The Form and Function of Next-Turn Repetition in English Conversation*

Haeyeon Kim
(Chung-Ang University)


As an attempt to characterize an aspect of the interaction between conversation and grammar, this research deals with forms and functions of repetition in English conversation. Viewing repetition as a mechanism to which participants engaged in conversation must display orientation, this research investigates repetition in terms of an economy system that accomplishes social actions as part of our everyday conducts in talk-in-interaction. After a critical review of previous research on repetition, this research investigates structural and interactional contexts of next-speaker repetition in terms of second-position and third-position repetition. The examination of instances of 'exact' and partial repetition in the present data shows that third-position repetition is found in the following two contexts: (i) when the second turn functions as a next-turn repair initiation and the repair solution is realized in the third turn in the form of partial or whole repetition of the prior utterance, and (ii) when the source turn is interrupted by or overlapped with the second turn, and the source turn is repeated in the third turn. The examination also shows that the social actions that second-position repetition performs are: (i) initiating repair in the next turn, (ii) seeking confirmation or clarification, (iii) displaying speaker's stance or attitudes such as surprise or incredulity, (iv) providing confirmation or 'registering receipt' (Schegloff 1997), (v) showing that the speaker is of the same opinion or is in agreement with the previous speaker, and (vi) expanding current speaker's turn by repeating the previous utterance, often providing additional information. These findings show that the practices of repeating can be viewed as accomplishments of social actions in talk-in-interaction.
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1. Introduction

In recent years, there has been much research on the relationship between conversation, social interaction, and grammar in the study of discourse. Many discourse/conversation analysts have shown diverse aspects of the interaction between conversation and grammar, dealing with topics such as turn-taking, sequence organization, repair, adjacency pairs, preference organization, and so on (Ford, 1993; Ford & Thompson 1996, Ono & Thompson, 1995, 1996; Ochs, Scheglof, & Thompson, 1996; Weber, 1993; among others). Along with this line of research, this study will explore repetition phenomena in conversation through an investigation of English conversation as an attempt to characterize an aspect of the interaction between conversation and grammar.

Repetition can be found widely in ordinary conversation, but it has often been viewed as redundant, imitative, sloppy or even evidence of a speaker's lack of good speaking skills (Shimanoff & Brunak, 1977). In recent years, however, researchers have come to view repetition as a human, social activity, part of our everyday conduct and behavior, and not just a marker of a "disfluent" and "sloppy" speaker (Scheglof, 1987, 1996, 1997; Wong, 2000). Norrick (1987) proposes a taxonomy of functions of first- and second-speaker repetition, but fails to offer a detailed discussion of functions of repetition in conversation. Tannen (1987a,b, 1989) also shows forms and functions of repetition in discourse in overall terms such as production, comprehension, connection, and interaction, rather than focusing on interactional aspects of repetition. She does not make a clear distinction among types and forms of repetition, neither does she consider the social actions the repetition performs in talk-in-interaction. Scheglof (1996, 1997) discusses repetition in terms of types of sequential positions and actions associated with repeats in those positions. But his research is mostly devoted to explicating repetition in terms of a social action of repair which repetition performs in conversation.

This research will characterize forms and functions of second-speaker repetition in conversation from an interactional perspective through an investigation of American English conversational data. In the framework of conversation analysis (CA), repetition is viewed as a mechanism to which participants engaged in conversation must display orientation. That is, in CA, repetition is treated as a kind of economy system that accom-
plishes social functions as part of our conduct and behavior in everyday talk-in-interaction (Schegloff, 1987, 1996, 1997; Wong, 2000). The conversation-analytic perspective enables us to describe the orderliness of repetition in conversation, the actions that the practices of repetition perform in talk-in-interaction. In this regard, this study will explore structural contexts and functions of repetition in conversation, adopting the methodology of conversation analysis.

More specifically, the present research will deal with the repetition in inside adjacency pairs, particularly in the following two cases: (i) other-initiated self-repetition (in the next-turn or third-turn position) (i.e., A-B-A type repetition) and (ii) other-repetition in the next turn (i.e., A-B type repetition). Along with reviewing and defining notions of repetition, the forms of repeats will be carefully examined in terms of exact repetition and partial repetition, excluding paraphrased repetition (expanded repetition). After that, types and functions of repetition in the third-turn position will be discussed in terms of repair initiation and overlapping/interruption, paying attention to forms and functions of repair-initiators in the second-position. This research will also discuss functions of repetition in the second-turn position in such terms as repair initiation, seeking and providing confirmation, showing agreement, collaborating, and displaying speaker's stance or attitudes, among others. The discussion of these functions of next-speaker repetition as social actions will show that the interaction between speaker and hearer shapes forms of grammar, and that forms of grammar related to social actions are manifested in conversation. In this regard, social actions reflected in the practices of repetition in conversation can function as sources for shaping forms of grammar.

2. Context of the Research

Repetition has attracted many researchers, and thus it has been widely studied in various areas such as anthropology, linguistics, poetics, and literary theories (Casby, 1986; Goodwin, 1980; Haiman, 1997; Norrick, 1987, 1994; Ochs Keenan, 1975; Shimanoff & Brunak, 1977; Schegloff, 1996, 1997; Tannen, 1987a,b, 1989; Tsai, 2001; Wong, 2000; particularly many papers in Johnstone (ed.) 1994). In recent years, repetition has begun to be investigated in terms of general cognitive and interactional motivations,
particularly in the production and understanding of discourse or natural conversation. For example, repetition has been dealt with in discourse in a limited number of studies (Norrick, 1987, 1994; Tannen, 1987a,b, 1989) (For a similar line of research on repetition in Korean conversation, see Jeon 1998), and only a few studies have been carried out from an interactional perspective (Schegloff 1996, 1997, Sorjonen 1996, Wong 2000, Tsai 2001). However, as Schegloff (1987) points out, "not infrequently in naturally occurring, spontaneous conversation, speakers will repeat, re-say, recycle some part of their utterances." In this regard, there is a need to study repetition in conversation.

Norrick (1987), in his study of the repetition in conversation, proposes a taxonomy of functions of first- and second-speaker repetition, showing functions of repetition in contexts such as openings/closings, questions/answers, statement-affirmation, statement-disagreement, and so on. He classifies both same-speaker and second-speaker repetitions along with cognitive and interactional strategies and other related parameters to account for the functions of repetition involved in the process of production of discourse. In discussing functions of second-speaker repetition, he first makes a distinction between inside adjacency pairs and outside adjacency pairs, and illustrates contexts where repetition occurs. Norrick's work may be the first attempt to characterize contexts and functions of repetition in conversation. However, his work is no more than an attempt to provide a taxonomy or an overview of various functions of repetition in conversation. Norrick does not consider functions of repetition from the perspective of interaction between speaker and hearer, nor does he offer a detailed discussion of repetition in the contexts where repetition takes place.

Tannen (1987a,b, 1989), in a series of research on repetition, claims that

1) According to Norrick (1987), in inside adjacency pairs, repetitions can be found in (i) closed sets such as openings (i.e., Hi, Hi) and closings (i.e., Bye, Bye), (ii) questions and answers in cases of question foregoing statement and answer foregoing question, (iii) statement-affirmation to acknowledge, concur, spotlight, and accept formulation, (iv) statement-disagreement to express surprise/disbelief, match claim, counter claim (contradict, correct), and to show mocking imitation. In outside adjacency pairs, repetitions are used (i) to restate without showing affirmation or disagreement (in the case of replaying/thinking aloud or re-broadcasting for a group) and (ii) to borrow phrase in unconnected turns (as in playing on phrase for humor). With respect to same-speaker repetition, he shows four contexts: (i) semantic (idiomatic, iconic, parallel parsing), (ii) production-based (to hold floor, and to bridge interruptions), (iii) comprehension-based (to insure precise understanding, and to increase coherence), and (iv) interaction-based/patterned on adjacency pairs.
functions of repetition in conversation can be subsumed under the four categories of production, comprehension, connection, and interaction. According to her, functions of repetition in an extended multi-party conversation can be understood in terms of repetition as participation, ratifying listenership, humor, stalling, and expansion. Tannen's research does not take into consideration the orderliness of repetition and social actions that repetition performs in talk-in-interaction. She does not make a clear distinction between same- or other-speaker repetition, and thus her research does not deal with specific aspects of repetition in conversation. Nor does she make it clear about the types or degree of repetition between the prior utterances and their repeats. Furthermore, she fails to make a distinction between immediately next repetition and other remotely distanced repetition.

Schegloff (1996, 1997), on the other hand, discusses repetition in conversation as a way of giving an empirically grounded account of actions. Schegloff's research mostly deals with next-speaker repetition in the immediately next turn positions or other-initiated third-position repetition in order to give an account of an undescribed action, the action of confirming an allusion, accomplished by practice of agreeing with another by repeating. Schegloff (1997) also discusses the practice of repeating in terms of 'other-initiated repair.' He claims that the actions which the practice of repeating implements are: (i) registering receipt, (ii) initiating repair, and (iii) targeting a next action. His main interest in dealing with repetition lies in explaining repetition phenomena in conversation mostly in terms of initiating repair and confirming allusions.

Some other studies of repetition that are carried out in conversation analysis are Tsai (2001) and Wong (2001). Tsai (2000), in her research on functions of repetition in Chinese conversation, claims that other-speaker repetition performs five major discourse functions: (i) initiating repair, (ii) indicating receipt, (iii) targeting a next action, (iv) humor and savoring, and (v) stalling. Wong (2000), on the other hand, discusses functions of the self-repetition in English conversation, particularly dealing with the repetition in the form of verbal bracketing or repair repeat (i.e., "first saying + insertion + second saying"). She claims that the second saying is a practice of repositioning a prior turn-constructional unit in a subse-

---

2) Tannen and some other researchers use the term 'other-speaker repetition' instead of 'next-speaker repetition' or 'second-speaker'. These three terms can be used interchangeably.
quent environment of post-insertion as one kind of practice by which

In her overall review of the research of repetition, Johnstone (1994, p. 6)
states that repetition can be used for emphasis, iteration, clarification, or
confirmation. She claims that repetition can be a bridging device in
conversation, a way of dealing with an interruption, a way of validating
what another speaker has said, or a way to get the floor in conversation,
to recycle until it's your turn. She also adds that repetition is both
collaborative, on the textual level of jointly creating cohesion, and
conflictual, on the ideational level. In carrying out research repetition in
conversation, one can raise many questions. In fact, Johnstone (1994:2), in
the introduction to the study of repetition, puts forth the following
questions: (i) What forms of repetition in discourse can we distinguish?
(ii) What are the functions of repetition in discourse? (iii) Are there
functions universally served by repetition? (iv) What are differences across
languages, social and cultural groups, modalities and genres of discourse?
Instead of exploring the general questions discussed above, this research
will investigate next-speaker repetition mainly from the perspective of
social interaction between speaker and hearer.

As has been discussed above, research on repetition that has been
carried out so far is diverse in many areas and the topics range from
literature to linguistics. However, a few of the research works have been
done in spoken discourse or conversation, and the number of research
done from an interactional perspective is limited. Norrick's (1987) study
may be the first one in spoken discourse, but it only provides a taxon-
omy of functions of repetition, not offering any detailed discussion of the
functions in contexts where repetition takes place. Tannen (1987a,b, 1989)
is another study of repetition done in discourse, but her research is also
an overall treatment of repetition phenomena, rather than focusing on
interactional aspects of repetition. Schegloff (1996, 1997) is a work done in
conversation analysis, but he treats repetition mostly in terms of initi-
ating repair and confirming allusions. This research, on the other hand,
will explore functions of next-turn repetition, i.e., repetition in second-
turn and third-turn positions, showing that the functions of repetition not
limited to initiating repair and confirming allusions. A more careful
examination of the present data will show that some other functions are
also at work in next-turn repetition, in addition to the functions that
Schegloff (1997) and other researchers propose.
3. **Data and Methodology**

3.1. **Database**

The data that are used in this research come from the Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English. The conversations in the database were collected and transcribed by the Discourse Group at the Department of Linguistics, University of California, Santa Barbara. Each conversation is transcribed by the transcription convention proposed by Du Bois et al. (1992). This transcription convention takes an intonation unit as a basic unit of spoken language, each line representing one intonation unit. In this system, each line ends with a punctuation mark that indicates the shape of the intonation contour. That is, a comma is used to indicate a continuing contour, a period a final contour, and a question mark an appeal contour.

The original database consists of fourteen American English conversations, each lasting about between 20 and 30 minutes. The number of repetitions ranges from 4 to 30 in the conversations. The total number of exact and partial repeats in the database amounts to about 160 cases. This number may vary slightly because of the difficulty in making a judgment about repetition. However, the criteria that will be suggested in the following are applied in making a correct judgment.

3.2. **Methodology**

The question of what counts as repetition is not well defined because of the complexity repetition phenomena display in discourse and the diversity with

---

3) The following are transcription conventions used in the Santa Barbara spoken English corpus (Du Bois et al. 1992):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intonation unit</th>
<th>Pause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truncated IU</td>
<td>Long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truncated word</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech overlap</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition continuity</td>
<td>Latching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Vocal noises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>Vocal noises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td>Inhalation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcriber's perspective</td>
<td>Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher's comment</td>
<td>Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain hearing</td>
<td>Laugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecipherable syllable</td>
<td>Quotation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
which researchers use the term. In a strict sense, there is no exact repetition in conversation because nobody can reproduce the previous turn exactly the same way. In the study of repetition in conversation, one must make a decision whether certain words, phrases, clauses count as repetitions or not.

In characterizing repetition in conversation, it is necessary to make it clear what counts as repetition. As has been mentioned, there is no exact repetition in a strict sense. Here, the exact repetition means the same wording between repetend and repetition. In fact, the examination of the present data shows that there is a limited number of tokens of ‘exact repetition’, and the instances of exact repetition are expressed usually in the forms of single words or phrases. Most of the tokens in the present data are partial repeats of the critical part of prior turns. There are some instances of paraphrased repetition, which are excluded in this research. In addition, there is a question of the localness of repep­end and repetition. Here, local repetition, particularly next-turn repetition, will be investigated extensively, focusing on the interactive nature of repetition in conversation. Thus, cases where the repetend and the repetition are remotely distanced will not be included in the present discussion. 4)

In characterizing repetition in conversation, first the forms of repetition in conversation will be examined, checking whether they are partial or full repetition of prior turns. After that, the contexts where repeats occur will be examined, and tokens of repetition will be grouped into two types: (i) second-turn position repetition, and (ii) third-turn position repetition. Based on the classification of types of repetition, the question of what roles and functions the repeats play will be investigated in the

4) In Tannen (1987a), the term repetition is more or less loosely defined. In her example, the following underlined are all treated as examples of repetition.

1. Terry: THAT’S NOT DAYDREAMING! ... darn it!
2. Frank: [laughter]
3. Well daydreaming is something that comes natural!
4. [You don’t don’t PLAN daydreaming.
5. Terry: You don’t even
6. You’re not even hearing what I’m SAYING! What?
7. Frank: You can’t PLAN daydreaming ...
8. I’m gonna do daydream for a couple of hours guys
9. so
10. Terry: Yes you CAN plan it! 
   You can plan daydreaming.

This loose treatment of repetition may be helpful in describing repetition in terms of cohesion, but this is too loose to discuss repetition from an interactional perspective where local orderliness is of important concern.
contexts where the repeats occur. The methods that are used in this research are both qualitative and quantitative.

4. Notions and Classification of Repetition in Conversation

In the research on repetition, the notion of repetition has been defined in various ways, and researchers have used their own definitions of repetition, using loose or strict definitions in accordance with their research goals. For example, Haiman (1997) defines repetition as the following: "the notion of repetition or replication must presuppose a prior notion of identity. That is, in order to determine whether an experienced sequence { ..A.B.. } involves a repetition of an ‘X’ , we need to compare them, and then agree first, that ‘A’ and ‘B’ are indeed ‘two X’s’ (hence, counting), and that they are in fact ‘the same’ (hence repetition)." Theoretically, this statement clearly characterizes the nature of repetition, but this definition does not tell about the degree of exact identity of repetition, nor does it make clear about the localness or trans-boundary aspects of repetition. Furthermore, this definition fails to consider interactional aspects of repetition in conversation. This statement does not tell whether repetition is limited to repetition that occurs in the same turn or in the next turn. If this statement refers to repetition in the next turn, it is not clear whether it refers to repetition that occurs in the immediately next turn or in any subsequent turn which may be far distanced from the prior turn.

In a simple way, the notion of repetition presupposes an utterance that has been said before, and thus the existence of the prior text is essential. The terms for repetition and the prior utterance are different among researchers. The prior utterance or text that is to be repeated is termed the 'repetend', 'model', or 'first saying'. The utterance that repeats the prior text is termed the 'repetition', 'copy', or 'second saying' (Urban, 1994; Schegloff, 1996, 1997; Wong, 2000). These terms assume that there are prior texts that are local, unlike other terms such as retelling or allusions which presuppose global or distant prior texts (Johnstone, 1994). This study will use the locally assuming terms of repetition, focusing on interactive nature of repetition.

The next thing that should be considered in discussing repetition phenomena is the degree of identity between the repetend and the
repetition. Repetition is realized in the form of either all or part of some preceding turns, most commonly the immediately preceding speaker's turn. In theory, the repetition can be exactly the same as its prior utterance (exact repetition), and this will be treated as true repetition. However, a closer examination of real conversational data will show that there is no exact repetition at a phonetic level, taking prosodic elements into consideration. Even a cursory look at conversational data shows that the number of tokens of exact repetition at a phonemic level is very limited. The 'exact repetition' in the present data is found in the case when the prior turn takes the form of a single word or phrase. In fact, in actual conversational data, most instances of repetition are part of its prior text (partial repetition). There can be a paraphrased text of a prior utterance (paraphrased or expanded repetition). Let us take a look at Excerpt (1):

(1) Lenore: Where was he from.
Doris: ... U=m, ... [X I forget X].
Lynne: [Idaho]=? <<---A
Doris: Idaho=, <<---B
[and],
Lynne: [up] in the mountains,
[2In Idaho2]. <<---C

As can be seen in (1), the phrase 'Idaho' is repeated in B and C positions. The repetend 'Idaho' in A is produced with upward intonation, but its repetition in B is realized with downward intonation and followed by the word 'and', and in C it is preceded by a prepositional phrase and a preposition. If we apply the notion of repetition strictly, these two cases cannot count as repeats. With respect to the notion of repetition, Schegloff (1997, p. 525) uses a rather loose definition of repetition which allows for transformations geared to deixis, tense shift, speaker change, etc., as well as changes of prosody. However, he excludes paraphrase and other substantial rewording of its target. If we adopt his notion of repetition, the two cases in Excerpt (1) will be counted as repeats. In this regard, this research will basically follow Schegloff's criteria in determining repetition, which means that 'exact' repetition and partial repetition will be taken into consideration, excluding paraphrased repetition. In fact, the
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examination of the present data shows that 37 cases of the total 160 repeats (i.e., 23.1%) can be treated as examples of exact repetition, and they are usually expressed in single words or phrases.

Furthermore, there is a question of the grammatical forms of repetition. As Schegloff (1987) points out, the repeat or re-saying or recycling of part of the utterance in a conversational turn is sometimes brief, sometimes longer, ranging from a single word to a clausal unit. The repeat or resaying with strings of some length is exactly the same or more or less identically repeated. With respect to turn-constructional units (TCUs) in conversation, Sacks et al. (1974) state that TCUs can be sentential, clausal, phrasal, or lexical. In a similar way, the units of repetition can be sentential, clausal, phrasal, or lexical. The repetition in the second or subsequent turn can be part or whole of a prior source turn, or it can be expanded along with the repeated elements. All these possibilities are a matter that should be evidenced by examining real conversational data.

5. Types and Frequency of Next-turn Repetition

In this section, let us discuss types of next-turn repetition. Repetition may occur in a variety of sequential environments. Thus, there should be a distinction among types of repetition according to the repeater and positioning. Repetition occurs in a variety of sequential environments: (i) in the same turn as contains the antecedent of the repetition (or a first saying), (ii) in the next turn immediately after a first saying, or (iii) in any subsequent turn (Schegloff, 1996). That is, if the current speaker repeats a previous utterance, such a case is called same-speaker repetition, and if the next speaker repeats a prior utterance, it's called second-speaker repetition (Norrick, 1987). Tannen (1989) terms same-speaker repetition self-repetition and second-speaker repetition allo-repetition, respectively. Same-speaker repetition or self-repetition refers to the case where repetend and repetition occur in the same turn. Other-speaker repetition refers to the case where the repetend occurs in the current turn and the repetition occurs in the next speaker's turn. With respect to repetition, Schegloff (1996) lays out: three types of sequential position that a repeat can occupy, and actions associated with repeats in those positions: (i) a repeat may be used to initiate a sequence, mostly in a repair sequence, (ii) it can be deployed as a response/answer to a question in a second position
in sequence, and (iii) it can occupy a third position, where it may receive a response or an answer to a question. Schegloff's work shows that interactional studies demonstrate that sequential contexts and a range of actions associated with the contexts play a constitutive role in the production and interpretation of repeats in talk-in-interaction.

When repeats are considered in terms of their sequential contexts, they can be divided into two types: (i) repetition occurs in the immediately next turn to the turn that contains the prior text (repetend) (i.e., A-B type), and (ii) repetition occurs in the third position from the repetend turn in the case where the second position motivates the occurrence of the repetition in the third position (i.e., A-B-A type). Bearing these distinctions in mind, let us consider Excerpt (2).

(2) Pamela: And then we went to the Chalk Fair, and then he took off with Tobias?
Darryl: The Chop Fair?
Pamela: The Chalk.
Darryl: [Oh, [The Chalk Fair].
Pamela: [The Chalk Fair].
Darryl: .. unhunh]?

In (2), the repetition takes place in the second, third, and fifth positions from the source turn which contains the prior text of the repeats. That is, in the second turn, Darryl makes a partial repeat of the immediately previous turn, which is expressed in a single noun phrase (NP). The repetition in this case functions as a repair initiator, and thus in the third turn, Pamela provides a repeat as a repair solution. Then in the next turn the repair solution is accepted, and at the same time Pamela repeats what she has said before as a way of repairing her prior utterance. As can be seen in this excerpt, the next-turn repetition occurs in the immediately next turn position, forming an A-B type, in the third-turn position, forming an A-B-A type. One may argue that repetition in the fourth or subsequent turn position will be possible. But it depends on the criteria

5) There may be some other possibilities for the positioning of repetition. As Schegloff (1996, p. 177) points out, the repetition can occur in the turn after the first saying or in any subsequent turn. That is, the repetition may occur in the fourth or fifth position. But this is an empirical problem and such a possibility may be evidenced by an examination of real conversational data.
where the repetend for the repetition is located. In fact, as has been pointed out earlier, the term repetition has been more or less loosely defined in previous research. For example, Tannen (1987a,b) does not provide any clear definition about the positioning of repetition and its source turn. However, in this research, next-turn repetition is classified into two types: (i) the repetition that occurs in the immediately next turn to the turn that contains the prior text (repetend) (i.e., A-B type), and (ii) the repetition that occurs in the third position from the source turn (or, the repetend turn) in the case where the second turn motivates the occurrence of repetition in the third-turn position (i.e., A-B-A type). Based on this classification of next-turn repetition, let us discuss forms and functions of next-turn repetition in more detail.

The examination of next-turn repetition in the present data shows that the frequency of the repetition that occurs in the third-turn position is very low, compared to that of the repetition that occurs in the immediately next turn, showing only 9 cases out of the total 160 repeats. On the other hand, the frequency of the repetition in the second-turn position is dominantly high, compared to that of repetition in the third-turn position. That is, as far as the present data are concerned, the frequency amounts to 151 cases out of the total 160 repeats. This fact suggests that other-speaker repetition is sequentially organized in a local domain, forming a repetend-repetition adjacency pair.

Next, the examination of the present data shows that third-turn repetition is mostly related to overlapping/interruption or repair caused by next-turn repair initiations (NTRIs) in the second turn. In this respect, the number of examples of repetition in the third-turn position is limited to only a few instances. Repetition in the second-turn position is also closely related to the function of repair (Schegloff et al., 1977; Schegloff, 1997). However, the second-turn position repetition is not limited to repair, as Schegloff (1996, 1997) demonstrates in his research. Schegloff states that second-turn repetition is used not only as practices for initiating repair but also as devices for registering receipt or targeting a next action. In fact, many other researchers (Norrick, 1987; Tannen, 1987a,b, 1989; Sorjonen

6) In this respect, it may be controversial whether in Excerpt 2 the repetition in the fifth turn should be regarded as a 'fifth-turn' repeat or a second-turn repeat. When we consider the fact that every turn in conversation is locally managed, it would be reasonable to treat this as a second-turn repeat.
1996, and Tsai 2001) show that repetition in the second-turn position cannot be explained solely in terms of repair. Rather, other functions are also at work in the repetition of the second-turn position. Bearing this in mind, let us discuss types and functions of repetition in the second- and third-turn positions one by one in the next sections.

6. Contexts and Functions of Repetition in the Third-turn Position

In this section, let us discuss contexts where repetition takes place in the third-turn position from the source turn. As has been discussed, the frequency of the repetition in the third-turn position in the present conversational data is very low, amounting to only 9 cases out of the total 160 instances. As mentioned earlier, in the present data, the repetition in the third-turn position is related to repair or overlapping/interruption. This means that the turn in the second position initiates production of repetition in the third-turn position. Here, let us examine contexts for the third-turn repetition in more detail.

The examination of the present data shows that one of the most prominent functions of repetition in the third-turn position is asking for clarification of what the addressee has misunderstood or has difficulty understanding. In this regard, the repetition in the third-turn position is occasioned by NTRIs in the second-turn position by next speaker. According to Schegloff (1997, p. 503), repair "refers to practices for dealing with problems or troubles in speaking, hearing and understanding the talk in conversation". Repair activity is composed of initiation and outcome. The question of who initiates repair is to differentiate between repairs initiated by the speaker of the problematic talk and those initiated by anyone else—self-initiation and other initiation (Schegloff, 1997). Next thing that should be considered is the matter of where repair is initiated. That is, this is related to the question of whether the repair is made in the same turn of the trouble source or after it, i.e., in an next turn following the trouble-source turn. When we consider the example of third-turn repetition, the repetition is closely related to repair activity. Let us consider Excerpts (3) and (4).
(3) Kendra: you won't make half of what I make. <<--trouble source turn
   Ha ha.
   (H)
Ken: .. Wha=t? <<--repair initiation
Wendy: (Hx)
Kendra: .. Dad's like,
   you won't make half of [what I make. <<--repair solution
Ken: [Oh,

(4) Ken: ... You got a food processor,
   and everything.
Kendra: ... <X What uh X>? <<--trouble source turn
   .. Hunh? <<--repair initiation
Ken: .. You got a food processor,
   and a=,
   ... what all did you guys get back.
   ... Mixer?
   ... What all did [you] ___

In (3), in a party, Kendra talks to her father about her salary, and she says she makes much more money than her father does. In (4), Ken helps Kendra in preparing food in the kitchen. In (3) and (4), repair is occasioned by a repair initiator in the immediately next turn to the trouble-source turn that carries a repairable element. In this case, the repair is initiated by someone other than the speaker of the trouble-source turn, indicating his or her problems in understanding or hearing. This type of other-initiated repair that is initiated in the next turn after the trouble-source turn is referred to as NTRIs, as has already been discussed. When we consider Excerpts (3) and (4), the trouble-source turns are immediately followed by other speakers along with the repair initiators 'what' and 'hunh'. In addition to these two NTRIs, there are other kinds of repair initiators such as wh-question elements, reactive tokens, and partial repeats, and so on, as Schegloff et al. (1977) show7).

7) Schegloff et al. (1977), in discussing types and functions of repair mechanisms and the preference for self-repair in the organization of repair, cite types of turn-constructional devices in English that are used to initiate repair: (i) Huh, What?, (ii) question words who, where, when, (iii) partial repeat of the trouble-source turn, plus a question word such as The who?, (iv) partial repeat of the trouble-source turn, (v) Y'mean plus a possible
When a repair is initiated, the repair outcome will be solution or abandonment of the problem. In (3) and (4), the solutions for the repair are realized in the forms of partial or whole repetition of the trouble-source turns in the third position from the trouble-source turns. This fact shows that repetition functions as practices of social actions that provide solutions for troubles in hearing or understanding.

Another context that involves repetition in the third-turn position is found in the case when the source turn is interrupted by or overlapped with the second turn. In this case, the current speaker repeats part or whole of his or her prior utterance as a way of making the point clear. Let us take a look at Excerpt (5).

(5) Doris: .. Well !Debby got- --
Lynne: [I would be] tired too.
Doris: .. !Debby got to the point,
      where all she would do is,
      when she did,

In (5), the utterance Doris produces is partially overlapped by the next speaker Lynne, and thus her turn is truncated. In this situation, Doris repeats what she said before in the previous turn in the third position from the trouble-source turn, which results in a third-turn repeat.

So far, we have seen that repetition in the third-turn repetition occurs in the following two contexts: (i) when the second turn functions as a next-turn repair initiator (NTRI) and the repair is realized in the third turn in the form of partial or whole repetition of the prior utterance, and (ii) when the source turn is interrupted by or overlapped with the second turn, and the source turn is repeated in the third turn. When such social actions are performed in those structural contexts, repetition is realized in the third-turn position. This means that repeats in the third-turn position occasioned by repair or overlap/interruption function as social actions that provide solutions for the troubles or problems.

understanding of prior turn, among others.
7. Contexts and Functions of Repetition in the Second-turn Position

Now let us turn to the contexts and functions of repeats that occur immediately next to the source turn, which is termed second-turn repetition. As has been discussed earlier, it is observed in the present conversational data that the practices of repetition in the second-turn position perform many functions. Among the functions, repair initiation is one of the most prominent roles that repetition in the second-turn position plays (Schegloff et al., 1977; Schegloff, 1997). In addition to the function of repair initiation, Schegloff shows that second-turn repetition is used as devices for registering receipt, targeting a next action, or confirming allusions (Schegloff, 1996, 1997). In the study of repetition in spoken Chinese, Tsai (2001), adopting terms from Tannen (1987a,b, 1989) and Schegloff (1996, 1997), shows that next-speaker repetition performs five major discourse functions: (i) initiating repair, (ii) indicating receipt, (iii) targeting a next action, (iv) humor and savoring, and (v) stalling. Along with this line of research, let us consider contexts and functions of repeats that occur in the second-turn position.

The examination of the present conversational data shows that second-turn repetition is closely related not only with repair initiation but also with some other functions which will be discussed below. In discussing functions and structural contexts of repeats in the second-turn position, prosody also should be taken into consideration whether the repeats carry an appeal intonation contour or a downward intonation contour. When a repeat carries a rising intonation contour, it is usually treated as a type of question, performing a range of functions along with "questioning". In dealing with functions and structural contexts of repeats, three types of repeats with a rising intonation contour will be discussed first, and the other three types of repeats with downward intonation will be discussed later. Bearing this in mind, let us consider structural contexts and functions of practices of repetition in conversation in more detail.

First of all, one of the most prominent functions of repetition in the second-turn position is initiating repair. We have discussed functions of repetition in the third-turn position in terms of repair. In the third-position repetition, the repetition is occasioned by NTRIs in the second-turn position. However, in second-turn repetition, the repetition itself
functions as NTRIs. Schegloff et al. (1977) and Pomerantz (1984) illustrate that repeats, particularly partial repeats, often function as repair initiators in the second-turn position. In this case, the repair initiation carried out by repeating the immediately preceding turn leads to correction when the “repeat” reveals a mis-hearing/understanding/remembering. That is, the repeats in the second-turn position function as repair-initiators when the speaker has a problem or difficulty in understanding or hearing the prior utterance by producing turn-constructional devices that signal the need for repair. Let us take a look at Excerpt (6):

(6) Lynne: on a horse.
   (H) .. And that's as far as we got.
   I mean,
   if you would really get into it,
   (H) Well as a matter of fact,
   (H) this is really funny.
   You know,
   there isn't .. really .. any girl farriers .. around anywhere. <<<
   They're [really] --
   Lenore: [farrier]?
   Lynne: (H) .. th- Yeah.
   farrier is what they're called.
   .. (H) And the m- % --
   .. the reason they were showing us this at college,
   was just,
   .. to get us,
   (H) to know if our= trimmer=,
   and shoer were_s .. doing it right,
   (next 18 intonation units of this turn are omitted)

In (6), the repeat in the form of a full NP turn marked with a double-headed arrow is used when the recipient Lenore has difficulty in understanding the new term introduced in the previous turn. Here, the partial repeat itself in the second turn functions as a repair initiator. In this case, Lynne, whose turn is cut off because of the repair-initiating turn produced by Lenore, does not finish her turn, but restates what she said in the previous turn, providing additional information as a way of solving the trouble.
In discussing repair mechanisms, Schegloff et al. (1977) state that 'self-repair' and 'other-repair' can be discussed in terms of whether the efforts at repair succeed or fail. When we consider the function of repetition in the second-turn position in terms of a type of other-initiated repair, there are two possibilities in the outcome: (i) the efforts at repair are successful and thus there is an outcome of repair in the next turn, and (ii) the efforts at repair fail and the outcome of repair does not follow in the next turn. As has been shown, NTRIs are used in the case when the speaker has a problem or difficulty in understanding or hearing the speaker's prior utterance. When we consider the functions of repeats, we can notice that repeats in the second-turn position function as next turn repair initiators, which produce a successful outcome in the following next turn, as can be seen in (7).

(7) Marci: [@[@]
   Kendra: [I did] already have a piece of .. wedding cake, <--trouble-source turn about this big.
   Wendy: .. Wedding cake? <--repair-initiating turn
   Kendra: We=ll, <--repair turn
       no=.
       It was,
       .. you know.
       .. (H) It was celebration cake,

In (7), Kendra talks about her experience of having a piece of wedding cake, which is questioned by Wendy. In this case, Wendy's turn functions as a repair-initiating turn which asks for clarification about the statement made in Kendra's turn. Thus, in the next turn, Kendra repairs her previous turn, providing revised information. This excerpt shows that a partial repeat of the prior utterance with upward intonation functions as a repair initiator which produces a successful outcome for an effort at repair.

However, some of the repeats in the second-turn position that are used as NTRIs do not produce successful outcomes for the efforts at repair. Schegloff et al. (1977) note that 'failure' in repair refers to cases in which a repair procedure is initiated and does not yield a successful solution in the following next turn. An example of failure in repair can be seen in (8).
In (8), Kendra claims that she does not like ice cream, but her claim is challenged by the next speaker, Kevin. So, Kendra asks Kevin to call Kelly, her former roommate, who has never been mentioned before in their talk. In this situation, her turn functions as a trouble-source turn, and a partial repeat in the next turn functions as a next turn repair initiator. However, such a repair-initiator does not work, and it fails to get a successful outcome in the next turn.

So far, we have seen functions of repetition in the second-turn position in terms of repair initiation. The examination of the present data shows that repeats often expressed in the form of full NP turns, usually accompanied with upward intonation, are used as questions that function as repair initiators. We have also seen the outcomes of the efforts at repair carried out by repetition in the second-turn position are realized into three types: (i) explicit successful repair outcomes, often in the form of rephrasing or restatement of a word, phrase, or clause in the trouble-source turn, (ii) failure in repair and no outcome, and (iii) no explicit repair in the trouble-source turn, but usually a confirmative statement, often a repetition of the repair initiator, for the repair initiator.

Secondly, the function of repetition in the second-turn position is seeking confirmation from the immediately preceding speaker's turn. In this case, the repetition is uttered with an appeal intonation contour, thus functioning as a type of question. This type of question is sometimes
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Leonore: What's her name?
Lynne: ... Bran- --
(H) <F what's her name?
Doris: .. !Rana !Lee. <<--
Lynne: ... !Rana !Lee F>?
Doris: .. Unhunh.
Lynne: ... !Rana !Lee.
Leonore: m.

In (9), the double-arrowed phrase with upward intonation that functions as a question is a repeat of the immediately preceding turn. In this case, the repetition of the immediately preceding turn is used as a way of getting confirmation from the previous speaker. In this case, the practice of repeating the immediately preceding turn receives confirmation in the next turn. This type of question is called a recapitulatory echo question, which repeats the previous turn, seeking confirmation from another speaker (Quirk et al., 1985, p. 835) (For Korean echo questions, see Kim

8) Bolinger (1957) divides repetitive questions into four types: (i) reclamatory questions, in which the speaker calls for repetition of the preceding utterance or part of it, (ii) ditto question, in which the speaker repeats his own question, (iii) echo questions, in which the speaker repeats the other person's question, and (iv) reflex questions, in which the speaker repeats, as a question, a part or all of the preceding non-question. Ex.) (i) A1: When will Jane go to England?
B: What? <--reclamatory question
A2: When will Jane go to England? <--ditto question
(ii) A: Did you bring the book?
B: Did I bring the book? <--echo question
(iii) A: I met Jane in the park yesterday.
B: Did you meet Jane yesterday? <--reflex question

9) Quirk et al. (1985) illustrate two types of echo questions: (i) a recapitulatory echo question and (ii) an explicatory echo question. An "explicatory echo question" is always a wh-question and serves sometimes as a request for clarification, as can be seen in the following.

Lynne: ... I don't know what it's called either.
The discussion of this type of repetition draws attention to the structural relationship between the repeat and its prior utterance and to prosody as an index for utterance functions. It also shows a type of verbal action accomplished by repeats and the association between the action and its sequential context.

Thirdly, another type of repeats that carry an appeal intonation contour is found in the contexts where the repeat in the second-turn position performs the social action of displaying speaker's stance or attitudes such as surprise, astonishment, doubt, incredulity, or disagreement about the prior speaker's utterance.¹⁰ Pomerantz (1984), in her study of agreeing and disagreeing with assessments, illustrates that some examples of partial repetition perform an action of signaling rejection, correction, or disalignment. The examination of the present data shows that some of the repeats in the conversations are used to display a social action of signaling next speaker's negative or incredulous attitudes toward the prior turn, as can be seen in Excerpt (10):

(10) Montoya: When I do uh,

<X make X> a comparison nineteen_ninety_three,
(H) nineteen_sixty_eight,
.. nineteen_sixty_three,
.. during those three periods,
.. when,
.. would you say,
.. Blacks .. demonstrated .. much more power.

¹⁰ One may argue that this type of repeats can be explained in terms of repair. However, this type is closely related to the speaker's emotional attitudes such as astonishment, surprise, doubt, or incredulity. In addition, in the repair context, repair is occasioned in the case when there are problems or troubles in speaking, hearing, or understanding. In Excerpt (10), it is difficult to say that the repeat is occasioned by the second speaker's problems in hearing or understanding. Rather, it is occasioned to show the speaker's emotional attitudes. Furthermore, this type of repeat is different from a repeat found in a repair context in the sense that repair does not follow in the third turn.
Rachel: ... Now?
    ... They have more power now.
Montoya: ... They have more power?
    ... Why do you say that.
Rachel: ... Cause they're more recognized.
    ... X I mean X,
Montoya: ... (H) Does recognition give you power?
    ... Hm?

In (10), Montoya talks about politics and asks Rachel when Blacks demonstrated much more power during the three periods of nineteen ninety-three, nineteen sixty-eight, and nineteen sixty-three. In response to this question, Rachel answers that they have more power nowadays. Then, Montoya, through her repetition of the prior turn, expresses her disagreeing attitude toward the response. In addition, she explicitly asks Rachel the reason for saying that, indicating her attitude of not being convinced by her answer. Then, Rachel provides a reason for her response, which still fails to convince Montoya, when we consider the next utterance produced by Montoya. This example shows that repetition in the second-turn position performs a function of displaying next speaker’s stance or emotional attitudes toward the proposition in the prior turn.

Fourthly, the function that repetition in the second-turn position performs is providing confirmation. This function and the function discussed above (i.e., seeking confirmation and providing confirmation) can be said to be like the two sides of a coin. In the case of seeking confirmation, the repeat is accompanied with upward intonation. However, the repeat that is associated with a social action of providing confirmation carries a downward intonation contour. Bearing this fact in mind, let us consider Excerpt (11):

(11) Kevin: .. !Wendy ha=s .. tried her hand, for the first time at making a clue=.
    Ken: (H) Oh,
        a clue=?
    Kevin: .. A [clue],
    Wendy: [Oh]2=,
confirmatory device for the immediately preceding turn. In response to this, Kevin produces an utterance in the form of repeating the confirmation-seeking turn as a way of providing confirmation. In this case, Kevin does not provide his response in the form of 'yes', but he repeats the prior utterance as a way of providing confirmation in a more emphatic way. This function is more or less related to the function of what Schegloff calls 'registering receipt', though not exactly the same. With respect to this function, Schegloff (1997) states that repetition with this function is produced with downward intonation, a great of many such downward-intoned repeats are followed by some form of agreement or confirmation token by the initial sayer of the repeated material. He shows that repeats that are used as acknowledgements of receipt, ones that receive no response in the next turn, are the most conservative set of examplars of repeats. In this regard, the confirmatory repetition in Excerpt (11) can be said to be used as acknowledgements of receipt, receipting both the preceding turn and the action done in it, as Schegloff (1997, p. 527) states.

Fifthly, the next function of repeats in the second-turn position is showing that the current speaker is of the same opinion or is in agreement with the immediately preceding speaker, as can be seen in (12):

(12) Jamie: ... You know how boys are.
     ... They never buy clothes.
     [H] Students are .. are broke.
     [H]
     Pete: [Right].

In (12), Jamie talks about students' living conditions that do not allow them to buy new clothes. In response to that statement, Pete, the next speaker, describes their situation in a single word, 'broke'. Then, Jamie repeats the prior utterance as a way of showing that she is of the same opinion or is in agreement with Pete. Here, Jamie even expands the repetition, as a way of expressing her sympathetic attitude of fully agreeing with the prior utterance. In this regard, the repetition can be viewed as a social action that demonstrates the speaker's agreement with
the prior speaker in its structural and activity context.

Finally, the function of repetition in the second-turn position is expanding the repetition as a way of providing additional information or elaborating the prior utterance. Excerpt (12) above shows that the next speaker repeats the prior utterance, expanding the prior turn. When the next speaker repeats what the previous speaker has said, the repetition becomes a ground for providing additional information. Here are some examples which demonstrate that repeats function as grounds for expanding or elaborating the repeats in the second-turn position:

(13) Jamie: ... [(SIGH)]
   Harold: [And in] the front yard-
   You saw [2that X2],
   Pete: [2I saw2] that,
   ... right [3in3] [4the front, ...]

(14) Marilyn: [It’s kinda,]
   ... I think it’s oregano].
   Pete: I guess it’s just really dark],
   ... it’s oregano [2and stuff yeah2].
   Marilyn: [2Dark oregano2].
   ... [3X That famous black oregano3].
   Pete: [3X XX XX3].
   Alright.
   Marilyn: It’s like,
   ... purple basil.
   ... Purple basil.
   ... @@@ (H)
   PETE: [Right].

As can be seen in (13), in the second-turn position, Pete repeats what Harold has said in the immediately preceding turn. In this case, he repeats the clause ‘I saw that’ (with the change of deixis), and putting an adverbial phrase at the end of the repeat. In (14), on the other hand, the source text (or repetend) in Marilyn’s turn ‘(I think) it’s oregano’ is repeated and expanded in the next turn into two intonation units. That is, in the next turn produced by Pete, ‘I think’ is changed into ‘I guess’ (lexical change with a similar meaning) and ‘it’s’ is expanded to ‘it’s just..."
really dark'. In the split second intonation unit, 'it's oregano' is repeated, and 'and stuff' is added. In response to this expansion, Marilyn repeats the prior utterance, making it into a single phrase, 'dark oregano' in a single intonation unit. And then, she revises and expands her repeat into a longer phrase 'that famous black oregano', also forming another intonation unit. In this case, if the next speaker had uttered simply a word of affirmation such as 'yeah' or 'right', the next turn would not have been expanded as it is expanded in the next turn. In this respect, the repetition in the second-turn position performs an action of expanding or adding more information to the prior utterance.

So far, we have examined six types of repeats in the second-position in terms of their structural contexts and functions. The first three types of repeats are characterized by their prosody of an upward intonation contour, and thus they basically have the function of "questioning". We have seen that these three types of repeats perform the social actions of initiating repair, seeking confirmation, or displaying speaker's emotional attitudes. The other three types are characterized by their prosody of a downward intonation contour. These latter three types of repetition perform the social actions of providing confirmation, showing that the speaker is of the same opinion or is in agreement with the previous speaker, or expanding a prior turn or providing additional information.

We have discussed functions of repetition in the second-turn position in terms of interaction between speaker and hearer. As has been discussed, repetition is not a matter of disfluency, unplannedness, or carelessness of speakers. Rather, repetition can be described by the orderliness with respect to the question of what the practices of repeating may be doing in the interaction between speaker and hearer in conversation. Then, the practices of repeating can be viewed as accomplishments of social actions that perform many functions in everyday conversation. We have seen that major functions or social actions of repetition in the second-turn position are characterized as the following: (i) initiating repair in the next turn, (ii) seeking confirmation or clarification, (iii) providing confirmation or 'registering receipt' (Schegloff, 1997), (iv) displaying speaker's stance or attitudes such as surprise or is incredulity, (v) showing that the speaker is of the same opinion or in agreement with the previous speaker, and (vi) expanding his or her turn by repeating the prior utterance, often providing additional information. These findings show that the practices of repeating can be viewed as accomplishments of social actions.
8. Summary and Conclusions

In this research, we have discussed forms and functions of repetition in conversation in American English. Adopting the perspective of conversation analysis, we have viewed the practices of repeating as accomplishments of social actions. The conversation analytic perspective shows that repetition is not a matter of disfluency, unplannedness, or carelessness of speakers. Rather, CA approach provides a possibility of explaining repetition in terms of orderliness in talk-in-interaction, paying attention to the question of what the practices of repeating is achieving in conversation. Analyses of particular examples of repeats in their structural contexts have revealed that repeats in conversation are associated with different actions that the repeats are used to accomplish.

In this regard, the first part of this paper has reviewed the notion and types of repetition as a way of clarifying diverse notions of repetition proposed in the literature. After the critical review of the notion of repetition and research results, data and methodology for the present research have been proposed. That is, in this research, a database of tokens of repetition is collected in terms of exact repetition and partial repetition, but not including paraphrased repetition. Also this research has focused on the next-turn repair, i.e., repetition in the second- and third-turn positions. The examination of the present data has shown that the frequency of the repetition in the third-turn position is very low, only occurring nine times in the data, and that of the repetition in the next-turn position is dominant in conversation. Based on this frequency, the structural contexts and functions of repetition have been carefully examined in the present conversational data.

The examination of instances of repetition in the present conversational data has shown diverse functions of repetition. First of all, the repetition in the third-turn position is occasioned by repair initiation and overlap/interruption by other speaker in the second turn. When such social actions are performed, repetition takes place in the third-turn position as a way of accomplishing the social actions of repair and clarification. After that, repeats in the second-turn position carefully examined in structural contexts in association with the social actions that repeats perform in conversation. The examination of the present data shows that major functions that repeats perform in the second-turn position are characterized as the following: (i) initiating repair in the next turn, (ii)
seeking confirmation or clarification, (iii) providing confirmation or 'registering receipt' (Schegloff, 1997), (iv) showing that the speaker is of the same opinion or is in agreement with the previous speaker, (v) expanding his or her turn by repeating the prior utterance, often providing additional information, and (vi) displaying speaker's stance or attitudes such as surprise or incredulity. These findings show that the practices of repeating can be viewed as accomplishments of social actions. They are tools which members of a speech community collaboratively and systematically adopt in everyday life. This research on repetition has also shown that social activity is not only a context for linguistic forms, but it is closely related to the interpretation of meanings of linguistic forms employed in talk-in-interaction.
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