

# On Replacing<sup>※</sup>

Park, Jae-Eun  
(Kangnam University)

## Abstract

**Park, Jae-Eun. 2017. "On Replacing". *The Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea* 25(3). 139~164.** This study examines a reparative operation that occurs in the same turn: replacing. Based on about 100 instances of replacing in Korean conversation, the paper mainly focuses on specifying what replacing achieves. The analysis shows that replacing is largely classified into two functional categories: correcting and adjusting. Correcting handles a wide range of 'innocent' errors, from slips of the tongue to those that reflect momentary failing in various cognitive activities. Adjusting, on the other hand, targets a non-error, conveying various interactional import within the particularities of each different context. After a brief presentation of correcting, this paper focuses on showing three main adjustment types, namely perspective, scope, and degree adjustments. It also raises the possibility that adjusting may fail to achieve the goal that it has set out to.

**Keywords:** conversation analysis, self-repair, error correction, adjustment, Korean

## 1. Introduction

Repair organization is part of the fundamental infrastructure for sustaining human interaction in an orderly manner, dealing specifically with problems of

---

※ This was supported by the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea and the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF-2015S1A5A8017115).

speaking, hearing, and understanding (Schegloff, Sacks, & Jefferson 1977). Repair organization specifies several places where these problems can be managed, with the initial place being in the same turn, or more precisely, in the same turn constructional unit (or TCU) as the trouble source (Schegloff et al. 1977). Based on an examination of Korean conversation, this study investigates one of the reparative operations that occurs in the same TCU: replacing. Replacing refers to “a speaker’s substituting for a wholly or partially articulated element of a TCU-in-progress another different element, while retaining the sense that ‘this is the same utterance’” (Schegloff 2013: 43), as shown in excerpts (1) and (2).<sup>1)</sup>

Excerpt (1)

- 1 S: *실내 인터라 = 인테리어가 짱이야 짱.*  
*silnay inteli- =inteylieka ccangiya ccang.*  
 indoor intori(or) interior.NM best.be.DC best  
 ‘The into- interior (design) is the best.’

Excerpt (2)

- 1 P: *예를 들어서. 우리 학교, 한양 대학교야.*  
*yeyul tulse. wuli hakkyo:, hanyang tayhakkyoey:,*  
 for.example our school ((name)) university.at  
 ‘For example, (at) our school, at Hanyang University,’

In excerpt (1), S replaces *inteli* (‘intori(or)’) with *inteylie* (‘interior’), and in

---

1) The following abbreviations are used in this paper: AC: Accusative particle, CMM: Committal suffix, CIR: Circumstantial suffix, DC: Declarative sentence-type suffix, G: Genitive case particle, NM: Nominative case particle, NML: Nominalizer, RL Relativizer suffix, RT: Retrospective mood suffix, TC: Topic-contrast, PO: Polite speech level or suffix, Q: interrogative sentence-type suffix, QT: Quotative particle

excerpt (2), P replaces *wuli bakkyo* ('our school') with *Hanyang taybakkyo* ('Hanyang University'). These two instances of replacing differ in several aspects: the site of repair initiation (within a word vs. after a fully articulated word), the initiation method (a cut-off vs. a sound stretch, coupled with a continuing intonation), and what replacing does (dealing with an error vs. dealing with a non-error). This last point is the focus of this study. The primary goal of the paper is to specify what it is that replacing achieves.

## 2. Self-initiated Same-Turn Repair

Repair that happens in the same turn is initiated and most likely carried out by the speaker of the trouble source. As with repair occurring in other opportunity places, self-initiated same-turn repair (hereafter, self-repair) is a sequential phenomenon that involves a repair segment; the repair segment basically consists of initiation and outcome (Schegloff et al. 1977). Self-repair is typically initiated by a cut-off, a sound stretch, other lexical or non-lexical resources, or covertly, and the trouble is most often quickly and successfully resolved (Schegloff 1979). A repair segment may also include various other components such as pre- and post-frames (that is, the repetition of some of the talk around the trouble source), apologies (e.g., 'sorry'), self-talk (e.g., 'what was her name?'), and so on (Kitzinger 2012).

There has been much effort surrounding the understanding of self-repair practices. Some research has focused on a particular operation, mainly clarifying the technology for the operation. Mazeland (2007), for instance, detailed the syntactic, prosodic, and sequential accomplishments of parentheticals (the insertions of a subsidiary remark) and explained their interactional uses, such as preempting a recipient's possible understanding problem. In their study on insertion repairs, Wilkinson and Weatherall (2011) explained the specific

modification patterns of inserting including specifying, intensifying, and describing.

Previous research has also noted that self-repairs fine-tune or alter a turn to meet various interactional needs at hand (Kitzinger 2012; Schegloff 2013). Self-repairs are not necessarily implemented to fix an error; rather, they can address various turn design issues that arise in the midst of turn construction (e.g., Drew, Walker, & Ogden 2013; Lerner & Kitzinger 2012). Consequently, self-repairs may manipulate an action's construction (such as changing it from a suggestion to an invitation) or its form (e.g., an offer, request, or question) (Drew et al. 2013).

Research has addressed how various interactional issues are handled by self-repairs. Particularly notable is the extensive research on self-repairs relating to a person reference (e.g., Lerner & Kitzinger 2012); self-reference repairs (specifically aggregation and extraction) manage the issues of epistemic authority and responsibility (Lerner & Kitzinger 2007), and recalibration on the granularity of a person reference can upgrade the credibility of an information source or, on the contrary, display uncertainty (Lerner et al. 2012). Research has not been limited to person reference repairs; for instance, a word search may display unease about what is about to be said (Lerner 2013), and various uses of self-repairs have been addressed on a case-by-case basis (Kitzinger 2012: 242).

Some self-repairs have been shown to be particularly attuned to institutional context. Based on the analysis of an example drawn from a courtroom discourse, where 'cop' is replaced by 'officer' in the turn addressed to a judge, Jefferson (1974) noted how the speaker presents himself as someone who would otherwise say 'cop', but adjusts his speech style "out of deference to the courtroom" (p. 192). In another study on a similar courtroom setting, Romaniuk and Ehrlich (2013) showed that self-repairs are deployed to meet setting-specific tasks and constraints in trials (e.g., a defendant's presentation

of an event in a favorable light).

A line of research from interactional linguistic perspectives has focused on exploring the relevance of morpho-syntactic features of self-repair practices in various languages. Mainly analyzing instances of recycling and replacing, this research has investigated various issues concerning how syntactic constituency is reflected in repair practices (e.g., Birkner et al. 2012 on German and Swedish; Fincke 1999 on Bikol; Fox & Jasperson 1995 on English; Fox, Hayashi, & Jasperson 1996 on English and Japanese; Németh 2012 on Hungarian; Wouk 2005 on Indonesian).

The current research focuses on examining one type of self-initiated same-turn repair, namely replacing. Specifically, it aims to explicate what it is implemented for by observing the changes that replacing brings to repairables. Some research has looked at particular workings of replacing (e.g., Lerner & Kitzinger 2007), but as of now, there has not been an attempt to explicate the range of accomplishments of replacing as a whole. As an initial step toward this effort, this study classifies instances of replacing according to the effect that it bears on a repairable.

The analysis draws on about 100 instances of replacing gathered from 15 audio- and/or video-recorded naturally occurring conversation data, each of which lasted for an hour or less.<sup>2)</sup> The conversations were recorded in Korea and America, and the participants, male and female, represented various ages and occupations. The excerpts, particularly the focal lines, will be presented in four-line transcripts which show the original Korean text, the original text Romanized by the Yale system, glosses for morphemes and words, and the English translation, respectively. The original texts were transcribed following conversation analytic conventions (See the Appendix). Due to space constraints,

---

2) The corpus comprises selected data from the Sejong corpus, collected by the National Institute of the Korean Language, and the Korean Telephone Conversations Speech corpus, collected by the Linguistic Data Consortium, in addition to personally recorded data.

only the original Korean texts and English translations are offered for the lines that surround the focal lines.

The remainder of the paper presents a brief overview of the manner in which replacing is accomplished, followed by the specification of replacing and a discussion on cases that deserve special attention before concluding.

### 3. The Methods of Replacing

Replacing is mostly initiated by a sudden stopping of a turn in progress, that is, a cut-off within a word or within a sound (i.e., the last sound of a word) (about 56 cases in this study). Replacing also can occur rather tacitly; it may not involve a prosodic break that signals a sudden disruptive stopping (18 cases). Another tacit initiation of replacing involves a prosodic break of a particular kind; speakers bring a turn to a temporary stop as if they are only momentarily taking a rest before continuing further (See excerpt (2) above). What occurs after this rest beat, indicated here as a comma commonly coupled with a sound stretch, is not the next word(s) that were anticipated to appear, but an alternative form of a preceding word(s) (11 cases). Though infrequent, replacing may also be initiated by a sound stretch (3 cases).

The dominant use of a cut-off suggests that replacing overwhelmingly has a 'backward' orientation, which addresses a repairable that has already occurred (Schegloff 1979). As reported above, however, a handful of replacements also exhibit forwardness (as their initiation involves a sound stretch). Without further investigation, it can only be speculated that this type of replacing may be only consequential; in the face of whatever trouble lies ahead, speakers change their tactic by choosing to alter what has preceded it instead (Schegloff 1979).

Replacing is frequently pre- or post-framed. Pre-frames are often of a size

smaller than a word, as in *inteli*–=*inteylie* (‘intori–=interior’). A word may also serve as a pre–frame, as in *wuli dongney: wuli cip* (‘our town: our house’). Similarly, post–frames may be smaller than a word (e.g., *wulipoko– napoko*, ‘us,to– me,to’) or word–long (e.g., *nwukwu oko sonnim oko*, ‘somebody comes a guest comes’). Both pre– and post–frames may simultaneously appear (e.g., *kathi hacakonun– kathi bakilonun*, ‘together do.let’s.Q.TP– together do.NML.toward.TP’). Replacing may not involve any linguistic frame at all; nevertheless, its occurrence is identifiable given that the replacement is the same sort of thing as the repairable.

## 4. Achievements of Replacing

My analysis suggests that replacing is largely broken into two functional categories: correcting and adjusting.<sup>3)</sup> The critical distinction between these two categories is whether or not replacing deals with an error or mistake in an objective sense. Correcting targets a repairable identifiable as a transparent error or mistake. Correcting is locally confined in the sense that the resolution of the trouble does not affect the overall turn. On the other hand, adjusting brings a change in one aspect of a repairable while retaining the overall sense of it, and it is often manipulative in the sense that it changes how a message or action is delivered. Let us discuss correcting first.

### 4.1. Correcting

Most frequently, replacing corrects various speech errors such as

---

3) These may be performed by other self–repair operations. For instance, inserting seems to be commonly used to adjust the scope of a repairable (Wilkinson & Weatherall 2011).

mispronunciation or verbal conjugation errors as shown in excerpts (3) and (4).

Excerpt (3)

- 1 S: *실내 인터라 = 인테리어가 짱이야 짱.*  
*silnay inteli- = inteylieka ccangiya ccang.*  
indoor intori(or) interior.NM best.be.DC best  
‘The into- interior (design) is the best.’

Excerpt (4)

- 1 R:→ *야 정면으로 봤 봤 보고 있는*  
*ya cengmyenulo pwass- pwass- poko issnun*  
hey front.from sa(w) sa(w) see.and be.RL  
2 *나는 어떨겠어.*  
*nanun ettebkysse.*  
I.TC guess.how.DC  
‘Hey, guess how I would feel, saw- saw- seeing (it) from the front.’

Corrections also target various slips of the tongue, as in excerpt (5).

Excerpt (5) 76 60

- 1 G: *나는 처음에 학기 얼마 학비 얼마였어?*  
*ninun chemumey hakkilma- hakkilmayesse?*  
you.TC first term how.much tuition how.much.was  
‘(When you started) first, how much was the term-(the) tuition?’

As shown, correcting can deal with various ‘innocent’ errors and mistakes, which are immediately replaced with correct alternatives. Notably, many of the speech errors reflect momentary failing in various cognitive activities such as reckoning, categorizing, identifying, and so on. A couple of examples are shown below.

www.kci.go.kr

Excerpt (6)

- 1 J: *군대 이년 [있었고,*  
‘(I was) in the army for two years and’
- 2 A: *[아: 그렇게 (> 한 거구나<).*  
‘Oh I see.’
- 3 (.)
- 4 J: → *갔다와서 육 일년 정도 (지금) 있었고,*  
*kasstawase yuk- ilnyen cengto (cikum) isessko,*  
returned.and six- one.year about now have.been.and  
‘I came back and I have been (here) for about six- one year.’

In excerpt (6), in the midst of recounting how he has ended up in America studying English, J corrects his calculation mistake regarding how long he has stayed in America, from *yuk* (‘six’), likely to have been followed by *kaywel* (‘month’), to *ilnyen* (‘one year’).

Another similar instance is shown in excerpt (7), where B’s misreckoning of age is corrected.

Excerpt (7)

- 1 B: *우리가 지금 서른하나 서른둘. 된 거잖아.*  
*wulika cikum selun bana selun twul: toyn kecanba.*  
we,NM now thirty one thirty two turn,RL thing,right  
‘We have turned thirty one thirty two, right?’

As exemplified above, errors frequently concern numbers (indicating time, age, and so on), but there seems to be no limit to what sort of errors appear in conversation. In fact, the wide variety of errors hinders an exhaustive categorization of error types. This section is concluded with one more example of correcting, concerned with some sort of classification error.

Excerpt (8)

1 S: →머리 마음 속에서 이게 끓어오르는 뭐가

*meli maum sokeyse ikbey kkulbeolunun muweka*

head heart inside like boil.up,RL something,NM

2 있는 거야 불끈 막 하면서.

*issnun keya pwulkkun: mak bamyense.*

be,RL thing,DC burst relentlessly do.as

‘There’s something like boiling up inside (my) head heart, bursting.’

In excerpt (8), S is talking about why she runs on a treadmill (instead of walking on it); that is, she feels something ‘boiling up inside her’ when she does so. Her trouble lies in classifying where she has this feeling. Her initial choice, *meli* (‘head’), which refers to a mental domain, is quickly withdrawn and replaced by *maum* (‘heart’), which is now correctly tied to the domain of feelings.

As shown in this section, correcting addresses an objective error or mistake by substituting in a correct version instead.

## 4.2. Adjusting

Adjusting presents a repairable in a new light while retaining the general sense of it; changing just one aspect of a repairable. Trouble sources addressed by adjusting widely vary in terms of what they denote, and they are not limited to people, places, and time. Repairables are also frequently observed in verbal components, adjusting formulations of actions and states. This section explores what sorts of adjustment are made onto such a wide range of repairables, focusing on three main adjustment types: perspective, scope, and degree adjustments.

It should be noted that the interactional or systemic import of an adjustment

www.kci.go.kr

seems to vary widely within the particularities of each sequential and distal context, and that it is not always apparent. Where noticeable, an attempt will be made to explore a connection between an adjustment and the action or message of the turn, or the interactional context, but the emphasis will be placed largely on explaining the three types of adjustments.

#### 4.2.1. Perspective adjustment

Speakers convey a certain stance on a referent via a particular word choice, which may be undone via adjusting, as in excerpt (9). W is talking about the convenience of hiring a ‘professional’ marriage officiant rather than personally asking someone to serve as an officiant; that is, they do not have to express their thanks in person to the officiant (lines 1, 3, and 5).

Excerpt (9)

- 1 W: [결혼 끝나고 (어) 또 찾아뵙고 인사=  
*{kyelhon kkutbnako- (e) tto chacapoypko insa=*  
 wedding end.and again visit,see thanks  
 ‘After the wedding- (uh) again you should visit (the officiant)’
- 2 S: [어.  
 ‘Yeah.’
- 3 W: =[드려야 되잖아.  
*= [iulyeya toycanba.*  
 give:should do:you.know  
 ‘to express your thanks’.
- 4 S: [어어어어.=  
 ‘Yeahyeahyeahyeah.’
- 5 W: =그런 거 안 하[구.  
 ‘(Yon) don't (have to) do such a thing.’

6 S: [o:].  
'Yeah:.'

7 (0.2)

8 W:→ 주례만 전담하는 선 = 사람들이 있대.

*cwulyeyman centambanun sen- =salamtuli isstay.*

officiant.only assume.RL tea(cher) persons be.I.hear

'(I) hear there are tea- people who professionally officiate.'

A perspectival adjustment occurs at line 8, where she mentions the 'professional' officiant; after *cwulyeyman centambanun* ('who professionally officiate'), W continues with *sen*, (which is on the way to becoming *sensayngnim*, an honorific term for a person), but immediately cuts it off and replaces it with *saram* ('person'). This adjustment entails a change in W's stance toward the professional officiants, specifically in such a way that neutralizes the honorific stance initially taken. It should be noted that the shift occurs after W's talk about those who serve as an officiant upon a couple's personal request (lines 1 and 3), where she cast an honorific stance toward them as shown by her lexical choices (*poypta* and *tulita*, honorific forms of the verbs *pota* ['see'] and *cwuta* ['give']). By changing her attention in a contrasting way to professional officiants at line 8, W neutralizes her honorific stance, arguably signaling her personal detachment from them.

Excerpt (10) shows a perspectival shift in a place reference. Before the expert, P mentioned that a student organization, *Hanchonghyen*, values the public nature of a university.

Excerpt (10)

1 P:→ 예를 들어서. 우리 학교, 한양 대학교에,

*yeyul tulse. wuli bakkyo:, hanyang taybakkyoey:,*

for.example our school ((name)) university.at

www.kci.go.kr

‘For example, (at) our school, at Hanyang University,’

2 L: *여.*

‘Yes.’

3 P: *공무원 노조가, = 진입을 했었는데,*

*kongmwuwun nocoka:, = cinkipul bayssesnumey:,*

civil.servant union.NM had.entered.and

‘The civil servant union had entered (the campus) and’

In the target line, P starts to give an example in support of his earlier mention. The trouble occurs with his choice of an expression where the instance has occurred. The initial choice, *wuli bakkyo* (‘our school’) is replaced by the official name of the university, *banyang taybakkyo* (‘Hanyang University’), which depersonalizes the place being referred to. It is speculated that P may be preemptively addressing a putative problem concerning the recognizability of the initial reference, ‘our school,’ on the part of the recipients; as supported by the earlier talk (not shown here) where he was jokingly accused of being conscious of being recorded for non-present researchers. Thus, he may have been orienting to the presence of the unknown third party researcher who would be listening to the recording.

A perspective adjustment also occurs as speakers shift a point of reference. In excerpt (11), J is announcing his determination as to how he will file a complaint against professors for cancelling a class. Note that he was in America at the time of the recording.

Excerpt (11)

1 J: → *나 나 진짜 서- 흥- 학교가서 교수들*

*na na cincca se- h- bakkyokase kyoswuteul*

I I really Se(oul) school.go.and professors

2 *안 들어오면 나( 진짜) 따질거야 맨날*

[www.kci.go.kr](http://www.kci.go.kr)

*an tuleomyen na (cincca) ttacilkeya maynnal*

not come.if I really will.complain everyday

‘Really, I I will really complain everyday if professors don’t come (to teach)  
when I go back to Seo- school.’

Given his current stay in America, J makes it a precondition that he will go back to the place where he can carry out his plan of action (filing a complaint). The formulation of this place undergoes a perspective adjustment; Jun initially says *se*, which is heard to be on the way to becoming *seul* (‘Seoul’), and replaces it with *bakkyo* (‘school’), which shifts the adopted reference point from the physical location (a particular city) to the function (an educational institution) of the place. This function-based choice turns out to be a better fit to the unfolding message of the turn (complaining about professors).

Another example of a reference point shift is shown in excerpt (12), where the participants are talking on the phone about traveling to Florida by car. At the time of the recording, they were living in different parts of the US.

Excerpt (12)

1 B: *저기서 가긴 너무 멀지.*

*kekise kakin nemwu melci.*

there.from go.NML:TC too far.CMM

‘It is too far to go from there.’

2 A: *예/.*

‘Yeah:.’

3 B: →[그래서 여기선 이제 가-

*ŭkulaŷe yekisen inceŷ kakk-*

so here.from:TC now clo(se)

4 →= 멀진 않은데,

=*melcin anbunteŷ,*

www.kci.go.kr

far.CMM:TC not.but

‘So now, from here (it) is clos- not far but’

- 5      여기선 운전해서도 가는데; 운전 하면 뭐 한 이십 시간 운전해야 된다 그  
러더라고

‘From here, you can even drive there, but if you drive, it takes about twenty  
hours or so.’

At line 1, B claims that it is too far to go (to Florida) from *keki* (‘there’), that is, where A is living. This claim is followed by a target adjustment at lines 3 and 4, where he contrastingly reckons the distance from where he is to Florida. Notably, his initial choice, *kakk-* (‘clo(se)’) is replaced by *mel* (‘far’), drastically shifting the point of reference employed, from how close to how far Florida is. The shift entails the lexical adjustment of the rest of the verbal component after the replacing (*melcin anhuntey*, ‘not far but’).

It is noteworthy that the adjustment in point is immediately followed by B’s withdrawal from his projected position on how feasible it is to drive to Florida from where he is. He has assertively argued that Florida is too far from *kekise* (‘there’) at line 1, and continues on with *yekisen* (‘from here’), at which point it is anticipated that he will contrastingly say that Florida is close (or not far) and thus feasible to go to from where he lives (line 3). He does say that Florida is not far, but attaches *-ntey* (‘but’) to the end of the utterance, starting to back down from his projected position, and ends up suggesting that it is not an easy task to drive there even from where he lives (line 5). In such a context, the target adjustment (the shift of reference point from how close to how not far) seems to be a precursor of B’s shift of position regarding the feasibility of driving to Florida.

As shown in this section, speakers adjust a perspective when referring to and formulating things and persons via various means, such as employing a new stance or a different point of reference. The examples showed how speakers

opt for a better fit in terms of the content or action of the turn, as well as in the sequential and distal context.

#### 4.2.2. Scope adjustment

Speakers can recalibrate a scope or range of what they are referring to, either specifying or broadening it. The following two examples show the specification of a time and a person, respectively. Before excerpt (13), B invited A and another friend, Sangi, to visit her, proposing binge drinking.

Excerpt (13)

- 1 A: *아이고 상이가 마실까. [(막(h) 이래bb `hh)=*  
 ‘Aiko ‘Will Sangi drink?’ (I’m like this hh `hh)’
- 2 B: *[왜냐면;*  
*waynyameyn;*  
 because
- 3 → = *삼월 달에 오사 삼월: 중순 정도까지*  
 = *samwel taley osi- samwel: cwungswun cengtokkaci*  
 March month.in come.PO March middle around.until
- 4 *오시는 게 좋을 게,*  
*osinun key cobul key,;*  
 come.PO:RL thing:NM good,RL thing:NM  
 ‘The thing is, what would be good is that in March (you) com- around until mid-March (you) come.’
- 5 *제가 이제 룸메이트를 찾아야 되거든요;*  
 ‘I should look for a roommate, you know.’
- 6 A: *응: [,*  
 ‘Uh-huh,’
- 7 B: *[근데 지금 당장은 들어가면 제가 룸메이트가 없어요;*

- 8 >그러니까< 이제 룸메이트 없을 때 얼마나 놀고서는,  
 ‘I won’t have a roommate immediately after moving in, so (we) should play hard when I don’t have a roommate and’

The adjustment occurs at line 3, where B is talking about when she hopes that A and Sangi will visit. She says *samuel taley osi* (‘in March [you] co[me]’), but cuts off and specifies a time in March: *samuel: cwungswun cengtokkaci* (‘around until mid-March’). The further talk is crucial for understanding what has motivated the adjustment: she wants to host the friends in her apartment before she finds a roommate in mid-May. In light of the rest of the turn, the initial time formulation exhibits insufficiency, which the speaker notes and immediately manages by specifying.

In excerpt (14), Sen is sharing an interesting bit of information that he has gained during his trip to Hollywood: a house with an orange wall under the Hollywood sign is Madonna’s.

Excerpt (14)

- 1 S: → 간판 보(으)는 데 거기 갔더니 누가봐 `hh (> 그<)  
*kanphan po(i)nun tey keki kassteni nwuka h `hh (>ku<)*  
 sign see.RL palce there went.RT.and somebody:NM uh
- 2 → 관 광객이 나보고, 저기저기 집 보이내.  
*kwan(h)kwangkayki napoko:, cekiceki cip poinyay.*  
 toursit.NM me.to there,there house see.Q:QT:ask  
 ‘Where the sign is seen, (we) went there, and somebody h`hh (uh) a tourist asks me if I see the house there.’
- 3 오렌지 색 담벼락 있는 데; 할리우드 밑- 간판 밑에;  
 ‘Where there is an orange wall, under Hollywood- under the sign.’

The issue arises as to how to refer to the source of the information. Sen

initially utters *nwuka* ('somebody'), and, after slight laughter, he specifies the person by replacing it with a more precise category word, *kwankwangkayk* ('tourist'). In so doing, he disambiguates the source, which increases the credibility the information (Lerner et al. 2012).

Adjusting the scope of a repairable can also occur in the opposite direction; that is, broadening. Consider except (15), drawn from a long distance phone conversation between two friends in two different states in the US.

Excerpt (15)

1 B: 어 근데 진짜 배고프다. =

'Ugh I'm really hungry now.'

2 A: →= 알았어 알았어. 전화 끊을게. 밥= 뭐라도

= *alasse, alasse. cenbwa kkunbulkey. pap=mwelato*

Okay okay phone hang.up.will rice anything.even

3 사 먹고 와. 그래 hub-hub-hub-hub-hub! [Hub-hub!

*sa mekko wa. kulay hub-hub-hub-hub-hub!* [Hub-hub!

buy eat.and come. do.so

'Okay, okay. I'll hang up. Go out and eat rice=anything. Do so. huh huh-huh-huh-huh-huh! Huh-huh'

At line 1, B expresses hunger, which is, in fact, a repetition from an earlier part of the conversation not shown here. A treats this as her move to end the call and offers to hang up. A's offer to hang up is immediately followed by an imperative that encourages B to eat. The adjustment occurs in indicating what B should eat. A broadens her initial suggestion, *pap* ('rice'), indicative of Korean food, to *mue* ('anything'). A may be orienting to the distal environment where B has a limited choice in terms of what she can eat out (B is in America, not in Korea). The adjustment seems to be also related to the action being carried out; as the form of the target utterance (i.e., an

imperative) suggests, A is deciding what action B should take (Stevanovic & Peräkylä 2012). She may be trying to lessen her imposition on B by adumbrating the what-to-eat part in the imperative.

This section showed two types of scope adjustment. Specifying seems to largely complement a repairable by clarifying, elaborating, or disambiguating it. Treating the utterance as insufficient in light of the turn or overall context, specifying preemptively deals with a problem that may arise on the part of the recipient. As was observed by previous research (Lerner et al. 2012), specifying seems to occur more frequently than broadening. When it appears, broadening seems to reflect the speaker's endeavor to fine-tune the turn in light of the action being delivered as well as the context of its delivery.

#### 4.2.3. Degree or level adjustment

Speakers can adjust the degree or level of various formulations, specifically when dealing with measurable or gradable items. Two examples are shown, starting with excerpt (16). J is talking about his experience as an administrative clerk in the army.

Excerpt (16)

1 J: *우리 행정병들은, (.) 워드로 갈구잖아.*

‘We administrative clerks, nag about Word (skills).’

2 → *(워드) 병- 한 상병쯤 되면*

*(wetu) pyeng- han sangpyengccum toymyen*

word serg(eant) about specialist.around turn.if

3 *워드 진짜 잘 쳐요*

*wetu cincca calchyeyo.*

word really type.DC

‘Word, one becomes really good with Word around when they become a

serg- specialist.'

J is talking about when one becomes competent with the Word program, and the trouble lies in the way he estimates that time, expressed in terms of military rank. J initially chooses *pyengcang* ('sergeant'), cuts himself off in the mid-course, and replaces it with *sangpyeng* ('specialist'); that is, it is around when they become a specialist that they handle Word well. As a result, the needed time is reduced by one rank.

The example in excerpt (17) shows a degree adjustment to a social distance. B is talking about a girl that he has been interested in.

Excerpt (17)

- 1 B: *근까 개 개잖아.*  
'I mean, that's her, right?'
- 2 S: *내가 얘기했었냐?* =  
'Did I tell you?'
- 3 B: *= 어 근테 개 남자친구도 있대매.*  
'Yes, but didn't (you) say she had a boyfriend?'
- 4 S: → 음: *알구 봤더니 그냥 그냥 알 친한*  
*mm:: alkwu pwassteni kunyang kunyang al- chinban*  
*mm as.it.turns.out just just kn(ow)- close:RL*
- 5 → 오- *사이더라구.*  
*o- saitelakwu.*  
*older.m(ale) relationship.RT.QT*  
'Mm:: as it turns out, he is just just (an) acquaint- close ma- friend.'

Responding to B's reminder that she has a boyfriend at line 3, S offers up new information that he has gained; in fact, he is not her boyfriend (lines 4 and 5). The target adjustment occurs in the midst of his effort to define their

www.kci.go.kr

relationship; after the notable repetition of the minimizer *kunyang* ('just'), S opts for the lexical choice *alta* ('know'), but cuts it off at *al-* ('kn[ow]'), and instead uses *chinban* ('close'), thereby increasing the level of intimacy being estimated. Arguably, contrary to his wish (given that the man may be his competitor), B acknowledges that they are close enough to have caused him to be mistaken that they were romantically involved.

As shown in this section, a level or degree of something gradable or measurable, such as time, distance, or quantity, can be adjusted, and such an adjustment is closely tied to estimating or measuring. In a way, speakers make such a cognitive activity publicly visible, specifically revealing the process up until a precise outcome of the activity is gained through a round of adjusting.

## 5. Discussion

Speakers overwhelmingly succeed in correcting and adjusting, as shown in the sections above. There are also quite a number of instances that counter this observation; that is, some sort of adjustment has occurred, but the effect seems rather obscure or minimal. This section examines such instances, based on which it is speculated that adjusting may end up with less than an 'ideal' outcome.

Consider excerpt (18) first. Referring to a Harvard professor he saw on TV, Jun is recounting that the professor does not neglect teaching despite his accomplishment as a scholar.

Excerpt (18)

1 J: → 근데, (0.2) 그 되게 되게 존경- 그

*kumtey, (0.2) ku toykey toykey conkyeng- ku*

But uh really really respect uh

www.kci.go.kr

- 2 →[신망받[는 석학이고;  
*sinmang[patnun sekbakiko*  
 trust.receive:RL great.scholar.is.and  
 ‘But (0.2) (he) is a great scholar who receives a lot a lot of  
 respect- uh trust and’
- 2 A: [(그런)네].  
 ‘(Such) Yeah.’
- 3 J: 수업 준비 열심히 해서, 한 학생들 한 뭐 열댓 명 스무 명 모아놓고  
 ‘prepares for his classes hard and gather about fifteen or so twenty students  
 together and’

The trouble lies in modifying what kind of great scholar he is, specifically in the adjectival portion of the turn: *conkyeng-ku sinmangpatnun* (‘who receives respect- uh trust’). As to what the professor receives, Jun initially chooses the word *conkyeng* (‘respect’), but immediately replaces it with *sinmang* (‘trust’). Considering that a great scholar is likely to be respected, rather than trusted, the alternative that has been put forth is, in fact, awkward to be used in the given turn; the repairable turns out to be a better fit. Excerpt (19) similarly shows an instance where the effect of replacing seems obscure or minimal at best.

Excerpt (19)

- 1 A: ‘bb 돈은 따로 내. 각자 내야죠 그러며는  
*‘bb tonen ttalo nay- kakca nayyacho kulemyenun*  
 money separately pa(y) individually pay.should then  
 ‘ ‘hh if (he) says we should pay separately- individually’

Here the speaker replaces *ttalo* (‘separately’) with *kakca* (‘individually’) in saying ‘let’s go dutch.’ Except that there is a slight adjustment of language code

(from a native to a Sino-Korean word), the interactional effect of the adjustment is less than clear.

Certainly the effect of an adjustment is not to be determined by an analyst, but there seems to be varying levels of observable clarity in terms of what an adjustment has set out to achieve. The two examples show a lesser effect of an adjustment compared to the others in the previous sections, which would be noticeable not only by an external researcher but also by the co-participants.

Instances such as the above two indicate the possibility that adjusting does not guarantee a 'dramatic' effect. Speakers find a certain word choice problematic for whatever reason that may be and attempt an adjusting, and they do succeed in bringing some change onto the word. However, the outcome may not necessarily offer a clue to what possibly has motivated the adjustment in the given context. In certain cases, as in excerpt (18), an adjustment even seems less 'fitted' than the initial choice. More research is needed for a better understanding about this, but there seems to be a possibility that speakers may fail to find a better fitting alternative than the repairable; adjusting may fail to achieve the goal it has set out to when initiated.

## 6. Conclusion

To summarize, replacing largely corrects or adjusts. Adjusting mainly affects the perspective, the scope, and the degree of various formulations. The interactional consequences of such an adjustment greatly vary, showing high sensitivity to various factors including the content, action, and the sequential and distal context. Whatever it is, speakers monitor a word choice and rework it to get a better fit in a way that maximizes whatever action the turn has undertaken to accomplish, though they may fail.

More research is needed for a better understanding of this phenomenon.

Which types of errors are managed and during which actions or activities they occur need to be clarified. A closer look at each type of adjustment that has been broadly examined in this study is also needed. It would be particularly interesting to examine which range of actions or activities each adjustment type is closely tied to, as degree adjustment has been shown to be an intrinsic part of estimating and measuring things.

## References

- Birkner, K., Henricson, S., Lindholm, C., & Pfeiffer, M. (2012). "Grammar and self-repair: Retraction patterns in German and Swedish prepositional phrases". *Journal of Pragmatics* 44(11), 1413~1433.
- Drew, P., Walker, T., & Ogden, R. (2013). "Self-repair and action construction". In M. Hayashi, G. Raymond, and J. Sidnell (eds.). *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding*, 71~94. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fincke, S. (1999). "The syntactic organization of repair in Bikol". In B. A. Fox, D. Jurafsky, and L. A. Michaelis (eds.). *Cognition and Function in Language*, 252~267. Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Fox, B., Hayashi, M., & Jasperson, R. (1996). "Resources and repair: A cross-linguistic study of the syntactic organization of repair". In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, and S. A. Thompson (eds.). *Interaction and Grammar*, 185~237. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fox, B., & Jasperson, R. (1995). "A syntactic exploration of repair in English conversation". In P. W. Davis (ed.). *Alternative Linguistics: Descriptive and Theoretical Modes*, 77~134. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jefferson, G. (1974). "Error correction as an interactional resource". *Language in Society* 3(2), 181~199.
- Kitzinger, C. (2012). "Repair". In J. Sidnell, and T. Stivers (eds.). *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, 229~256. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

- Lerner, G. H. (2013). "On the place of hesitating in delicate formulations: A turn-constructional infrastructure for collaborative indiscretion". In M. Hayashi, G. Raymond, and J. Sidnell (eds.), *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding*, 95~134. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lerner, G. H., Bolden, G. B., Hepburn, A., & Mandelbaum, J. (2012). "Reference recalibration repairs: Adjusting the precision of formulations for the task at hand". *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45(2), 191~212.
- Lerner, G. H., & Kitzinger, C. (2007). "Extraction and aggregation in the repair of individual and collective self-reference". *Discourse Studies* 9(4), 526~557.
- Lerner, G. H., & Kitzinger, C. (eds.) (2012). At the intersection of reference and repair [Special issue]. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45(2).
- Mazeland, H. (2007). "Parenthetical sequences". *Journal of Pragmatics* 39(10), 1816~1869.
- Németh, Z. (2012). "Recycling and replacement repairs as self-initiated same-turn self-repair strategies in Hungarian". *Journal of Pragmatics* 44(14), 2022~2034.
- Romaniuk, T., & Ehrlich, S. (2013). "On the interactional import of self-repair in the courtroom". In M. Hayashi, G. Raymond, and J. Sidnell (eds.), *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding*, 172~197. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1979). "The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation". In T. Givón (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics, Volume 12: Discourse and Syntax*, 261~286. New York: Academic Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2013). "Ten operations in self-initiated, same-turn repair". In M. Hayashi, G. Raymond, and J. Sidnell (eds.), *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding*, 41~70. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). "The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation". *Language* 53(2), 361~382.
- Stevanovic, M., & Peräkylä, A. (2012). "Deontic authority in interaction: The right to announce, propose, and decide". *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45(3), 297~321.
- Wilkinson, S., & Weatherall, A. (2011). "Insertion repair". *Research on Language and Social*

*Interaction* 44(1), 65~91.

Wouk, F. (2005). "The syntax of repair in Indonesian". *Discourse Studies* 7(2), 237~258.

## Appendix: Transcription Conventions

[	the beginning of overlapped talk
(0.0)	length of silence
(.)	micro-pause
underlining	relatively high pitch or volume
::	noticeably lengthened sound
-	sudden cut-off of the current sound
=	'latched' utterances
?	rising intonation
.	falling intonation
,	continuing intonation
(words)	unintelligent stretch
((words))	comments by the transcriber
hh	audible outbreath
´hh	audible inbreath
> <	increase in tempo

**박재은**

jepark@kangnam.ac.kr

논문 접수일: 2017년 8월 10일

논문 심사일: 2017년 8월 14일~9월 1일

게재 확정일: 2017년 9월 11일

www.kci.go.kr