure 2.34.

Figure 2.34. Data set Example 1 Uomini e Donne del 8.10.1996 from Galatolo and Mizzau (1998, p.155)\(^5\)

\(^5\) My line numbering and my translation.
If she speaks for example about children aren’t you interested in talking about children?

Why? Who said that?

No (. ) It was just to say (. ) I am trying to understand what you do not want to talk about

(0.7)

O-on certain things that I don’t like I don’t want to talk

In Figure 2.34, in line one and two, the speaker’s question is formulated as stating that speaker B does not like to talk about the children with his wife. B feels attacked and reacts attacking as well. He replies in line three with a question that argues with the previous statement and, at the same time, asks who said it. According to Galatolo and Mizzau, B feels attacked by M’s question and consequently his turn displays an articulated structure, as it seems to be built to verbally attack M, but at the same time, to react to M’s turn with a self-defense. In line four, M replies, self-repairing her utterance produced in lines one and two. B does not explicitly ratify the repair and in line six there is a (0.7) silence followed by B’s answer to the original question in line one and two.

The authors define conflict as a divergence or opposition between two interlocutors with different backgrounds that when resolved re-establishes unity. Conflict cannot exist if there are not two or more people involved who have to resolve their divergences.

The Italian studies show how repairs in institutional talk can be deployed to perform negotiation of descriptive categories and resolve a conflict as the participants display the intelligibility of the activities in progress and they co-build them.

Talking about repairs, Kalin (1995) states “in order to achieve a coordinated action, the participants must display to each other the intelligibility of the events they are engaged in, including what activities are in progress and what they expect to happen next” (p. 49). According to Kalin, whenever there is a breakdown in a conversation the participants feel face threatened as they have failed in achieving intersubjectivity. Participants engaged in a repair sequence can rely
on a series of devices, which help them save face and re-establish the mutual understanding that constitutes a pre-requisite for the progress of the talk. As Kurhila (2006) describes, “repair is a mechanism to achieve clarification, to re-establish mutual intelligibility after some perceived trouble” (p. 21). She also states that repair can be considered as turn-holding device; despite the fact that speech perturbations cannot be considered as turn-holding device per se.

Repair is an orderly phenomenon, organized around a turn, which contains material that is to be changed or abandoned. So far we have been describing “backward-looking” repairs; i.e., repairs that deal with a trouble source located in some prior stretch of talk. In the next section, I will discuss a “forward-looking” repair, namely a word search. In this type of repair, eye gaze will be a key element.

2.2.4 Word searches

Word searches are repairs in which the progressivity of the turn is halted because the speaker encounters problems in formulating the talk. Word searches are a type of self-initiated repair. Conversation analysts (e.g., M. H. Goodwin, 1980, 1983; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Lerner, 1996: Helasvuol, Lakso, & Sorjonen, 2004) have analyzed this particular phenomenon. A word search presents three stages: the onset of the search, the search in progress, and finally the resolution or abandonment of the search. Schegloff et al. (1977) noticed that repairs, including word searches, initiated by the speaker within the trouble source turn, were often accompanied by non-lexical speech perturbations such as cut-offs, sound stretches and hesitation marks.

Another important contribution comes from Lerner (1996) who studied the phenomenon from a syntactic perspective. He highlighted those occurrences in which the search was solved by the recipient and, in fact, Lerner affirms that a word search “is specifically designed for conditional entry by recipients” (p. 261). He also found two other practices: word cut-offs and word
repetitions. Words cut-off are those words that are abruptly cut-off before they have been fully articulated and are generally replaced by another word. Such a format provides the recipient with a locus to offer a replacement of the word as next action. The repetition of a word, on the other hand, disrupts one aspect of turn progressivity: sequential adjacency (Lerner, 1996). The excerpts in Figures 2.35 and 2.36 show occurrences of word cut-off and word repetition, respectively.

*Figure 2.35. Data set 6 giugno 2001 Cellulare*

01 S: no no no::n ho:: bisogno di cellulare non so
no no no::t haveIPersin need of cellular not knowIPersin
no no i don’t need a cellular i don’t know

02 ⇒ ehm se io alla mia appart-
ehm if i atArtPrep+theFemSin myFemSin apart-
ėhm if i at my apart- in my apartment not

03 ⇒ nel mio appartamento non-
inArtPrep+theMasSin myMasSin apartment not
in my apartment not

*Figure 2.36. Data set 5 giugno 2001 Neve*

01: S: con ernesto e arriva emma tutta bagnata di acqua così piangendo
with ernesto and comes emma all wet of water so crying
with Ernesto and here comes emma all soaked with water so crying

02 ⇒ o penso che era- e:::: era non so se era neve
or think that was- w::::: was not know if was snow
or I think that it was- w::::: it was I don’t know if it was snow

03 comunque era neve
anyhow it was snow
anyhow it was snow

Lerner also focused his attention on the way the resolution of a search can be done. He noticed that the candidate solution is offered either for confirmation or as an assertedly correct guess. In native speaker interactions word searches are generally rather short sequences; however, this is not what happens in aphasic speakers’ conversations. Helasvu, Laakso, and Sorjonen (2004) analyzed word searches in aphasic patients and found that the search can be
prolonged for many turns, something that has also been found in L2 learners’ interactions (Egbert et al., 2004).

Word searches are easily found in any interaction, but they are more common when the participants’ resources or their linguistic knowledge are not shared, as in adult-children or L1-L2 conversation as in the present data.

2.2.5 Non-verbal cues

Non-verbal cues play an important role in word searches. The literature on interaction and gesture is quite broad (e.g., Crawford Camiciottoli, 2004; Hadar & Butterworth, 1997; Hayashi, 2003a, 2003b; Heath, 1986, 1992; Kendon, 1972, 1981, 1983, 1995, 2004; McNeill, 1992; Ricci-Bitti, 1987; Rimè, 1987; Streeck, 1988, 1993, 1994; Streeck & Hartge, 1992). These researchers have analyzed how bodily movements reveal the imagery of people’s thoughts and how the movements are intertwined “with spoken language in time, meaning, and function” (McNeill, 1992, p. 1). Gestures provide a broader view of our mental processes reflected in our talk. Our language is not only made up of segments, sounds, and words, but it is also holistic and imagistic. Image and speech are simultaneously present in our mind. Sometimes gestures reflect our thoughts more than words can. McNeill (1992) hypothesizes “the utterance has both an imagistic side and a linguistic side. The image arises first and is transformed into a complex structure in which both the gesture and the linguistic structure are integral parts” (p. 29-30). Kendon (2004) states that “an utterance is looked upon as an ‘object’ constructed for others from components fashioned from both spoken language and gesture” (p. 5). He also highlights how body actions can play a fundamental role in interactions and communication in general. They can disambiguate a word, complete a sentence, and convey meanings that words can only in part convey.
Another characteristic of word searches is facial gestures, particularly the one named “thinking face” (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986). Goodwin and Goodwin (1986) describe that speakers divert their gazes when engaged in the search of a lexical item, assuming a characteristic “thinking face” that has been observed across cultures.

C. Goodwin (1980, 1986, 1996) found that gaze shifts occur systematically during interaction and they represent one way to invite another speaker to be a co-teller in a story. In particular, Goodwin and Goodwin (1986) demonstrate the important role that eye gaze plays during word searches and how speakers appeal for assistance by directing their gaze to the recipient. Thus, instead of being a private event, such as when the speaker is engaged in a solitary search and assumes the typical thinking face (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986), the word search is transformed into a social activity by both inviting the co-participant via eye gaze to participate in the search and marking it with a wh-question as in the following example (Figure 2.37).

*Figure 2.37. Data set (I) G.86: 490 from C. Goodwin, 1987 (p. 117)*

01 Mike: I was watching Johnny Carson one night en there was a guy

02 ⇒ by the name- What was that guy’s name.

Mike Shifts Gaze to Phyllis

As Figure 2.37 shows the wh-question generally occurs during the gaze shift (C. Goodwin, 1987). Moreover, as highlighted by Goodwin and Goodwin (1986) for English and also by Hayashi (2003b) in his research on Japanese conversations, word searches are characterized by a variety of manual and facial gestures, including iconic gestures that represent some features of the targeted lexical item. These non-verbal cues are deployed to announce a forthcoming trouble, such as a missing word or expression that marks a shift in the ongoing
activity. The shift creates a new activity framework in which the recipients cooperate with the speaker, in a collaborative participation to target the word the speaker is searching for.

In addition to gazes, other nonverbal actions such as hand gestures are often found in connection with word searches. While engaged in a word search, speakers often wave or whirl their hands (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986); raise their palm or finger to indicate turn holding; point to people or objects and places (C. Goodwin, 1987); or use iconic gestures, also called illustrators, as they express a meaning close to the one expressed verbally, to illustrate the missing word (Hadar & Butterworth, 1997; Ricci-Bitti, 1987; Rimè, 1987). Kendon (1972, 1981, 1995, 2004) calls emblems those gestures that are independent and can represent an efficient and complete communication. And lastly, gestures clarify verbal interaction especially in native/non-native speakers’ communication. People focus their gaze on the movements of their hands while attempting to retrieve the missing lexical item. Streeck (1988, 1993, 1994) found that speakers initiating a gesture normally turn their gaze to their hands at the onset of the gesture. In this way they indicate that the oncoming movement is relevant for the understanding of the emerging talk. Non-verbal behaviors range from vague batons that accent words or phrases, to larger descriptive gestures as pictographs used to draw the referent in the air; kinetographs, which depict movements; spatial gestures, showing a spatial relationship; and deictics, which are natural, biologically determined gestures—pointing, showing an object, or reaching for something (Crawford Camiciottoli, 2004), but all of them have the same purpose, namely to accomplish a joint utterance construction. Embodied cues are used together with verbal cues, such as question markers or interrogative questions, to invite the recipient’s help in searching for a word. They are intertwined with the unfolding course of the action especially during word searches in L1-L2 interactions.
2.3 SLA and Repair

While CA research has focused on native speaker interactions in everyday conversation, in the field of SLA, repair has been investigated for its primary role in the acquisition of a second language (Long, 1983, 1996; Swain, 1985; Gass, 1997). In SLA, repair is usually understood as synonymous with correction (e.g. Kasper, 1985), that is the replacement of an error with a correct form. Such view of repair excludes investigation of any difficulty occurring in the absence of error, including a learner’s action on anticipated trouble. Problematic for research on L2 course is the assumption that the basic problem in talk is always due to an incomplete and incorrect L2 system, a bias that can limit our understanding of talk involving an L2 speaker.

According to SLA, the repair process allows the learners to receive comprehensible input and consequently produce comprehensible output (Pica, Halliday, Lewis & Morgenthaler, 1989; Swain, 1985). Pica (1994) and Pica, Young, and Doughty (1987) affirmed that during repair processes language learners are exposed to comprehensible input (Krashen, 1985) and modified input (Musumeci, 1996) whenever the interlocutors modify their talk. In addition, repair sequences give the learners the opportunity to produce modified output as the result of the intake that has been processed. Such output, called by Swain (1985, 1995) comprehensible output, has a reflective function as it allows learners to step back from language use and periodically engage in lexical or morphosyntactic analysis. According to Swain (1985), such analysis favors second language acquisition.

Repair has been investigated as a critical factor in non-native speakers’ acquisition by other SLA researchers, who consider CA a useful approach to study language acquisition (e.g., Kasper, 1985; van Lier, 1998; Markee, 2000; Seedhouse, 2004). Markee (2000) states that SLA
researchers might consider repair as “the sociopsychological engine that enables learners to get comprehended input” (p. 31).


Another important component in SLA research is the body of work on communication strategies (CS), whose focal point is the notion of repair. CS refers to those linguistic adjustments employed by language learners when they encounter disparity between their linguistic capacity and the communication demand. Two different approaches to CS have been developed: one psycholinguistically oriented (Bialystock, 1983, 1990; Færch & Kasper, 1983) and the other one favoring an interactional perspective (Poulisse, 1990; Tarone, 1980, 1981/1983; Wagner & Firth, 1997). According to the psycholinguistic approach, CS is a mental approach employed by the learner to overcome difficulties in expressing meaning. Færch and Kasper (1983, p. 36) define it as “potentially conscious plan for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal.” Interactionalists, on the other hand, consider CS a joint endeavor, involving both the learner and the interlocutor (Poulisse, 1990), to co-construct meaning when a speaker has a problem. According to Tarone (1981/1983), CS are “attempts to bridge the gap between the linguistic knowledge of the second-
language [sic] learner and the linguistic knowledge of the target interlocutor in real communication situations” (p. 65). Psycholinguists have been concerned with the cognitive process behind the use of CS, while interactionalists have been concerned with showing how such strategies are interactionally contingent and situated, conforming to the modern notion of communication as interaction between multiple parties.

Researchers have tried to distinguish the positive and negative effects CS could have on language learning, the positive effects being approximation, word coinage, circumlocution, appeal for assistance, restructuring and the like. Topic avoidance, message abandonment, language switch and other similar elements, on the other hand, were considered negative categories. However, Wong (1994) highlighted how the lack of a clear definition of the concept of communication strategy leads to inconsistency in the data used for the analysis. She stated that forms of interactions such as insertions, aborted attempts, and the like, are generic practices employed in everyday conversations both by native and non-native speakers. Such practices represent a few of the different options a speaker can employ when repairing a trouble-source utterance.

Conversational troubles, problems in hearing, speaking, or understanding talk, need to be repaired to restore understanding among the participants to the conversation. As Schegloff, Koshik, Jacoby, and Olsher (2002) highlighted, it is misleading to use the CA term “repair” and its features to describe error correction in pedagogical settings as repair is a generic term, which refers to problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding putting on hold the action, while correction is one particular type of repair, precisely the replacement of an error (whatever it might be) made by the speaker. Schwartz (1980) considered repairs as a process of negotiation “involving speakers conferring with each other to achieve understanding” (p. 151).
Both L1 and L2 conversations are often characterized by errors or problems in understanding. One way to deal with errors and problems is by initiating repair. In SLA, repair encompasses the concept of “correction;” instead, in CS repairs are the linguistic adjustments deployed by language learners when there is a gap between their linguistic capacity and the communication requirements; finally, repair in CA refers to problems inherent to speaking, hearing, and understanding. The present investigation uses only a conversation analytic framework.

2.3.1 Repairs in L2 settings

The role of repair in native/non-native interactions can be different compared to L1 interactions. Schegloff et al. (1977) had already pointed out that in adult-child interactions the preference for self-repair is not as prevalent as in adult-adult interactions because of the inequality in the participants’ competence. In the former it seems that other-corrections are more frequent since they are “a device for dealing with those who are still learning or being taught to operate with a system which requires, for its routine operation, that they be adequate self-monitors and self-correctors as a condition of competence” (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 381). The same expectation can be applied to L1-L2 conversations and several investigations have highlighted interesting elements that will be presented here. CA-informed research has shown that a variety of repair practices are deployed. Kasper (1985), in her study on repair in an English as a Second Language (ESL) classroom at a Danish gymnasium, distinguished two phases in the class: language-centered and content-centered. Her analysis shows that the language-centered phase is characterized by other-correction, while the content-centered one is mostly distinguished by self-correction. She also analyzed what she called “delegate repair” (p. 207). Delegate repairs are other-completed repairs initiated by the teachers and completed by another learner. Such
repairs aim to involve other learners in the repair activity and encourage active participation in
the learning process. The focus of such repairs is on formal correctness. The second phase is
mostly characterized by self-initiated self-completed repairs; however, other-initiated other-completed repairs are also often done by teachers. During this phase participants avoid
interrupting content-based talk when linguistic troubles occur.

Van Lier (1988) in his study confirmed Kasper’s analysis and stressed the importance of
context, in analyzing repairs in L2 classroom settings. He identified four basic kinds of repair:
(a) didactic, (b) conversational, (c) conjunctive, and (d) disjunctive. Didactic repairs have a
pedagogical function as they aim to help the students respond when they have a problem or to
evaluate the response; conversational repairs are characteristics of any conversation and address
troubles in interaction. Conjunctive repairs aim to help and support; disjunctive repairs evaluate,
challenge, and contest. Van Lier (1988) also establishes three macro categories of repair that
reflect the purposes of the participants. The repairs are labeled according to the language
functions: medium-oriented, message-oriented, activity-oriented (p.187). Activity-oriented
repairs focus on the organization and structure of the classroom environment, for example, rules
for conducting activities. The following excerpt (Figure 2.38) presents one such occurrence.

Figure 2.38. Data set Extract 7.4 from van Lier (1988, p. 188)⁶

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T</th>
<th>o::h okay. Ruben how about number five ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>L7</td>
<td>five [oh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>[number... I’m sorry ... four okay yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>LL</td>
<td>[/four/four/]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁶ According to van Lier (1988) the square brackets identify the onset and end of overlap or
insertion of concurrent turn; for convenience a space can be inserted in the turn above, but this
does not indicate a pause unless marked by periods.
Medium-oriented repairs focus on the forms and/or on the functions of the target language as in the following example (figure 2.39).

**Figure 2.39.** Data set Extract 7.2 from van Lier (1988, p. 187)

```
01   L2   I was listening   listening
02-03 ⇒ L1   [in the ra-] [to the radio in (bed)]
04   L2   oh ja
05 ⇒ L1   while you having a bath
06   L2   and you and you was having a bath
07 ⇒ L1. [you were-were having]
```

According to van Lier (1988), repairs in Figure 2.36 and in Figure 2.37 are also conjunctive ones since in the first excerpt L7 repairs T’s mistake at line two and, in the other data segment, L1 repairs to help L2 produce utterances in lines two, three, five, and seven.

He also affirms that medium-oriented repairs can be found in message-oriented sequences, which deal with the transmission of thoughts, information, feeling, and the like, as in the following example (Figure 2.40).

**Figure 2.40.** Data set Extract 7.27 from van Lier (1988, p. 209)

```
01   T   ((to L8)) you’re going to California?
02   L9   California?
03   T   California
04   L4   ((to L8)) how do you: going?
05 ⇒ T   how are you going?
```

This data set, Figure 2.40, shows a disjunctive repair. Van Lier considers this as a type of routine repair, often delivered in the form of a paraphrase of the defective utterance. Learners

---

7 Ibidem.
usually accept them without commenting. Van Lier (1988) affirms that such repairs show the superior status of the teacher as a competent or native speaker of the target language. He also stresses how context and kind of repair are strictly connected. Seedhouse (2004) claimed, “each context has its own particular pedagogical focus and its own typical organization of repair which is reflexively related to that pedagogical focus” (p. 158-159). Repair, in second language classrooms, is organized differently according to the different types of context.

Considering that the L2 learners do not master the language and their language competence is typically lower than that of the L1 speakers, several researchers have found some interesting preference organization. Zorzi (1998) analyzed Italian ordinary conversations between native and non-native speakers. She found that when a problem is related to content the native speaker favors intersubjectivity and sometimes accepts problematic utterances with signs of assent and comprehension. This is confirmed by Kurhila (2006) who affirms “By avoiding activities which would interrupt the progress of conversation and display understanding, NSs deal with the asymmetry between the participants and construct the interaction as demonstrating the existences of intersubjectivity” (p. 232). Zorzi also noticed that non-native speakers emphasize problems of content and initiate repairs when they feel that the native speaker has not adequately displayed comprehension of the content because of its emotional significance or conceptual difficulty. On the contrary, if the trouble source is a linguistic form the native speakers employ strategies to expose the problem and tend to initiate repair. The following data from Zorzi show some of the occurrences described.

*Figure 2.41. Data set example 22 from Zorzi (1998, p. 569)*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td><strong>NN:</strong> c’è un palazzo incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td><strong>N:</strong> =mh mh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>⇒ <strong>NN:</strong> =nonne adesso com-construito completo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

8 The line numbering has been added to explain the data.
In the previous excerpt, Figure 2.41, line one, the non-native speaker has difficulty in producing the element a ‘building under construction’; however, in line two, the native speaker produces a continuers *mhmh* and does not intervene. In line three the non-native speaker repairs his previous turn. The native speaker, in line four, leaves the hesitant formulation unresolved as he asks where the building is.

Zorzi states that, in interaction between native Italians, references that are formulated ambiguously or are unclear trigger a self-initiation of other-repair. The interactant notices the troublesome source and attempts to clarify the uncertainty. While in native/non-native interactions hesitant formulations, false starts, or other similar occurrences are rarely responded to.

Next instance, Figure 2.42, shows how a problematic utterance is accepted by the native speaker with a sign of confirmation and the non-native speaker initiates repair on the latter, asking the native speaker for additional confirmation.

_Figure 2.42. Data set example 28 from Zorzi (1998, p. 574)_

9 The line numbering has been added to analyze the data.
In Figure 2.42 the non-native speaker has been explaining that he does not want to get married because he does not have the money to allow a child to live well. In lines two and five the native speaker confirms the non-native speaker’s utterances with the confirmation si/‘yes’.

The non-native speaker continues telling about his problem and in line eight the native speaker confirms the utterance by the non-native speaker with ho capito/‘I see’. In line nine the non-native speaker repairs line eight and invites the native speaker to confirm that he really understands. When the native speaker claims to understand, in line ten, the non-native speaker reformulates his explanation in line eleven. The non-native speaker cannot find the word to complete his turn and in line twelve the native speaker immediately offers the candidate solution with a final intonation. The non-native speaker acknowledges the solution by repeating it, then he continues his turn uttering Non posso sposare/‘I can’t marry’ and asking once again for a confirmation in line thirteen. In line fourteen the native speaker replies positively, repeating twice certo/‘sure’ offering a further claim of understanding to the non-native speaker.

According to Zorzi, non-native speakers tend to avoid exposed repair or present a different attitude as they minimize problems of form, either by ignoring them or by limiting their reaction to minimal signs of acceptance. Instead they emphasize content ones, initiating repair
when they do not feel that the native speaker has adequately displayed comprehension of content which they consider problematic because of its emotional significance or conceptual difficulty..

Kurhila (2006), in her study on institutional talk, confirms such findings and affirms “there are no verbalisations of non-understanding by the NSs and, when mutual intelligibility is at stake, the NSs deal with the situation by producing turns that display understanding rather than non-understanding” (p. 232).

Kinginger (1995) analyzed how learners in foreign language classrooms and learners in ESL manage repair and observed that learners in foreign language classrooms use code switching to communicate as they share a common first language. Instead, in ESL lessons, learners do not share a common linguistic background and thus rely on the second language to communicate. Such observations lead Kinginger to affirm that linguistic and cultural homogeneity of language classes has an impact on negotiation.

Markee (2000) states that second language learners prefer two types of repair: self-initiated self-completed vs. self-initiated other-completed. He argues that these repair types reflect the students’ state of knowledge in a particular moment of the conversation. Moreover, he showed: (a) how one learner deploys talk to understand and learn the word “coral” and (b) how another learner fails to understand and learn the meaning of the sentence “We cannot get by Auschwitz.” According to Markee the two sets of analysis show how CA might contribute in revealing the importance of negotiated talk and conversational modification to trigger second language acquisition. Buckwalter (2001), who analyzed adult dyad conversations in Spanish as a FL classrooms, also found that self-initiated self-repair was the most common form of repair. This form of repair, as well as other-initiated other-repair that were very rare in the study,
operates on the lexicon, pronunciation, and morphosyntax, while the other repair pattern, namely self-initiated other-repair and other-initiated self-repair, operates mainly on the lexicon.

Several studies have analyzed native speaker and non-native speaker interactions. By comparing the conversation in oral language proficiency interviews and conversation in ordinary settings, they showed that the two forms of conversation have similar structures, but different sequence organizations (Lazaraton, 1992).

Few studies deal with repair strategies employed by students. In one of them Egbert (1998) studied the various kinds of repair initiations employed by German learners in dyadic interviews. She observed six types of repair; five of them were the ones Schegloff et al. (1977) had described and the sixth can be listed under requests for repetition. Such requests of repetition are not used in native German conversations, but they were listed in the textbook used by the students, and consequently, instructors and learners used them during oral exams. However, the most common repair patterns used by the learners were partial repeats and comprehension checks. Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain (2003) added another category to the ones defined by Egbert (1998): requests for definition, translation or explanation. They also stated that students prefer specific repair initiation techniques “to avoid committing face-threatening acts that would seem inappropriate to their role in classroom as learners” (Liebscher & Dailey-O’Cain, 2003, p. 387).

Brouwer (2004) addressed a particular kind of repair as “doing pronunciation.” She refers to a phenomenon that occurs when the students have trouble pronouncing a particular item. She noted that the L2 speakers’ turns present speech perturbations or rising intonation so as to capture the attention of the L1 participant who confirms or corrects the item in the next turn,
constructing a side sequence. Finally the non-native speaker repeats the mispronounced word with correct pronunciation sealing the completion of the repair.

Wong (2000b) observed how L2 speakers used the token “Yeah” in turn medial positions while engaged in a repair activity. She found that the token is produced when the L2 speakers are initiating repair or producing repair-initiating signals (e.g., cut-offs, sound stretches or other similar features). According to Wong, this particular use of the token could be related to the students’ attempt to provide a positive image to the recipient even while managing a trouble.

Repair activities seem to be a tool that enables students to deal with problems in understanding in their conversation by negotiating an agreement of meaning.

### 2.3.2 Word searches in L1-L2 speakers’ interactions

A word search is a type of repair in which a speaker momentarily ceases his talk in the midst of a turn and pauses to search for the next item due. It is a ubiquitous phenomenon for speakers of any language, whether it is their L1 or L2 (Brouwer, 2003; C. Goodwin, 1987; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Hayashi 2003a, 2003b; Hosoda, 2000, 2006; Kurhila, 2004, 2006; Markee, 2008; Mori & Hasegawa, 2009; Mori & Hayashi, 2006; Schegloff et al., 1977). As described above, when speakers are engaged in a word search, their turn is characterized by hesitation markers (e.g., *uh, like*), sound stretches, self-addressed questions for recollection (e.g. *What is/was it*), and/or by bodily movements such as withdrawal of gaze from the recipient, posture shifts, or a variety of manual and facial gestures. Speakers may redirect their gaze at the recipients or vocally address the recipients to invite them to appeal for assistance.

Recent CA studies on L2 have investigated word searches in native/non-native speaker interactions. Schwartz (1980) in her study on repair highlighted that the organization of word searches presents different characteristics in native and non-native speakers. She found both self-
and other-repaired word searches. Gaskill (1980), instead, affirms “other-corrections are elicited in the context of word searches, where the search constitutes a kind of correction-invitation format” (p. 136). Both Gaskill and Schwartz observed that other corrections are infrequent.

Schwartz (1980) also reported that L2 learners engaged in word searches tried to recall lexical items, while native speakers very often were engaged in retrieving person and place names (Daden as cited in Schwartz, 1980 p. 143). Kurhila (2006), in her L1-L2 Finnish interactions study, also noticed how the element the non-native speakers search for is either a lexical item or a grammatical one, while native speakers typically search for specific lexical items. She also confirmed Zorzi’s (1998) and Orletti’s (1994) findings: the categories of native and non-native speakers surface because the participants consider as repairable different things and activate different strategies according to the trouble source (i.e., content or structure). Zorzi (1998) and Kurhila (2006) observed that while conversational resources used towards the achievement of understanding are generally the same for L1 and L2 speakers, the ways in which they participate in word search activities reveal their linguistic identities. The L2 speakers feel the pressure of showing their L2 competence or, in other words, they want to demonstrate that certain features (dysfluencies, hesitation markers) of their talk are not signs of incompetence. When searching for a word, L1 speakers ask immediately for help, while the non-native speakers try first to solve the search by themselves, thus portraying themselves as competent and responsible interactants (Kurhila, 2006).

Hosoda (2002, 2006), analyzing L1 and L2 Japanese interactions, reported that L2 speakers occasionally stop the turn constructional unit in progress to check the correctness of the vocabulary produced and request the L1 speaker’s confirmation. L2 speakers located the trouble source with cut-offs, non-lexical perturbation, and sound stretches. According to the author, only
when such strategy was deployed, the two different categories, novice/expert, surfaced. By soliciting native speakers’ confirmation the L2 speakers displayed themselves to be “novices” of the languages, while the native speakers displayed themselves to be “experts” in the language by providing help to the non-native speakers.

Brouwer (2003), instead, by analyzing naturally occurring conversation between L1 and L2 speakers of Danish, demonstrated how a close analysis of interactional features allows us to identify the types of interactional moments that create opportunities for vocabulary learning. She states that word searches can be considered language learning opportunities when “(a) the other participant is invited to participate in the search, and (b) the interactants demonstrate an orientation to language expertise, with one participant being a novice and the other being an expert” (p. 542).

In sum, the participants’ linguistic identities shape the repair sequences on linguistic matters in L1-L2 conversations, creating opportunities for vocabulary learning. The non-native speakers initiate word searches, the native speakers help in the search and the non-native speakers accept the candidate solution, recognizing, at the same time, the asymmetry in the linguistic competence of the interactants.

Kurhila (2006), among others, has examined the strategy of incorporating a word from other languages and “foreignizing” it so that it fits the grammar and pronunciation of the L2. However, while previous studies have tended to focus on the use of such a strategy in native versus non-native interactions, Mori and Hasegawa (2009) present cases in which “Japanized” English words are used within Japanese utterances addressed to a fellow L2 learner. The authors explain that the students organize word search sequences through the display of their own cognitive states as well as the observation of their peer’s behavioral manifestations of cognitive
states. The authors also noticed how the students utilized different types of resources available to solve several cases of word searches and approached each case in a different way. The learners simultaneously employed structurally different kinds of semiotic resources, such as language, body, and the structures of their textbooks and notebooks for language learning.

Thanks to such interactive processes, the students demonstrate their understanding of shared materials and learning history, which shape their learning experience in important ways.

Word searches can be found in all kinds of interactions, but they occur more often when the interactants have to rely on less linguistic knowledge or resources. Non-native speakers, who are engaged in a word search, display dysfluencies in their turn and when they are not able to self-repair, they activate verbal and non-verbal resources to appeal for help to the other recipient/s to resolve the search, to achieve understanding, and to re-establish intersubjectivity.

2.3.3 Non-verbal cues in L2 interactions

Recently SLA researchers have highlighted the importance of analyzing non-verbal behavior in second language interaction using a conversational analytic approach (e.g. Belhial, 2005; Carroll, 2004; Lazaraton, 2004; Markee, 2004a, 2004b, 2005; Mori, 2004a, 2004b; Mori & Hayashi, 2006; Mori & Hasegawa, 2009; Olsher, 2004).

Markee (2004b) showed how a closer analysis of interlocutors’ non-verbal behavior favors a deep comprehension of the nature of human cognition and how learning activities are structured. He argued that the analysis of the role of non-verbal cues in L2 interactions’ key psycholinguistics concepts, such as comprehensible input and output, can be deepened. In another study, Markee (2005) pointed out how the sequential organization of L2 classroom talk can be more easily understood when non-verbal behaviors are included in the analysis.
Olsher (2004) focused his research on a practice that he calls “embodied completions” (p.221) in an EFL class in a Japanese vocational college. Such practices deal with “launching a turn at talk, and then at a point where some trajectory of the turn is projectable, ceasing to talk and completing the action that had been initiated by the partial turn through gesture or embodied display” (Olsher, 2004, p. 221). The author concludes that the practices analyzed are not peculiar to second language learners and are not the result of ‘low competence,’ but are necessary to create and maintain intersubjectivity and to avoid misunderstanding. They show that the second language speakers are able to deploy, parse, and project the trajectory of turns-in-progress, creating the recipient’s relevant next action, demonstrating their interactional competence.

Mori and Hayashi (2006), further developing Olsher’s (2004) study, stressed the possible role of the interlocutors’ embodied practices in second language learning. Their analysis of casual conversation among speakers of Japanese as first and second languages reveals the local processes used to evaluate, discover, and establish shared linguistic and non-linguistic resources in pursuing intersubjectivity. Moreover, they show that the sequence of actions following an embodied completion provides an incidental, interactional opportunity for the first language speaker to reformulate what the second language speaker has said with a more sophisticated linguistic expression. Their explication enables us to understand how non-verbal cues can create and facilitate an opportunity for language learning.

Lazaraton (2004), too, stressed how non-verbal behavior can modify and make input more comprehensible and salient to the learners. She found that a teacher using gesture, eye gaze, and facial expressions added important cues to the verbal explanation, helping the students to build their lexical knowledge. Crawford Camiciottoli (2004) in her study on L2 guest speakers’ non-verbal behaviors in an Italian university found that, besides the different national
and academic culture of the speakers, non-verbal cues enhanced the verbal message in terms of both content and interpersonal meaning, influencing audience responsiveness.

Belhial (2005) argued that non-verbal behavior in L2 interaction is not a sign of linguistic incompetence, but an important interactional component. In his study, he described how students and tutors amplify the meaning of the verbal utterances by deploying gestures to disambiguate the meaning of lexical items and to display alignment.

Mori (2004b) and Carrol (2004) analyzed non-verbal behavior in their study even if it was not the main focus. Mori (2004b) analyzed how social actions and participation structures are negotiated in classroom discourse, demonstrating “how the attempts to pursue understanding of the intended meanings of particular lexical items but also the relationship to the topical focus and the projected action, were aided by vocal and non-vocal means” (p. 175). Carroll (2004) demonstrated how the common held assumption that second language learners are “‘unsophisticated’ communicators” (p.217) cannot be supported as what are normally considered ‘dysfluencies’ in the talk of a novice L2 learners, are instead “skilled interactional achievements” (p.218). Moreover, he argued for the need to carefully observe the non-verbal behavior intertwined with the interaction to better understand the construction of intersubjectivity.

Schwartz (1980), in her study on repairs and negotiation on meaning, points out how the other-initiation of repair is often marked by “speech preparatory” actions, as Kendon (1972) labeled them, by the recipients. Among the bodily movements Schwartz (1980) observed are posture shifts, expression changes, and lip parting. She also indicated how second language learners engaged in a word search would turn their gazes away from the recipient and look either up or down, assuming a ‘thinking face’ as Goodwin and Goodwin (1986) later labeled it, and sometimes fluttered their eyelids. She also observed that when the learners engaged in the search
averted their gaze while simultaneously addressing the recipient with an overt question, such as “how do you call?,” the recipient did not help the learners in the search until eye contact was again regained. When the eye gaze was averted, recipients considered the question as signaling that the speaker was involved in a word search and not as an appeal for help. In addition, she noticed rotating hand movements that accompanied the turning away of the eye gaze.

Non-verbal behavior can be a very important pedagogical tool in L2 classrooms in that it can reduce ambiguity and enhance understanding. In fact, non-verbal cues may replicate a verbal message, which is obscure for the L2 learners, providing another opportunity to interpret it. In word searches, instead, they represent a key element in the resolution of the search.

2.4 Conclusion

CA has revealed the fundamental organization underlying ordinary conversation. Such fundamental organization based on turn-taking, sequence, and repair affords the possibility to apply a CA approach to the study of L1-L2 interactions. Conversations cannot be analyzed with a predetermined set of rules or by interviewing the participants, asking what they would say or answer in specific situations. Each phase of the interaction responds to a precise organization that is built moment by moment and in an orderly way by the participants, using particular devices, which contradistinguish the interaction. CA also addresses SLA issues with regard to the use of communicative strategies, corrections, and acquisition of lexical items, relevant for the present research.

The present investigation wants to address the following research questions using a conversation analytic approach:

1. How do participants organize word searches? How do they initiate a search, how does it progress and, finally, how is it resolved or abandoned?
2. How do participants make it clear that they are engaged in a search and what non-verbal cues do they use to untangle the search and to appeal for help?

3. How do participants restore the intersubjectivity that has been disrupted by the search?

4. Are there any unique or special features that characterize word searches in Italian L1 speakers and Italian L2 speakers?

5. What contribution does the present CA study on L1 and L2 word searches in Italian conversations make to second language learning and teaching?

   I analyze these questions by studying Italian L1-L2 dinner table conversations to disclose the interactional resources and non-verbal cues the participants deploy in solving a word search.
Chapter Three: Word Searches

3.1 Introduction

This chapter investigates how interactants in conversation engage in word search sequences. It analyzes how speakers signal the upcoming difficulties, how they deal with them, how potential solutions or requests for help are formulated, and how they finally achieve an intersubjective understanding with the other co-participant/s. The data contain a total of 52 word searches, 21 self-initiated self-repaired ones, 19 self-initiated other-repaired ones, and a third group, which includes word searches that are abandoned or not completed.

A word search is a particular kind of repair. A repair is a conversational mechanism that is used when the interactants have difficulty creating an intersubjective understanding (Zorzi, 1996). Zorzi (1996) affirms “Non si assume l’intersoggettività come un contesto dato, ma come un aspetto dell’interazione negoziato (e quindi reso variamente rilevante) nell’hui et nunc del discorso in atto” (p. 348).10 As Schiffrin (1990) states: “…we may view intersubjectivity as but another feature of talk that is interactively managed” (p.147). According to Heritage (1984a), intersubjective understanding is systematically achieved through actions implemented on a turn-by-turn basis. In word searches, the action is put on hold to retrieve the missing element; consequently, the interactants need to renegotiate their mutual understanding before being able to resume the previous action that had been momentarily suspended.

This “architecture of intersubjectivity” (Heritage, 1984a, p.254) relies on “a form of action template” (Heritage, 1984a, p.254), namely, on an adjacency pair. According to Sacks (1995a, 1995b), an adjacency pair is a fundamental unit of interactional social organization.

---

10 “Intersubjectivity is not considered as a given context, but as a negotiated aspect of the interaction (and therefore it becomes variably relevant) in the ‘hic et nunc’ of the speech act” (my translation).
Adjacency pairs, being a combination of a first pair part and a second pair part, provide interactants “with ready–made methods for achieving specific outcomes” (Psathas, 1995, p.18).

The following exchange shows two different types of adjacency pairs:

*Figure 3.1. Data set “Bof E-02” from Zorzi (1990, p. 16)*

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>fpp</td>
<td>AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Buongiorno.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Goodmorning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Goodmorning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 02 | spp | CM   |
|   |   | Buongiorno.   |
|   |   | Goodmorning. |
|   |   | Goodmorning. |

| 03 | fpp | CM   |
|   |   | Vorrei sapere se avete questo libro. + Di |
|   |   | I would like to know if you have this book. + Of |
|   |   | I would like to know if you have this book. + By |

| 04 |   | Eastwood e: Mackin, “A basic English grammar” |
|    |   | Eastwood and: Mackin, “A basic English grammar” |
|    |   | Eastwood and: Mackin, “A basic English grammar” |

| 05 | spp | AA   |
|   |   | Si. |
|   |   | Yes. |
|   |   | Yes. |

The first adjacency pair is an opening greeting exchange and the second is a question/answer sequence. Other basic pairs are, for example, offer/invitation and acceptance/decline. An adjacency pair is a sequence of two utterances that are adjacent, are produced by different speakers, and are complementary, as the first pair part requires a specific second pair part.

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 of which the first pair part is recognizably a member. (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, p. 296)

---

11 According to Zorzi’s transcription the small black triangles (♦♦) indicate overlapping, while a plus (+) indicates a pause.
Adjacency pairs keep participants attentive to the ongoing interaction, and “the nonoccurrence or absence of the conditionally relevant next” (Psathas, 1995, p.21) can be due to many different causes such as non-hearing, non-understanding, misunderstanding, and/or a disruption in the interaction that often need to be repaired before the interaction can resume its previous action.

A repair deals with problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding (Egbert, 1997b; Sacks et al., 1974/2006; Schegloff et al., 1977). It occurs when an utterance contains a problem, when recipient shows difficulties in comprehending, and/or when speakers want to revise their utterances or express themselves more accurately.

There are four combinations of repairs in terms of who begins and who completes the repair, namely self-initiated self-repaired, self-initiated other-repaired, other-initiated self-repaired and other-initiated other-repaired. Schegloff et al. (1977), in analyzing repairs in naturally occurring conversation, found out that (in English) self-initiated—self-repairs were preferred to other-initiated other-repairs. The term repair covers a range far broader than correction or replacement; for example, the activity of searching for a word also falls under the domain of repair and presents many different characteristics typical of repair practices.

Word searches can be considered a specific type of self-initiated repair. Schegloff et al. (1977) noticed that self-initiated repairs, which occurred within the trouble source turn, were often characterized by hesitancy markings. These are hesitation sounds; non-lexical items such as “er,” “uh,” “ehm,” sound stretches, pauses, cut-offs (typically a glottal or other stop), and restarts. Sacks (1995b) affirms that hesitation markers “have an interesting lawfulness” (p. 547) as they are produced when a person, who is able to choose among different alternatives, is engaged in determining which alternative s/he wants to pick. Moreover, a set of contextual constraints can enhance the speed and accuracy of any possible guess about the word search in
progress. The elicitation of confirmation and its subsequent reply constitute an adjacency pair. A word search can be considered a socially recognized activity in which the types of contribution are mutually projected.

The following data segments show some of the characteristic features of word searches.

Figure 3.2. Data set ‘GTS: 5:6’ from Schegloff et al. (1977, p.370)

01 Ken: He siz uh (1.0) W’ll then what ‘r you so ha– er wuh– unhappy
02 about.

Figure 3.2 shows how hesitancy markings are used during a search-for a word. Ken starts his turn but soon he emits a hesitation item followed by a long pause before starting a new turn. He stops after pronouncing the beginning of a word that might be happy. He then hesitates with er and restarts uttering wuh-, which is cut off. Finally, he produces the adjective unhappy. The repair is initiated with different speech perturbations, and is completed with the subsequent lexical item. Goodwin and Goodwin (1986) observed that the same features were characteristic of and preceded a word search sequence. Lerner (1996) also lists word repetition as another practice used by speakers engaged in a word search.

Word searches deal with trouble finding a lexical item such as a proper/common noun, a grammatical item, or even a syntactic unit such as a prepositional phrase. The following is an example of a word search solved by a self-initiated self-repair taken from Schegloff et al. (1977):

Figure 3.3. Data set ‘Clacia’ from Schegloff et al. (1977, p. 363)

01 Clacia: B’t, a-another one theh wentuh school with me
02 ⇒ wa:s a girl na:med uh, (0.7)”W’t the’ hell wz
In this particular case, Figure 3.3, the word sought is a proper name, and at the end the speaker is able to retrieve it. This word search is, as self-initiated repairs generally are, introduced by disfluencies such as sound stretches, the hesitation sound *uh*, and a pause.

Another example taken from Kurhila (2006) illustrates a grammatical search.

**Figure 3.4.** Data set ‘Babies’ from Kurhila (2006, p. 125)

01  J:  .hhhh Sitte he (0.2) huomaa huomu–huom–huoma= then they notice. PRS3 (variations of the verb stem)
    ⇒  .hhhh Then they (0.2) notice noted–noti–notic=

02  S: =Jo[o huoma-s ye[s notice-PST.3
    ⇒  Yes noticed

03  J: [Ohumat °huoma-s° notice-PST.3
    [Onotic °noticed°

04  S: °Joo° °Yes° °Yes°

In this excerpt, Figure 3.4, Kurhila shows how the non-native speaker J tries to conjugate the verb *huomata*/*notice* in line one. She explains: “The modifications of the verb include only the very beginning of the word, roughly the part which is invariant (*huoma-*) regardless of the following suffixes. These modifications thus do not give much information about the target form” (Kurhila, 2006, p. 125). However, the native speaker is able to recognize the searched-for suffix, relying on the narrative prior to the segment, and offers a completion, the past tense *huomas*/*noticed,* in line two. The non-native speaker acknowledges it by repeating it in line three. The author also highlights how “the pattern of the search rather accurately follows the pattern of the corrections as a response to uncertainty” (p. 125). In fact, the completion turn, like the correction one, contains first an affirmative particle and then the new version. The *joo*/*yes* particle seems to confirm that the intersubjective understanding between the interlocutors has not
been disrupted. Consequently, the search sequence can be closed and the interaction can move forward.

A word search can occur anywhere in a conversation. During word searches, the speaker is focused on the progression of the talk and displays difficulty in finding a relevant linguistic item to convey the meaning to be shared with the co-participant/s in the talk. The current speaker, then, interrupts his/her present course of action to address the problem in speaking. The interruption is generally characterized by speech perturbations. Thus, the speaker puts on hold the ongoing activity and addresses the difficulty. The previous interactional activity is resumed only when the problem is resolved or abandoned.

*Figure 3.5. Data set (SBL, SW) from Schegloff (1979b, p. 266)*

01  B: No, I had the queen Clarie. And uh Gene uh that Nobles, or
02    no their names aren’t Noble. But Gene and Ruth or Roo-uhm
03    oh whoever they// are
04  A: Yeah I-I keep saying Noble-Jones.
05  B: Yeah, Jones
06  A: Uh // huh
07 ⇒ B: Uh that Gene had the ace king.

The example in Figure 3.5 shows how the speaker is, probably, telling about a game of cards, and is referring to a person named Gene in line one, but s/he cannot remember the surname and starts to search for the surname. In line three, s/he seems to give up the search, and in line four the recipient offers a candidate solution that is accepted by the speaker in line five. In the subsequent line, the recipient acknowledges the acceptance of the solution and finally the previous action can be resumed, line seven.
Failure to resolve the search halts the progress of the conversation and threatens the intersubjectivity of the participants (Kurhila, 2006). Consequently, the interactants need to restore the mutual understanding and re-establish the interactional order as soon as possible (Couper-Kuhlen, 1992). A word search is considered completed “when the participants have reached intersubjective understanding of what they are talking about” (Kurhila, 2006, p. 92).


The present chapter explores the construction of sequences through which a word search is initiated, detected, and resolved by native Italian speakers. It begins by presenting a brief outline of the previous CA research on word searches. Subsequently, it discusses Italian word search sequences and the similarities and differences that they present in comparison to word search sequences in other languages. It looks at how participants gain an intersubjective understanding of what they are talking about. It then highlights some relevant distinctions in constructing and completing the activity of searching for a word in order to discuss in Chapter
four the similarities and differences in word searches of native and non-native speakers of Italian.

3.2 Previous Research on Word Searches

Schegloff (1979b), in analyzing repairs, noticed a phenomenon that he addressed as *forward-looking repair*. Such repairs are oriented forward as they target a possible upcoming problem, e.g., a word search, in the portion of the turn to be produced. In native speaker talk, a word search is anticipated by “hitches,” perturbations of the spate of talk, such as sound stretches, hesitations, and cut-offs. Sound stretches are particularly associated with possible word searches and act as repair initiators (Schegloff et al., 1977; Schegloff, 1979b). Schegloff (1979b) shows how pauses and markers of hesitations are positioned prior to the trouble source, and cut-offs are positioned afterward.

The data set, Figure 3.6, shows how a word search interrupts the ongoing action and how it is resolved.

*Figure 3.6. Data set “SF:2:24, Simplified” from Schegloff (1979b, p. 265)*

01 Mark: Okay well Bob? ah hhmhh Ah’ll see yuh Friday.
02 (0.2)
03 Bob: t’hhh Okay Mark en uh::: yiknow, a (. ) thous’n pard’ns= =fer yer- the oversight.
04 (0.2)
05 Mark: ‘t’hhhh= 
06 Bob: (Or // is it) 
07 ⇒ Mark: Oh: .uh no:. Well I wasn’t I didn’t fee:l like I
08 wu:z:: ah.hh wt’s the wor:d uhm=
09 ⇒ Bob: =rebu:ffed?= 
10 ⇒ Mark: =‘hh-hh rebu:ffed.h

---

12 The transcription is reproduced as in the book cited.
In Figure 3.6, after a state of change token and a negative particle, Mark begins a new turn in line four that is interrupted and repaired, but he cannot complete his sentence as he cannot find a word. The onset of the search is announced by the sound stretches of the word *wuːzː* followed by a hesitation mark *ah* and the speaker’s inhalation. It is after these disfluencies that the speaker overtly signals his engagement in a word search with the interrogative *wt’s the word*, followed by another disfluency marker *uhm*. The recipient immediately offers a candidate resolution *rebuːffed?*, prosodically marked and latched to the speaker’s final marker in line five. The speaker acknowledges the word acceptance by repeating it. Once the search is concluded, the interactants can resume their previous action.

Speakers are generally engaged in a course of action such as telling a story, when they experience trouble in producing a word needed in the ongoing talk. The trouble can include lexical and grammatical items, as well as more complex structural units. As conversations are structured around actions, when the speaker displays a difficulty and engages in a word search, the previous action is halted and it is resumed as soon as the repair is resolved. The word search has thus created an incidental sequence.

Schegloff (1995a) describes incidental sequences as types of sequence that occur within another sequence; however, they are different from insertion sequences. A sequence is ruled by conditional relevance organization. Schegloff (1972) affirms, “When one utterance (A) is conditionally relevant on another (S), then the occurrence of S provides for the relevance of the occurrence of A” (p. 76). An insertion sequence is an adjacency pair that is inserted between a
first and a second part of a base adjacency pair, such as a summons/answer pair. It could be a request for clarification or specification (Schegloff, 1972; Schegloff, 2007) as in the following example.

Figure 3.7. Data Set from Schegloff (1972, p. 78)

01 A: Are you coming tonight?
02 B: Can I bring a guest?
03 A: Sure.
04 B: I’ll be there.

In the previous segment, Figure 3.7, the initial question in line one is not answered immediately because another turn constructional unit is inserted before the relevant second pair part is produced. It is evident that the insert sequence is necessary to answer the first question. This type of insertion is called pre-second and looks forward “to establish the resources necessary to implement” (Schegloff, 2007, p. 106) the pending second pair part. While a pre-second insert expansion is specific being preliminary to a particular kind “of second pair part to which it is responding” (Schegloff, 2007, p. 106), post-first insert sequences are, instead, generic because they are not differentiated by the type of sequence in which they occur. Other-initiated repairs are post-first as they occur after a turn that contains a base first pair part, which displaces the relevant second pair part with a different first pair part that becomes the first pair part of an insert sequence (Schegloff, 2007). The aim of other-initiated repairs is to solve any problem in hearing and understanding that might interfere with a proper second pair part and ensure mutual understanding between the interlocutors as this excerpt from Schegloff shows.

Figure 3.8. Data set (6.05) TG, 1:16-21 from Schegloff (2007, p. 102)

01 Bee: =W h y]what′sa mattuh with y-yih sou[n d H A:PPY,] hh
02 Ava: [Nothing]
In Figure 3.8, line three, Ava repairs Bee’s first pair part in line one, repeating the trouble source and try-marking it. After Bee’s confirmation in line four, there is a gap in line five. It is only in line six that Ava finally replies to Bee’s question uttered in line one. The repair is inserted between the base first pair part and the second pair part, and it clearly looks back at the trouble that needs to be clarified before the interaction can move on. If the trouble is not sorted out, the interlocutors might give up after three attempts and find a new strategy to continue the interaction (Schegloff, 2007). As Ten Have (2007) states, “Sequences, then, are patterns of subsequent actions, where the ‘subsequentiality’ is not an arbitrary occurrence, but the realization of locally constituted projections, rights, and obligations” (p. 132).

There are, however, sequences that seem to lack any reference to the base adjacency pair. Such sequences are called incidental and are related to other sequential and interactional structures (Schegloff, 2007). Incidental sequences can arise for a variety of reasons such as try-marking (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979; Schegloff, 1995b, 2007). Try-marking occurs when a speaker checks in mid-turn whether a recipient knows a referent, for example, a person to whom the speaker is referring. This activity of checking is accomplished by stating a name with rising intonation, the try-marker, and waiting for some signal of recognition from the recipient. The try-marker and its response constitute a two-part sequence, even though they occur during another sequence. Incidental sequences occur within a first or second pair part or even outside of the context of an adjacency pair, such as in the word search in Figure 3.6. A word search is an example of an incidental sequence, and it is designed to simply allow a current speaker to
continue speaking. The appeal for help that occurs within the context of a word search can be characterized as part of an incidental sequence. The following example illustrates how after the incidental sequence caused by a word search the previous action is resumed as the telling of the story continues.

*Figure 3.9. Data set 5 giugno 2001 v. 1:28:01 Emulazione*

01 D: >[che ] poi anche il dramma è questo >[that] then also the drama is this >[that] then the drama is also this one

02 che dopo che ci sono queste cose,< that after that there are these things,< that after that such things occur

03 ⇒ ci sono tutte- questi:= there are all these there are all these

04 U: hh.[eheh ] hh.[eheh ] hh.[eheh ]

*she is looking at the student* she turns her head and seems to look across towards her husband rotating and turning her hands towards the outside

05 ⇒ D: * [e-e-e]pisodes di:::m:* * come di[re ], * [e-e-e]pisodes of:::m:* how [say],Inf * [e-e-e]pisodes of m *how can we [say], it


07 ⇒ D: emulazione. [per] cui un sac[co (di)][( )] emulation. [for] which a sack of [ ]( ) emulation. [bec]ause of which a [lot of][()]

08 S: [ah ] [ah ] [ah ]

09 U: [certo] [sure ] [sure ]

This excerpt, Figure 3.9, comes from a longer sequence in which the hosts (D and U), the student (S), and the friend (F) are engaged in talking about recent sensational murders occurring
in Italy. In line one, the woman takes the floor and rushes the first part of her turn. In line three, the first signal of the onset of a word search is her use of the indefinite adjective *tutto*/*all,* feminine and plural, which seems to recycle *queste cose*/*these things* from line two, and instead is followed by the proximal demonstrative *questi*/*these,* masculine and plural, whose final *i* is stretched, clearly showing that a word search is unfolding. In line five, the first letter of the following word is repeated two times before the woman comes up with the searched-for word. Once the first search is completed, she starts a new search announced by the stretching of the vowel of the preposition *di*/*of* followed by the letter ‘*m*’ slightly prolonged and then confirmed by the interrogative *come dire*/*how can we say it,* uttered with a continuing intonation. Unfortunately, on the video, the head of the friend covers the woman and it is not possible to clearly observe her gaze. However, it can be noticed that during the first part of her turn, her head is turned towards the student sitting on the left side and, when she utters the explicit question in line five, she slightly turns her head in order to face her husband sitting opposite her. The disfluencies have highlighted an upcoming problem that is confirmed by the uttered interrogative; the friend, sitting on the right side of the woman, noticing that a word search is in progress and being able to project the end of the turn, offers a candidate possible solution in overlap with the ending of the interrogative question in line six. The woman accepts the candidate solution by repeating it with falling intonation before moving forward in her utterance, line seven. The candidate item, offered in overlap with the overt request by the woman, shows how the friend attends closely to the unfolding of the turn and is, thus, able to promptly provide the possible solution. The word search is resolved and the action of the turn is resumed and continued in line seven.
Word searches are embedded in the sequence structure of the talk that occasioned them and they can also be engendered in “collaborative turn sequence” (Lerner, 2004). “A collaborative turn sequence is a collaboration of two speakers producing a single syntactic unit” (Lerner, 2004, p. 229). Word searches are specifically designed for conditional entry by recipients.

Though word searches can expand in long sequences, roughly they minimally provide conditional access to the current turn for other participants to aid in the search by suggesting candidate words and a slot for the original speaker to accept or reject proffered candidates. (Lerner, 1996, p. 261)

Lerner (1996) has studied word searches from a syntactic point of view. He explains the process of word searches in terms of the “progressivity” of a turn’s talk, based on data from native speakers’ word searches. Word searches, disrupting the TCU in progress, provide potential slots for co-participants to jump in with candidate solutions, and for the original speaker to possibly accept or reject the offered solution, generating in this way an incidental sequence as shown in the previous example, Figure 3.9, as well as in the following one.

Figure 3.10. Data set (28)[GL: DS] from Lerner, (1996, p. 261)\(^\text{13}\)

01 L: he said, the thing thet-thet-sad about the uhm black uhm
02 0.3
03 P: muslims,
04 L: muslims, he said is thet they don’t realize.

The data in Figure 3.10 show how the speaker’s first utterance in line one is designed so that the recipient can complete it. It is “the completion of a preliminary component in a compound structure” (Lerner, 1996, p. 262). Such collaborative completions are designed to

\(^{13}\) The line numbering has been added to help the reader analyze the turn.
allow the conditional entry of the recipient in order to produce only the word sought and let the
speaker proceed in his/her telling. Lines two and three represent the incidental sequence inserted
to solve the word search before resuming the telling in line four.

Lerner noticed that word searches are often placed near the end of the unit giving the
recipient the opportunity to offer a candidate potential solution that is also the terminal item
completion as shown by this example from Lerner (1996, p. 262).

Figure 3.11. Data set (29)[Adato:II] from Lerner, (1996, p. 262)\(^14\)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Jay: Well, I- I <strong>pretty</strong> much had in <strong>mind</strong> the:::;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>G. <strong>the human race</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.11 is an instance of a word search and clearly shows how the recipient’s
collaborative contribution is offered after the onset of the search and that it “is designed as an assertedly
correct continuation and not as a try-marked candidate” (Lerner, 1996, p. 262). The same
early collaborative completion can be noticed in the previous Italian data, Figure 3.9. The recipient,
projecting the speaker’s end of the turn, offers, in overlap, a possible resolution; the speaker
accepts the proffered item by means of its repetition and then resumes her story telling. As
Lerner (1993) states, such early completions might have a distinctive role: they might arrange
who will deliver the story when there are different potential story-tellers (Lerner, 1992) or they
might highlight the recipient’s alignment with the speaker and therefore be considered
“association co-membership” (Lerner, 1996, p.263). The Italian excerpt, in Figure 3.9, shows
that the recipient, aligning with the speaker, shares the same vision of the narrated event and
therefore stresses their association.

\(^{14}\) Line numbering added.
The turns analyzed in Lerner’s examples are similar to those presented by Goodwin and Goodwin (1986). The speaker stops in the middle of a TCU, produces sound stretches, hesitation sounds, or simply pauses allowing the recipient to take a turn. In the first example from Lerner’s article (1996), Figure 3.10, we notice that cut-offs, word repetitions, and hesitation markers signal trouble that invites the recipient to take a turn and offer a candidate solution that is acknowledged by the speaker’s repetition of the word offered. In the second example, Figure 3.11, from Lerner as well, the sound stretch on the determiner the, recognized by the recipient as an invitation to offer a possible solution to the word search, entitles him/her to proffer it showing his/her alignment with the speaker who can then resume his/her turn after the collaborative completion. Both Lerner’s (1996) and Goodwin and Goodwin’s (1986) research studies show how the ongoing conversational activity is disrupted by hesitations and perturbations, which characterize the speaker’s speech.

Word searches are normally rather short as, most of the time, the targeted word is found within the same turn or in the turn immediately following. Helasvuo et al. (2004) have analyzed conversations of aphasic speakers, and their data show that word searches are a very frequent activity and a word search sequence can be, on the contrary, quite long. The authors present an instance where an aphasic attempts to retrieve the searched-for-item for many lines, from line eight to line nineteen. Concomitantly to the search, the man continues his story telling. He finally and successfully resolves the word search in line nineteen, as the following excerpt shows.

*Figure 3.12. Data set: Explosion from Helasvuo et al. (2004, p.11)*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>A: There is always exi-excitement there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>T: Mm::? mm, it is quite--=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>A: Y[eah,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Only the English translation of the data is reproduced.*
T: [wasn’t it there in Lapua or when was it, (.)
or what was it now when it was something (0.2) like
fifteen years ago was the [0.4] accident.

A: [Yeah [Yeah
there year there y’know went the X (.) err the X (.)
there exploded that X (1.2) hmm hmmh! (what would it be that X)
(0.2)
and then I’ve seen such a thing
when I was a young man
I have seen such a? (neologism) see.
that X yx (1.6)
(0.2) and many people died
that X (0.7) #err# it/he/she died that X ##
e- no I mean (1.5) #m#hmy (2.4)am- err that *state owned
*ROLLING MOVEMENT
went the *X ### this: X ### where those X (1.2)
LEFT HAND**SHAKES BOTH HANDS*
A Deposit. S-(uaa)bullet[depot- (#.) de{pot.

T: [I see, [a

bullet de{pot.

Goodwin and Goodwin (1986), analyzing word searches, also found that both native speakers and recipients understood and utilized gestures and facial expressions meaningfully in the process of looking for a lexical item. Their descriptions reveal that speakers frequently withdraw their gazes from their recipients with a characteristic “thinking face” when they embark on a word search, and then look again at the recipients when the search is self-resolved. Speakers involved in a forward-looking repair, when in need of help, can solicit it not only with disfluencies in their talk or with wh-questions directed to the other recipients, but also by returning their eye gaze to a co-participant before arriving at a possible solution. Goodwin and
Goodwin (1986) pointed out that the returning of the eye gaze before arriving at a candidate answer is a way of eliciting assistance. These results have been confirmed by research in other languages, i.e. Japanese, Finnish, German (Hayashi, 2003a, 2003b; Kurhila, 2006; Streeck, 1988, 1993, 1994), and in the ESL classroom context (Seo, 2008; Lee, 2004; Willey, 2001). Eye gaze can be considered a crucial element in examining word searches and in analyzing how recipients co-participate in solving the trouble. The following example from the Italian data shows how the speaker engaged in searching for a word assumes a thinking face in her attempt to retrieve the word.

*Figure 3.13. Data set 29 maggio 2001 v. 53:42 Vienna*

*left hand open, palm up and with the left hand index finger points at the center of her palm, in the meantime she looks at the student*

01  A: *e poi, (.) ti ripeto da vienna*  
*and then, (.youObjPro repeat1stPerSin from vienna*  
*and moreover, (.I’m telling you again from Vienna*

*she points away from the palm, in the air on her right*

02  *a salisburgo, non è lontano puoi prendere*  
*to salzburg not is far can2ndPerSin take*  
*to salzburg it is not far you can take*

03  il treno, e poi andare a salisburgo (.che*  
theMasSin train, and then goInf to salzburg (.that*  
*a train, and then go to salzburg (.that*

*her elbows on the table she opens*

04  è- (.deliziosa. ↑a parte ri- *andare li è proprio*  
is- (.lovely. ↑besides ri- *goInf there is really*  
is- (.lovely. ↑besides re- *going there is really*

*her hands forward and then she closes her hands, puts the right arm down with the left elbow still on the table with the hand down almost making a fist*

05  ⇒  
respirare=aria di-  
to breath=air of-  
breathing an atmosphere*

06  S:  
uhm  
uhm  
uhm

*she almost use her left hand as a microphone*

07  A:  
*eh::m*  
*eh::m*  
*eh::m*
The data in Figure 3.13 show one conversational strand from a schism, which occurred before the lines presented. The father and the younger child are engaged in talking about the jobs of relatives and friends, and the other three participants are talking about the opportunity to study abroad for a semester, while the older daughter is listening to this second interaction. The aunt is talking about visiting Austria and she affirms that it is very easy to travel by train from Vienna to Salzburg, a city famous for being Mozart’s hometown and for the festival dedicated to the composer. The student is a music major, so the aunt is offering important information about studying abroad to learn a foreign language, and also as an opportunity to be immersed in a city well known all over the world for its musical engagement. It is when the aunt wants to describe

Schisming occurs when a previous conversation (in which four or more speakers participate) splits into two conversations and the interlocutors participate in one of the two conversations (Egbert, 1997a).
Salzburg and its atmosphere, that she cannot retrieve the searched for item. In line five she cuts off the preposition *di* of, then, in line seven, she produces a filler *eh::m* with a slightly prolonged sound, looks down and assumes a thinking face. This gesture highlights her “solitary attempt” to solve the search. In line eight she displays her engagement in a word search asking *come si chiama.* ‘what is it called.’ with a falling intonation. The mother (D) offers a candidate solution followed by an aspiration that becomes almost a sort of token asking for confirmation. The start of the candidate solution is produced with high pitch probably to attract the attention of the speaker. The aunt accepts the proffered candidate by repeating it, adding two more items creating a typical three-part list (Jefferson, 1990), which foreshadows the utterance’s completion and therefore the possibility for the recipient to take a turn. The speaker’s conduct shapes the co-participation of the other recipient, who orients to the unfolding course and places her delivery of the candidate item as a collaborative solution, even if she has not been directly involved by the speaker’s eye gaze. As in the previous Italian data, Figure 3.9, the candidate item is offered after the overt request by the speaker showing how the recipient attends closely to the unfolding of the turn and is, thus, able to promptly provide a possible solution. The word search is resolved and the action of the turn is resumed and continued in line thirteen. Unfortunately, it is not possible to discern if the speaker corrects the inconsistent agreement produced at the end of line ten in the following lines for three reasons. First of all, she utters the word or words in a very low voice. Secondly, because of the schism in progress, the other people sitting at the table are interacting at the same time and their voices cover the speaker’s utterance. Finally, the older child takes the floor, overlapping with the aunt, asking a question, which does not get a second pair part immediately or later in the data. However, we might deduce that the speaker has aborted the possible projected item and consequently added the masculine pronoun to complete in some way
her list and the projected turn completion, considering that the inconsistent agreement *tutte-questi/*all of it* is the third element of a three-part list and that it is a “generalized completer,” which, according to Jefferson (1990), means that the speaker is unable to list a third item either because s/he cannot find an appropriate one or because any possible third item is inadequate to exhaust the array. It seems that aunt tries to produce a third item again in line twelve by partially recycling the demonstrative adjective, but it is not audible and the turn is not completed as in line thirteen the student takes the floor.

Thinking faces and eye gazes, as well as other gestures accompanying a word search, not only manifest an inner state or mental representation but they also perform important communicative functions for the other co-participants in that they can show the speaker’s engagement in a solitary search or his/her need for help in solving the search (Streeck, 1993, 1994). As it can be noticed in Figure 3.13, A’s turn is characterized by different hand movements that accompany her turn both before the onset of the word search and during the search. When the speaker refers to Vienna she points the index at the center of the palm as if Vienna were there, when she refers to Salzburg she points away from the palm to indicate that it is in a different location. The speaker uses her palm and the space around her as if it were a geographical map.

Speakers engaged in word searches deploy different devices such as hesitations markers, interrogatives, and body posture to manifest their attempt to retrieve the searched for item. How those elements shape the three stages of a search: (a) the onset of the search, (b) the search in progress, and (c) the resolution or the abandonment of the search is the focus of next section.
3.3 Onset of Search

A word search, or the failure to find an item necessary to complete the Turn Constructional Unit (TCU) projected, interrupts the course of the ongoing action. The point of interruption is characterized by “non-lexical speech perturbations, e.g. cut-offs, sound stretches, ‘uh’s etc., to signal the possibility of repair initiation immediately following” (Schegloff et al., 1977). The tokens “uh” and “uhm” are generally found in English data. Betz (2008), in her German data transcriptions, uses the tokens “äh,” “ähm.” The tokens “ehm” and “eh” are found in the present Italian data and, in addition, “m” that is generally latched to the final vowel of last lexical item proffered. Research carried out in many different languages has shown that the use of such markers\(^\text{17}\) is quite widespread (cf. Fox et al., 1996; Schegloff et al., 1977, for English; Fox et al., 1996; Hayashi, 2003b, for Japanese; Streeck, 1996, for Ilokano; Streeck, 1996; Egbert, 2009, for German, Helasvu et al., 2004, for Finnish).\(^\text{18}\) The following excerpts show the fillers used by English, German, and Italian speakers during word searches. The German data are taken from both Egbert (1997b, 2009) and Betz (2008).

*Figure 3.14.* Data set (28)[GL: DS] from Lerner, (1996, p. 261)

01 ⇒ L: he said, the thing thet-thet-sad about the uhm black uhm

02 0.3

*Figure 3.15.* Data set Nr. 10 (FAC, drastically simplified) from Egbert (1997b, p.630)

07 ⇒ H: ford baut die bau- (. ) bes- eh baut die besten autos

\[
\text{ford builds the bui- (. ) bes- uh builds the best cars}
\]

---

\(^{17}\) The different sound markers used in initiating a repair depend on the phonological inventory of the particular language analyzed. Generally, these are sounds that are not phonemic, they do not distinguish words or morphemes.

\(^{18}\) See also Chapter two.
**Figure 3.16.** Data set Nr. 16 (FAC, drastically simplified) from Egbert (2009, p.59)

01 ⇒ Inge: ich hab gestern ehm wie heißt se noch mal, (0.1)  
I have yesterday ehm what is called she once more, (0.1)  
I met yesterday ehm what is she called once more, (0.1)

02  
haubold die: eva hausmann getroffen  
haubold theFemNom eva hausmann met

**Figure 3.17.** Data set WS_C3 motorradunfall [129_Oregon1A_480] from Betz (2008, p.111)

14 ⇒ M: das war: ähm und meine (.).das war natürlich wieder=>äh<  
that was: uhm and my (.).that was of course again=>äh<  
that was: uhm and my (.).that of course=>uh<

**Figure 3.18.** Data set 29 maggio 2001 v. 53:42 Vienna

05  
A: respirare=aria di-  
to breath=air of-  
breathing an atmosphere

06  
S: uhm  
uhm  
uhm

*she almost uses her left hand as a microphone

07 ⇒ A:  
*eh::m  
*eh::m  
*eh::m

*she looks down, has a thinking face, and opens her left hand

*come si chiama.  
*what PasPro call.  
*what is it called.

**Figure 3.19.** Data set 29 maggio 2001 v. 23:07 La forchetta

04  
A: gliel’hai lasciata  
CompoundProFem+Fem her+it have2ndPersIn left  
you have left it

05 ⇒  
nel[::: eh::]  
inArtPrep+theMassSin[::: eh::]  
on the[::: eh::]

---

19 The author did not provide a translation in her article, we added it.
In the last data set, Figure 3.20, the disfluency \( m \) is latched to the prolonged final vowel of the preposition \( di/\text{‘of’} \). Another characteristic feature of a word search is the sound stretching of the word that precedes the item that is difficult to retrieve. Sometimes such a word can give important information about the searched-for word to the interactants; for example if it is masculine or feminine, plural or singular, if it is a proper noun, a common noun, or even a verb.

Figure 3.21. Data set 29 maggio 2001 v. 23:07 La forchetta

*looking at the aunt and his wife

01  U:  *[ehi cuìè ca si [fregau ]] ((sicilian dialect))
       *[ehi chi si è [fregato ]] ((italian gloss))
       *[ehi who RefPro is [stolen ]]  
       *[ehi who [took away]  

02  A:  
       *[brava ]°
       *[goodFemSin]°
       *[good girl]°

03 ⇒ la- la- la::: la mia
     theFemSin- the- the- the::: the myFemSin
     the- the- the::: my

04  forchetta.
    fork.

05  A:  gliel' hai lasciata
     CompoundProFem+Fem her+it have\(2\)ndPerSin left
     you have left it
     
     *pointing at something on the counter
     *nel ::: eh:::
     *inArtPrep+theMasSin ::: eh:::
     *on the ::: eh:::

06  C2:  [io io]
        [i i ]
        [me me]
This excerpt, Figure 3.21, clearly shows two examples in which the words preceding the searched for items indicate the gender and number of the nouns sought. In line two, the man is looking for a feminine, singular noun and he attempts several times to retrieve the searched-for noun recycling and cutting off the feminine, singular article three times. The fourth time he does not cut off the article but prolongs the final vowel, and then he produces the article again followed by the feminine and singular possessive pronoun mia/’my,’ finally retrieving the searched for item forchetta/’fork’ with falling intonation. The aunt, while producing the second pair part to the man’s first pair part, starts a search as well. In line five, uttering the head of a prepositional noun-phrase, she prolongs the final sound of the articulated preposition, which is followed by the hesitancy marker eh, which is also prolonged. She is trying to retrieve a masculine, singular noun, probably piatto/’plate,’ but she abandons the search as she points to the object that is probably on the counter and also because the younger child, in overlap, affirms that she has taken the fork.

The next instance is very similar to the previous ones, as the woman engaged in the word search stretches the sound of the article that precedes the item searched giving information about the gender and number of the noun she is looking for. The only difference is that she flags the search with an over question come si chiama:/’how is it called:.’

*Figure 3.22. Data set 5 Giugno 2001 v. 22:54 Contrabbandieri*

01  F: [(     )] quando
     [(     )] when
     [(     )] when

02  andai a Napoli guarda io sono rimasta sconvolta
    went to Naples look I am remained disturbed
    *I went to Naples well I was astonished*

03  a Napoli (io ho detto       )
    in Naples (i have said       )
    in Naples (I said            )
D: >eppoi diceva agli angoli
>and then said at the corners
>and then she said that at the corner

delle strade per esempio-
of the streets for example-

da noi pulivetri per carità
by usObjPro windshield cleaners for charity
here (we have)windshield cleaners for heaven’s sake
*looks down *looks towards her friend
va benissimo *(.) ma *lì::: come si chiama:
goes very well*(.) but *there what ProPas call:
it’s alright *(.) but *there what is it called
i:::contrabbandieri cioè ad ogni angolo
the smugglers that is at every corner
the smugglers I mean at every corner

ci- ti vendono tutte le
usObjPro-youObjPron sell3rdPerPl allFemPl theFemPl
they sell us- you all the
(del mondo perché
( ) of the world because
( ) in the world because

The excerpt, in Figure 3.22, is part of a longer interaction. The student (S) is telling about her presentation on Naples and she is stressing the unusual creative ability that Neapolitans show. The hosts’ friend (F) and the woman (D) are commenting about the Neapolitans in general, as well. In this excerpt, the friend overlaps the student’s utterance to tell that she was astounded when she visited Naples. What she says at the end of the turn is not audible, but it is evident that the woman, noticing that the turn has reached a possible turn relevance place, rushes in before the friend can continue with it. The woman starts by reporting something that, it seems, was done by the student during her previous visit in Naples. The woman gets the floor, rushing her utterance that is cut off on the phrase, per esempio/‘for example,’ which clearly shows that she wanted to report an example about Naples. However, she first adds a comment about the situation in her city. The reference to the city is done using the deictic da noi, which can be
translated “here” or “in our city” (in the translation the former version is preferred as it clearly contrasts with the other distal deictic used in line seven). She affirms that there are car windshield cleaners\textsuperscript{20} on the street corners and she comments on them, implying that she can accept this kind of ‘service.’ After that, there is a micro-pause during which she looks down. She then uses the contrastive conjunction \textit{ma} ‘but’ followed by the distal deictic \textit{li} ‘there,’ showing that she is now speaking about \textit{Napoli} ‘Naples,’ which is uttered with a prolonged \textit{i}, highlighting that a problem is forthcoming. In the meantime, she looks at her friend and she says: \textit{come si chiama} ‘what do you call it’ without a rising intonation, which clearly shows that she is searching for a word. The last sound of the interrogative is somewhat prolonged, and she then utters the article \textit{i}, that is masculine and plural, thus forecasting the search for a masculine plural noun, prolonging it until she finally gets to the word she was searching for \textit{contrabbandieri} ‘smugglers,’ in line eight.

In the following data excerpt, Figure 3.23, the searched-for item is again a noun but in this instance we do not have information about its gender and number.

\textit{Figure 3.23. D 29 maggio 2001 v. 53:42 Vienna}

\begin{verbatim}
01 A: *e poi, (.) ti ripetto da vienna
     *and then, (.) youObjPro repeat1stPerSin from vienna
     *and moreover, (.) I’m telling you again from vienna

02 *a salisburgo, non è lontano puoi prendere
     *to salzburg it is not far you can take

03 il treno, e poi andare a salisburgo (.) che theMassSin train, and then goInf to salzburg (.) that a train, and then go to salzburg (.) that
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{20} A lot of immigrants that live in Sicily make a living by cleaning car windshields at crossroads where there are traffic lights. They clean car windshields as they prefer to ask for money for a service rather than just a handout.
As previously stated (see Figure 3.13), the interlocutors are engaged in talk about studying abroad and the great opportunity that Vienna and Salzburg offer as cities with an extraordinary musical atmosphere. It is in line five when the aunt wants to refer to the musical aspects related to Salzburg that she cuts off her turn just after uttering the preposition *di*/*of*.' Then she produces a hesitation sound *ehm*, slightly prolonged before uttering an overt question *come si chiama*/*what is it called* with final falling intonation in line eight. The un-retrievable word in the noun phrase introduced by the preposition, in this particular case, can be only a noun, either a common noun that could be preceded by an adjective, or a proper noun. The recipient has sufficient information not only about the possible projection of the turn but also about the
type of word, a noun, the speaker is trying to retrieve and produces a candidate solution that fits that particular slot. The speaker, in turn, immediately acknowledges the solution and repeats it.

The data collected also include instances of searches for proper nouns such as the ones proposed in the following excerpt.

*Figure 3.24. Data set 28 maggio v. 24:03 Renato—Viale Ionio*

01 D: [↑va alla performance "o alla fitness," ↑]
    [↑goes to the FemSin performance "or to the FemSin fitness,"
    [↑does he go to the performance "or to the fitness, "

02 U1: no alla fit[ne]ss
      no to the FemSin fit[ne]ss
      no to the fit[ne]ss

03 R:
    [no]
    [no]
    [no]

04 U1: secondo me è u[na per-]
      according to me is [aFemSing per-]
      in my opinion he is [a per-]

05 ⇒ F:
    [ la fitne]ss è quella
    [ the fitne]ss is that
    [ the fitne]ss is the one over

06 ⇒
    là:::hm
    over there:::hm
    there:::hm

07 U1: una peculiarità di rick [è un-]
      aFem peculiarity of rick [is a-]
      one of rick’s peculiarities [is a-]

08 F:
    [vici ]no:
    [near ]:
    [near ]:

09 U1: è quella di [( )]
      is that of [( )]
      it is that of [( )]

10 ⇒ F:
    [a:::- rena ]to,
    [to:::- rena]to,
    [to:::- rena]to,

11 U1: sì sì accan[to]
      yes yes ne[xt]
      yes yes ne[xt]to it

Lines from 12 to 18 missing
The previous data segment, Figure 3.24, contains two examples of word searches for proper nouns while the interactants engage in different short conversations. However, it is also evident that all the interactants, even if briefly engaged in different strands of talk, still orient to the main unfolding course of the action. The first search starts in line five when the friend (F), in overlap with the utterance of the man (U1) in line four, wants to be sure that she knows the location of the gym to which the man is referring and asks the woman (D), sitting at her left, for confirmation. The search starts when the friend after the demonstrative pronoun quella/‘that’ adds the distal deictic là/‘there’ whose final vowel is stretched and attached to the filler hm, lines five and six. In line seven, the man resumes his talk and tries to complete his turn re-elaborating his previous statement truncated by the overlap. Once again, the friend overlaps him before the man can complete his turn and she utters vicino/‘next’ and slightly stretches the final vowel of
the adverb. In line nine, the man repairs the final part of the TCU uttered in line seven, but he is overlapped one more time by the friend’s attempt to resolve her search in line ten. She produces the preposition *a*/*to* that normally follows the adverb *vicino*/*next,* forming a prepositional phrase. The sound of the preposition is stretched and then cut off. The friend recycles the preposition and completes the search with the proper name of the owner of a shop close to the gym. In this particular case, the recipient does not know if the speaker is looking for a common noun or a proper name, as she could have tried to retrieve information about the kind of shop next to the gym, instead of using the owner’s name. However, the next search, in line twenty-four, clearly shows that the friend is looking for the name of a street. She stretches the final vowel of *via*/*street,* indicating that she cannot retrieve the name of the street. In line twenty-five, the man (U2) is asking the other man a question (U1); overlapping with the final vowel of the second man’s turn the friend resumes her turn and recycling the preposition she solves her search in line twenty-six.

The Italian data show that hesitancy markings and pauses are positioned at the onset of the search and that the gaze is shifted away from the recipient/s when the speaker becomes engaged in a word search. We have also highlighted how cut-offs and the thinking face are typical of a search in progress; we will analyze them in the following section.

### 3.4 Search in Progress

The retrieval process, or repair, can be complex and difficult. If interactants do not remember a relevant item, they make it recognizable by other means such as non-lexical elements (pauses, breathing, hesitations) on the onset of the search or lexical elements (repetitions, descriptions, interrogatives) while the search is in progress.
The first elements of the search in progress are repetitions. The speaker engaged in a word search very often cuts-off his/her turn either on the word that precedes the searched for item or the non-appropriate word s/he is producing and repeats. The following data, Figures 3.25 and 3.26, show some examples.

*Figure 3.25. Data set 5 giugno 2001 v.1:13:04 Il gatto*

08 ⇒

.convinto che il ca- che-

- convinced that theMasSin ca- that-

- sure that a do- that-

09 ⇒

.che co- che co- che il gatto

- that co- that co- that theMasSin cat

- that ra- that ra- that a cat

*Figure 3.26. Data set 31 maggio 2001 v 59:18 Background*

05 ⇒

.c’ha-c’è- c’ho un:::

-Pleo has-there is- Pleo havel1stPerSin aMas:::

-she has- there is- i have a:::

Speakers experiencing trouble in retrieving a word may also use non-verbal cues. Body language such as gestures, posture, facial expressions, and eye gaze are very important elements exploited by the speaker to resolve the search. Birdwhistell (1970) called the interpretation of body language kinesics. The body is a machine that accompanies any spate of talk and allows speakers to express what is momentarily verbally impeded. Rimè (1987) showed that, nine times out of ten, iconic gestures precede the utterance, underlining the intrinsic connection, an interdependency (Ricci-Bitti, 1987), between word and gestures. Argentin (1987), on the other hand, stresses how “il non verbale contribuisce alla formazione del senso [the non verbal contributes to the shaping of the meaning]” (p. 51). Caldognetto, Vaggges, & Casalini (1987) noticed that those gestures, labeled as illustrators, seem to depend on the semantic meaning of the phrase or lexical item with which they are co-produced. Butterworth and Beattie (1978),
Butterworth and Goldman-Eisler (1979), and Beattie (1980) noticed that the gesture often anticipates the lexical item, even if the latter is not immediately available to the speaker. It seems that particular lexical choices involve a complex retrieval of the related phonological items and therefore the speaker presents in his/her talk a pause, hesitations, or talk perturbations. As a result, because sign language is narrower (Caldognetto et. al, 1987), the word searcher is able to retrieve the gesture related to the word faster than the phonological word.

The following example, Figure 3.27, shows that the speaker is looking for the word ‘christening’ and instead utters the word ‘communion.’ La comunione/‘communion’ in Italian is a feminine, singular noun, while il battesimo/‘christening,’ is masculine and singular. The speaker does not complete the word ‘comunione,’ as she cuts it off and recycles the preposition and the article. Since the article, feminine and singular, does not match the searched-for word, which is masculine and singular, there is another cut-off before the correct word is pronounced. During the search the speaker accompanies her utterance with gazes and gestures.

*Figure 3.27. Data set 29 maggio 2001 v. 20:57 Comunione*

```
01 A: poi quando avevi il cappellino
      then when had2ndPerSing theMasSin hatDim
      *she looks at child 1 and points at child 2
      then when you had the small white

02 ⇒ bianco per la *comunio- per la:*
      white for theFemSin *communio- for theFemSin:-
      hat for the *communio- for the-

      *then she looks at child 2

03 ⇒ *[per il batt]esimo di rebecca.
      *[for theMasSing] christening of rebecca.
      *[ for Rebecca]’s christening.
      [*

04 C 1:
      [battesimo ]
      [christening ]
```

In Figure 3.27, the children (C1 and C2) have been talking about the student’s (S) photos and the mother (D) has stressed that they have not shown their photo album to the student. The
aunt (A) is telling the older child that she should have shown the student pictures taken when the child was just born or where she was wearing the white hat for her sister’s christening. In the above example, the speaker is searching for the word christening and instead utters the word communion that has been proffered before in relation to the student’s photos and to the older child’s communion dress. The aunt is recalling another event: the younger daughter’s christening, when the older girl was wearing a small white hat. When the woman tries to complete her TCU she utters almost all the prepositional noun phrase per la comunio-‘for the communio-’ and she cuts it off, as she is immediately aware that it cannot be correct. At that moment, she points to the younger child and she recycles the preposition and the feminine and singular article. Unfortunately, she recycles the wrong article; consequently, she prolongs the final vowel and cuts it off before being able to resolve her search in overlap with the child’s candidate solution. The woman utters the wrong sacrament, but she is immediately aware of the mistake. Since the christening she refers to is the younger child’s, she first points to the child and then diverts her gaze from the older sister and looks at the younger one, not for help, but to indicate that the word she is trying to retrieve is connected to the younger sister and not to the older one. It is when the speaker is oriented towards the younger sister that she is able to solve her search. The action of pointing to the younger child, before solving the word search, seems to confirm that gestures can be retrieved faster than phonological words (Caldognetto et al., 1987). Other examples supporting this research have been found in these data: for example, especially when people are engaged in describing something, they accompany their utterances with gestures that very often precede the actual verbal production.

Interactants engaged in a word search, do not only point to people or objects and places (Goodwin, 1987), as in the previous data sample, they also raise their palms or fingers to indicate
turn holding. The present data include a similar occurrence in which one of the children raises her hand to indicate that she wants to take a turn. The typical use of iconic gestures to illustrate a missing word (Hadar & Butterworth, 1997; Ricci-Bitti, 1987; Rimè, 1987) is discussed in the data set from non-native speakers presented in the next chapter. Goodwin and Goodwin (1986) emphasize that people engaged in word searches often wave or whirl their hands as the following Italian data show.

*Figure 3.28. Data set 29 maggio 2001 v. 53:42 Vienna*

*left hand open, palm up and the left hand index finger points at the center of her palm, in the meantime she looks at the student*

01 A: *e poi, (.) ti ripeto da vienna *and then, (.)youObjPro repeat1stPerSin from vienna
*and moreover, (.)I’m telling you again from vienna

02 *she points away from the palm, in the air on her right
*a salisburgo, non è lontano puoi prendere *to salzburg not is far can2ndPerSin take
*to salzburg it is not far you can take

03 il treno, e poi andare a salisburgo (.).che theMasSin train, and then goInf to salzburg (.).that a train, and then go to salzburg (.).that

04 è-- (.).deliziosa. ↑a parte ri- *andare lì è proprio is-- (.).lovely. ↑besides ri- *goInf there is really is-- (.).lovely. ↑besides re- *going there is really

*her elbows on the table she opens

05 ⇒ respirare=aria di- to breath=air of-breathing an atmosphere

06 S: uhm
uhm
uhm

07 A: *eh::m
*eh::m
*eh::m

*she almost uses her left hand as a microphone

08 ⇒ *she looks down, thinking face and she opens her left hand
*come si chiama. *what PasPro call.
*what is it called.
In the two different data sets, Figures 3.28 and 3.29, both speakers use a whirling movement of the hand when they flag their search with an interrogative. Embodied cues are often used together with verbal cues, such as question markers or interrogative questions. Interrogative utterances are often used to flag the engagement in a search, and in these data they have the effect of eliciting a candidate solution from the recipient even if the speaker has diverted his/her gaze from him/her. Kurhila (2006) noticed in her data that non-native speakers used ‘unspecific interrogatives’ as ‘general word search markers’ (p.100). On the other hand, these data show Italians use this strategy to inform the recipient about a search in progress and
also as an indicator for the problematic turn construction. These interrogative questions present a peculiar prosodic characteristic; they are not uttered with raising intonation but rather a leveled contour or falling intonation. According to Agard and di Pietro (as cited in Grice, 1995) the unchanged contour signals that more is to come. Grice (1995) noticed the contour to signal interrogativity in Palermo Italian presents an accentual high or rising pitch on the nucleus and a falling intonation on the phrase peripheral, showing that the patterns used to analyze English prosody can’t be applied to Palermo Italian. Marotta (2001) confirms Grice’s finding especially regarding the southern Italian variations, and stresses how the occurrences increase in spontaneous interactions.

The previous instances have demonstrated how speakers, dealing with their word searches, explicitly show, after a series of preliminary perturbations, that they lack a linguistic item and produce an interrogative utterance to indicate that they are engaged in a word search and sometimes to invite the recipient(s) to participate in the search.

Goodwin and Goodwin (1986) showed that eye gaze has an important role during this phase of the search. They emphasize how the speaker withdraws her/his gaze as soon as s/he is engaged in a word search, assuming the characteristic thinking face shown in Figure 3.28. In line eight, while the woman is flagging her search with the interrogative she looks down and assumes a thinking face, a gesture that highlights her ‘solitary’ attempt to solve the search. She does not look at the recipient who offers her a candidate solution in line nine. She just turns her face towards her without gazing at her, but she accepts the offer repeating the solution and acknowledging it with a yes in line ten.

During the speaker’s withdrawal the recipient looks at the speaker demonstrating his/her co-participation in the talk in progress. Once the speaker resolves the search, his/her gaze returns
to the recipient/s. Goodwin (1981) found that gaze shifts occur systematically during word searches. He reported that it is “an interactively orchestrated form of social organization” (p.136) as shifting the gaze to the recipient allows the speaker to elicit help. Visual signals (e.g., eye gaze) can pinpoint a critical word production with great accuracy.

These Italian data do not support this strategy as the recipient offers a candidate solution even if the speakers’ gaze is diverted as we have demonstrated in Figure 3.28.

An analysis Figure 3.29, reveals the same pattern. In fact, in line five, the woman, already engaged in the search, flags her search with an interrogative question. Unfortunately, it is not possible to see the direction of her gaze, even if from the movement of her head she seems to look at her husband sitting opposite her. However, it is not her husband who offers the possible solution, but the friend, in line six. The woman does not make eye contact with the friend, but acknowledges the offer repeating it and resumes her telling in line seven. The speaker’s conduct shapes the co-participation of the recipient, who orients to the unfolding course and offers her candidate item as a collaborative solution, even if she has not been directly involved by the speaker’s gaze. In the following data segment, the speaker’s gaze is directed toward the recipient to request help.

Figure 3.30. Data set 5 giugno 2001 v. 22:54 Contrabbandieri

07 ➞ va benissimo *(.) ma *lì::: come si chiama: goes very well*(.) but *there what is it called
*looks down *looks towards her friend
08 i::::contrabbandieri cioè ad ogni angolo the smugglers that is at every corner
the smugglers I mean at every corner

Unlike the previous instances, in this Figure 3.30, the speaker does not display a ‘solitary’ engagement by withdrawing her gaze. Instead, in line seven, she turns her gaze toward the
recipient, her friend, in mutual orientation that seems to indicate that the recipient’s co-participation in the word search is relevant and may be asked for. The peculiar detail in this example is that her question is not uttered with rising intonation, as we have discussed previously. She never gives up the floor, she keeps it until she resolves the search by herself and resumes her telling in line eight. However, the woman resorts for help to the co-participant, gazing at her and overtly asking for help using one of the possible interrogative forms Goodwin and Goodwin (1986) described.

Sometimes, phonological features or sounds of the word sought may be available to the speaker. The role of these features is illuminated by the research on tip-of-the-tongue (TOT). The lexical item might be at the TOT; that is, the speakers are experiencing “a momentary inability to utter an intended word, accompanied by the feeling that the target word is known and that is on the verge of being available” (Miozzo & Caramazza, 1997, p.1411). Miozzo and Caramazza (1997), in their psycholinguistic studies on the TOT phenomena of Italian speakers, found evidence that grammatical information is represented independently from lexical-phonological forms and consequently they recognized the possibility of two different retrieval stages: (1) a semantic and syntactic representation and (2) the corresponding lexical-phonological representation. During a tip-of-the-tongue phenomenon, the participant is aware of knowing the word that s/he cannot retrieve or can recall only partially. Their results, confirmed by Ivanyi (1997) for German, show that

(a) grammatical information is specified and accessed independently of semantic and phonological information; (b) selection of a lexical-semantic representation does not guarantee access to its grammatical features; and (c) access to phonological features of a
word may not strictly depend on access to its grammatical features. (Miozzo & Caramazza, 1997, p. 1421).

In the following excerpt, Figure 3.31, the speaker attempts three times to retrieve the searched-for item, and his attempts show that he is looking for a masculine, singular noun, specifically the name of an animal.

Figure 3.31. Data set 5 giugno 2001 v.1:13:04 Il gatto

01 U: [(bè) ]credо che in assolutо [(well)]believe1stPerSin that in absolute [(well)]I firmly think that

02 se lo mangiassimo piacerebbe if itMasSin eatSub1stPersPl likeCon3rdPerSin if we ate it we would like

03 anche a noi è un fatto culturale also to usCompPro is aMasSin fact cultural it too it is a cultural issue

04 [un tabù] culturale quello che è- [aMasSin ]taboo cultural thatMasSin that is- [it is a] cultural taboo

05 D: [uh uh ] [uh uh ] [uh uh ]

06 U: io sono convinto- non l’ho mai mangiato I am convinced- not itObProMasSin never eaten I am sure- I have never eaten it

07 perlomeno consapevolmente, ma sono at least consciously, but am as far as I know at least but I am

08 ⇒ convictо che il ca- che- convinced that theMasSin ca- that- sure that a do- that-

09 ⇒ che co- che co- che il gatto that co- that co- that theMasSin cat that ra- that ra- that a cat

10 sappia più o meno come tasteSub3PersSin more or less like theMasSin tastes more or less like

11 il coniglio *(più o meno)* theMasSin rabbit *(more or less)* a rabbit *(more or less)*
In the missing lines the friend (F) asks the student (S) what food she likes. During the conversation the man (U) reports that the student does not like rabbit. The friend explains that rabbits are considered pets in the United States. Then she tells the student that there is a saying in Italy that people from Veneto, a northern region, eat cats. The man comments that it is a cultural taboo to eat cats and at the end of his utterance in line eight, he clearly shows that there is a problem accessing the item needed to complete his turn. The difficulty in retrieving the missing word is shown by the repeated recycles of the declarative conjunction *che/*‘that,’ introducing a content clause, followed by a possible solution. The first attempt to recall the missing word is truncated after the first two letters of the possible candidate solution, line eight. The presence of the masculine and singular article followed by *ca-* demonstrates that the speaker has access to some features of the lexical item targeted in his search. He has access to the grammatical gender of the noun; he knows that it is a masculine, singular word and that it is the name of an animal. In fact, in his first attempt, *il ca-* probably refers to a dog or horse that are respectively called “cane” and “cavallo” in Italian. In the second attempt he recycles only the conjunction and in the third and fourth attempts, both truncated after the first two letters of the candidate solution, he drops the article and changes the vowel uttering *che co-*. Once again it is evident that the name of the animal he is looking for is unavailable and instead another animal’s name is presumably retrieved: “coniglio” (rabbit), but it is once again truncated in *co-*. After four attempts, he retrieves the word he was looking for and he utters *che il gatto/*‘that the cat’ and he can finally close his turn. The interlocutor did not manifest any difficulty in retrieving the plural form of the same noun a few lines before the ones analyzed, and it might be possible that this is the reason why the speaker is aware not only of the grammatical gender of the noun to be retrieved, but also of the category to which it belongs, consequently he recycles the trouble source four times before
he finally gets the right animal, *il gatto*‘the cat.’ When the lexical item is at the tip-of-the-tongue and cannot be accessed by the speaker, the meaning of the word under search may be already available to the speaker independently of its form.

The action of searching for a word is often based on a recycling procedure, as Figure 3.21 and Figure 3.31 show. Fox et al. (1996), analyzing the relationship between syntax and repair, noticed: “recycling constitutes a procedure for delaying the production of a next item due” (p. 204). The characteristics of the American English language allow speakers to recycle either the local constituent under construction (e.g. noun phrase) or the beginning of a clause (Fox et al., 1996). Because of the syntactic organization of their languages English, German (Betz, 2008) and Italian speakers recycle the part of the unfinished TCU, which leads to the slot for the searched-for item. Italian and German offer the possibility of recycling function words, such as determiners, prepositions or auxiliaries, which can carry grammatical information for the noun phrase they anticipate, as part of a delay strategy. The repetition of one or more items during a word search provides the speaker with more search or processing time to retrieve the target word. Such occurrences appear in Figure 3.21 and Figure 3.31.

In Figure 3.21, the feminine and singular article *la*‘the’ of the noun phrase is recycled four times, and in Figure 3.31, the beginning of the declarative content clause, ‘che,’ followed by the truncated noun is recycled three times. Another instance of recycling is shown in the following data.

*Figure 3.32. Data set 5 giugno 2001 v. 43:59 Seppioline*

01 D: ↑[alla] liparese↑
    ↑[atArt]Prep+theFemSing lipari style
    ↑[lipa]ri style

02 U: °alla °liparese°
    °atArtPrep+theFemSing lipari style°
    °lipari style°
In Figure 3.32, the family and the friend are talking about food, and the student is telling them that she really liked the squid and anchovies. The woman explains that they were cooked Lipari (Aeolian Isle) style and the man takes a turn to suggest another dish cooked in the Lipari style. In line three, the man (U) starts a search for the word *seppioline*/*small cuttlefish* and before retrieving it, he cuts off and recycles the preposition two times.

In one particular instance, the verb is recycled three times during the search for the missing item, but every time it changes form. A candidate solution to the word search is offered by one of the recipients and it is acknowledged with *ecco*/*that’s right*.

*Figure 3.33. Data set 31 maggio 2001 v 59:18 Background*

```
03 ⇒  un fritto     di- di- (.)[di seppioline]
       aMasSing fry of- of- (.)[of cuttlefish]DimFemPl
       a fry     of- of- (.)[of small cuttlefish]lefish

In Figure 3.32, the family and the friend are talking about food, and the student is telling them that she really liked the squid and anchovies. The woman explains that they were cooked Lipari (Aeolian Isle) style and the man takes a turn to suggest another dish cooked in the Lipari style. In line three, the man (U) starts a search for the word *seppioline*/*small cuttlefish* and before retrieving it, he cuts off and recycles the preposition two times.

In one particular instance, the verb is recycled three times during the search for the missing item, but every time it changes form. A candidate solution to the word search is offered by one of the recipients and it is acknowledged with *ecco*/*that’s right*.

*Figure 3.33. Data set 31 maggio 2001 v 59:18 Background*

```
01  D:  cre[sciut]a in tosca[na],
       ra[ised ] in tusca[ny]
       ra[ised ] in tusca[ny]
       [ ]
02  U:  [ma-]     [in] maremma.
       [ma-]     [in] maremma.
       [ma-]     [in] maremma.
03  D:  poi in <libya>[(ahah] quindi)
         then in <libya>[(ahah] then)
         then in <libya>[(ahah] then)
         [ ]
04  ?   [(   )]
05 ⇒  c’ha-c’è- c’ho un:::
       Pleo has-there is- Pleo havelstPerSing aMas:::
       she has- there is- i have a:::
06  C:  un background misto
       aMas background mixed
       a mixed background
07  D:  .hecco.    [ahah]
       .h that’s right[ahah]
       .h that’s right[ahah]
In Figure 3.33, the husband (U) explains that gesturing is not only a characteristic of Sicilian people, but that it is a feature common to all Italians, and as an example he refers to his wife’s origin. She says that she was born in Tuscany and raised in Libya and when she needs to complete her turn, line five, she starts a search in which she recycles the verb three times. The first two times the verb is cut off, and the third time it is followed by an indefinite article that is stretched. This instance shows how the speaker recycles the conjunction che/‘that’ three times before being able to retrieve the verb sought. Most of the Italian data, as the examples show, involve the search for a noun phrase, a subject, object or prepositional one, and/or sometimes a proper name. The only data set in which the search for a verb is in progress is the following, Figure 3.34.

**Figure 3.34.** Data set 30 maggio 2001 v. 20:34 Pane

01 F: °posso spezzare un po’ di pane°
°may to break aMas some of bread°
°may i break some bread°

02 D: certo, ma c’è. guarda che checheche
sure, but there is. look that thatthatthat
sure there is enough. I am sure that thatthatthat

03 ⇒ che fini[sce] che rimane.
that e[nds] that is left.
that at the end it will be left over.

In Figure 3.44, the friend asks if she can break the bread and the host replies affirmatively. In line two, after the affirmative reply, the woman starts a new turn but just after uttering the verb, she recycles the conjunction four times before she is able to retrieve the searched for verb.

The retrieval process can be complex and difficult. The data analyzed show “how the moment-to-moment deployment of vocal and visual conduct contributes to the interactive organization of multiple participants’ coordinated participation in the word search activity”
(Hayashi, 2003b, p.149). The interactants’ synchronization and coordination shape a mutual cooperation in the ongoing word search, and it acts as a resource to achieve a collaborative solution.

3.5 Search Resolution

The launch of a word search interrupts the ongoing TCU. The subsequent outcome of the word search allows the completion of the turn since “there are various unit-types with which a speaker may set out to construct a turn.” (Sacks et al., 1974/2006, p. 702) and these unit-types “allow a projection of the unit type under way, and what roughly, it will take for an instance of that unit-type to be completed” (Sacks et al., 1974/2006, p. 702). The features signaling the beginning of a word search, which put on hold the TCU progressivity toward completion, offer slots for the speaker and the other recipients to provide a solution. The resumption of the main action underscores the end of the search.

The sequential organization of the turn taking system enables the current speaker to provide her/his own solution before the others do. A word search, being a type of repair, has a preference for self over other-repair (Schegloff et al., 1977). However, these findings have not been confirmed for Italian speakers. According to Gavioli and Mansfield (1990), in Italian service encounter interactions and interviews, the interlocutor is the repair initiator as s/he intervenes immediately without leaving time for the first speaker to self-correct in the transitional space. This means that repair takes the form of a negotiation. Moreover, the use of ambiguously formulated or uncertain references by Italian speakers makes relevant the interlocutor contribution to disambiguate the formulation. Zorzi (1996) affirmed that such procedures do not threaten the speaker’s face and aim to maximize intersubjectivity. Such relevant differences might influence the way Italians resolve word searches.
Speakers, engaged in a word search, may find an outcome before the turn comes to an end, they provide a solution with certainty, and then they simply continue the turn, which had been momentarily put on hold. In that case, there is no sequential organization, as the turn transition does not occur. Syntactic and pragmatic features of the turn can limit the choices for a possible solution to the search. The possible outcomes can be: (1) the searched-for word, (2) a preliminary solution (see discussion below) or (3) an inappropriate word that does not fit at all.

Still another possible outcome is that the word search is not completed. In that case, the trajectory of the projected turn changes and the speaker abandons the search.

Instances of word searches that are self-repaired can be found in the following lines from previous data sets.

*Figure 3.35. Data set 5 giugno 2001 v. 22:54 Contrabbandieri*

07 D: va benissimo *(.) ma *li::: come si chiama: goes very well*(.) but *the:::re what PasPro call: it’s alright *(.) but *there what is it called

08 ⇒ i::::contrabbandieri cioè ad ogni angolo
theMasPl::: smugglers that is at every corner
the smugglers I mean at every corner

*Figure 3.36. Data set 29 maggio 2001 v. 20:57 Comunione*

02 A: bianco per la * comunio- per la:- white for theFemSing communio- for theFemSing:- *hat for the communio- for the-

*then she looks at child 2

03 ⇒ *[per il batt]esimo di rebecca. *[for theMasSi]ng christening of rebecca. *[for Rebecca]‘s christening.

*Figure 3.37. Data set 5 giugno 2001v.1:13:04 Il gatto*

08 U: convinto che il ca- che-convinced that theMasSin ca- that-
sure that a do- that-
The speaker, who has a word search in progress as shown by verbal and non-verbal perturbations, initiates the repair and completes it, then s/he resumes the activity that had been put on hold during the search, completing the turn or the telling.

The turn’s projectability allows the recipient to display an understanding of the ongoing activity by producing an utterance that fits grammatically and semantically into the speaker’s course of action. Italian recipients, most of the time, produce a single word as a candidate solution. On one occasion the recipient, after offering a first solution that is accepted by the speaker, then, offers a second candidate that is acknowledged as well as the following excerpt shows.
In this excerpt from a longer exchange, Figure 3.40, the participants at the dinner are talking about the performances of the Greek tragedy at the Greek theater in Taormina and the possibility of visiting the archaeological site. In line one, the friend, asked if it is possible to visit the theater, replies that there will be a cordon, but she cannot complete her turn as the woman jumps in, in line two. The woman seems to continue the friend’s TCU and utters *la parte* _dello_/‘the area of,’ but the friend in overlap, line three, continues her own TCU that partially coincides with the woman’s production. However, the friend uses the feminine and plural articulated preposition *delle*/‘of the’ that projects a noun she is unable to retrieve as the following lines show, while the woman produces a masculine and singular articulated preposition *dello*/‘of the’ that projects the word she utters, *stage*, in line four. In line three the friend makes it apparent
that she has difficulties in retrieving the word necessary to complete her TCU by repeating the
apertured preposition twice. Overlapping with the last syllable of the friend’s repetition, the
woman produces the completion, *stage*, line four, acknowledged by the friend with *si*/*yes’ in
line five. The search could be considered complete with the acknowledgement, but, instead, the
woman produces another possible item and this time she produces an Italian word
*palcoscenico*/*stage,’ line six. Once again the friend accepts the offered item by repeating the
proffered solution with a falling intonation in line seven. It is possible that the woman is not
satisfied with her first candidate solution because, even if it is a noun frequently used by Italians,
it is an English word and she prefers to present to the American student the Italian equivalent.

Past research demonstrated that candidate solutions are generally given with upward
intonations so they can be either confirmed or disconfirmed by the current speaker (Lerner,
1996). Since the solution is provided as a candidate, the decision is left to the speaker, complying
with the preference for self-initiated over other-initiated repair (Schegloff et al., 1977). However,
our Italian data do not present a try-marked candidate solution, except for the particular instance
in Figure 3.49 that will be discussed at the end of the present chapter. The candidate solution can
be accepted and acknowledged by the speaker or it can be rejected. In her German data, Betz
(2008) shows how a final “*ja*” can sometimes confirm the information found, acknowledging its
status as the solution to the search, completing the action with a type of ‘self-confirmatory
move.’ However, different “*turn final acknowledgement tokens” were found in the Italian data.

The following instance, Figure 3.41, shows how the recipient’s preliminary solution is
accepted by the speaker, who repeats the word and resumes the previous action to complete her
turn.
In the following excerpt (Figure 3.42), the speaker overtly indicates that she is involved in a word search and, when the recipient offers a candidate solution, she repeats and acknowledges it with *si*/‘yes,’ but then she comes up with further elements, as discussed previously.

Figure 3.42. Data set 29 maggio 2001 v. 53:42 Vienna

"her hands forward and then she closes her hands, puts the right arm down with the left elbow still on the table with the hand down almost making a fist"

05 A: respirare=aria di-
to breath=air of-
breathing an atmosphere

06 S: uhm uhm uhm

*she almost uses her left hand as a microphone

07 A: *eh::m *eh::m *eh::m

*she looks down, thinking face and opens her left hand
*come si chiama.
*what PasPro call.
*what is it called.
This excerpt, Figure 3.43, shows how the speaker acknowledges the candidate solution proffered by one of the recipients by uttering ‘that’s right’ followed by a laugh.

*Figure 3.43. Data set 31 maggio 2001 v 59:18 Background*

In the preliminary solution, when the word needed is still under retrieval, a placeholder, such as ‘thingy’ in English or ‘cosa’ in Italian, can stand-in for the item to be produced (cf. Hayashi, 2003b, p. 136). Placeholders have no deictic or anaphoric function, but they momentarily replace a word that is still under search. They fill in a gap, but the search has not been completed. In most cases, a solution is offered immediately after the ‘filling word’ or the recipient’s help is required to complete the search.

The following Figure 3.44 shows how such placeholders are employed in our data.

*Figure 3.44. Data set 5 giugno 2001 v. 1:28:01 Emulazione*
che dopo che ci sono queste cose,<nthat after that there are theseFemPl things,<nthat after that such things occur<
ci sono tutte- questi:=there are allFemPl theseMasPl:=there are all these

hh.[eheh]
hh.[eheh]
hh.[eheh]

*she is looking at the student *she turns her head and seems to look across towards her husband rotating and turning her hands towards the outside

episodi di:::m:* come [re ],
episodi of:::m:* how [say],Inf
episodi of m *how can we [say], it

emulazione. [per] cui un sac[co (di)]{}
emulazione. [for] which aMasSin sa[ck of ]{}
emulazione. [bec]ause of which a [lot of]{}

In Figure 3.44, the woman is engaged in two different searches: the first one is self-initiated and self-repaired, while the second one is self-initiated and other repaired. The first search starts in line one when she wants to affirm that the recent murders are episodes that are emulated by others. She is not able to produce the word ‘episode,’ but the flow of her turn is not disrupted as she substitutes queste cose/‘these things,’ feminine and plural for the searched word. It is evident, from the projected turn, that as she cannot find the word episodi/‘episodes,’ she immediately replaces it with a placeholder, these things, and soon after she produces another adjective tutte/‘all,’ feminine and plural, that agrees with the placeholder, followed by a demonstrative questi/‘these’ that is masculine and plural and whose final vowel is stretched to denote that a search is in progress. Overlapping with the stretched sound, her husband acknowledges what she says in line four with a simple eheh. In line five, the woman accomplishes her search and the word is uttered with a stretched initial vowel as its retrieval has,
probably, triggered another search. However, this time the woman, after stretching the final vowel of the preposition, deploys an interrogative to ask for help. Unfortunately the video is not clear enough to see if she gazes at the friend who offers a candidate solution when she asks the question. The candidate solution fits the projectable turn and she repeats it to then resume her telling.

Italians often use *cosa* ‘thing’ to replace a non-retrievable word, as Figure 3.44 line two showed. However, in our data there is only one other similar example, Figure 3.45.

*Figure 3.45. Data set 30 maggio v. 38.25 Penguin*

```
01  C: gli ho insegnato anche una parola (speaking with a full mouth)
     I even taught even aFemSin word
     I even taught him a word

02

03 ⇒ R: ↑s’è fissato co’ ‘sto coso. io dicevo pinguin
     ↑he set his mind on this thing. I said pinguin
     ↑himself is fixed with thisMasSin thing. I said pinguin
     e lui ha detto penguin, meh! ho ragione io ti ho insegnato
     and he has said penguin, meh! have reason I you have taught
     and he said penguin, meh! I am right I taught you
     una parola.↑
     a word.↑
     a word.↑
```

The two brothers are picking on each other and the younger brother (C) affirms that he taught his older brother an English word. The boy (R) reacts and uses ‘sto coso’ ‘this thing’ to replace the word *pinguin* that he is able to produce immediately after. What is noticeable about this example is that the feminine word *cosa* ‘thing,’ is used in the masculine and singular form, *coso*. This means that the speaker is aware of the Italian gender and number of the word he wants to say: “il pinguino.”
The Italian data also contain word searches in which the speaker cannot find the word, and substitutes for it a demonstrative pronoun and/or points to the object (in this instance a dish).

The following excerpt, Figure 3.46, contains such an example.

Figure 3.46. Data set 30 maggio v. 22:59 Questo?

01 D: ti sei saziato? vuoi un altro po' di pasta?  
you are satiated? want another bit of pasta?  
are you sate? do you want some more pasta?

02 C: no no. non mi piace,  
no no. not me like,  
no no. I don’t like it,

*looking at the child and pointing at the dish in front of her

03 ⇒ D. *e il:::: questo?  
*and the:::: this

04 C. >non mi piacciono<  
>not me like<  
>I don’t like them<

In the previous data, Figure 3.46, the woman is asking the child if he would like something else to eat. She offers a dish that is on the table, but she cannot remember the name of the dish, and while she is looking at the child she points to the dish, uttering the demonstrative *questo/’this.’ The search is over, as she does not need to retrieve the word for which she has substituted a clearly comprehensible gesture. The child replies that he does not like it.

Our data also present an instance in which the preliminary solution is rejected as shown in Figure 3.47.

Figure 3.47. Data set 28 maggio 2001 v. 29:18 Preconcetto

01 D: *nessuna idea? nessuna pre::  
*noAdjFemSin idea? noAdjFemSin pre::  
*no idea? no pre::

*he looks at the student

02 U2: *pre-idea  
*pre-idea  
*pre-idea
In Figure 3.47, the host mother (D) is asking the student what she thought of Sicily before coming. The student replies that she did not have ideas about Sicily. Then the woman, in line one, recycles her previous question in a simplified way; however, her first clause is clear and complete while in the second she recycles the indefinite feminine and singular adjective and then she utters pre prolonging the final vowel. The man, in line two, offers a candidate solution almost as a collaborative completion. The woman rejects the proffered item with the words volevo dire preconcetto/‘I meant to say prejudice.’ While she utters her turn she looks around, as she does not know who offered the candidate solution, but everybody seems engaged in a different activity: eating. Her final statement seems to stress that she already had in mind the missing item she needed to complete her turn, but she produced a feminine and singular adjective while the word she was searching for is masculine and singular.

The use of the wrong gender for the adjective preceding the word search might have misled the man who offers as a possible solution a feminine, singular noun, pre-idea. In this particular instance, the item offered fits the projection of the turn, but does not fit the speaker’s intention. Although the specific word chosen is not accepted, it clearly shows that the recipient is closely attending to the turn in progress and is participating to the co-construction of the utterance in progress, even if the only signal of a word search is given by a stretch of sound since the interactants are not sharing eye gazes.

Another data set, Figure 3.48, shows how a word search is abandoned without completing the incidental sequence.
In the previous excerpt, Figure 3.48, the woman (D), a retired high school teacher, has been telling about her recent health problems. The colleague (C), who still teaches at the same school where the woman taught, is telling her that she often loses her voice and that her ear, nose, and throat physician diagnosed two nodules on the vocal cords and suggested that she change her job. What follows is the end of their talk. S is the woman’s son in line eight. In line one, the woman recognizes, indeed, that teachers in general have problems with their voices.
However, when she wants to state what they suffer from, she is not able to retrieve the missing word and she stretches the adjective, masculine and plural. In the meantime, her colleague in her next turn asks what can be considered a rhetorical question, as she wants to know how teachers can change their jobs. The colleague gets a reply from the woman *eheh* in line four that seems to be a sort of confirmation. However, the colleague recycles her question in line five and she does not get a reply. Soon after, the woman, instead, recycles her prepositional phrase in the attempt to retrieve the missing word. She even stretches the final vowel and adds a hesitation marker *m*, but no one offers a preliminary solution and the colleague, overlapping with her, overtly asks the woman to give her an answer, line seven. The search is aborted and the colleague does not receive an answer. However, in line eight, the woman’s son asks if the colleague raises her voice and in line nine the mother replies to his questions. It seems that, notwithstanding, the woman does not complete her search and the colleague does not get an answer to her rhetorical questions: They achieve intersubjective understanding thanks to the son’s intervention and the action moves on.

In our Italian data, even if a candidate solution is not proffered with upward intonation, it is confirmed or rejected. When flagging the search with an interrogative, Italian speakers often use a whirling movement of the hand. Some of our data also show that participants in speech interactions can detect the initiation of word searches and provide solutions even without any explicit ‘appeal for assistance’ (Tarone, Cohen, & Dumas, 1976/1983; Færch & Kasper, 1983b). The accuracy of their proposed solutions may be improved by awareness of contextual constraints. These constraints that bear on the basic word recognition process can enhance the speed and accuracy of any possible guess about the word search in progress.
3.6 Word Search or Remembering?

This chapter has discussed the many different features that characterize word searches. Disfluencies occur at the beginning of the searching process and are followed by cut-offs. The thinking face, which a speaker assumes during a word search in progress, not only manifests an inner state or a mental representation, it also acquires an important communicative function for the co-participants, as it shows the speaker’s engagement in a ‘solitary search.’ On the other hand, gazing at the recipient shows the speaker’s need for help to solve the search. Finally, the speaker either solves the search by him/herself or the recipient offers a candidate solution that the speaker can accept or reject. When the incidental sequence of the search is completed, the interactants go back to their previous action.

The following excerpt, Figure 3.49, presents almost all the characteristics of a word search. Instead, it shows a search in progress for the title of a song that the child is not able to remember. The distinction between search for a single word and search for multiple words that form the title of a song is not important.

*Figure 3.49. Data set 29 maggio 2001 v. 24:44 Santa Lucia*

| 01 | U:  | [scusa lei ] suona [quello,]=  |
|    |     | [excuse she ] plays [thatMas]Pl,= |
|    |     | [pardon me she] is play[ing it,] |
| 02 | C1: | [brava, ] .h *eh::(.)
|    |    | [goodFemS]in.h*eh::(.)
|    |    | [well do]ne .h*eh::(.)
| 03 |    | *closes her eyes, thinking face (elbow on the table face in her hand)*
|    |    | *>come era come si chiama quella [canzone?]<*  
|    |    | *>how was how PasPro call thatFemSin[song? ]<*  
|    |    | * how was what was that song [called? ]  
| 04 | D:  | [(come? ) ]
|    |     | [(what? ) ]
|    |     | [(what? ) ]
In Figure 3.49, before the lines shown in the excerpt, the mother (D) is telling about the student’s (S) attempt to play the piano and sing a song and how the younger daughter (C2) interrupted and disturbed the student. The daughter replies that she wanted to try playing the piano. The father (U) intervenes implying that since she doesn’t know how to play the piano, she shouldn’t have disturbed the student. At this point the older daughter (C1) who, during the
exchanges was drinking and, in the meantime, following with her eyes her parents’ spates of talk, is able to attract attention by uttering with emphasis *brava*/*well done,*’ a positive assessment to her sister (C2). In this way C1 gets the floor and interrupts her father’s possible increment in line two. She then takes breath and utters *eh* with a stretched sound indicating that she is trying to recall something that is unavailable at the moment. While stretching the hesitation marker *eh*, she diverts her eyes from the other participants and looks down. Then, during the micro-pause, line three, she closes her eyes and, leaning on her right elbow, tilting her head to the right, her face in her right hand, she assumes a classical ‘thinking face,’ “which embodies the activity of trying to remember a word” (Goodwin, 1981). In such a position she rushes her overt display that she is looking for the title of a song: *come era come si chiamava quella canzone?*/*how was what was the song called?’ The gaze aversion might show that the speaker is involved in a “solitary word search” (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986). Such a posture is relevant for the other recipients, as it indicates that the speaker is engaged in remembering the title of a song, and at the same time attracts their attention to the ongoing activity. As soon as the child thinks of a possible title, she utters it with a rising intonation in line five and opens her eyes. She first looks towards her father and, then, directs her gaze to her mother when the mother (D) replies no and offers a possible resolution to the search, try-marking it, line six. The child’s overt claim of being engaged in a search (see line three) and the possible candidate item, proffered with rising intonation, get a prompt reply from the mother, even if the gaze was not immediately directed towards her. The older daughter, gazing at her mother, rejects her mother’s candidate solution and starts a search again, but this time she tries to remember the tune of the song. After a very short pause, she starts singing. The older child does not realize that the song she is singing is the same one her mother had suggested. The young sister and the student join the older daughter in the singing and the
incidental ‘remembering’ sequence is finally closed. The aunt suggests letting the student sing alone, referring to the previous talk where they were telling the student what a beautiful voice she has and how clever she is in playing the piano.

This excerpt shows how the child, engaged in remembering the title of a song, deploys word search features. The interrogative and try-marked questions, eye gazes and gestures, other non-verbal features, which interrupt the course of action and signal the possible initiation of remembering the song, characterize this instance making it very similar to a word search.

3.7 Conclusion

The analysis presented in this chapter focused on native Italian speakers interactive process of co-constructing an unfolding utterance using word searches. Word searches can occur anywhere in a conversation. Italian speakers who, like speakers of English, Japanese, and German (cf. Schegloff et al. 1977; Egbert, 2009; Hayashi, 2003a; 2003b; Betz, 2008), display trouble in producing the next element of talk when it is due, initiate a word search by means of ‘non lexical speech perturbations’ (Schegloff et al., 1977). Such perturbations can appear together with or followed by characteristic features of talk and body movements. Italians generally use tokens such as “eh,” “ehm” or “m,” similar to the ones analyzed in other languages (cf., Fox et al. 1996; Schegloff et al., 1977, for English; Fox et al., 1996; Hayashi, 2003b, for Japanese; Streeck, 1996, for Ilokano; Streeck, 1996; Egbert, 2009, for German; Helasvuo et al., 2004, for Finnish). The different sound markers that the Italian language presents are inherent to the characteristic phonological inventory of the language.

In addition, non-verbal elements may appear to signal the beginning of a word search (cf. Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Hayashi, 2003a, 2003b; Kurhila, 2006; Streeck, 1988, 1993, 1994). Italian speakers often withdraw their gaze from their recipients with a characteristic ‘thinking
face’ when they are engaged in a word search. The speaker’s gaze is directed to the other participants when the search is completed. However, our data show that Italian recipients offer possible candidate solutions to the speaker even when there is no eye contact or appeal for help. It seems that Italians privilege a resolution of the search that is carried out jointly and done as a collaborative completion, highlighting the interlocutors’ alignment in an “association co-membership” (Lerner, 1996). Lerner (1996) affirms that word searches “provide conditional access to the current turn for other participants” (p.261), but the Italian word search data show that the access is less conditioned as recipients provide a candidate solution even if speakers have not appealed for assistance. As Zorzi (1998) affirms, such collaborations seem not to threaten the speaker’s face, confirming the preference for self-initiated other-repair (cf. Gavioli, 1995).

Once the turn constructional unit is interrupted, so is the course of action (Sacks et al., 1974/2006; Schegloff et al., 1977; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Lerner, 1996). The Italian speaker is engaged in self-repairing the trouble source, but, at the same time, the disrupted TCU in progress provides potential slots for other recipients to jump in with a candidate solution that sometimes is acknowledged and accepted with “sì” or “ecco” or by repetition. However, the present data do not contain any candidate solutions offered with a rising intonation, such as a try-marker, except for the particular ‘remembering’ data instance and the search for a person’s name (See Figure 4.36). These results agree with the studies by Agard and di Pietro (as cited in Grice, 1995), Grice (1995), and Marotta (2001) who noticed that Italians, especially in naturally occurring interactions, generally use a high pitch at the level of the nucleus and a low pitch or a leveled contour in the peripheral phrase.
Some speakers flag their search for a word with interrogatives that vocalize their urge to be helped in the retrieval process (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986). As it appears for other languages, such as American English and German, in Italian the interruption almost always involves noun or prepositional phrases and the chunks recycled are generally the functional heads in prepositional phrases or determiner phrases. These data present only one instance of a search for a verb. The use of placeholders, “cosa” in Italian, is exploited “to project certain types of searched for items to be produced in the subsequent talk” (Hayashi, 2003b).

Ricci-Bitti (1987) affirms that Italians have a rather rich repertoire of gestures as the present data show. Some of them are triggered as soon as a speaker ‘looks for’ the proper lexical items to express his/her idea. It has been shown that gestures can precede the utterance and facilitate its production (Caldognetto et al., 1987). Ricci-Bitti (1987) considers them ‘the working memory’ of the speaker’s talk in progress. A variety of manual and facial gestures, as well as iconic gestures, are displayed during word searches, especially during the thinking face. Such behaviors highlight the speaker’s mind processes, but also the projection of a collaborative framework among the recipients to reestablish the intersubjective understanding that had been disrupted by the implementation of the word search.

The present analysis affirms that the intricate vocal and visual processes, deployed by Italians engaged in word searches, present significant differences from the processes that have been analyzed for speakers of other languages. Further research could shed more light on these particular occurrences.
Chapter Four: Word Searches in Non-Native Speakers

4.1 Introduction

The present chapter analyzes the phenomenon of searching for a word in Italian dinner table conversations in which native and non-native speakers are engaged. Specifically, it will describe the practices employed by non-native speakers during word searches. It will analyze how the learners of Italian initiate repair during the search for a word, how the repair sequence is accomplished, and finally how learners incorporate the proffered solution into their talk. It will, at the end, discuss if the word search helped the non-native speakers to develop their vocabulary and if evidence of learning can be identified. The data yielded a total of 53 word searches: 38 self-initiated other-repaired, 12 self-initiated self-repaired, and 3 abandoned.

Word searches have been investigated in SLA research, but most of the time the focus was on lexical communication strategies employed by the non-native speakers dealing with problems during their language production (Dörnyei & Scott, 1997; Færch & Kasper, 1983a, 1983b; Kasper & Kellerman, 1997; see also the review in Chapter two). Researchers, such as Kasper and Kellerman (1997) and Poulisse (1997a), have considered a word search to be just a gap in the learner’s knowledge that had to be filled. As Jung (2004) affirms “… despite the main interest in L2 learners’ strategies to solve lexical problems, most research on communication strategies has focused on identifying and classifying the different kinds of strategies in communicating lexical items, not on examining the roles of these strategies in the interaction and the learners’ L2 vocabulary development” (p. 30). Recent studies have investigated SLA in interaction, but the focus has been more on the ‘modified’ input than on the interaction itself. Moreover, interaction is only considered in a limited sense, mainly as a setting for providing comprehensible input. Firth and Wagner (1997/2007a) argued that methodological practices in
SLA research that investigate acquisition through interactive discourse are not erroneous but biased and according to them

This has resulted in a skewed perspective on discourse and communication, which conceives of the foreign language speaker as a deficient communicator struggling to overcome an underdeveloped L2 competence, striving to reach the “target” competence of an idealized native speaker (NS) (Firth & Wagner, 1997/2007a, p. 757).

Indeed they affirm, “Researchers working with a reconceptualized SLA will be better able to understand and explicate how language is used as it is being acquired through interaction, and used resourcefully, contingently, and contextually” (Firth & Wagner, 1997/2007a, p. 768).

Markee (2005) considers CA and its “detailed quantitative records of how talk is co-constructed by members on a moment by moment basis” the appropriate platform to investigate interaction and particularly the practice called repair (p.358). Brouwer (2003) highlights that in CA, a word search is “an interactional practice” (p. 537). That is, research shows that word search activities are based on the participants’ mutual monitoring and coordination of their verbally performed actions. Using a CA approach it is possible to analyze how word searches are carried out by non-native speakers and discover the mechanism behind such searches and the ability of the interlocutors to build intersubjectivity. Schegloff (1992) affirms that intersubjectivity can be achieved by “a set of practices by which actions and stances could be composed in a fashion which displayed grounding in, and orientation to, ‘knowledge held in common’” (p.1298). A word search is a practice in which participants have the opportunity to share understanding and assumptions within and through interaction.

Intersubjectivity becomes of outmost importance in native and non-native speakers’ interaction during word searches, as it represents a prerequisite for the conversation to progress
and move on. A non-native speaker might show limited linguistic competence. When displaying a lexical problem they might rely on the recipient for help to solve the search, thus achieving mutual understanding. Gardner and Wagner (2004) highlight that L2 conversations are normal conversations and such conversations present the same methodology developed for first language conversations. CA considers the participants in a conversation to be first of all “active, knowledgeable agents” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 5); any other identity or ‘a priori category’ is not taken into consideration unless the interactants’ orientation makes it relevant in that particular sequence (Schegloff in Wong & Olsher, 2000). CA’s characteristic features, such as turn taking and adjacency pairs, work independently of any external influence, such as nativeness, gender, or age. L2 speakers’ identities are primarily the ones they have in their daily life, for example teacher, doctor, lawyer; therefore they are able to engage in a conversation with great competence as they master all the conceptual, interactional procedures that are necessary in an interaction (Gardner & Wagner, 2004, p.15). Being a L2 speaker becomes evident only in particular circumstances and words searches can represent one of those circumstances.

The present chapter will present previous conversation analytic research, which describes the resources non-native speaker interactants rely on when engaged in a word search. Following the outline of the features presented is an analysis of how non-native speakers of Italian show their engagement in a word search, how the search progresses and finally how the search is resolved and the intersubjectivity is restored. Subsequently it will discuss the results and highlight the differences between native and non-native speakers’ word searches and the possible implications for SLA.
4.2 Research on Word Searches in Non-Native Speakers

Schegloff et al. (1977) consider repair “a vehicle for socialization” (p. 381) and a device suitable for language learners who need to acquire the competence necessary to operate in a foreign language system. Failure to find a word can halt the progression of the conversation. “Linguistic asymmetry between the participants can result in linguistic difficulties that may impede successful communication” (Kurhila, 2005, p. 143). If the interlocutors do not achieve mutual understanding, the conversation is hindered and the interlocutors are forced to abandon the search and start a new sequence. Egbert, et al. (2004) show how non-native speakers of German, engaged in a conversation, “enfold a multitude of efforts in order to re-establish mutual understanding” (p. 180) after a trouble source. The particular instance analyzed shows a repair sequence that stretches over two minutes; the interactants are able to resolve the trouble one hundred and eleven lines into the transcript after its occurrence. The limited proficiency presented by the co-participants delays the resolution of the trouble until after a long series of actions. The interactants seem to abandon the repair several times, but they go back to it, showing the desire and the need to restore their mutual understanding jeopardized by their inadequate linguistic resources. The interactants negotiate to achieve intersubjectivity, but “their means to remedy the situation do not always coincide” (Kurhila, 2006, p. 151). The different identities characterizing the participants may play an important role in this process. The native speaker is considered the one with the linguistic knowledge, while the non-native speaker is seen as the one who is less proficient, but also the one who needs to demonstrate his or her competence. Lately, research on native and non-native speakers’ authentic interactions has been carried out to better understand the mechanisms used to negotiate interactions in many different languages (cf. Brouwer, 2003, 2004; Carroll, 2000, 2004, 2005; Funayama, 2002; Gavioli, 1990,
Rasmussen and Wagner (as cited in Gardner & Wagner, 2004) have shown that repair distribution is similar in native speakers’ conversations and in those of native and non-native speakers, with self-repairs more common than other initiated or other repairs. They also affirm, “repair of form is typically initiated by the L2 speaker. Repair of trouble with understanding, meaning, and the consequences of actions seems more to be the business of first language speakers” (2004, p.11).

Zorzi (1998), examining repairs in encounters between Italian native speakers and Pakistani and Moroccan immigrants speaking Italian, asserts, “troubles in discourse do not exist except as they are identified and located intersubjectively” (p. 546). Her data show that when the trouble is related to the content, the native speaker maximizes intersubjectivity and does not always initiate repair, while non-native speakers initiate repair to solve trouble related to content as they consider them more important than grammatical troubles. Zorzi affirms “cases in which NN’s responses indicate limited comprehension of the preceding turn are fairly common, but N rarely calls attention to the incongruence between question and answer” (p. 559). When Italian speakers initiate repair to solve a content related problem, they repeat the problematic element with rising intonation, they ask a question, or they use an adverb with rising intonation. Instead, when the repair concerns a linguistic form, they tend to call attention to the trouble source and enact repair strategies. Non-native speakers of Italian generally minimize the impact of linguistic forms and emphasize problems in content considered problematic for their emotional
significance or conceptual and expressive complexity. The non-native speaker accepts the repair of linguistic forms from the native speaker, but does not accept that his/her general knowledge is questioned. Two different identities emerge and different repair strategies.

The following data from Zorzi (1998) show how native speakers signal a comprehension problem and how a problem of form is addressed by the native speaker.

*Figure 4.1.* Data set example (9) from Zorzi (1998, p.559)\(^{21}\)

01 NN: (...) anche questo giorni iniziato uno ehm: pe registrazione di REC
02 ⇒ N: una corso
03 NN: (2) registrazione?
04 NN: registrazione di REC(2) ehm questo (+) per esercisi ehm per
05 esercizi commerciali c'è un commerciale bisogno registrare nel
06 REC

01 NN: (...)Also this days begun a um for registering of REC
02 ⇒ N: a course
03 NN: registering?
04 NN: registering of REC um this for activities um for
05 business activities there is a business need to register in the
06 REC

In these data, Figure 4.1, the native speaker repairs the non-native speaker’s previous turn by repeating the problematic element using a rising intonation in line three as if it were a hearing problem. Zorzi calls this type of strategy to elicit repair as “minimal grasp strategy” (p. 559).

*Figure 4.2.* Data set example (17) from Zorzi (1998, p. 566-567)

01 NN: i musulmani (+) che abita qua per lavoro motivo lavoro.
02 N: mh.
03 NN: noi ospet_ospetti (+) vostrri.
04 N: mh.
05 NN: noi lo siamo (++) ma bisogno (1) ospitare noi come un ospito hh
06 N: mh.
07 NN: mh.
08 N: tutti e due.
09 NN: tutti due.
10 N: perché: l’ospite ehm $ è il padrone di casa%-
11 NN: $anche c’h una:%(+) n altro
12 N: mh
13 NN: un rapporto fra tutti due (3) ehm ′l questo rapporto (2) bisogno
14 cambiare tutti due nonne uno solo.

\(^{21}\) All the examples from Zorzi have been reproduced as in the original article. The line numbering has been added to make it easier for the reader to follow the explanations.
In the previous excerpt, Figure 4.2, the non-native speaker is explaining that Muslim working in Italy should be treated well like guests. In line ten the native speaker provides the correct form of the word *ospite*/*guest* that the non-native speaker misspelled in line three and line five and at the same time he introduces a new element in that in Italian the word “ospite” can mean both *guest* and *host*. The non-native speaker ignores the correction and the new element presented by the native speaker and resumes his action.

In the same study the author shows how non-native speakers tend to use repair procedures mainly when there is a problem with their own production. Non-native speakers tend to correct their own production with self-initiated self-repair or self-initiated other-repair as the following data show.

*Figure 4.3. Data set example (19) from Zorzi (1998, p. 569)*

01 NN: (…) Io già fatto eh: due me- eh due anni studente.
01 NN: I already done eh two month eh two years student

*Figure 4.4. Data set example (24) from Zorzi (1998, p. 571)*

01 NN: (…)quando io esposo quando mia mamma scel- madre scelle scelta
02 sscl-scelga
03 N: sceglie
04 NN: sceglie
05 N: mh mhm
06 NN: una moglie per me
In Figure 4.3, the non-native speaker corrects the troublesome source in the same turn. It is evident that he was going to say *two months* and corrects it in *two years*. In the second instance, Figure 4.4, the non-native speaker struggles to recall the correct form of the verb *scegliere*/*choose*, after several attempts within the same turn in line one and two he finally opts for the incorrect form *scelga*. In line three the native speakers offers the correct solution *sceglie*/*chooses* that is acknowledged by repetition by the non-native speaker in line four. After a continuers produced by the native speaker in line five, the non-native speaker completes his action in line six.

Zorzi also has noticed that foreigners tend to signal comprehension problems with a lengthy silence or using what she calls “a minimal grasp strategy” (p. 559). According to Zorzi, minimal grasp strategies are those features used by the recipient to elicit repair. She recognizes three different strategies: (a) repeating the problematic element using rising intonation; (b) asking a question; (c) using an adverb with interrogative intonation, e.g., *Cioè*/*You mean*? Zorzi’s findings show how different identities, native speaker versus non-native speaker, surface through the action sequences as already affirmed by Orletti (1994).

Research carried out by Wong (2000a) on native and non-native speakers showed that “NNs may produce delayed OIs [other-initiated repairs] within the next turn in ways which may be somewhat different from that of native speakers. In doing so they construct their identities as interactants who are talkers and learners (or NNs)” (p. 261). Analyzing the details of talk she demonstrated how non-native speakers’ limited competence in the target language influences the
construction of the action of the talk. Wong noticed in her data that a “free-standing receipt token” (p. 265) was first followed by a silence and then by other-initiated repair. A free-standing receipt token is a non-native speakers’ utterance such as “uh huh,” “oh,” which claims understanding of the talk in the prior turn. By claiming understanding the non-native speaker passes up the first opportunity space available to initiate repair as the following example shows.

*Figure 4.5.* Data set example 13 [Wong 1994, IH, 6:6] from Wong (2000a, p. 253)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Han: So when are you going to (.) Boston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>TST Irene: *h I’m going to go: the last uh::</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
<td>t(h)wo weeks (0.2) of Jewly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>XXX Han: Uh huh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Irene: *h so::</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 ⇒</td>
<td>Han: Oh so you mean jus stay there for two weeks?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Irene:*h (0.2) Y-eah so that I c’n uh: get a job [first</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Han [huh huh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Irene: [before I move back there</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Han: [uh huh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Figure 4.5, line four, the response token *uh huh* does not occur after the resolution of the trouble but before the repair sequence begins. The token appears to perform the task of receipting the turn containing the trouble source in line three. What was understood before, in this case line three, becomes problematic in line six and is repaired in the following lines.

In contrast Schegloff (2000b), in his data involving native speakers, found that other-initiated repairs are preceded by an aborted or abandoned segment, without gap of silence. The aborted or abandoned segment creates “a sense of disjunction” (Wong 2000a, p. 260) between the turn initial segment and the other-initiated repair. Wong affirms that the non-native speaker’s claim of understanding that precedes the silence does not deliver a sense of disjunction but a sense of “supersession” (p. 260). It seems that the speaker is speaking ‘late’ or ‘later’ than he ought to have spoke. The native speaker’s silence or the minimal talk in next turn orients the non-native speaker to the native speaker’s different expectations. Wong suggests that the non-

---

22 The line numbering has been added to the original excerpt to analyze the data.
native speaker might have let the trouble source pass hoping that subsequent talk would have clarified what was problematic. The silence or minimal talk forces the non-native speaker to initiate a delayed repair to reach a new alignment of the talk.

Kurhila (2006), as well, discerns two linguistic identities in her study: the native speaker, who does not need to demonstrate her/his competence, and the non-native speaker whose status is more vulnerable and who is often engaged in grammatical searches or self-correction in the attempt to demonstrate her/his competence. She also shows how, in her institutional conversation data, the native speakers tend to repair conceptual trouble sources that would cause misunderstanding and ignore any problematic linguistic form search in which the non-native speaker is engaged, as opposed to Zorzi's analysis of repairs in ordinary Italian conversations.

Kasper and Kellerman (1997) analyzing communicative competence, more specifically lexical strategies, indicate three categories, which are easily related to word searches in L2 learners. L2 speakers may present communicative problems when (a) they want to talk about a concept and do not have the relevant resources; (b) they have the resources, but they are momentarily not available, that is, they are not able to recall them; and (c) the context impedes the use of the resources that are available.

Word searches are interactional phenomena in which both native speakers and non-native speakers exploit strategies, which are similar, but exploited in different ways, and display similar outcomes. The turns of L2 learners engaged in a word search present the same disfluencies, such as repetitions, cuts off, and hesitation sounds, as native speakers do. In the second phase the speaker involved in the search may try to solve the search on his/her own or to appeal for assistance to the L1 speaker. The difference lies in the kind and quantity of the searches carried out. As Kurhila (2006) noticed in her data, both native speakers and non-native speakers,
interacting together, can be engaged in searching for a word; however, generally, the L1 speaker searches for lexical items, while the L2 speaker searches both for lexical and grammatical items. She affirms that native speakers’ searches are mostly “within the construction of a turn,” while one third of the non-native speakers’ searches are “within the construction of a word” (p. 149). Because of this, non-native speakers are more often engaged in searches than native speakers.

The following excerpt from Kurhila (2006) shows some of the characteristics of a word search previously addressed.

Figure 4.6. Data set (21) Office form Kurhila (2006, p. 140-142)

01 V: And I- (..) the question is that <coul-> (2.5) <is it:>
02 possible if I: later on transfer (..) in the Helsinki
03 ⇒ area because I (.). li- li live in Vantaa and there=
04 S: =Yes:?,
05 V: .hh #eh# Sometimes difficult #eh# >because I< 9.) can’t
06 ⇒ #m# get .hh ↓what is i##t↓ ((an adjective)) #eh#
07 (.). (( V. Draws a square in the air))
08 S: Mm::,
09 V: .h I can’t (..) get #m# "what is i-phhh"
10 (4.0)
11 ⇒ V: >Bill less< (descending)
12 S: <Y:es?> m[mm
13 V: [.nff For (..) ticket.
14 S: Ehm ↓travel card,
15 V: [For the ticket. Yes
16 S: ↑ A bus,
17 V: A:[n:d (..) mhehh
18 S: [Or ↑no (..) no
19 V: .h Yes. I travel (..) by train.
20 S: Yes right I see
21 V: [And I have am not (..) I haven’t got #m# (..) the righ-right-
22 S: [“That’s right yes”
23 ⇒ S: The right.
24 V: The right: ##

23 Only the English translation has been reproduced.
The above sequence takes place in an office. The secretary (S) is filling out an application form for the student (V). Kurhila explains that just before this segment the secretary has asked about the student’s accommodations and is writing down the information when the interaction in the present excerpt takes place. The student is unable to find the word for “reduction” and this causes a long negotiation sequence. In lines five and six, trying to explain the reason why he is moving, the student starts a lexical search that is preceded by a prosodically marked interrogative, what is it?, without gazing at the recipient. The word that follows, indicated by Kurhila as “((an adjective)),” is an attempt to utter a Finnish word; however, the author states that even if it presents Finnish phonological characteristics it has no meaning in the standard Finnish language. It can be recognized as an adjective because of the use of the Finnish ending suffix. The non-native speaker displays his creativity by using an adjective final suffix with the verb, meaning ‘descend,’ in the attempt to find the word searched. The secretary presumably does not recognize the word and consequently utters a delayed mm:: token in line eight. The student tries to resolve the search by restarting the utterance in line nine. Once again the pattern of the first search is repeated, in fact, the student disrupts the utterance with the same
interrogative and again uses the verb ‘descend’ to create the two subsequent attempted resolutions: (1) \textit{Bill less}, (2) \textit{descending} in line eleven. These particular instances show how lexical and grammatical searches can be very permeable. Sometimes it is hard to cut a clear distinction between them. The student exploits grammatical morphemes to create lexical items in the attempt to find the searched word.

The student seems to complete his utterance in line thirteen. After this line the native speaker, relying on a chain of lexical items—ticket, travel card, bus—uttered in the lines from thirteen to sixteen, is finally able to help the student in resolving the search, offering the word \textit{reduction} in line twenty-five. The two identities, native and non-native speaker, surface also in the way the search is carried out. The first orients to lexical information and relies on the basic form of the lexical items, while the latter pays attention to the grammar; he focuses on the form of the words. There are two other searches in the sequence analyzed: line three and line twenty-one. In line three, the student is able to solve the search on his own without asking for contributions; in line twenty-one, instead, the student is apparently uncertain and repeats the word while gazing at the secretary who in line twenty-three offers the solution with terminal intonation. The student acknowledges the solution by repeating the lexical item in line twenty-four.

The searches presented highlight how the role of the native speaker as knowledgeable person is strictly correlated to the non-native speaker’s actions. In the search through lines six-eleven the secretary has no clue of the word the student is trying to utter and consequently she cannot produce any candidate solution. Any possible offer could be threatening, as the student would probably feel forced to accept the proffered solution without being able to know if it was the one he really was looking for. In the search in line twenty-one there is no possibility to offer
a mistaken solution. The secretary is the linguistic expert and can easily offer the appropriate lexical items and she is also directly invited to participate in the search by the student’s eye gaze. In line twenty-eight the student is again in trouble, but this time he points at his fingers and the secretary is able to understand the meaning of the word that he is looking for and provides it, in line thirty after a very short silence and an understanding token Oh. In line thirty-one the student acknowledges and repeats the solution to the search and in line thirty-two the secretary confirms it with Yeah that’s right. After a short pause the conversation is resumed. This last search shows how the student resorts successfully to non-verbal cues to indicate the search for a lexical item and the secretary intervenes offering the candidate solution. It is when the speaker appeals for help that the other interlocutor participates in searching for a solution. Normally self-initiated self-repairs are preferred to self-initiated other-repair.

Brouwer (2003) in her investigation of Danish native and non-native speakers’ interaction highlights “the preference for self repair rather than immediate help upon the production of an explicit word search marker” (p. 539), as shown in the excerpt that follows. In fact she shows how explicit word search markers do not get an immediate answer. Hosoda (2000) in her examination of naturally occurring native/non-native speakers’ conversations in Japanese confirms the preference for self-initiated repairs.

The excerpt, taken from Brouwer (2003), shows the preference for self repair despite the fact that the interactant produces two word search markers that are explicit questions, in lines three and seven (2003. p. 539).

**Figure 4.7.** Data set Excerpt 3 from Brouwer (2003, p. 538-539)

01 ⇒ J:  
```
in-- (0.4) in oh hvad hedder det "ih det der" bjerg
```
```
in-- (0.4) in uh what is called the ih this mountain
```

02  
(1.5)
In line one, Figure 4.7, J starts his word search with an overt question that is followed by (1.5) silence. In line three J offers a hint and a sort of candidate solution to his search that is followed by another silence (0.8). In line five he gives an account; he cannot remember the name and once again the turn is followed by (2.0) silence. In line seven J produces one more word search marker. Word search markers that have the form of questions are very often not considered as request for help in a word search by the other recipient, especially when uttered in a very low voice. They are considered as a moment of thinking. According to Brouwer, to encourage other interactants to join in a search, speakers provide information about the searched-for item, as line seven and nine of her excerpt show, and produce an account for not providing the item as in line five. Sometimes the L2 speaker addresses the recipient as the expert and produces word search markers such as “I don’t know what it is in Finnish/Italian/Danish” or “I
don’t know how to say it.” These markers account for the search and, at the same time, they orient to the hearer’s expertise. As Goodwin and Godwin (1986) affirm “Word searches are one of the activities that can be used to obtain heightened attention from a recipient, for example, to obtain a gaze which has not been previously given” (p. 54-55). They also demonstrated the importance of interactants’ non-verbal cues in mono-cultural settings. Hosoda (2000) and Kurhila (2006) confirm that non-verbal cues are used together with verbal ones by non-native speakers engaged in word searches to solicit the interlocutor’s help. Non-verbal sources, or “vocabulary checks” as Hosoda (2006, p. 33) calls them, are gaze, posture, gesture, raised eyebrows, and head tilts. She affirms that “vocabulary checks” and their response form a repair sequence, which addresses the speaker’s problems during speech. In this way the L2 speaker’s identity is the one of a novice who resorts to the other interlocutor as the language expert. The excerpt that follows is taken from Hosoda (2006) and shows the word search details discussed.

*Figure 4.8. Data set from Hosoda (2006, p. 36)*

01  **Jeff:** sou nazeka minna souiu knakei o suru=
   *Right. Somehow, everybody {speculates that they’re} having an affair.*

02  **Haru:** =a::=
   *oh*

03  ⇒ **Jeff:** =ano::: (. ) nan desu ka ano::: sui- suitei?=  
   *Uhmmmm what do your say uhhm est- estimation?*

04  **Hary:** =u:[n]
    =uh:-huh

05  ⇒ **Jeff:**  [su]isoku?=  
    *speculation?*

06  **Haru:** =suisoku suru.=
    *{they} speculate.*

07  **Jeff:** ="suisoku da°
    *{It’s}speculation.*

---

*24 Only the original Japanese turns and the English translation are reproduced.*
In Figure 4.8, line three, Jeff starts a word search with a disfluency token and then with an explicit word search marker *what do you say*. In this way he offers a slot to the other recipient to offer a candidate solution for his search. Then he himself offers a possible lexical item with rising intonation and stops the TCU that is in progress. Hosoda underlines how Jeff’s non-verbal behavior is particularly important; in fact, she affirms “At the beginning of line three, Jeff shifts his gaze from Haru as he hesitates; toward the end of the turn, he return his gaze to Haru, raises his eyebrows, and says *suitei* (‘estimation’) with rising intonation” (p. 36). Although Jeff’s possible solution is not correct in Japanese, Haru does not repair the previous turn and in line four produces only a continuer *un/uh-uh.* In this way Jeff is forced to repair in third turn position in ‘an effort at getting it right.’ Jeff is uncertain about his new choice, *suisoku* (‘speculation,’ and presents it for confirmation in line five. Once more Hosoda highlights Jeff’s non-verbal behavior, “Jeff focuses his gaze on Haru, raises eyebrows and leans forward, thereby soliciting repair from Haru” (p. 37). In fact, in line six Haru intervenes as the linguistic expert and provides the solution: *suisoku suru* (‘they} speculate.’ Jeff closes the sequence acknowledging the new solution by repeating it in line seven. The present data show how L2 speakers immediately invest the recipient with the role of language expert when they display limited expertise in the interaction. The interlocutor takes the role offered and provides the required help. Hosoda, moreover, stresses the exploitation of non-verbal cues to make the invitation more evident and Chapter three showed the importance of the same cues among Italian speakers.
Placeholders are other relevant features used in word searches. The use of the demonstrative pronoun *are* as placeholder has been analyzed in Japanese native speakers’ conversation by Hayashi (2003a) and is also found in Hosoda’s (2000) data on Japanese learners. Chapter three has shown how Italian native speakers generally use placeholders in the preliminary solution when the word needed is still under retrieval. Placeholders have no deictic or anaphoric function, but they momentarily replace a word that is still under search.

In his analysis of the conversational interaction of a student of English from Korea, Jung (2004) shows that “the L2 learners used three different resources to initiate repair while searching for a word and the conversation partners provided the target word by orienting to the turn prior to the trouble source turn or the context as well as their role as a language expert or language teacher” (p. 27). The learners then repeated the target word or incorporated it into their utterances. The three different resources to initiate a word search, according to Jung (2004) were: (1) the formulaic expression – “How can I say;” (2) code switching; and (3) similar sounding words. Later in the present chapter, the non-native speakers of Italian will be shown to use (1) formulaic expressions such as *come si dice*/*How do you say?* or *non so/*I don’t know;* (2) code switching, knowing that generally more than one of the people participating in the dinner spoke English, but they seldom used (3) words that they thought sounded similar.

The present data show that non-native speakers, having a rudimentary knowledge of the language, when engaged in word searches activate all the strategies discussed in previous research in their attempt to solve their search. The first evidence that they are involved in a search is given by interruptions, hesitations, pauses, and productions of sound stretches, generally called non-lexical speech perturbations.
4.3 Non-Lexical Speech Perturbations

As already highlighted in the previous chapters, a word search is an activity that falls into the domain of repair, and it is signaled by non-lexical speech perturbations, such as cut-offs, sound stretches, and “uh’s.” These “are positioned differently relative to the element they initiate repair on” (Brouwer, 2004). “The cut-off stops a ‘next sound due’ from occurring when it is due; the uh and pause occupy the position at which a next due element of the talk would otherwise be placed” (Schegloff, 1979b, p. 273). “The former is generally disjunctive syntactically, interrupting what is syntactically projected by the sentence so far. The latter delays but carries forward the syntactic projection of the sentence so far” (Schegloff, 1979b, p. 273).

However, speech perturbations can be found also in context different from word searches. Carroll (2004) found in his data “false starts, i.e. apparent stopping and restarting of an utterance” (p. 201) that might resemble disfluencies accompanying a word search. Our data show how the students very often start their TCU with the token “ahm,” even if they are not engaged in a word search.

Figure 4.9. Data set 30 maggio 2001 Ercole

01 ⇒ S: ahm che::: ho ho parlato
ahm that::: havelstPerSin havelstPerSin spoken
ahm that::: I have spoken

02 inglese tutto il giorno
english all theMasSin day
english all day long

03 e adesso aahah[ahahahha] aahahh
and now aahah[ahahahha] aahahh
and now aahah[ahahahha] aahahh

Figure 4.10. Data set 30 maggio 2001 Ercole 2

01 F: perché?
why?
why?
In Figure 4.9 the perturbation *ahm* is followed by a word whose final vowel is stretched and the verb that follows is repeated twice; such speech perturbations might recall a word search, but it cannot be confirmed as the student completes her turn without any other hindering. Instead, in Figure 4.10 and Figure 4.11 the token is either pronounced with a stretched sound or followed by a pause and it might, at first glance, be confused with the perturbation of a word search; however, once again the turn is completed smoothly. In Figure 4.12 the *ahm* is used at the beginning of the turn and again before the verb and after the brief stretching of the final vowel of

---

25 The student has been studying both Italian and Spanish and very often she mixes the two languages. In this case it seems that she is using the Spanish word ‘y’ instead of the Italian word ‘e,’ both meaning ‘and’ in English.
one of the name part of the subject of the sentence. Even this turn proceeds smoothly and does not present any further hesitancy that might indicate that the student is engaged in a search.

According to Schegloff (1987a, 1987b, 2007) TCU beginnings are important places as they constitute “a recognizable action in context; that is, at that juncture of that episode of interaction, with those participants, in that place, etc.” (Schegloff, 2007, p. 4). It is important to remember that the projectability of a TCU is very essential in the turn taking system, therefore it could be claimed that by using *ahm* at the beginning of the turn, the students show their engagement in the production of a turn. The present data provide other occurrences of “*ahm*” as the instances below show. It seems that, in both excerpts, the lexical perturbation “*ahm*” is employed as a filler to cover the lack of fluency and take time before articulating the turn that later ends up in a word search.

*Figure 4.13. Data set 29 maggio 2001 v. 21.21 L’accartocciata*

01 A: cosa avete mangiato oggi a pranzo?
what have2ndPerSin eaten today at lunch?
what did you have for lunch today?

She puts down her fork on the plate, she looks down on the plate with the left hand adjusts her glasses

02 ⇒ S: ahm oggi, (.)
ahm today, (.)
ahm today, (.)

shakes her head laterally, looks shortly to A.

03 non so, (.) il nome.
not know1PerSin (.) theMasSin name.
I don’t know, (.) the name

positions her hands in front of her mid-air and looks at them

04 ma è un ahm: ahm::=
but is anMas ahm: ahm::=
but it is an ahm: ahm::=

In this first instance, *Figure 4.13*, after the question in the first line, the student starts her turn with the token *ahm* as if she has to recall for a moment what she had for lunch, line two. It is the micro-pause that follows the adverb that reveals that trouble is coming up. In fact, in line
three she overtly affirms that she does not know the name of the food she had and in a new turn she starts what is clearly a word search, line four. The TCU beginning can be rather problematic for novice L2 speakers as they are engaged in expressing themselves in a language they have not mastered.

The excerpt that follows displays a series of hesitancy token ‘ahm,’ but they seem to have slightly different connotations.

*Figure 4.14. Data set 6 giugno 2001 v. 18.35 Bruschetta*

01 C: come cibo, qual è il cibo che as food, what is the food 
      and food, what food
02 ti è piaciuto di più? you obj pro is liked of more? did you like most?
      * looks down
03 S: ah:::: *di più ah:::::m ah:::: *of more ah:::::m ah:::: *most ah:::::m
04 Rn: il pane bread
      looks at C *looks down
05 S: ehehehe[hehehehehe *si]eheh ehehehe[hehehehehe *si]eheh ehehehe[hehehehehe *si]eheh 
      [ looks at S ]
06 D: [il pescespada ] [the swordfish ]
      *looks at C and opens his arms
07 ⇒ S: ah::::m *qui o in (generale)? ah::::m *here or in (general)? ah::::m *here or (generally) speaking? 
      looks at S
08 D: qu[i qui qui ] he[re here he]re he[re here he]re 
      [ looks at S ]
09 C: [ in genera]le [ in general]le 
      [ generally] speaking
S looks at D pointing in the air and drawing a circle, then leaning on her left
hand touching the chin, elbow on table

10 D: qui in sicilia, ecco.
here in sicily, that’s it.

*looks down *looks at D nodding

11 ⇒ S: *qui, ah:::m (.)*.h il pescespad[a::a::hm ]=
*here, ah:::m (.)*.h theMasSin swordfis[h::a::hm ]=
*here, ah:::m (.)*.h swordfis[h::a::hm ]=

[looking at S and *then C ]
[ecco *(vede)hehe]
[that’s it *(see)hehe ]
[that’s it *(you see)hehe]

*diverts gaze looks down and with his hands forms a circle

13 ⇒ S: *=mi piace ahm bro-
=*me like ahm bro-
=* I like ahm bro-

looks at D

14 S: prociutta.
prociutta.

looks at S

15 C: prosciutto?
ham?

*looks down and then at R moving his hands up and down

16 ⇒ S: no no nno *ehm bread [(bianco)bread-
no no nno *ehm bread [(white)bread-
no no nno *ehm bread [(white)bread-

[ ]

17 R [(bread)]

18 D: eh l’a[ranci-]
eh theMasSin a[ranci-]
eh a[ranci-]

[looks down hands forming a circle

19 S: [pane ]:
[bread ]:
[bread ]:

In Figure 4.14 the first two ahms in line three seem to indicate that the student is
occupying the turn, which has been assigned to him by C, while he is thinking. We do not know
if it is the start of a word search or not as, in line four, Rn intervenes offering a possible answer
to the question. The student bursts into laughter, confirms with si/’yes’ the answer offered by Rn
while looking down and then laughs again. In line six, D, in overlap with the laughter and the confirmation *si*/*yes,* suggests another possible answer. In line seven, the student does not confirm or reject the suggestion, but, instead, at the end of his laughter he produces another hesitancy token and repairs the question, showing that he did not understand if C wanted to know what food he likes in general or if she was asking what Sicilian food he liked. The end of the repair is rushed after he has prolonged the vowel of the disjunctive conjunction *o*/*or* in line seven. In line eight the woman, D, answers *qui*/*here,* meaning in Sicily and she repeats it three times as she is overlapped by C. Instead, C answers that she wants to know what he likes in general. In line ten the woman specifies that they want to know what Sicilian food he likes. In line eleven the student repeats the word *qui*/*here* and looks down. Then he utters again a token *ahm,* stretching the sound and after a micro-pause he looks at the woman, nods, and repeats the candidate solution offered by the woman in line six *pescespada*/*swordfish* followed by another disfluency stretched as well. However, this time the student uses the token to probably keep his turn, as the woman projecting a possible turn relevance place produces a comment in overlap with the final vowel of the word uttered by the student shifting her gaze from the student to C. In line thirteen the student, while diverting his gaze, looking down, and shaping a circle with his hands, produces a new turn. The student starts the turn with the verb *mi piace*/*I like* followed by a hesitancy token and a word that is cut off and then he produces the word *prociutta*/*ham* looking at he woman. C, looking at the student, repairs the word with rising intonation in line fifteen. The student disconfirms the word, looks down and moving his hands up and down produces a different hesitancy token *ehm* followed by the English word *bread,* a word that is not clearly audible and that might be the Italian word for *white,* the word *bread* again, and a cut off. The perturbation *ehm* followed by the English word seems to indicate that the student is looking
for a word that he knows, but that he is unable to retrieve. This hypothesis is confirmed later in the transcript when the word search is solved and the student affirms that he could not remember the word.

The use of hesitancies, shown in the previous excerpts, demonstrates how novice L2 learners exploit such tokens at the beginning of their turn. This is frequently the case after they have been asked a question. It seems that the token is a way to occupy their turn space while they elaborate their answers. As Carroll (2004) affirms, these ‘breakdowns’ should be considered as strategies that the students activate to maintain the floor and to be able to formulate and complete their turns. The following excerpts in English show how native and non-native speakers of English use the same non-speech perturbations.

Figure 4.15. Data set Session 1A

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>B:</td>
<td>ok. so::: i’ll leave you here. i’ll be here.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>M:</td>
<td>so what are we limited to for the presentation (or what)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>⇒ B:</td>
<td>a:::h well. basically now ah it’s just a matter of ah preparing for the presentation. so a:::h you have to figure out which topic you want to talk about. a:::hm. you already know the topics of the third presentation you’re going to do, like the different categories. and now we are doing economy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>⇒ J:</td>
<td>so. uhm: is there (any) topic(s) that you really feel that you really wanna do?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>⇒ L:</td>
<td>i ha- i actually have an idea. i don’t know if you guys would be interested in doing this. uhm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>J:</td>
<td>i think we have the same idea ( ) the way you started but keep going.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>M:</td>
<td>((laughs))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>J:</td>
<td>yeah. i think we are on the same page. but keep going.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>⇒ L:</td>
<td>ok. uhm. discrimination?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

26 Silvia Kunitz, Ph.D. student at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, kindly shared her data.
J: oh no. no. that’s not my idea. but yeah. discrimination. Go on.

L: well

M: in che senso like what do you mean?

⇒ L: uhm well i just remember like uhm i saw this one exhibit at chicago’s historical society a few years ago. and it was like based around like uh: african-american hazing during like the late eighteen hundreds and early nineteen hundreds but because like a lot of immigrants were coming in at that time like (that) were also being hazed like you know being (hanged                 ) like that type of thing and like hazing as (               now) but uh i was thinking like (                    ) discrimination (of)like uh like italian (or) like people like immigrants (like) italian immigrants coming to america then like italians discriminating against other italians then italians discriminating against outsiders.

In this conversation (Figure 4.15), three American students of Italian, who are meeting to prepare a presentation in Italian, and their teacher are involved. At the beginning of the meeting the teacher, who is Italian but fluent in English, gives some instructions. In the first line of our excerpt, the teacher speaks and takes leave from the students. In line three she replies to the student’s request and she starts her turn with the disfluency ah whose sound is stretched and is followed by the token well. During her turn she produces two more tokens of hesitancies ah and ahm, but none of them is related to a word search as the speech flows without any other perturbations. Later in the data the students are discussing the topic of their presentation and in line thirty-four the student after a so produces a hesitancy token uhm. In the following line another student completes the turn with a final uhm. The same student produces other tokens in lines thirty-nine and forty-three, but none of them precedes a word search. Looking at the excerpt, nobody would say that the speakers are not competent because they scatter hesitancies in their turns. This proves that the use of such tokens does not imply that the interactants are not
proficient language speakers, but that they exploit the tokens to ensure a smooth completion of the turn.

The way such perturbations sounds are transcribed, however, varies across languages as the previous example shows as well. The research has indicated the perturbations of the teacher using the vowel “a” and those of the student with “u.” The token “uh” is generally found in English data, and in fact in Egbert’s (1997b, 2009) German data the token is either “eh” or “ehm,” translated with “uh”/“uhm” in the English gloss. Here are two examples from Egbert’s data:

Figure 4.16. Data set Nr. 10 (FAC, drastically simplified) from Egbert (1997b, p.630)

7 ⇒ H: ford baut die bau- (. ) bes- eh baut die besten autos

ford builds the bui- (. ) bes- uh builds the best cars

Figure 4.17. Data set Nr. 5 (AIK) from Egbert (2009, p. 15)\(^{27}\)

01 ⇒ Inge: wir ham ja zwei dicke- eh voll eh ehm tch

Inge: we have yes two thick- uh full uh uhm tch

02 [hirschgeweihe hätt ich schon gesagt

[deer antler I would have already said

03 [gehörne

[antlers

As shown in the previous chapter in our native Italian data, the tokens are “eh,” “ehm,” as in Egbert’s German data, and in one sample even “m.” In our non-native data instead we find, most of the time, a phonetic sound “ahm” (that can be rendered in the English gloss with “uhm”) and rarely “ehm.” It seems that there is a different sound quality in the vowel when comparing the native and non-native data. Local (2004) in his studies on and-uh(m) (that would be the English for “ahm” in our data) shows the different phonetic details characterizing the single

\(^{27}\) The translation has been added.
elements, “and” and “uh(m),” compared to the combination of the two, “and-uh(m).” Further investigations on the phonetic characteristics of the hesitation markers in Italian native and non-native speakers might shed some light on the possible differences in the quality of the vowels. They might clarify if “ahm” is to be considered a marker used in different contexts implementing different actions, as Local (2004) highlights, while “ehm” is typically used in the onset of word searches.

4.3.1 Non-lexical speech perturbations at the onset of a word search

In the previous excerpts L2 learners use perturbations at the beginning of their turn probably to show that they are producing a turn and therefore intend to keep their turn. However non-lexical speech perturbations, anything that is not lexical and disrupts “the smooth delivery of a turn” (Brower, 2004, p. 95), are also utilized by non-native speakers when they are engaged in a word search, just as native speakers do. This section shows the onset of word searches where hesitancies are produced together with other perturbations, such as cut-offs and pauses. In the following excerpt the student is answering the question cosa avete mangiato oggi a pranzo?/‘what did you have for lunch today?’ and she does not know the name of what she ate so she tries to explain what it was and she produces several tokens as she is engaged in targeting the words she needs.

*Figure 4.18. Data set 29 maggio 2001 v. 21.21 L’accartocciata*

01 A: cosa avete mangiato oggi a pranzo?
what have2ndPerSin eaten today at lunch?
*what did you have for lunch today?*

She puts down her fork on the plate, she looks down on the plate with the left hand adjusts her glasses

02 ⇒ S: ahm oggi, (.)
ahm today, (.)
*ahm today, (.)*

shakes her head laterally, looks shortly to A.

03 non so, (.) il nome.
not know1PerSing, (.) theMassSing name.
*I don’t know, (.) the name.*
positions her hands in front of her mid-air and looks at them

04 ⇒ ma è un ahm: ahm::=
but is anMas ahm: unMas ahm::=
but it is an ahm: an ahm::=

In Figure 4.18 the student starts her turn, line two, with a speech perturbation “ahm” and repeating the adverb oggi/“today,” then there is a micro-pause immediately followed, in line three, by the statement that she does not know the name of what she had. In line four she starts a new turn that aims to describe the food she had, as the next lines, not included here, show. She utters an adversative conjunction ma/“but;’ however, just after the masculine indefinite article, which might signal that she is searching for a masculine singular noun, she produces two disfluency tokens that are stretched ahm: and ahm:::

Figure 4.19. Data set 6 giugno 2001 v. 18.35 Bruschetta

01 C: come cibo, qual è il cibo che
as food, what is theMasSin food that
and food, what food

02 ti è piaciuto di più?
youObjPro is liked of more?
did you like most?

* looks down

03 ⇒ S: ah::: *di più ah:::m
ah::: *of more ah:::m
ah::: *most ah:::m

04 Rn: il pane
theMasSin bread
bread

looks at C *looks down

05 S: ehehehe[hehehehehe *si]eheh
ehehehe[hehehehehe *si]eheh
ehehehe[hehehehehe *si]eheh
[
[looks at S ]

06 D: [il pescespada ]
[theMasSin swor]dfish
[swordfish ]

*looks at C and opens his arms

07 ⇒ S: ah:::m *qui o in (generale)?
ah:::m *here or in (general)?
ah:::m *here or (generally) speaking?
looks at S

08  D:  
  [qu[i qui qui ]
  he[re here he]re
  he[re here he]re
  [  
  [ looks at S]

09  C:  
  [ i n g e n e r a l e ]
  [ i n g e n e r a l ]
  [ g e n e r a l l y ] speaking

S looks at D pointing in the air and drawing a circle, then leaning on her left hand touching the chin, elbow on table

10  D:  
  qu[i qui qui ]
  he[re here he]re
  he[re here he]re

here in sicily, that’s it.
here in sicily, that’s it.

*looks down  *looks at D nodding

11 ⇒ S:  
  *qui, ah:::m (.).* h il pesce[spad[a::a::hm]
  *here, ah:::m (.).* theMasSin sword[fis[h::a::hm]
  *here, ah:::m (.).* h sword[fis[h::a::hm]
  
  [ looking at S and *then C ]

12  D:  
  [ecc[o]hehe]
  [t ha t’s i t * (s ee) he he]
  [that’s it *(you see)hehe]

*diverts gaze looks down and with his hands forms a circle

13  S:  
  =*mi piace ahm bro-
  =*me like ahm bro-
  =* I like ahm bro-

looks at D

14⇒ S:  
  prociutta.
  prociutta.
  prociutta.

looks at S

15 ⇒ C:  
  prosciutto?
  ham?
  ham?

*looks down and then at R moving his hands up and down

16  S:  
  no no nno *ehm bread [(bianco)]bread-
  no no nno *ehm bread [(white)]bread-
  no no nno *ehm bread [(white)]bread-
  
  [  
  [(bread)]

17  R

18  D:  
  eh l’a[rci-]
  eh theMasSin a[rci-]
  eh a[rci-]
  
  [ looks down hands forming a circle

19  S:  
  [pane ]:
  [bread ]:
  [bread ]:
looks at D, one hand putting something on top of the other

20
con pomodoro:
with tomato:
with tomato:

looks at S and then C

21 ⇒ D:
ah la bruschetta.
ah theFemSin bruschetta.
ah bruschetta.

In Figure 4.19 the hesitancy markers *ahm* produced by the student in line three, seven, and eleven seem to indicate that the student is trying to keep his turn, as previously discussed. Instead in line thirteen the student, while diverting his gaze, looking down, and shaping a circle with his hands, produces a new turn with the verb mi *piace*/*I like* followed by a hesitancy token and a word that is cut off and then he produces the word *prociutta*/*ham* looking at the woman. This time the hesitancy token followed by a cut-off word indicates that the student is engaged in a word search he thinks to have solved within his turn. C, looking at the student, repairs the student’s solutions, uttering what she thinks the student failed to pronounce correctly with rising intonation, in line fifteen. The student disconfirms three times the candidate solution, showing that he knows the meaning of the lexical item proffered and that it is not the word he is trying to retrieve. In the meantime he looks down, moves his hands up and down and produces a different hesitancy token *ehm* followed by the English word *bread*, another word that it is not clearly audible and that might be the Italian word for *white* and finally recycles the word *bread* and cuts it off. The perturbation *ehm*, followed by the English word and the cut-off that follows, highlights the onset of a word search. His attempts to offer verbal hints, as well as the iconic gestures used to describe the word, indicate that the student knows the word he is trying to retrieve. This is confirmed later in the transcript when the word search is solved and the student affirms that he knew the word, but could not remember it.
These data present other occurrences in which other students use the same non-verbal lexical perturbation “ahm” in word searches, as the following four examples (Figure 4.20, Figure 4.21, Figure 4.22 and Figure 4.23) show.

Figure 4.20. Data set 28 maggio 2001 v. 1.04.54. Marionetta – ceramica

01 S:  sl. i²⁸ ha la seramica ne[l: ]
yes. and has theFemSin ceramic inArtPre+[the]MasSin
sl. and it has ceramic in [the]

02 U 1:
[ah ] ceramica
[ah ] ceramic
[ah ] ceramic

03 ⇒ S: nella ahm:
inArtPre+theFemSin ahm:
in the ahm:

04 D: nel [manico]
inArtPre+theMasSin [handle]
in the [handle]

05 F: [nel ma]nico
inArtPre+theMasSin [handle]
in the [handle]

06 S: sl. i piatti:
yes. theMasPl plates:
yes. the plates:

In Figure 4.20 the student produces a lexical perturbation *ahm* in the third line when she is trying to retrieve the word searched for. This excerpt comes from a longer one in which the student is engaged in explaining what she wants to buy. During the whole explanation she tries to mime the object with her hands turning her gaze to the man (U) or the woman (D).

Unfortunately neither of them is able to recognize the object she is miming. It is only when she takes a fork (line three) and shows the handle that they finally can offer a candidate solution: manico/*handle,* the word the student has been struggling to find.

²⁸ The student has been studying both Italian and Spanish and, very often, she mixes the two languages. In this case it seems that she is using the Spanish word ‘y’ instead of the Italian word ‘e,’ both meaning ‘and’ in English. The pronunciation of the following word ‘ceramica’ is also Spanish.
This excerpt, Figure 4.21, from another student, whose competence in Italian is very good, shows in line two how she starts her turn using *ahm* twice.

*Figure 4.21.* Data set 31 maggio 2001 v. 06.46 II cane

```
01 C: che razza? what breed? looking at C, turns toward the man ((smiling))
      a:hm: ahm .hh how .hh say2ndPerPl in Italian? ah.
      a:hm: ahm .hh how .hh do you say it in Italian? ah.
03 U: =basta[rdino. ]
      = mon[grelDimHasSin]
      =a lit[tle mongrel ]
      [ looks at C]
04 S: [ spanijel]
      [ spanijel]
      [ spanijel]
      looks at U *looks at C
      british spaniel? *spanil?
```

In the excerpt, Figure 4.21, the use of *ahm* is related to the word search in which the student is engaged. It is clear that the student is struggling to find the word also because she explicitly asks *come dite in italiano?* /’how do you say it in Italian?,’ showing that she does not know the word she is targeting. The answer she gets from the man does not satisfy her search and she utters the breed three times and the last two times try-marks her production, indicating that she does not know if it is the same word in Italian.

In the next example, Figure 4.22, the student uses both sound stretches, which are common indications of a search coming up, and the token “ahm.”

*Figure 4.22.* Data set 30 maggio 2001 v. 1.10.38 Requirement

```
01 ⇒ S: no::: ero::: ahm
      no::: was::: ahm
      no::: i was::: ahm
```
In this data segment the student starts a search on line one, prolonging, at first, the final
vowels of the negative adverb *no/*'no' and the verb *ero/*'was,' then she produces a token *ahm,*
followed by a (1.8) silence, another important indicator that a search is in progress, in line two.
In line three she recycles the previous turn and increments it with the adjective *finita/*'ended,' the
target of her search.

These data, Figure 4.23, present another example where the student makes use of several
tokens “*ahm*” indicating her engagement in a word search.

*Figure 4.23.* Data set 9 giugno 2001 v. 03.56 Tegola

01 **E:** alla mamma cosa hai preso?
   toArtPre+theFemSin mom what have2ndSin taken?
   what did you get for your mom?

02   (1.2)((she looks at E with a puzzled face))

03 **E:** a mamma cosa hai comprato?
   to mum what have2ndPersSin bought?
   what did you buy for your mum?
   *looks up

04 ⇒ **S:** oh, *ahm
   oh, *ahm
   oh, *ahm

05   (0.3)((looks down))
   *looks up

06 ⇒ **S:** *ok- ahm
   *ok- ahm
   *ok- ahm

07   (0.7)((draws something in the air with her hands))
In Figure 4.23, at first the student, when asked what she bought for her mother, is silent. E treats the (1.2) silence and the puzzled face, assumed by the student, as a request for repair. In fact in line three E recasts her question. In line four the student answers with a change of state token oh, used to indicate that she has understood the question (Heritage, 1984a) and then ahm. In line five there is a (0.3) pause and in line six she confirms that she understood the question by uttering the acknowledgement token ok, followed by another ahm. In line seven there is another pause of (0.9) and finally in line eight she utters an articulated preposition del/‘of the’ followed, again, by a token ahm and a micro-pause. Then she says roof with rising intonation, followed in
line nine by the preposition *con* ‘with’ and the definite article *il* ‘the’ masculine and singular. The student really struggles to recall the word she needs to answer the initial question as the use of hesitancy markers, her pauses, and the several attempts to find the word demonstrate. In line ten there is another short pause (0.1) and in line eleven the negative adverb *non* ‘not’ is cut-off followed by another pause (0.5) in line twelve. Finally, in lines thirteen and fourteen, the student recycles the negative adverb and states that she does not know the word, but she knows how to say it in Spanish and offers the candidate solution (*ail*) that is not clearly audible and recalls the English word “tile” rather than any Spanish word for it.

Besides hesitancy markers, cut-offs and pauses, non-lexical speech perturbations include the production of sound stretches, another characteristic feature of the onset of word search. Sound stretching usually occurs during the production of the word that precedes the item that is difficult to retrieve. In native Italian data, sometimes, such words offer the recipient important information about the searched-for word, if it is masculine or feminine, plural or singular, if it is a proper noun, a common noun or an adjective or even a verb as was shown in Chapter three.

Students, engaged in finding a targeted item, very often stretch the sounds of the final letter of the words preceding the one searched, and they also produce cut-offs and pauses as the following examples clearly demonstrate.

This excerpt, which has been partially analyzed in Figure 4.18, shows how the student produces a cut-off after the indefinite masculine article *un* ‘a’ in line four, followed by two hesitancies showing that she is trying to retrieve a word that according to the article should be a masculine, singular noun. In line seven she produces *prosciutto* ‘ham’ that is a masculine, singular noun. The lexical item produced in line seven as well as the one in line eight are both masculine, singular nouns and they match the indefinite article that has been previously cut off.
Figure 4.24. Data set 29 maggio 2001 v. 21.21 L’accartocciata

01 A: cosa avete mangiato oggi a pranzo?
what have you eaten today at lunch?
what did you have for lunch today?

She puts down her fork on the plate, she looks down on the plate with the left hand adjusts her glasses

02 ⇒ S:

ahm oggi, (.)
ahm today, (.)
ahm today, (.)

shakes her head laterally, looks shortly to A.

03 non so, (.) <il nome>.
not know, (.) <the name>.
I don’t know, (.) <the name>.

positions her hands in front of her mid-air and looks at them and rotating the right hand over the left ont

04 ⇒

ma è un ahm: (.)
but is an ahm: (.)
but it is an ahm: (.)

she looks up while moving her hands

05 ahm::=
ahm::=
ahm::=

student looks at cl

06 C1: =un’altra volta?
=an other time?
=once again?

hands in midair with a rotating movement

07 ⇒ S: prosciutto
ham
ham

looks down at her plate rotating her hands in front of her *her hands positioned to represent something in the middle

08 e formag*gio
and chee*se
and cheese

looks at D

09 nel centro.
inArtPre+theMasSin center
in the middle

rotates one hand around the other and then lowers hands

10 e un tipo di:[pane ]
and aMas type of:[bread]
and a sort of [bread]
However, further research and more data are necessary to investigate in depth the present phenomenon as the masculine and singular article, especially the indefinite one, is generally considered as the unmarked form.

Phonological features or sounds of the word under search can be available to the speaker. Some of such occurrences can be also categorized as tip-of-the-tongue (TOT) phenomena. TOT phenomena occur when a speaker is experiencing a “momentary inability to utter an intended word, accompanied by the feeling that the target word is known and that is on the verge of being available” (Ivanyi, 1997; Miozzo & Caramazza, 1997). According to Miozzo and Caramazza the syntactic and semantic context of the sentence can offer several syntactic properties of the omitted word. Experiments have shown that the meaning as well as syntactical (and some phonological) information of a word can be retrieved independently of its form. However, it is not simple to distinguish in non-native speakers’ word searches what is really a TOT from a search for a word that they do not know or they might have heard or seen but they cannot recall.

In the following excerpt the student show they have some access to the lexical item she is trying to retrieve as Miozzo and Caramazza affirm.

In Figure 4.25, the student is trying to recall what she had eaten a few days before, but she can’t retrieve the name of it and her turn is characterized by some perturbations. The use of a placeholder in line two shows that the student has some access to the lexical item she is trying to retrieve as it gives us information about the gender and number of the searched word.

*Figure 4.25. Data set 5 giugno 2001 v. 43.45 Calamaretti*

01 S: >no l’altro giorno cosa abbiamb-no the other day what havPersin-

02 ha mangiato quelli là::=

has3rdPersin eaten thatMasPl thereAdvEnf::=

*she* ate *those* ones::=
In Figure 4.25, line one, first the student cuts off the verb and then recycles it, changing the person. In line two, she completes her turn using a distal demonstrative and stretching the final vowel denoting she is looking for a specific word. In line three, D latches her answers to the student’s previous turn offering the solution to the word search: *i calamaretti* ‘the small squids.’ In line four the student produces a change-of-state token *ah*. According to Heritage (1984a) such change-of-state tokens are ‘sequence exiting device[s]’ (p.318) that are produced after the trouble resolution, showing that the problem has been resolved. In this particular case the student produces the device in overlap with the last part of the candidate solution, repeating immediately the word searched-for in its regular plural form *calamari* ‘squid’ and not with the suffix for the diminutive ‘etti’ as does the woman in line three. This might indicate that she now remembers the word. The turn is completed with a positive comment. This particular example shows how the student, who is very fluent in Italian, uses a placeholder *quelli là* ‘those ones’ to substitute for the missing word. The placeholder gives us information about the noun searched as it is masculine and plural and in fact the solution offered by the recipient is *calamaretti* ‘small squids,’ a word that in Italian is masculine and plural.

The previous data excerpt shows how information about the word to be retrieved is available to the speakers; in fact in Figure 4.25, the student does have access to the grammatical and semantic features of the word. She knows that it is masculine and plural, but she has no access to the phonological features and therefore she uses a masculine, plural placeholder to indicate that she cannot retrieve the word needed. These are characteristics that word searches
have in common with TOT (Ivanyi, 1997) and it is quite difficult to clearly distinguish the two phenomena.

In sum, non-native speakers of Italian use two tokens to announce that they are engaged in a word search: “ehm” and “ahm.” The hesitancy marker “ahm” is used not only when announcing that a person is engaged in a word search, but also as a filler to disguise the lack of fluency the learner presents or her/his hesitation when starting a TCU. Moreover, it can show that the L2 learner wants to keep the turn as s/he has more to say. As Kurhila (2006) affirms: “By producing some vocalization, speakers can take time out for processing the utterance, but still hold the turn for themselves by indicating that there is more to come” (p. 27).

Like native speakers, non-native speakers produce other lexical perturbations when a word search is triggered, such as sound stretches, cut-offs and pauses. When students display hesitancy, they “can be seen as orienting to their linguistic identities, i.e. portraying themselves as not-yet competent speakers” (Kurhila, 2006, p. 126). The retrieval process, or repair, can be complex and difficult. If interactants do not remember a relevant item, they make it recognizable by other means such as non-lexical elements (pauses, breathing, hesitations) at the onset of the search or lexical elements (repetitions, descriptions, interrogatives) while the search is in progress.

4.4 Word Search in Progress

Speakers engaged in a word search very often rely on lexical elements to proceed in their search. As we have seen in the previous excerpt analyses, after the perturbations, most of the time, the non-native speaker cuts off the word, which precedes the searched-for item or the non-appropriate word s/he is producing, and repeats it or a fragment of it. Fox et al. (1996), analyzing the relationship between syntax and repair, noticed: “recycling constitutes a procedure for
delaying the production of a next item due” (p. 204). The repetition of one or more items during a word search provides the speaker with more search or processing time to retrieve the target word without being afraid to lose the turn. Sometime the repetitions are also attempts to find the correct solution to the search.

The following excerpts highlight how the students exploit cut-offs, repetitions as well as interrogatives.

*Figura 4.26. Data set 29 maggio 2001 v. 45.03 Tre volte*

01 S: oh::: no no no ahm a una altro collegio
   oh::: no no no ahm at anFemSin otherMasSin college
02 che ho visto: prima di andare a-
   that havelistPerSin seen before of go a-
03 ⇒ è trei volt- tre ahm ah times?
   is threa tim- three ahm ah times?
04 A: volte giusto
    timesFemPl correct
    times correct
05 S: volte [tre volte ]
    times [three times]
    times [three times]
06 U: [tre volte ]giu[sto]
    [three times]cor[rect]
    [three times]cor[rect]

In Figure 4.26, line three, the student cuts off the word *volt-*/’tim(e)-’ and then she repeats the words that precede the one that is cut off, this time with the correct pronunciation, then she produces two hesitancies before producing the searched word in English in line three. The student try-marks the noun to appeal for help; the recipient is then called to contribute in the resolution of the search.
In this data segment, *Figure 4.27*, the student, when questioned about the difficulties faced by the other students during their stay in Italy, in line one starts her reply with a perturbation. She then repeats the preposition three times before producing the masculine plural pronoun *alcuni*‘some’ and after a micro-pause she repeats the words but this time using the feminine plural form of the pronoun. The pronoun is repeated again in the masculine and plural form in line two as if the student were not sure which ending is appropriate. At the end of line three she produces the masculine singular article *lo*‘the,’ then she cuts off and recycles the *l*-followed by another cut-off. In line three, she pronounces an *a* that is cut off as well. In line four she finally produces the feminine and singular articulated preposition *alla*‘at the.’ This data segment thus demonstrates how cut-offs and repeats are used in word searches.

*Figura 4.28*. Data set 5 giugno 2001

01 S: ma penso che sta così perché- perché era e:: ma se but think that stays so because- because was e:: but if
02 no:::[: :]

In this short turn, Figure 4.28, the student starts without any hesitations but in the middle of the turn produces a cut-off after the word *perché/‘because,*’ she recycles the word and produces a stretched *e* sound. Sound stretchings are also indications of a forthcoming problem and in fact after producing two more words she prolongs the final vowel of the negation indicating she is engaged in a word search.

The data analyzed show how the moment-to-moment deployment of lexical markers helps the student maintain the turn, gain time to try and solve the upcoming trouble, and in the meantime contribute to make the recipient aware that the speaker is dealing with a problem.

Speech perturbations are considered markers for a word search and signals of repair. A repair can be either self-repaired or other-repaired. The student can solve the search on his/her own or invite the recipients to participate to the search using explicit word search markers.

Interrogative utterances are often used to invite co-participant to engage in a search, and in these data they have the effect of eliciting a candidate solution from the recipient. Brouwer (2003) and Kurhila (2006) noticed in their data that non-native speakers used “unspecific interrogatives” as a “general word search marker” (p.100).

The following data, which have been previously analyzed in Figure 4.21, show the use of an interrogative utterance, specifically an unspecific interrogative, to flag the search.

*Figure 4.29. Data set 31 maggio 2001 v. 06.46 II cane*

```plaintext
01 C:  che razza?  what breed?  looking at C, turns toward the man ((smiling))
          a:hm: ahm .hh how .hh say2ndPerPl in Italian? ah.
          a:hm: ahm .hh how .hh do you say it in Italian? ah.
03 U:  =  basta[rdino .
          =  mon[grelDimWasSin].
          =a little [mongrel ]
```
In Figure 4.29, the student is unable to retrieve the word to answer the question, therefore after a series of hesitation markers she flags her turn with an explicit request for help asking *come dite in italiano?* ‘how do you say it in Italian?,’ showing that she does not know the word she is targeting. The answer she gets from the man does not satisfy her search and she utters the breed three times and the last two times she offers her production for confirmation by using rising intonation, indicating that she does not know if it is the same word in the Italian language. The interactants’ synchronization and coordination shape a mutual cooperation in the ongoing word search, and it is a resource to achieve a collaborative solution to the search in progress.

Verbal cues, such as question markers or interrogative questions, are often used together with embodied cues.

### 4.4.1 Non–verbal cues

Non-verbal cues play an important role in word searches. These cues are deployed to announce a forthcoming trouble that marks a shift in the ongoing activity. The shift creates a new activity framework in which the recipients cooperate with the speaker, in a collaborative participation to target the searched word. The relevance of eye contact in native/non-native speakers’ interaction has been well documented (cf. Carroll, 2004; Crawford Camiciottoli, 2004; Hosoda, 2000; Kurhila, 2006). However, as Kurhila (2006) states, “there are no changes in the directions of the participants’ gaze during the NNS’s self-repair, until the end of the turn” (p. 97). The non-native speakers retain their turns until they find all the words necessary to complete
their utterance avoiding looking at the other recipients. “Gaze shifts are thus a systematic component of word searches in face to face interaction” (Helasvuo et al., 2004, p. 3). Besides gazes, other nonverbal actions, such as hand gestures, are often found in connection with word searches. Kendon (1983, 1995, 2004) calls ‘emblems’ those gestures that are independent and can represent an efficient and complete communication. “Because non verbal communication is inherently interactional” (Crawford Camiciottoli, 2004), gestures can clarify verbal interaction especially in native/non-native speakers’ communication to support speech and to express interpersonal attitudes.

Embodied cues are used together with verbal cues, such as question markers or interrogative questions, to invite the recipient’s help in searching for a word.

The following instances will show how gestures and gazes are intertwined with the unfolding course of the action.

*Figure 4.30.* Data set 29 maggio 2001 v. 21.21 L’accartocciata

01 A: cosa avete mangiato oggi a pranzo?
what have2ndPerSin eaten today at lunch?
what did you have for lunch today?

She puts down her fork on the plate, she looks down on the plate and with the left hand adjusts her glasses

02 S: ahm oggi, (.)
ahm today, (.)
ahm today, (.)

shakes her head laterally, looks shortly to A.

03 non so, (.) il nome.
not know1PerSin, (.) theMasSin name.
*I don’t know, (.) the name.*

positions her hands in front of her mid-air and looks at them and rotating the right hand over the left one

04 ma è un ahm:
but is anMas ahm: unMas
*but it is an ahm: an*

she looks up while moving her hands

05 ahm::=
ahm::=
ahm::=
student looks at c1

06  C1:  =un'altra volta?
=an other time?
=once again?

hands in midair with a rotating movement

07  S:  prosciutto
ham

looks down at her plate rotating her hands in front of
*her hands positioned to represent something in the middle

08  e formaggio
and cheese

looks at D

09  nel centro.
inArtPre+theMasSin center
in the middle

rotates one hand around the other and then lowers hands

10  e un tipo di:[pane ]
and a type of:[bread]
and a sort of:[bread]

[looking at S]

[acca]rtocciata?^{29}
[acca]rtocciata?
[acca]rtocciata?

S opens her arms and leans her head on the right and looks at D lowering her hands
as to resuming eating

12 ⇒ S:  possibilmente sì.((smiling)) non so
probably yes.((smiling)) not know

13  U:  [(al forno        )]
[(at [ArtPre+theMasSin] oven)
[(in the oven    )]

[looking at s and *showing with her hands a folded up pizza]

14  D:  [   come il       ]calzone?^{30} *la pizza chiusa?
[ like the      ]calzone? *theFemSin pizza closed?
[ as a         ] calzone? *a folded up pizza?

15  U:  (  )

looks at D and then U

16 ⇒ S:  sì, è come questo, sì
yes, is like this, yes
yes it is like it yes

17 ⇒ U:  ah ah esatto
ah ah correct
ah ah correct

{29} Italian speciality.
{30} Another Italian speciality.
looking down

18 ⇒ S: yes. yes.

looking at S

19 ⇒ A: accartocciata. accartocciata. accartocciata.

looking at S

20 ⇒ D: accartocciata si chiama. accartocciata PasPro calls3rdPerSin. it is called accartocciata.

In Figure 4.30 the excerpt shows how the nonverbal cues accompanying the narration move the interaction forward and make it easier for the recipients to imagine the shape of the food item the student is searching for. The student becomes engaged in a series of body movements as soon as she asked the question *cosa avete mangiato a pranzo?*/*what did you have for lunch?* in line one. She immediately stops eating and puts her fork on the plate, looks down and readjusts her glasses while she produces a token followed by the repetition of the adverb *oggi*/*today* from the question. It seems that the student is trying to remember what she had, but also to retrieve the necessary words to utter her response. In line three, before she completes her statement *non so il nome*/*I don’t know the name* she already offers a negative assessment shaking her head and looking at A. Line three is characterized by the adversative conjunction *ma*/*but* and two disfluencies in line four and five; however, in the meantime, she is miming with her hands the kind of food she had. While she moves her hands in a rotatory motion, she looks up to her left, this eye movement is considered in neurolinguistic programming as evidence that a person is engaged in retrieving information (Dilts & Epstein, 1995) and in this particular instance the student is probably trying to recall the words to describe the food she had, since she does not know its name. Throughout the student’s explanation, lines seven to ten, her body, especially her hand movements, gives further information about the food whose name she is
trying to retrieve from the other recipients. When D offers a candidate solution with rising intonation, in line eleven, the student replies positively, in line twelve, but her si/’yes’ is preceded by the adverb probabilmente/’probably’ as she does not know the name of the food and therefore she has no certainty. In line thirteen U seems to add another piece of information, but unfortunately his utterance is not clear enough. In line fourteen D asks if the food is similar to a calzone and then she explains that a calzone is a folded up pizza and she accompanies her utterance with the movement of her hands miming a folded up pizza. It is hard to resolve a word search when the word is not known, but the verbal cues accompanied by the embodied cues disambiguate some of the possible misunderstanding and the student confirms that what she had eaten is similar to a calzone in line sixteen. The man confirms as well saying esatto/’correct’ in line seventeen, followed by a positive confirmation from the student in line eighteen. Speaker A acknowledges the solution in line nineteen and D does the same in line twenty incrementing the acknowledgement with the words si chiama/’it is called.’

Another excerpt from a different student clearly shows how speaker and recipients attend not only to the unfolding action, but also to the speaker’s gestures.

Figura 4.31. Data set 9 giugno 2001 v. 03.56 Tegola

01 E: alla mamma cosa hai preso?
toArtPre+theFemSin mom what have2ndSin taken?
what did you get for your mom?

02 (1.2)((she looks at E with a puzzled face))

03 E: a mamma cosa hai comprato?
to mum what have2ndPerSin bought?
what did you buy for your mum?

*looks up

04 ⇒ S: oh, *ahm
05 (0.3)((looks down))
*looks up

06 ⇒ S:  
*ok- ahm
*ok- ahm
*ok- ahm

07 (0.7) ((draws something in the air with her hands))

*looks at D draws in the air  points to the roof

08 ⇒ S:  
*del ahm (. ) il tetto?
*ofArtPre+theMasSin ahm (. ) theMasSin roof?
*of the ahm (. ) the roof?

looks down hands open as if she has a box in them

09 con il
with the
with the

10 (0.1) ((looks at her hands))

looks down and with her hands draws something curved

11 S:  
non-
not-
not-

12 (0.5) ((looking down, mouth open, hands curved))

looks down  
* looks at E

13 ⇒ S:  
non so (. ) la parola ma, *spagnolo?
not know1stPerSin (. ) theFemSin word but, spanishMasSin?
I don ’t know the word but, spanish?

14 ⇒ nella spanish (ail)
inArtPre+theFemSin spanish (ail)
in spanish (ail)

15 ⇒ E:  
(ail) una: tegola.
(ail) a:Fem tile.
(ail) a: tile.

looks at D

16 ⇒ S:  
tegola[ sì]
tile [yes]
tile [yes]

In Figure 4.31 at first the student, when asked what she bought for her mother, is silent for (1.2) pause and assumes a puzzled face while looking at E. E treats the facial expression and the pause as a request of repair as evidenced by fact that she recasts her question in line three. In line four the student answers with a change-of-state token *ahm, a claim that she has now understood the question. She follows with a hesitancy marker *ahm, and in the meantime she is
looking up to the left. This movement that occurred also in the previous excerpt can be considered as an attempt to retrieve information to answer the question or the word that later on will be the object of the search. In line five, there is a (0.3) pause and meanwhile the student looks down as if she is trying to concentrate. In line six she confirms the acknowledgement with ok, followed by another disfluency ahm and once again she looks up. In line seven there is another pause of (0.9), during which the student seems to draw something in the air, and finally in line eight she utters an articulated preposition followed, again, by the perturbation ahm and a micro-pause, then she says roof with an interrogative intonation and pointing in front of her to a roof. In line nine she utters the preposition con/‘with’ and the definite article il/‘the’ masculine and singular, but at the same time she represents with her hands the shape of an object. The student really struggles to recall the word she needs to answer the initial question as her pauses and several attempts to find the word demonstrate. Every turn is built not only with verbal cues but also eye gazes and gestures, whose aim is to offer accurate information about the targeted lexical item to the recipients, who do not intervene as the student has clearly shown to be engaged in a word search that she is trying to solve by herself. In line ten there is another short pause (0.1) in which the student looks at her hands. Then, in line eleven, she utters the negative adverb non/‘not’ that is cut-off and in the meantime she draws with her hands something curved. In line twelve there is another pause (0.5) in which the student looks down, her mouth is open and her hands draw something curved. Finally, in lines thirteen and fourteen, the student recycles the negative adverb and states that she does not know the word while looking down and then she looks at E and utters a word that is not clearly audible ail that recalls the English word for tile that a few lines later will be acknowledged as the word she searched for. The student knows that E speaks English; it might be possible that, unable to find the searched item, she relies on E for
help and she utters the English version of the word she wants to retrieve. It is not clear why the student before uttering the word ail, in line thirteen says a spagnolo/‘in Spanish,’ try-marking it, and in the following line repairs it correcting the preposition from a/‘at’ into nella/‘in the’ and uses the English word Spanish as if she wants to give the Spanish translation of the word she is looking for and then she utters what sounds like the English equivalent of the searched for item. None of the recipients offers a candidate solution during the search as the speaker’s body cues clearly display that she is engaged in a word search and that she is trying to solve it on her own (Schegloff et al., 1977). The student, when engaged in recalling the missing item, does not look at the recipients, but she looks down and this cue is generally interpreted, in many different languages, as stating that there is a personal involvement in the search. When the student looks at E, she is both appealing for help and at the same time she seems to provide the English equivalent of the lexical item she is not able to retrieve, knowing that E can understand it. Since E exchanges eye gaze with the student during the utterance of what seems the English word, the recipient knows that she can now intervene and help in the search as she effectively does.

The excerpt that follows has already been analyzed when presenting the non-lexical perturbations, but it is worthwhile to re-present it to highlight how the student accompanies his search with the movements of his hands to help the recipients target the word he is looking for.

Figure 4.32. Data set 6 giugno 2001 v. 18.35 Bruschetta

```
07  S:  ah:::m *qui o:: >in generale<?
ah:::m *here o::r >in general<?
ah:::m *here or generally speaking?
          *looks at C and opens his arms
08  D:  qu[i qui qui ]
            he[re here he]re
            he[re here he]re
            [ looks at S]
09  C:  [ in genera]le
            [ in genera]l
            [ generally] speaking
```
S looks at D pointing in the air and drawing a circle, then leaning on her lefthand touching the chin, elbow on table

10 D: qui in sicilia, ecco. here in sicily, that's it. here in sicily, that's it.

*looks down *looks at D nodding

11 S: *qui, ah::m (.) *.h il pescespad[a::a::hm] *= *here, ah::m (.) *.h theMasSin swordfis[h::a::hm] *= *here, ah::m (.) *.h swordfis[h::a::hm] *=

[looking at S and *then C ]

[diverts gaze looks down and with his hands forms a circle]

12 D:

[ecco *(vede)hehe ]

[that's *it (see) hehe ]

[that's it *(you see) hehe]

13 S: *mi piace ahm bro- *

*me like ahm bro-

*I like ahm bro-

looks at D

14 S: prociutta. prociutta.

prociutta.

looks at S

15 C: prosciutto?

ham?

ham?

*looks down and then at R moving his hands up and down

16 S: no no nno *ehm bread [(bianco)]bread- no no nno *ehm bread [(white) ]bread- no no nno *ehm bread [(white) ]bread-

[ (bread )]

17 R

[(bread )]

18 D:

eh l'a[ranci-]31

eh theMasSin a[ranci-]

eh a[ranci-]

[ hands in circle

19 S:

[pane: ]

[bread:]

[bread:]

*one hand putting something on top of the other

20 *con pomodoro:

*with tomato:

*with tomato:

In Figure 4.32 the student starts moving his hands at the moment he repairs the question that has been asked a few lines before. In the previous lines he just looks down as if to

31 She means arancino an Italian speciality.
concentrate and recall or retrieve the information to answer or start the repair. It is in line eleven after the repair has been solved that he again looks down as if to think or to retrieve the information necessary to reply. Then he nods his head while confirming that he likes swordfish as suggested by the woman in line six. He continues his turn, looking down, and while saying *mi piace*/*I like* he draws a circle. After disconfirming the try-marked candidate solution offered by C, the student keeps moving his hands while trying to retrieve the word he needs, lines sixteen, nineteen and twenty. It is hard to say if the movements together with the words pronounced by the student helped the recipient in solving the search. However, as in the previous excerpts, it seems obvious that, when engaged in a search, students automatically resort also to gestures as the product of a process of interaction (C. Goodwin, 1979; M. H. Goodwin, 1983).

In sum, during native/non-native speakers’ interactions the participants’ linguistic identities surface (Kurhila, 2006; Orletti, 1994, 2000; Testa, 1988, 1991; Zorzi, 1996, 1998). The non-native speakers display their lack of competence with hesitancy markers and other non-lexical perturbations. When the non-native speakers are not able to solve the problem on their own, they shift their gaze to the native speaker, considered as the one who is competent and has the possible knowledge to resolve the search. However, at first the non-native speakers try to resolve the search on their own, showing once again a preference for self-initiated-self repaired. When trying to solve the search on their own, the students generally look down, sometimes they assume a thinking face as they try to recall and retrieve the word necessary to move on the action.

The progress of the conversation is very important and therefore any possible obstacle to its smooth progression needs to be addressed immediately. Mutual understanding must be restored as soon as possible to be able to move on in the interaction. Students and recipients, in
these data the native speakers, build a collaborative action aimed to fit the unfolding course of speech. The analysis of body postures and eye gazes during word search demonstrates how different forms of participations are required according to the framework of the ongoing search. As Hayashi (2003a) states “talk and other bodily conduct constantly provide a context for one another, and progressively elaborate one another’s meaning at each moment in the unfolding course of action in interaction” (p. 168). Non-native speakers’ utterances can hence be difficult to comprehend and an accompanying gesture can help disambiguate what is said in the talk. At the same time a gesture can be hard to understand without the specification of the co-occurring talk.

Streeck (1988, 1993, 1994) has extensively analyzed the importance of gestures in contextualizing upcoming utterances, as well as how gestures are deployed and adapted to the constraints of the conversational interaction. He highlights how speakers initiating a gesture normally turn their gaze to their hands at the onset of the gesture. In this way they indicate that the oncoming movement is relevant for the understanding of the emerging talk. Students in our data very often concentrate their gazes on the movements of their hands while attempting to retrieve the missing lexical item, captivating the attention of the recipients.

Eye gazes, pre-positioned speakers’ gestures, and explicit word search markers provide a projection to the recipient, who can, then, anticipate and formulate the possible candidate solution to the speaker’s word search.

4.5 Word Search Resolution

The speakers who cannot complete their turn because they are looking for a targeted lexical item exploit a variety of options to make the relevant word recognizable by other means,
such as producing an alternative to the missing word, or appeal for assistance so that the recipient offers a candidate solution that the speaker can accept or reject.

Non-native speakers engaged in finding a word can either try to self-initiate self-repair or appeal for assistance and jointly construct the utterance with the recipients and therefore the search would be self-initiated other-repaired. Jung (2004) in his study presents three different ways used by foreign language learners to ask for help in word searches: (1) formulaic expressions such as “How can I say;” (2) code switching; and (3) similar sounding words.

The excerpts (Figure 4.33, Figure 4.34, and Figure 4.35) will show how learners of Italian solve the search, also using some of the strategies highlighted by Jung.

**Figure 4.33.** Data set 9 giugno 2001 v. 23.27 Cibo Americano

01 S: sembra che il cibo americano è una:: seems3rdPersIn that the food american is aFem::

02 (0.1) ((oking down and moving hands))

looking at S

03 D: (che è elaborato di più?) (that is elaborated of more) (that is more elaborated)

opens her arms and looks at D *looks at E

04 ⇒ S: ahm, (. ) sl. un-[un] *espermente con (. ) ahm, (. ) yes. a-[a ] *experiment(s) with (. ) ahm, (. ) yes. a-[a ] *experiment(s) with (. )

05 U: [ ]

moving the right arm back and forth

06 S: <tutti gli altri cibi>. ( )

<allMasPl theMasPL otherMasPl food>. ( )

<all other food>. ( )

The excerpt in Figure 4.33 shows how the student at the end of her turn, in line one, stretches the last letter of the article and then there is a (0.1) pause while she looks down and moves her hands. As soon as she hears the woman taking the floor she turns her gaze towards her. The woman provides a try-marked explanation to the search in which the student is
involved. In line four the student opens her arms and confirms what the woman uttered, but she continues her turn and cuts off the article, then she recycles it followed by _esperimente/_perimental(s),_ the word sought, and completes her turn. In this sequence, even if the student accepts the woman’s candidate explanation, she continues her search and solves it by herself and in this way she can complete her action that had been halted by the upcoming search.

In another excerpt, Figure 4.34, the student completes her search without relying on the recipients’ help; the search is self-initiated self-repaired. It is also one of the two examples where the search can be considered a grammatical one according to the definitions given by Kurhila (2006). Kurhila states that the distinction lies in the way speakers initiate the search. Grammatical searches are those instances in which speakers begin a word and then the focus is shifted to some grammatical part of it. The speaker might be able to produce the stem of the word, but is not able to complete the word, as is the case in the two examples discussed next.

_Figure 4.34._ Data set 30 maggio 2001 v. 1.10.38 Requirement

01  S:  no::: ero::: ahm
      no::: was::: ahm
      no::: i was::: ahm

02  (1.8)

03  ⇒  S:  no ero finita _ con (requirement) quando sono
      no was finishedFemSin with (requirement) when am
      no I was finished with the requirements when I am

04  arrivata  all’università perché ho preso
      arrivedFemSin toArtPre+theFemSin univer[sity because] have
      got  into  the  univer[sity because] I took

In line one of Figure 4.34, first the student elongates the final vowel of the negation, then she stretches the final vowel of the following verb before uttering a hesitation mark _ahm_. These perturbations are followed by a long silence (1.8) that stresses the involvement of the student in a search. However, after the pause she recycles the previous negation and the verb, followed by
what is a possible solution to the search. The student produces an incorrect verb form that is, 
however, easily understood in Italian. In fact nobody, in the following lines, addresses the 
incorrect form with a repair. Once the search is solved the student completes her turn without 
any further troubles.

The data that follow show a search that is completed by the student herself, but she is not 
sure so she switches code and try-marks the English corresponding words. Even this search hides 
a grammatical one as the student cuts off the Italian word before the final vowel, probably 
because she is not sure of the plural form of the word. In fact when she acknowledges the 
confirmation she first repeats both the isolated noun volte/‘times’ and the whole noun phrase tre 
volte/‘three times’ so as to be sure to transform the input into intake to become a possible correct 
outcome in her future interactions.

Figura 4.35. Data set 29 maggio 2001 v. 45.03 Tre volte

01 S: oh::: no no no ahm a una altro collegio  
oh::: no no no ahm at anFemSin otherMasSin college  
oh::: no no no ahm at another college

02 che ho visto: prima di andare a–  
that havelstPerSin seen before of go a–  
that I have seen before going to a–

03 ⇒ è trei volt– tre ahm ah times?  
is threa tim– three ahm ah times?  
is threa tim– three ahm ah times?

04 ⇒ A: volte giusto  
timesFemPl correct  
times correct

05 ⇒ S: volte [tre volte ]  
times [three times]  
times [three times]

06 ⇒ U: [tre volte ]giu[sto ]  
[three times]cor[rect]  
[three times]cor[rect]

In the first line, Figure 4.35, the student immediately produces a stretched sound followed
by three negative adverbs and the hesitancy token *ahm* showing that a trouble is upcoming. In the second line, the final vowel of the verb is stretched and then she, first, cuts off the preposition without completing her turn and in line three she starts a new turn and she cuts off the word she is trying to produce *volte*/*times.* Then she produces two more tokens and the word she is looking for in the English version with rising intonation, directing it to the ‘knowing participant(s)’ (C. Goodwin, 1987) who immediately confirm that her attempted candidate solution was correct in line four. The student uses the try-marked English equivalent of the word she searched for to solicit the intervention of the native speaker as the expert that can dissolve the doubt. The expert responds immediately to the solicitation repeating the word and stating that is correct. In line five the student confirms the solution, repeating first the word and then the phrase. Finally, the man confirms the solution as well, repeating it in overlap with the student and adding *giusto*/*correct,* mirroring the candidate solution offered in line four.

Non-native speakers also appeal for assistance when they have completed the search by themselves, as the previous example shows, because they need confirmation from the native speaker. The Italian speakers in these data do not show such a procedure; once the item is retrieved they do not try-mark it for confirmation since they know that the candidate solution fits in the slot. This does not mean that try-marking does not occur in native word searches, but it occurs when the speaker is trying to retrieve the name of a person and she/he is not sure of the name, as the following excerpt from our Italian native speakers’ data shows.

*Figure 4.36. Data set 6 giugno 2001 v. Antonio*

01 C:  c’era con te anche:::m il figlio della professoressa moro,
      there was with you also:::m the son of the professorFemSin moro,

02 D:  sì
       yes
       yes
This excerpt, Figure 4.36, is part of a longer conversation in which the host mother (D), her older son (R), and D’s colleague (C) are involved. They are talking about a school trip the older son took part in and the colleague, in the first line, states that Professor Moro’s son participated as well. In line two, the son acknowledges C’s statement with a simple *sì/yes*’ and, in line three, she affirms that she can’t remember the name of her colleague’s son. D immediately offers a candidate solution with a falling intonation, followed by a tag question. The son after uttering a disfluency *ehm*, answers with a *no/’no,* in line five. In line six the woman proffers a new possible solution, but this time it is try-marked, showing that she is not sure she is remembering the right name. The colleague accepts and confirms the new solution, repeating the name *Antonio* in line seven. The woman repeats the name again in the following line so as to acknowledge it once again; however, it is the colleague who finally concludes the series of acknowledgments repeating the name two more times in line nine.
The next instance is interesting as the student thinks he has found the targeted item, but he soon realizes that he was wrong and finally the search is solved by one of the recipients.

*Figure 4.37.* Data set 6 giugno 2001 v. 18.35 Bruschetta

01 C: come cibo, qual è il cibo che
as food, what is the food

02 ti è piaciuto di più?
youObjPro is liked of more?
did you like most?

03 S: ah::: *di più ah:::m
of more ah:::m
ah::: *most ah:::m

04 Rn: il pane
bread

05 looks at C
*looks down

06 S: ehehehe[hehehehehe *si]eheh
ehehehe[hehehehehe *si]eheh
ehehehe[hehehehehe *si]eheh

07 D: [il pescespada ]
[swordfish ]

08 looks at C and opens his arms

09 S: ah:::m *qui o in (generale)?
*here or in (general)?
ah:::m *here or (generally) speaking?

10 C: [ in general]e
[ generally] speaking

11 S: *qui, ah:::m (.)*.h il pescespad[a:::hm ]=
*here, ah:::m (.)*.h theMasSin swordfish[h:::hm ]=
*here, ah:::m (.)*.h swordfish[h:::hm ]=
D: [looking at S and *then C   ]
[ ecco *(vede)hehe]
[ that's it *(see)hehe ]
[ that's it *(you see)hehe ]

*diverts gaze looks down and with his hands forms a circle

S: *=mi piace ahm bro-
*=me like ahm bro-
=* I like ahm bro-

looks at D

S: prociutta.
prociutta.
prociutta.

looks at S

C: prosciutto?
ham?
ham?

*looks down and then at R moving his hands up and down

S: no no nno *ehm bread [(bianco)]bread-
no no nno *ehm bread [(white)]bread-
no no nno *ehm bread [(white)]bread-
[  
  
  looks down hands forming a circle
]

R  
[(bread)]

D: eh l'a[ranci-]
eh theMasSin a[ranci-]
eh a[ranci-]
  
  looks down hands forming a circle

S: 
[pane ]:
[bread ]:

looks at D, one hand putting something on top of the other

C on pomodoro:
with tomato:
with tomato:

looks at S and then C

D: ah la bruschetta.
ah theFemSin bruschetta.
ah bruschetta.

U: [la bruschetta ]
[the bruschetta]
[bruschetta ]
[  
  touching his head with the left hand
]

S: [la bruschetta ]
[the bruschetta]
[ bruschetta ]
[  
]

C: [ah bruschetta]
[ah bruschetta]
[ah bruschetta]
In Figure 4.37 the student proffers what he thinks is the solution to the word search, but the word he utters is not a correct Italian word and it sounds like the word *prosciutto*/*ham*. In fact in line fifteen C repairs it, try-marking her utterance. The student, in line sixteen, immediately rejects the try-marked candidate solution and starts a new search displayed by the use of the hesitancy token *ehm*, by switching code and using the English word bread and another unintelligible word, maybe uttered in Italian. Since the student looks at the boy sitting next to him while uttering his turn and is thus displaying that he needs help, in line seventeen the boy says something that unfortunately is not audible. In line eighteen the mother offers a candidate solution that is cut off as the student starts a new turn displayed visually by the movements of his hands that mime the action of putting something, probably the tomato, on the bread accompanied by the words *pane con pomodoro*/*bread with tomato*. In line twenty-one, finally the woman realizes what lexical item the student has been struggling to recall and after a change of state token *ah* she produces the solution with final intonation. The candidate solution is accepted by the student in line twenty-three by repeating the item in overlap with the man and the colleague. While repeating the word the student touches his head with a gesture that clearly suggests that he had forgotten the word he was looking for. The gesture causes a general outburst of laughter. In line twenty-six, while looking down, the student utters what he had previously gestured *ho*
dimenticato/‘I have forgotten.’ This clearly demonstrates how gestures are strictly correlated and support the interaction. The student, at first, indicates that he ‘has forgotten the word’ deploying a gesture triggered well before the utterance of the corresponding lexical string that is, then, repeated twice so as to stress that he is really embarrassed not to remember such an easy word. In line twenty-seven the woman repeats once again the solution with final intonation. In the following line the student repeats that he has forgotten the word and apologizes. There is another occasion when a student apologizes, but in the other data she apologizes because she made a mistake and the child corrects her. The participants manage to establish mutual understanding exploiting verbal and non-verbal cues and they finally seal the regained intersubjectivity with the confirmations in line twenty-four and twenty-seven.

The mispronounced candidate solution in line fourteen forces the student to engage in a long negotiation during which he looks down to his hands so as to attract the recipients’ attention to what he is doing or he looks at the recipients to appeal for assistance to solve the search. This confirms Streeck’s finding

Speakers withdraw their gaze from wherever it is and temporarily aim it at their own hands. Typically, the speaker’s eyes reach the hands as these are beginning to gesticulate, and a gaze is returned to the interlocutor while the speaker utters the key word, the word that formulates the meaning of the gesture (given that such an affiliate exists) (Streeck, 1994, p. 239).

The next data segment, Figure 4.38, shows a student that does not reject the candidate solution, but she switches code and proffers the name searched in English.

*Figure 4.38. Data set 31 maggio 2001 v. 06.46 Il cane*

01 C: che razza?
what breed?
what breed?
In Figure 4.38, upon being asked about the breed of her dog, the student in her turn, line two, immediately produces two hesitancy tokens flagged by the interrogative *come dite in italiano?* "how do you say it in Italian?" and in the meantime she smiles at the man, appealing clearly for help. As the man is half through the candidate solution, the student, in overlap, names
the breed in English and repeats it twice. The first time she gives the complete name *british spaniel*, the second time it seems that she is trying to translate it into Italian (line five). In the following line, the colleague initiates repair, saying *cocker* with rising intonation and she repeats, specifying *cocker spaniel* in line eight. The student rejects the name and she cuts off her turn while saying that it is another kind of spaniel. She does not complete the turn because of the cut off and the colleague completes the student’s interrupted turn in line ten, partially overlapped by the student’s repetition of the breed’s name and a confirmation token *sì/*yes.’ In line twelve the colleague acknowledges the solution of the trouble with the token ‘ahah.’ The participants then resume the interaction. As Kurhila (2006) affirms “completion turns are produced as a response to the hesitancy marking and the gaze shift by the non-native speaker” (p. 130); however, even if completions from the native speakers are asserted more then suggested, the non-native speaker has still the choice to accept or reject them.

This excerpt shows how the student, after initiating a word search, is not able to retrieve the lexical item and appeals for help switching code and saying in English that she does not know it in English.

*Figure 4.39. Data set 30 maggio 2001 v. 1.05.35 Stipendio*

01 D:  [ quanto danno ] di stipendio?  
        [ how much give]3rdPerPl of salary?  
        [ how much is ]the salary?  

02 F:  [(sono contenta)]  
        [(am happy) ]  
        [(I am happy) ]  
        looks down looks at F  

03 ⇒ S:  ahm::: quasi,  
          ahm::: almost,  
          ahm::: almost,  

04 (0.1)  

05 S:  °°.hh i don’t know°° ((in English))
In Figure 4.39, the woman asks the student how much she earns in line one; the student, in line three, produces a hesitation token followed by the adverb quasi/‘almost,’ then there is a (0.1) pause and in line five she says in English and in a very soft voice I don’t know.

Immediately after, in line six, she repeats the same clause in Italian non so/‘I don’t know’ followed by a cut-off word com-. In line seven a new perturbation precedes her attempt to produce the required answers that is cut off as well quaranta-/‘forty-.’ In the meantime she looks at F, who offers the completion to the solution with a rising intonation. In line nine the student positively acknowledges the completion repeating si/‘yes’ twice and nodding at the same time. In line ten the friend acknowledges the conclusion of the search, repeating the complete phrase with falling intonation.

The following data segment has been analyzed in the previous sections and it is reproduced again as it is a good example of how extensive a search can become. When the students are trying to find a word they do not know, gazes or explicit word search markers are
very important to achieve a result that satisfies both the speaker and the recipient in restoring mutual understanding.

*Figure 4.40.* Data set 29 maggio 2001 v. 21.21 L’accartocciata

01  **A:** cosa avete mangiato oggi a pranzo?  
**what have**2nd**PerSin eaten today at lunch?**  
**what did you have for lunch today?**

She puts down her fork on the plate, she looks down at the plate with the left hand adjusts her glasses

02  **S:**  
**ahm oggi,** (.)  
**ahm today,** (.)

shakes her head laterally, looks shortly to A.

03  ⇒  
**non so,** (. ) **il nome.**  
**I don’t know (. ) the name**

positions her hands in front of her mid-air and looks at them and rotating the right hand over the left one

04  **ma è un ahm:**  
**but is an Mas ahm: an**

she looks up while moving her hands

05  **ahm::=**  
**ahm::=**  
**ahm::=**

student looks at c1

06  **C1:** un’altra volta?  
**an other time?**  
**once again?**

hands in midair with a rotating movement

07  **S:** prosciutto  
**ham**

looks down at her plate rotating her hands in front of her  
*her hands positioned to represent something in the middle*

08  **e formag*gio**  
**and chee*se**  
**and chee*se**

looks at D

09  **nel centro.**  
**inArtPre+theMasSin center**  
**in the middle**

rotates one hand around the other and then lowers hands

10  **e un tipo di:[pane ]**  
**and aMas type of:[bread]**  
**and a sort of [bread]**
In Figure 4.40, line three, the students immediately admits that she does not know the noun that refers to the food item in question. Before admitting her lack of knowledge she deploys different non-verbal cues to address her engagement in a word search. Eye gazes and gestures

---

32 Italian speciality.
33 Another Italian speciality.
accompany her entire turn in order to explain the kind and shape of the food she had. Even if in line eleven D offers a candidate solution with rising intonation and the student replies *possibilmente sì* ‘possibly yes’ the search is not closed as the student demonstrates that she is not sure. In line thirteen U seems to add another piece of information, but unfortunately his utterance is not clear. It is in line sixteen that the student confirms that the candidate solution in line eleven is the word she is searching for. After that D explains to her that *accartocciata* is similar to a *calzone*, a folded pizza, miming a folded up pizza with her hands. In order to acknowledge the resolution of the search the man confirms it, saying *esatto* ‘correct’ in line seventeen. Then the student confirms again in line eighteen. The aunt acknowledges the solution, in line nineteen, and D does the same in line twenty, incrementing the acknowledgement with the words *si chiama* ‘it is called.’ It is hard to resolve a word search when the word is not known, but the verbal cues accompanied by the embodied cues disambiguate some of the possible misunderstanding.

Another excerpt from a different student clearly shows how speaker and recipients attend not only to the unfolding action, but also to the speaker’s gestures and eye gazes.

*Figura 4.41.* Data set 9 giugno 2001 v. 03.56 Tegola

01 E:  alla mamma cosa hai preso?  
toArtPre+theFemSin mom what have2ndSin taken?  
what did you get for your mom?  

02 (1.2)((she looks at E with a puzzled face))

03 E:  a mamma cosa hai comprato?  
to mum what have2ndPerSin bought?  
what did you buy for your mum?  

04 *looks up  
S:  oh, *ahm  
*ahm  
*ahm  
*ahm

05 (0.3)((looks down))
In Figure 4.41 it is remarkable how the student, turn by turn, builds the word search and that none of the recipients jumps in to offer a candidate solution until she looks at E and gives the possible English translation of the word. “Though such recipients orient to the speaker, they remain silent, and thus grant the speaker the opportunity to find the word on their own” (C. Goodwin, 1987, p. 117), they do so until their help is solicited which in this particular case
occurs via eye gaze.

The resolution of a word search reestablishes intersubjectivity and the course of the action that was interrupted is resumed. To reach a mutual understanding the speaker and the recipients exploit all sorts of communicative strategies in mutual collaboration. However, the recipient does not intervene in helping to solve the search unless the speaker clearly states that s/he needs help and or they appeal for help by eye gaze as in Figure 4.35, Figure 4.38, Figure 4.39, Figure 4.40, and Figure 4.41. In order to appeal for help the students in these data, besides relying on formulaic expressions or eye gazes, sometimes used code switching, but did not use similar sounding words. When the students look for a word that they have never seen or heard before the negotiation is longer and they have to rely on the native-speaker to solve the search. As Hinnekamp (cited in Zorzi1998) states, conversational problems are repaired taking account of the identity attributed to the recipient. The speakers by flagging their searches, attracting the attention of the recipients with gestures or eye gaze, make evident that they feel insecure about the appropriateness and correctness of what they are about or want to say and thus they entitle the recipients to be the expert and solicit their interventions.

4.6 Conclusion

A word search is when a speaker breaks off a turn in progress, not modifying anything previously said, but pauses to search for the continuation of her or his turn (Schegloff, 1979b; Schegloff et al., 1977; Sorjonen, 1997 as cited in Helasvuuo et al., 2004) and this is common to native and non-native speakers. Typical ways of initiating a word search include stretching word final sounds, separate search sounds (“ehm,” “ahm,” “m,“), and pausing. Studies investigating the intricate relationship between language and body (Crawford Camiciottoli, 2004; C. Goodwin, 1987; M. H. Goodwin, 1983; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986;
Ricci-Bitti, 1987; Streeck, 1988, 1993, 1994) have demonstrated how interactions are contextualized not only by the verbal cues but also by embodied cues. Changing body and gaze orientation and deploying gestures provide important resources for participants “to organize relevant action in concert with one another” (Hayashi, 2003a, p. 123). Non-native speakers rely especially on iconic gestures to disambiguate their verbal utterances during word searches. The excerpts in these data show students assuming a thinking face, as we find in the Italian data, while targeting the lexical items. They are engaged in clarifying with the movements of their hands the meaning of their verbal production to simplify a possible resolution. As is the case in native-native talk (Schegloff, 1984), the iconic gesture preceded, most of the time, the onset of the utterance, giving the opportunity to the students to attract the attention of the recipients to their body movements.

In this phase of the interaction students divert their gaze from the recipient and look down at their hands. It is only when the students gaze at the recipients that they then intervene, proffering a candidate solution. In the Italian data iconic gestures accompany interactions, but do not play a key role in disambiguating the searches, probably because searches targeted abstract nouns, proper and general names and less objects or food-related items as in the non-native speakers’ search in our data. Moreover, the Italian data show instances of collaborative completion even if the participants do not make eye contact.

At a later stage, speakers may also make the search more explicit with formulaic expressions, such as questions like “how do you say it?” (Schegloff et al., 1977; C. Goodwin, 1987). This expression is used by native and non-native speakers to display difficulty with a vocabulary problem directly so that, in the next turn, the participants could respond to it by supplying the target word or proffering a candidate solution word.
Word searches are constructed in real time in face-to-face interaction. Lerner (1996) described word searches as being grammatically designed for conditional entry by recipients. These phenomena allow for collaborative completion. Collaborative completion is typically designed so that only the next word sought is produced and the primary speaker who initiated the word search may resume her or his turn. Both native and non-native speakers data show collaborative completions but, while in students’ data a word search expanded into long sequences, the Italian data, instead, presented shorter sequences. This characteristic is probably due to the lack, on the non-native speakers’ part, of sufficient linguistic competence to facilitate the resolution of the search in shorter times. Occasionally, the learners used an English word, even when the co-participants were not able to understand it. In these instances, the learner was searching for a targeted item by producing the word in their tongue, as well as targeting the trouble source. That is, even though the co-participants could not understand what the trouble source was, the L1 word signals that a word search is underway, and thereby appeals to the other participants to guess or provide the target word, treating the code switches as self-initiated repair. It is significant that the L2 speakers in the Italian data often signal their membership in the family. They often first appeal for help to their peers or other members of the host family, when they flag their word search with an interrogative.

Moreover, most of the word searches of the native speakers occur during story telling and therefore, as soon as the search is completed, the telling is resumed. In our data non-native speakers present less opportunity of telling a story and most of the time the word search is triggered by a question they have been asked. Consequently, once the lexical item is found, the action that was on hold is completed and the conversation moves on. When non-native speakers self-initiated and self-repaired a search, the candidate solution was always proffered with rising
intonation; while in the native speakers’ data the possible solutions were not try-marked. The non-native speakers offering their solution as a candidate resolution identify themselves as not having enough linguistic competence to acknowledge their choice and therefore they need the native speakers’ acknowledgement. Sometime students and recipients confirmed the candidate solutions repeatedly, two or more times, as it often happens in L2 classrooms.

During word searches in native/non-native speakers’ interaction, Italians, who normally jump into the conversation to provide a candidate solution during native speakers’ word searches, wait to offer a candidate solution until the learner explicitly appeals for help. This different behavior can be related to the fact that native speakers do not want to disrupt the student’s ongoing search nor threaten their faces. Besides the candidate solution is proffered with a rising intonation probably because they are not sure whether the offered lexical item is the one the student is looking for and it needs to be confirmed.

In sum, the repair sequences occurred in a very systematic way. The location of the use of the resources (i.e., repair initiator) was either (a) after an uncertain candidate solution (i.e., trouble source) or (b) in a location of a trouble source. In addition, the students’ use of the resources to initiate repair is not only to deal with production problems in the talk, but also to display and construct their identities as non-native speakers in the interaction (Mori, 2003; Wong, 2000b).

Moreover, the examined data show that non-native speakers are generally able to discern the right word from many possible solutions, on the basis of their knowledge of the sought for word. This demonstrates how the learner’s lexical knowledge should be considered as a continuum presenting different degrees and dimensions of knowledge. In other words, it affirms that, even if the non-native speaker cannot produce the target item, the learners’ receptive knowledge enables
them to accept or reject the candidate solution provided by the recipient/s, resolve the search and resume the conversation.

The findings of this chapter confirm previous research (Carroll, 2004; Olsher, 2004) stating that native/non-native speakers interactions do not differ from first language use. The L2 learners demonstrate they were able to apply their conversational skills fully as they were able to offer not only verbal hints but also appropriate non-verbal cues to facilitate the resolution of the search. Moreover, the use of non-lexical perturbation at the beginning or within a turn should not be seen as highlighting the lack of fluency of the learners, but as a strategy to maintain the turn and to show that they wanted to say more. Another important aspect is that native speakers tend not to correct grammatical mistakes unless they might really hinder the communication, while students sometimes aim to be grammatically correct and therefore solicit the intervention of the native speaker as expert. It is difficult to track any learning process that occurred during the searches as the data are gathered during a short elapse of time. However, it might be assumed that the students have at least had the possibility to be exposed to new input, which has probably been transformed into ‘intake,’ though we do not know if it will be turned into output in the future. Moreover, the learners’ ability to recognize the word they searched for, even if they have never heard it before, demonstrates their ability to create a connection between their background knowledge of the language and the new lexical knowledge, activating all their skills to discern the appropriate solution. As Hosoda (2006) affirms

L2 speakers occasionally assumed the roles of (relative) ‘novice’ through such activities as seeking help on L2 vocabulary and repeating corrected words, while the L1 speakers took on (relative) ‘expert’ roles by supplying lexical items and pursuing L2 speakers’ uptake. Whether inside or outside of formal teaching settings, when participants orient to
their differential expertise in the target language, opportunities for L2 learning arise—
although such opportunities are in no way limited to the moments when linguistic
competence becomes a participant concern (p. 44).

In sum, non-native speakers show to be competent interactants even though they are not
competent speakers. Their expertise in using non-verbal behavior allows the recipients to help
the students solve the word search and restore intersubjectivity. Their linguistic identities surface
when they want to show that certain features are not signs of incompetence.
Chapter Five: Conclusion

This concluding chapter summarizes the main findings of this study on interactional practices called “repair,” specifically “word searches,” which are characterized by speakers’ displays of hesitancy markers and their difficulty in retrieving the linguistic item relevant to establish an intersubjective understanding during Italian L1 and L2 dinner table conversations. It will also discuss implications for CA studies on L1-L2 interactions, SLA implications, and directions for future research.

5.1 Main Findings

The main objective of this study has been to apply CA to investigate a particular feature of a specific repair practice, namely word searches, in L1-L2 speakers of Italian during naturally occurring conversations. Specifically, this study addressed the following questions:

1. How do participants organize word searches? How do they initiate a search, how does it progress and finally how is it resolved or abandoned?

2. How do participants make it clear that they are engaged in a search and what non-verbal cues do they use to unravel the search and to appeal for help?

3. How do participants restore the intersubjectivity that has been disrupted by the search?

4. Are there any unique or special features that characterize word searches in Italian L1 speakers and Italian L2 speakers?

5. What contribution does the present CA study on L1 and L2 word searches in Italian conversations make to second language learning and teaching?

I attempted to address questions 1, 2, and 3 throughout Chapters three and four, dealing with the characteristics of Italian native speakers’ word searches in Chapter three and of Italian non-native speakers’ word searches in Chapter four. Questions 4 and 5 are addressed
in the present chapter. The analytic focus and findings in each chapter can be summarized as follows.

The theme of Chapter three was to investigate how Italian participants in conversation engage in word search sequences. It analyzed how speakers signal the upcoming difficulty, how they deal with it, how potential solutions or requests for help are formulated, and finally how they achieve an intersubjective understanding with the other co-participant/s.

This investigation showed that Italian speakers who are engaged in a word search very often turn the search into a multi-party activity in which collaboration becomes relevant (cf. Sacks, 1972; M. H. Goodwin, 1983; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Lerner, 1996; Hayashi, 2003a, 2003b). The activity of searching for a word provides the opportunity for a joint construction of the utterance in progress. Italian participants in a conversation pay close attention to each other’s vocal and visual behavior to actively participate in the ongoing word search activity and accomplish the co-construction of the utterance in progress.

Italians, just like English, Japanese, and German speakers (cf. Schegloff et al., 1977; Egbert, 2009; Hayashi, 2003a, 2003b; Betz, 2008), initiate word searches by displaying some trouble in producing a next element of talk when it is due. Such ‘non-lexical speech perturbations’ can be sound stretches, word cut-offs, and intra-turn pauses. Among the perturbations used by Italians we find tokens such as “eh,” “ehm” or “m,” similar to the ones analyzed in other languages (cf. Fox et al., 1996; Schegloff et al., 1977, for English; Fox et al., 1996; Hayashi, 2003a, 2003b, for Japanese; Streeck, 1996, for Ilokano; Streeck, 1996; Egbert 2009, for German; Helasvuo et al. 2004, for Finnish); however, the different sound markers that the Italian language presents are inherent to the characteristic phonological inventory of the language.
Non-lexical speech perturbations may co-occur with or may be followed by body movements, such as gaze shifts and/or manual and facial gestures to signal the beginning of a word search (cf. Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Hayashi, 2003a, 2003b; Heath, 1992; Streeck, 1993). Italian speakers often withdraw their gaze from their recipients with a characteristic “thinking face” (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986) when they are engaged in a word search. Ricci-Bitti (1987) affirms that Italians have a rather rich repertoire of gestures as the data of the present investigation show. Some of them are triggered as soon as speakers ‘look for’ the lexical items to express their idea. It has been shown that gestures can precede the utterance and facilitate their production (cf. Caldognetto et al., 1987; Kendon, 1972, 1981, 1983, 1995; McNeill, 1992; Schegloff, 1984; Streeck, 1988). They are “the working memory” (Ricci-Bitti, 1987) of the speaker’s talk in progress. A variety of manual and facial gestures, as well as iconic gestures, are displayed during word searches, especially during the thinking face; such gestures highlight the speaker’s cognitive processes. Research on word searches both in ordinary and institutional talk (cf. Hayashi, 2003a, 2003b; Kurhila, 2006; Streeck, 1993, 1994), and in the ESL classroom context (cf. Seo, 2008; Lee, 2004; Willey, 2001) have demonstrated that eye gaze can be considered a crucial element in resolving a word search. This research has shown how the speakers’ gaze is directed to the other participants either when the search is completed or when they appeal for help and solicit the recipients’ active intervention to solve the search. However, our data show that Italian recipients offer a possible candidate solution to the speaker even when there was no eye contact or appeal for help. It seems that Italians favor a resolution of the search that is carried out jointly and done as a collaborative completion to create and to manifest affiliation with the speakers and their talk. Word searches in Italian might trigger membership categorization (cf. Egbert, 1997b, 2004; Maheux-Pelletier & Golato, 2008) in that the recipient
intervenes without any solicitation to solve the search, demonstrating that s/he is on the same wavelength with the speaker. As Zorzi (1998) affirms, such collaborations seem not to threaten the speaker’s face, confirming the preference for self-initiated other-repair. Some speakers flag their search for a word with interrogatives that vocalize their urge to be helped in the retrieval process as has been noticed in other languages (i.e., Brouwer, 2003 for Danish; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986 for English; Kurhila, 2006 for Finnish), as well as with a whirling movement of the hand.

In a word search, the turn constructional unit is interrupted by the ongoing search and the course of action is put on hold as well (Sacks et al., 1974/2006; Schegloff et al., 1977; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Lerner, 1996). The disrupted TCU in progress provides potential slots for the other recipients to offer a candidate solution that sometimes is acknowledged and accepted with “si” or “ecco” or by repetition. It has been shown that in word searches carried out in English, native speakers generally offer a candidate solution with an upward intonation. Lerner (1996) suggested that many word search candidates are given with rising intonation so that they can be confirmed or disconfirmed by the current speaker. The recipient, by providing a candidate solution with upward intonation, hands the decision to the speaker, partially complying with the preference for self-repair over other-repair. However, in our data we did not find any candidate solution offered with rising intonation, except for two particular instances: When the speakers were engaged in retrieving a person’s name and in the data where a child initiates a search to remember the title of a song and carries it out with the same identical characteristics of a word search. The absence of question-intoned candidate solutions proffered by Italian native speakers might confirm the studies on Italian intonation (Agard & di Pietro as cited in Grice, 1995; Grice 1995; Marotta, 2001), which showed that Italians, particularly in naturally occurring interactions,
tend to use high pitch at the level of the nucleus and low pitch or a leveled contour in the peripheral phrase.

As it appears for other languages, such as American English and German, the interruption within the TCU almost always involves noun or prepositional phrases and the recycled chunks generally involve the functional heads in prepositional phrases or determiner phrases. Most word searches in our data deal with lexical items or proper names and there is only one instance of a search for a verb. Sometimes speakers have trouble in finding or formulating a next item in their ongoing utterance, consequently they produce a “placeholder” (Hayashi, 2003a) in the slot in which the unavailable item had to be produced and complete their utterance. Italian speakers deploy the word *cosa*/*thing*’ for an item that is momentarily unavailable to the speaker when it is due, projecting a prospective specification that will replace the place-holding item.

The analysis of word searches in Italian native speakers showed that most of the results of previous research, conducted in languages other than Italian, apply also to Italian, except for two particular features. In these data, recipients spontaneously offer a candidate solution even when the speaker does not make eye contact or explicitly appeal for help. The second feature is that candidate solutions are not try-marked as it occurs in other languages; this characteristic might be related to the different intonation pattern that the Italian language presents.

The objective of Chapter four was to examine the strategies employed by Italian L2 speakers engaged in word searches. Typical ways, both for native and non-native speakers, of initiating a word search include non-lexical speech perturbations (e.g., stretching word final sounds, separate search sounds [“ehm,” “ahm,” “m”], and pausing).
Non-native speakers rely especially on iconic gestures to disambiguate their verbal utterances during word searches. As is the case in native-native talk in English (Schegloff, 1984) and in Italian (Chapter 3), the iconic gesture precedes, most of the time, the onset of the utterance. Thus students have the opportunity to attract the attention of the recipients to their bodily movements. Changing body and gaze orientation as well as deploying gestures provide important resources for participants “to organize relevant action in concert with one another within the ongoing activity” (Hayashi, 2003a, p. 123).

In the present data the L2 students, as well as the Italian native speakers, assumed the typical thinking face described by Goodwin and Goodwin (1986) while targeting a lexical item. The students, engaged in clarifying with their hand movements the meaning of their verbal production to favor a possible and rapid resolution of the word search, focus their gaze on their hands to attract the recipients’ attention. It is only when the students look back at the recipients that the recipients then intervene proffering a candidate solution. In the present Italian native speakers’ data iconic gestures accompany interactions, but do not play a key role in disambiguating the searches, probably because searches targeted abstract nouns, proper and general names. On the contrary, non-native speakers searched for objects or food-related items, at least in our data, and their iconic gestures were, instead, essential to resolve the search. This analysis shows how important it is, when analyzing talk-in-interaction, especially in native/non-native interactions, to take into consideration not only talk, but also a wider range of communicative behaviors. Such modalities include not only gaze, gesture, and body orientation, but also the spatial framework surrounding the participants to the conversation. As Hayashi (2003a) asserts, talk should be considered as “a temporally unfolding, interactively sustained domain of embodied action through which both the speaker and recipients build in concert with
one another relevant actions that contribute to the further progression of the activity in progress” (Hayashi, 2003a, p. 171).

Word searches are constructed in real time in face-to-face interaction. Lerner (1996) described word searches as being grammatically designed for conditional entry by recipients. These phenomena allow for jointly constructing utterances. Collaborative completion is typically designed so that only the next word sought is produced by the co-participant and the primary speaker who initiated the word search may resume her or his turn and complete the action that was momentarily put on hold. In these L1 data the search was also collaboratively solved even if the speaker did not make eye contact with the recipients, whereas in the L2 data the native speakers waited to intervene until the non-native speakers shifted their gaze from the gesture to the co-participant(s).

Both native and non-native speakers data show collaborative completions but, while in the students’ data a word search expanded into long sequences (cf. Egbert et al., 2004), the native Italian data, instead, presented shorter sequences. This characteristic is due to the lack, on the non-native speakers’ part, of sufficient linguistic competence to facilitate the resolution of the search in shorter times. Even if it were possible that the students knew the word, they could not retrieve it because it was momentarily not available.

Sometimes in the attempt to target and retrieve the proper lexical item the L2 learners switched codes, using an English word, even when the co-participants were not able to understand it. In those instances, the learner was searching for a targeted item by producing the word in their mother tongue, in this way targeting the trouble source. Although the co-participants could not understand what the trouble source was, the L1 lexical item signaled that a
word search was underway, and thereby the L2 learners appealed to the other participants to
guess or provide the target word, treating the code switch as self-initiated repair.

Speakers make the word searches more explicit by using formulaic expressions, such as
questions like “how do you say it?” (Schegloff et al., 1977; C. Goodwin, 1987). This expression
is used both by native and non-native speakers to display difficulty with an upcoming lexical
item and, in the next turn, the participants respond to it by supplying the target word or
proffering a candidate solution. It is significant that the non-native speakers in the Italian data,
when flagging their word search with an interrogative, often first appealed for help to their peers
in the host family or to other members of the host family before turning to other speakers. They
thus signal their membership in the family.

Another characteristic difference between native and non-native speakers’ word searches
is their occurrence. Native speakers are mainly engaged in word searches during story telling and
therefore, as soon as the search is completed, the telling is resumed. Instead, in our data non-
native speakers search for a word when they are asked questions such as “What did you buy?” or
“What is your favorite Sicilian/Italian dish?,” which offer less opportunities for telling a story.
Consequently, once the lexical item is found, the action that was on hold is completed and the
conversation moves on to another action. When non-native speakers self-initiated and self-
repaired a search, the candidate solution was always proffered with rising intonation; while in the
native speakers’ data the possible solutions were not try-marked. The non-native speakers
offering their solution as a candidate resolution identify themselves as not having enough
linguistic competence to acknowledge their choice and therefore they need the native speakers’
acknowledgement. In this way the L2 students reveal their identity as lacking linguistic
competence and consequently their non-nativeness (Kasper, 2004; Kurhila, 2006; Markee, 2004a; Mori, 2004a; Zorzi, 1996, 1998).

In sum, the repair sequences occurred in a very systematic way. As Jung (2004) noticed, learners initiated repair either (a) after an uncertain candidate solution (i.e., trouble source) or (b) in a location of a trouble source. The resources (e.g., hesitation markers, stretched sounds), used by the students to initiate repair, not only deal with production problems in the talk, but also display and construct the learners’ identities as non-native speakers in the interaction (Jung, 2004; Mori, 2002; Wong, 2000b).

The examined data show that non-native speakers are generally able to discern the right word from many possible solutions, on the basis of their knowledge of the sought-for word. This demonstrates how the learner’s lexical knowledge should be considered as a continuum presenting different degrees and dimensions of knowledge. In other words, even if the non-native speaker cannot produce the target item, the learners’ receptive knowledge enables them to accept or reject the candidate solution provided by the recipient/s, resolve the search, and resume the conversation.

In conclusion native/non-native speakers’ interactions present similar characteristics as those by native speakers, confirming previous research (Carroll, 2004; Olsher, 2004) and adding new insights. During a word search, the second language learners are able to apply fully their conversational skills as they produce not only verbal hints but also appropriate non-verbal cues to facilitate the resolution of the search. The use of non-lexical perturbations at the beginning or within a turn should be considered as the ability to exploit a strategy to maintain the turn and to show that non-native speakers want to say more, and not as a lack of fluency in the L2. The students try-mark the proffered candidate solution as has been noticed in other studies (cf.
Hosoda, 2006; Jung, 2004; Kurhila, 2006; Lee, 2004; Park, 2007; Seo, 2008; Willey, 2001).

Sometimes the candidate solution, produced by the recipients, was acknowledged repeatedly, two or more times, as it was confirmed by the L2 student and also by the other recipients, as it often occurs in language classrooms.

Another important feature surfacing in this study is that native speakers tend not to correct grammatical mistakes within the interaction unless they might really hinder the communication. As Hosoda (2006) affirms “differences in their language expertise was thus not a participant concern” (p. 44). Occasionally the students, in their attempt to build a grammatically correct turn, solicit the intervention of the native speaker as expert (cf., Hosoda, 2006; Kurhila, 2004, 2006; Zorzi, 1998). Such an occurrence shows that it is not the speaker, who initiates repair, as it instead occurs in classroom interactions, but the L2 learner, who thus shows his non-nativeness and, at the same time, the desire to acquire and produce the correct form. The learners are eager and willing to acquire a native-like competence and they request to be corrected. Once an analysis of the data was completed, I was able to draw some practical implications, which may not be decisive but may still be productive for their pedagogical implications and directions for future research.

5.2 Implications and Directions for Future Research

This investigation analyzed L1-L2 Italian interactions during dinner table conversations. Some implications for talk-in-interaction and second language acquisition can be derived from the findings of the study.

First of all, the present study demonstrates how useful a CA methodology is in analyzing talk-in-interaction (cf. Markee, 2004b, 2005; Markee & Kasper, 2004; Markee, 2008) and particularly studying L2 interactions (Aston, 1988; Brouwer, 2003; Gavioli & Mansfield, 1990;
Kalin 1995; Kurhila, 2006; Maheux-Pelletier & Golato, 2008; Mori, 2002, 2003, 2004a; Mori & Hayashi, 2006). The study shows, along with previous research in other languages, that the general organization of conversation may be universal across languages and cultures or at least present several common features besides the ones that can be considered language or culture-specific. It seems that in repair sequences, differently from other speakers, Italians favor a self-initiated other-repaired or other-initiated self-repaired format (for more instances cf. Gavioli, 1995; Giannoni, 2001; Testa, 1988; Zorzi, 1990, 1998), but this does not mean that they do not share with the other language speakers the same general repair organization.

Second, this study, as in other previous studies (cf. Hosoda, 2000; Seo, 2008), confirms the importance of looking closely not only at single turns, but also at the other resources employed by the speakers, i.e., sequence organization, local interactional contexts, as well as gaze and body movements accompanying or substituting for the verbal production. The analysis of how verbal and non-verbal resources shape the actions in a conversation may help researchers to better understand not only language use, but also the process of language acquisition, considering how such resources are intertwined in any interaction. Silence, which is often considered in mainstream SLA as student’s withdrawal or thinking time (e.g., Gass, 2004), is often accompanied by relevant non-verbal behavior, which momentarily substitutes the verbal outcome. Such analyses might change the usual SLA understanding of input and output, which in mainstream SLA are being considered only in their verbal form (Seo, 2008). Word searches show that words can be substituted by gestures, which can be negotiated in the course of the interaction and can be processed as input and output. Accurate video data are extremely important to capture the many different nuances of an interaction and to be able to discuss
interpretations that are grounded in actual data. Therefore video data are of great importance in analyzing L1-L2 talk-in-interaction (cf., Jung, 2004).

Third, the present investigation, looking at a particular type of repair, namely a word search, shows how repair is a mechanism that maintains and restores intersubjectivity, being consequently a possible locus to observe language learning. During word searches L2 students exploit their communicative competence in dealing with and resolving troubles using their limited L2 knowledge and their elaborated L1 communication competence. In addition, CA shows how particular production features, such as hesitation markers and disfluencies, are not markers of a deficient competence in the second language, but rather demonstrate the students’ ability to deal with a trouble source and keep the floor while attempting to solve the search. Moreover, as Markee and Kasper (2004) affirm, it is important to analyze how roles and identities in talk-in-interactions are co-constructed turn-by-turn, considering that the context is locally achieved. L1 and L2 speakers’ identities surface moment by moment. The speakers’ identities are constructed and become relevant according to every single action produced in the interaction.

Some SLA studies have argued that tasks, designed to orient participants to a shared aim, encourage negotiation and provide more input than uncontrolled conversation (e.g., Long, 1983, 1996; Pica, 1994). The sometime lengthy negotiation in which students engaged to resolve the word searches in the present study demonstrates that natural conversations favor situations where students have to activate all their resources to re-establish intersubjectivity. The students’ desire to share their thoughts with the other speakers forces them to exploit all useful elements to solve the break in the communication. Unfortunately a simple dinner table conversation did not offer the opportunity to track any learning process that occurred during the searches. A diachronic
approach might offer insights that data gathered during a short elapse of time do not present. However, it might be assumed that the students have at least had the possibility to be exposed to new input, which has probably been transformed into intake, though we do not know if it will be turned into output in the future. Markee (2008) in his study on classroom talk presents a possible way to track whether, when, and how learning occurs using a methodology that he calls learning behavior tracking, based on learning object tracking and learning process tracking.

The students have negotiated input and output, and occasionally their clarification requests result in participants modifying the input and sometimes the output is modified by means of non-verbal behavior; however, we do not have any proof of learning in our data. As Brouwer (2003) and Jung (2004) noticed, the repetition of the searched-for word and its incorporation into the context to complete the action that was on hold resulted in language learning at least at the local level, at that particular moment of the interaction. Moreover, the learners’ ability to confirm, after long negotiations, the word they searched for, even if they have never heard it before, demonstrates their ability to create a connection between their background knowledge of the language and the new lexical knowledge, activating all their skills to discern the appropriate solution.

This study adopted a conversation analytic framework, which is different from the framework used in previous SLA studies. Instead of analyzing linguistic products of students, this study focused on the processes toward mutual understanding between L1 and L2 interlocutors. With its micro-analytic approach, this study provided insight into the L1 and L2 word search patterns and strategies. A strategy observed in this study is non-verbal resources. Non-linguistic or non-verbal features, e.g., students’ gestures, bodily movements, eye gazes, facial expressions, hesitation pauses, and silence, are involved in the coding system. In
conversations, speakers use placeholders, hesitations markers, pauses or silences, which are intended for them not to lose their turn. Learning about these different practices of repair and their functions increases our understanding of the discourse structure of L2 learners. Auer (2005) observed how grammatical structures and interactional structure are intertwined. He affirms “syntax can be seen as the historical result of a sedimentation and regularization of certain interactional projection techniques” (Auer, 2005, p. 33). It means that students engaged in conversations, even at a very early stage of proficiency, are “doing grammar”; e.g., they are processing to learn where it is syntactically appropriate to enter discourse.

Understanding how L2 learners treat communication breakdowns provides educators, such as teachers and researchers, with more insight about how to create materials and lessons to assist students in further developing verbal strategies, e.g., practicing paraphrase, circumlocution, description of general categories, or the use of the Italian placeholder “cosa/coso” to provide NS with more clues during word searches. Moreover, students should be exposed to a more collaborative and less conditioned way to solve a word search, as the Italian framework requires. This study can provide language teachers with a resource to better understand the mechanisms underlying word searches in native/non-native interactions. Teachers, during regular classroom activities, would be able to recognize, even from across the room, whether a student is engaged in a word search by looking at eye gaze, thinking face, bodily movements and go out to help.

More research is needed to generalize the findings of the present study. The data examined were limited to multi-party interactions during family dinners, further investigation in a range of different settings, with smaller groups or dyads, and with a diachronic approach will broaden our understanding of word search practices in Italian L1-L2 naturally occurring interactions.
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Appendix A: Transcription Notation

Notation according to Jefferson’s Transcription Convention (cf. Atkinson & Heritage, 1984)

[       ] Overlapping utterances

= Latching: when there is no interval between adjacent utterances; latching between TCUs in one turn (e.g., uttered by one speaker); continuation of a speaker’s turn across lines of intervening transcript

(0.0) Timed silence within or between utterances in tenths of a second

(.) Micropause (less than 1/10 of a second)

- A glottal stop, or abrupt cutting off of sound

(       ) Unintelligible stretch of talk

((       )) Transcriber’s remark or transcription of events

: A colon indicates an extension of the sound

::: Multiple colons indicate a longer extension of the sound

, A period indicates TCU-final falling intonation, e.g., sentence final

, A comma indicates TCU-final continuing intonation, e.g., phrase final

? A question mark indicates TCU-final rising intonation, e.g., question

* A star indicates the location of or the beginning of embodied action described by the transcriber above the actual script

.hh Audible inbreath

hh Audible outbreath

hr Clearing throat

ahaheh Different vowels indicate different quality of laugh tokens

underline Stressed sound

WORD Capital letters indicate higher volume, louder than surrounding talk

°word° Passage of talk quieter than surrounding talk

↑↓ Marked change in pitch on the following vowel/syllable: upward or downward

(hh) Laughter within a word
< > Utterance delivered at slower speed than surrounding talk

> < Utterance delivered at quicker speed than surrounding talk
## Appendix B: Abbreviations Used in the Descriptions of Grammatical Features Within the Transcription (Interlinear Gloss)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sin/Pl</td>
<td>Singular/Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mas/Fem</td>
<td>Masculine/Feminine inflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArtPre+the</td>
<td>Articulated preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dim</td>
<td>Diminutive form of a noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enf</td>
<td>Emphatic form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObjPro</td>
<td>Object pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PasPro</td>
<td>Pronoun ‘si’ used to make the verb passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProRel</td>
<td>Relative pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleo</td>
<td>Redundant form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PerSin/PerPl</td>
<td>First person singular/plural ending on verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp</td>
<td>Imperfect indicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub</td>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>