From Graham Button and
    John R.E. Lee (eds.)

Talk and Social Organization

(Clevedon: Multilingual
    Matters)

4 On exposed and embedded correction in conversation[1]

GAIL JEFFERSON
University of York

The phenomena I will be considering here are implicated in such general matters as the organisation of 'repair' in conversation (see, for example, Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks, 1977) (and the relationship of 'correction' to interactional discord), and a recurrent feature of conversation; that while various activities can be done explicitly, they can as well be accomplished without emerging to the conversational surface.[2] I will not be discussing these matters *per se*, but will touch on them in the course of a consideration of the phenomena.

I will start off with some observations on repair, focussing on materials in which one participant corrects another. These are distinctive from those in which, for example, a speaker corrects himself:

(1) [SBL:1:1:12:11]

Hannah:	And he's going to make his own paintings.
Bea:	Mm hm,
→ **Hannah:**	And– or I mean his own frames,
Bea:	Yeah,

or those in which someone locates a trouble in another's talk but leaves it to that one to do the correction (in effect, to correct himself):

(2) [GTS:III:42(r)ST]

Ken:	Hey (.) the <u>first</u> <u>ti</u>:me they <u>stopped</u> me from selling <u>cigarettes</u> was this morning.
	(1.0)
→ **Louise:**	From <u>selling</u> cigarettes?
Ken:	Or <u>buying</u> cigarettes.

The materials I will start off with are those in which someone produces an item which stands as a correction of an item in another's talk:

(3) [SF:II:7]

Larry:	They're going to drive ba:ck <u>W</u>ednesday.
→ **Norm:**	Tomorrow.
Larry:	To<u>morrow</u>. Righ⌐t.
Norm:	⌊<u>M–h</u>m,
Larry:	They're <u>working</u> half <u>d</u>ay.

(4) [GJ:FN]

Milly:	. . . and then they said something about Krushchev has leu<u>ke</u>mia so I thought oh it's all a big put on.
→ **Jean:**	<u>Breshnev</u>.
Milly:	<u>Breshnev</u> has leukemia. So I didn't know <u>w</u>hat to think.

(5) [GJ:FN]

Pat:	. . . the Black Muslims are certainly more provocative than the Black <u>M</u>uslims <u>ev</u>er were.
→ **Jo:**	The Black <u>Pan</u>thers.
Pat:	The Black <u>Pan</u>thers. What'd I
Jo:	You said the Black Muslims twice.
Pat:	<u>Did</u> I <u>real</u>ly?
Jo:	Yes you <u>di</u>:d, but that's alright I forgive you,

(6) [GTS:II:2:ST]

Ken:	And they told me how I could stick a th–uh:: Thunder-bird motor? (0.5) in my Jeep? And I bought a fifty five ⌐Thunderbird motor.
→ **Roger:**	⌊Not motor, <u>engine</u>.
Roger:	You speak of ⌐electric motor and a gasoline engine.
Ken:	⌊Okay
Ken:	Engine. ⌐Okay–
Al:	⌊<u>In</u>ternal com<u>bus</u>:tion.
Ken:	Alright, So⌐lookit,
( ):	⌊mhhhh
Ken:	I moved this thing in the Jeep, yesterday . . .

(7) [Frankel:HB:14–16:ST]

Ellie:	I said jeez I said thank god we didn't take Marney's boo:ks ˙hhh and all your reh–your stuff <u>t</u>oo,
Marny:	<u>Ö</u>h::: yhhheah. Oh I didn't even think of that, yeah, ˙hhh

Ellie:	I'm gla:d that your(a) procrastinator as far as
Marny:	gYehh–hh–hheh! 'hhh Wait a minute,
→ Marny:	We're not puh– we're relaxed about it =
Marny:	We're not procrastinators ehh–huh.
Ellie:	= [[That's it relaxed I didn't get it righ(h)t.

(8) [Goodwin:DP:32–33:ST]

Jan:	I guess they paid two–twenty thousand for the house and two thousand for the ki:l.
Beth:	Mm::,
Jan:	Technically,
→ Ron:	(It's a) kil:n.
Jan:	Kil:n, I don't know how to say it,
Ron:	You always say kil.
Jan:	I don't know I thought that's right⌐t.
Beth:	Ye⌐ah.
Ron:	⌊It's like–
Ron:	Is that right? You say kil?
Beth:	Kil:n, I don't know I've heard both . . .

These fragments vary in their particulars and have a range of features which warrant attention, but for the purposes of this report I will make three gross observations.

(1) Whatever has been going on prior to the correcting is discontinued. Where prior utterances have been occupied with various ongoing matters, utterances are now occupied by the doing of correcting. That is, 'correcting' is now the interactional business of these interchanges.

(2) In the course of the business of correcting we can find such attendant activities as, e.g. 'instructing' (fragment 6, 'You speak of electric motor and a gasoline engine'), 'complaining' (fragment 8, 'You always say kil'), 'admitting' (fragment 7, 'I didn't get it right'), 'forgiving' (fragment 5, 'That's alright, I forgive you'), and in other materials, 'accusing', 'apologising', 'ridiculing', etc. That is, the business of correcting can be a matter of, not merely putting things to rights, as in, say fragment 4, but of specifically addressing lapses in competence and/or conduct. Call this class of activities 'accountings'.

(3) Whatever else may be going on in the correcting talk, we find an identical series in each fragment:

1. A speaker produces some object (X).
2. A subsequent speaker produces an alternative (Y).
3. Prior speaker produces the alternative (Y).

(In fragment 3, we find 'Wednesday', 'Tomorrow', 'Tomorrow'; in fragment 4, 'Krushchev', 'Breshnev', 'Breshnev'; in fragment 5, 'Black Muslims', 'Black Panthers', 'Black Panthers'; in fragment 6, 'motor', 'engine', 'engine'; in fragment 7, 'procrastinator', 'relaxed', 'relaxed'; and in fragment 8, 'kil', 'kiln', 'kiln'.) That is, whatever else is going on in the course of the correcting, and however it is done, it is this (X, Y, Y) series which constitutes 'correction of one speaker by another'; specifically, someone who at one point produced one sort of object now produces the alternative to it proffered by a co-participant.

We can also find materials in which a correction is offered and rejected, in contrast to the above, in which the correction is accepted by prior speaker. When a correction is offered and rejected, we find, not the (X, Y, Y) series, but (X, Y, X).

(9) [DN:I:2:18(r):ST]

Meg:	It came from England Loren,
	(0.4)
Loren:	Ah–ah:::,
Loren:	Ah–ah it's stampted on the botto:m.
	(3.5)
Loren:	I:ndia:.
	(4.0)
→ Loren:	Madid in India.
	(0.9)
→ Meg:	°Ma:de. in India not madid,°
Loren:	.hh
Meg:	°in India,°
	(1.2)
Loren:	(you said) m:madid.
	(1.0)
Meg:	You:: shouldn't say madid.
	(0.5)
→ Loren:	Madid in En:gland.
	(0.4)
Loren:	Da–uh i–in In:dia. .hh
	(0.4)
Loren:	°°England .hh°°
	(1.4)
Loren:	They have s::ome, .hh they have them sort of like it in Indee (.) in: England, .hh but it's no:t exactly like it,

(10) [GTS:IV:45]

Roger: Did you have oil in it?

Al: Yeah. I–I mean I changed the oil, put new oil filters, r–
completely redid the oil system, had to put new gaskets

→ on the oil pan to strop–stop the leak, and then I put– and
then–

→ Roger: That was a gas leak.

→ Al: It was an oil leak buddy.

→ Roger: It's a gas leak.

Al: It's an oil leak.
⌈On the number one jug.

Roger: ⌊On the number one jug.

Al: It's an oil leak!

Roger: Outta where. the pan?

Al: Yeah.

Roger: Oh you put a new gasket on it stopped leaking

Al: Uh huh,

Roger: °°(No you didn't have to)°°
⌈Then I–then I had full oil, and I was going up

Al: ⌊Then I–then I had full oil, and I was going up
to Lafayette, at about thirty or forty miles an hour . . .

That is, instead of, say, 'madid', 'made', 'made', in fragment 9 we get 'madid', 'made', 'madid'. And in fragment 10 we find, not 'oil', 'gas', 'gas', but 'oil', 'gas', 'oil'.

These, then, are the three gross features: (1) *Correcting as the current interactional business,* with discontinuation of the ongoing activity, with utterances now occupied by the doing of correcting, (2) *the possibility for attendant activities — Accountings —* which address lapses in competence and/or conduct, and (3) *the presence of the* (X, Y, Y) *series* which constitutes 'correction of one speaker by another' (and its alternative, the (X, Y, X) series via which a proffered correction is rejected).

These features are found in materials collected as instances of *repair,* in which one speaker is correcting another. Now let me turn to an altogether different sort of collection, having to do with *procedures for consecutive reference to same objects.*

One common procedure for consecutive reference to a same object is the following. An object is named, and subsequent reference is done with *proterms.*

(11) [Schenkein:II:61:ST]

*→ Kitty: Don't forget to watch Born Free tonight

Gloria: Oh yeah I know

→ Kitty: Oh I l:loved it.

→ Gloria: Yeah. It was– And we have never seen it.

Miles: Haven't you =

Kitty: =[[Oh you haven't?

→ Miles: ⌊Oh it's great.

Gloria: No::.

Kitty: Oh:: I wish you kids (come to our house)

→ and watch it in colour.

→ Miles: It's a great picture.

Gloria: (   ) in colour?

Kitty: Oh::: yeah.

→ Kitty: =[[Yeah I really liked it.

*→ Stan: ⌊We saw Midnight Cowboy yesterday– or suh– Friday.

Kitty: Oh?

→ Gloria: Did you s– You saw that, =

→ Gloria: =[[It's really good.

→ Kitty: ⌊No I haven't seen it Jo saw it and she said she f– depressed
her terribly

→ Stan: Oh it's terribly depressing
⌈

Gloria: ⌊Oh it's depressing.

This is a particularly 'pure' instance. There are two series in which a movie is named (first, Born Free and then Midnight Cowboy), and each subsequent reference, over a long string of references, across multiple speakers, is done with a proterm (Series 1: 'Don't forget to watch Born Free . . .', 'Oh I loved it', 'And we have never seen it', 'Oh it's great', '. . . watch it in colour', 'It's a great picture', 'Yeah I really liked it'. Series 2: 'We saw Midnight Cowboy . . .', 'You saw that', 'It's really good', 'No I haven't seen it, Jo saw it . . .', 'Oh it's terribly depressing', 'Oh it's depressing').

Another procedure is the following. An initially introduced term is *repeated.*

(12) [GTS:II; 73]

Roger: This is an abnormal session see =

Jim: =[[Yeah,

→ Roger: ⌊We're not together without the broad.

Jim: Yeah.

→ Al: See we gotta have the broad here cause she– she unites
us.   [

Ken: heh

(13) [NB:IV:13:14:ST]

Emma:	So I mean <u>we</u> did a lot of walking arou:nd you know, there's ⌈not much to getting a turkey <u>di</u>nner,
Lottie:	⌊Yuh.
	(0.4)
Lottie:	⌈⌈No.
	<u>D</u>amn turkey'd put it in the hhh thing in the oven and <u>b</u>asting it and everything, and, IT WAS PRETTY <u>GOO</u>:d.
→	<u>V</u>ery very good turkey.
→ **Lottie:**	Where'd you get the <u>tu</u>rkey.
Emma:	Up at the Ferndale Market,

That, is, simply enough, in fragment 12, following the utterance 'We're not together without the broad', we find, not, for example, 'See we gotta have her here . . .', but 'See we gotta have the broad here . . .', a repeat of the prior term. Likewise, in fragment 13, following 'Very very good turkey', we find, not 'Where'd you get it?', but 'Where'd you get the turkey?', a repeat.

And a third sort of procedure is the following. An item is introduced and a next speaker uses an *alternate* from the same syntactic class, or, using the same item, an alternate pronunciation.

(14) [GTS:II:60:ST]

→ **Ken:**	Well– if you're gonna <u>race</u>, the police have said this to us.
Roger:	<u>That</u> makes it even <u>be</u>tter. The <u>cha</u>llenge of running
→	from the <u>cops</u>!

(15) [GJ:FN] ((hardware store: customer trying to match a pipe-fitting))

→ **Customer:**	Mm, the wales are wider apart than that.
→ **Salesman:**	Okay, let me see if I can find one with wider threads.

(16) [TC:II(a):14:21:ST]

Griff:	Well I– uh I didn't know <u>anyone</u>: that knew anything
→	about kilns except <u>you</u>:.
J.R.:	Whhhhuhh<u>h</u>uh .hh <u>A</u>ctually <u>m</u>ost've <u>my</u> experience's
→	been in <u>g</u>as kils though <u>re</u>ally

In fragment 14 we find 'police' followed by 'cops'. In fragment 15, the customer uses 'wales' to refer to the ridges on the pipe, the salesman uses

'threads', referring to the complex of ridge and space. And in fragment 16, we get 'kilns' followed by 'kils'.

It appears, then, that something more than sheer consecutive reference is occurring; i.e. that different, and characterisable work may be done when a proterm is used, or a repeat, or an alternate. For the purposes of this report, I will be focussing on the latter procedure. And it turns out that as the latter three fragments unfold, something interesting happens. When prior speaker talks again, he now produces, not the item (word or pronunciation) he, himself initially used, but that which was used by his co-participant.

(14a) [GTS:II:60:ST]

→ **Ken:**	Well– if you're gonna race, the police have said this to us.
→ **Roger:**	<u>That</u> makes it even <u>be</u>tter. The <u>cha</u>llenge of running from the <u>cops</u>!
→ **Ken:**	The <u>cops</u> say if you wanna race, uh go out at four or five in the <u>mor</u>ning on the freeway . . .

(15a) [GJ:FN]

→ **Customer:**	Mm, the wales are wider apart than that.
→ **Salesman:**	Okay, let me see if I can find one with wider threads ((Looks through stock))
Salesman:	How's this.
→ **Customer:**	Nope, the threads are even wider than that.

(16a) [TC:II(a):14:21:ST]

Griff:	Well I– uh I didn't know <u>anyone</u>: that knew anything
→	about kilns except <u>you</u>:.
J.R.:	Whhhhuhh<u>h</u>uh .hh <u>A</u>ctually <u>m</u>ost've <u>my</u> experience's
→	been in <u>g</u>as kils though <u>re</u>ally
Griff:	I <u>know</u> it. That's what I keep <u>te</u>lling myself. Why the hell do you <u>f</u>ool with an el<u>e</u>ctric ki(h)l when you can get a
→	ga<u>:</u>s kil.

That is, when prior speaker talks again, we find that co-participant's alternative has been consequential in a specific way: it has become a replacement for the initial item, has been adopted by prior speaker. Over and above sheer consecutive reference, then, it appears that when a next speaker produces, not a proterm or a repeat, but an alternative item, *correction* may be underway.

Specifically, we find one of the grossly observable features of the fragments collected as instances of the type of *repair* in which one speaker corrects another. That feature is the (X, Y, Y) series which constitutes 'correction of one speaker by another', via which prior speaker accepts next speaker's proffered correction. In fragment 14a we find 'police', 'cops', 'cops', in fragment 15 a 'wales', 'threads', 'threads', and in fragment 16 a 'kilns', 'kils', 'kils'.

In fragments collected as instances of 'consecutive reference', we can also find instances of the (X, Y, X) series. For example, in the following fragment, while the two participants are asserting agreement with each other, a candidate correction of a peculiar phrasing is offered and rejected in the series ('eve', 'night', 'eve').

(17) [SBL:3:6:4]

Adele:	Do you think they might go tomorrow,
Milly:	Oh I don't think so,
Adele:	Oh dear. They're ([ )
Milly:	[No I don't think until after uh
	(0.2)
Milly:	after New Years now cause uh, New Y– New Years is
→	tomorrow <u>eve</u> [isn't it.
→ **Adele:**	[It's tomorrow <u>night</u> uh huh,
→ **Milly:**	Yeah tomorrow eve,
	(1.5)
Milly:	No. .hhh [Well–
Adele:	[(I'm just) going to go to the neighbours . . .

And in the following fragment, two women are appraising a third. While they are both asserting agreement with each other, and both using positive assessment terms, next speaker's alternate can be seen as a downgrade, prior speaker's as an upgrade, next speaker then preserving the downgrade term ('pretty', 'beautiful', 'pretty').

(18) [NB:PwT:2:ST]

Emma:	Oh <u>honey</u> that was a <u>lovely</u> luncheon I shoulda ca::lled you soo:ner but <u>I</u> l:<u>loved</u> it. It was just deli:ghtfu:l.
Penny:	Well <u>I</u> was gla[d you (came).
Emma:	[And your <u>friends</u> are so da:rli:ng, =
Penny:	= Oh:: it was
→ **Emma:**	That <u>Pa</u>:t isn't she a do:[:ll?
→ **Penny:**	[Yeh <u>i</u>sn't she pretty,
	(.)

→ **Emma:**	<u>Oh</u>: she's a beautiful girl. =
Penny:	= Yeh <u>I</u> think she's a pretty girl[l,
Emma:	[And that <u>Henderson</u>::
	(.)
Emma:	She SCA:RES me.with <u>eigh:t kids</u> . . .

Thus, for both sets of fragments (the 'repair' collection, fragments 3–8, and the 'consecutive reference' collection, in fragments 14a–16a) we find prior speakers changing their terminology following a next speaker's alternative, i.e. we find the (X, Y, Y) series, or we find prior speakers preserving their terminology in the face of a next speaker's alternate (as in 'repair' fragments 9 and 10, and 'consecutive reference' fragments 17 and 18); i.e. we find the (X, Y, X) series. For this one of the three grossly observable features of 'one speaker correcting another', the two collections are similar. It is on the other two features that the two collections part company, and because of that difference that, although similar in one respect, they look so unlike each other.

(1) While the initial collection has the feature that whatever has been going on prior to the offering of a correction is discontinued, in the latter collection the talk in progress continues. The (X, Y, Y) or (X, Y, X) series is embedded into that ongoing talk. That is, the utterances are not occupied by the doing of correcting, but by whatever talk is in progress. Thus, while in the initial collection, correcting has the status of 'the interactional business', in the latter collection, correction occurs, but is not what is being done, interactionally. What we have, then is *embedded correction* as a by-the-way occurrence in some ongoing course of talk.

(2) While the initial collection has the feature that in the course of correcting, as an interactional business, we find attendant activities, 'accountings', which specifically address lapses in competence and/or conduct, embedded correction has no place for such attendant activities. Simply enough, to direct an accusation, apology, etc., to an item in some ongoing talk would necessarily discontinue that ongoing talk, would have utterances now occupied with talk directed to the trouble; i.e. would have that as, now, the interactional business. Thus, *the talk which constitutes 'embedded correction' does not permit of 'accountings'*.

It might be said then, that 'embedded correction' is a means by which correction, and only correction, occurs in contrast to activities recognisable as 'correctings', which permit not only of correction, but of 'accountings'.

The distinction between 'embedded correction' and 'correcting' seems to cut across other sorts of classifications in the organisation of 'repair'. For

example, it holds not only for those instances in which one participant corrects another, but also for the types of materials we glanced at to start off with; i.e. those in which a speaker corrects himself, and those in which a next speaker locates the trouble but leaves it to prior speaker to do the correction. To get a sense of that across-the-board working of 'embedded correction; versus 'correcting', we can notice that a variety of 'accountings' show up in the following fragments, which are all instances of 'correcting', but which can be otherwise classified. For example, we find explanations of the error, ridicule, and apology in the following instances of 'self-correction'.

(19) [GTS:V:29]

Roger:　　The mother isn't holding– the father isn't– ah Freudian
　　　　　　Slip heh heh mother hah hhehh hhhehh

(20) [Agorio:II:223]

Diaz:　　she's the product of a:n incestuous::::°incestuous°
→　　　　I'm sorry hih .hhh em::: ā uh
　　　　　　　　(2.0)
Diaz:　　°mm:::°
Carla:　　°A dul (trous)°
Diaz:　　└relationship with another woman,

And, for example, we find apologies and forgiveness in materials in which a next speaker locates the trouble and prior speaker does the correction.

(21) [SPC:10(a):4:ST]

Desk:　　. . . but it's at– on three o'clock and she might just be free
　　　　　　or between interviews.
　　　　　　　　(1.0)
Mr. O.:　　w–What time is it now sir?
Desk:　　Three isn't it?
　　　　　　　　(0.7)
Mr. O.:　　(We:ll?) I thought it was earlier than tha:t,
　　　　　　　　(0.3)
→ **Desk:**　　It's two o'clock I'm sorry.
Mr. O.:　　Yeah.
→ **Desk:**　　I got the hour wrong. But it's just two. hfhh Okay let me
　　　　　　call her and then you call her in about fifteen or twenty
　　　　　　minutes.

(22) [GTS:II:2:54]

Ken:　　He likes that waiter over there,
Al:　　Wait–er?
→ **Ken:**　　Waitress, sorry,
→ **Al:**　　That's better,

And in the following fragment, a speaker asks for correction, the correction is supplied by another, and prior speaker then initiates ridicule of the error.

(23) [Actors Group:42]

Charles:　　I mean a– even actors are okay if you pick the ones who
　　　　　　are not all hung up in uh you know — wanting — to —
→　　　　well I think you gyrate — not gyrate — is gyrate the
　　　　　　right word?
→ **Lee:**　　Gravitate.
→ **Charles:**　　Gravitate! heh Gyrate hehh
→ **Lee:**　　hehh
→ **Martha:**　　heh ((zig-zag whistling))
Charles:　　gravitate towards the people who are — you know all
　　　　　　involved in in ideas and concepts . . .

That is, once 'correcting' has become the business, there is room for 'accounting', regardless of how or by whom the correction is done.[3]

With these sorts of observations in hand, we might now re-examine our characterisation of these collections. So far we have asymmetrical formulations: 'correcting' and 'embedded correction'. The former names an activity, the latter names a procedure or device. But we can notice that the former is, equally, a device. Where the latter can be observed to be incorporating the correction into ongoing talk, the former can be observed to be isolating the correction, making of it an interactional business in its own right; i.e. exposing it. And, once exposed, the doing of correction can be invested with a set of activities which would otherwise be unavailable; i.e. the 'accountings'.

We have, then, two distinctive forms: *'exposed correction'* and *'embedded correction'* as devices for repairing a problematic item in ongoing talk.

Having located these distinctive forms we can make a further observation on the materials at hand: *Whether he accepts or rejects the correction,*

prior speaker does so in the form initiated by his co-participant. If next speaker produces an utterance which discontinues the ongoing talk and is occupied by the doing of correction, then prior speaker does likewise. If next speaker produces an utterance which is continuous with ongoing talk, which happens to have an alternate item, then prior speaker produces continuous talk which happens to repeat the alternate (or which happens to repeat his own initial item).

This feature is so recurrent and unproblematic that it appears to be a given, an automatic sequence. It is not. The following fragment demonstrates that while next speaker can *initiate* correction in one form, this does not guarantee that prior speaker will follow suit. In this case, a next speaker initiates correction, and does so in 'exposed' form. While prior speaker accepts the replacement item, he does so in the 'embedded' form.

(24) [GTS:IV:23–24(r):ST]

Jim: Like yesterday there was a track meet at Central. Ree:se
         was there. Isn't that a reform schoo:l,
              (0.4)
Jim: Ree:se?
              (.)
Roger: Ye:s.
Ken: [[Yeah.
Jim: Buncha niggers and everything?
Ken: Yeah.
              (0.3)
Jim: He went right down on that fie:ld and he was just sitting
         there talking like a nigger and all the guys (mean) all
→   these niggers are a:ll [up there in–   ]
→ Roger: [You mean Ne]gro: don't you.
              (.)
Jim: Well and [they're all–ih–u] =
Ken: [And Ji:g,
Jim: = They['re– they're A:LL up in the sta:nds you know all
Ken: [hunh
              (.)
Jim: Th:ese guys just (are) completely radical. I think I think
→   Negroes are cool gu:ys you kno:w,
Ken: Some of them yeah.
Jim: s:Some of them yea[:h but when they get in groups.]=
Ken: [The others would just as soon
Ken: = sla[:sh your fa:ce as see you.]
Jim: [forget it you know? hehh]

We get the (X, Y, Y) series, 'nigger', 'Negro', 'Negro'. We also get an exposed-form initiation, 'You mean Negro, don't you' and an embedded-form acceptance; i.e. 'I think Negroes are cool guys' is occupied, not with the doing of 'correcting' (in this case the accepting of a proffered correction), but with some ongoing, 'on-topic' talk. The shift into embedded form proposes to exclude the possibility of 'accountings' *vis-à-vis* the use of the word 'nigger'. It should be noted, however, that while prior speaker rejects the form which provides for 'accountings', he does address the general implications of that form; i.e. that 'nigger' has been seen as a perjorative reference, for which he is being held accountable.

And, although I haven't yet captured an instance, people report occasions on which a next speaker initiates embedded correction and prior speaker, while accepting the correction, rejects the form, shifting into exposed form.[4] For example, they say things like 'That's the word I was looking for!' and go on to explain that they knew the word they were using was wrong, but the right word has slipped their mind. That is, they shift into the device which will provide a place for an accounting, and in the accounting they display that an apparent lapse in competence was, say, nothing of the sort, but a matter of problem-solving ingenuity.

The possibility for rejecting a form initiated by next speaker leads us to see that the recurrent, unproblematic feature, that the interchanges run off in one form or another, but run off in the form initiated by next speaker, is a collaboratively achieved feature of the phenomenon. The interchanges do not simply run off that way; it is not automatic. Rather, not only is it to be worked out, here and now, step by step, whether a correction will be accepted or rejected (or perhaps reconciled, as is a potential in fragment 8, with a decision that both versions are correct), but it is a matter of collaborative, step by step construction that a correction will be an interactional business in its own right, with attendant activities addressing issues of competence and/or conduct, or that correction will occur in such a way as to provide no room for an accounting.

Notes to Chapter 4

1. This paper first appeared in a limited circulation of Studium Linguistik: 14 pp. 58–68, Konigsteinlts, 1983.
2. In his unpublished lectures, Harvey Sacks now and again addresses such issues as, 'asking for a name without outright doing so' (Fall, 1964, Tape 1), 'refusing without observably refusing' (Fall, 1964, Tape 5, side 1), producing information in such a way that is is capturable but not respondable-to, in contrast to announcing it

(Winter, 1970, Lecture 2), indicating, versus asserting, a position (Spring, 1971, April 5, pages 7–9), indicating, versus asserting, a relevance (Spring, 1971, April 23, pages 4–5), musing aloud to elicit but not officially request response (Spring, 1971, May 21, pages 5–6), indicating that one knows what is being talked of without naming it (Fall, 1971, Lecture 3, page 4), showing the 'normalness' of an event without asserting that it was normal (Fall, 1971, Lecture 6, pages 5–11).

3. Such a consideration predicts that we will find cases of embedded self-correction whatever that might look like. One form it might take is that, instead of, say, 'X, I mean Y', we get an 'X' which is not correct or acceptable, incorporated into a list, in which context it becomes a type-instance, not an intended specific; i.e. 'X, or Y, or Z'. In fragment 24, although it is an instance of multi-party work, we find the potential for such a procedure. A speaker says 'nigger' and another initiates correction with 'You mean Negro don't you'. A third participant then says 'And Jig'; i.e. proposes that what is going on is a three-party listing of synonyms (nigger, Negro and Jig), rather than a 'correcting'.

4. This phenomenon can provide a further glimpse into the workings of embedded correction. What we have so far is that embedded correction can be a way of doing correction-and-only-correction; of keeping such issues as incompetence and/or impropriety off the conversational surface. In effect, the embedded form provides the opportunity to correct with discretion. That someone rejects the opportunity to correct with discretion can be accounted for in the following way. Initiation of the embedded form is doing something interactionally. Its very discretion constitutes an implicit account of that which it is being discrete about; i.e. to initiate embedded correction is to *bestow* discretion upon a prior speaker's demonstrated incompetence/misconduct. By accepting the form, prior speaker accepts that implicit account. By rejecting the embedded form and the bestowal of discretion, prior speaker can reject the implicit account carried by that discretion. And by using the form which permits of attendant activities directed to accounting for the item in question, he provides a place in which to offer an alternate to the implicit account.