Tampere University

Riikka Rinne

”AND THEN THINKING WHY AM I- WHY DID THAT COME- WHY DID THAT COME INTO M- TO MY HEAD”

A qualitative study of hesitation indicated by self-initiated self-repair in narratives about difficult discussion topics

Faculty of Information Technology and Communication Sciences

Bachelor’s Thesis

October 2021

TIIVISTELMÄ

Riikka Rinne: ”And then thinking why am I- why did that come- why did that come into m- to my head”: A qualitative study of hesitation indicated by self-initiated self-repair in narratives about difficult discussion topics
Kandidaatintutkielma
Tampereen yliopisto
Kielten kandidaattiohjelma: englannin kielen opintosuunta
Lokakuu 2021

Puhuminen on monimutkainen prosessi, joka vaatii puhujalta samanaikaista työskentelyä puheen suunnittelun, tuottamisen ja arvioimisen muodoissa. Tämä johtaa monesti siihen, että spontaanissa puheessa esiintyy erilaisia monimutkaisuudesta johtuvia piirteitä. Tällaisia piirteitä ovat esimerkiksi epäröinnistä kertovat merkit, jotka ovat keskeisiä tässä tutkielmassa.

Tässä kandidaatintutkielmassa tarkastellaan itsealoitetun oman puheen korjaamista, eli itsealoitettua itsekorjausta. Sitä tutkitaan yksittäisten henkilöiden puheenvuoroissa esiintyvien epäröinnin merkkien kautta ja hankalan tai aran keskustelunaiheen kontekstissa. Epäröintiä ilmentäviä merkkejä tässä tutkimuksessa ovat pitkät tai täytetyt tauot, täytesanat kuten ’like’, ’you know’, ’I mean’, kesken lopetetut ja uudelleen aloitetut sanat, tavujen tai sanojen pidentäminen sekä toistot. Epäröintimerkkeihin ei usein kiinnitetä huomiota tutkimuksessa, sillä ne eivät lisää keskustelun sisällöllistä merkitystä, ja ne voidaan yleensä tulkita vain omassa kontekstissaan. Tässä tutkielmassa niitä kuitenkin tarkastellaan tärkeinä oman puheen itsealoitettuun korjaukseen johtavina tekijöinä.

Epäröinnistä kertovia itsealoitettuja itsekorjauksia tutkitaan kolmessa *Death, Sex & Money* -podcastin jaksossa. Kyseinen podcast käsittelee sellaisia kysymyksiä, jotka yleensä jätetään arkisen keskustelun ulkopuolelle. Tästä syystä podcastin jaksojen keskustelunaiheet ovat aina vähintään jossain määrin hankalia tai arkoja. Erilaisilla aiheilla voi olla vaikutuksia keskustelun etenemiseen ja yksi mahdollinen ongelmien aiheuttaja on hankalat keskustelunaiheet. Podcast-dataa käsitellään tässä tutkielmassa keskustelunanalyyttisin menetelmin. Niinpä kaikki käytetyt materiaalit on litteroitu ja sen jälkeen analysoitu laadullisesti.

Tutkielman tarkoitus on arvioida epäröinnistä johtuvia itsealoitettuja itsekorjausjaksoja hankalien keskustelunaiheiden ympäristössä tapahtuvissa spontaaneissa puheenvuoroissa. Tutkimuskysymykset, joihin tutkielma pyrkii vastaamaan, ovat seuraavat: Lisääkö hankala keskustelunaihe epäröinnistä kertovia itsealoitettuja itsekorjauksia, ja miten niiden lisääntyminen ilmenee puheessa esiintyvinä epäröintimerkkeinä? Hypoteesina on, että henkilöiden puheessa esiintyvät epäröinnistä johtuvat itsealoitetut itsekorjaukset lisääntyvät, kun keskustelun aihe on hankalampi. Tulokset, jotka tutkimuksessa nousivat esiin, kannattavat hypoteesia. Niiden mukaan itsealoitettujen itsekorjausten määrä nousi kaikissa niissä tarkasteltujen puheenvuorojen kohdissa, joissa keskustelunaihe oli verraten hankala, eli joissa puhuja epäröi enemmän.

Avainsanat: epäröinti, puheen korjaus, keskustelunaihe, keskustelunanalyysi, puhe

Tämän julkaisun alkuperäisyys on tarkistettu Turnitin OriginalityCheck -ohjelmalla.

Table of Contents

1 Introduction 1
2 Theoretical background 3
2.1 Conversation analysis 3
2.2 Repair 4
2.2.1 The elements of repair 4
2.2.2 Self and other in initiation and repair 5
2.3 Self-repair 5
2.4 Markers and functions of hesitation 7
2.5 Discussion topic and context 9
2.6 Earlier studies 10
3 Data and methods 12
3.1 Data 12
3.2 Methods 13
4 Results and discussion 15
4.1 Silent and filled pauses 15
4.2 Repetition, cut-offs and fresh starts 20
4.3 Small words and lengthening of syllables and words 24
5 Conclusion 26
Bibliography 29
Appendix 31

1 Introduction

Speech progresses in time as participants in a conversation co-operate in order to build up the interaction by monitoring and editing their own and others' speech. There are three different actions that take place at the same time in the process of speech construction: planning of speech, production of the sounds and words, and finally, evaluation of the speech that has been produced. Because of this multifaceted nature, there are some noticeable signs of difficulties in unscripted spontaneous speech. These signs are, for instance, pauses, hesitative words and sounds as well as repeats and fresh starts.

This thesis looks at speech repair that is targeted at one's own speech and is initiated by oneself, which is referred to as self-initiated self-repair. The main topic of the study is the appearance of self-initiated self-repairs that indicate hesitation in conversations where the discussion topic is somehow difficult. These aspects are examined in individual persons' narratives of difficult or sensitive situations and compared at different points of the persons' speech turns. The research questions for this study are the following: Does the difficult nature of a discussion topic increase self-initiated self-repairs as a result of hesitation in speech, and how does this become evident through emerging hesitation markers? The hypothesis is that a difficult topic increases self-initiated self-repairs due to hesitation, which are demonstrated by the following markers of hesitation: long silent pauses, filled pauses with fillers like 'uh' and 'um', small words such as 'like' and 'I mean', cut-offs, fresh starts, repeats and finally, lengthening of sounds and words.

The data for this study consists of clips of recordings from three episodes from the podcast *Death, Sex & Money*, hosted by Anna Sale. The podcast was accessed through the digital music and podcast service *Spotify* for this study. The clips were transcribed by hand and a speech analysis software was utilized for measuring the silent pauses in the clips. The research

method chosen for the study is conversation analysis. It studies social interaction and embraces all its details in everyday life. Since linguistics is the study of language, it is relevant to use conversation analysis as a research method in linguistic studies. Much of conversation analytical research of self-initiated self-repair has been conducted in the context of language learning and language competency. Hesitation in connection to self-repairing has been observed in earlier studies as well but little previous research has been done on the particular topic of this thesis, which is why it is important to conduct this examination. Regardless of this study being a small-scale one, this thesis aims to provide some additional insight to the conversation analytical approach in linguistic research. What it does not aim at is making any broad generalizations about the topic as it is a qualitative study with a small data set.

Some earlier research has been administered on related topics. For instance, Rinne (2010) has examined the functions and positions of hesitative sounds in speech repairing in Russian talk show conversations. It was found that hesitative sounds have many possible functions, including announcing an upcoming self-repair and acting as an initiator for repair. Another study by Jackson and Jones (2013) considered how speakers preface their speech by 'well' to manage accuracy of an interaction. The results showed that 'well' is often used intentionally to maintain the relevancy of a previous utterance or to demonstrate the speaker's knowledge on a matter.

The second chapter of the thesis presents the theoretical framework behind conversation analysis, repair, self-repair and hesitation markers, and also the effects of context and discussion topic. The last section of the theory chapter discusses some previous studies on similar research topics. The data used in this study as well as the methods in analysing it are introduced in the third chapter of this thesis. The fourth chapter focuses on the results of the study and is followed by a conclusion in the final, fifth chapter.

2 Theoretical background

This chapter of the thesis consists of six sections, each of which introduces background for central topics of the thesis. The first four sections cover the theoretical basis for conversation analysis, repair, self-repair and markers of hesitation and their functions in interactions. Then, the effect of different discussion topics and context is introduced in the fifth section. After that, some relevant earlier studies on similar topics are presented in the final section of this chapter.

2.1 Conversation analysis

Conversation analysis (CA) in its current form was developed in the 1960's by Harvey Sacks, Emanuel A. Schegloff and Gail Jefferson. Harvey and Schegloff established the original framework and basic concepts for analysing speech in interaction by conversation analytical means. A significant contribution was also made by Jefferson, who developed a transcription system suitable for the purposes of CA studies (ten Have 2007). Conversation analysis is a qualitative research method that prefers to study naturally occurring social interactions rather than those of artificial settings. It focuses on the details of interaction and only considers what is said in a conversation situation, not what could be said. It also emphasizes the fact that any little aspect of an interaction can be remarkable.

As Lindholm et al. (2017) mention, conversation analysis, like any other method, has its strengths and weaknesses. A significant strength is the access to the tiniest possible details due to the microanalytic nature of the approach. This feature is, however, simultaneously a weakness of CA. Because of the sensitivity for details in interactional contexts, it might be difficult to make any pervasive generalizations about behaviour in social interactions with this method. Furthermore, conversation analytical studies are often case studies or have small-scale data sets, which add to the difficulty of making generalizations (Lindholm et al., 2017).

2.2 Repair

Repair is a central topic of interest in conversation analytical research. Schegloff et al. (1977) describe repair as a "self-righting mechanism" (p. 361) that addresses recurring troubles in speaking, hearing, and understanding. Sequences of repair occur in conversation where a speaker feels the need to change a whole utterance or a part of an utterance that has been said or is planned to be said. Marks of repair are, for example, pauses, hesitation markers and repetitions (Baker & Ellece, 2011, p. 115). Kaur (2011) writes that, in general, there is a massive occurrence of repair in conversations. She explains that this is due to conversation participants addressing "the difficulties that arise in interaction in an ongoing manner" (p. 2706).

2.2.1 The elements of repair

According to Schegloff et al. (1977) it is important to make a distinction between 'correction' and 'repair'. The former, correction, usually refers to a change in an utterance where a noticeable error or mistake can be found and therefore also be corrected. For repair, they give two distinctive properties: firstly, repair can occur in an utterance where there are no noticeable mistakes or anything that would need to be corrected. Secondly, repair of an utterance does not always occur even in an event of an observable error (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 363).

The parts of utterances that are changed can be referred to as 'repairables' or 'trouble sources' (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 363). Repair is a process and according to Rieger (2003), the components of repair are firstly, the repaired segment of an utterance that contains the repairable, secondly, repair initiation, and finally, the repairing segment. The last component, repairing segment, is what is used for repairing whatever problem perceived in a part of speech. The repairable might not always be noticeable to other interlocutors in a conversation. However, it is usually possible to deduce that there exists a perceived repairable in a previously uttered part of speech due to the appearance of a repair initiation and a repairing segment (p.

48). Repair initiators, then, are the elements setting off the repair. These initiators in different repair sequences can be, for example, cut-offs, fillers and stretches of sounds. In addition, question words, partial repeats of the speech turn or the phrase 'You mean' are some instances of repair initiators in conversation (Schegloff et al., 1977, pp. 367-368).

2.2.2 Self and other in initiation and repair

Two central features of repair are the divisions into self-repair and other-repair, and self-initiation and other-initiation (Schegloff et al., 1977, pp. 363-364). Self-repair refers to repairs that are made by the speaker of the repairable and other-repairs are made by another interlocutor. Repair initiation, then, is defined in relation to whether the repair is made in response to prompting or not: self-initiated repair is made to a repairable without any prompting from other participants, other-initiated repair is made after another interlocutor requests it (Matthews, 2007). These divisions together constitute the four different types of repair: self-initiated self-repair, other-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair and other-initiated other-repair.

According to Schegloff et al. (1977) there is a preference for self-correction as well as for self-initiated self-repair. They explain this by their findings showing that opportunities for self-initiation are more frequent than those for other-initiation. They conclude their explanation by mentioning that the general organization of repair essentially provides for self-repairing (pp. 376-377).

2.3 Self-repair

As mentioned, in conversation analysis self-repair means the changes that a speaker makes in their own utterances. Conversation analytical research on self-repair has been conducted for at least the past two decades. Jefferson, one of the pioneering characters in developing CA, initially referred to this type of repair as 'error correction', not 'self-repair'. Nevertheless, she

was the one who initiated the examination of self-repair phenomena in spoken interaction (Rieger, 2003, pp. 47-48).

Different self-repair techniques can be divided into groups by their function. According to Kaur (2011) different functions of self-repair can be either to 'right the wrongs' or to raise explicitness. Righting the wrongs refers to the type of changes that are usually triggered by an observable error. Emphasizing explicitness through self-repair refers to repair segments in situations where no observable errors have happened (pp. 2707, 2709).

This division by Kaur is comparable with the one that Schegloff et al. (1977) make between correction and repair when speaking of repair in its broader sense, which was presented in section 2.2.1. Both divisions share the principle of one term referring to the repair of something that is observable and can be considered an error, whereas the other term is used when repairing without the presence of an observable error. Therefore, Kaur's 'righting the wrongs' is similar to Schegloff et al.'s 'correction' and 'raising explicitness' is closer to 'repair' in meaning.

Rieger (2003) lists several features that interrupt the flow of speech and can therefore be listed as possible instances of self-initiated self-repairs. These features include, for instance, hesitation pauses, false starts and repetitions (p. 48). Schegloff et al. (1977) add to this list cut-offs, stretches of sounds and quasi-lexical fillers like 'uh' and 'um' (p. 367). 'Quasi-' is "used to show that something is almost, but not completely, the thing described" (*Cambridge Dictionary*, n.d.). Therefore, quasi-lexical means some piece of utterance that is almost lexical, almost language. When the focus of examination is on the type of self-repair with no observable errors, it can be questioned why the repair took place. A demonstrative example of a trigger for self-initiated self-repair in these situations, suggested by Schegloff (2000), is "the unavailability

of a word, such as a name, when needed" (p. 209). This can be added to the list of possible features in speech that initiate self-repair.

Self-repair is an effective device that allows the speaker to make changes and corrections, as well as to make conversation more explicit. Using a self-repair move, the speaker can also pre-eliminate possible ambiguity or problems of understanding in the interlocutors (Kaur, 2011, p. 2712). In addition, self-repair techniques can commonly be used to gain more planning time for the production of upcoming words and utterances (Rieger, 2003, p. 49). Since speech production contains many stages, like planning upcoming utterances and choosing words, gaining more time for this process is important (Erman, 1987; Holmes, 1986 as quoted in Fox Tree & Schrock, 2002, p. 731).

According to Laakso and Sorjonen (2010) self-repairs are common on all occasions of talking (p.1151). Ekberg (2012) specifies that "Self-initiated self-repair is the most common type of repair in talk-in-interaction" and that there exists "a structural reason for this" (p. 375). Heritage (2009) explains that a current speaker of a social interaction has the first opportunity at doing repair in their ongoing turn of the conversation and, therefore, say what they want to say (p. 14). Regardless of the commonness and structural potential of self-initiated self-repair, it is "the most difficult category of repair to perceive as negotiated interaction because the speaker does not overtly confer with the auditor" (Schwartz, 1980; as quoted in Kaur, 2011, p. 2706).

2.4 Markers and functions of hesitation

Spontaneous spoken language is unrehearsed and speakers need to plan, produce and review it at the same time. This results in times in a conversation where the speakers might be hesitant and unaware of what they want to say next (Gilquin, 2008, p. 120). This often appears in the form of hesitative words, sounds or features such as pauses, sounds like 'uh', 'erm', repeats and

cut-offs. These features tend to be overlooked by both speakers and hearers, as well as researchers, as they do not bring significant contributions to the message of an utterance. Usually, the focus of attention is on the semantic, that is, meaning-related content of utterances (Gilquin, 2008, p. 119). The meaning or function of hesitation features can often only be deducted from clues in the context of the conversation (Khojasteh rad & Abdullah, 2012, p. 103).

Different markers of hesitation that are relevant to this study are silent pauses and their lengths, filled pauses, repetitions of words or phrases, cut-offs, fresh starts, small words, such as 'like', 'you know', 'I mean' and finally, lengthening of syllables or words. The term 'small word' does not refer only to one word instances, but also to phrases that can be used in the same place of speech as repairs as can be seen from the examples 'you know' and 'I mean'. Silent pauses are, indeed, pauses where nothing is uttered. The length and number of silent pauses is generally not the focus of interest when researching pauses, but this thesis sets them as one of the main indicators of hesitation in speakers. Filled pauses, then, refer to pauses in an utterance that are filled with some expressions or sounds. The fillers in pauses considered in this study are the quasi-lexical fillers 'uh' and 'um'. Lastly, an example of lengthening of syllables or words could be 'the:' in which the colon ':' marks that the word or syllable before it is lengthened in speech.

There are many functions for the use of hesitation markers in speech. Due to the multifunctional nature of these markers, there may be situations where speaker and hearer interpret their use differently. Nevertheless, these markers of hesitation generally work to reveal or point out some sort of problem in an interaction. Hesitation markers acting as indicators of problems or difficulties in conversation is an important function from the point of view of successful interaction, because solving the problem is central in order to continue the flow of conversation (Rinne, 2010, p. 101).

In addition to hesitation markers expressing difficulties in uttered conversation, they also reflect the process of speech planning. Hesitation markers can give a speaker some extra time for deciding what to say next, as well as for searching a missing word. Other participants in a conversation can also be invited to the word search process by using hesitation markers. This is often evident in situations where the topic of an interaction is somehow difficult. Hesitation in relation to speech turns can indicate to other participants that a speaker still wishes to keep their turn, even when they are, for example, searching for a word or simply trying to get their thoughts organized. Hesitative features also act as initiators for shifting the speech turn to someone else, or for starting one's own turn of speech, especially if there is uncertainty of upcoming utterance (Rinne, 2010, pp. 91-92, 101).

2.5 Discussion topic and context

According to Baker and Ellece (2011), a distinction is made by Van Dijk between local and global contexts. Local contexts refer to "properties of the immediate interactional situation in which a communicative event takes place" and global contexts are "defined by the social, political, cultural and historical structures in which a communicative event takes place" (Van Dijk, 2001, p. 108 as quoted in Baker & Ellece, 2011, p. 21). In this thesis, the relevant definition to look to is the former one, local contexts, since the focus is on a few specific cases of interaction situations. In these, the possible effects of larger, global contexts are not taken into consideration.

As mentioned in the previous section, hesitation markers themselves usually do not carry much meaning, but can be understood from the context in which they occur. According to Khojasteh rad and Abdullah (2012), some earlier studies show that the amount of hesitation markers often increases in contexts where the speaker has to deal with some difficulties or challenges in interaction (p. 104). A sensitive or difficult topic of discussion could be one such challenge. Although the case usually is that a speaker hesitates less when the subject or topic is

familiar beforehand, this might be different in situations where the topic is difficult to talk about. Regardless of, for instance, the time between an incident and the event in which it is being talked about, or regardless of the number of times the story has been told, it may still take extra effort to be able to speak about it. A topic or incident that has been explained several times may become sort of automated, which can decrease the amount of hesitation. However, in a conversational situation, things like previously unanswered questions can change this. Of course, there are different personalities and characteristics that affect the way people experience things like difficult topics, but that is not taken into account in this particular study. Therefore, the context of this examination is very narrow, since the only contextual feature that is included as an effective factor is the difficulty of the topic of discussion between participants.

2.6 Earlier studies

Repair of speech is a topic that has been widely studied from different perspectives and across different fields. Much research on self-repair has been from the point of view of language learning or competency and often conducted in a classroom setting. Studies on learning or becoming competent in a language focus on adult and child learners, as well as both native and non-native learners. Another interest in research on speech repair is the effects of neurological impairment on speech production and comprehension. The topic of this thesis, hesitation leading to self-repair, has also been researched, albeit less than, for example, correcting observable errors in learners' speech. The remainder of this section presents some examples of studies related to hesitation and the use of self-initiated self-repair techniques.

Research on hesitation and repair has been done by, for example, Rinne in 2010. The study looked into the location and function of hesitative sounds in speech repair segments in Russian talk show conversations and used conversation analysis as its method. The sounds were analysed from two different perspectives: their position in the repair segment and whether they were retrospective or prospective, meaning whether they were past or future oriented. The

results of this study were in line with other research on hesitative sounds in other languages (Rinne, 2010, p.101). Three findings on hesitative sounds emerged from this study. Firstly, they can announce an upcoming repair segment, both a future oriented and a past oriented. Secondly, they can act as repair initiators, both for the speaker themself and others. Finally, a new type of repair was found to be partial abandonment. This occurs when a speaker is dissatisfied with their choice of word and initiates a repairing segment in order to replace the original word (Rinne, 2010, pp. 98, 101).

One other study on self-repair was conducted by Jackson and Jones (2013) on self-initiated repairs prefaced with 'well' to manage accuracy in communication. A conversation analytic study was administered focusing on how speakers use 'well' to introduce self-repair that operates by modifying a speech turn without retracting it. This type of repair segments appear as, for instance, additions or clarifications to previously uttered statements. This study shows that 'well' is often purposefully selected to maintain a speaker's claimed knowledge on a subject matter and to demonstrate the factual status of a previous utterance. It also helps maintaining the previous utterance's relevancy in an interaction (Jackson & Jones, 2013, pp. 28, 37).

Regarding language competency in relation to self-repair, a study conducted by Liyanage and Gardner (2013) questioned whether formal assessment criteria of second-language speakers' fluency are fair. The study investigated the use of self-repair, as well as pauses and silences in the speech of English as first language (L1) teachers and nurse trainee learners of second-language (L2) English. They found that the occurrence and distribution of silences, pauses and self-repairs did not differ greatly between the L1 and L2 speakers in the data. This finding suggests that if disfluency markers of L2 speech are observed superficially, practices used by L2 speakers that may display a high level of competence, might go unnoticed (Liyanage & Gardner, 2013, pp. 27, 33).

3 Data and methods

This chapter presents the data and methods of the study. The first section introduces the data in more detail and explains how it was collected. The methods of analysing the data are described in the second section of this chapter.

3.1 Data

The materials for this thesis consist of audio clips selected from three full-length episodes from the podcast *Death, Sex & Money*, which is hosted by Anna Sale and produced by *WNYC Studios*. The introduction text on the podcast's homepage describes *Death, Sex & Money* as a podcast about "the big questions and hard choices that are often left out of polite conversation" (*WNYC Studios*, n.d.).

The episodes selected for the study were *When we sent our son way.*, *They were managing their OCD. Then came the pandemic*. and *I killed someone. Now I study police violence.* The length of these episodes range from 23 to 40 minutes. *When we sent our son away* was published on February 20th in 2019. Two clips were taken from this episode and together they produced 2 minutes and 26 seconds of recording and 52 lines of transcript. *They were managing their OCD. Then came the pandemic* was published during the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, on April 22nd in 2020. Only one clip was taken from this episode, which was 2 minutes of recording and 43 lines of transcript. The last episode, *I killed someone. Now I study police violence* was published on November 11th in 2020. In total, four clips were chosen from this episode, which is the longest of all three. These extracts added up to 7 minutes and 43 seconds of recording and 160 lines of transcript. Even though the third episode's extracts were so long, they were all included because they produced the most demonstrative examples of the topic of this thesis.

The data was collected from public audio recordings from the digital music and podcast service *Spotify*. In order to listen to the podcast in *Spotify*, one needs to have a registered account. The recordings are, however, public to the extent that they are also available at other sources that do not require a user account, it was a mere personal preference to access them through *Spotify*.

When using data that is recorded, both from scripted and natural situations, there always exists a possibility of some effects on the results. Recordings from speech that has been scripted beforehand can be distorted since the interaction is not completely spontaneous. Unscripted situations, however, are not immune to distortion either: participants can filter their speech due to awareness of being recorded. This could be avoided by not letting speakers know about the recording, but this would raise some ethical problems. Since the data in this study comes from previously recorded, edited and to at least some extent beforehand scripted speech, it does not fully resemble real life conversation. Regardless, the effect that these factors might have on the results emerging from the data is relatively small, so it has been overlooked in this study.

3.2 Methods

The research method in this study is conversation analysis. This means that the whole process of analysis from selecting the audio clips to the final examination of the results emerging from the materials was carried out in a qualitative approach. Some quantitative measuring was also utilized in explaining the results from the analysis of the materials.

The clips used for this study were selected from full episodes of *Death, Sex & Money* based on their relevance to the topic of the thesis. The selected clips were then transcribed using the conversation analytical transcribing conventions. All the features in the transcripts except for the length of silent pauses were transcribed by hand through listening to the clips on the

desktop version of *Spotify*. The recorded conversations in these episodes happened over the phone, so at some points it was difficult to be absolutely certain of each word. Therefore, the transcripts include a few instances of (), meaning that there was an unclear section in the transcribed speech. Then, in order to be able to measure the silent pauses, a free screen recorder was used for recording the clips. Finally, the recording files were converted to mp3 form, which is supported by the software that was chosen for the measurement. The free speech analysis software *Praat*, created and developed by Paul Boersma and David Weenink, was the one utilized for measuring the lengths of silent pauses. As Harjunpää et al. (2020) mention, transcribing of materials is not merely mechanical work with the data, but rather already a sort of preliminary analysis because the phenomena of interest emerge in detail during the process of transcription (p.199).

After transcribing all of the data, the more detailed analysis of it began. In analysing the transcribed materials, the focus was strictly on the features and hints of hesitation appearing in the form of self-initiated self-repair in the participants' speech. No other features, such as grammatical details, were considered. In addition, things like the speakers' native language or their gender, age and other such attributes were purposefully disregarded in order to objectively examine the materials.

The aspects analysed from the materials include the following markers of hesitation surfacing as self-initiated self-repairs in this current study: filled pauses and their fillers (quasi-lexical 'uh', 'um'), silent pauses and their lengths, small words ('like', 'you know', 'I mean'), cut-offs, repetitions, fresh starts and lengthening of syllables or words. Silent pauses are marked in parentheses in the transcripts. A micropause is a pause that lasts less than 0.2 seconds and is marked with (.). Anything that is 0.2 seconds or longer is indicated with the length in parentheses, for example, (0.7). The pauses under 0.7 seconds are considered 'normal' length pauses. Some explanations of hesitation markers and their functions were presented in section

2.4. The transcription symbols are provided at the end of the thesis as an appendix along with a short explanation for each one's meaning. It is important to note that in conversation analytical context, the marks '. , ?' have nothing to do with punctuation. In transcripts, they are markers of intonation.

4 Results and discussion

This chapter presents the results that emerged from analysing the materials. The research questions to which an answer was looked for in this thesis were: Does the difficult nature of a discussion topic increase self-initiated self-repairs as a result of hesitation in speech, and how does this become evident through emerging hesitation markers? The hypothesis was that the occurrence of such features would increase in the parts of participants' narratives where the topic of discussion is more difficult or sensitive.

The chapter is divided into three sections, each of which deals with a few particular aspects of hesitation and its markers. The first section addresses silent and filled pauses. The second section takes a closer look at repetition, cut-offs and fresh starts. The third section concerns small words and the lengthening of words and syllables. To demonstrate the results, extracts from the transcripts are provided in each section. The relevant features in the extracts are in ***bolded italics*** for emphasis. These are not conversation analytical ways of marking and thus should not add any confusion to reading the extracts. The full transcripts are provided as appendixes at the end of the thesis. For each extract it is also noted which transcript and appendix it is taken from.

4.1 Silent and filled pauses

Firstly, I will present the results regarding pauses found in the materials. More specifically, the focus of this section are the lengths of silent pauses and the fillers in filled pauses. As a reminder, pauses of under 0.7 seconds are considered as 'normal' in length.

Extract 1 from appendix 5, transcript 4

T: I'd already spent so much time thinking about it, (0.4) and: a lot of times it's not (0.6) a choice, to think about it, you just it's something that (0.4) is always gonna be something that you're gonna think about. (0.2) you know like ***(0.9)*** so: ***(1.7)*** when I when I: (0.5) watch these I'm like uh I find it um (0.6) like I'm doing something productive.

Extract 2 from appendix 5, transcript 4

T: Um: no. (0.4) So ***(0.9)*** I ***(1.8)*** cause when I: see them ***(1.2)***
I: (0.2) .h when I watch them: I find myself just very focused on: ***(0.9)*** finding identifying things that went wrong, ***(0.7)*** or identifying things that could be ↑changed (.) .hh or identifying trying to identify a pattern like ***(0.9)*** .hh.
(3.9)
T: () for one sec.
(0.5)
A: Yeah.
(9.2)
T: So I guess they did ha I do um ha .hh.

Extract 3 from appendix 6, transcript 5

idea of being like a police officer, (0.6) was: like a (0.3) a good solid respectable ***(1.3)*** type of a position, (0.5) and I also thought that it would be an interesting (0.4) background to bring into ***(0.7)*** my reapplication to the state department.

Extracts 1-3 are all from the episode *I killed someone. Now I study police violence*. These three extracts demonstrate the emergence of silent pauses, both of 'normal' length as well as longer ones. Since these extracts are from the same episode, the speaker remains the same in all of them, which emphasizes the observations. The guest in this episode is Tom, a former police officer, who shot someone on the job and afterwards proceeded to study criminology and police violence.

Extracts 1 and 2 are close to each other in a turn of speech but there is a difference between them in terms of the number of silent pauses and their lengths. Extract 1 includes a total of 8 measurable silent pauses, of which 6 are under 0.7 seconds and 2 are over. In comparison, extract 2 includes 12 pauses. Out of these, only 4 are under 0.7 seconds in length. The other 8 instances of silent pauses in this extract range from 0.7 seconds all the way to 9.2 seconds. The two longest pauses, 3.9 seconds and 9.2 seconds are both in between speech turns. 3.9 seconds appears between two of Tom's turns on line 18, and the pause of 9.2 seconds takes place between Anna and Tom's speech turns on line 22. Extract 3 is similar to extract 1 in its pauses: out of a total of 6 pauses, 4 are under 0.7 seconds and the other 2 are 0.7 seconds or longer.

The major difference between extracts 1 and 3 and extract 2 is the length of pauses in each. In 3 Tom is explaining how he felt about not getting into the state department on his first try and as can be seen from the extract as well as from the full transcript (appendix 6), there are only a few pauses and in general, the speech is not hesitative. The same is true for extract 1, where Tom is disclosing insights about whether the incident is something he is always going to have on his mind. He also states that he has thought about it so much that thinking about it does not affect him as negatively as before and neither do his studies related to the incident. In this extract, there is also no evidence of much hesitation in the form of silent, long pauses.

Extract 2, then, presents a noticeable contrast when compared with extracts 1 and 3. The speech in this extract is only a few seconds after the first one. Here, Tom continues discussion about his studies and how he feels that it is actually helpful. First, he is explaining what he is getting out of his research. During this there are already some longer pauses in lines 11-17 of this extract, and then he starts to hesitate more and goes silent for almost 4 seconds, mid-sentence. On line 19, there is an unclear section, which from the context could be deducted to be something along the lines of "Could you hold on", as it is continued with "for one sec". Anna, the host of the podcast, almost immediately gives a "Yeah" as an answer. Then, a silence of almost 10 seconds follows from both ends. During this time, Tom probably had to pull together his thoughts, words and even himself due to remembering the event. Anna gave Tom the time he needed for this.

Extract 4 from appendix 2, transcript 1

```
3  D:   hh (1.6) .hh Um: (0.7) it it it (0.6) it devastated me.
4       (0.3) um (1.3) completely. I mean I um (2.2) I just
5       really went down a very: uh a (1.3) dark (0.7) place,
6       I just um (2.7) hh. (1.5) I think in the ↑past, (0.5)
7       >one thing I was always able to hold on, to was like
8       this optimism. that< (1.2) okay. things aren't great
9       right now, but we can figure out how to make 'em better.
```

Extract 5 from appendix 3, transcript 2

```
7  D:   [ha ha ha like] (.) wait a minute. ha ha ha .hh ↑what
8       the hell .hh um (0.7) and so yeah that was it was
9       >bizarre< and (0.5) and so (0.2) when we left there it
10      was like oh wow okay (0.4) and: so then we started you
11      know having date nights, and .hh (0.5) um ha ha you
12      know just kind of relaxing: and I've seen more movies
13      probably in the in this past six weeks than I've seen
14      in like a you know (.) a year, the past year ha ha,
```

Extracts 4 and 5 are from transcripts 1 and 2 from the episode *When we sent our son away*, which means that again, the speaker in both extracts is the same. The guest in this episode is Diane M., who is disclosing her experiences with having to send one of her two autistic sons away due to a violent outburst. The extracts provide examples of pauses filled with quasi-lexical sounds “um” and “uh” at different parts of narration. Extract 4 shows how Diane M. is telling something about a difficult time in her life. Within the 7 lines of transcript the filler ‘um’ is found 4 times and the other filler ‘uh’ is also present once. In this extract, she describes having felt devastated by the event and lines 5-7 imply that at that time, she no longer felt like there was much optimism left. This recollection of the difficult situation makes Diane M. hesitant in her speech.

In contrast to extract 4, extract 5 presents quite a different mood from Diane M.. In these 8 lines of transcript, the filler ‘um’ only occurs twice and ‘uh’ does not appear at all. In this extract, Diane M. is explaining what happened after she and her husband had sent their son away. Her speech includes laughter and is less hesitant as the discussion leans more on some of the positive aspects of the difficult circumstances. She is describing having date nights and more relaxing time with her husband without too many worries about their son, who after all turned out to do well away from home.

The first five extracts demonstrated that there were a good number of instances of hesitation-caused self-initiated self-repairs in the forms of silent pauses and filled pauses in the materials. In the next section I introduce cases of repeating, cutting off words or phrases and starting fresh.

4.2 Repetition, cut-offs and fresh starts

In this section, I will discuss the instances of repetitions, cut-offs and fresh starts in the data. This section includes quite a lengthy amount of transcript extracts since the materials provided great examples of this type of self-initiated self-repairs.

Extract 6 from appendix 4, transcript 3

D: =I remember in January (.) some friends who know me very well (0.4) like texted they were like ↑how are you doing. 'cause it was sort of coming or February I guess when it started coming towards New York. (0.9) um (0.8) and ***I was sort of joki- I was joking*** about it. and I was like you guys I've been preparing for covid for my entire life. (0.3) .h and I ↑think I was sort of like. you know what ↑I may be able to handle this. because

Extract 7 from appendix 4, transcript 3

be okay, and then °I don't know°. ***it sort of*** (1.3) ***it sort of*** (0.7) came out of nowhere. and just knocked me sideways again. that um (2.3) yeah ***I had like a breakdown with my husband***: (0.3) two weeks ago where (2.0) hhh I () ***then I get this*** (0.5) again anxious (0.3) uh (0.3) ***b-*** (0.6) ***breathing*** thing where I hyperventilate. (1.0) and ***I just one night I just*** (0.3) ↓***broke down***. (1.2) ***with with my husband*** and. (1.3) just there's something wrong with me. and ***I will never*** (0.9) you know ***something is broken***. (0.6) and I can't cope. (1.4)

D: This is like ***every every*** fear that I've ha:d you know when I was (1.0) ***s- stru- really really*** in the midst of of ***struggling*** with this. is like (0.5) ↑oh (0.3) you were right all along. ha ha um ha ha .hhh so its very weird. (0.9) that everything that I was afraid of is coming true.

Extracts 6 and 7 are from the episode *They were managing their OCD. Then came the pandemic*. In this episode, the speaker is Diane D., who has been managing her obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD) for over 20 years. She was faced with troubles in coping when the COVID-19 pandemic began to spread.

In the first of these two extracts, Diane D. is describing a quite light-hearted situation from January 2020 before the pandemic hit her hometown. She had told her friends jokingly that her OCD had prepared her for this type of a situation for the past two decades. There is only one case of repetition, cut-off or fresh starts in this extract: "I was sort of joki- I was joking" on line 11. This example is all three at the same time. The word 'joking' is repeated and the sentence is restarted after cutting off the first utterance of 'joki-'. This sentence does not really imply that the repair would be due to hesitation. Rather, it points to maintaining the plot of the story. Based on these observations, this extract from Diane D.'s speech does not indicate hesitation.

In contrast, extract 7 presents a different way of narrating than the previous one. There are only about 10 seconds in time between these two extracts, but the hesitative features of Diane D.'s speech change quite noticeably between them. In extract 7, she is describing a breakdown that happened to her when the impact of the pandemic took her by surprise in terms of coping with her OCD. This extract includes four instances of repetition : "it sort of (1.3) it sort of" (line 17-18), "with with" (line 24), "every every" (line 28) and "really really" (line 29). Cut-offs appear on lines 22 and 29-30: "b- (0.6) breathing" and "s- stru- … struggling".

In addition to these repeats and cut-offs, utterances on lines 19-20 and 23-24 demonstrate a fresh start for this part of the narration. The previous utterance "I had like a breakdown with my husband" begins the description of this event, but it is interrupted by additional information. Lines 23-24 then pick up the storyline, restating and specifying the

breakdown that happened. Another fresh start is after a cut-off on lines 25-26, where Diane D. continues disclosing her feelings at the time of the breakdown. First, she starts an utterance with "I Will never" and then cuts it off. After a pause, she starts fresh with a changed form of utterance and a change to the story with "something is broken".

The difference between Diane D.'s speech in these extracts is perhaps caused by the difference in recentness and level of difficulty in the events she is describing in each. The first situation is from three months prior to the publishing of this episode and it is a casual, humoristic one. The latter, at the time of the interview, had only happened two weeks ago, which makes it a lot more recent. It is also a much more difficult incident than a humorous conversation among good friends, as Diane D. was very vulnerable in that situation as well as when talking about it. It was also clearly a setback for her in coping with her OCD.

Extract 8 from appendix 7, transcript 6

13 to face the (0.8) the door (0.4) there was (.) the man
14 from night before (0.5) and he was like (0.4) no shirt
15 o:n and ***he was like had a*** bunch of blood all over him
16 and he had a big (0.5) .h knife in his hand (1.1) and
17 (0.7) .hh SO I WAS IN A KIND OF A TOUGH SPOT, (0.5)
18 he's only a few feet away from me (0.5) and I know
19 there's children in the apartment, (1.0) so: (0.2)

Extract 9 from appendix 8, transcript 7

23 slow (0.4)and ***I could see my-*** (0.4) ***I could see my >my***
24 ***so my*** brain I was thinking< okay, (0.8) ***you don't have***
25 you know ***you don't have*** any options here ***you need to***
26 (0.3) ***you need to*** shoot this guy or else he's gonna

Extract 10 from appendix 8, transcript 7

51 watching my body do something. (0.5) .h and ***I'm also***
52 ***th- and it was also thought about we- it was we- like***
53 ***a weird*** thing because ***I remember thinking*** .hh (0.9)

54 while I was shooting, (0.4) ***I remember thinking I'm***
55 ***gonna miss my Spani- my Spanish exam***. (1.1) I r- um:=
56 A: =Wow.
57 (1.0)
58 T: I have the ***Spanish exam*** tonight (0.5) and ***I'm gonna***
59 ***miss my Spanish exam*** (0.4) and then thinking .hh ***why am***
60 ***I- why did that come-*** (0.3) ***why did that come into m-***
61 (0.6) ***to my head*** (0.5) .h but it's all: (0.9) so: ***w-*** it
62 felt like I had so much time to think about that (0.6)

Extracts 8, 9 and 10 are all from the episode *I killed someone. Now I study police violence.* with Tom, the former policeman, as the speaker. Here, extract 8 is different from extracts 9 and 10. The former only includes one instance of a fresh start: "he was like had a" on line 22. Here, Tom stated first that the man from the night before *was* something and then changed it into how the man *had* a bunch of blood on him. This is quite a neutral case of repair and does not point to hesitation behind it.

The two latter extracts, then, present many more instances of hesitation leading to repeating, cutting off and starting again. Extract 9 contains three examples of repeats. These are "I could see my- … I could see my" on line 23, "my >my so my" on lines 23-24, "you don't have … you don't have" on lines 24-25 and "you need to … you need to" on lines 25-26. Extract 10 also has several instances of repeats. "my Spanish exam" is repeated on lines 55 and 58-59, twice in both cases. Then, "I remember thinking" is first uttered on line 53 and interrupted by inserting additional information and uttered again on the following line. Lastly, the whole phrase "I'm gonna miss my Spanish exam" is repeated on lines 54-55 and 58-59.

In addition to these repeats, there are also two sentences containing cut off words and fresh starts in extract 10. "I'm also th- and it was also thought about we- it was we- like a weird…" in the beginning of this extract cuts off a total of three times, once at "th-" and twice

at “we-“ and then restarts the formatting of the sentence. “why am I- why did that come- … why did that come into m- … to my head” on lines 59-61 also cuts off three times at “I-“, “come-“ and “m-“ to rephrase the upcoming utterance. The first instance of “my spani-“ on line 55 is also a cut off word. Line 61 includes one last instance of a cut-off in “w-“.

The fact that these extracts differ from one another is perhaps due to the exact moment of the shooting incident Tom is describing in each of them. In extract 8 he is outlining what happened in the seconds before the actual shooting took place. Then, extracts 9 and 10 are of him recalling what was going through his head at the exact time of the shooting. Therefore, the first of these three extracts displays a more rehearsed and to some extent less difficult piece of speech, and the two latter ones demonstrate a part that is more difficult and perhaps more personal as well.

As can be seen from the results I presented in this section, the materials included a large number of self-initiated self-repairs due to hesitation embodied as repetition, cutting off words and starting sentences or words again. In the next final section of this chapter I present results considering the occurrence of small words and lengthening of words and syllables in the data.

4.3 Small words and lengthening of syllables and words

Lastly, in this section of the results I will look more closely into the use of the small words ‘like’, ‘I mean’ and ‘you know’ as well as the lengthening of words and syllables that were found in the materials.

Extract 11 from appendix 7, transcript 6

```
28      (0.4) raised the knife and started just ***like*** (0.2) a
29      sprint (.) towards ***me:*** (0.3) with the knife, (0.7) ***a:nd***
30      so I fired two rounds (0.2) and I hit him twice in the
31      chest. (0.5) .hh um he fell to the ground, (0.3) and
32      (0.6) I could tell by the way he (0.3) was (0.3) b-
```

33 (0.2) ***you know*** (0.6) breathing ***like*** his last ***like*** his
34 last few (.) .hh sort of ***heavy:*** (0.3) sighs and then he (.)
35 uh stopped moving pretty quickly.

Extract 12 from appendix 8, transcript 7

7 I had ***like*** a time distortion, (0.4) I ***kno:w*** at a
8 rational level, that it was (0.6) it was ***like*** (0.6) a
9 split second, ***like*** it was almost immediate, (0.7) ***like***
10 um ***I mean*** a a second or two at the most, (0.5) kind of
11 a thing, (0.7) ***um:*** (0.6) he was only I think (0.3) I
12 don't remember the exact () he was 17 feet away from me
13 is what they ***measu:red*** (0.6) and when you're sprinting
14 that you can cover that in just a couple of seconds,
15 ***like*** its (0.3) uh- a second ***you know*** it's nothing. (.)
16 .hh but in my ***mi:nd*** (1.0) it was ***like*** a really ***lo:ong***
17 (1.2) thing, (0.3) hh so it's ***uh:*** (0.8) ***um:*** (1.1) so ***like I:***
18 (0.7) it was ***like*** watching myself (0.9) do it,

These last two extracts are again from *I killed someone. Now I study police violence* with Tom. They offer great examples of lengthening of syllables and words and the use of small words. Extract 11 is from transcript 6 which is in general not very hesitative. It includes 4 uses of the small words 'like' and 'you know' and 3 cases of lengthening. This extract is from the part of the interview in which Tom is explaining how the shooting situation played out.

Extract 12 presents a total of 18 cases of small words or syllable and word lengthening. 8 out of these are 'like', 1 is 'I mean' and 1 is 'you know' adding up to 10 instances of small words. The remaining 8 cases are lengthening of words and syllables. These occur on lines 7,11, 13, 16 and 17. Here, Tom is answering Anna's question about his perception of time during the shooting situation.

The difference in the number of small words and lengthening is quite clear between extracts 11 and 12. What is interesting about there being such differences though, is how in

both of them Tom is describing the same exact time of the event. In the first of the two he is even explaining how the man took his last breaths and soon passed away in front of him. The probable reason for this is the difference in the actual questions he is answering. In extract 11 Tom is answering the question of what happened during the shooting. This description of the course of events is very likely something that Tom has disclosed several times to the authorities, to people close to him and also to himself. In addition, as a police officer, this was probably not his first time handling a situation in which something like this had happened. His studies on police violence could also be a factor in giving him ways for dealing with it. Thus, it is something that has become almost automated in the way that he does not have to live the events again in order to express them. In extract 12 Anna has asked how much time Tom thinks passed during the actual shooting. This is likely a question that has not been asked before. Tom does not have an automatic answer for it, so it surprises him and he needs more time for thinking about the answer, which leads to the emergent instances of small words and lengthening. In addition, this question addresses more of Tom's personal thinking and reflections.

These extracts illustrate the frequent occurrence of small words and the lengthening of words and syllables in the data collected. This section concludes the results from the analysis of the materials for this study. The following chapter presents conclusions of the thesis and is followed by bibliography and the appendix.

5 Conclusion

The aim of this thesis was to examine the self-initiated self-repairs that are caused by hesitation in individuals' narratives in the context of difficult discussion topics and realized in the form of hesitation markers. My research questions were the following: Does the difficult nature of a discussion topic increase self-initiated self-repairs as a result of hesitation in speech, and how does this become evident through emerging hesitation markers? The hypothesis I set for the

study was that there would be an increase in the amount of hesitation-triggered self-initiated self-repairs in participants' narratives about difficult or sensitive discussion topics. I tested the hypothesis by analysing the speech of clips from three episodes of the podcast *Death, Sex & Money*. I approached the analysis mostly qualitatively and used conversation analysis as my research method. I also included a small amount of quantitative method in the form of pointing out some instances of hesitation features in the materials numerically.

The results from the analysis of these materials seem to support my hypothesis, as they point to the direction of a large amount of the defined markers of hesitation in participants' speech around a difficult topic. I found a great number of instances of hesitation leading to self-initiated self-repairs in my data. For demonstrating the results, I divided the self-repair techniques that indicate hesitation into three sub-categories. These categories are the sections of chapter 4 in my thesis. The first category was silent and filled pauses, the second category was repetition, cut-offs and fresh starts and the third one was small words and lengthening of syllables and words. I chose to introduce extracts from the materials that best demonstrated the results. Therefore, I presented quite a lot of transcript amidst the analysis. I attempted to be able to show clear comparisons between extracts, which is why I included at least two extracts from an episode that was used for demonstrating the results. This is because having two or more extracts from one episode means that there are two or more extracts with the same speaker narrating the same event as evidence of hesitation leading to self-initiated self-repairs. Each of the sections with different subcategories of self-initiated self-repair due to hesitation showed an increase of these in the speaker's speech turns at more difficult parts of the narration.

I would like to note that my study was a very small one with very limited materials. Thus, the results I presented in this thesis are not in any way generalizable, nor did I aim for them to be. Although I presented some earlier relevant research in the theoretical background for my thesis, there exists little research on the specific topic that I examined. Therefore, I think

it is important to explore these more overlooked areas of research as well. For future studies, it could be beneficial to look into these features on a larger scale with a broader and more extensive data set than the one I was able to analyse. In addition, hesitation could be investigated in a comparative approach between, for instance, self- and other-initiation or self- and other-repair.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Sale, A. (Host). (2020, November 11). I killed someone. Now I study police violence. [Audio podcast episode]. In *Death, Sex & Money*. WNYC Studios.

Sale, A. (Host). (2020, April 22). They were managing their OCD. Then came the pandemic. [Audio podcast episode]. In *Death, Sex & Money*. WNYC Studios.

Sale, A. (Host). (2019, February 20). When we sent our son way. [Audio podcast episode]. In *Death, Sex & Money*. WNYC Studios.

Secondary sources

Baker, P., & Ellece, S. (2011). *Key Terms in Discourse Analysis.* Bloomsbury Publishing Plc. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/tampere/detail.action?pq-origsite=primo&docID=634551

Boersma, P. & Weenink, D. (n.d.). *Praat: doing phonetics by computer* (Version 6.1.35). www.praat.org

Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d.). Quasi-. In *Dictionary.Cambridge.org dictionary.* Retrieved September 8, 2021, from https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/quasi

Ekberg, S. (2012). Addressing a source of trouble outside of the repair space. *Journal of Pragmatics,44*(4)*,* pp. 374-386. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.01.006

Fox Tree, J. E., & Schrock, J. C. (2002). Basic meanings of *you know* and *I mean*. *Journal of Pragmatics, 34*(6), pp. 727-747. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00027-9

Gilquin, G. (2008). Hesitation markers among EFL learners: Pragmatic deficiency or difference? In J. Romero-Trillo (Ed.), *Pragmatics and Corpus Linguistics: A mutualistic entente* (pp. 119-149). De Gruyter Mouton. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/tampere/reader.action?docID=370772&ppg=125

Harjunpää, K., Mondada, L., & Svinhufvud, K. (2020). Multimodaalinen litterointi keskustelunanalyysissä. *Puhe ja kieli*, *39*(3), pp. 195–220. https://doi.org/10.23997/pk.77350

Heritage, J. (2009). Conversation analysis as social theory. In B. Turner (Ed.), *The New Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*. Wiley-Blackwell. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311102386

Jackson, C., Jones, D. (2013). Well they had a couple of bats to be truthful: Well-prefaced, self-initiated repairs in managing relevant accuracy in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics, 47*(1)*,* pp. 28-40*.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.11.013

Kaur, J. (2011). Raising explicitness through self-repair in English as a lingua franca. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(11), pp. 2704-2715. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.04.012

Khojasteh rad, S. & Abdullah, A. N. (2012). Effect of context on types of hesitation strategies used by Iranian EFL learners in L" oral language tests. *English Language Teaching, 5*(7), pp. 102-109. DOI:10.5539/elt.v5n7p102

Laakso, M., & Sorjonen, M.-L. (2010). Cut-off or particle – Devices for initiating self-repair in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 42*(4), pp. 1151-1172. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.09.004

Lindholm, C., Stevanovic, M. & Peräkylä, A. (2017). Johdanto. In C. Lindholm & M. Stevanovic (Eds.), *Keskustelunanalyysi: Kuinka tutkia sosiaalista toimintaa ja vuorovaikutusta.* Vastapaino. https://www.ellibslibrary.com/book/9789517685993

Liyanage, I., & Gardner, R. (2013). Assessing fluency: are the criteria fair? *Classroom Discourse. 4*(1), pp. 27-41. https://doi-org.libproxy.tuni.fi/10.1080/19463014.2013.779285

Matthews, P. H. (2007). Repair. In *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics.* 2nd ed. Oxford University Press. https://www-oxfordreference-com.libproxy.tuni.fi/view/10.1093/acref/9780199202720.001.0001/acref-9780199202720

Rieger, C. L. (2003). Repetitions as self-repair strategies in English and German conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics, 35*(1), pp. 47-69. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(01)00060-1

Rinne, H. (2010). Epäröintiäänteiden sijainti ja tehtävät korjausjäsennyksessä venäläisissä televisiokeskusteluissa. *Puhe ja kieli, 30*(2), pp.89–106. https://journal.fi/pk/article/view/4735

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation. *Language*, *53*(2), pp. 361-382. DOI:10.2307/413107

Schegloff, E. A. (2000). When 'others' initiate repair. *Applied linguistics*, *21*(2), pp. 205-243. DOI:10.1093/applin/21.2.205

ten Have, Paul. (2007). *Doing Conversation Analysis*. 2nd ed. SAGE. https://dx-doi-org.libproxy.tuni.fi/10.4135/9781849208895

WNYC Studios. (n.d.). *Death, Sex & Money with Anna Sale.* https://www.wnycstudios.org/podcasts/deathsexmoney

Appendix

Appendix 1: Transcription Symbols

Symbol	**Description**
(.)	A micropause - a pause shorter than 0.2 seconds.
(0.7)	A timed pause - long enough to measure.
wo:rd	A colon indicates lengthening of syllable or word.
word-	A dash indicates a cut-off.
[]	Square brackets indicate an overlap in speech.
( )	Empty parentheses indicate an unclear section.
.hhh	Indicates an inbreath. Three letters mean a 'normal' duration, more or fewer letters mean longer or shorter inbreaths.
hhh	Indicates and outbreath. Three letters mean a 'normal' duration, more or fewer letters mean longer or shorter outbreaths.
w(h)ord	Indicates a spurt of an outbreath during speech, for instance in laughing while talking.
~word~	Tilde signs indicates shaky voice, for instance in crying.
=	An equal sign indicates that there is no pause between the end of one turn and the beginning of another.
.	Indicates falling intonation.
,	Indicates slight rising intonation or 'continuing intonation'.
?	Indicates rising intonation.
<u>word</u>	Underlining indicates emphasis.
WORD	Upper case letters indicate syllables or words that are louder than the surrounding speech by the same speaker.
°word°	Degree signs indicate syllables or words that are quieter than the surrounding speech by the same speaker.
>word<	Right/left arrows indicate speech that is faster than the surrounding speech by the same speaker.
<word>	Left/right arrows indicate speech that is slower than the surrounding speech by the same speaker.
↑word	An upwards arrow indicates a rise in pitch.
↓word	A downwards arrow indicates a drop in pitch.

(University Transcriptions. (n.d.). *Jefferson Transcription System – A guide to the symbols.* https://www.universitytranscriptions.co.uk/jefferson-transcription-system-a-guide-to-the-symbols/)

Appendix 2: Transcript 1

A: What was it like for you to make that decision.
(0.3)
D: hh (1.6) .hh Um: (0.7) it it it (0.6) it devastated me. (0.3) um (1.3) completely. I mean I um (2.2) I just really went down a very: uh a (1.3) dark (0.7) place, I just um (2.7) hh. (1.5) I think in the ↑past, (0.5) >one thing I was always able to hold on, to was like this optimism. that< (1.2) okay. things aren't great right now, but we can figure out how to make 'em better.
(0.4)
A: Mm-hmm.
(0.5)
D: And. (0.7) when this happened um (1.4) it felt like (2.1) .hh everything I'd done for the past (0.4) 15 16 years was (0.3) completely .hh (0.3) for not it w- you know nothing: um (1.2) because here we were. after all these years of (0.6) therapy, and working with him, and everything and we were exactly at the place that I: (0.3) never wanted us to be. (.) where we were sending him somewhere else.
(0.8)
A: Mm.
(0.2)
D: Um (1.7) .hh and ↑yeah and I just got um:. really severely >depressed.< (0.4) um: I was crying all the time. I mean I was .hh hh I would just be (0.3) it wo- it it took like (0.3) like all my energy to get through the day:. (0.6) at work, or whatever and not just be bursting into tears at every second it was (0.8) I would (.) I was (1.0) I was a complete wreck. (0.2) .hhh um: (1.2) and yeah and and and hhh you know your your your your brain can spiral you kno(h)w um (0.9) because

you know it became not just this is a bad moment. (0.8) but this is (0.3) this has been (0.5) bad. everything is bad. things are always going to be bad. (0.4) you know (0.7) um (0.6) and I just and I got to a point where I was um (0.6) where I was suicidal. (1.3) I just I just couldn't I couldn't take it anymore.

Appendix 3: Transcript 2

D: So then (0.2) I did go see him in the following week. (0.3) So Greg and I went () lets go see him, (0.8) and he's (0.3) he's just kind of like (0.9) why are you here. (0.6) BYE MOMMY DADDY.
(0.3)
A: [hhh ha ha]
D: [ha ha ha like] (.) wait a minute. ha ha ha .hh ↑what the hell .hh um (0.7) and so yeah that was it was >bizarre< and (0.5) and so (0.2) when we left there it was like oh wow okay (0.4) and: so then we started you know having date nights, and .hh (0.5) um ha ha you know just kind of relaxing: and I've seen more movies probably in the in this past six weeks than I've seen in like a you know (.) a year, the past year ha ha,

Appendix 4: Transcript 3

A: So what has it been like for you. (0.2) for this real (0.5) threat to be moving around. (0.3)
A: [that]
D: [Everybody st(h)arted]
D: [washing] ha(h)nds .hh=
A: [↑↑Yeah.]
D: =I remember in January (.) some friends who know me very well (0.4) like texted they were like how are you doing. 'cause it was sort of coming or February I guess when it started coming towards New York. (0.9) um (0.8) and I was sort of joki- I was joking about it. and I was like you guys I've been preparing for covid for my

entire life. (0.3) .h and I ↑think I was sort of like. you know what ↑I may be able to handle this. because (0.2) I know what it is to be: really afraid, .hh (2.0) of of contamination, and an:d I thought I was going to be okay, and then °I don't know°. it sort of (1.3) it sort of (0.7) came out of nowhere. and just knocked me sideways again. that um (2.3) yeah I had like a breakdown with my husband: (0.3) two weeks ago where (2.0) hhh I () then I get this (0.5) again anxious (0.3) uh (0.3) b- (0.6) breathing thing where I hyperventilate. (1.0) and I just one night I just (0.3) ↓broke down. (1.2) with with my husband and. (1.3) just there's something wrong with me. and I will never (0.9) you know something is broken. (0.6) and I can't cope. (1.4)

D: This is like every every fear that I've ha:d you know when I was (1.0) s- stru- really really in the midst of of struggling with this. is like (0.5) ↑oh (0.3) you were right all along. ha ha um ha ha .hhh so its very weird. (0.9) that everything that I was afraid of is coming true.

(2.8)

A: Yeah.

(0.4)

D: And then my rational brain knows (0.5) you know. there's like OCD brain and then there's rational brain. just like °you know° (0.5) Diane you know this is a very specific thing that's happening. (1.0) .hh it's fine. you'll be fine. (0.8) .hhh um: (0.2) but then I have this other spinning part that's just um (1.5) that is that is um on high high alert.

Appendix 5: Transcript 4

T: I'd already spent so much time thinking about it, (0.4) and: a lot of times it's not (0.6) a choice, to think about it, you just it's something that (0.4) is always

gonna be something that you're gonna think about. (0.2) you know like (0.9) so: (1.7) when I when I: (0.5) watch these I'm like uh I find it um (0.6) like I'm doing something productive.
(1.1)
A: Is it ↑hard for you to watch them?
(1.6)
T: Um: no. (0.4) So (0.9) I (1.8) cause when I: see them
(1.2)
I: (0.2) .h when I watch them: I find myself just very focused on: (0.9) finding identifying things that went wrong, (0.7) or identifying things that could be ↑changed (.) .hh or identifying trying to identify a pattern like (0.9) .hh.
(3.9)
T: () for one sec.
(0.5)
A: Yeah.
(9.2)
T: So I guess they did ha I do um ha .hh.
(0.3)
A: Di- did you meet yourself, or did you have a sort of moment of emotion that came up, (1.4) when you were talking?
(0.8)
T: Um: (0.5) yeah. (0.3) I just had a (1.1) it just made me emotional to think about (1.5) my- myself doing that (0.2) like it seems like a weird thing to do, (0.4) to like (0.6) watch these incidents, and read about these incidents over and over again, (0.7) .hh it doesn't make uh: (1.5) that probably should really (1.6) hurt me. (.) I think maybe but it doesn't, and I find it(0.9) helpful.

Appendix 6: Transcript 5

T: I did the written exa:ms I did really well on tho:se

and (0.6) made it all the way to like (0.7) an interview in DC, (0.6) and didn't (0.6) get selected. (0.7) but they guy: one of the guys who was there (0.4) like (0.3) said hey you did a (.) you know you did really: well and (0.5) you were close you just needed a little bit more (0.4) um: experience then we had a little conversation and I (0.3) tho:ught he had mentioned something about (0.7) like crisis manageme:nt and I didn't even remember, (0.3) what it was exactly that he'd said, (0.7) but as I thought I- in my mind. I thought well I'll go take a jo:b. (0.4) and I (.) and I d- thought (0.6) I'll be I'll go be a cop for a couple years. and (0.5) .hh I:'d been in the military:, so I kind of (1.6) I kind of thought I had an idea what the culture would be like, and felt as though that I would be able to (0.5) to do well in that type of an environment, (0.7) .hh and then gro- ↑you know growing up in like working class (.) family. (1.0) like the men in my family:, the coache:s the- the: community, the idea of being like a police officer, (0.6) was: like a (0.3) a good solid respectable (1.3) type of a position, (0.5) and I also thought that it would be an interesting (0.4) background to bring into(0.7) my reapplication to the state department.

Appendix 7: Transcript 6

T: And he was like (0.3) cry:ing and like (0.3) saying help in Spanish, (0.6) and he was pointing into the (0.6) apartment (0.8) um (1.0) and I could hear screaming coming from inside of the apartment, (0.4) [like]=

A: [Mmh.]

T: =through this open door, (0.9) so I started running up the stairs, .hh and I noticed there was blood everywhere on the- (.) the landi:ng and (0.2) some on the sta:irs .hh um (0.7) so as I was like the last couple of steps

I started to draw my (0.5) firearm, (1.1) and had my flashlight (0.5) .h and I was ahead the landing turned to face the (0.8) the door (0.4) there was (.) the man from night before (0.5) and he was like (0.4) no shirt o:n and he was like had a bunch of blood all over him and he had a big (0.5) .h knife in his hand (1.1) and (0.7) .hh SO I WAS IN A KIND OF A TOUGH SPOT, (0.5) he's only a few feet away from me (0.5) and I know there's children in the apartment, (1.0) so: (0.2) *cough* what my- m- what I always: try to argue in my research is that when there's an edged weapon that officers should be trying to maintain distance, (0.3) from the suspect, (0.8) as of- because distance equals ↑ti:me (0.3) more time to react, (0.2) you know .h but I didn't really have any (0.6) distance, or (0.4) time, (0.4) um .hh I told him to drop the knife, (0.3) and he (0.6) .hh said let's kill motherfucker, (0.4) and (0.4) raised the knife and started just like (0.2) a sprint (.) towards me: (0.3) with the knife, (0.7) a:nd so I fired two rounds (0.2) and I hit him twice in the chest. (0.5) .hh um he fell to the ground, (0.3) and (0.6) I could tell by the way he (0.3) was (0.3) b- (0.2) you know (0.6) breathing like his last like his last few (.) .hh sort of heavy: (0.3) sighs and then he (.) uh stopped moving pretty quickly.

Appendix 8: Transcript 7

A: How much time. (1.0) when you think of what it felt like being there in that moment. (0.7) .hh how much time elapsed when you were (0.4) actually engaging (0.4) with this guy with the knife,
(1.3)
T: Um it was (1.0) s- well- so it- the weird thing is is I had like a time distortion, (0.4) I kno:w at a rational level, that it was (0.6) it was like (0.6) a split second, like it was almost immediate, (0.7) like

um I mean a a second or two at the most, (0.5) kind of a thing, (0.7) um: (0.6) he was only I think (0.3) I don't remember the exact () he was 17 feet away from me is what they measured (0.6) and when you're sprinting that you can cover that in just a couple of seconds, like its (0.3) uh- a second you know it's nothing. (.) .hh but in my mind (1.0) it was like a really lo:ong (1.2) thing, (0.3) hh so it's uh (0.8) um (1.1) so like I: (0.7) it was like watching myself (0.9) do it, (0.6)

A: Mmh,

(.)

T: Like I- I everything (0.7) was very (.) calm (0.4) and slow (0.4)and I could see my- (0.4) I could see my >my so my brain I was thinking< okay, (0.8) you don't have you know you don't have any options here you need to (0.3) you need to shoot this guy or else he's gonna stab you with that knife (0.8) and I while I was thinking that I could see my body (0.5) start to discharge the first round, (0.2) like (0.4) and (0.6) and I remember thinking okay good .hh (0.4) um- (1.3) .hhh ~hhh~

(5.2)

T: °↑Can I have uh one second?°

(0.2)

A: Yeah.

(7.5)

T: Ahem (0.7) um (0.5) so I I remember (1.1) feeling like a a feeling a sense of relief. (0.4) that I had (0.9) developed the skillset and reinforced it (0.8) enough that I: (0.8) reacted in the way that I wanted my body to in that moment,

(0.5)

A: Yeah and you're describing a certain um (.) .hh (0.5) distance like the- you at the time were thinking oh (0.3) good my body is doing what I'm- (1.0) my brain is hoping my body would do in this s- situation. (0.4)

like it's (1.0) .hhh you're describing a disconnect.
(0.8)
T: Yeah kind of like being: (0.2) just sort of watching
yourself (0.5) while I'm st(h)ill in my o(h)wn body I'm
watching my body do something. (0.5) .h and I'm also
th- and it was also thought about we- it was we- like
a weird thing because I remember thinking .hh (0.9)
while I was shooting, (0.4) I remember thinking I'm
gonna miss my Spani- my Spanish exam. (1.1) I r- um:=
A: =Wow.
(1.0)
T: I have the Spanish exam tonight (0.5) and I'm gonna
miss my Spanish exam (0.4) and then thinking .hh why am
I- why did that come- (0.3) why did that come into m-
(0.6) to my head (0.5) .h but it's all: (0.9) so: w- it
felt like I had so much time to think about that (0.6)
while this: (1.1) thing: was happening um (1.2) and it
was really r- really really bizarre.