



Post-other-correction repeat: Aspects of a third-position action in correction sequences

Yusuke Arano ^{a, b, *}

^a School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Chiba University, Japan

^b Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, Japan



ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 21 August 2017

Received in revised form 3 August 2018

Accepted 6 August 2018

Keywords:

Conversation analysis

Organisation of correction

Correction invitation

Other-correction

Post-other-correction repeat

Instruction

ABSTRACT

Employing conversation analysis, this article explores correction sequences initiated by correction invitations in ordinary multilingual interactions. The article focuses on a phenomenon I call the post-other-correction repeat (POCR) and has three main findings. First, a POCR recurrently occurs at the third position of the correction sequence. Second, it is an accomplishment of the self-corrections. Third, the repeat is a demonstration of one's real-time analysis of the prior correction by transforming an aspect of the expression used in the first-position action. In addition, the article argues for the endogenous accomplishments upon the production of the POCR. Finally, I discuss the possible instructive properties of correction sequences.

© 2018 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

This article examines correction sequences in ordinary multilingual interactions. Specifically, it focuses on the *post-other-correction repeat* (POCR), which overwhelmingly appears in the third position in the correction sequence initiated via proffering a candidate expression. In other words, a POCR is occupied at a sequential slot upon completion of an other-correction:

1 A: Candidate expression

2 B: Other-correction

3 A: Post-other-correction repeat

The previous literature discusses the third-position actions from an interactional analytic perspective (e.g., Antaki et al., 1996; Brouwer, 2004; Jefferson and Schenkein, 1978; Seuren, 2018, among others). According to Schegloff (2007), the third-position object is a possible expansion of adjacency-pairs organisation. Nevertheless, the recipients of the second-part actions are expected to respond adjacently to the second-part actions in the third position in a sequence type, for example, where the import of the second-position action is not guaranteed by the interactants themselves (Jefferson and Schenkein,

* Corresponding author: 1-33 Yayoi-cho, Inage-ku, Chiba-shi, Chiba, 263-8522 Japan.

E-mail addresses: y.arano@chiba-u.jp, aranoyusuke@gmail.com.

1978; Kevoe-Feldman, 2015; Kevoe-Feldman and Robinson, 2012; Mehan, 1979; Seedhouse, 2004; see also Heritage, 1984a). It is the third-position action that “fulfils the function ... of ratifying intersubjectivity regarding the nature of the relationship between the second-part action and the first-part action” (Kevoe-Feldman and Robinson, 2012, p. 237). Therefore, the third-position practice is a sequentially incumbent object in specific types of the course of action.

This article aims to provide an empirical account of the organisation of the correction sequences involving POCRs. Below, previous literature on other-correction is reviewed, particularly works investigating multilingual interactions vis-à-vis the in-situ ascription of expertise (Section 2). Section 3 discusses the data and methodology employed in this study. Throughout Section 4, the correction sequences associated with POCRs are described. After introducing the phenomenon (Section 4.1), more detailed analysis is presented (Section 4.1.1). Section 4.2 examines several cases from the collection to show the distributions and variations of the practices in the sequences. Section 4.3 demonstrates local interactional contingencies upon productions of POCRs. Section 4.4 describes a contrastive case to establish what the POCR does and how it is related to the interactants' orientation towards difficulty in producing a correct wording. Section 5 discusses the achievements of correction and POCR based on the findings, especially the possible instructional properties of the sequences involving the POCRs.

2. Other-correction and asymmetrical expertise

The notion of correction in this article follows that of Schegloff et al. (1977), Jefferson (1987, 2007, 2017a, 2017b) and Macbeth (2004). According to Macbeth (2004) and Maeda (2008), correction is still in the domain of repair, but the two concepts are not synonymous; parties in interaction properly use one of the two concepts depending upon ongoing practical purposes in relation to a members' practical task. Other-correction, which is described and explicated in terms of members' methods, is the replacement of an interlocutor's erroneous, incorrect or inappropriate object with the correct version thereof according to the normativity of accomplishments (Evans and Reynolds, 2016; Macbeth, 2004), in addition to securing a mutual understanding of the object (Goodwin, 1981; see also Hauser, 2010, 2017).

Other-correction is more often deployed in the context of interactions where the interactants orient towards asymmetrical expertise than in ordinary interactions between first-language (L1) speakers (Egbert, 2004; Hosoda, 2006; Macbeth, 2004). Regarding the occurrences of other-corrections in instruction-centred settings, when a student/learner fails to follow an instruction, a correction or other-initiation of correction is often performed to demonstrate the correct version for learning purposes (Evans and Reynolds, 2016; Igarashi, 2016; Keevallik, 2010; Lindwall and Ekström, 2012; Macbeth, 2004; Mondada, 2009; Nishizaka, 2017; Seedhouse, 2004, among others).¹ In a multilingual setting – whether a second language (L2) classroom or an ordinary L2 interaction (e.g., Hall, 2007; Kurhila, 2001, 2006, among others) – when the interactional focus shifts from maintaining mutual understanding of an object to correctly or appropriately producing the object, then the interactants' orientations shift to the object's production (Brouwer, 2004; Hauser, 2010; Kasper and Burch, 2016). Other-corrections are, thus, used as “one vehicle for socialisation” for “the not-yet-competent” (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 381).

That other-corrections can be a vehicle for instruction in certain contexts means that the interactants use asymmetrical expertise, knowledge or competence as a resource for correction activities (e.g., Bolden, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2018). Note that, as Nishizaka (1995, 1999) and Bolden (2012, 2014) argue, asymmetrical linguistic expertise is not *invariably* relevant just because there are L1 and L2 speakers in a certain context (see also Schegloff, 1991). Indeed, asymmetrical expertise is not an a priori concept brought from outside the ongoing interactions. Rather, it is a notion that is jointly made relevant by the interactants (Nishizaka, 1995). The interactants, therefore, reflexively show each other who they are, what they are entitled to know or how competent they are (Bolden, 2012, 2013, 2014; Heritage, 2012; Nishizaka, 1995, 1999; Sacks, 1972), thereby making a specific membership category relevant for ascribing and recognising actions and activities. These accomplishments are built upon various interactional contingencies of, in and through the unfolding interaction, yet are organised in a rational, publicly available manner so they appear in practice to be sensitive to members' local interests in their own right (see e.g., Sacks et al., 1974, p. 729f; their discussion on the parties' understandings are also available to the “professional” analysts).

3. Data and methods

Employing conversation analysis (Heritage, 1984b; Sacks, 1992; Schegloff, 2007), the instances of correction sequences containing POCRs in multilingual interactions were identified and analysed (I have collected 38 instances of the target phenomenon in total). The excerpts were from a data corpus that consists of approximately 40 h of data collected in northeast England and eastern Japan. The corpus includes audio and video recordings of face-to-face, naturally occurring, unscripted, non-instruction-centred interactions. In most cases, the interactants were having a break, coffee or dinner. They were from various countries, including Britain, China, Denmark, Japan, Thailand and so forth. English or Japanese were spoken in all interactions. To adhere to ethical guidelines, all proper names were anonymised, and hand-drawn images were used instead of actual pictures from the video data. The data were transcribed using the conventions developed by Gail Jefferson (e.g., Jefferson, 2004; see also Hepburn and Bolden, 2016). Utterances in Japanese were transcribed in three tiers. In the first tier, the actual utterances are transcribed. When necessary, a word-by-word gloss is provided in the second tier using the following abbreviations: CP for “copula”, GEN for “genitive”, INT for “interjection”, PN for “person's name”, PST for “past

¹ *Demonstration* refers to the practical exemplification of conduct for the recipient (e.g., Nishizaka, 2017).

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8947921>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/8947921>

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