



Recycling as a Same-Turn Self-Repair Operation in Turkish Everyday Discourse

Türkçe Gündelik Söylemde Aynı Söz Dizisinde Kendini Onarım Aracı olarak Yineleme

Derya AYDIN**
Gülsüm Songül ERCAN***

Abstract

Self-repair, which is defined as righting mechanism for the organization of language use in social integration, is a commonly used strategy in everyday talk across languages. Specifically focusing on self-initiated same-turn recycling self-repairs, the study seeks to discover i) if recycling used as a self-initiated same-turn self-repair operator in Turkish and ii) what functions do self-initiated same-turn recycling self-repairs serve in Turkish everyday discourse within the framework of Conversation Analysis (CA) as the method of analysis. A review of the literature shows a large body of research on repair in Turkish data, however this specific form of self-repair and its functions remain to be explored. The database of the study consists of the recordings of a 10-hour Turkish everyday discourse. Cohen's kappa score was used in data analysis to calculate inter-rater agreement in identifying this specific type of self-repair. The findings showed that in line with the previous studies conducted in other languages, Turkish speakers use self-initiated same-turn recycling self-repairs and they use them with several pragmatic functions such as providing extra information/detail, clarifying a point in prior talk, downgrading speaker's epistemic stance, delimiting the scope of one's assessment, gaining linguistic/cognitive planning time, revising person/object references and revising the constituent order in a clause/phrase.

Keywords: Repair, self-repair, recycling, conversation analysis, kappa score.

Öz

Toplumsal etkileşimde dil kullanımının düzenlenmesinde bir düzeltme aracı olarak tanımlanan kendini-onarım farklı dillerde gündelik konuşmada sıkılıkla başvurulan bir dilsel stratejidir. Bu çalışma, kendi başlatılmış aynı söz dizisinde yinelemeli kendini onarım pratiğine odaklanarak i) yinelemelerin kendi-başlatılmış aynı söz dizisinde kendini onarım aracı olarak kullanılıp kullanılmadığının ve ii) bu tür kendini onarımların Türkçe gündelik söylemde ne türden işlevlerle kullanıldığına Karşılıklı Konuşma Çözümlemesi çerçevesinde belirlenmesini amaçlamaktadır. Türkçe dil verisi kullanılarak onarım pratiği yaygın biçimde incelemiştir ancak kendi-başlatmalı aynı söz dizisinde yinelemeli kendini onarımların nasıl ve ne türden işlevlerle kullanıldığı henüz incelenmemiştir. Çalışmanın veritabanı 10 saatlik Türkçe gündelik söylem kayıtlarından elde edilen çevriyazı metinlerinden oluşmaktadır. Veritabanında bu özel

** Öğr. Gör. Dr., THK Üniversitesi, İzmir Havacılık Meslek Yüksekokulu, Motorlu Araçlar ve Ulaştırma Teknolojileri Bölümü, Uçak Teknolojisi Programı, e-posta: daydin@thk.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0003-0706-8051.

*** Prof. Dr., Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, Dilbilimi Bölümü, e-posta: songul.ercan@deu.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-5392-7008.

kendini onarma türünün saptanmasında değerlendirciler arasındaki uyumun hesaplanması amacıyla Cohen'in kappa skoru kullanılmıştır. Bulgularımız, diğer dillerde yapılan çalışmaların bulgularına koşut olarak, Türkçe konuşucularının da kendi-başlatılmış aynı söz dizisinde kendini onarım aracı olarak yinelemelere başvurduğunu ve bu türden kendini onarımları fazladan bilgi /ayırtı sunma, önceki konuşmada bir noktayı netleştirme, konuşucunun bilisel tutumunun gücünü azaltma, kişinin değerlendirmesinin kapsamının sınırlandırma, dilsel/bilişsel planlama zamanı kazanma, kişi/nesne gönderimlerini değiştirme ve tümce/öbekte kurucu öge sıralanışı değiştirme gibi çeşitli edimbilimsel işlevlerle kullandığını göstermiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: onarım, kendini onarım, yineleme, karşılıklı konuşma çözümlemesi, kappa skoru.

Introduction

Conversation is an indispensable activity that every human takes part in to build, develop, and maintain social relations. As the conversation is designed for understanding (Sanders, 2005; Schegloff, 1992), participants frequently repair any trouble in talk (Robinson, 2006). In this effort, speakers build their turns bit by bit during a conversation, often stopping to revise their emerging talk (Laakso & Sorjonen, 2010). Spontaneous talk is characterized by routine occurrences of "hitches" or "disfluencies" of various sorts (Schegloff, 1979). Speech troubles such as misarticulations, malapropisms, use of wrong words, failure to hear to be heard, unavailability of a searched word, incorrect understanding by the recipient, etc. (Schegloff, 1987) are handled by participants of a conversation through the practices of repair.

First defined by Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977), repair in conversation analysis refers to a set of practices whereby a co-interactant interrupts the ongoing course of action to attend to a possible trouble in speaking, hearing, or understanding the talk. Similarly, Fox et al. (1996) define repair as a process by which speakers correct errors they have made in their immediate prior talk, emphasizing that repair is more general than "correction". In the field of CA, the term "repair" is used rather than "correction" because "correction" is meant to refer to the process of replacement of an "error" or "mistake.". In contrast, repair covers all the communicative breakdowns of conversation and, therefore, has broad applicability to all domains of interactions (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973) since a repair is not limited to error correction, and utterances with no perceivable "error" may also be repaired (Schegloff, 1997; Fox et al., 2010). During a conversation, speakers often tend to change what they are saying or have just said, not to correct a mistake but for some other interactional purpose (Drew, Walker & Ogden, 2013).

Moreover, Schegloff et al. (1977, p. 381) consider repair as "the self-righting (self-correction) mechanism for the organization of language use in social integration." This means that it is an indispensable apparatus for well-organized social interaction, suggesting that while repair practices are often utilized to fix problems of hearing, speaking, and understanding - that is, in the maintenance of intersubjectivity - it is also a vehicle for social action (Hayashi, Raymond & Sidnell, 2013). Repairs negotiate who is entitled to knowledge, who has commitment to a claim, and how knowledge is oriented and distributed across participants in interaction (Heritage, 2012). Repair is important for the maintenance of intersubjectivity: it enables speakers to accomplish, sustain, and defend mutual understanding in talk (Sidnell 2010, p. 136). Intersubjectivity is also supported by a system of repair, without which mutual understanding in spoken language would be extremely difficult to achieve (Sidnell 2015, p. 178).

Self-repairs have been associated with interactional uses of designing turns in conversation. The adjustments employed by the speakers through self-repairs serve to better design the turn for the interactional work it is being constructed to do. Self-repairs

give us direct access to the alternative designs considered by speakers, the initially selected design being rejected by the speaker in favor of the subsequent version, the repair (Drew et al., 2013). Because repair operates at surface level, it provides analysts with empirical footholds at a vantage point within the participants' world where the sequential structure of each repair highlights whatever the participants are currently treating as relevant and mutually understood -or not- in any given situation (Albert & Ruiter, 2018).

In the domain of CA, self-repairs have been associated with several interactional functions including word search, word replacement, repair of person references, and repair of the next speaker selection (Schegloff et al. 1977); reducing the conducive design of a question frame (Heritage, 2002, p. 1432); delaying the production of next item due, postponing a possible Transition Relevant Place (TRP), holding the floor and buying linguistic/cognitive planning time (Rieger, 2003); performing surprise (Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 2006); redesigning an offer to fit its sequentially-specific context (Curl, 2006); managing issues of epistemic authority and responsibility (Lerner & Kitzinger, 2007); avoiding display of entitlement in making a request (Curl & Drew, 2008); upgrading the credibility of an information source and meeting the requirements of a story's telling (Lerner et al., 2012); displaying speaker's or recipient's categorical membership (Hepburn et al., 2012); defending a speaker against a complaint (Kitzinger et al., 2012); addressing to pronunciation errors, diction problems, missing constituent, wrong constituent, wrong constituent order, focus misplacement and perceived misunderstanding (Asgede, 2024); showing speaker's displayed remedial orientation towards selecting a better or more appropriate design or action and reducing face threatening effect (Kwon & Kim, 2024) and achieving epistemic balance and congruence in talk through epistemic upgrading or downgrading (Bespala, Meyerhoff & Albury, 2024).

The practice of repair encompasses the elements of *repair initiation*, which launches a repair process to treat the *trouble source* (also termed the *repairable*) and the outcome is the *repair solution* (also termed *repair*). After the occurrence of a trouble source, a *repair sequence* is inserted into the ongoing conversation to resolve the problem before the conversation is continued (Fox et al., 1996; Schönfeldt & Golato, 2003; Kitzinger, 2012).

As a ubiquitous element in talk in interaction (Xu & Gei, 2023), a repair can be initiated by the speaker of the trouble source or by other speakers, which are termed *self-initiated* and *other-initiated* repairs, respectively (Schegloff, 1997). The repair process is further divided into two based on which speaker completes the repair as *self-repair* and *other-repair* (Schegloff et al., 1977).

Considering the focus of the present study, a self-initiated, self-repair results when the speaker of the trouble source turn recognizes that there is a problem and addresses it (Schegloff et al., 1977).

Our study specifically focuses on a particular type of repair in which:

- i) the repair is initiated and completed by the same speaker in the same turn, and
- ii) recycling is used as the repair operation.

It also aims to determine how recycling is used as a same-turn self-repair operation and what functions it serves in Turkish everyday discourse.

The following section provides a brief overview of same-turn self-repairs to facilitate a better understanding of this specific repair operation.

1. Same-Turn Self-Repair in Conversation

Self-initiated same-turn self-repair, which is also termed “self-initiated self-repair in the same Turn Constructional Unit (TCU)” (hereinafter same-turn self-repair), refers to the process whereby speakers manage interactional contingencies that arise in the production of their utterances (Schegloff et al., 1977). In same-turn self-repair, the *repairable* and the *repairing* sequences occur in the same turn, and the repair is performed by the initiator of the repairable (Rieger, 2003). The turn here simply refers to the utterance of a particular speaker before others take the floor; its boundary is determined primarily by speaker change, not by the content of the speech (Chui, 1996, p. 345). By the term *same-turn self-repair*, Fox et al. (1996) mean a repair which is produced by the speaker of the repairable as in the following example:

(1) H:.hh And *tshe*-* *this girl's* fixed up onna da-* a blind da:te.
(Fox, et al., 1996, p. 190)

In Example (1), the speaker cuts off the subject pronoun *tshe* and, in a sense, replaces it with a full noun phrase, *this girl*. The asterisk indicates the site at which repair is initiated. This example is classified as a same-turn self-repair because both the repairable – the pronoun, *tshe* – and the repair – the full noun phrase, *this girl* – are produced by the same speaker. A second self-repair in the utterance occurs when the noun date is cut off to introduce a modifier – *blind date*. The utterance is considered as a same-turn self-repair as it takes place in the same TCU as the repairable (Fox et al., 1996).

A key feature of self-initiated self-repair is that the speaker puts the interaction on hold and isolates the repair, making it an interactional business in its own right (Jefferson, 1987). In other words, the current speaker stops what she is saying to deal with something which is treated as a problem in what is said, or is about to be said, such as cutting off the talk to replace a word uttered in error with the correct word (Kitzinger, 2012). The default relationship between most components of the organization of interaction (sounds within words, words within turn-constructional units etc.) is that each component should progress to the next relevant component immediately before or after it (Sacks, 1987; Robinson, 2006). This feature of interaction has been termed progressivity (Lerner, 1996; Stivers & Robinson, 2006). In self-initiated self-repairs this progressivity can be halted through the use of several “technologies” as Kitzinger (2012) puts it, including frames, silences and delays, apologetic terms, repair prefaces, multiple tries, self-talk and, relevant to the present study, repeats (also termed as recyclings) etc.

Self-repairs are considered the most commonly used type of repair, constituting a universal feature of interaction (Kitzinger, 2012; Nemeth, 2012; Tekdemir-Yurdaş, 2018; Kazemi, 2020). Due to the rules for turn-taking (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974), the first opportunity for repair goes to the speaker of the talk that embodies trouble (i.e., to the speaker of the trouble source) as that speaker knows that there is a trouble to be fixed (Kitzinger, 2012). As such, most trouble is resolved within the same turn of talk (Robinson, 2006). In same-turn self-repairs, repair tends to occur in the first position close to the trouble source (Xu & Ge, 2023) based on the assumption that the trouble source which is not addressed close their occurrence might lead to serious problems in the exchange (Schegloff, 1992). Self-initiated self-repair is employed not only to correct obvious “errors” but also to “fine-tune” the turn concerning the action the speaker means to be doing (Kitzinger, 2012).

Schegloff (2013) identifies ten operations in self-initiated same-turn repairs: replacing, inserting, deleting, searching, parenthesizing, aborting, sequence jumping, recycling, reformatting, and reordering. These operations are used to address certain trouble sources in an ongoing turn at talk in conversation or modify its interactional impact.

Adopting these ten operations as the basic framework of analysis, the study specifically focuses on recycling self-repairs which are further explained in the following section, in Turkish everyday discourse.

1.1. Recycling

In CA, several definitions have been introduced to address the term “recycling” including repeating the repaired segment either with no apparent changes or with some minor additions or deletions (Fox, et al., 1996); the redeployment of linguistic material from prior utterances during a conversation (Perkins, 2014) and the act of repeating one or more segments (i.e. morphemes, words, phrases or clauses) of speech (Quan & Weisser, 2015). In the same vein, Rieger (2003) posits that recyclings consist of the consecutive usage of the same quasi-lexical or lexical item or items” (p. 51). It can be inferred from previous studies that the terms “recycling” and “repetition” have been used interchangeably in certain research frameworks. Aydin & Ercan (2023), Aydin & Ercan (2024), Ercan, Aydin & Başaran (2024) and Aydin (2024) presents a detailed analysis of the types and interactional functions of repetitions in Turkish everyday conversations.

According to Schegloff (2013), recycling refers to a speaker's saying again some stretch of talk, almost always less than a full TCU, that they have previously or ordinarily just previously said (p. 59). Schegloff (2013) draws attention to the fact that recycling can be used to frame a repair for most of the operations in self-initiated same-turn repairs. For example, an *inserting repair* can be framed by a recycled unit, or a *deleting repair* can be framed by a recycled item. In these instances, the recycled element(s) *figure* in the repair segment but not as the repair *itself*; they are resources but not the product, and there are other such applications. But recycling can be a repair operation in its own right (Schegloff, 2013, p. 59). This study limits itself to this type of self-initiated self-repair operations in Turkish, where "recycling is the *star* of the repair show, not a secondary supporting role," as Schegloff (2013) puts it.

Example (1) below shows an instance of self-initiated self-repair recycling which was originally provided by Schegloff (2013):

(2) 1 Rbn: Well thee uhm (.) (a paz) they must have grown a
2 culture.
3 (0.5)
4 Rbn: You know,(.) they must've I mean how lo- he's been
5 in the hospital for a few day:s, right?
6 {(1.0) /hhh}
7 Rbn: Takes a[bout a week to grow a culture,]
8 Kay: → [I don think they grow a] **I don think**
9 → **they - grow a culture to do a biopsy.**
10 Rbn: No::: (.) They did the biopsy while he was on the
11 - table.
12 Kay: Nononono. They did a frozen section. when he
13 [was on the tab[le.
14 Rbn: [Right, [()
15 Kay: But they didn't do the- it tales a while to do a
16 complete biopsy.
17 (0.8)

(Schegloff, 2013, p. 59)

In this excerpt, Rubin and Kathy are talking in overlap in lines 7 and 8. As Rubin comes to a possible completion of his turn in line 7, Kathy withholds production of the next element due in her turn and instead recycles the turn from the beginning. According to Schegloff (2013), here Kathy stops the advancement of her TCU by virtue of the ending of the competing talk so that she can be heard. Therefore, this recycling self-repair is designed to deal with whatever trouble in hearing or understanding accompanied its involvement

with simultaneous and potentially competing talk by another, including in particular trouble in hearing or understanding by that other (cf. Schegloff, 1987). In fact, Schegloff (1979) emphasizes that recycling repairs predominantly serve the function of delaying the next item due, for instance, in cases of a word search (Fox et al., 2010). For whatever cognitive or interactional reason recycling occurs; its purpose is always to stop the progressivity of the current turn (Nemeth, 2012), where repair begins with a possible disjunction with the immediately preceding talk (Schegloff, 2000) and ends with the resumption of the suspended talk for the purpose of repair.

In the same vein, analyzing recycling repairs and replacement repairs in Hungarian, Nemeth (2012) found that *recycling repairs* prevent a potential surface problem, while *replacement repairs* can only treat an existing surface problem (p. 2029). Contrasting the use of *recycling* and *replacement repairs* presented by Fox et al. (2009; 2010) in nine languages (English, Hebrew, German, Indonesian, Sochiapam Chinantec, Japanese, Mandarin, Bikol, and Finnish) with Hungarian, Nemeth (2012) reported that all these languages show a preference for *recycling repairs* which are associated with the fact that they might be a universally more preferred repair operation as they provide the speaker with cognitive and/or linguistic planning time and thus serve to prevent a potential problem in conversational turn before it fully occurs. The research showed that, similar to the nine languages analyzed by Fox et al. (2009; 2010), Hungarian, too, showed a strong preference for *recycling repairs* (Nemeth, 2012, p. 2033). Analyzing the display of epistemic stance using same-turn self-repairs in Chinese courtroom discourse, Xu and Ge (2023), reported that the plaintiff used lexical *recycling self-repair* to keep the convergence [K-] epistemic stance in the turn to highlight a detail.

In Turkish data, Erdoğan (2013) found that one of the pragmatic functions of the discourse marker *sey* was self-repair. Tekdemir Yurdaş (2018) pointed out to repair-initiation by recycling words in self-repair and completion of the self-repair process by changing the words in the second recycling episode. Doğru (2019) analyzed self-repair mechanisms in spontaneous speech in Turkish. Altunay & Aksan (2018) analyzed the use of pragmatic markers *hayır* and *yok* for functions of repair. Sağın Şimşek & Akkuş (2018) found that recycling was one of the most commonly used strategies of self-initiated self-repair in conversations in Turkish-Azerbaijani receptive multilingual communication. Baş (2021) reported that *pardon* was mostly used as a self-repair marker in Turkish National Corpus. Altıparmak (2022) and Altıparmak (2023) reported self-repair functions of a series of discourse markers in Turkish.

In an effort to determine the way recycling is used to launch same-turn self-repairs and what functions it serves in Turkish conversations, the present study uses Turkish spoken data, the details of which are explained in Section 2.

2. Database and Method

Our study used CA as the methodology to investigate repair sequences. Analyses conducted on naturally occurring data reveal that the participants of an interaction reciprocally build meaning using sequential organization tools such as sequence organization, turn taking, and repair, and CA allows researchers to unravel the dynamics of mundane conversations (Sert et al., 2015; Girgin et al., 2020, Ercan, 2022). In the present study, a specific form of repair, as one of the principal tools of CA, was identified and analyzed in our database.

Transcriptions of 10-hour audio recordings of Turkish everyday discourse examples constitute the database of the study. The data comprises of 24 conversations of varying lengths among a total of 49 participants who were minimum university graduates and aged

between 26-35. The participants are all Turkish native speakers who are friends, colleagues or partners. Audio recordings were collected in social environments such as cafes, restaurants, cafeterias or the houses of the participants. The participants were informed that the recordings would be used for academic purposes only and their written consent had been taken, and ethics committee approval has been obtained. The recordings were transcribed using simple orthographic transcription method without any speech delivery markers since the study did not take into account prosodic or paralinguistic features (Jenks, 2011, p. 22).

Data analysis was conducted in three consecutive steps: transcription, turn-by-turn identification of the recycling self-repairs as an extension of the data analysis conducted in Aydin (2024), (which identified a total of 103 recycling self repairs as a combination of repairs and corrections) and the coding of recycling self-initiated same-turn self-repairs following the annotation procedures defined in Section 2.1.

2.1. Inter-Annotator Agreement: The Kappa Statistic

Agreement between individual raters can be used as a means to analyze qualitative/categorical data. The agreement is statistically calculated (Sreedhara & Mocko, 2016). Cohen's kappa (κ) determines whether the degree of agreement between two raters is higher than would be expected by chance (Cohen 1960). It assumes that (a) the subjects being rated are independent of each other, (b) the categories of ratings are independent, mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive, and (c) two raters operate independently. Kappa statistic has also been increasingly used in the domain of linguistics. For example, in genre analysis studies, the author is usually the main rater (coder) of the data. Second raters may be used during the formative stage to ensure the validity and clarity of the categories, or at the summative stage, to ensure the uniformity of the final coding. The second rater may be a subject-area specialist or, more commonly, another linguist (Rau & Shih, 2021, p. 3). Cohen's κ is calculated according to the following equation:

$$\kappa = \frac{p_o - p_c}{1 - p_c}$$

where P_o is percent agreement, defined as the proportion of subjects on which the raters agree, and P_c is chance agreement, defined as the proportion of agreement that would be expected by chance (Sun, 2011).

In the present study, the Cohen's kappa statistic was employed to compute the inter-rater agreement for the identification of self-initiated, same-turn, self-repairs in our database as the data is nominal. The annotators were required to rate a total of 103 recycling repairs as YES (it is a self-initiated same-turn self-repair) or NO (it is not a self-initiated same-turn self-repair). κ is often interpreted according to the scale proposed by Landis and Koch (1977) (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Value of Kappa and its interpretation

Value of Kappa	Level of agreement
0.00 – 0.20	None
0.21 – 0.39	Minimal
0.40 – 0.59	Weak
0.60 – 0.79	Moderate
0.80 – 0.90	Strong
Above 0.90	Almost perfect

In the first phase of the analysis, to compute the inter-rater agreement for the identification of self-initiated, same-turn, self-repairs in our database, the two authors separately coded the self-initiated same-turn self-repairs in the database separately.

In the second phase of the analysis, the authors separately analyzed the discourse segments in terms of their pragmatic functions and they crosschecked their findings. The opinion of the third rater was also consulted until an agreement was reached among the three raters. However, the researchers did not resort to Kappa statistic to calculate the agreement among the raters but adopted a more conventional approach since, for all measures of κ , the units must be predetermined, fixed, independent items, assigned to predetermined, fixed, independent, mutually exclusive, exhaustive nominal categories (Rau & Shih, 2021).

It should be noted that some of the examples presented in Section 3 consist of several instances of self-repair. For example, in Example 8 below, the expression "...from twelv-, one o'clock to five or six o'clock..." in line 1 is clearly a self-repair, which, however, does not qualify as a recycling repair. Here, the speaker leaves the utterance "twelv-" incomplete and chooses to continue with a repair, which is "one o'clock". This operation is defined as "aborting" by Schegloff (2013) and thus is outside the scope of the present study as it seeks to identify recycling self-repairs only.

3. Analysis and Discussion

As presented in the Introduction section; our study specifically focuses on self-initiated same-turn recycling self-repairs in Turkish conversations. The study seeks to discover:

- i) is recycling used as a self-initiated same-turn self-repair operator in Turkish?
- ii) what functions do self-initiated recycling self-repairs serve in Turkish everyday discourse?

A total of 103 recycling self-repairs were identified in our database, 45 of which were classified as self-initiated, same-turn self-repairs based on the criteria described in Section 2 and based on the identification criteria defined in Section 2.1. The codings of the annotators were then entered into an MS Excel Table and Cohen's κ equation produced the value of 0,866 which is "almost perfect" according to Figure 1. As a result, the 45 instances identified in our database prove that recycling is used as a same-turn self-repair operator in Turkish, thus answering the first research question in our study.

As for the second research question, the 45 recycling self-repairs were analyzed taking into account the context in which they have been used in such way to provide sufficient background information on the relationship among the participants within each everyday discourse segments under analysis. The distribution of the functions of self-initiated same-turn recycling self-repairs is presented below. Among these functions, several have been reported in the literature, including providing additional information or detail, clarifying a point in the discourse, downgrading the speaker's epistemic stance, gaining linguistic or cognitive planning time, repairing person or object references, and revising constituent order within a clause or phrase. However, to the best of our knowledge, delimiting the scope of one's assessment emerges as a novel function of recycling self-repairs. The functions identified in our database are listed in Table 1 and discussed with reference to examples from our data, in order of frequency.

Table 1. The Functions of Self-Initiated Recycling Self-Repairs

Distribution of Recycling Self-Repairs	Conversational Functions
12	Providing extra information / detail
11	Clarifying a point in prior talk
7	Downgrading speaker's epistemic stance
5	Delimiting the scope of one's assessment
4	Gaining linguistic / cognitive planning time
4	Revising person / object references
2	Revising the constituent order in a clause/phrase
Total	45

It is understood from the table that self-initiated recycling self-repairs are most commonly used for the function of providing extra information / detail in Turkish everyday discourse, followed by clarifying a point in prior talk, downgrading speaker's epistemic stance, delimiting the scope of events / things, gaining linguistic / cognitive planning time, revising person / object references and revising the constituent order in a clause/phrase. In this section, we present one example from our database for each function.

The first example of self-initiated recycling self-repairs in our database is presented in Example (3):

(3) 1 S1: Gelişme var mı?
(Are there any developments?)

2 S2: Protokoller tamamlamamız isteniyor ama onun da büyük bir maliyet gerekiyor. Karar alınması gerekiyordu onun yerine havaalanı ile protokol imzalanmıştı zaten. Şimdi havaalanındaki protokollerle hani dersleri orada işliyoruz şeyini vereceğiz. Ama o derslerin de %25'ini en fazla orada vereceğiz. Geri kalan %75'in okul bünyesinde verilmesi gerekiyor. Ders hesaplarını falan yapacağız. Gideceğiz oradaki uçak sistemlerine falan bakacağız...

(We were asked to complete the protocols but that requires a high cost. A decree should have been issued, instead of which a protocol has already been signed with the airport. Now, through these protocols with the airport we will give the thing that the courses are given there. But we will give maximum 25% of the courses there. The remaining 75% has to be given at school. We will calculate course loads etc. We will go and check aircraft systems etc. there...)

In Example (3), two colleagues are discussing the details of a training program designed for their students. Upon the question of Speaker 1, Speaker 2 provides a lengthy response summarizing the details of a previously held meeting. In this response turn Speaker 2 produces the utterance "...Şimdi havaalanındaki protokollerle hani dersleri orada işliyoruz şeyini vereceğiz...." (Eng. Now, through these protocols with the airport we will give the "thing" that the courses are given there.). Following this utterance, presumably in an attempt to redesign the content of his utterance to present a better picture of the situation for the other speaker, the speaker launches self-repair stating "...ama o derslerin de %25'ini en fazla orada vereceğiz..." (Eng. ...but we will give maximum 25% of the courses there...) hereby using the connective "ama" (Eng. but) as the repair preface. In this same-turn self-repair, Speaker 2 provides extra details for the listener to give him a more correct account of the developments who, otherwise, might have thought that 100% of the courses would be given at the airport.

(4) 1 S1: O ne için o bolluk bereket için mi?
 (What is it for? Is it for abundance and copiousness?)
 2 S2: Bolluk bereket için miydi? (.) (Bir bakayım) Bakıyorum canım hemen. (.) Şey (.) arınma galiba, arınma olabilir.
 (Was it for abundance and copiousness? Let me see. I am checking right away honey. Well, purging I guess, it could be purging.)
 3 S1: Hi (.) Yok işte onu ben daha yapamadım Defne.
 (Oh, Well, no I haven't done it yet Defne.)
 4 S2: Onu yaparsın sorun değil, [onu: sonrasında da-]
 (You can do it it's okay, you can do it later.)
 5 S1: [İşte yani dediğim gibi] ben de o esmaları okuyorum, okudum yani onu. Hemen oluyor zaten o iki esma: o (.)
 (Well, as I said, I am reciting, I mean I recited those names of the God. Those two names are quickly done.)
 6 S2: Evet.
 (Yes.)

In Example (4), two friends are talking about a series of rituals of manifesting and praying they recently took up together. The question asked by Speaker 1 in line 1 is replied by Speaker 2 with a repetition in line 2, where the speakers discuss the motivation for a certain ritual. The conversation continues with a remorseful expression from Speaker 1, stating that she hasn't yet done the purging ritual, upon which Speaker 2 gives an encouraging answer stating that she can do it later. In line 5, Speaker 1 initiates a self-repair by recycling the verb oku- (Eng. read), changing its continuous aspect from "okuyorum" into past tense "okudum". It is worth noting that the utterance was followed by "yani", a commonly used lexical repair initiator in Turkish, which is equivalent to "I mean" in English. The utterance medial occurrences of "yani", as in this example, are basically 'self-editing' whereby the speaker marks the clarification of a point in prior talk (Yilmaz, 2004). It could be argued that Speaker 1 resorts to self-repair in line 5 to clarify that the action of reciting the names of God is not in progress as the verb form "okuyorum" denotes, but in fact was completed as the verb form "okudum" denotes. This recycling self-initiated self-repair serves the function of clarifying a point in the prior talk; in this instance, the speaker makes it clear that the process of reciting has been completed.

(5) 1 S1: Küçük müydü? Gaye... yaş...?
 (Was she young? Gaye... How old was she?)
 2 S2: Küçüktü, küçük. Gaye ile yaşıttı. Yani Gaye ile aralarında bir ay iki ay var yok. Konuşamıyordu. Bir de böyle klasik otizmli hareketler vardı çocukta...Büyük bir ihtimal otizmin de seviyeleri var. Çok ileri derecede değilmiş demek ki.)
 (She was young, young. She was the same age as Gaye. I mean, maybe two or three months younger or older than Gaye. And the child exhibited classical signs of autism...Probably there are certain levels of autism. This child wasn't severely autistic then.)
 3 S1: Muhakkak.
 (Definitely.)
 4 S2: Ve kadın ikinci çocuğuna hamileydi.
 (And the woman was expecting her second child.)
 5 S1: Gaye onunla oynadı mı?
 (Did Gaye play with her?)
 6 S2: Oynadı, oynadı. Oynadı dediğim işte, çocuk oynayamıyor zaten. Ama işte seviniyor Gaye yanında olunca filan. Başka bir çocuk onun yanında olunca seviniyor...
 (She did, she did. By "she did," I mean the child cannot play at all. However, she becomes happy when Gaye gets around her. She becomes happy when another child gets around her...)

In the excerpt in Example (5), a couple is talking about their daughter's encounter with another child, possibly with autism, in the playground. Following the father's (Speaker 2) introductory remarks, the mother (Speaker 1) asks questions and comments on

this encounter. Upon the question of Speaker 1 in line 5, "Gaye onunla oynadı mı?" (Eng. Did Gaye play with her?) Speaker 2 first produces a positive reply with an exact repetition remarking, "oynadı oynadı". (Eng. She did she did). Immediately after this utterance, he launches a self-repair by exactly recycling the repairable "she did," which is followed by the repair initiator "oynadı dediğim işte..." (Eng. by "she did" I mean...). This results in the utterance being momentarily suspended at the point of repair initiation. In response, the speaker engages in same-turn self-repair, employing this mechanism to reframe or reformat the epistemic force underlying their original statement. In the excerpt under analysis, the use of recycling as a strategy within self-initiated, same-turn repair serves the function of downgrading the speaker's epistemic stance (Bespala, Meyerhoff, & Albury, 2024). By doing so, the speaker is able to recalibrate the degree of certainty or authority previously projected. This adjustment reflects a moment of reconsideration or epistemic recalibration, prompted by the recognition that the child with autism may not, in fact, "play" in the conventional or normative sense typically associated with the term.

(6) 1 S2: işte ne dinliyosam Metallica mı dinliyorum, Megadeth mi dinliyorum
bu acayıp bar bar bar falan (.) şey ya- olmuştu böyle arkadaşlar...
Şey demişlerdi abi bu gürültüyü niye dinliyosun ya [falan] demişlerdi
böyle.

(Well, What was I listening to? Metallica or Megadeth, something weird like bar roar roar roar. Well, my friends asked me bro why are you listening to this uprearing music?)

2 S1: Heh.

(Hah.)

3 S2: Heh şimdî mesela şu an baktığım zaman bi yerde haklılar yani
çünkü eee bazı şarkilar vardı böyle(.) Lamb of God'ın mesela bazı
şarkiları va- tatatatata. Bazi şarkiları rororororo yani hani şu an
mesela oturup ben onu dinleyemem ya yani ya- dinlerim, dinlerim ama
yani hepsini dinleyemem. Hani (1) lisedeki kafayla dinleyemem hani
ninni niyetine dinleyemem.

(Considering it now, I somewhat agree with them because errr, there were some songs. For example Lamb of God had some songs like tatatatata and some like rororororo. I mean, I can't listen to those songs now, I mean, I listen. I listen but, I mean, I can't listen all of them. I can't listen to them in the same way I did when I was in high school, with the same spirit I once had. Well, I can't listen to them as a lullaby.)

In the extract in Example (6) two friends are talking about music. In this extract Speaker 1 eagerly talks about the type of music he used to play in his high school years. In line 3, he produces the utterance "...hani şu an mesela oturup ben onu dinleyemem ya yani ya- dinlerim, dinlerim ama yani hepsini dinleyemem...". (Eng. "...I can't listen to those songs now, I mean, I listen. I listen but, I mean, I can't listen all of them..."). The speaker first produces the expression "...I can't listen to those songs now..." and then puts his utterance on hold at the repair initiation site "...ya yani ya...". (Eng. well, I mean). He then continues his utterance with the repair "...dinlerim, dinlerim ama yani hepsini dinleyemem..." (Eng. "...I listen. I listen but, I mean, I can't listen all of them..."). The comparison of the unrepainted and the repainted version of the utterance reveals that the speaker redesigns his assessment of the probability to listen to that kind of music now. The unrepainted version denotes that the speaker cannot and will not listen to that music anymore while the repainted version gives room for a certain degree of likelihood that he might do so based on the use of the addition of the qualifier "all of them". This repainted version of the utterance serves the function of delimiting the scope of one's assessment, in this specific incident, the scope of the amount of music the speaker can listen to. With this subtle modification the recycling repair specifies that the negative assessment applies not to the entire category of music, but to a subset of it. In doing so, the speaker recalibrates both the intensity and generalizability of the original statement.

(7) S1: ...Bilmiyorum en son ne yaptılar. Yani Manga'nın son 10 senede yaptığı en değişik şey Cartel'le birlikte düet yapmasıydı.

(...I don't know what they finally did. I mean, the strangest thing Manga did in the last ten years was the duet with Cartel.)

2 S2: Heh.

(Hah.)

3 S1: Gerçekten gerçekten yani, Cartel'i Rock N Coke'a getirdiler, hatta sürpriz diye getirdiler. Manga x Cartel falan filan herkes delirmiştir Cartel geri döndü falan filan diye böyle. Ben Cartel çok severim bu arada yani hakkaten Cartel, Karakan, Erciye, işte Cinaye Şebeke falan bunları iyi bilirim hani. o dönemde çok iyi bir şey, stratejiydi. Beraber şarkı yaptılar falan filan klip çektiler falan, bu kadar ama. Hiçbir şekilde Manga kendini geliştirmemi abi. Mesela Kurban'ın son işte *Yobaz* albümü *Yobaz* mıydı? Sahip albümü, Sahip albümü eee acayip bi albüm. Hakkaten o böyle zaten Kurban'ın da şeyi var ya işte havaları esintileri. Zaten kendileri de söylüyolar yani bir benzeri bir soundları falan filan.

(I mean, really. They brought Cartel to Rock N Coke, they even brought them as a surprise. Everyone went mad for Manga X Cartel and like for Cartel came back. By the way, I like Cartel very much, I mean, really Cartel, Karakan, Erciye, well, Cinaye Şebeke etc, I know them very well. Having said that, it was a very good thing, strategy at that time. They made songs together and like, they made videos, but that was all. Manga did not improve itself in any way bro. For example, Kurban's final album, *Yobaz* album, was it *Yobaz*? Sahip album, *Sahip* album, err an amazing album. Really, you know that Kurban has its thing, I mean its flow. They themselves also say that they have a similar, they have a sound and like.)

Example (7) was taken from the same conversation on music as in Example (6). In this extract Speaker1 continues to comment on Turkish rock bands and their performance in the past. In line 3, in an effort to remember the name of an album, the speaker performs recycling self-repair by uttering "...Yobaz albümü Yobaz mıydı Sahip albümü, Sahip albümü eee...". (Eng. Kurban's final album, *Yobaz* album, was it *Yobaz*? *Sahip* album, *Sahip* album, err...). Trying to remember and utter the name of the album correctly, the speaker first produces the utterance "Yobaz albümü" (Eng. *Yobaz* album) and then stops the progressivity of interaction this time through the use self-talk "Yobaz mıydı?" (Eng. Was it *Yobaz*?). This pause indicates an effort to regain cognitive control and proceed with a revised epistemic stance, this time with a higher degree of certainty and authority over the subject at hand. He then automatically and immediately repairs himself with the utterance "Sahip albümü, Sahip albümü", thus finally ending the word search process. This recycling self-repair helps the speaker organize his thoughts and gain time to produce the correct album name. In this extract, the speaker resorts to recycling self-repair to gain cognitive planning time before continuing talk, in line with the literature (Rieger, 2003).

(8) S1: Geçen sene ne zaman(..) bu zamanlar.. dershanede bizim etütlerimiz oluyordu böyle akşam on ik- birden, öğlen birden akşamaya kadar, beş altıya kadar *kaliyorduk işte, kaliyordum*. Ben de o gün taktim kulaklığını falan, ullan dedim(.) gidim bir şey dinliyim, rain neydi ya rainli bir şarkısı vardı şeyin, unuttum bak nasıl o kadar unutmuşsam artık.

(Last year, when? Around this time... We used to attend extra lessons at the course. We were staying, well, I was staying there from twelve-, one o'clock to five or six o'clock. That day I wore my headphones, I said, like I had better listen to some music. There was a song called "Rain", what was it, the song by... I forgot, I wonder how I could possibly forget this much.)

S2: Slayer'ın mı?

(A song by Slayer?)

S1: Slayer'ın heh. Blood of Rain miydi, Raining Blood Raining Blood.

(Slayer, yeah. Was it Blood of Rain? Raining Blood Raining Blood.)

S2: Raining Blood aynen aynen.

(Raining Blood exactly exactly.)

S1: Onu dinliyordum tam böyle, onun bir "yiaaaaahhh" kısmı var ya hani, tam arasında tam bitiyor böyle, ben de öküz gibi matematik türev çalışıyorum tamam mı, tabi o zaman türev mürev kalkacağını nerden bilelim, hayvan gibi türev çözüyoruz, türev çözüyorum... kafamı bir kaldırdım abi en arkada oturuyorum tamam mı, 30 kişilik bir sınıf, hepsi bana bakiyo heh.

(I was listening to it. The song has a piece where it says Yeehaa!", in the ending. I was studying derivatives in mathematics like crazy okay, of course at that time how could we know that derivatives etc. would be out of the scope of the exam, *we were solving, I was solving* derivative questions like crazy. All of a sudden, I raised my head, I was sitting at the back row okay. A class of thirty students, all of them were staring at me hah.)

The excerpt above is extracted from a conversation between two friends discussing their musical preferences. In this exchange, mainly Speaker 1 talks while Speaker 2 takes up the role of helping this speaker remember some details or providing confirmatory responses. The exchange consists of a recycling self-repair launched by Speaker 1 in line 5 in the statement "...hayvan gibi türev çözüyoruz, türev çözüyorum..." (Engwe were solving, I was solving derivative questions like crazy"). With this recycling self-repair, the speaker puts the interaction on hold through the use of recycling sand then reassigned the agents in the utterances by changing the pronouns "we" into "I". The use of self-repair with the function of repairing person references (Schegloff et al., 1977) or repairing wrong constituents (Asgede, 2024) have been reported in the literature. From another perspective, judging from Speaker 1's tendency to change the pronoun "we" into "I" during his narrative, it can be suggested that the speaker first makes a deliberate emphasis on the collectivity of the actions of staying and solving derivative questions at the time he refers to in the past. In both cases, the speaker changes the doers of the actions from a "group" to "I only" through these self-repairs. This excerpt shows that recycling same-turn self-repairs are used in Turkish everyday discourse to serve the function of repairing person references.

(9) 1 S1: Seninle böyle program falan, yapmıştık bir şeyler.

(We did something together, like a program, with you.)

2 S2: (Haa, söyle ben FL Studio bir süre kullanmıştım ama asıl Cubase kullandım baya bir zaman, yani işte bizim müzik hocası(.) öğretmişti bana Cubase'i, söyle yaparsın böyle yaparsın falan filan. Cubase de aslında hayvani bir program zaten(.) böyle sektörün ilklerinden falan(.) Yani ilk Cubase var ondan sonra Logic var bildiğim kadariyla Ableton sonradan çıktıyo hatırladığım kadariyla. Cubase'i baya kullandım ben ama böyle(.) evde çalabildiğim bir enstrümanım olmadığı için ... ya da evde bir enstrüman çalamadığım için işte şeylerin Cubase'lerin böyle bi Cubase kadar paketleri var yani mesela diyelim 10 GB'sa Cubase 10 gb 12 gb paketleri oluyo. Davul paketi mesela hayvan gibi davul paketi yani...)

(Oh, well, I used FL Studio for a long time, but in fact, I used Cubase for a long time. Well, our music teacher taught me how to use Cubase. He said you can do this you can't do this etc. Cubase is a great program, one of the first in the music industry. I mean, Cubase is the first one, Logic comes after it as far as I know; Ableton was introduced after it as far as I remember. I used Cubase for a long time but well, *since I didn't have an instrument to play at home err or since I couldn't play an instrument at home...* Well, the Cubase program has packages which are as big as Cubase itself, I mean for example if Cubase itself is 10 GB, it can have 10 GB, 12 GB packages. The drum set for example, there is a great drum set...)

In Example (9), two friends are conversing about making electronic music at home using audio programs. In line 2, Speaker 2 shares his experience with a program called Cubase and, in the meantime, delivers the information "...evde çalabildiğim bir enstrümanım olmadığı için ..." (Eng. since I didn't have an instrument to play at home...) followed by the cut off "err or" which puts the interaction on hold. The speaker then immediately repairs the utterance as "...evde bir enstrüman çalamadığım için..." (Eng. ...since I couldn't play an instrument at home...). The recycling self-repair here consists of a relatively longer clause, which is, in fact, left unfinished by the speaker, who seems to

have focused on providing as many details as he can about the so-called music program judging from his eagerness to talk about it. The repair segment consists of the recycled use of the units "since", "I", "play", "instrument", "at home" with a new constituent order where "didn't have an instrument to play" is exchanged to "couldn't play an instrument". The changed constituent order gives the clause a completely different sense and thus directly impacts the meaning of the utterance. The unrepaired version denotes that the speaker did not possess any musical instrument to play at home. In contrast, the repaired version makes it obvious that the speaker could not play a musical instrument at home, which entails that he possessed one. Therefore, the self-initiated self-repair in this example is used with the function of revising the constituent order in the clause in an effort to provide a more accurate version of things or actions. This function is also in line with the previous studies, as reported by Asgede, (2024).

Conclusion

Repair is widely used for a range of practices in all languages, by which trouble of all sorts is managed during a conversation. This practice has been widely studied and its uses and functions have been well-documented in the literature providing insights on the use of language as a tool for intersubjectivity among discourse participants. In an effort to document how recycling is used as an operator in a particular type of self-repair, namely, self-initiated same-turn self-repairs and to uncover the pragmatic functions of this specific type of repair, the study analyzed a 10-hour Turkish everyday discourse data.

Our findings showed that Turkish speakers too use recycling used as a self-initiated same-turn self-repair operator in everyday Turkish conversations. As for the functions, the study found that Turkish speakers use recycling self-repairs for several pragmatic functions including providing extra information / detail, clarifying a point in prior talk, downgrading speaker's epistemic stance, delimiting the scope of one's assessment, gaining linguistic / cognitive planning time, revising person / object references and revising the constituent order in a clause/phrase. Among these functions, delimiting the scope of one's assessment is identified for the first time in the present study, representing a key contribution to the literature. These functions help the speakers not only to correct troubles in talk but also to fine-tune their utterances in ways that promote mutual understanding.

The fact that the study included only recycling self-initiated self-repairs is a limitation. Documenting the use and functions of recycling other-initiated self-repairs or other-initiated other-repairs might enable the researchers to make comparisons in a larger database. Furthermore, future studies might also use specialized spoken data such as institutional or classroom discourse and crosscheck the findings with those of everyday discourse.

References

Albert, S., & De Ruiter, J. P. (2018). Repair: the interface between interaction and cognition. *Topics in cognitive science*, 10(2), 279-313.

Altıparmak, A. (2022). An Analysis of Turkish interactional discourse markers 'ŞEY', 'YANI', And 'İŞTE'. *J Psycholinguist Res* 51, 729-762.

Altıparmak, A. (2023). A socio-pragmatic analysis of the Turkish discourse markers of 'şey', 'yani' and 'iste' based on educational level of speakers. *Pragmatics and Society*, 14(6), 908-943.

Altunay, S., & Aksan, Y. (2018). Türkçede edimsel belirleyiciler olarak *hayır* ve *yok*: Sözlü Türkçe derlemi'nden bulgular. *Mersin Üniversitesi Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi*, 15(2), 23-43.

Asgede, D. M. (2024). Self-Repair in Tigrinya: Trouble sources, mechanisms and solutions. *Dialogue & Discourse*, 15(2), 85-112.

Aydın, D. (2024). *Türkçe gündelik söylemde yinelemeler ve işlevleri*. [Doctoral dissertation]. İzmir: Dokuz Eylül University.

Aydın, D., & Ercan, G. S. (2023). Edimbilimsel yinelemeler, türleri ve sözlü söylemdeki işlevleri. *Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, 16(98).

Aydın, D., & Ercan, G. S. (2024). Multiple sayings as a resource for halting a course of action in interaction: Evidence from Turkish Everyday Discourse. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 35(2), 223-239.

Baş, M. (2021). Pragmatic functions of 'pardon' in Turkish corpus. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 8(1), 60-75.

Bespala, L., Meyerhoff, M., & Albury, C. (2024). Navigating epistemic challenges: Self-initiated self-repair in weight loss discussions within clinical settings. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 233, 51-69.

Chui, K. (1996). Organization of repair in Chinese conversation. *Text & Talk*, 16(3), 343-372.

Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 20(1), 37-46.

Curl, T. S. (2006). Offers of assistance: Constraints on syntactic design. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(8), 1257-1280.

Curl, T. S., & Drew, P. (2008). Contingency and action: A Comparison of two forms of requesting. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 41(2), 129-153.

Doğru, F. (2019). Türkçede konuşma anında kendini düzeltme. *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı - Belleten*(68), 227-253.

Drew, P., Walker, T., & Ogden, R. (2013). Self-repair and action construction. *Conversational repair and human understanding*, 30, 71-94.

Ercan, G. S., Aydin, D. & Başaran, Ö. (2024). Türkçe gündelik söylemde yinelemeler ve işlevleri. In H. I. Güler, D. Sarışoy & P. Turan (Eds.), *Dilbilimde Güncel Tartışmalar-4*. (pp. 152-168). Dilbilim Derneği Yayıncıları.

Ercan, G.S. (2022). Karşılıklı konuşmanın özellikleri ve yapısı. (In) Ranguelov, B., Efe, R., & Çelik Uğuz (Eds.), *Academic Researches and Studies in Sciences*, pp. 189-195. St. Kliment Ohridski University Press.

Erdoğan, Y. (2013). Interactional functions of şey in Turkish: Evidence from spoken Turkish corpus. *Mersin Üniversitesi Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi*, 10(2), 33-52.

Fox, B. A., Hayashi, M., & Jasperson, R. (1996). Resources and repair: A cross-linguistic study of syntax and repair. *Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics*, 13, 185-237.

Fox, B. A., Maschler, Y., & Uhmann, S. (2010). A cross-linguistic study of self-repair: Evidence from English, German, and Hebrew. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(9), 2487-2505.

Girgin, U., Acar, Y., Akbaş, E., Yavuz, E., Selçuklu, A. E., Boran, M., ... Ölçü Dinçer, Z. (2022). Konuşma çözümlemesi yöntemi: Veri toplama ve çözümleme süreçlerinde geçerlik, güvenirlik ve etik. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi EğitimFakültesi Dergisi*, 37(1), 381-402.

Hayashi, M., Raymond, G. & Sidnell, J. (Eds.). (2013). *Conversational repair and human understanding* (No. 30). Cambridge University Press.

Hepburn, A., Wilkinson, S., & Shaw, R. (2012). Repairing self- and recipient reference. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(2), 175-190.

Heritage, J. (2002). The limits of questioning: Negative interrogatives and hostile question content. *Journal of pragmatics*, 34(10-11), 1427-1446.

Heritage, J. (2012). Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(1), 1-29.

Jefferson, G. (1978). Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation. In *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 219-248). Academic Press.

Jenks, C. J. (2011). *Transcribing talk and interaction: Issues in the representation of communication data*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing

Kazemi, A. (2020). Same-turn self-repairs in Farsi conversation: On their initiation and framing. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 170, 4-19.

Kitzinger, C. (2012). Repair. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 229-256). Wiley-Blackwell.

Kitzinger, C., Shaw, R., & Toerien, M. (2012). Referring to Persons Without Using a Full-Form Reference: Locally Initial Indexicals in Action. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(2), 116-136.

Kwon, H. J., & Kim, K. H. (2024). Self-repair in Korean conversation. *East Asian Pragmatics*, 9(2), 151-189.

Laakso, M., & Sorjonen, M. L. (2010). Cut-off or particle—Devices for initiating self-repair in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(4), 1151-1172.

Landis, J. R. & Koch, G. G. "The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data." *Biometrics*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 159-174, 1977.

Lerner, G. H. (1996). Finding "face" in the preference structure of talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 59, 303 / 321.

Lerner, G. H. & Kitzinger, C. (2007). Extraction and aggregation in the repair of individual and collective self-reference. *Discourse Studies*, 9(4), 526-557.

Lerner, G. H., Bolden, G. B., Hepburn, A. & Mandelbaum, J. (2012). Reference recalibration repairs: Adjusting the precision of formulations for the task at hand. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 45(2), 191-212.

Németh, Z. (2012). Recycling and replacement repairs as self-initiated same-turn self-repair strategies in Hungarian. *Journal of pragmatics*, 44(14), 2022-2034.

Perkins, M. R. (2014). Linguistic recycling in typical and atypical interaction. *Clinical linguistics & phonetics*, 28(7-8), 590-601.

Quan, L., & Weisser, M. (2015). A study of 'self-repair' operations in conversation by Chinese English learners. *System*, 49, 39-49.

Rau, G., & Shih, Y. S. (2021). Evaluation of Cohen's kappa and other measures of inter-rater agreement for genre analysis and other nominal data. *Journal of English for academic purposes*, 53, 101026.

Rieger, C. L. (2003). Repetitions as self-repair strategies in English and German conversations. *Journal of pragmatics*, 35(1), 47-69.

Robinson, J. D. (2006). Managing trouble responsibility and relationships during conversational repair. *Communication Monographs*, 73(2), 137-161.

Sacks, H. (1987). On the preference for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organisation* (pp. 54 / 69). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696-735.

Sağın Şimşek, S. Ç., & Akkuş, M., (2018). Türkçe-Azerice Algısal Çok Dilli İletişimde Konuşma Onarım Yöntemleri. *Türkçede Yapı ve İşlev* (pp. 221-238), Ankara: BilgeSu.

Sanders, R. E. (2004). Introduction: LSI as subject matter and as multidisciplinary confederation. In *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction* (pp. 1-14). Psychology Press.

Schegloff, E. & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8(4), 289-327.

Schegloff, E. (1987). Some sources of misunderstanding in talk-in-interaction. *Linguistics*, 25(1), 201-218.

Schegloff, E. A. (1979). The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation. *Syntax and semantics*, 12, 261-286.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97(5), 1295-1345.

Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Practices and actions: Boundary cases of other-initiated repair. *Discourse Processes*, 23(3), 499-545.

Schegloff, E. A. (2000). When'others' initiate repair. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(2), 205-243.

Schegloff, E. A. (2013). Ten operations in self-initiated, same-turn repair. *Conversational repair and human understanding*, 30, 41-70.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53(2), 361-382.

Schönfeldt, J., & Golato, A. (2003). Repair in chats: A conversation analytic approach. *Research on language and social interaction*, 36(3), 241-284.

Sert, O., Balaman, U., Can Daşkın, N., Büyükgüzel, S. & Ergül, H. (2015). Konuşma çözümlemesi yöntemi. *Mersin Üniversitesi Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi*, 12(2), 1-43.

Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis: An introduction*. John Wiley & Sons.

Sidnell, J. (2015). "Conversation Analysis." In B. Heine and H. Narrog (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis*, pp. 167-192. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sreedhara, V. S. M. & Mocko, G. (2015). Control of thermoforming process parameters to increase quality of surfaces using pin-based tooling. In *International Design Engineering Technical Conferences and Computers and Information in Engineering Conference* (Vol. 57113). American Society of Mechanical Engineers.

Stivers, T. & Robinson, J. D. (2006). A preference for progressivity in interaction. *Language in Society*, 35(3), 367-392.

Sun, S. (2011). Meta-analysis of Cohen's kappa. *Health Serv Outcomes Res Method* 11, 145-63.

Tekdemir Yurdaş, Ö. Ü. G. (2018). İnsanlararası ilişkilerde anlam inşası: Türkçede onarım türleri. *Kalem Eğitim ve İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 8(1), 87-103.

Wilkinson, S., & Kitzinger, C. (2006). Surprise as an interactional achievement: Reaction tokens in conversation. *Social psychology quarterly*, 69(2), 150-182.

Xu, J. & Ge, L. (2023). Displaying epistemic stance through same-turn self-repair in Chinese civil courtroom interaction. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1285759.

Yılmaz, E. (2004). *A pragmatic analysis of Turkish discourse particles: Yani, işte and şey*. [Doctoral Dissertation]. Ankara: Middle East Technical University.