



ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Linguistics and Education

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/linged

Or-prefaced third turn self-repairs in student questions



Innhwa Park*

Department of Languages and Cultures, West Chester University, United States

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Available online 27 June 2015

Keywords:

Conversation analysis
Educational discourse
Repair
Preference structure
Discourse marker
Gesture
Writing conference

ABSTRACT

Analyzing video-recordings of university-level writing conferences, this conversation analytic study identifies interactional practices through which participants orient to the preference structure of talk-in-interaction. In particular, the study examines students' *or*-prefaced third turn self-repairs produced during the earliest moments of the teacher's possible dispreference projection (e.g., short pause, hesitation, and possibly, gaze shift). In addition to displaying their orientation to getting a preferred response via the *or*-prefaced self-repair, students show their orientation to the correctness and relevance of their initial question formulation. The analyses show the ways in which students as well as teachers establish their divergent institutional goals and approach the task at hand differently. This study has implications for conversation analytic work on turn design, repair, and action projection while broadening the scope of existing research on discourse markers and educational discourse.

© 2015 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Introduction

This study uses conversation analysis (CA) to show the ways in which students as well as teachers establish their divergent institutional goals and orient differently to the task at hand during writing conferences. In particular, the study examines students' *or*-prefaced third turn self-repairs produced upon the possible projection of the teacher's dispreferred answer. By deploying the conjunction *or*, students may appear to be providing an equivalent alternative to their previously conveyed candidate understanding in the initial question. However, upon closer examination, the data show that students instead problematize the correctness or relevance of their question via the third turn self-repair. In particular, the current paper focuses on the cases in which students produce the self-repair at the earliest moments of the teacher's possible dispreference indication. Excerpt 1 illustrates the student's *or*-prefaced third turn self-repair (line 3):

(1) [AS4 Tables]

```
01 S: -> and then for the tables, I can use all of them just to::
02 T: (0.2) [(nod)]
03 S: ->> [or should I not.
```

It is important to note that the third turn is produced very early with reference to the possible projection of a dispreferred response – only after a 0.2 s pause (line 2). In fact, the student's *or*-prefaced self-repair turns out to be in an overlap with the teacher's preferred response conveyed by her nodding (Goodwin, 1980; among others). Although prefaced by the conjunction

* Correspondence to: 232 Mitchell Hall, West Chester, PA 19383, United States. Tel.: +1 610 436 2640.
E-mail address: ipark@wcupa.edu

or, the student's third turn does not convey an equivalent alternative. Instead, it conveys her orientation to the possible non-correctness of the initial question formulation in line 1. The following schematic is provided to illustrate the target phenomenon examined in this paper:

01	S:	->	Question
02	T:		Possible projection of dispreference (e.g., short pause, hesitation, gaze shift, etc.)
03	S:	->	Or-prefaced self-repair

Before analyzing examples of *or*-prefaced third turn self-repairs, I first discuss preference organization in social interaction and the structural importance of third turn repair, focusing on practices of dealing with the projection of a dispreferred response. I then briefly review the interactional functions of *or* and its use in framing alternative questions. Lastly, I consider the implications of the current study for educational interactions. The literature review is followed by the introduction of the current data and its analysis.

Preference organization

By examining the detailed practices of third turn self-repair, this study contributes to our knowledge of the preference structure of a sequence and how participants manage dispreference in interaction. Many action types project two alternative responses: one displays alignment with the FPP (First Pair Part) (e.g., agreement, granting, acceptance to assessments, requests, invitations respectively) and the other displays disalignment with the FPP (e.g., disagreement, refusal, rejection to assessments, requests, invitations respectively) (Pomerantz, 1984; Sacks, 1987; Schegloff, 2007, pp. 58–73). These different types of responses in adjacency pair sequences are not “symmetrical alternatives” (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, p. 314); the SPP that aligns with and furthers the action launched by the FPP is structurally preferred (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973; Stivers & Robinson, 2006).

The preference for promoting alignment in social interaction (cf. Goffman, 1967, 1983) manifests in the way the SPP is produced in a contiguous or a non-contiguous manner subsequent to the FPP (Sacks, 1987). That is, in a question–answer sequence, which is a prototypical example of an adjacency pair sequence, there exists “a strong preference for contiguity between question and answer, and for agreement between question and answer” (Sacks, 1987, p. 58). These two types of preferences interact with each other; aligning answers that advance the initiated course of action are produced contiguously to questions, while disaligning answers are produced with delay (pause, mitigation, elaboration, etc.) (Pomerantz, 1984; Sacks, 1987; Schegloff, 2007, pp. 58–73). Thus, one of the central features of producing a dispreferred SPP is its positioning; a preceding inter-turn gap (silence) and various delay markers (uh, well, etc.) often project a dispreferred SPP (Sacks, 1987; Schegloff, 1987, 2007, pp. 58–73).

It has been well-established in the CA literature that participants jointly orient toward completing a sequence in which the FPP and the SPP are in a preferred relationship; not only do recipients prefer their SPP to be in agreement with the FPP in a contiguous manner, but FPP speakers also modify their turns upon the projection of disagreeing answers (Davidson, 1984; Pomerantz, 1984, pp. 152–163; Sacks, 1987, pp. 63–65). Exploring various action types including an invitation, offer, request, or proposal, Davidson (1984) analyzes a range of practices by which speakers of FPPs deal with potential or actual disalignment. Sacks's (1987) and Pomerantz's (1984) observation of non-continuous disaligning SPPs shows that silence, turn beginning sentence prefaces (well, uh:), and filled silence (breathing or laughing, or both) are often treated as disalignment-implicative. Here is an excerpt from Pomerantz (1984, p. 77):

(2) [from Pomerantz, 1984, p. 77]

01	A:	->	D'they have a good cook there?
02			(1.7)
03	A:	->>	Nothing special?
04	B:		No. Every- everybody takes their turns.

The question in line 1 exhibits the questioner's preference for a 'yes' answer. However, the response is delayed, resulting in a discontinuity in the sequence. Upon the lack of response and the ensuing 1.7 s pause, A re-asks the question, its formulation now projecting a contrasting preferred answer. The revised question in line 3 is built for a 'no' answer, and B's response in line 4 is in accordance with this preference now projected by the question.

Davidson (1984) expands on Pomerantz's (1975, p. 82) work on weak agreements (hm, uh huh, Mm hm, yeah), showing how such weak agreements may also be treated as rejection-implicative in an invitation/request sequence. Excerpt 3 is taken from Davidson (1984, p. 113):

(3) [NB:48, p. 201 from Davidson, 1984, p. 113]

01	A:	->	.hhhhh Uh will you <u>call</u> 'im tuh <u>n</u> ight for me, =
02	B:		=eYea:h,
03			(.)
04	A:	->>	<u>P</u> lea::se.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/366097>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/366097>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)