

On self-repair in Spanish. A qualitative analysis using CORLEC

Anja Hennemann
Potsdam University / Poland

Abstract – Since self-repair represents a phenomenon that has not been investigated for native speakers of Spanish in interactive contexts, this study is an attempt to approach the different forms of self-repair in this Romance language. The theoretical basis are the studies by Cohen (1966) for the different types of speech errors that lead to self-repair, Levelt (1983) for the different forms of repair, and Schegloff et al. (1977) for the different phases of repair organisation. The data to be qualitatively analysed are retrieved from the corpus CORLEC. The study shows that the different forms of repair are more easily to be detected than the different types of speech error. The reason is that the influences of an earlier segment or of a following one are sometimes not clear. Additionally, the influences on the troublesome item are not always phonological in nature but cognitively motivated.

Keywords – self-repair, speech errors, Spanish, corpus study, qualitative analysis

1. PRELIMINARIES

The aim of the paper is to investigate the different forms of self-repair in Spanish spoken interaction, that is when speakers correct themselves, in contrast to being corrected by others.¹ So self-correction and other-correction are clearly to be distinguished, as pointed out by Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977), who explain:

Among linguists and others who have at all concerned themselves with the phenomenon of ‘correction’ (or [...] ‘repair’ [...]), a distinction is commonly drawn between ‘self-correction’ and ‘other-correction’, i.e. correction by the speaker of that which is being corrected vs. correction by some ‘other’. (Schegloff et al. 1977: 361)²

Even though more work on self-repair has been done (see, for instance, Fromkin ed. 1980; Levelt 1983; Schegloff 1987; Selting 1987; Uhmann 2001; Fox et al. 2009, 2010) since the publication of Schegloff et al.’s (1977) seminal article “The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation”,³ most studies treat the phenomenon of self-repair in connection with second language acquisition or second language interaction, that is, in connection with non-native speakers (see, for example, Dietrich 1982; Henrici and Herlemann 1986; Kleppin and Königs 1991; Kurhila 2006; Scheuerer-Willmar 1993).

¹ I would like to thank Elena Quintana Toledo and Francisco Alonso Almeida for their helpful comments on this paper. In other words, they initiated my self-repair.

² However, even self-repair might be initiated by others – at least with an asking face of the interlocutor. In more obvious cases the origin of self-repair lies in the (verbal) behaviour of the interlocutor: “It is often the interlocutor who makes the speaker aware of some trouble in his speech, by asking *what?* or *what do you mean?*” (Levelt 1983: 499).

³ The data used by Schegloff et al. (1977) were retrieved from conversations between English native speakers. Since then, however, most studies that deal with self-repair and other-correction do not focus on data from native speakers (of whichever language), but see, for instance, Papantoniou (2012), who investigates repair mechanisms in conversations between German native speakers.

In Spanish, more precisely, for native speakers of Spanish in interactive contexts, self-repair has not been investigated so far. This article analyses in detail the different forms of self-repair. In doing so, self-repair is understood as one form of interaction (Uhmann 2001: 373) and considered “a classic example of the processual character of oral communication” (Uhmann 2001: 377).⁴ The following two examples illustrate the phenomenon of self-repair:

- (1) <H1> [¿]Es muy difícil, *esto*<*palabra cortada*>... *estos* manojos? (AENT001A)
‘Is it very difficult, *thi*<*cut word*>... *these* bunches?’
- (2) <H2> Tú piensa, bueno, ¿qué pasa, que solamente *interesa*... *interés* *p*<*palabra cortada*>... *por* preguntar...? (AENT001C)
‘You think, well, what happens, that only *t*<*cut word*>... *the questioning interests*... *interested* ...?’

The examples analysed in the present study, as examples (1) and (2), come from the corpus CORLEC, *Corpus Oral de Referencia de la Lengua Española Contemporánea*, a corpus of oral speech containing ca. 1,100,000 words, which was compiled at the Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND: SPEECH ERRORS AND SELF-REPAIR

Speech errors are commonly understood as “unintended, non-habitual deviations from a speech plan” (Postma 1991: 26).⁵ According to Fromkin (1980: 13), Meringer (cf. Meringer and Mayer 1895) may be considered “as the ‘father’ of the linguistic interest in speech errors”. Speech errors may be of various kinds since speakers “rarely produce their utterances in a perfectly fluent and smooth concatenation” (Postma 1991: 3):

They often pause, they insert numerous ‘eh’s’, they repeat words or part of words, or they get completely stuck in a sentence. These interruptions of the speech flow have been denoted with a variety of names: hesitations, nonfluencies, disfluencies, stuttering, pauses (Postma 1991: 3).

Goodwin (1981: 141) even calls these phenomena techniques that are “available for signalling that repair is being begun” and describes “speech perturbations, cutoffs, sound stretches, and ‘uh’s” as repair initiators. Cohen (1966) distinguishes three different kinds of speech errors:

1. Anticipation, whenever the segment which is actually being produced clearly reflects the influence of a segment that should occur later in the utterance.
2. Perseveration, whenever a segment is produced which clearly reflects the influence of a segment that had already occurred earlier in the utterance.
3. Transposition, when two segments clearly manifest a mutual influence in the utterance. (Cohen 1966: 89)

In distinguishing speech errors from self-repairs one could say that the latter “refer to speakers’ backtracking in an utterance to correct a speech error or unintended meaning” (Postma 1991: 27). So self-repair represents the consequence of speech errors. Self-repair may be either realised overtly or covertly (Postma 1991: 15; see also Hockett 1967: 118 and Scheuerer-Willmar 1993: 16, who distinguishes between overt corrections and covert corrections). Example (a) represents an instance of an overt self-repair because “the speaker needs several tries until he finally produces the right form, i.e. accomplishes the self-repair” (Postma 1991: 15). If the speaker detects the speech error before actually pronouncing it, it is an instance of covert self-repair (see Postma 1991: 15), as in example (b):

- (a) You made so much noise you worke Cor? – wore? – w? – woke Corky up.
- (b) You w? – w? – w? – woke Corky up.

Thus the speaker discovers the trouble source and interrupts himself before the trouble item is actually uttered, so that the “repair is called ‘covert’ because we don’t know what was being repaired” (Levelt 1983: 478). As example (b) indicates, covert self-repair is often represented by stuttering. Repair mechanisms in general represent a phenomenon of natural speech since speakers monitor themselves while pronouncing enunciations, and after having made a mistake, they may make a repair (see Levelt 1983: 458).

Speakers attend to what they are saying and how they say it. They can monitor almost any aspect of their speech, ranging from content to syntax to the choice of words to properties of phonological form and articulation. (Levelt 1983: 497)

Furthermore, speakers also monitor their speech indirectly “by attending to the interlocutor’s reactions”. (Levelt 1983: 499)

⁴ It should be mentioned, however, that the data used in the present study are transcribed oral texts.

⁵ See Goodwin (1981: 55–59) about “the apparent disorderliness of natural speech” and restarts as well as pauses, and Ochs (1979), who is also concerned with deviations from a speech plan, namely with unplanned discourse.

In studying the different forms of self-repair, three phases of repair organisation can be identified: (i) the trouble source, (ii) the initiation of repair, and (iii) the accomplishment of repair (see Schegloff et al. 1977). In example (3), for instance, *puedemos* represents the trouble source and immediately after it had been uttered, the initiation of repair begins. So *le puedo* can be described in terms of repair accomplishment. However, the corpus analysis reveals that the application of these three phases is not always possible since self-repair may be accomplished covertly, which might be the case for *eh* in (3), for *de... de* in (4) or for *un... un* in (5):

- (3) <H1> [...]. *Eh...* si anda muy apremia<(d)>o lo único que *puedemos... le puedo...* admitir son las matrículas del curso 90 91. (CADM035A)
'*Uh...* if he is very short of money the only [thing] *we can... I can allow* him are the course fees for the year 90 91.'
- (4) <H2> *Y hoy... Y es además...* Hay una cosa muy curiosa, y es que además hoy te dan la antena *de... de* oro de la comunicación, a los Herrero. (ACON001A)
'*And today... And furthermore [it] is...* There's one strange thing, and this is that furthermore today they give you the antenna *of... of* gold of communication [gold antenna of communication], to the Herrero.'
- (5) <H1> Pues también falta por enviar *un... un* violetero [...]. (ACON017A)
'Well, *a... a* little vase should also be sent [...].'

In example (5), for instance – to explain the phenomenon of covert self-repair – the indefinite article *un* is repeated before *violetero* so that an unpronounced item, an item instead of *violetero*, could be the trouble source. Another possible interpretation is that the speaker simply searches for the right word. In this case, however, *violetero* or a similar item would also be considered the trouble source. That is why the repair is covertly accomplished and represented as a form of stuttering.

Levelt (1983) distinguishes different forms of repair: instant repairing, anticipatory retracing, and fresh start. Instant repairing “is a single troublesome word, and the speaker retraces to just that word and replaces it with a new item” (Levelt 1983: 490). Anticipatory retracing means “to retrace to and repeat some word prior to the trouble element”, while making a fresh start means that “the speaker neither instantly replaces the trouble element nor retraces to an earlier word. Rather, he starts with fresh material that was not part of the original interrupted utterance” (Levelt 1983: 490). The sequence *Y es además*, which follows the sequence *Y hoy* in example (4) represents a fresh start. Goodwin (1981) calls this interruption and new beginning a “restart” instead of fresh start. He explains:

An event that occurs in the construction of both a restart and a pause is the self-interruption of a turn-constructional unit after its beginning but prior to a recognizable completion. The talk that occurs after this interruption may either be a continuation of the unit already in progress or the beginning of a new unit. Only if it is the latter has a restart occurred. (Goodwin 1981: 69-70)

Since self-repair has not been investigated so far for native speakers of Spanish in interactive contexts, the present study aims at analysing the different forms of self-repair in this Romance language by using CORLEC.

3. QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS USING CORLEC

In what follows, different forms of repair in Spanish are analysed. The data are oral in nature as we deal with transcribed oral texts. However, paralinguistic devices and intonation cannot be taken into account here. The analysis is qualitative and tries to identify the different kinds of trouble sources like anticipation, perseveration, or transposition (see Cohen 1966) and to focus on the different forms of self-repair distinguished by Levelt (1983). Whenever possible, the three phases of repair organisation are identified (see Schegloff et al. 1977).

3.1 Overt self-repair

In (6) the troublesome item is obviously the imperfective verb *echaba*, which is replaced by *echo*. This might be considered an instance of instant repairing but the pronoun *le* is repeated as well, which is significant for anticipatory retracing:

- (6) <H1> Doctor Beltrán, *le echaba... le echo* un pulso... aquí en directo mañana. (ACON001A)
'Doctor Beltrán, *I threw.IPFV* him... *I throw down the gauntlet...* here directly this morning.'

The speech error is in no way phonological in nature, that is, it has neither to do with anticipation, perseveration, nor transposition. According to the three phases of repair organisation, it is obvious that *echaba* represents the trouble source since it is replaced by the present tense form *echo*. The repair is initiated immediately after the error has occurred, and the repair is accomplished when *le echo* is uttered.

Example (7) also represents an instance of anticipatory retracing, even though the trouble source cannot be clearly identified. It is perhaps the definite article *la*, so that the repair is accomplished by *el equivalente a la Junta nuclear*:

- (7) <H1> No, si... han comprado <ininteligible> O sea, *el equivalente a... el equivalente a la Junta nuclear* [...] (ACON014A)
 ‘No, if... they have bought <unintelligible> that is *the equivalent to... the equivalent to the nuclear council* [...].’

The phases of repair organisation are to be described in the same terms as for example (6). The speech error is not phonological, unlike in example (8), where the speech error is found in the /z/ sound, even though it is unclear what exactly causes it, i.e. the speech error cannot be assigned to anticipation, perseveration, nor transposition. The speaker notices immediately his error so that he interrupts (initiation of repair) and corrects himself by *proceso* (accomplishment of repair). Even though he repeats the indefinite article, I consider this an instance of instant repairing:

- (8) [...] hacen mucho más difícil, caótico, *un prosez<palabra cortada>... un proceso* que de por sí es muy difícil. (ADEB002B)
 ‘[...] they make much more difficult, chaotic, *a proc<cut word> ... a process* which itself is indeed very difficult.’

Actually, the error occurs even before the /z/ sound, namely in the /s/ sound. So one could argue that the wrongly pronounced sounds have a mutual influence on each other.

Example (8) clearly represents an instance of the so-called “Main Interruption Role”, that is, when the speech flow stops immediately upon detection of the trouble (Levelt 1983: 478). This role is called into action “[w]hen a speaker detects trouble that is sufficiently alarming according to the speaker’s current standards, [so that] the decision will be taken to interrupt speech and to initiate a repair” (Levelt 1983: 478). In example (8) the interruption takes place during the troublesome item, but it can also take place “right after it, or one or more syllables later” (Levelt 1983: 479).

In (9), (10), and (11) the speaker interrupts himself, as in (8). The difference is that in (9) the troublesome item cannot be identified as the speaker begins to pronounce *además* and then finally utters *además*. So the three phases of repair and even the kind of error are difficult to identify:

- (9) <H1> Es decir, que *ad<palabra cortada>... además* de las dificultades técnicas y políticas [...] (ADEB002B)
 ‘That means that *be<cut word> ... besides* the technical and political difficulties [...].’

Example (10) could be described in a similar fashion: what the speaker began to utter is finally uttered, and then he goes back to *estos*, so that one could even speak about anticipatory retracing. The interesting thing is, however, that obviously no error is actually repaired:

- (10) <H3> Es que <simultáneo> *estos america<palabra cortada>... estos americanos*, son... son mucho. (PCON002E)
 ‘It is that <simultaneously> *these America<cut word>... these Americans* are... are very peculiar.’

In (11), by contrast, the errors are clear, even though the type of speech error, following Cohen (1966), cannot be identified. The speaker interrupts himself but the errors seem lexical in nature:

- (11) <H2> [...] *eso n<palabra cortada>... es... yo creo im<palabra cortada>... teóricamente y prácticamente imposible*. (ADEB002B)
 ‘[...] *this n<cut word> ... is... I think im<cut word> ... theoretically and practically impossible*.’

In the first instance of speech error in (11) the speaker decides not to choose a word beginning with /n/ and accomplishes his repair with *es*, and in the second instance he decides to insert two adverbs before *imposible*, which he had already begun to pronounce with *im-*. So the second instance of self-repair represents a fresh start: the speaker inserts fresh material. The original speech plan could have been to utter *eso no es posible*. Then the speaker goes for another formulation that sounds less ‘hard’ and decides for a fresh start with *eso es teóricamente y prácticamente imposible*. So the speaker shows that he had – according to Levelt (1983) – “second thoughts” about the information to be transmitted:

Even if the speaker is sure about the information to be conveyed, he may get second thoughts about the way it should be expressed, given the discourse record – i.e., given the topic and content of previous discourse, given what was literally said earlier, and so on (Levelt 1983: 460)

While it seems impossible to detect the three phases of repair organisation for examples (9) and (10), it seems possible to do so for example (11): the trouble source is, according to the speaker, the (rather hard) formulation with *no*, so that he interrupts himself while pronouncing the negative particle. The sequence *es...yo creo* marks the initiation of repair: the speaker is obviously thinking about an alternative way to formulate his thoughts. After having inserted the adverbs, the repair is accomplished by having made a fresh start.

Example (12) can be interpreted in similar terms as example (11): the speaker tries to insert a prepositional phrase (*de cuadros*). Additionally, the speaker inserts *o* as a signal for correcting. Hence, *o* initiates the repair:

- (12) [...] que están presentes en los últimos niños que han podido ser diagnosticados de *depre*<palabra cortada>... o de cuadros depresivos antes de los seis años. (ADEB033A)
 '[...] which are present in the last children for whom the diagnosis of being *depr*<cut word> or of signs of depression was possible before six years of age.'

In (13) the replacement of *la* by *una* is clearly a form of instant repairing, while the interruption of *en*[*tusiasmo*] is obviously caused by anticipation, an error that is the result of an influencing syllable that is still unspoken. The speaker misses to pronounce the definite article *el*, which is possibly due to the first syllable of the following noun:

- (13) [...] estas personas van a estar estigmatizadas para el resto de sus días con *la... una incapacidad para en*<palabra cortada>... *el entusiasmo* [...] (ADEB033A)
 'These persons are going to be stigmatised for the rest of their days with *the... an incapacity for en*<cut word>... *enthusiasm* [...]'

Hence, the trouble source, the initiation of repair (interruption), and the accomplishment (*el entusiasmo*) can clearly be identified.

In example (14) the speaker interrupts himself immediately after the error has occurred in order to initiate self-repair. The trouble source is obviously the /s/ following the /a/ sound, which is not present in the word *desabastecimiento*.

- (14) [...] lo cual ha llevado a esta tragedia de *desas*<palabra cortada>... *desabastecimiento* total y de un malestar social tremendo. (ADEB002B)
 '[...] which has led to this tragedy of *cut*<cut word>... *cutting of the supply* and of the tremendous social indisposition.'

Here we find the speech error which Cohen (1966: 89) calls anticipation: a segment reflects the influence of another one that should occur later in the utterance. As the sound combination /as/ is about to occur after the /b/ sound in *desabastecimiento*, this could be considered as an instance of anticipation if the /a/ sound is also followed by the /s/ in the syllable before.

In example (15) it is more difficult to detect the source for the speech error, especially if we take into account that the speaker begins his turn with the error:

- (15) <H3> *Por*<palabra cortada>... *probablemente* está caliente todavía, eh? (ACON017A)
 '*por*<cut word>... *probably* it is still hot, right?'

The speaker interrupts himself immediately after the error has occurred in order to initiate self-repair, and obviously the trouble source is scrambled letters: /por-/ is pronounced instead of /pro-/. However, the repair is done by pronouncing the adverb correctly.

Other examples in which the Main Interruption Role (Levelt 1983) comes into action are (16) and (17):

- (16) <H1> Bueno, normalmente, *hay alg*<palabra cortada>... *hay unos* pequeños [...] (BCON048A)
 'Well, usually, *there are so*<cut word> *there are some* small [ones] [...]'

In this example the speech error is clearly not phonological in nature; it rather seems a lexical choice to pronounce *unos* instead of *algunos*. By all means, we deal with an instance of anticipatory retracing to *hay*, i.e. the verb is repeated during the repair. The self-repair is accomplished by pronouncing the nominal phrase *unos pequeños* instead of *algunos pequeños*.

Example (17) is interesting because the repair is obviously not really accomplished. The speaker interrupts himself while very likely pronouncing the word *ministerio*, but he does not finish pronouncing the noun nor decides to choose another lexeme. So *ministerio de cultura* is not completely uttered; the speaker rather 'corrects' by only pronouncing the second part of the noun.

- (17) <H2> <ininteligible>... allí... del *minis*<palabra cortada>... *de cultura*. (ECON006A)
 '<ininteligible>... there... of the *minis*<cut word>... *of culture*.'

3.2 Covert self-repair and repair by the help of fillers

Examples (18) and (19) represent covert self-repair because of the repetition of certain elements (see also Rieger 2003 on repetitions as self-repair strategies or Kurhila 2006: 62 on self-repair by repeating). The interesting point is, however, that not only single sounds are repeated but whole words like *pero*. Possibly we do not deal with forms of repair but with affective and emotional speaking, which is especially underlined by the context of nervousness in example (18):

- (18) <H1> *Pero no, pero o sea, pero estoy nerviosa* pero al mismo tiempo contenta, no? (ACON022C)
 '*But no, but that is, but I am nervous* but at the same time satisfied, no?'

Or could the repetitions of the phrases containing *pero* also be interpreted as repetitive anticipatory retracing to the conjunction? In that case, the repair is not accomplished after *pero o sea* but after *pero estoy nerviosa*. The last sequence (*pero al mismo tiempo contenta*) cannot be considered the final try of repair since it matches with the statement *estoy nerviosa*. Clearly, the speech error that causes the self-repair cannot be identified, just as in example (19):

- (19) <H2> Y de beber... *eh... un... un* agua mineral. <H1> Y una “Coca-cola”. (BCON048A)
 ‘And to drink... *uh... a... a...* mineral water. And a Coca Cola.’

In example (19) the repetition of the indefinite article is preceded by *eh*, a prominent filler in spoken Spanish (see also example (3)). Example (20) also contains this filler, together with the repetition of the preposition *en* and one interruption, which is followed by a fresh start. It seems that the speaker wanted to say *Paramos un segundo*, but then he decided to deviate from his original speech plan in order to mention first the place where they stopped and then focus on the time span:

- (20) <H1> También. Muchos. *En... en* algunos sitios... te ponían... Paramos un *se<palabra cortada>... en* donde Tortuguero y eso paramos un segundo, a mear; *en... el to<(d)><(o)> el camino, eh... fue... era* el camino *en... en* [...] (ACON006D)
 ‘Too. Many. *In... in* some places... they gave you... We stopped a *se<cut word>... where* Tortuguero is and the like we stopped a second, to pee; *in... the.. the* whole way, *uh... it was... was*.IPFV the way in... in [...]’

Furthermore, the speaker corrects the tense of the verb *ser* by a fresh start: after having pronounced *fue*, that is the perfect tense, he decides to use the verb in the imperfective tense (*era*). Levelt (1989) mentions that it is not unusual that the speaker’s interruption is followed by a filler, as in example (19) above:

After self-interruption there is a moment of suspense. The speaker’s *er* may help him to keep the floor, and various editing expressions may be used for the same purpose or to indicate the kind of trouble at hand. This moment of suspense will be used to prepare the correction. (Levelt 1983: 484)

The following examples also contain “moments of suspense”, and every single example contains – besides other repair mechanisms like repetitions – the filler *eh*:

- (21) <H1> Llegaron dos amigos de la hermana de Tato *cuando eh... cuando n<palabra cortada>... nos* íbamos nosotros, *que... que* estaban recién cas<(d)>os y iban... de viaje de novios. (ACON006D)
 ‘Two friends of Tato’s sister arrived *when uh... when w<cut word>... we* left, *who... who* very recently got married and left for honeymoon.’
- (22) <H3> < simultáneo > ...pesaba noventa kilos el perro y *eh... le... cogíamos* en el camión *cuando eh... había* que vacunarle y entre dos subíamos a la caja [...] (PCON002E)
 ‘<simultaneously> ...the dog weighed ninety kilogrammes and *uh... we* put him in the truck when *uh... he* had to be vaccinated and we both lifted the box [...]’

In example (22) the *ehs* do not seem to be inserted during an overt repair organisation. If it is not used as a cognitive particle, i.e. as a filler that is inserted to gain time in processing the enunciation, we deal with an instance of covert self-repair. So the repair can be said to have been completed if an appropriate utterance is pronounced. But in examples (21) and (22) it seems impossible to detect the kind of speech error among those identified by Cohen (1966).

- (23) <H2> Sí. Era... a través del teléfono *con... con las... los tonos estos* de cada número, pues accedía a un ordenador que... estaba *en el... en casa, ¿no?* , y pues podía... si <ininteligible> apagar la calefacción, o la luz, *o eh... algunos electrodomésticos, o algo así, ¿no?* (ACON006D)
 ‘Yes. It was.IPFV... by the telephone *with... with the... these sounds* of each number, well he accessed.IPFV a computer which... was.IPFV *in the... at home, no?*, and well he could... if <unintelligible> turn off the heating, or the light, *or uh... some electrical appliance, or something like that, no?*’
- (24) <H1> No, hombre, porque *son... pues... no son* porque *se... se... se fuman* todo suave ahí, de... muy suave, muy suave. *Eh... el... el* que es más fuerte no es ni la mitad de fuerte (ACON006D)
 ‘No, man, because *they are... well... they are not* because... *they... they... they smoke* everything light there, of... very light, very light. *Uh... the... the* strongest one is not even half strong’

In example (23) *eh* does not seem to be used during an overt repair organisation (see also example (22)). If it does not represent a filler, which is inserted to gain time in processing the enunciation, it is an instance of covert self-repair. Generally, the speaker of example (23) prefers the repair strategy of inserting fresh material, and initiates the repair by moments of suspense. The kind of speech error cannot be identified. In example (24), another filler becomes prominent: *pues*. Then fresh material is inserted, i.e. the negation of *son*. Interestingly, however, the repair is not completed, as the repetition of the reflexive pronoun *se* after *porque* indicates. The second utterance of example (24) begins with *eh* and is followed by a repetition of the definite article *el*. It is not clear what is being corrected; the kind of speech error – anticipation, perseveration, or transposition – remains undetected.

Another filler, which may also be inserted in moments of suspense, is *vamos*, as examples (25) and (26) show:

- (25) <H2> [...] Que no hace falta que me compre ahí un equipazo supercaro que a lo mejor *por me<palabra cortada>... vamos*, por sesenta mil o por ahí [...] (BCON048A)
‘[...] That it is not necessary for him to buy me a very expensive equipment, that perhaps *for XX<cut word>... well*, for 60.000 or something like that [...]’
- (26) <H3> y cuando veía al veterinario *ma<palabra cortada>... era lo... la... la... la... vamos* veía la bata blanca y bueno, horrible. (PCON002E)
‘and when I saw.IPFV the veterinarian *XX<cut word>... it was.IPFV the... the... the... the... well* I saw.IPFV the white tunic, and well, horrible.’

In example (25) the insertion of *vamos* takes place right after the self-interruption so that it can be said to initiate the self-repair. In example (26) the speaker interrupts himself without completing what he had begun to utter (*ma...*), tries to go on and finally inserts *vamos* to then go back to the main verb of the sentence (*veía*), ending it a totally new way.

4. CONCLUSION

Most studies concerned with repair in general and self-repair in particular focus on non-native speakers, i.e. on contexts of second language acquisition and second language interaction. Self-repair has not been investigated so far for native speakers of Spanish in interactive contexts. This study was a first attempt to investigate the different forms of self-repair in Spanish interactive contexts, analysing the different forms of self-repair with the help of the corpus CORLEC.

In doing so, I tried to identify the different steps of repair organisation, i.e. the trouble source, the initiation of repair, and the accomplishment of repair following Schegloff et al. (1977). Furthermore, the study tried to distinguish the different forms of repair according to Levelt (1983): instant repairing (when the speaker retraces to just the troublesome word and replaces it by a new one), anticipatory retracing (when some word prior to the troublesome item is repeated), and fresh start (when the speaker inserts ‘totally new’ material instead of correcting what he has begun to utter). Finally, the different kinds of speech error that lead to self-repair were tried to be detected (see Cohen 1966).

All in all, one can say that the different forms of repair (Levelt 1983) are more easily to be detected than the different types of speech error (Cohen 1966), since in the latter the influence of an earlier or a following segment is not always clear. Furthermore, the influence on the troublesome item is not necessarily phonological in nature, but can also be cognitively motivated, e.g. *Versprechen und Verlesen*. if the speaker searches for the right word⁶ or decides to insert another word. Even though the study was not quantitative but qualitative in nature, the CORLEC data made it possible to identify every kind of repair mentioned by Levelt (1983: 490). The phases of repair organisation are generally applicable, but it is not always clear where exactly the trouble source is if speakers start to pronounce a word and then only restart without correcting anything, or if the repair is accomplished covertly. This topic should be explored in more detail, especially with regard to Romance languages.

REFERENCES

- Cohen, Anthony. 1966 [1973]. Errors of speech and their implication for understanding the strategy of language users. In Victoria A. Fromkin ed. *Speech errors as linguistic evidence*. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter, 88–92.
- Dietrich, Rainer. 1982. Selbstkorrekturen. Fallstudien zum mündlichen Gebrauch des Deutschen als Fremdsprache durch Erwachsene. *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 12/45: 120–149.
- Fox, Barbara A., Yael Maschler and Susanne Uhmman. 2009. Morpho-syntactic resources for the organization of same-turn self-repair: cross-linguistic variation in English, German and Hebrew. *Gesprächsforschung* 10: 245–291.
- Fox, Barbara A., Yael Maschler and Susanne Uhmman. 2010. A cross-linguistic study of self-repair: evidence from English, German, and Hebrew. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42/9: 2487–2505.
- Fromkin, Victoria A. ed. 1980. *Errors in linguistic performance*. New York: Academic Press.
- Goodwin, Charles. 1981. *Conversational organization. Interaction between speakers and hearers*. New York: Academic Press.
- Henrici, Gert and Brigitte Herlemann. 1986. *Mündliche Korrekturen im Fremdsprachenunterricht*. München: Goethe-Institut.
- Kleppin, Karin and Frank G. Königs. 1991. *Der Korrektur auf der Spur – Untersuchungen zum mündlichen Korrekturverhalten von Fremdsprachenlernern*. Bochum: Dr. N. Brockmeyer.

⁶ Kurhila (2006) distinguishes different kinds of word search: grammatical search and lexical search.

- Hockett, Charles F. 1967 [1973]. Where the tongue slips, there slip I. In Victoria A. Fromkin ed. *Speech errors as linguistic evidence*. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter, 93–119.
- Kurhila, Salla. 2006. *Second language interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Levelt, Willem J.M. 1983. Monitoring and self-repair in speech. *Cognition* 14: 41–104.
- Meringer, Rudolf and Carl Mayer. 1895. *Versprechen und Verlesen*. Stuttgart: Goschensche.
- Ochs, Elinor. 1979. Planned and unplanned discourse. In Talmy Givón ed. *Discourse and syntax*. New York: Academic Press, 51–80.
- Papantoniou, Theodoros. 2012. *Über die Darstellung von Problemtypen des Sprechens im Deutschen. Eine interaktional-linguistische Untersuchung von Reparaturen*. Mannheim: Verlag für Gesprächsforschung.
- Postma, Albert. 1991. *Stuttering and self-correction. On the role of linguistic repair processes in disfluencies of normal speakers and stutterers*. Nijmegen: NICI.
- Rieger, Caroline L. 2003. Repetitions as self-repair strategies in English and German conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35/1: 47–69.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1987. Recycled turn beginnings: a precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organization. In Graham Button and John R. E. Lee eds. *Talk and social organization*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 70–85.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A., Gail Jefferson and Harvey Sacks. 1977. The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53/2: 361–382.
- Scheuerer-Willmar, Astrid. 1993. *Die Selbstkorrektur in mündlichen und schriftlichen englischen Sprachproduktionen bei Schülern der Unter-, Mittel- und Oberstufe des Gymnasiums*. München: tuduv Verlag.
- Selting, Margret. 1987. Reparaturen und lokale Verstehensprobleme. Oder: Zur Binnenstruktur von Reparatursequenzen. *Linguistische Berichte* 108: 128–149.
- Uhmann, Susanne. 2001. Some arguments for the relevance of syntax to same-sentence self-repair in everyday German conversation. In Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Margret Selting eds. *Studies in interactional linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 373–404.